REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

San Diego State University

March 21- 24, 2016

Team Roster

Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Chancellor, University of Massachusetts Amherst (chair)

Jillian Kinzie, Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University Bloomington (assistant chair)

Cecilia A. Conrad, Director, MacArthur Fellows Program, MacArthur Foundation

Francisco J. Hernandez, Emeritus Vice Chancellor for Students, University of Hawaii, Manoa

Ralph Jay Hexter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, University of California, Davis

Barbara Gross Davis, Vice President (WSCUC staff liaison)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Section A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Founded in 1897, San Diego State University (SDSU) is a public research university and the third-oldest university in the 23-member California State University (CSU) system. Designated in the Carnegie classification as an R2 Research University with "higher research activity," it is among the top 200 higher education institutions in the country conducting research, with external funding awards increasing 12 percent in 2014-2015 to $120.6 million. The institution is committed to providing its 35,000 students and approximately 1,100 faculty in more than 200 degree programs rich opportunities to teach and learn in an academic curriculum distinguished by high levels of student-faculty interaction and an increasing international emphasis. With 106 masters programs, and 21 doctoral programs at its main campus, SDSU has well-established graduate degree programs. The university has expressed a strong commitment to improving student success, advancing research and creative endeavors, and contributing to the community.

With more than 60% of SDSU graduates remaining in San Diego, SDSU is a chief educator of the region's work force. In addition, SDSU operates the Imperial Valley Campus (IVC), which is designated by WSCUC as a "standalone." The campus includes a research park and related facilities and it recently expanded curricular offerings from upper division, teacher certification, and graduate students, to include lower division students pursuing degrees in criminal justice, liberal studies, or psychology. The commitment to serving the diverse San Diego region and beyond places SDSU among the top ten universities nationwide in terms of racial-ethnic diversity in its student body, as well as the number of bachelor's degrees conferred to historically underrepresented students.

SDSU committed itself to building a culture of philanthropy, as demonstrated by its 2015 recognition from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education for the sustained excellence of its fundraising program. The university ranked 15th in the nation for the number of students studying abroad in the latest Institute for International Education's Open Doors report. By all indicators, SDSU appears to be a dynamic and thriving university.

Aside from preparing for this reaffirmation, the most recent accreditation activity at SDSU involved a series of substantive change actions related to the review and approval of

graduate degree programs, the offering of degrees abroad, including approval of a Georgia international location and an accelerated bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) program to be offered in distance education and off-campus modality. SDSU's last accreditation review was conducted in 2005, and the institution was re-affirmed in 2006 for ten years.

This report reviews SDSU, the standalone IVC campus in Calexico, CA, and several master's level distance education programs. Separate reports on the distance education programs and the visit to IVC are included as appendices and are discussed, as appropriate, within the body of this report. No special follow-up related to substantive change was conducted in connection with this visit.

Section B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team began its review process in advance of the Offsite Review (OSR) on November 18-19, 2015, by studying the institutional report and associated evidence available for download on the cloud content management system Box.com, and completing WSCUC worksheets that invited examination of the SDSU institutional report under the WSCUC standards and components. During the OSR, the team prepared lines of inquiry (areas for further exploration at the time of the visit) and identified commendations based upon the institutional report. The OSR included a 45-minute video conference call with SDSU administrators in which the team shared the areas that would be further explored during the Accreditation Visit (AV) on March 21-24, 2016. The lines of inquiry were provided to SDSU, and the institution subsequently submitted additional information requested in that document.

Prior to the AV, the team reviewed the additional materials and in a pre-AV conference call, discussed the materials, and determined a plan for conducting the AV. The team considered a preliminary visit schedule drawn up by the SDSU Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) with respect to individuals and groups with whom the team wished to meet. A final visit schedule was prepared and sent to the team prior to the actual visit. Prior to the visit, the team was provided the "WASC Campus Brief," a report prepared by SDSU that was intended to prepare members of the institution for the visit. It addressed the reason for the visit and provided additional information and responses to the commendations and lines of inquiry. SDSU posted the "WASC Campus Brief" on its website.

The AV began with a team executive planning session on Monday, March 21, 2016 in which the team discussed the visit process, including the AV deliverables, decision options available and WSCUC's policies on public disclosure. The team reviewed the final visit schedule, considered the areas of inquiry and identified specific questions to be pursued during each group or individual meeting.

The actual AV began on Tuesday, March 22, 2016 with a meeting with the president, followed by a session with the SDSU WASC Steering Committee. These two meetings helped set the context for the visit, including the challenges and opportunities at SDSU. Meetings with vice presidents, student affairs and faculty leaders, senate committee members, institutional research staff, advisors and program directors filled out the day. The second day began with a campus tour, followed by a series of meetings with members of the general education and student learning outcomes committees; associated students officers; undergraduate and graduate council members; student success working group; faculty who have completed program reviews; technology staff; deans; and open forums for students, faculty, and staff.

