
Capacity and Preparatory Review

<http://wasc.sdsu.edu>

Submitted to the
Western Association of
Schools and Colleges

August 2004



**SAN DIEGO STATE
UNIVERSITY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW	
Introduction	2
<u>Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives</u>	3
<u>Essay 1a: From the Revolving Door to the Corridor to Graduation: How Do We Balance Issues of Access, Retention, and Graduation?</u>	3
<u>Essay 1b: Expanding Our Horizons: Educating Students for the Global Community</u>	7
<u>Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions</u>	10
<u>Essay 2a: The Learning-Centered University</u>	10
<u>Essay 2b: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity</u>	15
<u>Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability</u>	18
<u>Essay 3a: Using Our Resources Wisely</u>	18
<u>Essay 3b: An Organization Built Upon Shared Governance</u>	22
<u>Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement</u>	27
<u>Essay 4a: Shifting to a Culture Based on Evidence</u>	27
<u>Essay 4b: Assessing Writing Competency and Proficiency</u>	30
Concluding Essay	32
RESPONSE TO 1997 VISIT	36
SUMMARY DATA FORM	48

A University in Transition: Changes Since Submission of the Institutional Proposal

San Diego State University submitted its Institutional Proposal to WASC in October 2001 and it was accepted in December 2001. The proposal, written during a time of transition for WASC, took into account both the emerging guidelines and the previous WASC focus on compliance and accountability. In order to involve faculty, staff, and students and to engage in a process that was open, inclusive, and grounded in a culture of inquiry and evidence, President Weber appointed a WASC Coordinating Committee in the summer of 2002. This committee, comprised of 20-22 faculty, staff, administrators, and students, began meeting in August of the same summer.

Our work began with a two-day retreat followed by frequent campus meetings. In the first several months, the Committee worked to understand the new WASC processes and also began to focus more on questions and less on compliance, more on inquiry and the use of evidence and less on issues of accountability. Our aim was to develop a Capacity and Preparatory Review that not only demonstrated that we met the four WASC standards but also one that clearly identified salient institutional issues to be explored in-depth during the Educational Effectiveness phase of re-accreditation. Consequently, the Committee looked at the history of the institution, at the major forces that have shaped who we are and who we are becoming, and at the institutional challenges we face.

Through this work the Coordinating Committee developed a Working Paper as an addendum to the Institutional Proposal. This Paper identified three major issues on which we wished to focus: a) student learning; b) the balance among access, retention, and graduation; and c) the integration of undergraduate students into research activities and the impact of such activities on learning outcomes. These issues provide the link between the Institutional Proposal, the Capacity and Preparatory Review, and the Educational Effectiveness Report.

Student Learning. Student learning is our central purpose as a University and it is critical that students graduate with the knowledge, skills, and abilities they should have upon graduation. Today's world has become increasingly diverse, technological, and complex and our learning outcomes will play a critical role in ensuring that our graduates can become successful citizens. The re-accreditation process allows us to examine our practices and programs for the role they play in improving student learning.

Access, Retention, and Graduation. Like all higher education institutions in California, SDSU is experiencing enrollment pressures while concomitantly facing severe budgetary reductions. In response, SDSU has implemented a number of practices to serve our students within our resource constraints. Two of these practices, enrollment management and improved preparation of entering first-year and transfer students have had positive effects. While both retention and graduation rates have been increasing, we have much to do, especially in regard to graduation rates. The re-accreditation process affords us the opportunity to examine the impact of our current policies and procedures on access, retention, and graduation rates of all our students.

Undergraduate and Graduate Education. And third, San Diego State University has integrated into its historic teaching mission an expanding emphasis on research. This changing emphasis is evidenced in the increase in graduate degree programs and particularly joint-doctoral programs, the profiles of recently hired faculty, and the trajectory of increases in research funding by faculty. This increase in research productivity provides numerous opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to engage in research, yet it also means that faculty roles are changing. The re-accreditation process allows us to examine the extent to which undergraduate students are engaged in research activities and the impact these activities have on student learning.

The three themes we have selected to guide our thinking as we prepare the Educational Effectiveness Report are central to our institutional mission. The most recent challenges brought on by the California budget crisis have, and will, inevitably impact us. However, the Capacity and Preparatory Review demonstrates that we have the capacity to make adjustments to the unavoidable ebb and flow of financial support from the state of California while continuing to make progress toward our institutional goals.

Introduction

The Capacity and Preparatory Review is organized around a series of essays. These essays have been written to achieve two purposes. First, the essays align with the WASC standards and demonstrate that SDSU fulfills the core commitment to institutional capacity. Second, they allow us to reflect on how our core commitment to capacity shapes our institutional approach to the three challenges identified as the most pressing for SDSU. It is these challenges that we will explore in-depth and return to in the Educational Effectiveness Report as we reflect on our progress toward becoming a learning organization.

Standard 1, "Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives," is addressed in two essays. The first essay, "From the Revolving Door to the Corridor to Graduation," describes changes in policies, procedures, and organization that have taken place to address the issues of access, retention, and graduation. In the Educational Effectiveness Report we will return to these issues to examine the effectiveness of our policies and programs. The second essay, "Expanding Our Horizons: Educating Students for the Global Community" describes three initiatives that illustrate our commitment to student engagement in local and global communities.

Standard 2, "Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions," is addressed in two essays, "The Learning-Centered University" and "Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity." Essay 2a describes our capacity to examine student learning in the General Education program and our majors while Essay 2b describes our capacity to examine the integration of undergraduate students into research activities and the effect of these activities on student learning. Both of these essays are linked to topics we will discuss further in the Educational Effectiveness Report.

Standard 3, "Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability" is also addressed in two essays, "Using Our Resources Wisely" and "An Organization Built Upon Shared Governance." These essays illustrate our progress in using planning processes to achieve our institutional goals. The 1997 WASC Site Visit Report cited planning and governance as two areas meriting attention.

Standard 4, "Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement," is addressed in two final essays. The first essay, "Shifting to a Culture Based on Evidence," describes the alignment of Academic Plans and Academic Reviews, two processes used in examining the academic excellence of our programs. This essay also describes the reorganization of the Division of Student Affairs and its commitment to create a structure that supports student learning. The second essay, "Assessing Writing Competency and Proficiency," describes the changes that have taken place in the assessment of writing competency and proficiency at both matriculation and the upper division level.

Each of the essays has been written in reference to a particular standard. Yet their complexity invites cross-references to other standards. To assist the reader, we have listed the specific Standard, Criteria for Review, and Questions for Institutional Engagement that are relevant to each essay. Within each essay we have also embedded links to additional information. A concluding essay summarizes our findings in regard to our capacity and readiness for the Educational Effectiveness phase. The appendices contain the Required Data Elements tables, the Stipulated Policies, additional evidence relevant to each of the four standards, and our response to the last WASC visit.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Reflective Essay 1a: From the Revolving Door to the Corridor to Graduation: How Do We Balance Issues of Access, Retention, and Graduation?

Introduction

Since 1960, the campuses of the California State University have implemented the California Master Plan for Higher Education that promised admission to the CSU to first-time freshmen from the top one-third of all graduates of California public high schools and transfers from California community colleges with junior standing and a minimum 2.0 GPA. However, in 1996, concurrent with Dr. Weber's presidency at SDSU, there were strong signs that the CSU, and most dramatically SDSU, would no longer be able to accommodate all eligible applicants. Campus discussions began regarding how to manage enrollment in light of the impending influx of students, commonly known as "Tidal Wave II." These discussions have been challenging as the issues of managing enrollment and maintaining student access often appear at odds with one another. Having suffered serious problems with unfunded enrollment and budget reductions in the early 1990s, SDSU wanted to ensure that history would not repeat itself.

This essay discusses our capacity to address issues related to access, retention, and graduation. The essay is divided into sections to address each of these three issues for the sake of reader clarity; we know, however, that these issues are complex and interwoven. That is, a policy change we make to enhance one area may affect our progress in another area. We will return to explore in detail the challenge of balancing access, retention, and graduation in the Educational Effectiveness Report.

Admission Policy Changes: Enrollment Management and Issues of Access

[CFRs: 1.1 & Q4; 2.14; 3.7 & Q1, Q4; 4.2].

CSU policy defines a campus as "impacted" when it receives more applications during a defined application period than it can accommodate. An impacted campus may use supplemental admissions criteria as part of a planned enrollment management strategy. SDSU sought authority to manage its enrollment growth when it became clear that it was not funded at a level that would meet the needs of all CSU-eligible students who wished to enroll. For example, in 1996-97 SDSU was over-enrolled by 1,048 FTES at an unfunded cost of \$5.6 million; in 1997-98 there were 1,157 excess FTES at an unfunded cost of \$6.2 million. At the time, there were few tools to manage enrollments other than becoming an impacted campus. The most obvious, closing the application filing period early, was implemented in November 1996 for fall 1997 admission. Yet undergraduate applications to SDSU continued to grow. From fall 1998 to fall 2004 applications increased by 73%--from 25,536 to 44,235 for about 6,000 - 7,000 spaces. It was clear that additional measures were necessary if we were to continue to provide a quality education to our students.

Campus-wide discussions about impaction began in September 1996. As we will discuss further in Essay 3b, the SDSU Senate recommended seeking impaction status in March 1997 and developed the "Principles to Guide Impaction." These principles include: a) our commitment to provide the greatest possible access for qualified students with the funds available to us; b) our commitment to search for new ways to provide access; c) our commitment to maintain the rich diversity of our student population; d) the importance of using a consultative process including both on and off-campus constituents; and e) the implementation of an annual review of the effects of our enrollment management policies. In April 1997 the "80/20" admission model was approved by the University Senate, meaning that 80% of students would be admitted based on their academic preparation while the remaining 20% would be admitted based on supplementary criteria including special talent, local residency, socio-economic status and other factors. The Chancellor's office approved campus impaction in June 1997 and it was implemented in 1999. Prior to campus impaction, entry into some high demand majors has been impacted since the 1980's. Concurrent with the advent of campus

impaction, additional high demand majors (N = 35) also became impacted. These 35 majors include approximately 80% of the undergraduate population.

In addition to campus impaction, various CSU and self-imposed policies were created in an attempt to manage enrollment demand fairly. The first series of these policies became effective for students admitted for fall 2000. Students (first time freshmen and transfers) admitted to SDSU were required to submit an "Intent to Enroll" form, official transcripts, and \$100 nonrefundable (applicable to fees) deposit by May 1 to confirm their fall 2000 admission. At the same time CSU-eligible service-area freshmen who did not meet SDSU's selective eligibility index and who needed remediation in English and/or mathematics were required to begin their remediation during the summer or forfeit admission in the fall. And finally, students were required to submit their final official transcripts with spring grades by July 15. Failure to submit the final transcript or failure to meet the admission requirements with final grades rescinded their admission. Additionally, in December 2001 SDSU's service area was redefined to exclude high schools and community colleges that better fit into the CSU San Marcos service area.

A dual admission policy was approved for our campus by Chancellor Reed in December 2001, with the first students admitted in fall 2002. This policy requires service-area freshmen who are CSU-eligible, but do not meet SDSU out-of-service area selective criteria and who have remediation requirements, to be dually admitted to SDSU and a community college—the same population of freshmen who had previously been required to begin remediation in the summer. These students have one year to complete their remediation requirements in order to maintain their SDSU admission and begin their matriculation at SDSU.

The change to an impacted campus in 1999 and the increase in the number of impacted majors also increased the need for clear communication and dialogue between SDSU and the community colleges. Thus, a Transfer Studies Degree Agreement was developed in 2000 to: a) guarantee admission into an impacted major; b) lock in impaction criteria in effect at the time the student signs the agreement; c) encourage better advising and planning; and d) encourage more transfer students to enroll in the "Transfer Studies" Associate degree program at the community college to ensure that unnecessary course work was kept to a minimum. In 2002 the SDSU/San Diego and Imperial County Community College Association Enrollment Management Task Force was created to improve intersegmental communication and ensure a smooth transition from the community college to SDSU. The task force meets on a monthly basis and consists of the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Executive Director of Enrollment Services at SDSU and the Vice Presidents of the SDSU service-area community college districts. The importance of maintaining open lines of communication between SDSU and community colleges will continue as we make additional changes to transfer requirements. For example, beginning fall 2004, upper-division transfer students will be admitted to SDSU by major and must have attained 60 transferable units, including all General Education and preparation for the major courses, as well as the required GPA for admission to the major. Beginning in fall 2004, non-service area transfer students must meet all requirements for admission to a major and will also be ranked by their GPA, and admitted as spaces are available.

In addition to implementation of new policies to manage enrollment, organizational changes also occurred. In January 2000 the Office of Admissions and Records and Student Outreach Services, previously under Student Affairs, were moved into Academic Affairs and reorganized as Enrollment Services. This unit now includes the Offices of Admissions, Registrar, Advising and Evaluations, and a new Prospective Student Center housed in Advising and Evaluations. This re-organization emphasizes the interconnected nature of access, retention, and graduation and ensures that all areas dealing with these issues are housed in the same academic division.

Other Strategies to Increase Access [CFR: 1.5]

While the San Diego campus has been dealing with impaction, the University has increased access to the Imperial Valley Campus. SDSU, in coordination with community leaders in Imperial Valley, has worked to develop a college-going culture in the Valley. SDSU became the first four-year institution in Imperial Valley when eleven high-performing students were admitted to a pilot freshmen program in AY 2003-04. All of the students were women who had been admitted to other four-year institutions but were unable to leave the Valley for economic and/or familial reasons. This program has been expanded for AY 2004-05. In addition, two new majors, mathematics and agri-business, were added to the campus to meet community needs. The University has also opened a second site for the Imperial Valley Campus in Brawley to facilitate the enrollment of students at the north end of the Valley.

Finally, the issue of access is being addressed through a collaborative program with Sweetwater Union High School District, in which two-thirds of the students are Latino. The Compact For Success was created in 2000 to further three of SDSU's goals: a) community involvement; b) enhancement of academic quality; and c) a commitment to increasing diversity at SDSU. This unique program guarantees 7th graders in the years 2000, 2001, and 2002, admission and paid fees to SDSU if they complete the CSU required A- G courses with a 3.0 GPA and satisfy the writing and math competency tests. In addition, they must complete either the SAT or ACT admission test. SDSU collaborates and participates in district-wide reforms, offers tutoring, including summer sessions, and provides enhanced teacher preparation to ensure that students are equipped with the skills necessary to be successful in college.

The ultimate indicator of success of the Compact will be the percentage of students in the high school graduating class of 2006 who have completed the benchmarks and enter SDSU. In the interim, however, the Compact has already flourished beyond the original intent. A comprehensive reform of curricula, policies and practices within the Sweetwater district has developed. Collaborative efforts among SDSU faculty and students, district teachers, students, parents, and community leaders have resulted in improved curricula and support services in the district and opportunities for faculty and students to work in the "laboratory" of Sweetwater Union District. Other indicators of the success of the Compact include the broad acceptance of the program through feedback from parents and community meetings. Moreover, high school report cards now include a description of the Compact and show each student's progress toward completion of the requirements for admission to SDSU. Monthly progress checks on student achievement also take place.

Retention and Graduation Rates [CFRs: 1.7; 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 & Q5, Q6; 3.7; 4.3]

Interest in access to higher education in California has always seemed to overshadow interest in retention and graduation rates. SDSU believes this relationship must change. To quote Dr. Weber, "It is time to stop the revolving door of higher education and concentrate on the corridor to graduation." While we have long had a number of retention programs on campus (e.g. Freshmen Success Program, Faculty Student Mentoring Program, Educational Opportunity Program) we had not systematically examined their effectiveness. This changed when these issues were brought to the University Senate.

In May 1999, the University Senate received a report from the Senate Diversity, Equity, and Outreach (DEO) Committee that concurred with a March 1999 Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P) report to the Senate that SDSU needed coordinated recruitment and retention programs that would enhance graduation rates. In February 2001, the Senate issued a "Resolution on Student Retention," which called for a coordinator, a direction, and mandatory first-time freshman advising and orientation coupled with registration. As a result, the Retention Council was established collaboratively by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to gather information and to integrate retention programs and practices. Since 2001, representatives from several colleges and the directors of several retention programs have been meeting regularly to better align their efforts. In that year, the Council recommended working on "Ten Next Steps" grounded in retention literature, particularly the work of

Vincent Tinto, and relevant to our campus. These steps include improvement in the following areas: a) student engagement; b) orientation programs; c) analysis of retention programs; d) at-risk students (dual admits and students affected by Executive Order 665); e) students on probation; f) academic affairs/student affairs collaboration; g) the faculty role in retention; h) retention data in departmental plans; i) pre-majors not making progress toward the major; and j) coordination of academic advising. An annual report [see 2002 and 2003 reports] detailing our progress on the "Ten Next Steps" is presented to the Senate. As a result of these efforts, a number of changes in policy and procedures have been implemented. Some of these changes will be described in detail in this essay while others are described in an essay for Standard 4.

