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WASC Institutional Proposal
For
San Francisco State University

The activities surrounding the new cycle of reaccreditation for San Francisco State University began in Spring 2007 with the WASC Steering Committee. Under the leadership of Provost John Gemello, the Steering Committee developed the SF State Institutional Proposal after an extensive self-review following the WASC guidelines in the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation. This proposal will provide the basis for the Capacity/Preparatory Review, the Educational Effectiveness Review, the visits accompanying each review and the subsequent evaluation by the WASC Commission.

The proposal begins with a description of the SF State context that provided the starting point for the present document. The sections that follow respond to the 2001 WASC recommendations; outline the proposed research questions, work plan and expected outcomes; and address other elements related to the WASC Standards.

Section A. Institutional Context and Relating Proposal to WASC Standards

1. Context

Background
San Francisco State University was founded in 1899 and is the fourth oldest university in the CSU system. The institution is part of the system of state colleges, which was brought together in 1960 and became The California State University in 1982. Today CSU is comprised of 23 institutions, including comprehensive, polytechnic, and maritime universities. The CSU System distinguishes itself from the UC System in the breadth of its mission. As a member of that system, SF State provides access to all students who are qualified for admission at the undergraduate level, while also offering master’s and doctoral level programs. Moreover, the University emphasizes in its mission statement (Appendix B, SF State Mission Statement) a commitment to both quality instruction as well as support for scholarship and creative activities. The breadth and depth of this mission accounts for the enormous richness and variety in the institution and also the many challenges.

SF State Demographics
As an urban institution, SF State has the smallest footprint in the CSU system (142 acres), yet one of the largest enrollments, with a headcount of more than 30,000 students. This figure includes approximately 24,000 undergraduate students and 6,000 graduate students. The institution currently offers baccalaureate degrees in 119 areas, 27 credential programs, 34 certificate programs, 95 master’s degrees, and five doctoral degrees (Appendix C, Degree Programs). In addition to our students, the SF State
community includes over 1,700 faculty and academic staff and approximately 2,000 non-academic staff.

Signature Characteristics
Four distinguishing and interrelated features have shaped the development and define the current circumstances of San Francisco State University: a sense of community identity; a commitment to social justice and diversity; a responsibility for comprehensive programs; and a practice of shared leadership.

A Sense of Community Identity: Located in one of the world’s great cities, SF State sits at the crossroads of high-end technological research, a vibrant cultural center, and the home of many corporate headquarters. The University participates in each of these arenas by offering expertise and educational programs that benefit the entire community. In addition, the new Downtown Campus and the Institute for Civic and Community Engagement demonstrate the institution’s ongoing efforts to strengthen its ties to the community through productive relationships that enhance the quality of life for the entire Bay Area community. Each year over 8,000 SF State students participate in the University’s community partnerships, which provide outreach efforts to schools and social service organizations (CFR 2.11). The faculty is involved in the community as well, participating in economic and technological development, supporting scientific research, and promoting literary and artistic activities (CFR 2.9). As a consequence of this focus, the University was recently included in the new Carnegie classification of “Community Engaged” institutions.

A Commitment to Social Justice and Diversity: Social justice and equity is the signature value of the San Francisco State University campus culture. This value has evolved out of a long history of social activism which has become our campus heritage. Realizing that social justice and equity are ideals that may never be fully realized, SF State nonetheless remains committed to the pursuit of these ideals in the classroom and in scholarship whenever this is possible and appropriate (CFR 1.5). Corollary to this ideal is the belief that diversity is a strength and that diversity and pluralism create opportunities for working in real-world environments and for dealing with complexity.

As scholars, the faculty support research and activities that address issues of structural and social inequality in our community and globally. As educators, the faculty and staff are committed to increasing the competencies that enable our campus community to interact effectively in a diverse environment. Over 100 courses deal specifically with equity and social justice, and thirteen program curricula emphasize these issues. Fifteen centers/institutes promote equity and social justice, and 79% of the faculty surveyed indicate that they embed issues of diversity and social justice in their syllabi. It is not

---

1 “An Engaged Urban University: Equity and Social Justice as Core Values at San Francisco State University.” 2006:63-78.
surprising that San Francisco State has been recognized by *The Princeton Review* as one of 81 “Colleges with a Conscience.”

**A Responsibility for Comprehensive Programs:** As specified in the *California Master Plan for Education*, the CSU institutions have historically focused on undergraduate education, and the enrollment numbers at San Francisco State University still reflect this directive, with 80% undergraduate and 20% graduate students (Fall 2007). Over the years, however, the University’s responsibilities have expanded in many directions. One of our core goals is to serve students who have traditionally not had the opportunity to pursue higher education, and therefore, we provide assistance to students who may be under-prepared for college. At the other end of the spectrum, we now offer doctoral work in applied areas. Great complexity of curricula, staffing, faculty and resources is necessary to support an institution with such breadth and depth.