During the visit, the team met with various constituencies and individuals and learned more about the institution, the organizational structure, its values, the faculty, staff, and students. Sessions were focused on the original lines of inquiry and additional questions developed by the team. At least two team members were present for all sessions, with one member of the team assigned to be the discussion lead for each session (due to illness one team member was only able to join some meetings by phone). A confidential email account was established to allow for greater participation from the campus community, and it was monitored by the assistant chair throughout the visit. The visit ended on Thursday, March 24, 2016 with a private meeting between the team chair and president, followed by a public exit meeting in which the final commendations and recommendations were presented. Every session was productive and positive, and the team was very impressed by the level of commitment of all with whom team members spoke.

Team members were then assigned to compose sections of the report based on the initial review of the institutional report, lines of inquiry, interviews, meetings with groups, and new information from the AV. Team members reviewed the entire report for accuracy and clarity and to assure compliance with WSCUC expectations, satisfactory representation of team findings, and respect for SDSU's thorough self-examination and investment in the accreditation review process.

Section C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

SDSU's institutional report was a clearly written, comprehensive document that addressed the areas of review in a thoughtful manner. The report provided a candid assessment of strengths and weaknesses and articulated the activities that SDSU wishes to pursue in the future. The quality of the report suggests that preparation was thorough, insightful, and evidenced-based, and was completed with the involvement of faculty and staff. The report also provided links to various documents and addressed how the institution is generally responding to WSCUC expectations and standards. The SDSU institutional report was very well-organized. However, because the institution exercised the option to "structure its report in the way it finds best suited to tell its story" (Handbook of Accreditation, pg. 27), the report only loosely adhered to the component format. As a result, it was challenging for the team to associate SDSU evidence to the eight components and to WSCUC Standards. Also, the team wishes to acknowledge that the "WASC Campus Brief" prepared by SDSU in advance of the AV was an unexpected, but enormously informative and helpful account of information related to the OSR commendations and responses to the lines of inquiry.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

The institution's report addressed the status of the recommendations in the 2006 Commission letter. These recommendations were focused on five themes: (1) Assessment and Learning-Centeredness, (2) General Education Reform, (3) Analyzing and Improving Graduation and Retention Rates, (4) Improving Services to Transfer Students, and (5) Sustaining Progress on Integrating Imperial Valley and Brawley Campuses.

Assessment. The team determined that, as requested, SDSU has dedicated attention to assessment, including the building of an apparatus for assessment and program review, and a process for providing constructive feedback and guidance on recent, current, and future assessment efforts through the Student Learning Outcomes committee. The University Senate provided oversight and policy guidance, and the Center for Teaching and Learning offers professional development.

General education. Work on general education expanded since the 2006 recommendations, and achievements were made on the assessment of oral communication and writing. However, less progress seems to have been made to connect general education reforms with the larger institutional priorities and to develop a sense of coherency in the program. The team recognizes that SDSU's curricular changes in this area are restricted by the system-level general education requirements in some ways.

Retention and graduation. SDSU has clearly excelled in addressing the improvement of undergraduate retention and graduation rates while also reducing racial-ethnic gaps. As the institutional report notes, the six-year graduation rate improved from 44% in 1998 to 66.9% in 2007. Continuation rates for full time students also improved, moving from 81.3% in 2008 to 88.2% in 2013. Notably, since SDSU was last reaffirmed for accreditation, the university has received national attention for increasing graduation rates more than any other university in the United States, while at the same time becoming more diverse (see 2010 Chronicle of Higher Education article, 2014 Education Trust article, and 2014 SDSU NewsCenter article), and being recognized in 2012 as a Hispanic-Serving Institution. Recognition for SDSUs demonstrable improvements in increasing retention and graduation rates and closing achievement gaps is commendable.

Transfer students. The university undertook changes in transfer student orientation and advising to provide improved services to students. These changes included degree audits for all transfer students attending New Student Orientation in order to catch problems before the semester started and increasing the time allotted to advising during the same orientation sessions. SDSU also created transfer student receptions and a transfer-specific course to introduce students in the College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts to the University. These efforts have coincided with a 6.3% increase in two-year graduation rates for the 2005 incoming student cohort versus the 2002 cohort.

Imperial Valley Campus. The university has made considerable progress regarding concerns for further integrating the branch and main campuses, and improving the processes, structures, and technology communication that support higher education in the Imperial Valley. More information about the IVC is provided in the appendix.

After his appointment in 2011, the president engaged the campus community in a strategic planning process that resulted in "Building on Excellence," the strategic plan that outlined three broad institutional goals: (1) student success, (2) research and creative endeavors, and (3) community and communication. This thoughtful plan was created in a

time of enormous financial challenge – near the end of one of the longest recessions in in the U.S. SDSU is now in the third year of implementing "Building on Excellence," and the emphasis is on increasing revenue and improving the university's academic and co-curricular programs. The key is that quality academic and co-curricular programs prepare students to contribute broadly to the society they will enter.

The team commends SDSU for not resting on the laurels of achievements from the previous reaffirmation cycle, and instead continuing the positive momentum. As stated, SDSU made significant improvements in retention and graduation rates while increasing the diversity of the student body. The institution is clearly positioning itself to make greater progress on equity in student success and intends to do this by keeping undergraduate education affordable and of high academic quality.

Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Every institution under review for reaffirmation is evaluated for compliance with the WSCUS standards and is required to have in place policies and procedures considered essential for sound academic policies. The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that SDSU has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with all four of the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission. The sections below describe the results of the team's review of each Standard.

Component 2 of the report also includes a review of SDSU's Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) and the extent to which it offers an analytic and reflective overview of the assessment systems in place and what components or processes may need to be developed. SDSU's inventory lists whether programs have learning outcomes and where the outcomes are published, what evidence is assessed, who assess these outcomes, and how the findings are used. The date of the last program review for each degree program is also noted.

The information in the IEEI categories of institutional and degree program outcomes is consistent with details in the institutional report and evidence provided. However, the category of general education, as represented in the IEEI, does not fully reflect the hit-or-miss approach to general education outcomes assessment mentioned in the institutional report and that was discussed with administrators, faculty and advisors during the visit. In

addition, the team observed unevenness in the extent to which WEAVE or departmental websites provide information for all degree programs and the extent to which WEAVE provides a consistent process for collecting and using evidence to set standards of student performance and to improve learning. The institution could benefit from further reflection on the effectiveness of assessment systems in place.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

SDSU has a clear and explicit commitment to promoting academic achievement for a diverse student body through a formal curriculum that encompasses the creative and performing arts, the humanities, the natural and mathematical sciences, and the social and behavioral sciences and through student participation in research, international experiences, community engagement, and leadership.

Institutional purposes (CFRs 1.1- 1.6). SDSU's published mission statement and academic goals[1] describes the institution's broad aim to "impart an appreciation and broad understanding of human experience throughout the world and the ages" and its commitment to the development of core competencies of critical thinking, writing, reading, oral communication, and quantitative reasoning (CFR 1.1). The team noted that this mission statement did not seem to capture the distinctive elements of an SDSU education as identified in other documents and suggests that it be updated.

SDSU has defined educational objectives at the institutional level. Following a University Senate mandate, syllabi include expected learning outcomes for specific courses and undergraduate degree programs are beginning to report educational objectives through a standardized template in WEAVE, a web-based assessment and planning management system. However, the team learned during the campus visit that WEAVE has been less successful as a tool for information sharing (CFR 1.2). The team agrees with SDSU's self-assessment that more work is needed to identify a simple and sustainable method to provide transparency on student learning outcomes within degree programs (CFR 1.2).

SDSU's institutional report provided little information on the role of graduate education or about the institution's educational objectives for its masters' and doctoral programs. The campus visit revealed a consensus that the graduate programs supported the provision of research experiences for *undergraduates*, but exposed a lack of shared

---

[1] See https://newscenter.sdsu.edu/home/mission_and_goals.aspx

understanding of the place of graduate education at SDSU (CFR 1.1).

SDSU monitors and makes publicly available data on undergraduate student success indicators, namely retention and graduation rates (CFR 1.2). In response to the team's identified lines of inquiry following the OSR, SDSU compiled data on degree progress, employment outcomes, and doctoral program placement (for its masters programs), and made this information available to the public on its reaffirmation WASC website (CFR 1.2). However, faculty and staff commented on, and staff from the Institutional Research and Analytical Studies confirmed, the need for greater access to program-level data about students, including graduation and time to degree, and a strong desire for a data system that produces actionable information.

The team commends SDSU's deep and lived tradition of transparency and shared governance and its track record of creative approaches to problem solving (CFR 1.3). Faculty and staff were highly engaged in the development of SDSU's comprehensive strategic plan and in the working groups charged with its implementation. For example, the University Senate's chair of diversity, equity, and opportunity participates on the working group on faculty diversity. SDSU's astute financial management during deep cuts in state appropriations was facilitated by the work of the President's Budget Advisory Committee, comprised on members of the University Senate, the president's cabinet and an officer of the Associated Students. During the visit, the team heard strong statements of mutual respect and trust.

SDSU has a published policy defining its commitment to freedom of expression and it has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational function by external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements (CFRs 1.4, 1.6).

SDSU ranks among the top universities nationwide in the racial and ethnic diversity of its student body and, through a comprehensive suite of initiatives, has dramatically reduced the graduation gap for students from underrepresented minority groups. A major emphasis of this work has been promoting student engagement in high impact practices, including undergraduate research experiences and study abroad. SDSU's diversity website[2] describes the work of faculty and staff committees and of the chief diversity officer, provides relevant data, and describes educational and community outreach opportunities. The university recently completed its first climate survey on campus diversity, but has not yet completed an analysis of the survey findings (CFR 1.5).

---

[2] See http://newscenter.sdsu.edu/lead/Default.aspx

Integrity (CFRs 1.7-1.9). In its printed materials and on its website, SDSU truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and the larger public. The SDSU University Senate Policy document[3]defines policies and procedures regarding student conduct, procedures for student and faculty grievances, and methods of redress if there are violations of the university's grading policies. The Office of the University Ombudsman[4] provides information, advice, and other support to assist students in resolving problems with the university. The university's policies on the responsible conduct of research and its human subjects protection program are available on the Division of Research Affairs' website[5] and cross-referenced, where relevant, in the other university policies.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

SDSU has established strong educational goals through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success in an intentional and thoughtful way.