We have developed a number of policies and procedures that we believe assist both freshmen and transfer students in taking a more direct path toward graduation. Beginning in fall 2001 freshmen entering SDSU were required to register in oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, and mathematics within their first two semesters. To ensure that students registered for and completed these four classes, the requirement was computer-enforced at registration. In addition, freshmen receive priority registration, guaranteeing them space in these courses. In fall 2000 all new transfers were mailed a degree audit within their first semester of attendance. In December 2002 automated degree audits showing students exactly how credits are applied and what courses are needed to graduate were made available to current students online. A very recent improvement has been the development of four-year Road Maps [See Geological Sciences example] for all SDSU majors and emphases (N = 187). These Road Maps provide students with the best four-year sequence of courses for their majors. The Road Maps have been posted to the web and will be used in summer 2004.

Our use of technology has also greatly enhanced students' ability to obtain information relevant to their status. A web portal was developed in spring 2003. This feature allows us to send registration dates and information to students via the portal and students can pay their fees on-line. In addition, the portal allows current students to view and/or print unofficial transcripts, obtain degree audits, and receive advising information on-line. A message center built into the portal provides all students with important and timely information. Our ultimate goal is to incorporate degree audits, registration, and the class schedule into the portal so that students can find out which courses they need, go directly to the class schedule and find available classes, and then register immediately. Our plan is to have the class schedule/registration piece available by fall 2004. The availability of the web portal has also facilitated the work of campus advisors, who also have access to students' degree audits and unofficial transcripts, eliminating their need for access to our cumbersome Student Information System (SIMS).

Another example of how technology has assisted student planning is the development of the web-based Transfer Admission Planner (TAP) in summer 2003. The TAP system was developed using our Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) and ASSIST, which contains complete articulation information for our top 50 feeder schools. The system allows students and advisors at these feeder schools to verify how their courses apply to General Education and "preparation for the major" requirements and what they would be held to for preparation for the major from their transfer institution for admission to SDSU.

Evaluating the effectiveness of policy and procedural changes is accomplished through collaboration with the Office of Analytical Studies and Institutional Research (OASIR), which provides official information to the SDSU community, the CSU, and external agencies regarding admission applications, student enrollment, course enrollment, continuation rates, and graduation rates. In addition, OASIR customizes Web information/reports for departments to offer them information on their majors such as: a) student preparation, performance and outcomes such as remediation/proficiency at entry, new student academic indicators, one-year continuation rates, one-

year academic probation, cumulative GPA by student level; b) degrees granted/graduation rates by ethnicity and degree level; c) student enrollment by ethnicity, full-time/part-time status and gender, and average unit load; d) course enrollment sections by course level, FTES generated by majors and non-majors, FTES generated from General Education courses; e) faculty FTEF, FTES, SFR and unit load by faculty rank; and f) facility utilization, enrollment by section, day and time. Providing departments with the ability to access these data and customize reports has been a great step toward identifying areas of concern with regard to continuation rates, graduation rates, probation, and disqualification rates at the department level as well as the institutional level.

While the technological changes that have taken place facilitate student success, we also continue to find ways to improve our personal interactions with students. These include the first University-wide meeting of advisors, held in fall 2003, to enhance the consistency of information provided to students, the increased collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in conducting new student and transfer student orientations, and the development of the New Student Convocation. Ongoing reflection of practices takes place to ensure that students not only receive consistent information from offices across campus but also feel welcomed and part of a community committed to their success.

Summary

We have made great strides in developing the infrastructure, policies and procedures to examine the balance among access, retention, and graduation. CSU accountability data and SDSU campus data will allow us to compare retention and graduation rates over time. However, we also know that we have much more to do, particularly in examining the effectiveness of the dual admit program and the success of transfer students. These two issues will be addressed in the concluding essay.

Reflective Essay 1b: Expanding Our Horizons: Educating Students for the Global Community

Introduction

Through the *Shared Vision* process, the University has identified five goals for assisting students to become successful citizens. This essay will describe three initiatives that have been undertaken to meet the fifth goal, educating students for a global community: a) study abroad and internationalism; b) the City Heights Collaborative; and c) Community-Based Service Learning. These examples illustrate our commitment to providing students with opportunities to work with diverse groups in both local and international communities.

Study Abroad and Internationalism [CFRs: 1.1, 1.2 & Q4, 1.5; 2.11; 3.5; 4.2]

To advance the campus goal of becoming a global university, the position of Assistant Vice President (AVP) for international programs was created in 1998 to direct the Office of International Programs (OIP). The AVP is responsible for coordinating and facilitating the development of international programs and activities at SDSU. He oversees a budget of approximately \$275,000 per year for faculty development related to internationalizing the campus and increasing study abroad opportunities for students. Each year faculty submit proposals for awards of up to \$3,000 for the purpose of generating educational connections and activities that will lead to greater involvement of students and faculty in international educational experiences. Proposals that expand and build on existing programs are given highest priority, particularly those that involve study abroad, international internships, and student exchange programs. In its first five years of operation, the OIP has awarded \$698,199 to 406 faculty members for these purposes. Since 2001-02, OIP has also provided \$138,000 in scholarship funding for over 200 students to study abroad.

The International Student Center (ISC), located adjacent to OIP, provides another way to enrich and internationalize our campus. It has benefited from an increase in physical space as well as additional financial resources to support the goal of increasing the number of international students who study at SDSU. For example, between 1998-2004 the budget for the International Student Center was doubled

to \$500,000 and the staff increased from four to nine people. These resources, coupled with a coordinated recruitment and communication plan, were directed toward increasing the number of international students from 600 to 1300 by fall 2002, a goal we surpassed when enrollment reached 1429 in AY 2002-03.

Increasing internationalization has also been a goal of the Imperial Valley Campus. While the campus serves a bicultural and bilingual border community, it is geographically isolated from contact with people from other parts of the world. In addition to expanding the successful cooperative agreements with nearby Mexican universities, the university has, in recent years, aggressively sought opportunities for cultural exchange on a more global scale. A dozen new exchange agreements with universities throughout Europe and Latin America have brought students from several of these universities to year-long programs at the Imperial Valley Campus. These agreements have also facilitated numerous travel study programs for Imperial Valley Campus students in a growing list of countries ranging from Brazil to Finland.

Opportunities for students to study abroad abound. Currently SDSU maintains approximately 190 international exchange partnerships offering experiences in 44 countries. Collaborative efforts among departments, the International Student Center, and the College of Extended Studies (CES) have resulted in the design of programs that offer students a range of experiences including the ability to earn resident credit, to increase language proficiency, and to engage in and learn about the cultural aspects of the host country. Through these efforts the number of SDSU students studying abroad has increased from 167 in 1997-98 to 950 in 2002-03 (President's Convocation address: August 28, 2003). Some majors now require study abroad experiences. These include European Studies, Economics, Spanish, International Security, Conflict, and Resolution. The International Business Program, the first major to require a study abroad experience, is described in detail in the following paragraphs.

Internationalization has also been accomplished through the development of academic programs such as the International Business Program (IB). This program has over 750 students, 30% of whom are international students, and is one of the largest undergraduate International Business Programs in the United States. If desired, IB majors can choose to participate in one of several transnational multi-degree programs. Existing dual-degree programs involve agreements with partner universities in Canada (SanDiQué), Chile (San Paraiso), Brazil (San Brazil), and Mexico (MEXUS). The first and only triple-degree programs in the United States have been established with universities in Canada and Mexico (CaMexUS), and with Mexico and Chile (PanAmerica). Students in these programs study a minimum of one year (and in some programs two years) in each country to provide students with both training in business concepts and the language and cultural skills necessary for success in a global business environment. In fall 2003, a total of 84 students were enrolled in these programs.

These programs rely on a range of resource providers. Academic instruction is provided by the partner institutions along with SDSU's College of Arts and Letters and the College of Business Administration. When attending the foreign universities, SDSU students generally pay only SDSU fees and are still eligible for financial aid. We have received FIPSE grants from the US Department of Education to support the following programs: a) MEXUS (\$257,061 over 1993-1996; \$102,882 over 1995-1998), b) San Brazil (\$206,107 over 2001-2005), c) CaMexUS (\$205,697 over 2001-2004), and d) Project Amigos (\$150,000 over 2003-2005). SDSU provides matching funds during the life of these contracts and eventually assumes full financial responsibility for the program. The grants provide critical funding for program administration and oversight, including the hiring of a program coordinator, travel undertaken by the directors and program evaluators, and scholarships. Additional support for these programs is provided by SDSU's Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER), a collaborative activity of the College of Business Administration and the College of Arts and Letters. In 2000 the International Business Program won the Institution of International Education Andrew Heiskell Award for its Study Abroad program while in 2003, it was ranked 11th by

U.S. News & World Report. Also in 2003, Provost Nancy Marlin received the International Leadership Award for building internationalism into SDSU programs and curricula.

City Heights Educational Collaborative [CFRs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.5; 2.5 & Q4]

City Heights is a five square mile neighborhood consisting of about 80,000 residents who speak over 30 languages and scores of dialects. In this ethnically diverse neighborhood, only 40% of the residents have graduated from high school, 60% earn less than \$25,000 a year, and 30% are designated at below the poverty line. These demographic characteristics, coupled with the very low test scores of the neighborhood's children, led to the creation of the City Heights Educational Pilot in 1998. Funded by an \$18 million gift from Price Charities, San Diego State University operates an elementary, middle, and high school with a combined enrollment of over 5,500 students. The four objectives of the Collaborative are to: a) significantly increase student achievement; b) effectively prepare educators and other professionals for careers in diverse, inner city neighborhoods; c) provide solutions to community problems through an active research agenda; and d) coordinate public and private resources to provide a quality education. The initiative involves over 100 faculty from more than 40 departments who work on over 65 projects. These faculty contribute 13,000 hours a year in curricular design, implementation, teaching, and direct support to teachers and students in Rosa Parks Elementary, Monroe Clark Middle School, and Hoover High School. SDSU student involvement is unparalleled. Each year students spend 150,000 hours in course work, field work, and research. More than 100 SDSU students each semester serve as tutors in these schools, while scores of others work as student teachers.

We will focus attention on only one aspect of the program, the education initiative. The School of Teacher Education has developed a "teaching hospital," where student teachers from SDSU are immersed in their credential training on-site. They teach for a full year and work with students in all three schools, gaining experience with diverse learners across all educational levels. They are exposed to the most innovative teaching methods and are able to practice immediately those skills in an urban setting. In addition, teachers at the local schools receive training and work collaboratively with faculty from SDSU to create curricula that are aligned from elementary through high school that will successfully prepare students to attend college.

Indicators of the success of the education initiative abound. In the first three years, 75 teachers earned a master's degree in education and 175 student teachers completed the on-site teacher credential program. Graduates are highly sought after because of their unique education and experience working with diverse learners. Additionally, faculty published over 25 refereed journal articles, 10 book chapters, and gave over 17 presentations at professional meetings based on their research in City Heights. From the neighborhood perspective, success can be measured by increases in student test scores in reading and math and increased teacher retention at the schools. In fact, teacher retention has risen to 90% compared to 75% at similar schools. The most recent acknowledgement of success occurred in September 2003, when the School of Teacher Education won the prestigious Christa McAuliffe Award, one of only five universities honored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The award was given in recognition of the numbers of new teachers completing the program, the innovation of its practices and partnerships, the integration of pre-service preparation of new teachers and in-service development of practicing teachers, feedback from students who completed the program indicating their feelings of being well-prepared to teach in a diverse urban community, the high approval of cooperating teachers of the program and candidate performance, and employer satisfaction. As a result of these successes, what started as a pilot program became the City Heights Educational Collaborative in 2002, an ongoing and renewable partnership dedicated to improving the learning and lives of all participants.

Center for Community Based Service Learning (CCBSL) [CFRs: 1.1, 1.2, 1.5]

The mission of the CCBSL, created in 1998, is to enhance learning and civic responsibility through community engagement. The CCBSL coordinator works with an advisory board of about 20 members consisting of faculty, staff, and community members to promote and educate faculty and community partners on appropriate community-based service learning techniques and practices.

CCBSL assists faculty who want to include a service learning component in their classes. Workshops are held to help faculty learn about service learning pedagogy, including the design of mandatory reflective assignments for their courses. Materials on the website describe the process faculty must follow for a course to become designated as having a service-learning component. The number of service learning courses offered each semester has ranged from 16 to 28 and the number of participating students has ranged from 424 to 900. CCBSL also partially funds the "Alternative Spring Break Experience," which allows students to perform a service learning project in a foreign country over spring break. In the past three years, students have traveled to Mexico, Costa Rica, and South Africa to participate in community-based projects.

Expanding the number of service-learning courses we offer has been challenged by a number of factors. First, changes in leadership of CCBSL have made it difficult to maintain the stability necessary to see goals through to fruition. The most recent coordinator, hired in fall 2003, was successful in securing CSU funding for "advancing the academic culture to realize the civic mission of education." Unfortunately, she has moved to another position, leaving CCBSL without a coordinator. In addition, CCBSL was recently moved (summer 2004) from Career Services to the Centers for Student Involvement. Thus, CCBSL is in transition again and faces the challenge of hiring a new coordinator and developing the vision and infrastructure necessary to expand and sustain opportunities for students to engage in service-learning courses that will enhance their learning about civic responsibility.

Summary

As this essay indicates, the goal of educating students for global communities has guided decision-making, resource allocation, and action. Yet challenges remain in advancing this goal. First, a limited number of scholarships are available for study abroad. Students in majors requiring a study abroad experience face an unfunded mandate since they are ultimately responsible for covering the expenses involved with completing the study abroad component for their degree. Second, educating students for global communities does not only mean providing opportunities for international travel; it also includes an understanding and appreciation of multicultural and diverse communities. We have not yet examined the extent to which international perspectives and issues of diversity have been integrated into our programs and courses. And finally, while we have several indirect measures of student learning, notably through our successes in achieving national recognition and awards for our programs, we have not systematically studied direct measures of student learning in these programs.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Reflective Essay 2a: The Learning-Centered University

Introduction

This essay describes our progress in building capacity for examining student learning in both the General Education program and in the major. We also describe the activities provided by the Center for Teaching and Learning, since a discussion of improving student learning would not be complete without detailing our capacity for faculty development.

Student Learning Outcomes: Progress in the General Education Program [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 & Q8, 4.1] Our General Education (GE) program must conform to Title V in the state of California Education Code, which describes the general education requirements for students completing a bachelor's degree at a CSU campus. Students must complete at least 48 semester units of GE courses, including 9 units at the upper division level. In addition, the breadth requirement specifies that students must complete these units in the following areas: communication and critical thinking, natural sciences and quantitative reasoning, social and behavioral sciences, and humanities. At SDSU, students can select from over 400 courses to complete GE requirements. Thus, although all students fulfill the mandated breadth requirements, the path to meet this requirement can vary dramatically depending on student choice of course work. While this "cafeteria-like" program allows students great flexibility in course offerings, it can create challenges to examining student learning at the program level. This section describes the progress we have made and the policies and procedures we have put in place to increase our capacity to examine student learning in the GE program.

The first step in assessing student learning requires defining student learning goals and objectives that describe the knowledge, skills, and abilities we wish graduates to acquire as a result of completing the GE program. Multiple stakeholders, including faculty and students, were involved in conversations about desired goals for the GE program. For example, in 1997, students in 13 GE courses responded to a survey that asked about their satisfaction with the current goals and objectives as well as their perception that they were meeting these goals. Results of the survey indicated that the majority of students (over 75%) were satisfied with their experience in the GE course in which they were enrolled. Faculty discussions that included examining the results of the student survey as well as philosophical discussions of the role of GE in student learning led to a review and revision of goals and objectives. These initial efforts were published in the SDSU Curriculum Guide and used in the curricular review process to ensure that new courses were aligned with the stated learning goals.

In an effort to continue to make progress in student learning assessment in the GE program, a task force was formed in 2000 to develop a comprehensive plan to examine all course syllabi for alignment with the overall goals and objectives. A four-year schedule was developed in which clusters of faculty would create scoring rubrics to be used to assess whether course syllabi indicated appropriate student learning goals and objectives. Upon completion of this task we would have a clear understanding of which objectives were being measured in which GE courses so that we could create a plan for directly assessing student learning in the entire GE program. In addition, a workshop [see letter and schedule] that focused on strategies for assessing student learning was conducted in February 2001. However, when faculty groups met, the discussions moved toward a desire to expand the set of learning goals and objectives to a much larger set for each category of the GE program. This change led to the development of 28 additional goals and 95 additional objectives. The most recent SDSU Curriculum Guide contains this comprehensive list of goals and objectives. Faculty who propose new GE courses must describe in detail which learning goals and objectives are a part of the proposed course and how they will be measured.