**A Practice of Shared Leadership:** Throughout the CSU System, there is much discussion about the need for shared governance. At SF State, an established tradition of shared leadership is practiced by and between faculty and administration.

President Robert A. Corrigan and his Cabinet have fostered a sense of common purpose that has sustained the University through difficult political dialogs and lean budget years (CFR 3.10). On a regular basis, the President and the Provost engender on-going communication with faculty and their concerns by meeting regularly with the Academic Senate chair and also the Senate Executive Committee, and by having dinner with all new faculty members. Moreover, faculty, staff, and administration act as equal partners in the SF State Academic Senate where all three have voting members (CFR 1.3, 3.11). The March 2008 Town Hall Meeting on the CSU budget crisis, which included faculty, administrators and California Faculty Association members, is the most recent example of this partnership.

The most visible recent documentation of shared governance at SF State is the 2004 document developed by the Commission on University Strategic Planning (CUSP II). The development of this strategic plan was a two and a half year process that involved all constituency groups in the University community. It articulates seven strategic goals and includes objectives, outcomes, and strategies for achieving those goals. The complex bottom-up approach in creating this planning document has resulted in a pervasive sense of vision and purpose for the campus community and is often invoked by faculty, administration and staff in crafting a rationale for new programs or initiatives (CFR 4.1). The document continues to be a living part of the University through the CUSP II Assessment process that began in 2006 (*Appendix D*, CUSP Assessment Process). The make up of the WASC committees, which include faculty, department chairs, staff, students, and administrators, is another example of this shared sense of responsibility.

**Context of Changes**
The uneven funding of higher education by the State of California has had an impact on the University’s resource planning. In 2003, impending drastic budget cuts due to
economic downturns caused a serious campus-wide discussion regarding the viability of some programs and resulted in the discontinuance of several majors, minors, and programs (CFR 3.5). The University’s budget suffered an additional significant reduction with the incremental decrease in our international student population beginning in 2003 and continuing until the spring of 2006. While all campuses experienced this phenomenon, SF State was particularly impacted, having historically had the largest visa population in the CSU system. Through careful budgetary planning and increasing frugality, the University has managed to stay even with the continuing budget constraints. However, the fiscal situation has forced the System to use recent student fee increases only to replace the lost funding, and the recent higher cost of an education at SF State has not resulted in better services, improved classroom facilities, or a lower student/faculty ratio. In the most recent state budget the University has been hit once again with projected dramatic cuts to the CSU System. This change in the financial context has brought into question the system’s ability to fulfill the CSU and SF State mission of access to all who are qualified.

Despite all these changes, the University has been able to move ahead in many respects. The Office of University Development has created a five-year plan to attract additional support for both graduate and undergraduate students. The University has just completed a Physical Master Plan that increases the enrollment capacity and will provide much needed classroom, faculty, and community spaces. Departments in six of the eight colleges have managed to construct faculty workloads that allow a 9 unit teaching load each semester, which is a 3 unit reduction from a historical norm of 12 units (CFR 3.3). The University has embraced the concept of accountability and has employed a number of institutional assessment measures. In addition, it has developed a philosophy of departmental assessment that encourages processes differentiated to a variety of learning and teaching approaches (CFR 2.3, 2.6). All of this environment sets the stage for the current WASC reaccreditation review.

Responding to Previous Recommendations
Following the 2001 SF State WASC accreditation review, the Commission Action Letter of July 3, 2001 noted three areas for improvement. Specifically responding to the first recommendation in the Action Letter, the University has over the last five years significantly increased the attention given to graduate education. Based on the efforts of a two-year task force, the Academic Senate in Spring 2006 revised its program review policy for the 6th cycle to focus specifically on graduate programs (Appendix E, Sixth Cycle of Program Review Policy and Appendix F, Sixth Cycle Program Review Self-Study Guidelines). The revised policy set a minimum admissions criteria for GPA and writing for all graduate programs, and the 6th Cycle Program Review Handbook created guidelines for student learning outcomes, culminating experience assessment, and indicators of program success (CFR 2.2, 4.4, 4.7). While the University continues to track and respond to the assessment of undergraduate student learning in all programs (CFR 2.7), the special focus on graduate education has assisted the University in developing a shared commitment to graduate culture at SF State (Appendix G, Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and Appendix H, Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators).
The Action Letter also identified two other areas in their recommendations: the need for continued development of program assessment and enhanced support for faculty expertise in student learning outcomes assessment. Since the last review, the University has made great progress in gaining faculty buy-in for assessment. Prior to this year, the campus had one half-time faculty assessment coordinator, and a monolithic assessment process that required all departments to report annually using a prescribed social science model. With the leadership of the Office of Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness and college assessment coordinators with release time, the campus is gradually evolving toward an assessment process that is differentiated to the specific teaching philosophies and needs of each department (CFR 2.3). Departments that have not measured all of their student learning outcomes are required to report each year until they assess them all and are satisfied that their curriculum is effective. Once they reach this point, they are encouraged to conduct mini-studies that focus on pedagogy, reporting biennially. Over the next five years, we expect to put a policy in place that will require programs to revisit their student learning outcomes with any major curricular revision and to assess the new curriculum after two years of implementation. The new cycle is a work in progress. However, we believe that the new cycle will allow for more flexibility in methodologies and will also help keep faculty engaged in issues of assessment once they have confidence in the curriculum (CFR 2.4).