Teaching and learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7). SDSU has clearly defined programs that ensure the university's ability meet its core functions related to teaching and learning (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a). All degrees at bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels are defined by levels of student achievement appropriate for those degree levels (CFRs 2.2, 2.2b). Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are required for every course and are included on all syllabi as per university policy and Degree Learning Outcomes (DLOs) exist for degree programs within WEAVE (CFRs 2.2, 2.3). However, the team concurs with SDSUs self-review under the standards that noted the need for more programs to share their DLOs with students and align to these outcomes with CLOs to provide a broader programmatic context for students and to identify and facilitate course-embedded program assessment. The team was encouraged by efforts to raise student awareness regarding DLOs and to have faculty "model the way" on how course-based and other activities build student capacity to achieve established DLOs. The Program Assessment Primer devised by the Student Learning Outcomes Committee is comprehensive and should help facilitate assessment efforts.

---

[3] See http://commons.sdsu.edu/sdsu_policyfile.pdf
[4] See http://go.sdsu.edu/student_affairs/ombudsman/
[5] See https://go.sdsu.edu/researchaffairs/

SDSU is committed to establishing and holding students to high expectations, and these efforts have resulted high levels of achievement for graduates (CFRs 2.5, 2.6). Six-year graduation rates have improved to exceed national averages.[6] Notably, SDSU has committed to broadening access to high-impact practices, has made the case for their value to student retention, and has supported the integration of high impact practices as appropriate within courses (e.g., community-based service learning, writing intensive courses, undergraduate research), especially in courses that typically fall within students' first 45 credit hours (CFRs 2.3, 2.5).

SDSU has a program of general education that encompasses lower and upper division courses (CFR 2.2a), and there is some evidence that student progress in achieving general education objectives is being assessed. Yet, despite the previous accreditation recommendations to develop a clearer set of general education goals and to achieve a greater sense of coherency in the program, the institutional report dedicates little discussion to these matters. During the visit, faculty identified the lack of alignment between general education and institutional goals, limited integration of general education into the curriculum, and little to no administrative support to oversee or coordinate general education as problematic. General education was largely viewed as being devalued at SDSU. Student comments about general education also demonstrated a lack of appreciation and understanding of general education purpose (CFR 2.2a).

The Academic Program Review (APR) process, which programs undergo approximately every five years, has a clear purpose and procedures. The institution has established a platform for organizing program review information and developed resources to support the work. Each program self-study is reviewed for completeness and then shared with the Program Review Panel, which typically consists of two external disciplinary leaders recruited from aspirational programs and one internal senior faculty member recruited from a different college at SDSU (CFR 2.7). Following the panel visit, the Program Review Panel produces a report, and then the findings and recommendations are discussed among university leaders and the program (CFR 2.4). However, the team noticed that the APR guidelines 2015-16, do not specify the critical "closing the loop" aspect of the work. The procedure ends with "Departmental Response to Panel Report: The department

---

[6] National Center for Education Statistics notes that "The 2013 6-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time undergraduate students who began their pursuit of a bachelor's degree at a 4-year degree-granting institution in fall 2007 was 59 percent." https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40

shall submit a written response to the Associate Dean of Graduate and Research Affairs within two weeks of receiving the panel report." Evidence of some action taken by departments was presented to the team, so clearly there is a commitment to acting on the panel report, but it might be useful to specify the expectations for action and activities for closing the loop in the procedure manual.

With 106 masters programs, and more than 20 doctoral programs at its main campus, SDSU has established graduate degree requirements and expectations (CFR 2.2b). The Aztec Mentor Program is a clear expression of the commitment to creating community among undergraduate and graduate students by linking juniors, seniors, and graduate students in mentoring experiences with established alumni in San Diego and beyond (CFR 2.3). But again, the SDSU institutional report offers very little evidence of distinct graduate degree requirements and the accomplishments and outcomes of graduates of masters and doctoral programs. Post-graduate information for graduate students is also missing; SDSU reported that there is no centralized database of professional placement for graduates of advanced degree programs. The "WASC Campus Brief" and additional reports about retention and graduation rates for graduate programs provided to the team suggest that completion rates are on par with comparable programs nationally.

Scholarship and creative activities (CFRs 2.8, 2.9). SDSU has expanded and integrated scholarship and research activities for students and faculty. For example, established during the strategic planning process, the Undergraduate Research Working Group focused on furthering undergraduate research by increasing support for two forms of mini-grants, one for faculty and the other for students, to support student-faculty research, and also committed to studying the extent to which research, scholarship, and creative activity is embedded within the curriculum. Findings from the study supported the creation of developmental models for student engagement in research and have led to more opportunities within the Center for Teaching and Learning to help faculty develop proper sequencing of skills and approaches to expand research in all fields. The expansion of undergraduate research opportunities is demonstrated in the increased popularity of the Student Research Symposium, which in 2015 provided more than 450 students the opportunity to present their work, and the growth of Arts Alive SDSU, which has increased creative opportunities for students, faculty, and community members (CFR 2.8).