It is clear that the current list of learning goals and objectives is now so broad as to make it virtually impossible to create a meaningful, manageable, and sustainable assessment of student learning. This situation prompted the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to appoint a GE Assessment Task Force in September 2003 to develop operating guidelines for directly measuring student learning. The committee met throughout the fall semester and completed its recommendations in December 2003. These recommendations were approved by Undergraduate Council and will be implemented in fall 2004. Essentially, we will use an embedded assessment approach to obtain direct measures of student learning. Each semester, faculty will jointly develop an assignment or project to be used across multiple sections of GE courses. A random sample of student work will be collected and evaluated by a scoring rubric, also agreed upon by the faculty. To ensure that the loop of assessment is completed, the results of the assessment project will be shared with the faculty so that curricular changes can be

made where necessary. By employing this process we will create an ongoing cycle of examining student learning in the GE program. Adjustments to this plan will also be made as we learn from our successes and setbacks.

The GE Assessment Task Force suggested two other very important recommendations that add to our capacity to examine student learning. First, the GE Committee was directed to re-think the usefulness of the comprehensive list of goals and objectives that currently exist and to create a list of fewer than 10 goals that clearly define the knowledge, skills, and abilities we wish graduates to attain as a result of their GE education. The greatest challenge to this task is that for some departments the FTE generated by GE courses drives their ability to offer small undergraduate and graduate major courses. This leads to the belief that "letting go" of some of the goals and objectives might threaten the ability to offer some classes. Given the current budget crisis, this view is understandable to some extent; however, it challenges our ability to come to consensus on what is most important for student learning. Therefore, we need to engage faculty in a discussion centered on what we want students to know and be able to do as a result of their GE experiences. This is an important and formidable task that we will engage in during AY 2004-05.

Second, the University Committee on Assessment (UCA), which oversees assessment efforts for the campus, used to be a subcommittee of Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P). In this structure the committee was somewhat invisible to the campus community. Therefore, in spring 2004 this committee, re-named the "Student Learning Outcomes Committee" was re-positioned to become a free standing Senate committee with broad campus involvement and clearly defined functions. The Committee will also make annual reports to the University Senate on campus progress in student learning assessment. Committee members will be appointed by the Senate and the Student Learning Outcomes Committee will begin functioning in fall 2004.

Student Learning Outcomes: Progress in Programs/Departments [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 & Q1, 4.1]

The aforementioned University Committee on Assessment (UCA), established in 1989, has been charged with assisting the campus in examining student learning. Until the late 1990s, committee progress was slow due to a perceived lack of support from upper administration. Since her arrival in 1998, Provost Marlin has supported a much stronger emphasis on student learning outcomes assessment, which has enhanced our ability to make progress. In addition, the position of Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, which included chairing the UCA, was only half-time. Since August 2002, this has been a full-time position. This section describes the changes we have made to build our capacity for assessing student learning in programs and departments.

In 1998 the UCA developed an audit survey of student learning assessment practices that was distributed to all departments. Results of this survey indicated that about 50% of responding departments had developed learning goals, but they were generally very broad in nature. Little systematic assessment of learning was taking place other than the use of indirect measures such as surveys of graduates, alumni, or employers and most departments believed that the use of grades was sufficient to examine student learning. This information was used by the UCA to assemble a plan to educate the campus about student learning and provide resources for faculty development in this area. First, a website was developed that provides information about best practices in assessment, library and internet resources, and campus resources. In addition, a "Departmental Guide to Student Learning Assessment" was produced in 2002 and available to download. During spring 2004 a scoring rubric was also developed by UCA to review assessment plans and provide feedback to departments/programs regarding their progress.

Three campus workshops on student learning assessment have also been held. The first was conducted by Mary Senter, from Western Michigan, in spring 1998. Her 2-day workshop focused on how to begin to develop assessment at the program level and engage in discussions about student

learning. This workshop was followed by a visit from Dr. Lion Gardiner from Rutgers University, who conducted a 2-day workshop in 1999. He extended our understanding by focusing on the development of meaningful learning goals and objectives. In addition, he worked with faculty from eight departments (Anthropology, Biology, Child and Family Development, Economics, Geography, Recreation, Parks and Tourism, Psychology, and Sociology) who received assigned time to work with faculty in their respective departments to develop a student learning assessment plan. The third workshop focused on strategies for assessment of student learning in General Education.

While offering workshops can impact faculty who attend such events, campus-wide impact is more likely to occur with changes to policy. In 1999, a discussion of a program/department's progress in student learning assessment became part of the Academic Review process that all departments undergo every 7-9 years. Departments are to submit their assessment plans to the UCA for review and feedback prior to undergoing their Academic Review. The annual Academic Plan initiated by the Provost now also includes a section on student learning assessment. Most recently, the procedures that departments must follow for the Academic Plans and Academic Reviews have been aligned to make them more efficient for departments to complete, but also to foreground student learning. A detailed discussion of the evolution of these changes can be found in Essay 4a for Standard 4.

In May 2003, a follow-up survey [See letter and survey] to the 1998 audit was conducted to examine our campus progress. The survey, sent to 64 departments, schools, or programs, elicited an 88% response rate. Findings indicated that 85% of reporting departments have developed undergraduate learning goals and objectives. Assessment methods vary across departments with 40% - 58% of departments employing surveys. Eighteen departments have developed capstone courses and 11 departments use student portfolios. The most extensively developed portfolio, in existence as a requirement for students since 1992, can be found in the Liberal Studies Program. The most critical finding of the survey was the virtual lack of direct measures of student learning at the program level in General Education. As a result, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies created a task force to develop operating procedures for assessment of student learning in General Education, described in an earlier section of this essay.

In fall 2003, a follow-up to this survey was conducted by asking departments that indicated they had developed learning goals and objectives to send their documents to the Division of Undergraduate Studies. A review by the UCA found a wide variation in completeness of materials. The College of Business Administration, College of Education, College of Engineering, and College of Health and Human Services have made the most progress since many of the departments/programs residing in these colleges must also submit self-studies to outside accrediting bodies, which have shifted their emphasis to student learning. In addition, while many departments have clearly defined learning goals and objectives, there is much to be done to develop meaningful assessments for these goals. These findings led the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to engage in conversations with the Provost regarding changes to the Academic Plan for spring 2004. The Provost subsequently sent a letter to all department/program chairs that asked for the following information for all undergraduate and graduate programs to be submitted by April 16, 2004: mission statement, learning goals, learning outcomes/ objectives, proposed measures of their outcomes, and a timeline for assessment. We received plans from approximately 92% of departments/programs. Two members of the UCA reviewed each plan using a scoring rubric and letters were written to each department/program providing feedback on their progress. Best practices web pages were posted to the Assessment website to serve as examples for departments and as a way to make our assessment work more public. In addition, each department/program selected either October 15 or April 1 as their annual reporting date for describing their progress in student learning assessment for the previous academic year, a reporting procedure that will begin during the 2004-05 academic year. In addition, beginning in fall 2004, course syllabi must include student learning outcomes. Finally, the Center for Teaching and

Learning, which will be described in the next section, has also recently focused attention on student learning.

Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) [CFRs: 3.4, 4.7; Standard 2 Q6]

The Center for Teaching and Learning became a reality in 1999, with the appointment of a half-time Director and a full time administrative coordinator. During the first year of operation, the Director developed operating guidelines that described how the Center would support faculty development in teaching and learning. These services included providing individual assistance to faculty who wished to improve their teaching, workshops on a variety of pedagogical topics, monthly faculty lunches aimed at faculty in their first and second years at SDSU, and travel support for system wide workshops conducted by CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL). CTL also organized one day of the New Faculty Orientation held each fall. In addition, nine faculty members, one from each of the colleges and the Imperial Valley Campus, were selected as faculty fellows, with the responsibility of serving as "master teachers" for their colleagues.

During AY 2000-01 energies were directed toward developing a CTL website and acquiring books to build a CTL library, along with continuing the same activities as the previous year. Workshops were co-sponsored with Instructional Technology Services on use of Blackboard and how to conduct assessment of student learning in General Education. Lecturers, including part time and full time, received faculty development support for the first time with the creation of a Lecturer Associate whose responsibilities included providing an orientation to the campus and presenting workshops on teaching and learning. In addition, one-time lottery funds were used for Scholarship of Teaching grants and Curriculum Transformation Grants. This progress was challenged during AY 2002-03 when the director retired. We were fortunate when two faculty members stepped forward to work on an interim basis until a new director was hired. Two national searches to fill the Director position as a full-time position were conducted in spring 2002 and fall 2002 but both were unsuccessful. Therefore, an internal search was conducted during spring 2003 and we successfully appointed a faculty member in July 2003. His position is 75% during the academic year and 50% during the summer.

The new Director faces the challenge of creating strategies that increase the visibility and effectiveness of CTL services under a constrained budget. With a 50% decrease in the budget for operating expenses, the faculty fellows program, Lecturer Associate, and money to support faculty travel to teaching and learning conferences have been eliminated. This situation is certainly not ideal, resulting in limited support for new faculty primarily through an orientation workshop and monthly lunches on teaching and learning strategies. The Director has focused his energies toward using technology to make resources more readily available to faculty members and on aligning CTL support activities with other efforts to promote use of student learning outcomes, student-centered learning, and continuous improvement. For example, recent workshops on writing learning outcomes were presented in smart classrooms where participant responses were immediately projected onto screens to encourage a deeper discussion. The workshop is also available on the CTL website so that faculty who could not attend the workshop can still benefit from the materials. Finally, the CTL Director is working to improve coordination with other faculty support services on campus including Instructional Technology Services, which provides Baseline Access, Training, and Support (BATS), Blackboard support, and operates a faculty room that supports both teaching and professional growth activities to ensure the broadest campus reach within our limited resources. [See CTL summary].

Summary

We have made significant progress in building capacity for assessing student learning in both the General Education program and our majors, particularly since the arrival of a new Dean of Undergraduate Studies in 2002. Policies, procedures, and structures are in place that will facilitate our ability to examine student learning, thus indicating that our campus culture is beginning to change. Discussions of student learning have been a part of meetings of the Undergraduate Council, the

General Education Committee, the Academic Planning and Policy Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, and the University Senate. Without these conversations, the policy changes described in this essay could not have taken place. The Dean has also formed strong partnerships with other college deans in Academic Affairs, some who had already begun developing the capacity to examine student learning in their respective colleges. Finally, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of Students, who also arrived in 2002, have been working closely to create a stronger collaborative relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. However, the very recent departure (May 28, 2004) of the Dean of Students presents a challenge to the progress we have made in developing a shared understanding of student learning in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Yet, a cadre of administrators and faculty members remain who are working hard to develop a "culture of inquiry" at SDSU where student learning is examined both inside and outside of the classroom.

Our progress in the area of student learning assessment and faculty development must be tempered, however, with the recognition that sustaining these efforts requires a continual commitment of institutional support. Assessment of student learning at the program level using direct measures represents a paradigm shift for most faculty. The process is time consuming, messy, and ongoing. Faculty development support through CTL is currently done on an individual, and in some cases, department basis because of a constrained operating budget. Funding limitations currently challenge our ability to plan and implement more systemic approaches that assist faculty to design and manage courses and programs to promote more effective learning.

Reflective Essay 2b: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Introduction

Research is an integral part of our institutional identity. The pursuit of research and scholarly activity emerged from the interests of individual faculty, quickly evolved to a more clearly articulated component of faculty culture, and has long been embraced as a defining characteristic of our campus mission. To sustain these efforts, the University has recruited an extraordinary cohort of new faculty – 377 since 1997 – who engage enthusiastically and productively in research, scholarship, and creative activity. The pervasive nature of research and scholarly activity at SDSU is also illustrated by examining the Research and Facilities Organization. The University has seven Specialized Research Facilities, three National and Regional Research Resource Centers, three Consortia, and 41 Organized Research Centers and Institutes. These centers include almost all SDSU colleges and, in most cases, involve faculty and students working collaboratively in research settings.

Our investigation of the University's commitment to, and capacity for, research, scholarship, and creative activity will address two related components. First, we will describe capacity issues involving faculty including a description of University support and expectations for faculty research and creative activity. We will then describe student involvement in research to demonstrate our capacity to examine student learning in this context. We are cognizant, however, of the interrelationship between faculty and students and the richness this relationship brings to learning. Thus, the organization of this essay is for reader clarity only and does not suggest that faculty and students learn in separate environments.

Support for Faculty Research and Creative Activity [CFRs: 2.8, 2.9 & Q1; 3.2 & Q1]

Graduate and Research Affairs consists of two divisions: a) the Graduate Division, which is responsible for curricular and policy oversight for graduate programs; and b) the Division of Research Administration and Technology Services, which provides services, guidance, and support for research and creative activity. The Division of Research Administration and Technology Services is the office that gives final approval of all SDSU research grant and contract proposals to federal, state, corporate, foundation and other private sponsors. This office also provides direct consultation to faculty on various proposal development matters and serves as the administrative liaison with the San Diego

State University Foundation, which is responsible for the identification and dissemination of grant information to the University community. A data base of faculty research interests allows the Foundation to match grant opportunities with appropriate researchers. The Foundation provides program guidelines, application materials, and assists with budget preparation, award negotiation, completion of applications, and duplication and mailing of proposals. The Foundation also administers all funded grants and contracts.

Research and scholarly activity take both time and money and SDSU recognizes that support is necessary to achieve personal and institutional goals. While the San Diego State Foundation provides support for securing external grants and contracts and seed money for internal grants, state funds support internal grants, sabbatical leaves, and travel money for professional meetings. The Office of Faculty Affairs provides information on sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves, the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Awards (RSCA), and Faculty Development Program Awards (FDP). The purpose of the RSCA is to support creative and scholarly research or curriculum development while the FDP supports research and creative activity to assist in achieving tenure or promotion. The Faculty Grant-in-Aid (GIA) program is supported with Foundation money and is administered through Graduate and Research Affairs, with the purpose of supporting faculty members who are beginning a research project or pursuing a project that may lead to external funding. The RSCA, which is funded by the CSU, is administered at the College level, and since AY 1997-98 an average of \$237,000 has been awarded to approximately 67 faculty in all Colleges each year. The FDP, entirely funded from the SDSU budget, is administered at the University level and each year has awarded a total of \$95,000 to approximately 18 faculty while the GIA has awarded a total of \$92,000 to an equal number each year. These data also illustrate that the amount allocated to these three awards has either increased or remained fairly stable since 1997-98. In addition to these internal grant opportunities, some Colleges offer additional opportunities for faculty within the respective College to apply for these special funds. Taken together, Graduate and Research Affairs, SDSU Foundation, Office of Faculty Affairs, and the College Deans provide a variety of resources to assist faculty with their research and creative endeavors.

University Expectations for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity [CFR: 3.3 & Q1]

SDSU faculty members are instrumental in advancing the goals of a large, urban, public research university, and have varying demands upon their time, energy and attention. Retention, tenure, and promotion documents divide faculty workload into three parts: teaching effectiveness, professional growth and creative activity, and service. Within each category, several specific activities are included. Under teaching effectiveness faculty include: a) student evaluations; b) course development; c) creation of supplemental teaching materials; d) textbooks; and e) pedagogical publications. Under professional growth and scholarly activity faculty include: a) publications; b) creative activities; c) paper presentations; and d) grant-writing. Under service faculty document participation in: a) faculty governance; b) student mentoring and advising; c) community activities; and d) professional organizations.

SDSU must conform to the workload requirements set out by the Chancellor's office: each full-time faculty member is responsible for 15 weighted teaching units (WTUs) divided among teaching, supervision and advising, instructionally-related research, and service, as well as less routine activities such as curriculum development. A typical CSU faculty member teaches 12 WTUs and performs university service for the remaining three WTUs. However, SDSU tenure and tenure-track faculty have for many years had a 9-unit or less teaching load by employing the CSU assigned time code for instructionally-related research. This practice has allowed us to sustain and enhance our research mission and to provide faculty who actively engage in research the time necessary to carry out those responsibilities (assigned time), while remaining diligent in assuring its responsible use. Other faculty may buy out their teaching time through externally funded grants and contracts, or may be released by one of the highly competitive grants funded by the university. Under the leadership of the Provost,

colleges [e.g. College of Sciences] have developed clear criteria that are communicated to all faculty members. The goal is an equitable (although not necessarily equal) distribution of work across the entire faculty so that, as a whole, they can meet the multiple goals of a modern research university.