In addition to the assessment work in departments, the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development provides on-going faculty training for assessing student work at the course level (CFR 3.4). Increased numbers of faculty are participating in structured professional development activities sponsored by the Center, improving their knowledge and skills in many areas, including a more intentional development of learning outcomes and more nuanced assessment of student learning.

At the institutional level, the University now regularly administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), both of which played a significant role in this preliminary review. SF State will also be a test site in 2008 for the AASCU-developed survey “Degrees of Preparation.” The University has also administered the Collegiate Learning Assessment, scoring in the 98th percentile of all universities that employed this value-added test. The University also now participates in the Voluntary System of Accountability. Although assessment on this campus has been confined to academic programs in the past, the Divisions of Student Affairs and Business and Finance are in the process of instituting learning outcomes in all units that interface with students. The assessment work in these divisions will be part of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CFR 4.6).

Finally, in June 2007 the SF State doctorate in Educational Leadership received WASC Subchange approval to commence enrolling students in Fall 2007. The Subchange approval Action Letter stipulated that the program should undergo review at the time of the next WASC Accreditation Review. A report on the Educational Leadership Ed.D. will be included in the Fall 2010 CPR report.
2. Process for the Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards

The formal proposal development began in May of 2007 with the formation of the WASC Steering Committee (Appendix I, Committee Membership), which decided to follow a theme-based approach for the review. In order to determine the focus for the themes, the committee undertook a review and analysis of a variety of institutional assessments and data. The work began with a review of the assessment reports from the CUSP II Strategic Planning Assessment Working Groups (Appendix J, CUSP II Assessment Reports). These reports included discussion of the CUSP II goals on social justice and equity, post-baccalaureate education, and internationalization. The committee also heard progress reports from the working groups currently assessing the goals on writing and community engagement (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). In addition, the committee examined and discussed data from the most recent NSSE and FSSE surveys and institutional reports on enrollment, graduation and retention (CFR 2.10, 4.4, 4.5).

Several major university initiatives that have been underway for some time seemed potential candidates as WASC themes, so the committee invited representatives from those initiatives to report on their progress. These initiatives included the Task Force on Graduation Requirements, the Transformation of Curricula, and the E-Portfolio Development (CFR 4.2, 4.7).

In addition to reviewing established processes and special initiatives, we also conducted a comprehensive self-review under the WASC Standards. The Steering Committee members formed four sub-committees, each assigned to one standard. Each committee consulted with multiple constituencies throughout the University community to gather the data (Appendix K, WASC Standards and Criteria for Review; Appendix L, WASC Research Questions Matched to the Standards).

As the work progressed, consensus evolved around two issues that were profoundly apparent in the data analysis. The first issue is the changing profile of the University community among both students and faculty, and the second issue is student success. Both topics encouraged us to be forward thinking about where the University was moving and how to help faculty, staff and students as we go forward. These discussions, however, always seemed to take us back to our institutional values. Again and again, we would come back to the issues of social justice, equity, and civic engagement and how we could keep and foster those values in the face of great change, and so Social Justice, Equity, and Civic Engagement became our third theme.

In order to verify our sense of purpose, the committee developed and distributed two electronic surveys, one to students and another to university faculty, staff, and administration (CFR4.8; Appendix M, WASC Survey Summary). The surveys asked open-ended questions as a way of determining the issues most salient to each group. Over 2500 students and 300 faculty, staff, and administration responded to the survey. The response indicated that social justice, equity, and civic engagement are clearly institutional values that are embraced by all constituency groups. While resources and
budget issues were the most frequently named concerns, the concrete issues associated with resources were related to the increasing and changing population of students and graduation and retention. For example, the need for more classes and smaller classes, the need for more co-curricular activities, and improving graduation and retention were often named as areas that needed attention. The surveys reconfirmed our choice of themes.