The Office of Faculty Advancement, Reappointment and Promotion (Information for Faculty and the SDSU University Senate Policy File, July 2015), claims that faculty shall be

evaluated on their achievements and contributions in (a) teaching, (b) research, scholarship, and creative activities, and (c) service activities to the university, the profession, and the community that enhance the mission of the university (CFR 2.9). SDSU acknowledges the need for more consideration of the role of the scholarship of teaching and learning, specifically whether such peer-reviewed publications should be considered professional development or teaching effectiveness with respect to the Retention, Tenure, Promotion (RTP) process.

Student learning and success (CFRs 2.10-2.14). Assessing and improving student success is one of SDSU's primary goals. In fact, the abiding commitment to collaboration among faculty, staff, administration, and student leadership to enhance student success is a core value of the SDSU culture. There is ample evidence of the gains made during the last decade and beyond to increase student success, as measured by improved graduation rates, and at the same time increased expectations and high levels of student engagement. SDSU regularly monitors retention and graduation rates and examines gaps among its diverse student populations (CFR 2.10). The institution has developed an array of co-curricular programs to support student success, including learning communities (both residential and commuter), the Aztec Mentorship Program, and diversity education. Many staff and faculty commented on the strong sense of ownership for student success within colleges among deans, advisors, faculty, and student affairs staff.

Student success objectives are widely shared at SDSU. For example, the goals identified in the 2013-2015 Strategic Plan of the Division of Student Affairs are nicely aligned with academic goals, and there is a great deal of complementary work on high-impact practices in the co-curriculum including significant support for internships, community service, service-learning and diversity/global education (CFR 2.11). The co-curricular, high impact practices, and academic support programs that have been evaluated or are scheduled to be evaluated suggest that SDSU is committed to implementing appropriate student support services and evaluating their effectiveness (CFR 2.13). Although SDSU did not provide evidence of robust studies of program impact, the student satisfaction data provided to the team in response to a request for additional information suggested that regular satisfaction and assessment work was being conducted, and that programs like New Student Orientation, Casa Azteca, the Aztec Freshman Connection program, Sophomore Surge, and Educational Opportunities Summer Bridge were positively evaluated (CFRs 2.10, 2.13).

The establishment of MyMAPs to clarify requirements, guide course sequencing to align with courses offered each semester and to adhere to prerequisite requirements and maximize the overlap between general education and preparation for the major courses demonstrates a strong commitment by the institution to provide useful and complete information for advising (CFR 2.12). MyMaps seem to be helpful to course planning and sequencing at the program level. However, the team believes there is also value in making these more dynamic and tailoring them for students so they can see what is lacking for graduation.

The need for improved services for transfer students was a topic raised in the last review for reaffirmation. In response, the university reviewed its policies to increase student success and achievement for transfer students and made several adjustments by 2008 including improved advising at orientation, the provision of degree audits for all transfer students at orientation, transfer student receptions hosted by deans and faculty, and a seminar for transfer students (CFR 2.14). Since the implementation of these efforts, SDSU transfer student graduation rates have increased, and the university is focused on improving these rates further.

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

SDSU's growth and investment in undergraduate education and student success is significant, requiring additional support for faculty and staff and in physical and fiscal resources.

Faculty and staff (CFRs 3.1-3.3). To ensure sufficient, qualified faculty and staff to support programs and operations, SDSU is in the process of hiring 300 new faculty through the use of a new student fee. This will substantially change the institution (CFRs 3.1, 3.2). Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned, and appropriate policies are in place for faculty and staff, including those for evaluations.

However, conversations throughout the AV made clear that there is confusion among faculty and administrators (e.g. deans) about how faculty and staff positions are allocated through the "Areas of Excellence" process. Some wondered if there is a disconnect between investing in key areas of research and providing necessary day-to-day support for teaching high-demand classes. For instance, the team met with some people during the AV

who discussed 500 person classes whose subject areas seemed to be skipped over for faculty hires. No matter the rationale for allocating positions, there seems to be a need to involve stakeholders in the process so that there is transparency and a better understanding of need – or explanations for how existing need will be addressed if they do not align with strategic priorities.

Indeed, the outward focus seems to be on increasing the number of faculty and not necessarily on explaining where those faculty will go. The original response to the lines of inquiry provided to the AV team shows numbers of faculty hired or expected, but does not describe areas or disciplines. The subsequent "WASC Campus Brief" provided to the team references a Building on Inclusive Excellence program – a program whose goal to diversify the faculty is certainly commendable – but the description again fails to make a connection to the need to diversify the faculty workforce and the strategic priorities of the university in cultivating faculty in high impact areas and putting resources behind those key areas. The strategic plan supplement released in August 2015 does a better job at making this connection. It acknowledges that hires will be provided in "areas of excellence that reflect significant societal challenges" (p. 13) and notes important progress in hiring faculty, particularly faculty of color. Here, too, however, more information is needed about those positions that were authorized and seemingly do not align with those seven areas, and clarity is needed around how these positions relate to operational needs (e.g. class capacity and demand).