Several factors impact faculty workload issues. The university's longstanding commitment to research and graduate program development is but one. At the same time, our increased emphasis on student learning outcomes – both internally and externally motivated – affects both newly hired and more experienced faculty in the classroom. The campus tradition of shared governance, from the department to the Senate, places heavy service demands on faculty at a time when demographic shifts decrease the number of tenured, experienced individuals available to play leadership roles. For example, 189 faculty have retired between 2000-2004 with an additional 158 faculty currently in the faculty early retirement program. The recent extension of a "Golden Handshake" resulted in 46 additional full retirements, as well as 21 more faculty entering the faculty early retirement program. Furthermore, new imperatives, such as the international focus that has become a hallmark of the institution, compete for faculty time and attention

Student Involvement in Research and Creative Activity [CFRs: 2.3, 2.5, 2.9 & Q3]

San Diego State University's emphasis on research and creative activity developed in conjunction with its dedication to teaching. Initiation of research programs and creative activity that encourage and are dependent upon undergraduate student involvement naturally flowed from our history as a teachers college and as part of the CSU system. Thus, research activities are integrated with teaching to provide students with an in-depth understanding of their fields of endeavor—perhaps the best sort of hands-on education that can be offered. We will return to this issue in the Educational Effectiveness Report.

Undergraduate student involvement in research and creative activity takes place in a variety of ways. Each semester approximately 600 - 650 students take independent study units to work on research and/or creative projects with a faculty member. Research projects are also embedded in most laboratory classes required by several departments. Six departments (Astronomy, Chemistry, Geological Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics, Physics, and Public Administration) require completion of a senior thesis and all departments in the College of Engineering require students to conduct a senior design project. Creative activity is required in a number of courses in departments such as Art, Design, and Art History, Music and Dance, and Theatre within the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts, where student performance is a key measure of learning. Departments and schools within the College of Health and Human Services require internships, field experience, or clinical practice along with student reflection on these experiences. The College of Business Administration encourages students to engage in internships and Management majors are required to take a course in which students explain the learning experience associated with the internship and describe their progress on their learning objectives. Junior and senior level undergraduate students also have an opportunity to work in teams and perform small business consulting. In this capacity, students might conduct market research, develop financial, business, or marketing plans, or create customer satisfaction surveys and conduct analyses.

These avenues for student engagement in research do not include the many other students working with faculty on grants or other special programs. While it is difficult to quantify the total number of undergraduate students engaged in research and creative activity, examination of the curricular requirements of our majors indicates that faculty believe strongly that providing students with these opportunities is an essential part of their educational experience. A review of all department- and college-level reappointment, tenure, and promotion letters in AY 2003-04 showed that more than 47% of the departmental letters and 35% of the college letters identified bringing research into undergraduate learning environments as a factor in recommendations. While the University Policy File specified that "effectiveness of teaching may also be measured by ...involving students in research, scholarship, or creative activities," college and departmental policies are less explicit. Only

about one-third refer to mentoring student research in their criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

The College of Sciences has made a serious commitment to provide opportunities for undergraduate student engagement in research through the creation of the Office of Student Research and Support Programs. In some cases, these programs provide underrepresented students with opportunities that improve their academic and research capabilities while encouraging them to pursue doctoral work. While eligibility requirements vary somewhat depending on the program, most require completion of a minimum of 60 units, a GPA of 2.8 to 3.0, interest in obtaining a graduate degree in a science-related field, and a designation of low income and/or first-generation college attendee. Programs provide a variety of services including seminars, tutoring, and required research work with faculty mentors. Some programs also pay students a stipend for their research activities. The following programs are available to students: a) the McNair Scholar program, which also publishes a McNair Journal; b) the Minority Access to Research Careers program; c) Minority Biomedical Research Support; d) the Minority Science Program; e) Research Careers for Minority Scholars; f) Minority Access to Energy-Related Careers; g) Minority International Research Training; and h) Undergraduate Mentoring in Environmental Biology. The Education Center on Computational Science and Engineering, established in 1998, is another resource that is fostering use of high performance computing in the undergraduate curriculum. A number of undergraduate student projects have evolved from joint projects of faculty fellows and students

Summary

As this essay indicates, research and creative activity are embedded in the institutional culture with numerous faculty and undergraduate and graduate students working together in these endeavors. It is clear that we have developed the infrastructure to support these activities through creative use of resources, purposeful development of programs, and embedded expectations of student engagement in the majors. What is less well known, however, is the impact that these activities have on student learning, particularly at the undergraduate level. A systematic examination of student learning that results from engagement in research will be explored in detail in the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Reflective Essay 3a: Using Our Resources Wisely

Introduction

San Diego State University is a well-regulated university with clearly defined budgetary processes, open communication among the administration, faculty and staff, and access to diverse sources of funding to sustain its institutional purposes and educational objectives. This essay highlights the development of the University's budgetary processes through the work of shared governance and addresses three points: a) how the University obtains and allocates resources to support its institutional priorities; b) how the University provides for facilities to support and maintain its mission; and c) how the University supports its commitment to the growth of graduate programs.

Providing Resources to Support Our Mission [CFRs: 3.5, Q3, Q4]

The Cabinet Budget Committee (CBC) consists of the four Vice-Presidents, the Executive Assistant to the President, three faculty members, including the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Resources and Planning, and the President of Associated Students. It is responsible for providing recommendations to the President that assure that fiscal resources are allocated effectively and equitably. The CBC continually reviews new demands upon the budget, whether due to internal adjustments of mission or external demands, and recommends allocations of

resources accordingly. Overall, the administration and faculty leadership alike regard the budgetary process developed since 1997 as one of the key strengths of the university.

SDSU draws its fiscal resources from a variety of sources: state support, self-support, student fees, grants and contracts, auxiliary activities, and philanthropy (General Fund Support Budget 2002-03). Although we are a state-supported institution, the public funds we receive have been decreasing steadily and significantly. In 2002-03, only 35% of the total University revenues of \$610.8 million came from state appropriations. Grants and contracts awarded to faculty reached over \$130 million in the 2002-2003 fiscal year. Creation of The Campanile Foundation in 2000 has raised the level of private philanthropy. SDSU recorded \$43.3 million in private gifts for 2002-2003. The substantial support received from grants, contracts, auxiliaries, and private donations has allowed the University to develop in ways not typical of a CSU campus. For example, with only small allocations from the Chancellor's Office, and no graduate differential in funding of workload, SDSU has been able to bring online 14 joint-doctoral programs since 1965 and to greatly expand support of both masters and doctoral students. External funding sources also support undergraduate student research, student scholarships, new teaching initiatives, faculty research and travel, and buildings and equipment.

This diversified fiscal profile is particularly important as the University's ability to depend upon state funding is increasingly called into question. All public institutions of higher education in California began to experience the harsh reality of the state's current budget crisis in 2002-03, with deep cuts initiated in 2003-04. Our open and transparent processes that emphasize multi-year planning, together with campus community engagement through shared governance (Please see: Budget Messages from President Weber; SDSU Budget Updates; CSU Budget Central), are assuring that we weather the crisis in as rational and humane a manner as possible. In addition, the recent approval of a new CSU Compact with the Governor will provide some stability. The Compact provides a minimum of 3% enrollment growth funding plus an additional 3% in funding for other costs through 2010-11.

Providing Facilities to Support our Mission [CFRs: 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 & Q1; 4.1, 4.2]

The SDSU Campus Physical Master Plan, which provides a comprehensive strategy for addressing academic facility and related needs (e.g., parking, housing, research space), is designed to meet the University mission. However, our ability to provide facilities to support our mission is not without its challenges. SDSU is currently master planned with an enrollment capacity of 25,000 academic year, on-campus FTES. Based on CSU formulas, the campus currently has a physical capacity of 110% in lecture, 114% in lower division laboratory, and over 200% in upper division laboratory. The huge excess in upper division laboratory is primarily caused by the inability of the California legislature or CSU by formula to recognize the research space so necessary and vital to SDSU's instructional mission. Until we raise our master planned ceiling no new space will be forthcoming and cannot be justified under the current State and CSU policies. We are now in the process of raising the ceiling to 35,000 FTE capacity by 2020 to provide some relief and allow our facilities to keep pace with enrollment and to fulfill our mission.

The SDSU program and approval review process for State funding of facilities starts with a concept and feasibility study and ends with approval of funding as part of the Governor's budget. To receive any State funding, SDSU must compete at the system-wide level with 22 other campuses. Over the past five years (1998-2003) SDSU received approval for \$83 million for State-funded facility projects, ranking third among CSU campuses. However, this success in securing funding is tempered by the following constraints: the California legislature mandates that CSU make requests for capital outlay funding for space for classrooms and laboratories based on legislatively approved utilization standards and a reasonable assumption of summer term enrollment. CSU bases its five-year capital outlay plan on utilization of instructional facilities during the summer, assuming a summer term enrollment of at least 40%. This means that until we achieve a 40% summer term enrollment, a goal

that is not projected to be met for some years, no additional capacity space for lecture or laboratory will be achieved.

The constraints imposed by State and CSU policies have led to the development of a multitude of other sources (e.g., donor funds, student fees, self-support and auxiliary funding) to assist us in fulfilling our mission. SDSU acquired \$147.5 million for non-State funded facility projects, ranking first among all CSU campuses. As a result, SDSU's total of \$230.5 million for facility projects ranked first, 18% above the campus with the second largest total. Another example of the creativity used by various campus units, organizations, and individuals can be seen in the donation to SDSU of 200 acres of land near the SDSU Imperial Valley Campus (Brawley). Five of those acres were set aside and donated instead to one of our auxiliaries, Aztec Shops. This enabled Aztec Shops to finance the construction of a classroom/administrative building as the first facility on the new Brawley campus site. Initial cost of this facility, which will have eight classrooms, offices, and a snack room, totaling approximately 10,000 square feet, is \$1,339,875. From concept to opening, the project will have taken approximately 18 months. The facility will be leased to SDSU for 15 years, after which Aztec Shops will donate the facility to the University. This contribution – and many others – from Aztec Shops, a not-for-profit organization which primarily runs the University bookstore and food services, is but one example of the use of non-State funded dollars received from many sources within the SDSU community.

Maximizing the use and expanding the capabilities of existing facilities are also important elements of resource acquisition and utilization. For example, the need for larger lecture halls has been in the planning stages for some time. Though SDSU has had, for some time, 300-seat lecture halls, current and future budget constraints provided the impetus for the University to expeditiously find ways of accommodating even larger numbers of students in a single lecture hall. In October 2002 SDSU embarked on converting the former Women's Gym into a 500-seat lecture hall. This project was completed in August 2003, in time for the fall 2003 semester. The facility is extremely high tech, with video screens, wireless microphones, and keypads at every desk. Prior to the start of the fall 2003 semester, every instructor using the classroom was given extensive training in use of the technology located in the classroom and in pedagogical techniques especially relevant in large classes. Many of the course sections offered in this lecture hall also rely on breakout sessions (either lab or small lectures), which provide more opportunities for additional small group student experiences and provide an important source of funding for graduate students. Also, this large lecture hall has allowed more extensive use of existing lecture halls, creating a much more efficient use of space and an ability to help address SDSU's FTES demand in a reduced budget environment.

Not only is it essential to practice efficient and effective facility utilization, but it is also important to ensure that current facilities are maintained and updated to support the academic mission. A strong library is central to a strong university. The SDSU Library has extensive resources to support both students and faculty. The SDSU book collection remains superb, with holdings of 1,705,803 books and 6,435,109 total library collections. SDSU Library holdings are also supplemented by many scientific holdings from UCSD. Instructional support for faculty includes use of the Blackboard system, options for course readings, course reserves, electronic resource linkings, and library instruction for classes. Additionally, there are a number of on-line databases to support both student learning and faculty research. In 2002 the University Senate endorsed the need for increased funding for the Library (SDSU Senate minutes, April 9, 2002; SDSU Library Committee, SDSU Library Budget Study: Resource Needs for a Research Extensive University Report). Though the current budget is projected to meet Library needs for the current academic year, there is continued concern about inflation and budget reductions eroding the library's ability to remain current and to provide the full-range of library services the University requires. Development/fundraising for the Library endowment has been difficult due in some part to lack of a ready made pool of donors. To provide some assistance, in March 2002 the SDSU student body voted a \$10/semester fee to keep the Library open for extended hours.

Supporting Our Commitment to the Growth of Graduate Programs [CFRs: 3.5, 4.2]

SDSU, as discussed in Essay 2b, identified research as a key part of its mission over two decades ago. While important to both undergraduate and graduate education, research is particularly central to the latter. Hence, graduate programs have an important place in the culture of the University. The California Master Plan for Higher Education defines the primary mission of the CSU as providing education through bachelor- and master-levels and includes joint doctoral programs in partnership with the University of California and other California universities. SDSU doctoral graduates have been steadily increasing, with more than 50 graduates in spring 2004. In AY 2004-05 SDSU will have 16 doctoral degree programs and anticipates graduating more than 50 doctoral students. The development and sustenance of these doctoral programs, as well as 78 masters programs [See Graduate Bulletin] is a compelling example of how the institution has allocated resources to support its mission of becoming a nationally recognized university. It has required institutional will, focus, and dedication. The required resources include money, certainly, but also a qualified research faculty, individual leadership, and institutional planning.

The CSU's funding formulas do not include any differential for graduate education. All students — from first year freshmen to doctoral students — are funded on the basis of a 15-unit FTES. There is no recognition of the supervisory work required of thesis or dissertation chairs. No special funding is assigned to the support of graduate students. Graduate education — especially in doctoral programs — is very expensive and requires creative financing. SDSU supports its programs in two ways: through the instructional budget and through grants and contracts administered by the Foundation. Instructional funding used to build joint doctorates and to offer small graduate seminars comes from the same pool that provides undergraduate courses and programs, and here lies the crux of campus debates and disagreements: Is the dedication of resources to high-quality graduate education at SDSU, including joint-doctoral programs, harming undergraduate education? To answer this question, in 2003, the Graduate Council and Academic Resources and Planning Committee (ARP) of the Senate undertook a study that demonstrated that doctoral programs actually added value to the University. For example, grants and contract dollars generated by faculty officially appointed to doctoral programs exceeded \$242 million over the five years of their study. The study also observed that "Masters and undergraduate students receive opportunities that would not exist without the Joint Doctoral Programs" and that "Joint Doctoral programs within academic departments greatly increase the ability of the department to compete for faculty, over time, setting the direction of the department." Moreover, as noted in Essay 2b, students benefit directly from the research generated within these programs. Nonetheless, the unfunded cost of these programs creates additional challenges during this budget crisis. To assist us in weathering this financial storm, the SDSU Foundation promised the University approximately \$400,000 in AY 2004-05 to support course buy outs for research-active faculty, equipment matching funds, and library acquisitions. Without this support, some joint doctoral programs were in danger of not being able to admit students for AY 2004-05.

Instructional funds alone cannot sustain joint doctoral programs even in the best of budget years. Most programs rely on externally funded research to support masters and doctoral students. Research grants also provide equipment and facilities that enrich student learning at all levels. This has created a situation where funding opportunities, rather than University priorities, tend to drive research and program development. Most current joint doctorates are in departments that attract a substantial number of grants and contracts, and are heavily concentrated in the sciences.

Funding is only part of the resource question. Even more crucial is a qualified research faculty who can present themselves as peers to faculty at partner institutions. There must be one or more key individuals with the vision and dedication to lead programs into existence. The University is building this capacity through energetic faculty recruitment, bringing in people with strong credentials at advanced ranks and hiring and evaluating junior faculty for their research potential. In many cases,

mid-career faculty are revitalized by their participation in these programs through the research opportunities that doctoral students present.

Finally, a strong graduate program requires excellent students. To attract strong students, an institution must provide some degree of financial support, including stipends, assistantships, and fee waivers. Most doctoral students receive competitive support, which includes a stipend, fee subsidy and, if applicable, an out-of-state tuition waiver, while 25% of foreign and non-resident graduate students at SDSU also receive a tuition waiver. At the masters degree level, SDSU recognized the importance of financial support some years ago and by the mid-1990s there was an unwritten rule that no new graduate program would be approved unless the department could demonstrate a commitment to fund at least one-third of its students. Like many other funding categories, graduate student support is at risk in the current budget climate, raising worrisome questions about the survival of the strong, high-quality programs already in place.