In January of 2008 a subgroup of the committee attended the WASC proposal Workshop and in the Spring of 2008, members of the Committee and other faculty attended the 2008 WASC Annual Meeting. Following those meetings, subgroups were formed to develop and refine the research questions for the three themes. Over the spring and the summer of 2008, the Committee further articulated outcomes for the review and refined the format as a series of essay topics with specific questions for inquiry.

At the beginning of the Fall 2008 semester, activities focused on broad communication of the vision and specific outcomes for the self-review. The basic timeline and work plan for the entire accreditation review were shared with governance bodies and revisions continued through September. The Academic Senate, the President, and the President’s Cabinet formally endorsed the final draft of the Proposal in October 2008.

Section B. Framing the Review Process

1. Overview

The overarching goal of SF State’s accreditation process is institutional improvement that leads directly to enhanced student learning. The three themes emanate out of that commitment and what we have learned through the preliminary self-review over the past year.

Based on the current context and looking forward to the future, the WASC Steering Committee has identified three special themes based on a year-long institutional investigation. These themes will form the foundation for our work and subsequent reports for the 2010 and 2011 WASC reaccreditation visits:

- **Theme 1: Institutionalizing the Commitment to Social Justice, Equity, and Civic Engagement.** To further our commitment to these institutional values, we aim to improve the integration of subject matter in these areas into the curricula.

- **Theme 2: Facing the Challenges of a Changing University Faculty and Student Profile.** Over the past five years, SF State has experienced great changes in the faculty and the student body. We will investigate these changes in order to understand the new and different needs of both students
and faculty: how they teach and learn, how they live, and how they interact with one another.

- **Theme 3: Facilitating Student Success in the 21st Century.** A variety of data sets and information have indicated a need to clearly define student learning outcomes at the baccalaureate level and to improve our understanding of student learning in the disciplines at the graduate level.

All three themes aim to enhance the educational experience of both undergraduate and graduate students, and all include analysis, implementation and assessment components. Each theme is presented as follows. First, background and contextual material are provided to explain the importance of the theme for SF State at this time. Second, the specific research questions that will be addressed in both the CPR and the EER are presented, and finally the expected outcomes for each set of questions and the focus of the essays will be outlined.

### 2. Approach for the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

The findings and work of the WASC review will be reported in three essays in each of the two reviews (CPR and EER). A faculty chair will oversee the effort for the CPR with specific subcommittees for the essays of the three themes. Likewise, the EER will have a faculty chair who oversees the work of that review and coordinates specific subcommittees for each theme essay of the review. The essay teams will pursue lines of inquiry based on the research questions for each theme. The essays in the CPR will evaluate data that lead to initiatives for the EER. For each essay in the EER, specific research questions, methods of inquiry, and indicators will be identified to structure the evidence for educational outcomes tied to each theme.

**Theme One: Institutionalizing the Commitment to Social Justice, Equity, and Civic Engagement**

SF State prides itself on its identity as an institution that values social justice, equity, and civic engagement. This identity permeates the University in mission statements, strategic planning, addresses by administrators, and in curricular design. As part of the ongoing SF State Strategic Plan Assessment process, a Progress Report on Goal 1, Social Justice and Equity, was prepared (See Section A, [Appendix J](#)). It details the many successes and some of the challenges related to social justice and equity issues at the university and makes recommendations for next steps.

Some of the leading civic engagement activities of the university are described in [SFSUperlatives](http://www.sfsu.edu/~news/superlatives/resources.htm). Evidence abounds to suggest that the focus on social justice, equity, and civic engagement is a primary reason individuals choose to study or work at San Francisco State University.
Our commitment to preserving these core values as the institution changes led us to choose social justice, equity, and civic engagement as a WASC theme.

*Capacity Issue C1a: To what extent does the institution’s infrastructure support issues of social justice, equity, and civic engagement?*

We will analyze changes in recruitment, retention and advancement for students, faculty, staff and administrators, as well as policies and procedures governing these issues (CFR 3.1). We will implement an environmental audit to determine factors that impact the choice of SF State as a place to study or work (4.4, 4.5). We will identify programs focused on recruiting and/or training diverse students and faculty, and we will also identify professional development activities for staff and administrators (CFR 1.5, 3.2). Some of these data already exist and some will be gathered during the CPR. For example, we know that much work in these areas currently exists, but our evidence is mostly anecdotal. We do not have sufficient systems in place for collecting the data, and we do not have a process for on-going assessment. Moreover, the recent CUSP II assessment concluded that infrastructure to support this issue is lacking. We also intend to hold a number of focus groups in order to construct a more informed picture of the current environment. The work in this area will overlap with the work on Student Success.