Developing a plan to allocate positions via a consultative process will ensure the voices of multiple stakeholders are heard and will expose decision-makers to a broader set of concerns across campus. Such a process should help to alleviate this confusion while also providing a clear vision for the university moving forward. Most importantly, it can help to communicate the plans to a wider audience to ensure that there is no misunderstanding or confusion about the process (CFR 3.3).

Fiscal, physical and information resources (CFRs 3.4-3.5). SDSU has appropriately used assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of trainings for some of its instructors. For instance, an assessment of its mathematics department and courses revealed a need to improve the training of teaching assistants. SDSU would benefit from such assessments done systematically across campus (CFR 3.4).

In general, it appears as though the institution provides faculty professional development opportunities. The Center for Teaching and Learning and the Instructional

Technology Services units offer workshops and discussions to support faculty professional development. Providing support for faculty as they transition in-person courses online or develop totally new courses for hybrid or online models has helped to strategically align faculty with needs of the institution to embrace the rapidly increasing online education arena. However, as 300 additional faculty are added to SDSU's roster, the institution will have to reevaluate the level of support available to its instructors. A .5 FTE staff may not be sufficient. Moreover, aside from the recommendations in individual department-level task forces, it appears little direct attention is paid to graduate-level teaching development. It is not clear how graduate students, in general, are integrated into campus life or what training they may receive before they enter the classroom (CFR 3.3).

The institution has a history of financial stability and unqualified independent financial audits, and it has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has achievable plans to eliminate the deficit. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources.

Like many public institutions, SDSU faces significant budget challenges, especially in light of decreasing state appropriations. Nonetheless, SDSU has shown adequate commitment to capital construction given its budgetary restrictions. Its Conrad Prebys Aztec Student Union is approximately two years old, and its South Campus Plaza will be completed in a few short months. A new Engineering and Interdisciplinary Sciences Building will enable the university to keep pace with other institutions focusing significant resources in these disciplinary areas (CFR 3.5).

As SDSU strives to creatively address budget shortfalls, its shift to focus on fundraising is commendable, as is its continued growth of research dollars. Such diversification of revenue sources is critical. Moreover, the institution appears to have taken appropriate steps to evaluate appropriately their capacity to sustain institutional objectives and strategic priorities and continues to make financially-conscious decisions about its programming and areas of growth.

Organizational structures and decision-making processes (CFRs 3.6-3.11). SDSU appears to provide sufficient technological access and support to its members (CFR 3.6). SDSU has made recent changes to centralize information technology support for its classrooms. This was designed to improve response time and enable faculty success in using technology. Evaluations will have to be put into place to monitor if the move achieved its goals (CFR 3.7). SDSU has a clear organizational structure, and its decision-making processes have been addressed in its current strategic plan. Its shared governance model ensures representation of faculty, staff, students, and administrators on committees making important decisions about academic quality or effectiveness and institutional improvements (CFR 3.8). The CSU system is an effective governing board for SDSU (CFR 3.9). SDSU has a full-time CEO and SFO and is effectively staffed (CFR 3.10). SDSU's faculty roles, rights, and responsibilities are clearly defined (CFR 3.11).

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

The level of commitment to processes for quality assurance, institutional planning and improvement has been an important element of SDSUs advances in student success.

Quality assurance processes (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). The university's quality-assurance processes are well-developed, ranging from processes for developing and measuring student learning within majors to broad student achievement goals. The institutional report, for example, outlined the identification of DLOs and use of findings for assessments to identify and implement programmatic and curricular improvements. It is commendable that faculty, both within departments and programs and in the context of shared governance, have been and continue to be closely and productively engaged in both the development and implementation of these processes.

SDSU has articulated learning outcomes at both institutional and departmental levels and progress is being made on ensuring that all units have assessment plans in place. Yet, the team observed that work remains to be done to ensure that there is consistent follow-through on assessment plans. Even more, the team observed that the sheer number of structures and programs to capture data may be overwhelming both the practice and the practitioners and rendering the whole less than the sum of its parts. A lack of integrated and available data systems and shared analytic tools that are essential to supporting student success in decision-making and to assess effectiveness was acknowledged by both

faculty and staff

Strategic thinking and planning (CFRs 4.1- 4.5). Upon his arrival to SDSU in 2011, the president initiated a strategic planning process that eventuated in "Building on Excellence," a strategic plan that identifies three overarching institutional-level goals: (1) student success, (2) research and creative endeavors, and (3) community and communication. The team confirmed that there was indeed a "broadly inclusive process" to develop the strategic plan. The team also found impressive sophistication in strategic thinking (e.g., the president's own observation that what can appear a "strategic advantage from afar" may be a mere "descriptor") along with a keen sense of the particular challenges SDSU faces in the rapidly changing landscape of higher education.