These worries are not simply abstractions. Although until spring 2004 the absolute numbers of graduate students has been steadily increasing, graduate enrollments as a percentage of overall enrollments have been declining for more than a decade, and are now lower than the national average and even the CSU average. Historically, 18% of students have been enrolled in graduate programs at SDSU. This percent, however, includes all postbaccalaureate students. Currently, that percentage is between 13% - 18%, depending on whether we include students taking post baccalaureate classes for their teaching credential (18%) or exclude these students (13%). To some extent this decrease in percent of graduate students is the result of the surge in undergraduate enrollment we have seen since the mid 1990s. But the percentage of graduate students had been declining even before that, and in spring 2004 we experienced a surprising drop in graduate FTES. Campus conversations about increasing the percentage of graduate students to 20% began as early as AY 1993-94. In AY 2003-04 the Graduate Division clearly defined its goal to reach 20% of overall enrollment, not including postbaccalaureate students, and initiated a new approach to research and planning. In the past, the Division merely responded to department plans and faculty interest. At present, the Graduate Division is becoming more aggressive about University-led recruitment and stimulating new program growth. Assisted by the Graduate Council, it is gathering and analyzing data on the current situation, comparing the University to similar institutions, and conducting focus groups with departments targeted for growth. Using these results, the Graduate Division, guided by the Graduate Council, will build a strategic plan for growth.

The challenge is to increase the number of graduate students, while improving their overall quality. At first, these two goals may be contradictory: by tightening our standards we may lower our numbers initially. The long-term goal is to add programs where there is faculty expertise and student interest. In this, the key to growth lies in interdisciplinary programs, master's programs, and advanced certificate programs. For example, in 2004, the University initiated a new master's degree in Homeland Security, one of very few in the country that draws upon faculty and curricula in several colleges. This interdisciplinary program is taught by faculty from the Colleges of Health and Human Services, Sciences, Professional Studies and Fine Arts, and Arts and Letters. On the other hand, we may not be able to afford many more doctoral programs because of their cost and lower student yield. The University must decide if it will continue to make growth in joint-doctoral programs a priority, or shift to a broader view of graduate program growth. Clearly, these questions will require institutional planning, leadership, and consensus-building.

Reflective Essay 3b: An Organization Built Upon Shared Governance

Introduction

This essay will describe the shared governance process in detail and provide three examples of how shared governance has operated on our campus. The first two examples illustrate the manner in which

the University Senate, through its committees, has influenced the development of two key initiatives: multi-year budget planning and enrollment management. The third example addresses the role of students in shared governance.

Shared Governance Process [CFR: 3.11 & Q4, Q5]

SDSU has a strong tradition of shared governance through the University Senate. The Board of Trustees assigns decision-making authority to the President of the institution, who, in turn, "shares" that authority with the faculty and other campus constituencies through a system of advice and consent located formally in the Senate. Other relations of formal and informal governance exist, for example with the students through the Associated Students (AS) governing board. The Senate is made up predominantly of tenured/tenure-track faculty, but also includes representatives of the administration, staff, lecturers, and students. It thus incorporates models of both individual representation (each college directly elects a number of senators proportionate to its FTEF) and constituency representation. Our philosophy of governance is collaborative, not adversarial, decision-making. Since 1997, the Senate, for the most part, has succeeded in bringing together campus constituencies to further the work of governance, and has collaborated successfully with the President to develop policy. In fact, from January 1997 through May 2004 the President approved 86.1% of Senate items, modified 1.16%, did not approve .77%, and took no action on 13.13%.

SDSU is also governed by collective bargaining agreements between the CSU and its faculty and staff. These bargaining agreements include faculty, support staff, academic professionals, and physicians, skilled crafts members, and public safety. Thus, shared governance requires a careful negotiation of boundaries between the territory of the Senate and that of the faculty and staff collective bargaining agencies. Similarly, the University Policy File has been developed with careful attention to the language in our negotiated contracts, especially that of the California Faculty Association (CFA). SDSU has been very successful in developing a good understanding between the CFA and the Senate. For example, the president of the local chapter of CFA is an ex officio, nonvoting member of both the Senate and the Senate Executive Committee.

The institution encourages faculty to participate in governance at all levels. However, for reasons explained in Essay 2b, demographic changes in the faculty may lead to a small "crisis" of leadership in governance. As a generation of faculty leaders retires, we find a gap in mid-level faculty (caused in part by a long period of limited recruitment that only ended in the late 1990s). Thirty-five percent of the faculty (N = 271) has been at SDSU less than five years, which means that they are primarily engaged in demonstrating their competence in teaching and professional growth. Assuring future leadership through recruiting and mentoring junior faculty has become a high priority of the Senate in particular and the campus in general.

Although there is continual negotiation over the areas that are within the purview of the Senate, there is general agreement that the appropriate Senate committees review all academic policies and all practices that concern faculty. Among the major committees and councils through which the faculty exercises its influence are Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P), Academic Resources and Planning (AR&P), Academic Personnel, Diversity, Equity, and Outreach, General Education, Graduate Council, Research Council, Undergraduate Curriculum, and Undergraduate Council. Most committees and councils include representatives from each college, including the Imperial Valley Campus, as well as administrators, students, and staff.

Multi-year budget planning [CFRs: 3.5, 4.1, 4.2 & Q3]

The development of SDSU's budget planning process advanced with the expansion of the President's budget advisory committee—the Cabinet Budget Committee, or CBC—into a true embodiment of shared governance. Despite repeated requests throughout the 1980s to add faculty to the CBC, budgetary advice was divided between two committees: the Senate's Committee on Academic

Resources and Planning, or AR&P (mostly faculty), and the President's CBC (entirely administration). In 1992, President Thomas B. Day added two faculty and one student to CBC. In 1999, the CBC was expanded further to its current complement of five administrators (one a non-voting chair, except when there is a tie), three faculty members, and one student. Hence, today faculty and students have two opportunities to provide advice and consultation: through AR&P (which also includes a staff representative) and through CBC.

With the arrival of President Stephen L. Weber, a new opportunity arose for consultation that has had a significant impact on budget planning. Out of the Shared Vision process, the President developed a number of initiatives that required new funding. At the same time, the Athletics program faced a crucial need for resources in order to meet the requirements of a gender equity settlement between the Trustees of the CSU system and the California National Organization for Women. The faculty also advocated for an accelerated program to rebuild the tenure-track faculty, which had been sharply reduced by the cutbacks of 1992-93. Finding resources for all these priorities required a level of planning in which the university had not previously engaged. AR&P developed the structure of a three-year budget plan that spread out the costs, thus permitting more initiatives to be funded at any one time. A working committee consisting of Senate leaders and the administration's key financial officers crafted a document, the Compact for University Excellence, which outlined this new multi-year budgetary approach. Senate passed the Compact unanimously in May 1997, it was then endorsed by the CBC, and finally accepted by the President. The Compact was a comprehensive program that established the budgetary direction for the university under a new President. The University continued to follow the principles of multi-year budgeting—spreading costs out over successive years rather than concentrating them in one—through successive years, until the budget reductions that began in 2002-03 rendered such planning impossible. However, Budget Principles developed by the Senate in 2002 are used to guide decision-making during this current financial storm, another example of shared governance.

Through shared governance, we have built a structure that continues to support the financial health of the institution. A good example of this is the role of AR&P in helping to develop and support a strategy for reducing costs during the energy crisis of 2001. In addition, CBC and AR&P have cooperated to provide generally consistent advice to the President on how to enact budget cuts just as they had on budget enhancements. One of the most vexing issues each committee has faced is how to assure adequate course sections to meet instructional demands without severely damaging the infrastructure that supports the mission of the University. To do so, during the 2003-04 budget deliberations, CBC recommended a strategy to support course sections as a matter of highest priority essentially equivalent to institutional costs, which highlights the institution's commitment to meeting student needs. This commitment was further demonstrated by the President's approval, after appropriate consultation, of an \$80/semester increase in the Instructionally Related Activities fee to generate additional revenue for support of Athletics as well as to enable the transfer of state funds from Athletics to Academic Affairs for support of approximately 490 additional course sections.

The campus community has been deeply engaged in and regularly informed about the unfolding drama of the California budget crisis and the University's response to it through a series of budget updates. The Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs also set in motion a series of planning sessions involving a broad profile of campus constituencies to develop strategies for physical growth, enrollment management, and budget decisions. But, ultimately, the recommendations that go to the President come from the CBC and AR&P, both defined by and a part of our system of shared governance.

Enrollment Management [CFRs: 3.11 & Q5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5]

During the 1980s, over-enrollment of students occurred due to lack of enrollment management authority and tools. The result was large numbers of students attempting to "crash" over enrolled

classes, long lines at all student service offices, an increasing length of time to graduation, and a deteriorating reputation in the community. The budget reductions of 1991-92 and 1992-93 temporarily eliminated this problem, along with thousands of students and hundreds of temporary faculty and staff, but in the mid-1990s, enrollment pressures began to mount once again. In the summer of 1996, Stephen L. Weber arrived as the first new president of SDSU in 18 years. He immediately consulted with the chair of University Senate on two initiatives: enrollment management and strategic planning. They agreed that the Senate would take the lead on the first and the President on the second, with mutual consultation on both.

The Senate began its work with the initial goal of producing an enrollment management policy by the end of fall 1996. The need was underscored by the fact that the University was over enrolled by 1,200 students that semester, producing a \$5-6 million shortfall. It soon became evident that, despite meeting every two weeks, one semester would not be long enough to do the job well. The Senate needed to gather data from all constituencies, especially faculty who were concerned that limiting enrollment would have an unequal effect on the admission of underrepresented groups. Before recommending specific enrollment management strategies, such as requesting status as an impacted campus (which permits the establishment of higher admission standards), the Senate aimed to develop overarching principles that would guide the university through difficult decisions. The task of developing principles, reviewing budgetary implications, and recommending strategies was given to the existing committees on Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P) and Academic Resources and Planning (AR&P) and to a specially created Enrollment Management Task Force. [See review process] These groups worked throughout 1996-97, consulted continually with the administration, and in May 1997, at the last Senate meeting of the academic year, presented first, a recommendation to the President that he request impacted status for the campus and second, a recommendation to add Principles to Guide Impaction to the University Policy File. After considerable debate, and with some opposition, the Senate approved both, and President Weber subsequently requested and received impacted status for SDSU. [See timetable]

Enrollment management has not been universally accepted either on campus or in the community. Within the Senate, disagreements have taken place over what should be considered policy, and thus the prerogative of the Senate, and what is more properly implementation, belonging to the administration. Cognizant of the controversial status of this issue, the Senate attempted to put into place a number of requirements for review. Each year, the Division of Academic Affairs provides AP&P with extensive data on how well the enrollment management policies conform to the Principles and AP&P in turn reports to the Senate. Nevertheless, some controversy continues, especially with the addition of each new strategy for implementing the plan. In 2002, the chair of the Senate, responding in part to concerns of some faculty and students, expanded the enrollment management subcommittee of AP&P (which replaced the separate task force formed in 1996-97) to include a larger representation of faculty and students, which in turn became the campus-based part of a Presidential enrollment management advisory committee that also includes members of the community. There have been spirited debates, both inside and outside of the Senate, over our attempts to control enrollment and some notable failures of communication and understanding, particularly with the prior leadership of Associated Students. Nonetheless, the majority of faculty endorse the need to manage enrollment in order to provide an excellent education to those students we are able to admit. [See analysis] The example of enrollment management, like multi-year budget planning, demonstrates how the university is prepared to address large and vexing issues as a campus, and not just as an administration.

The Student Role in Shared Governance [4.1]

The move toward enrollment management tested traditional patterns and policies for student participation in shared governance of the university. The official governing body representing students is Associated Students (AS), which is also a multi-million dollar corporation that runs several

facilities and services at SDSU. During the AY 2001-02, Associated Students expressed concern about the potential impact of enrollment management on the diversity of the student population. The ensuing discussions highlighted two factors that constrain the interaction of students with other components of the university.

First is a difference in style. The AS Council deliberates and acts through resolutions. Issues are introduced directly to the full Council and are debated over successive meetings. On the other hand, deliberations in the Senate start at the committee level. By the time they are introduced to the full Senate, the issues have been well debated and prepared for relatively quick Senate action. Student representatives on the Senate, accustomed to extended debate in a large forum, are greeted with well-processed action items.

The logistics of student representation in Senate committees create a second factor that constrains student participation in governance. Students can have greater voice and opportunity to shape action items when/if they work through the Senate committees. However, Senate committees meet frequently and, some would say, offer a less exciting agenda. It has been difficult to find students who are able to attend the meetings regularly throughout the academic year or even a semester, especially since the demands of weekly meetings of the AS Council and of other AS committees and boards are already substantial.

AS and the Senate are working to address these constraints. In 2002, AS underwent a five-year review as is required of all auxiliary organizations by Senate Policy. The review was thorough and thoughtful, and from it came a number of recommendations to increase the participation of students in shared governance and to improve communication between AS and the Senate. Independently, AS established a University Affairs Board, headed by a new Vice President, to organize and facilitate student participation in Senate committees and elsewhere in the University governance structure (e.g., the Undergraduate Council). The Senate also recently approved pre-registration for students who serve on Senate committees, allowing students to shape their schedules to attend committee meetings. The Senate is also encouraging committees to establish their schedules early enough to accommodate students and faculty. At the request of AS, a Shared Governance Task Force was established in spring 2003 to seek improvements in the interaction between the components of the university.

Success stories to date include cooperation between the Senate and AS over efforts to enhance the Library's budget, the recent Senate approval of an AS initiated proposal to include American Sign Language as one of the options in the university's undergraduate language requirement, and discussions about course syllabi availability to students prior to the beginning of classes. Finally, the establishment of the Campus Fee Advisory Committee has played an important role in ensuring student input in fee changes related to courses, student services, parking, and housing. The Committee is composed of seven students (appointed by AS), three administrators, two faculty and one staff member (representative of Senate) and is the primary, but not exclusive, source of advice regarding increases in campus fees. Considerable change has already taken place that indicates the increased involvement and influence of the student voice on campus issues.

Summary

These two essays illustrate our capacity to achieve our institutional purposes and educational objectives through an organizational structure that facilitates decisions regarding our human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. Given the challenging budgetary situation we currently face, we are both pleased and confident that the structures we have in place will allow us to make wise decisions, aligned with our institutional purposes, about our resources. Finally, the essays provide evidence of our progress in the areas of planning and governance, two issues the WASC 1997 report felt merited attention. As in any learning organization, we are involved with reflection,

evidence, and change to ensure that we continue to make improvements in our shared governance processes as well as our planning.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Reflective Essay 4a: Shifting to a Culture Based on Evidence

Introduction

National conversations about higher education emphasize the importance of providing evidence of student learning as a principal gauge of educational effectiveness. Additionally, research over the past 20 years indicates that student learning occurs both inside and outside the classroom and can be enhanced by developing purposeful institutional practices that lead to greater student engagement. Thus, it is important that the traditional boundaries between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs so common on many campuses, including our own, be crossed to recognize that student learning occurs holistically from multiple sources of influence.

This essay will describe two examples, one from Academic Affairs and another from Student Affairs, of intentional planning efforts to improve student learning. The example from Academic Affairs describes changes that have taken place in the Academic Review process and the very recent alignment of this process with the yearly Academic Plans initiated by Provost Marlin in 1998. The example from Student Affairs describes recent changes in both organization and intention that began with the arrival of a new Vice President for Student Affairs in 2000.

Academic Affairs: The Alignment of Academic Plans and Academic Reviews [CRFs: 4.3, 4.4, 4.6 4.8, and 2.7]

The Academic Review process recognizes our abiding commitment to improving the academic quality of our programs in a collaborative and reflective fashion. The process is operated under the auspices of Academic Affairs and has been undertaken since the early 1970s. The Provost delegates operational functions to either the Office of Undergraduate Studies or the Office of Graduate and Research Affairs, depending on whether a department does or does not have graduate programs. The administrative team that conducts all reviews includes the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Graduate Dean, the Undergraduate Dean, the relevant College Dean, as well as a panel of three faculty members. Two members of the panel are faculty from appropriate universities with expertise in the discipline of the department under review, while the third member is an SDSU faculty person from a department in a different college than the department being reviewed. If a department or program undergoes external accreditation, it may ask for permission to substitute this process for the Academic Review process.

The primary purpose of the Academic Review is to provide a systematic process designed to improve the quality of our degree programs. Operating procedures are clearly described in the Senate Policy File and additional information is sent to departments from either Graduate Division or the Division of Undergraduate Studies prior to the review. Most reviews are held approximately every 7-9 years. Each department or program undergoing review develops a self-study that serves as the basis of the review process. While there was no standard format for the self-study until fall 2003, it has long been expected that departments provide quantitative and qualitative evidence, in support of their narrative, to indicate how well programs are meeting their goals. The visiting panel has an initial meeting with the SDSU administrative team at the beginning of the review process and another meeting at the conclusion of the visit. The panel then writes a report detailing the strengths and weaknesses of the department and provides recommendations for strategies to assist program improvement. This report is shared with the department/program and with the SDSU administrative team. Within a month, a follow-up meeting is held with the department chair and the administrative panel to discuss the

report and any potential changes including curricular offerings, advising practices, faculty hires, or budgetary issues that would facilitate program improvement.