We will also perform an audit of the university units that engage in outreach to the community in order to increase connections to the broader community. The data analysis here will include a review of annual reports from university institutes and centers, advancement activities, strategic planning progress reports on Social Justice and Equity, and college annual reports. The CPR will also review administrative decisions regarding resource allocations for initiatives linked to social justice, equity, and civic engagement.

Finally, the analysis will also include data on student participation in Community Service Learning, which is currently being gathered.

*Expected Outcomes:* We expect to find that some institutional changes have been made to better implement the goals of social justice, equity, and civic engagement, while in other areas (e.g., faculty reward structures) more support could be provided.

While the Capacity Review will provide a better picture of the ways the institution fosters the values of social justice, equity, and civic engagement, the Educational Effectiveness Review will examine the products of these values in the curriculum, student and faculty scholarly activities, and learning outcomes.

*Educational Effectiveness Issue E1a: To what extent have the goals of providing students, faculty, and staff with experiences that reflect the values of social justice, equity, and engagement in the broader community been demonstrated?*
In the EE Review, we will examine proposals for new courses and curricular changes and faculty participation in professional development activities aimed at teaching about social justice and/or civic engagement (CFR 2.3, 2.4). We will also examine the progress on incorporating practices of universal design for learning into pedagogy. The subcommittee will examine student work products from the American Ethnic and Racial Minorities (AERM) and Cultural, Ethnic, or Social Diversity (CESD) general education requirements. (CFR 2.6)

In the area of student and faculty research and scholarship, we will examine faculty-student collaborations in research and scholarly activities and identify themes of grants funded through the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (CFR 2.8). We know from preliminary review that these activities are occurring. However, we do not know if the work is consistent across colleges and if the efforts are “good enough” to satisfy this strategic priority. We will examine participation in specialized student research opportunities such as Career Opportunity in Research (COR), and we will review presentations at CSU and local student research conferences.

With regard to assessment, we will examine the data gathered from the assessment of the social justice and civic engagement graduation requirements that are currently in development (CFR 2.3, 2.4). We will have conversations with departments that have developed direct measures of student learning outcomes reflective of the values of social justice, equity, and civic engagement in order to determine what their measures indicate (CFR 2.6). Through focus group discussions with students, we will learn about their opportunities to engage with the surrounding community through service or service learning and what they have learned. Through discussions with alumni, we will investigate how the institutional focus on social justice and civic engagement has impacted their lives and their careers.

Expected Outcomes: We expect to find that the values of social justice, equity, and civic engagement permeate the curriculum and the research and scholarly activity of students and faculty. We expect that the values will be only partially reflected in the assessment of student learning outcomes.

**Theme Two: Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile**

Over the past eight years, enrollments at SF State have increased substantially while the State funding has fluctuated dramatically. In Fall 2001, total full time equivalent enrollment for the academic year was approximately 20,000 students. By Fall 2007, that number had risen to 24,500 students. Moreover, the Fall 2008 freshman class has increased by 12% over the previous year. The increases in enrollment have been complicated by the uneven distribution of students in colleges and majors. Some of the departments severely affected by the enrollment surge have filed petitions to declare impaction of the major, which would allow them to impose additional enrollment criteria.
The University has been reluctant to allow impaction program-by-program because of the uncertainty regarding the campus-wide consequences of such an action.

In addition to the overall enrollment numbers, analysis of several data sets led the Steering Committee to conclude that the University is in the process of a major transformation with regard to the population characteristics of faculty and students. The enrollment data and the NSSE data clearly demonstrated that SF State has a new population of students who are more traditional than the student populations of the past. An increase in freshmen has created a student body that works less, commutes less, and is younger than past students. Moreover, the FSSE data demonstrated equally clearly that the faculty were unaware of this change (Appendix N, NSSE/FSSE results). Furthermore, data on the faculty revealed that over 50% of the faculty have been hired within the past five years and also 54% of the faculty are commuters. It appears that SF State may be evolving toward a more residential student body, while most faculty are commuting.

**Capacity Issue C2a:** How should the University respond to increasing student enrollment with uneven distribution across majors and class levels? (CFR 4.2, 4.4, 4.5)

a. What should be the University’s over-arching enrollment strategy?
b. Have all allowable controls been exhausted in order to manage current enrollment pressures?
c. Should the University request permission from the Chancellor’s Office to impose additional admissions criteria through impaction status?
d. What would be the consequences of additional admission criteria?
e. How might enrollment controls affect faculty workload?