Institutional learning and improvement (CFRs 4.3-4.7). SDSU has structures in place and, more importantly, a deep culture of reflecting on its achievements in light of its goals, so that it can indeed "learn" as an institution and, by thoughtful and carefully crafted steps, move to achieve those goals in an impressively intentional manner. One sees this in the way the institution implemented "an integrated program of high impact practices," just one of the means by which it achieved "improvements in retention and graduation rates while increasing the diversity of the student body and closing achievement gaps" (to cite the language of two of the this team's commendations). To offer a very concrete example, after analyzing the data, the institution learned that commuting students experience more challenges and that their persistence rates, even when accounting for levels of academic preparation, are lower than those of students who live on campus in their freshman year. Based on this information, the university crafted several initiatives aimed at increasing the support for these students; with greater engagement in campus life, they showed increased persistence and success.

Summary of Component 2: The team's findings, which are subject to Commission review, is that SDSU has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standards and federal requirements. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission. The team identified areas where further attention and development are needed, as noted in the recommendations section of this report.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees

The institutional report and supplemental materials present strong evidence that SDSU is offering a rich and challenging academic experience that serves the goals of its

broad mission "to impart an appreciation and broad understanding of human experience throughout the world and the ages" (SDSU Mission Statement). The institutional report describes an ambitious effort to ensure the quality and integrity of degrees and transparency. However, the institutional report has not provided "a holistic exploration of the middle ground" (WASC Handbook of Accreditation, p. 29) between a concrete list of degree requirements available on the university website and the academic catalogue and a general mission statement also available on the university website. The institutional report says surprisingly little about the place and role of graduate education at SDSU and it does not explicitly address how undergraduates "embody the distinct values and traditions of the institution" as requested in the WSCUC guidelines for the institutional report (CFR 2.2).

Meaning of degrees. During the AV, the team pursued two lines of inquiry related to defining the meaning of the degree: graduate education and the evolution and future of the SDSU identity.

SDSU offers 21 doctoral programs (in some places, the reported number of doctoral degree programs is 22; administrators attribute the variable number to whether or not the EdD degree is included in the count). There are 106 masters degree programs at SDSU. In their "WASC Campus Brief," SDSU describes the graduate programs as "evolving." For some colleges, graduate students are critical to faculty recruitment and to maintaining a high research profile. During the campus visit, both the faculty and administrators emphasized importance of providing undergraduates with access to opportunities to participate in cutting edge research. The primary metric of student success is job placement.   For other programs, the masters programs are offered as a route to doctoral study at other institutions   and provide an opportunity to advance SDSU's commitment to diversity. The primary metric for success is placement in a doctoral degree program. Finally, there are professional masters and doctoral degrees offered by some programs. According to the "WASC Campus Brief," a small number of new programs may be added over the next five years and there are no plans to expand enrollments in existing programs.

In its "WASC Campus Brief," SDSU responded to the query about the essence of a SDSU education with a quotation from a recent blog post by the president in which he emphasizes a commitment to maintaining the quality of academic and co-curricular programs and to ensuring students from all backgrounds exceed at the highest level. The Hispanic Serving Institution designation and the geographic location of SDSU are descriptors that are part of the institution's identity, but are not drivers of that identity. The

blog post refers to high impact practices including international experiences and service learning and it became clear during the AV that, for many constituencies, study abroad, undergraduate research, and community based leadership and learning experiences are the hallmarks of an SDSU education.

SDSU promotes undergraduate research through the Undergraduate Research Program (URP), Faculty-Student Mentor Program, and the Student Research Symposium. SDSU has several programs that connect students to learning opportunities within the local community. For example, in the SAGE project, more than 1500 students in more than 30 courses took part in these projects during the 2014-2015 academic year. SDSU was designated with a Carnegie Foundation Community Engagement Classification in 2015. Nearly a third of SDSU graduates have taken part in a study abroad experience and 32 of 85 majors require an international experience.

The team commends implementation of an integrated program of high impact practices, including undergraduate research and study abroad, and adopting policies that require these experiences for undergraduates. However, the institutional report does not articulate a value for these experiences beyond student retention, and the team encourages nascent efforts, such as the use of the Global Perspective Inventory to assess learning outcomes and the quality of these experiences.

Moreover, despite the consensus view that these high impact practices are hallmarks of an SDSU education, there is little connection between these practices and general education requirements. General education requirements do not appear to contribute to a distinctive identity for an SDSU education. Participants in the open student forum, who were with one exception elected representatives to student government, were asked about the purposes of general education. Most could not identify a purpose beyond assuring exposure to a field of study other than their major.

The 2005 WSCUC team report suggested that a planned review of general education consider how out of class experiences "such as campus employment, off-campus work, service learning, volunteer work, and study abroad contribute to general education outcomes". The report suggested connecting general education reform to other institutional priorities such as undergraduate research, scholarship and creative activity and study abroad. Again, while learning outcomes for general education were adopted, there continues to be a disconnect between general education and student participation in these

high impact educational experiences. The questions and concerns raised by the 2005 team continue to be relevant (CFR 2.2a).