In 1999, in recognition of the growing conversation about student learning outcomes in higher education, the Academic Review process was expanded to incorporate discussions of the assessment of student learning. Departments were given specific instructions and materials to guide them with assessment and were directed to contact the Associate Dean in Division of Undergraduate Studies who chairs the University Committee on Assessment (UCA). An assessment workshop was held February 25, 1999, to assist departments with their assessment plans. In March of the same year the graduate dean sent a letter to all department chairs and program coordinators that outlined the time table for incorporating student learning outcomes assessment in Academic Reviews. Departments or programs reviewed in the AY 1999-00 were expected to incorporate an assessment plan into their Academic Review. Departments/programs being reviewed during the AY 2000-01 were expected to submit their assessment plan for review to the UCA during the previous year. And beginning academic year 2001-02, each department/program was to submit their assessment plan to UCA the year prior to their review and include assessment results as part of their Academic Review self-study. However, these changes were not entirely effective as no mechanisms were in place to ensure that departments submitted their assessment plans to UCA prior to their review. In addition, there was no follow-up on how departments used the results of their assessment of student learning to improve their programs.

Provost Marlin initiated annual academic planning by departments in 1998. As part of our shared governance process, the Provost worked in concert with the University Senate AP&P committee. These initial plans were primarily focused toward the allocation of tenure-track positions, which was to be tied to programmatic planning by departments, programs, and colleges. Each January, Provost Marlin requests that departments develop an Academic Plan that includes the following planning issues: 1) the department's overriding academic goals; 2) a description of programs that the department wishes to maintain and/or develop and their alignment with department academic goals; 3) a discussion of curricular and/or hiring changes required; 4) alignment of departmental goals with College and University goals; and 5) a summary of the comprehensive hiring plan.

More recently, to improve our capacity to examine student learning, additional changes have taken place to the Academic Plan process. In spring 2003, a description of student learning goals and objectives and a summary of the implications of assessment results was also included as part of the Academic Plan. During spring 2004 the Provost decided that the traditional academic plan would be modified to focus entirely on student learning and its assessment. In addition, beginning AY 2004-05 an annual report will be submitted by all departments/programs that describes modifications that have been instituted as a result of the assessment of student learning. These recent changes in policy and procedures demonstrate our commitment to create intentional planning efforts on student learning.

During the AY 2002-03, the Provost and the Deans of the Graduate Division and Undergraduate Studies worked together to align the Academic Plan and the Academic Review processes to streamline the process and make it more relevant to long-term planning. In addition, this alignment assists our efforts to shift the culture from one in which academic reviews are seen as periodic events undertaken every seven years to a culture that is truly committed to continuous improvement processes.

To facilitate this change in culture, the content of the Academic Review materials has been dramatically changed. Departments now write five reflective essays, one of which is an analysis of student learning outcomes, including a summary of results and how they were used for program planning and improvement. [See cover letter and written materials] Departments undergoing reviews in the 2003-04 AY were to be the first to undergo the new procedure; however, the Provost

temporarily suspended the Academic Review process due to budgetary constraints. Therefore, our ability to assess the effectiveness of this change will be delayed.

Student Affairs: The Development of Student Affairs Learning Outcomes [CFRs: 1.2, 1.5, 2.11, 4.6]
The Division of Student Affairs has undergone significant changes in the past three years. These changes include reorganization of the division and the creation of a new mission, changes and additions in personnel, and the development of a Dean of Students (DOS) model to create more intentional links between academic and student affairs.

Prior to 2000, each department within the Division of Student Affairs had its own director who reported to the Vice President of Student Affairs. This structure resulted in silo-like functioning, with each director essentially operating independently and with little interaction with other units within Student Affairs. Consequently, in 2001 the Division of Student Affairs was reorganized into three subdivisions: Dean of Students, Student Affairs Administration, and Student Services and Budget Administration. For example, the Dean of Students has responsibility for the following units within Student Affairs: Residential Education, Centers for Student Involvement, Career Services, Office of Student Rights and Responsibility, and Counseling and Psychological Services. The Dean of Students works with the assistant deans for student affairs from each College at SDSU and the Imperial Valley Campus. Departments within each subdivision work closely together toward common goals, resulting in coordinated efforts toward supporting student success.

The programs under the Dean of Students are in the process of defining their mission and purpose to students and to the campus community using learning outcomes as a framework. The goal is to identify learning experiences, within the overall University goals for student learning, that these programs currently offer, or should offer, to students. Additionally, these programs, services and activities will be organized to support, facilitate, assess and provide reflective opportunities about student learning.

To initiate this process, a retreat was held in January 2003 where the Dean of Students' directors worked with small groups of faculty, staff and students to identify Student Affairs learning outcomes. Six learning outcomes have been identified and include the areas of mentoring, involvement and leadership, wellness, personal and career development, ethical and civic responsibility, and cultural awareness. Conversations continue about the development of activities and services to support these outcomes. Next steps include developing strategies for assessing the outcomes and creating regular opportunities to reflect on evidence to ensure that continuous improvement processes become an embedded part of the Student Affairs division. Future plans include developing web-based materials for easy access for students, faculty, administrators, and others that create intentional links between what is going on inside the classroom with experiences outside the classroom. A Director for Testing, Assessment, and Research (TAR), hired in March 2004, will work with directors on refining outcomes, developing activities that align with the outcomes, and developing direct measures of student learning. The use of direct measures of student learning has not been a part of the culture of Student Affairs on our campus, where student perceptions of satisfaction with services have been the dominant form of assessment. Thus, we are in the very beginning stages of moving toward an evidence-based culture in Student Affairs.

Summary

Academic Reviews of all graduate, undergraduate, and interdisciplinary degrees and programs have been a part of our culture since the early 1970s. This process incorporates external and internal reviewers to ensure that program quality is evaluated on a regular basis. In addition, qualitative and quantitative data gleaned from students, employers, and alumni are used to provide feedback on the currency and vibrancy of the curriculum and the learning experiences of the students. As a result of these processes, the curriculum is constantly evolving and new degrees are developed to ensure that

students have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for our complex, diverse, and global society. Recent changes to these procedures are critical to moving the campus forward in the use of inquiry and evidence as part of these processes. Evidence of and reflection on student learning outcomes is now embedded within both the annual Academic Plans and the periodic Academic Review procedures. These changes are quite recent and we look forward to reflecting on the evidence gathered from reviews of departments that undergo the new procedures. Similarly, the changes in the Division of Student Affairs are also very recent. The addition of the TAR Director will enhance the ability of the Division to make progress in defining and measuring student learning outcomes for its programs. It is still too early to ascertain the impact the departure of the Dean of Students in May 2004 may have on the organizational structure of Student Affairs and/or the programs reporting to the Dean of Students.

Reflective Essay 4b: Assessing Writing Competency and Proficiency

Introduction

Writing provides one of the most informative, and most common, measures of student learning at the University. SDSU has refined the assessment of writing skills over recent years. In the past, freshmen either met a writing competency requirement—which demonstrates competency to begin baccalaureate-level writing—before admission or enrolled in and passed developmental writing courses before proceeding past their first year. Upon fulfilling the writing competency requirement, students moved into and completed the required General Education writing sequence. Transfer students met a writing competency requirement before enrolling in upper-division courses. In addition, all students completed an upper-division writing requirement to assure that student writing was proficient by the time of graduation. This essay will describe the changes that have taken place in demonstrating writing competency and proficiency at SDSU, the rationale for these changes, and how these changes facilitate a more timely assessment of writing proficiency that allows students opportunities for continued writing improvement.

Changes in Writing Competency Requirements: Freshmen [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 4.3, and 4.7]

Writing competency requirements are described in the SDSU General Catalog each year and can be found on the SDSU web site. Writing competency is demonstrated in two basic ways: receiving a specific score on one of a number of national or state tests [i.e., CSU English Placement Test (EPT), SAT verbal test, ACT English usage test, AP language and composition or literature and composition test, CSU English Equivalency Examination, College Board SAT II Writing Test]; or attempting but failing the EPT and earning credit in a developmental writing class.

While the requirements have been consistent, the time frame in which students must complete writing competency and the consequences of failure to complete this requirement have changed dramatically. In AY 1996-97 students had three semesters within which to demonstrate competency. This was reduced to two semesters in AY 1997-98. In AY 1998-99 students who were not exempt from the EPT because of test scores had to take the EPT prior to registration in any classes. Students who failed the EPT had to enroll in the appropriate Rhetoric and Writing Studies developmental course in the first semester. If they did not clear the requirement by the end of the second semester they lost registration priority. In AY 1999-00 the requirements remained the same, with the added stipulation that failure to complete the requirement by the end of the second semester resulted in disenrollment from the University. The following year students were required to complete both writing and math competency by the end of the first academic year or be subject to disenrollment.

Change in Writing Competency Requirements: Transfer Students [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 4.3, and 4.7]

Similar changes occurred for transfer students. In the past, students could demonstrate competency by either receiving a specific score on one of a number of national or state tests, as described for

freshmen; or passing with a C or better a transferable GE English Composition course and passing the Transfer Writing Assessment or earning credit in a developmental writing class.

Changes to the time frame for completion of writing competency for transfer students followed the same pattern as changes for freshmen. The primary difference was that the consequences of failing to complete the requirements resulted in loss of priority registration, rather than disenrollment. In addition, transfer students had to meet this requirement before enrolling in upper-division courses for which writing competency was a prerequisite.

Upper-Division Writing Test [CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 4.3, and 4.7]

All students, those who begin at SDSU and those who transfer in, must also satisfy the upper-division writing requirement, which is mandated through the CSU's Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement. In the past, in order to attempt to satisfy this requirement, students must have completed or be completing 60 units, have fulfilled the entry-level writing competency requirement, and have completed the General Education Communication and Critical Thinking requirement in Composition and Intermediate Composition and Critical Thinking. Students whose majors did not specify any particular course or procedure could demonstrate proficiency by passing either the University Upper Division Writing Test or passing one course from a specified list of courses with a grade of CR or C.

Rationale for Changes in Writing Requirements

The requirements described in the previous sections created three liabilities. One, considerable resources were devoted to the developmental writing needs of first-year students. For example, over the years 1998 to 2001 approximately 38% of freshmen were enrolled in these courses. Second, transfer students were treated differently than students who began as freshmen at the University on the assumption that the lower-division writing courses (and placement exams) at community colleges and other universities were not as effective as those at SDSU. Third, many students waited until their last semester to take the upper-division writing exam and only then learned that they did not write well enough to graduate.

Several factors brought about revisions in the writing requirements at SDSU. As described in essays for Standard 1 and Standard 3, enrollment management policies allowed the university to expect better academically prepared freshmen. In addition, the implementation of the dual admission program in fall 2002 meant that local students who did not meet SDSU eligibility requirements and who had developmental writing and/or mathematical needs began their education at a community college. These two policies reduced the need for developmental courses for freshmen. During 2003, 30.4% of freshmen students were in developmental courses. Beginning January 2004 the University eliminated the inequity of the Transfer Writing Assessment. Now, all students, transfers and those who begin as freshmen, take the new Writing Proficiency Assessment (WPA), which is scored using a 12-point rubric, when they have completed 60 units. Students who write proficiently fulfill the upper-division writing requirement for graduation. Students with competent writing skills but in need of improvement are directed into upper-division writing courses. Students with inadequate writing skills are required to take a lower-division writing course (RWS 280 or 281 for ESL) to prepare them for the upper-division writing course appropriate for their major. RWS 280/281 are new courses and will be refined over the next two years based on student outcomes and instructor input. Requiring students to take the new upper-division writing requirement when they have completed 60 units prohibits postponing this task until the last semester and provides students with opportunities to take additional writing classes to ensure that they acquire the writing skills we require of graduates.

Summary

The changes described in this essay, and particularly the recent implementation of the Writing Proficiency Assessment, have created the opportunity for the University to assess more systematically

the effectiveness of its writing programs as well as those of feeder institutions. All students will take the exam so different student preparations may be compared directly. The University plans to track these data with the goal of refining lower-division GE coursework as well as providing a measure of success for feeder institutions. In addition, the Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies is currently studying the efficacy of the WPA and exploring additional ways to improve the assessment of writing at the upper division level. They are paying particular attention to the ways in which student learning outcomes related to writing may be better reflected in assessment. They note that, in its present state, the Writing Proficiency Assessment measures the ability of our students to compose a timed essay on a general topic, but it is not specifically linked to many of the key learning outcomes of GE writing courses or W courses.

Concluding Essay

This essay summarizes SDSU's capacity to meet the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity as well as our readiness to conduct the Educational Effectiveness Review. Evidence from the reflective essays demonstrates our progress toward becoming a learning organization committed to reflection, planning, and improvement. Challenges we face and strategies for examining them in the Educational Effectiveness Review are discussed.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives. The changes in policies, procedures, and organization described in the first essay on access, retention, and graduation illustrate the challenges that can arise when external and internal policies must be addressed jointly while finding solutions to these three complex and interwoven issues. Despite this complexity, we have made considerable progress in developing the infrastructure necessary to examine and address these issues. The improvement and expansion of the Office of Analytical Studies and Institutional Research is critical to our ability to gather, analyze, and reflect upon data to make improvement in these areas. The Retention Council, consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators committed to student success, meets regularly to discuss strategies for increasing our effectiveness. These groups will play an integral role in the Educational Effectiveness phase as we examine the effectiveness of our policies and procedures on dual admission students and transfer students.

The second essay for Standard 1 described three initiatives that address one of the University's central goals, educating students for the global community. Growth in internationalism has become a hallmark of the University and the essay described in detail the infrastructure and financial resources that have been dedicated to increasing both the number of international students on our campus, as well as the number of students studying abroad. The other two initiatives described opportunities for students to engage with diverse groups at the local level. While taken together these initiatives demonstrate our commitment to educational objectives, we do need to meet the challenge of finding appropriate mechanisms to systematically examine direct measures of student learning in these programs.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions. The first essay for this standard described the policies, procedures, and structures that SDSU has developed to examine student learning. Many of these developments were implemented last year. The recent creation of a Senate-appointed Committee on Student Learning Outcomes will greatly facilitate our ability to systematically examine the assessment of student learning. The inclusion of student learning assessment as part of Academic Reviews and annual Academic Plans will also assist us in continuing this progress. Finally, the inclusion of workshops on student learning outcomes and assistance given to individual faculty or departments by the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning provides the faculty support so necessary when shifts in institutional thinking are undertaken. Though SDSU has the capacity to examine student learning in the GE program and the major, systematic

examination of student learning has only taken place in disparate programs across campus. We will examine this challenge in detail in the Educational Effectiveness Review.

The second essay for Standard 2 describes our capacity to support the research and creative activity of the faculty. Policies and procedures to support faculty scholarship have been in place for several years, as have expectations for this kind of activity in the retention, tenure, and promotion process. The Office of Faculty Affairs and the Office of Research and Graduate Affairs offer opportunities to apply for internal grants. College Deans have also begun to develop resources to support the scholarly activity of the faculty. In addition, the SDSU Foundation is a strong partner in assisting faculty with all phases of applying for grants and contracts, which has culminated in SDSU receiving over \$130 million dollars in grants and contracts this past year. In fact, the shared commitment of the Foundation and the University to scholarship can be seen by the most recent infusion of over \$400,000 by the Foundation to assist the University in continuing to progress in this area during these financially challenging times. We also described the pervasive nature of student involvement in research activities, with the hypothesis that this activity will enhance student learning. What remains to be examined, however, is evidence to support or refute this hypothesis. We will return to this question in the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability. The first essay for this standard described the mature processes in place to address issues of fiscal, physical, and information resources. SDSU effectively uses a variety of fiscal resources to support facility growth, maintenance, and maximal use of existing facilities. Examples were provided to illustrate our commitment to making decisions in support of our educational objectives. Discussions regarding resources for graduate education exemplify the complexity of these issues and the need for institutional planning and consensus-building as we begin to systematically examine graduate program growth.