**Expected Outcomes:** With the limitations of space and resources, we expect that some type of enrollment management strategies will need to be developed in the immediate future. There is some concern on campus that enrollment controls could impact the diversity of the student body, possibly affecting the University’s mission of social justice and equity, but there is equal concern about faculty workload and student learning.

**Educational Effectiveness Issue E2a:** How would the imposition of additional admission requirements affect the learning experience of students? (CFR 2.1, 2.3, 2.10, 4.2, 4.3)

a. Would enrollment controls at the undergraduate level affect resources available to graduate programs?
b. Would enrollment controls lead to cohorted programs, possibly improving student learning?
c. Has student learning been affected in the four SF State impacted programs or at other CSU impacted campuses?
**Expected Outcome:** It is expected that enrollment controls will have an impact on student learning. However, it is unclear what that impact will be and how the impact might change the current character and mission of the University.

**Capacity Issue C2b:** In what ways has the campus changed over the past ten years? (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5)

a. What story emerges from the data on student enrollment and university employment?
b. Where do students, faculty, and staff live now compared with ten years ago?
c. How has the campus focus changed?
d. How has the campus physical landscape changed?
e. What are the social, technological, economic, environmental, and political changes that have shaped the University?
f. What are the current learning styles and preferences of the students?
g. Have their educational goals changed?
h. To what extent do faculty work from remote (non-campus) locations?
i. How has the distribution of students in majors, colleges, and class levels changed since the last WASC review?

**Expected Outcome:** We expect to find either that the student body is evolving toward a traditional student population or that we have two distinct populations of students at SF State, a large group of traditional students and a large group of first generation college students who live at home and have work and family responsibilities that compete with their educational goals. We also expect to find altered learning styles given the New Millennial students now on campus.

**Educational Effectiveness E2b:** As the student population changes, how are their learning needs different? (CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

a. How is the University changing its curricula and pedagogy to reflect any changes in learning styles?
b. Have curricula changed to reflect the University’s values?
c. Have University student learning goals kept pace with changes in society, with technology, with the job market, with student expectations, and different faculty?
d. Has the University kept up with student needs outside the classroom? What co-curricular and extra-curricular activities need to be added?

**Expected Outcome:** We expect to find that students now learn in ways that are different from previous populations of students. We expect that the University will need to make adjustments in pedagogy, technology, and perhaps curricula to facilitate student learning more effectively.
**Capacity Issue C2c: What is the impact of the significant faculty hiring at SF State as a previous generation of faculty has retired? (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.7)**

a. What, if any, changes in faculty workload have developed over time?
b. Have faculty perceptions of their responsibilities changed?
c. How are class schedules developed?
d. Who teaches General Education, the major courses, and graduate courses?
e. Are new faculty members aware of the mission, goals and values of SF State?
f. How has the change in the balance of assistant, associate, and full professors affected faculty participation in service to the university?

**Expected Outcome:** As a result of intentional institutional changes, including a revised RTP policy, a reduced teaching load, and increased internal support, we expect to find that current faculty are more committed to research and scholarly activities and include their research and scholarship more in their teaching. We also expect to find that perceptions of the importance of certain aspects of the SF State culture are different among various faculty cohorts.

The CPR essay will focus on the capacities necessary to serve the needs of both students and faculty and the changes required for curricula and pedagogy to best promote student learning.

**Educational Effectiveness Issue E2c: How has the hiring of new faculty affected student learning? (CFR 2.9, 3.2, 3.3, 4.6)**

a. What curricular changes have been initiated by new faculty?
b. What courses are no longer offered because of retirements?
c. Do the teaching approaches of the new faculty match the learning style preferences of the New Millennial students?
d. How is the University supporting the on-going development of teaching and pedagogy for new faculty?

**Expected Outcome:** We expect that many of the programs on campus have evolved as new faculty have been hired. It is likely that these new faculty, like all of us, are relatively unaware of changing learning approaches and will need assistance to match their own teaching approaches to student needs.
The EER essay will report on changes made to address the findings from the CPR review and how these changes have impacted student learning.

Both essay teams will use University data sets, special studies, and focus groups to examine the research questions.

**Theme Three: Facilitating Student Success in the 21st Century**

Driving the entire WASC review process is SF State’s commitment to ensuring the success of our students. We know that our intentions are good and that many of our programs and initiatives are geared toward facilitating student success, but we also know there is much more we can do. Over the past several years, the institution has already put in place four specific initiatives geared toward improving student success at the capacity level. We propose to continue these efforts in the pursuit of student success.

1. **Assessment**: Every academic program is involved in assessment, focusing much attention on student learning. During the Capacity/Preparatory Review Student services units will develop assessment processes for all student service units that interface with students. The current program review cycle is focusing solely on graduate programs after many years of attending largely to undergraduate education.

*Capacity Issue C3a*: Does the current program level assessment process give us the appropriate information regarding student learning? (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7) What processes need to be implemented in order to assess the impact of student services on student learning? (2.10, 2.11, 2.13)

Expected Outcomes: With regard to the first question, we expect results to vary from one discipline to another. We expect that some departments will use assessment results to make changes in the assessment process while others will be using the results to make changes in curricula and teaching pedagogy. With regard to the second question, we expect student service units to implement learning oriented assessment processes. We also expect to find that for many students, transformational learning occurs outside of the classroom.

The CPR essay will focus on the capacities necessary to serve the needs of students and the changes required to best promote student learning.

*Educational Effectiveness Issue E3a*: What does the program level assessment data tell us about student learning across departments and disciplines? How have changes based on results from the evaluation of student learning impacted academic programs and student services? (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13)
The EER essay will focus on changes that have been made and how they have had an impact on student learning and the student experience.

2. **Writing:** After an external review of our writing programs in 2003, a university-wide Writing Task Force was created by the Provost and Academic Senate in 2004 to make recommendations on how the campus could transform the role of writing at the University. Also in 2004, the University’s strategic planning process identified student writing as a strategic priority. SF State has begun to implement the recommendations regarding writing by replacing remedial English courses for incoming freshmen with college-level Integrated Reading-Writing (IRW) courses, hiring a Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Discipline (WAC/WID) director, revising the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), and implementing graduate level writing requirements.

*Capacity Issue C3b:* Complete the implementation of the recommendations by the Writing Task Force, initiate the WAC/WID program, and initiate the graduate writing requirements in accordance with the 6th cycle of program review guidelines. (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.10, 3.4)

Expected Outcome: Implementation of changes to the GWAR and WAC/WID, and the 6th cycle of program review.

The CPR essay will describe the implementation of these programs.

*Educational Effectiveness Issue E3b:* Assess the impact of the changes to the GWAR and the implementation of WAC/WID. Assess graduate education across departments within colleges. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

The EER essay will focus on the assessment results and any necessary changes indicated from the assessment.

3. **Retention and Graduation:** The Facilitating Graduation Task Force (FGTF) was created by the Provost and Academic Senate in January 2005 and was charged to answer two questions: 1) What can we as a campus do to improve students’ progress to degree? 2) Is there anything we are doing as a campus to impede students’ progress? From this study we learned that in academic programs, we need to identify bottleneck courses and help faculty and students do a better job of planning (Appendix O, Facilitating Graduation Report 2006, 2007). The FGTF began work that needs to be continued in order to improve the University’s graduation rates. For example, we need to find out more about which students are not graduating by disaggregating our data and what obstacles they encounter. We also need to understand the habits and practices of successful students and how we might teach these habits to less successful students.
Capacity Issue C3c: Are different populations of students succeeding at similar or different rates? Are resources being deployed appropriately to ensure that different populations succeed at similar rates? (CFR 1.5, 2.10, 4.5, 4.7)

We will examine data on graduation/retention disaggregated by age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic background, part-time/full-time, language background, native/transfer, remedial/college-ready, and major choice. Enrollment Management already has disaggregated longitudinal data on continuation rates. We will use multivariate and correlation analysis of the data over time and compare this data to other CSU campuses. We will implement a mini-study on what makes successful students successful.

Expected Outcomes: Successful students have come to college with the skills to succeed or have found a way to navigate the bureaucracy to get the assistance they need. Students who are not achieving success at SF State are hindered or slowed by a lack of academic preparation in high school, the need to remediate in their first years on campus, and the challenges of focusing on academic work when job and family responsibilities draw them away from their studies. Students are also hindered in highly enrolled majors by the lack of space in prerequisite and required courses.

The CPR essay will focus on identifying the disparities and recommending activities or policy changes to reduce the disparity in graduation rates.

Educational Effectiveness Issue E3c: What have we done to respond to the disparities in graduation rates? How have various initiatives affected the disparities? (CFR2.1, 2.10, 2.13)

The EER essay will focus on the assessment of initiatives implemented. For example, if we find that language background impacts graduation, we might create support networks for multi-lingual speakers and then assess the impact of the support.