The second essay for Standard 3 incorporates two case studies to illustrate the shared governance process that operates on our campus. Since 1997, in particular, this process has allowed us to face and solve difficult issues confronting the University, including budget planning and enrollment management. Changes in the composition of the Cabinet Budget Committee further attest to SDSU's commitment to solving problems by working together. The changes in organization, structures, and policies greatly facilitate our capacity to make wise decisions about aligning resources with institutional purposes.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. The first essay in response to Standard 4 described the Academic Review process that has been employed on campus since the 1970s. More importantly, however, the essay illustrates changes that have taken place in this process to improve its relevance to program improvement, and most recently, to student learning. The essay also described changes that have taken place in Student Affairs to begin the shift toward a student learning emphasis. Many of the changes described in this essay, which have occurred in the past two years, are indicative of the goals of many new administrators, in both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, who have been hired since 2000. Clearly, San Diego State University is shifting its culture toward a focus on student learning. We are cognizant, however, that we are in the early stages of this shift and have much more to accomplish.

The second essay described changes that have taken place in the assessment of writing competency and proficiency. These changes were made in response to a thorough examination of existing policies and procedures and a thoughtful discussion of how best to improve these policies. The essay also described a shift in thinking about writing competency at SDSU: How can we enhance assessment of writing competency and proficiency to link it more directly to student learning and curricular changes in writing courses? The recent implementation (January 2004) of the new Writing Proficiency

Assessment provides an important opportunity to systematically examine the impact of SDSU's updated approach to writing assessment.

In summary, we believe that the Capacity and Preparatory Review demonstrates that San Diego State University has met the WASC four standards, that there is a strong commitment to Institutional Capacity, and that we are ready to stage the Educational Effectiveness Review. While undertaking this process, we have not only documented our progress but have also reflected on areas that we need to examine in depth during the Educational Effectiveness Review. The next sections will highlight the challenges we face, particularly in relation to the three themes we will explore during the next phase of re-accreditation.

Access, Retention, and Graduation

The dual admission program continues to be a subject of debate. Opponents of the program believe that it unfairly removes under-prepared students who are more likely to be students of color from the opportunity to begin their higher education at a university. Proponents describe the considerable resources that have been invested to ensure that students are successful and make the transition from the community colleges to SDSU. As we currently have only one year of data upon which to evaluate this program, we need to gather additional evidence to allow us to reflect on the effects of the dual admission policy on our students and their success.

To date, we have focused our attention on examining how a confluence of initiatives has affected the retention and graduation of first-time freshmen. We must also closely examine the impact of very recent changes in admission policies for transfer students on the retention and graduation rates of these students as well. Finally, given the literature on the positive relationship between student involvement in campus academic and co-curricular networks and student retention (as well as satisfaction with collegiate experiences and various aspects of student development), we need to examine how we facilitate student involvement, which we will be able to evaluate for the first time with our participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement in spring 2004.

By examining these multiple sources of data, we hope to identify the policies, programs, support services, technology, learning environments, faculty support, and co-curricular activities that enhance student learning and improve retention and graduation rates. We will feature and write about these issues in the Educational Effectiveness Report.

Student Learning

While we are pleased with our progress in building capacity to examine student learning, we know that we are in the beginning stages of a systematic examination of direct measures of student learning. We intend to explore student learning in depth as part of the Educational Effectiveness Review. We will select a number of programs for a close examination of direct measures of student learning, including programs with learning outcomes about diversity and/or international themes, two goals described in the Shared Vision document. In addition, during AY 2004-05, we will receive a report from all departments and programs describing assessment activities and documenting how these activities were used to improve student learning. The Educational Effectiveness Review allows us the opportunity to explore what our students are learning and provide recommendations for improvement.

Student Engagement in Research and Creative Activity and its Impact on Student Learning

Research and creative activity have been a definitive part of SDSU's culture for over 30 years. The Preparatory Review described the resources available to faculty to support these endeavors. As the faculty continue to increase the amount of money brought in by grants and contracts, their roles with students evolve into rich opportunities to collaborate on scholarly activities. Though we described the variety of ways that students can become involved in these activities with faculty mentors, we need to

examine the extent to which undergraduate students are integrated into research and creative activity and the impact of this engagement on student learning. We will examine this issue in detail in the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Engaging in the re-accreditation process has led us in important directions. As the essays in this review illustrate, we have identified key issues and challenges and through this process, we have developed strategies for addressing those. Thus, while the re-accreditation process necessarily entails a great deal of work, we believe that we have benefited already from this work. We fully expect that the work leading to the Educational Effectiveness Report will be just as important and useful to San Diego State University.

Response to 1997 WASC Team Visit

This appendix highlights the progress the University has made addressing issues raised in the 1997 site team's report as well as the Commission letter. These issues include: a) planning and faculty governance; b) student learning assessment and faculty effectiveness; c) diversity; and d) the Imperial Valley campus. In several instances, we have addressed these issues in the Preparatory Review report in detail. Thus, here we provide summaries of the progress we have made and refer the reader to specific essays for additional information. The feedback provided by the Commission has facilitated numerous positive changes to our campus.

Planning and Faculty Governance

The visiting team noted, "Recognizing that the shared vision experience with new leadership represents a new beginning, the team recommends that this experience be used as a springboard and that every effort be made to sustain progress in the development of a climate of mutual respect, trust and productive collaboration between the SDSU faculty and the university administration. Special attention should continue to be devoted to the critical role of open communication."

President Weber arrived in 1996, signaling the beginning of a planning process that has been inclusive and wide-reaching. In 1997, he initiated a series of conversations about the vision for SDSU over the next 10 years. The Shared Vision process grew out of a series of wide-ranging conversations involving faculty, staff, students, alumni, parents, neighbors, business and community leaders, friends, and patrons. Audio recordings of these meetings were made available via the web and comments and suggestions were solicited, resulting in over 10,000 visits to the Shared Vision web site. Subsequently, meetings were held in April 1997 and November 1997 to create a clear sense of goals and priorities for SDSU. Finally, President Weber met with cabinet members and deans in January 1998 to finalize the themes and initiatives that had emerged and to set benchmarks against which to measure progress. These activities culminated in five goals that SDSU must address if we are to prepare our students for the 21st century and fulfill our obligation to the communities we serve: a) enhancing SDSU's commitment to academic excellence expressed through superior teaching, research, creative activity, and public service; b) nurturing a learning-centered university that supports the growth and development of the whole person; c) creating a community proud of its diversity and committed to furthering social justice on and off campus; d) promoting the growth, development, and wise use of our precious human and fiscal resources; and e) creating a genuinely global university. Each year President Weber publishes an annual report that describes our progress toward these goals.

Several of the essays contained in the Preparatory Review describe the progress we have made in planning and faculty governance. In regard to planning, Essay 1b (Expanding Our Horizons: Educating Students for the Global Community) describes the creation in 1998 of the position of Assistant Vice President for International Programs to direct the Office of International Programs and to oversee and facilitate international activities and initiatives that advance the goal of creating a genuinely global university. A well developed and well funded infrastructure to assist with increasing both the number of students who study abroad and the number of international students who study at SDSU has been instrumental

in meeting these goals. In fact, from 1998 to 2002, international student enrollment increased from 600 to 1429 and student involvement in study abroad programs increased from 167 to 950 over the same time period. The essay also describes the evolution of the International Business program and the development of transnational multi-degree programs.

Both essays written to address Standard 3 provide detailed examples of our planning and shared governance processes in action. Essay 3a (*Using Our Resources Wisely*) describes the development of our budgetary processes through the work of shared governance. Essay 3b (*An Organization Built Upon Shared Governance*) describes how the shared governance process has been used to face and solve two challenging issues: multi-year planning and enrollment management. This essay also describes the student role in the shared governance process. These essays illustrate that we have evolved from a "shared vision" to shared planning. Data are routinely gathered by offices throughout the campus and used to inform practices. We are working to create a culture of inquiry where decision-making is rooted in evidence gathered from outcomes that are aligned with our goals. The following are selected highlights from these two essays:

- *Cabinet Budget Committee (CBC) role*
This committee consists of four Vice-Presidents, the Executive Assistant to the President, three faculty members, including the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Resources and Planning, and the President of Associated Students. The committee provides recommendations to the President regarding the allocation of resources and exemplifies the shared governance process.
- *Open and transparent budget processes*
Faculty involvement through University Senate Committees and CBC and the numerous budget updates to the campus we receive from both the President and the Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs contribute to an atmosphere in which both faculty and administration see these processes as a strength of the University – a true embodiment of both planning and shared governance at work.
- *Campus Physical Master Plan*
The essay highlights how this comprehensive strategy addresses University goals through use of State and non-State funding. Examples include discussion of the new Brawley campus, the advent of very large classrooms, and library support.
- *Shared Governance Process*
This process is described in detail in Essay 3b. The case study on multi-year budget planning details the collaborative work that resulted in the Compact for University Excellence, which outlined the principles to be followed in regard to resource allocation. In 2002, the University Senate developed Budget Principles that are used to guide decision-making. Enrollment management policies and updates provide another compelling example of the functioning of the shared governance and planning processes. Essay 3b describes in detail the collaborative nature of the development of enrollment management procedures and the ongoing communication about adherence to Impactation Principles through annual reports

from the Division of Academic Affairs to the Senate through the Academic Policy and Planning Committee.

Student Assessment and Faculty Effectiveness

The site team recommended the "creation of more comprehensive planning for undergraduate student learning and faculty development."

We have made considerable progress in developing the policies and procedures to examine student learning in a more systematic way. Essay 2a (The Learning-Centered University) describes our progress in building capacity for examining student learning in both the General Education program and in the major. Given the depth of coverage in Essay 2a, we will provide a summary of the primary changes that have taken place since the last review:

- *Development of learning goals and objectives for the General Education program*
Essay 2a details our progress in the development of learning goals and objectives and our four-year plan to begin assessing student learning. Unfortunately, faculty developed 25 additional goals and 95 additional objectives, which has challenged our ability to develop a meaningful and manageable assessment plan. With the hiring of a new Dean of Undergraduate Studies in 2002 we have developed a plan to use embedded assignments as direct measures of learning with the first data collection to begin in fall 2004. The Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Studies also directed the GE Committee to create a list of fewer than 10 goals that clearly define the knowledge, skills, and abilities we wish graduates to attain as a result of their GE education.
- *Increased visibility of the University Committee on Assessment*
This committee was re-named the "Student Learning Outcomes Committee" and was re-positioned as a free standing Senate committee with broad campus involvement and clearly defined functions. Annual reports will also be given to the University Senate.
- *Campus workshops held on student learning assessment*
Mary Senter, 1998; Lion Gardiner 1999; Mary Allen & Richard Noel, 2001
- *Development and expansion of a campus website on student learning assessment*
The site provides an extensive list of library and internet resources as well as the following campus resources: "Department Guide to Student Learning Assessment," "Scoring Rubric for Assessment Plans," "Annual Report Form," and "Best Practices" pages.
- *Assessment of student learning embedded in Academic Review process since 1999*
In 1999 the Academic Review process was expanded to incorporate discussions of the assessment of student learning. Departments were given specific instructions and materials to guide them with assessment. However, these changes were not entirely effective as no follow-up was undertaken to determine how departments used the results of their assessment of student learning to improve their programs.

- *Academic Review and Academic Plan processes aligned*
This process is explained in detail in Essay 4a (Shifting to a Culture Based on Evidence). Essentially, both procedures now include a discussion of student learning, how it has been assessed, and how results are used to inform decision-making, planning, and improvement.
- *Spring 2004 Academic Plan focused entirely on Student Learning Assessment*
92% of programs/departments submitted assessment plans that were reviewed by members of the University Committee on Assessment. Individual feedback was provided to each department/program. A comprehensive list of these plans and the assessment measures being employed can be found in Required Data Element 7.
- *Annual reports required of all departments/programs beginning in AY 2004-05*
These reports will describe department/program progress in student learning assessment for the previous year. Departments/programs select either an October 15 or April 1 reporting date. [See Checklist for Assessment Plans]
- *Best practices web pages developed to create diffusion model for the campus*
We have developed examples of "best practices" mission statements, goals and objectives to share our work with colleagues. We will continue to add pages as we begin receiving the annual reports from departments/programs regarding their assessment results and how these results are used to improve learning.
- *Workshops on writing student learning outcomes*
The Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning conducted workshops to assist faculty with writing learning outcomes. These workshops were held in a smart classroom where participant responses were immediately projected on three large screens to facilitate deeper discussion and learning. The Director also worked with individual faculty members and departments to assist them in their understanding and progress in student learning assessment.
- *Participation in the National Survey for Student Engagement*
In spring 2004, we participated for the first time in surveying freshmen and senior students using "The College Report," more commonly referred to as the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE). What makes this survey unique is its focus on asking students to report the frequency with which they engage in dozens of activities reflective of good educational practice. This kind of information will help us focus on providing students with the opportunity to engage in activities related to desired student learning outcomes. Results of the survey will be shared with the campus and used to inform our practices and continue our focus on teaching and learning.

Our greatest challenge will be sustaining the progress we have made by providing support to ensure that assessment of student learning becomes an embedded part of the University culture.

Faculty Effectiveness

The Commission letter urged the University to "make formal, visible and substantial its commitment to teaching excellence, through ongoing activities."

One of the initiatives funded out of the Shared Vision process was the establishment of a Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The initial budget was \$100,000, which included salaries for a half-time Director and a full time administrative coordinator, supplies and services, and financial support for faculty to attend conferences on teaching and learning. In the years since its inception, CTL activities have included individual support for faculty to improve their teaching, workshops on a variety of pedagogical topics, monthly lunches aimed at faculty in their first and second years at SDSU, one-day orientation for new faculty held each fall, and periodic offering of grants to support teaching and learning projects. A website also provides additional information and resources for faculty.

Partly because the Director is now .75, and because of state budget cuts, the operational budget for CTL has now been reduced to about \$10,000 per year, resulting in the elimination of many of the services previously offered. With such a small budget, limited opportunities exist for bringing guest speakers and/or consultants to campus, providing travel support, joining training consortia on teaching and learning, providing seed money for faculty development projects, or providing training and support of graduate teaching assistants. Thus, while we have a formal and visible unit for supporting teaching excellence, the limited infrastructure in terms of both budget and personnel makes it exceedingly challenging to develop a strategic plan for systemic support of faculty that can realistically be carried out.

In addition to CTL there are also a number of other faculty support services on campus. Instructional Technology Services, which has a goal to "provide faculty across all disciplines, with the support services they need to effectively use instructional technology in the teaching/learning process" includes a variety of resources to support faculty effectiveness. For example, the campus began with three "smart" classrooms in 1995 and ITS has now developed over 100 such rooms with instructor stations equipped with Mac and PC computers, a video/data projector, a video cassette player, a public address system with a wireless microphone unit, a visual presenter for the projection of transparencies, slides, print materials and three-dimensional objects, and connections for tying laptop computers into the room's high resolution presentation system. ITS consists of four units. Instructional Development offers assistance in instructional and course design as well as computer software training for faculty, staff, and students through the Baseline Access, Training and Support (BATS) program. The BATS program is a CSU initiative that began at SDSU in 1998. Two computer rooms in the library are available for the workshops; one with 40 PC stations and the other with 25 MAC stations. Table 1 provides information about participation rates from the most recent year.

Table 1
Participation in BATS Workshops

Workshop Offered	Number of Workshops	Number of Faculty	Number of Staff	Number of Students
Summer 2003	73 F/S; 62 Student	233	950	1202
Fall 2003	73 F/S; 86 Student	180	686	2040
Spring 2004	70F/S; 74 Student	202	574	2118

Note. Faculty, staff, and student participation is counted for each workshop attended.

Multimedia Production assists in the design and creation of instructional materials and provides support for the Blackboard Course Management software, which became available on campus in 2000. Table 2 illustrates the extensive use Blackboard on our campus.

Table 2
Participation in Blackboard Courses

When Course Offered	Number of Courses	Number of Instructors	Number of Students
Summer 2003	81	78	2729
Fall 2003	1483	821	50,080
Spring 2004	1054	561	37,210

Note. Students are counted more than once in enrolled in multiple Blackboard courses.

Instructional Resources offers a free library of videotapes, videodiscs, CD-ROMs, DVDs, films for classroom use. Technology Systems transmits a variety of programs over the campus closed-circuit television system. ITS also operates a faculty room that provides faculty with access to high resolution color laser printers, slide scanners, video editing, ParScore testing equipment and much more.

Office of Analytical Studies and Institutional Research (OASIR)

The Commission letter indicated that it "shares the concern of the evaluation team that the role and level of support for the office of institutional research be appropriate for the tasks assigned, and that these efforts be connected to the faculty."

The role of OASIR has evolved to one that provides official information to the SDSU community, the CSU, and external agencies regarding admission applications, student enrollment, course enrollment, new student profiles, continuation rates, graduation rates, and degrees granted. The Director also works closely with the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs to develop reports that provide information about enrollment management, probation and disqualification rates and other special projects. In addition, this office works closely with the Retention Council to gather data for projects undertaken to examine barriers to the success of our students.