4. Graduation Requirements Task Force: The undergraduate all-university graduation requirements have been in place since 1981. In 2006, the FGTF worked in conjunction with the Academic Senate to propose a review of graduation requirements, including general education and all additional requirements. This review led to an external review of our requirements and to the creation of the Graduation Requirements Task Force (GRTF), which has been working for the past two years to create institutional learning goals. The Task Force has completed a Vision Statement (Appendix P, SF State Vision Statement on Baccalaureate Learning) for the baccalaureate degree and has a draft of a new structure for learning at the baccalaureate level (Appendix Q, Draft Structure for Baccalaureate Learning).

Capacity Issues C3d: Completion and approval of undergraduate learning outcomes, implementation of a revised General Education program, and approval of
an assessment process for the undergraduate learning outcomes. (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10)

Expected Outcomes: We expect that the GRTF will complete the learning outcomes and the Academic Senate will approve the outcomes by Spring 2009. Implementation of the revised General Education program will commence in Fall 2010. Implementation of the General Education assessment process will begin in Fall 2011.

The CPR essay will present the new learning outcomes, describe the revised General Education program, explain the process of recertifying courses, and describe the assessment process, along with its governance structure.

*Educational Effectiveness Issue E3d: Do the results of the General Education assessment reflect satisfactory achievement of student learning? (CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.6)*

The EER essay will present the results and analysis of the first segment of the revised General Education assessment.

We plan to examine data from program reviews, gateway courses, culminating experiences, e-portfolios, and theses. What currently exists in the all-university experience as well as in individual programs? Do we provide services to students that ensure their success?

Expected Outcomes: We expect to find that students’ obligations outside the classroom and their preparation for university study may have an impact on their responses to these questions.

**Section C. Demonstrating a Feasible Plan of Work**

1. **Work Plan and Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>Appointment of WASC Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007 – Spring 2008</td>
<td>Preliminary Self-Study by WASC Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008 – Fall 2008</td>
<td>Drafting the WASC Institutional Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August –September 2008</td>
<td>Vetting of WASC Institutional Proposal to Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>Approval of WASC Institutional Proposal by Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>Approval of WASC Institutional Proposal by President Corrigan and the Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2008</td>
<td>Submission of Institutional Proposal to WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>Dr. Judi Strebel, Faculty Chair of CPR, convenes the CPR Subcommittees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>Conference call with WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>Theme Subcommittees convene and organize their work. Each theme holds a focus group at the All-University Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009-Spring 2009</td>
<td>Theme Subcommittees gather and analyze data. Dr. Michelle Wolf, EER Faculty Chair, convenes the EER theme subcommittees. CPR Theme Subcommittees meet with the EER Theme subcommittees to orient them to the work. They will share data and findings as their work progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009 – Fall 2009</td>
<td>CPR Theme Subcommittees draft essays for the CPR report and pass recommendations along to the EER subcommittees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>CPR Committee Completes report. WASC CPR visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>EER Subcommittees gather and analyze data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>EER Subcommittees draft EER essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>Submit EER essays to WASC. WASC EER visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Budget Appendix for overlap between the CPR and the EER.

### 2. Effectiveness of Data Gathering Analysis Systems

The collection and analysis of data takes place through The University Institutional Research Consortium, which has representation from four offices at SF State. [Enrollment Management](http://www.sfsu.edu/~admisrec) manages the University’s
SIMS database and keeps track of enrollment data; scheduling data; transcripts; and a common set of data on students and faculty. University and Budget Planning ([http://www.sfsu.edu/~ubp/data.htm](http://www.sfsu.edu/~ubp/data.htm)) keeps records on budgets, finances, and space and is implementing the Voluntary System of Accountability. The Division of Graduate Studies ([http://www.sfsu.edu/~gradstdy/grad-advising.htm](http://www.sfsu.edu/~gradstdy/grad-advising.htm)) also maintains a real-time database on graduate student enrollment, graduation numbers, and the progress on individual applications. Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness ([http://www.academic.sfsu.edu/apee/planning](http://www.academic.sfsu.edu/apee/planning)) maintains a website that provides information in report form over time on faculty workload and enrollment disaggregated by gender and ethnicity ([http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment](http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment)). This office also analyzes institutional assessment data including the NSSE, FSSE, and CLA and the assessment of the University’s strategic plan. University program reviews and departmental assessments are administered in APEE, and the semi-annual student opinion survey (PULSE) is also conducted and analyzed by this office. The four offices will work together on the collection and analysis required in both the CPR and EER.

3. Commitment of Resources

See Appendix R, WASC Budget.

Section D. Presenting Appendices Connected to the Proposal

1. The required data exhibits are in Appendix S.
2. The Stipulation Agreement is in Appendix T.
3. The Financial Audit Statements are in Appendix U.
4. The University Organization Charts are in Appendix V.
5. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree programs are listed in Appendix W.