More recently OASIR has developed the ability to customize web information/reports to offer departments information on their majors on a variety of demographic and academic success indicators. Providing this information to departments is a great step toward identifying areas of concern regarding continuation and graduation rates at the department

level as well as the institutional level. Given the number of impacted majors we currently have, this can be particularly useful in providing specific advising to students in their majors. Our next step is to make departments aware of these capabilities and engage them in using these services to inform decisions.

Diversity

We have continued to work diligently to sustain and improve the diversity of our campus, a concern raised by faculty and students alike as we embarked on Enrollment Management for the Campus. Table 3 provides a snapshot of the undergraduate ethnic diversity at the San Diego Campus from fall 1997 to fall 2003. For most ethnic groups the variation has been minimal. However, the percent of African American students has decreased by 1.5%, causing the Provost to direct the Diversity, Equity, and Outreach Committee to examine this issue. In addition, approximately 11 - 12% of our students do not provide information about their ethnicity, making it difficult to know the true ethnic composition of our student body.

Table 3
Undergraduate Ethnic Diversity

Ethnicity	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003
American Indian	232 (.9%)	251 (1%)	221 (.9%)	201 (.8%)	209 (.8%)	199 (.7%)	188 (.7%)
African American	1,395 (5.7%)	1,349 (5.3%)	1,254 (5.0%)	1,153 (4.6%)	1,182 (4.3%)	1,153 (4.2%)	1,121 (4.2%)
Mexican American	3,919 (16.0%)	4,124 (16.3%)	3,996 (15.9%)	3,878 (15.4%)	4,158 (15.2%)	4,086 (15.0%)	4,073 (15.2%)
Other Hispanic	1,047 (4.3%)	1,088 (4.3%)	984 (3.9%)	1,013 (4.0%)	1,126 (4.1%)	1,122 (4.1%)	1,082 (4.0%)
Asian	915 (3.7%)	902 (3.6%)	898 (3.6%)	913 (3.6%)	1,008 (3.7%)	1,036 (3.8%)	1,134 (4.2%)
SE Asian	906 (3.7%)	946 (3.7%)	917 (3.7%)	825 (3.3%)	916 (3.4%)	918 (3.4%)	916 (3.4%)
Pacific Islander	143 (.6%)	151 (.6%)	146 (.6%)	154 (.6%)	169 (.6%)	165 (.6%)	168 (.6%)
Filipino	1,803 (7.4%)	1,845 (7.3%)	1,784 (7.1%)	1,766 (7.0%)	1,975 (7.2%)	1,956 (7.2%)	1,936 (7.2%)
White	10,957 (44.8%)	11,273 (44.5%)	11,357 (45.2%)	11,488 (45.7%)	12,384 (45.3%)	12,361 (45.3%)	12,240 (45.8%)
Other/Not Stated	2,706 (11.1%)	2,958 (11.7%)	3,031 (12.1%)	3,082 (12.3%)	3,364 (12.3%)	3,438 (12.6%)	3,114 (11.6%)
International	425 (1.7%)	434 (1.7%)	522 (2.1%)	670 (2.7%)	850 (3.1%)	830 (3.0%)	774 (2.9%)

Note. This table provides the ethnic diversity of the SDSU campus. The IV Campus has ranged from 81% - 84% Mexican American and Other Hispanic students over the same time period. [Data available at <http://asir.sdsu.edu/>]

Table 4 provides the latest rankings of degrees awarded to minority students. *Black Issues in Higher Education* (June, 3, 2004) ranked SDSU 15th in the nation for bachelor's degrees

awarded to persons of color overall, 9th for Hispanic students, 22nd for Asian Americans, and 24th for American Indians.

Table 4
Minority Degree Rankings*

Degree Area	Ranking	Number of Degrees Awarded	Percent of Degree Graduates
Overall			
Total Minority	15	1993	35%
American Indian	24	44	1%
Asian American	22	700	12%
Hispanic	9	1038	18%

*Data excerpted from *Black Issues in Higher Education*, June 3, 2004

Table 5 provides the changes in ethnic and gender composition of the faculty from 1997 to 2003. As noted in the table, faculty of color have increased from 18% to 23% while female faculty have increased from 30% to 39%.

Table 5
Overall Faculty Composition*

Ethnicity	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003
Non White	18%	18%	19%	22%	23%	22%	23%
White	82%	82%	81%	79%	77%	78%	77%
Gender							
Female	30%	32%	33%	35%	37%	39%	39%
Male	70%	68%	67%	65%	63%	61%	61%

* Table reflects probationary and tenured Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. [Data available from the Office of Faculty Affairs]

Table 6 provides the same information for new hires. The table illustrates that of the 377 tenure/tenure track faculty hired since fall 1997, 34% (N = 129) have been persons of color and 49% (N = 185) have been women.

Table 6
Faculty Composition of New Hires*

Ethnicity	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Fall 2001	Fall 2002	Fall 2003
Non White	38%	19%	37%	36%	39%	26%	41%
White	62%	81%	63%	64%	61%	74%	59%
Gender							
Female	53%	59%	54%	41%	53%	51%	32%
Male	47%	41%	46%	59%	47%	49%	68%

*Table reflects probationary and tenured Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors. [Data available from the Office of Faculty Affairs]

In addition to our efforts to increase the diversity of our campus community, one of the themes of our Educational Effectiveness Review is student learning, with special attention to the definition and presence of diversity in course work and what students are learning as a result of taking these courses. This specifically addresses the recommendation regarding the need for linkages between curricular development and reform and how they enrich the learning experience for students.

Imperial Valley Campus

The Imperial Valley Campus, much as the University in general, has changed considerably since the last review. For example, enrollment has grown from 680 to 900; the number of full-time faculty has increased by a third; a new dean (Dr. Khosrow Fatemi) served for six years and another (Dr. Stephen Roeder) has now been hired; campus governance has been decentralized; and there are now two sites for the campus. Many of the developments have been guided by the concerns and goals discussed in the 1997 WASC review.

In 1997, the IV Campus reorganized the campus governance to decentralize decision-making. There are now three divisions, Arts & Sciences, Education, and Professional Studies. Division chairs are responsible for scheduling courses, hiring and evaluating part-time instructors, and representing their programs in campus-wide decisions. The faculty meet as needed within their divisions as well as in monthly campus meetings.

In the years since the last review, the role of the once critical SD Campus-IV Campus liaison committee has been supplanted by numerous other points of contact at the staff and faculty level, by the efforts of a very active dean, and by a responsive University administration. Faculty serve on the following Committees on the San Diego campus: General Education Committee, Curriculum Committee, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Committee on Academic Resources & Planning, Academic Policy & Planning Committee, and

Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure Panel. Two faculty and one staff member serve on the University Senate. IVC faculty also serve on a few committees in departments on the San Diego campus. The IV Campus Dean has been effective at the administrative level in promoting interest in the campus and garnering resources to meet campus needs. President Weber, Provost Marlin, Associate Vice President Singer and other members of the University administration have been to the campus to meet with community members and/or faculty on numerous occasions.

The fruits of this heightened exchange between the campuses are evidenced in the University's increased responsiveness to the needs of the Imperial Valley community. At the request of community members and with their help, a second site for the campus opened in spring 2004 in Brawley (at the opposite end of the Valley). The University has also taken the lead in community efforts to facilitate a college-going culture in the valley by providing lower-division curricula (starting fall 2004) in business, criminal justice administration, liberal studies, and psychology for high performing students. These courses were preceded by a successful pilot program in AY 2003-04 and provide the first four-year academic programs in the Imperial Valley.

Prior reviews have noted the "thinness" in the numbers of full-time faculty in the majors on the IV Campus. The growth of student enrollment and the corresponding increase in faculty numbers have alleviated this problem to some extent but there are still only three undergraduate single-discipline majors (public administration, English and Spanish) with three full-time faculty (and some of those faculty teach in other disciplines as well). There are two full-time faculty in psychology and just one in criminal justice administration, history, and mathematics. The interdisciplinary majors (business, education, international business, liberal studies, social science) are, of course, served by larger numbers of faculty. The new lower-division program highlights the need for increased numbers of faculty in each major. General education courses will now be offered in several other disciplines (e.g., philosophy) in addition to the lower-division preparation in the three majors (criminal justice, liberal studies, psychology). The Campus and the University are very mindful of these needs. Two searches in psychology in recent years have failed to fill a third position. Searches were underway for positions in education, criminal justice administration and history as well as for non-major positions in sociology and theater but these were discontinued with the budget reductions in spring 2004. The hiring freeze has been lifted and the IV Campus is requesting searches in Criminal Justice, Teacher Education (literacy), History, Educational Leadership, Finance, and Sociology with the expectation of filling at least three of these positions.

The IVC faculty are evaluated in accordance with a joint appointment to their respective departments and to the IV Campus. As noted in previous reviews, evaluative comparisons with other faculty in departments on the SD campus must take into account the differences and inequities between the two campuses. Departments and Retention, Tenure, and Promotion committees on the San Diego campus have demonstrated a range of familiarity with the joint-appointment policy and of the differences in the nature of the assignments on the two campuses. IVC faculty have more course preparations, more committee assignments, and less assigned time than faculty in San Diego. The campus dean has attempted to mitigate these differences by increasing the allotment of assigned time to allow a 3/4 load for most

faculty. Budget cuts, however, forced a return to a 4/4 load this year. As campus enrollment has grown, more courses are needed once (or, in a very few cases, twice) a semester so the number of preparations has been reduced for a few faculty but most faculty teach several preparations each semester; in some cases, teaching courses in more than one discipline. Starting in fall 2004, most faculty will also teach on both campuses in the Imperial Valley. Continued growth in enrollment and in faculty numbers may reduce the demands on individual faculty but the addition of the lower-division curriculum combined with the previous year's hiring freeze will delay any improvement in the teaching load for most faculty. As noted above, the hiring freeze has been lifted so we expect some improvement in a year's time. The new dean is committed to reducing the teaching load for probationary faculty to 3/3 as funds permit.

The 1997 WASC review also recommended that the development offices on the two campuses seek ways to increase the availability of funding for faculty research. While the development officer on the IV Campus has concentrated on general funds for campus development, there is now a grant budget officer who works with faculty to develop grant proposals and to maintain existing grants. The campus now has over \$1.5 million in federal and state grants (7 new, 8 renewals, 1 supplemental) and most are for curricular improvements. The yearly allotment for travel to professional conferences and related scholarly activities increased to \$800 per person. These funds were eliminated in last year's budget reductions but travel money has been restored for AY 2004-05.

Faculty scholarship is further hindered by the geographical separation from colleagues. The psychological distance has been reduced in recent years by email and the growing availability of such internet-based resources as full-text journals but the hallway encounters that often fuel intellectual progress are available only by appointment and a four-hour roundtrip. In short, the teaching load, as well as the differential support and opportunities for faculty scholarship, continue to play an important role in the morale and productivity of the IVC faculty.

The IV Campus has kept close to the pace of technological developments on the SD campus. The campus now has four "smart" classrooms on the Calexico site and one more on the new Brawley site. There are also three "Smart Carts" to allow instructors (and students) in other classrooms to make computer-aided presentations. Due in part to an ongoing Title V project promoting technology in the classroom, demand for these classrooms and carts has burgeoned over the last two years as an increasing proportion of faculty incorporate technology into their courses. There are also three computer classrooms in Calexico and one in Brawley for computer-based courses in mathematics, research methods, statistics, and educational technology. As recommended in the last WASC review, the technical service personnel, funded at that time by a Title III project, have been retained in staff positions to maintain the classroom and office computers on campus. Their support has enhanced faculty productivity in and out of the classroom.

Concluding Remarks

As described in this Appendix as well as in several essays in the Preparatory Review, we have made considerable progress in regard to the recommendations of the 1997 site team report and Commission letter. The campus climate is dramatically different than it was in

1997 and we are poised to continue our progress to inculcate evidence-based decision-making as the "way business is done" in improving San Diego State University in all areas and particularly with regard to student learning.

INSTITUTION: San Diego State University _____ PRESIDENT/CEO: Stephen Weber, Ph.D. _____ DATE: 6/29/2004 _____

SUMMARY DATA FORM

1. YEAR FOUNDED: 1897 _____

2. CALENDAR PLAN: Semester _____

3. DEGREE LEVELS OFFERED: Associate ☒ Bachelors ☒ Masters _____ Doctorate _____ Professional _____

4. SPONSORSHIP AND CONTROL: _____ State _____

5. LAST REPORTED IPEDS DATA FOR ENROLLMENT BY ETHNICITY AND GENDER

Use IPEDS definitions for students. Data reported as of September 29, 2003 _____ (date)

Enrollment by Category	Total FTE of Students*	Total Headcount of Students	Non-Resident Alien Headcount	Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount	Am Indian/Alaska Native Headcount	Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount	Hispanic/Latino Headcount	White/Non-Hispanic Headcount	Ethnicity Unknown Headcount	Total Male Headcount	Total Female Headcount
Undergraduate	23200	26861	782	1124	189	4169	5167	12298	3132	11247	15614
Graduate	3993	5942	685	140	46	551	850	2736	934	2328	3614
Non-degree											
Total	27193	32803	1467	1264	235	4720	6017	15034	4066	13575	19228

* If you have used a formula other than $FTE = FT + (PT/3)$, please indicate how you have calculated FTE.:

6. LAST 3 YEARS IPEDS DATA FOR 6-YEAR COHORT GRADUATION RATE BY ETHNICITY & GENDER:

If you track graduation rates separately for freshman students and for students who transfer in to your institution, please use question 6 to record FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATES and question 7 to record TRANSFER STUDENT GRADUATION RATES.

Please indicate if the data provided in question 6 table below is ☐ X ☐ for freshmen only OR ☐ ☐ for freshmen and transfer students combined.

Freshman Cohort Year (Entering Fall)	Overall Graduation Percentage	Non-Resident Alien %	Black, Non-Hispanic %	Am Indian/Alaska Native %	Asian / Pacific Islander %	Hispanic/Latino %	White/Non-Hispanic %	Ethnicity Unknown %	Male %	Female %
1997	44.0	55.0	32.7	50.0	43.0	35.1	50.0	43.8	40.0	46.9
1996	38.1	27.8	28.6	42.3	38.1	31.4	42.4	43.8	34.6	40.5
1995	36.2	44.0	22.4	20.0	33.1	31.0	42.7	37.2	33.9	37.8
Averages	39.4	42.3	27.9	37.4	38.1	32.5	45.0	41.6	36.2	41.7

7. If you track freshman and transfer graduation rates separately (see question 6), please provide

LAST 3 YEARS DATA FOR 6-YEAR COHORT TRANSFER GRADUATION RATE BY ETHNICITY & GENDER:

Transfer Cohort Year (Entering Fall)	Overall Graduation Percentage	Non-Resident Alien %	Black, Non-Hispanic %	Am Indian/Alaska Native %	Asian / Pacific Islander %	Hispanic %	White/Non-Hispanic %	Ethnicity Unknown %	Male %	Female %
Averages										

8. CURRENT FACULTY: Total FTE of faculty 1259* as of November 1, 2003 (date)

*includes tenured and probationary faculty

Full-time faculty headcount: 989 % Non-Caucasian 21.3 % Male 58.8 % Female 41.2

Part-time faculty headcount: 723 % Non-Caucasian 21.4 % Male 49.0 % Female 51.0

9. FTE STUDENT TO FTE FACULTY RATIO: _____ 19:1 _____

10. FINANCES:

A. Annual Tuition Rate: Undergraduate Resident Tuition: _____ \$2,936 _____ Undergraduate Non-Resident Tuition: _____ \$2,488 + \$339/unit _____
 Graduate Resident Tuition: _____ \$3,422 _____ Graduate Non-Resident Tuition: _____ \$3,422 + \$339/unit _____

B. Total Annual Operating Budget: _____ \$274,078,181 _____

C. Percentage from tuition and fees: _____ 27.7% _____

D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: _____ 0 _____ (FY20 _____); _____ 0 _____ (FY20 _____)

E. Current Accumulated Deficit: _____ 0 _____

F. Endowment: _____ \$74,240,170 _____

11. GOVERNING BOARD: A. Size: _____ Board of Trustees _____ B. Meetings a year: _____ 6 _____

12. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS: A. Number: _____ 3** _____ B. Total Enrollment: _____ 1032 _____
 ** - Includes IVC - enrollment 887, MA in Educational Leadership in Canada - enrollment 25, MBA in Tapei-enrollment 120.

13. ELECTRONICALLY-MEDIATED PROGRAMS (50% or more offered online): A. Number: _____ 3 _____ B. Total Enrollment: _____ 480 _____