Quality and integrity of degrees.   The university is developing the infrastructure to insure the quality and rigor of the degrees offered (CFR 2.6). All departments and programs at SDSU are now responsible for semi-annual reporting of how they assess established DLOs and use findings to identify and implement potential programmatic and curricular improvements. The Student Learning Outcomes Committee, which contains an assessment representative from each college, is charged with facilitating this process and providing constructive feedback and guidance on recent, current, and future assessment efforts. The periodic academic program review requires curricular maps relating DLOs to major required courses (according to the institutional report, all departments, schools, and programs undergo Academic Program Review on a five-year cycle; however, the team noted that this schedule has not been rigorously followed) and requires evidence of changes and improvements to pedagogy and the curriculum that have been made in response to the assessment of student work over time (CFR 2.7). In addition, the University Senate also implemented a policy in June 2014 requiring that all syllabi be posted to the library-hosted SDSU Syllabus Collection so that course content and learning outcomes are readily available to students and other stakeholders (CFR 2.3).

SDSU regularly shares data on student success in regards to retention, graduation, and time to degree, and there is a movement to greater transparency regarding learning outcomes and assessments (CFR 1.2). WEAVE has provided a framework for departments to identify DLOs and provide assessment reports, but this information is not accessible to students or even to faculty in other departments. SDSU's self-assessment notes that WEAVE is not as transparent as the institution would like.

SDSU continues to explore the best structure for the assessment of outcomes of general education. Although a university-wide faculty committee identified desired learning outcomes (CFR 2.4), efforts to develop rubrics and other assessment instruments have devolved to subunits of the university. The assessment of oral communication is an example where this decentralized approach appears to have worked well, but the team believes that there is a need for an effective administrative structure to coordinate this effort across all units (CFR 4.3).

SDSU's culture of evidence is manifest through actions taken by the University Senate, the institutional investments in WEAVE, and the institution's success in improving

retention rates and increasing graduation rates. Indeed, there has been considerable progress at SDSU. The team recommends that the university's progress in the assessment of educational effectiveness be sustained and enhanced, as discussed in "Educational Quality" section of this report.

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

SDSU has demonstrated a longstanding and serious commitment to enhancing the quality of undergraduate students' educational experiences. SDSU was commended on several areas during their previous reaffirmation review and the commitment has only grown stronger with significant progress leading up to SDSU's current institutional report, including further enrichment in high impact practices.

The institution initiated a redesign of general education following the recommendations from the Commission in 2006 about the need for a clearer set of outcomes, greater coherency, and more assessment at the program-level. As a result, general education learning outcomes have been specified. As documented in the Graduation Requirements section of the SDSU General Catalog 2015-2016, the general education program explicitly emphasizes seven essential capacities: 1. Construct, analyze, and communicate arguments; 2. Apply theoretical models to the real world; 3. Contextualize phenomena; 4. Negotiate differences; 5. Integrate global and local perspectives; 6. Illustrate relevance of concepts across boundaries; and 7. Evaluate consequences of actions, and describes how the curriculum addresses these capacities. However, the University Senate-designated organizational structure to oversee and track general education has undergone significant shifts overtime, moving from four committees to one committee and renaming the General Education Curriculum Committee the General Education Curriculum and Assessment Committee. The team is concerned that SDSU has not achieved greater coherence in general education or reliable administrative oversight of the program or assessment as recommended in the previous accreditation action.

The core competencies of oral communication, written communication, and quantitative reasoning have been thoughtfully addressed in the undergraduate program. Most impressive is the demonstration of evidence of student performance on several of these competencies and the work that went into creating the assessment plans and for considering results. SDSU seems to have engaged in assessment that is meaningful and

useful to efforts to improve student learning and success. For example, the widespread use of the Interactive Media Package for the Assessment of Communication and Critical Thinking (IMPACCT), developed by a faculty member to assess students' skills, combined with a peer rating, has provided multiple perspectives on oral communication, and also helped connect curriculum design, learning outcomes, and assessment. The results from this assessment effort have been shared with faculty through Center for Teaching and Learning workshops and have influenced the development of additional resources, including rubrics and a white paper on best practices to promote effective oral communication within and beyond courses across the campus (CFR 2.2a).

Another effective example of SDSU's careful examination of educational quality is illustrated in the review of student success rates in first year mathematics courses. This review helped encourage changes in pedagogy, consistency of outcomes across sections, greater support for quantitative reasoning for all students, and more robust placement procedures for pre-calculus, including the opportunity to use ALEKS, a well-established online adaptive learning program for mathematics, to improve their needed skills and then repeat the placement test to demonstrate mastery. SDSU's focus on quantitative reasoning for students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics led to the recommendation to establish a Mathematics Learning Center, which opened in 2015. Similarly, the assessment of written communication competency has involved the comprehensive collection of student papers and more than 24 faculty in the review process (CFRs 2.2, 2.2a). The College of Arts and Letters (CAL) General Education Assessment Project was particularly consequential, leading to a short and long term action plan, including making recommendations to programs as to which courses or instructors might need attention to their general education compliance and suggestions to a university-wide general education taskforce for revision of the current articulation of general education goals to align with documented student performance (CFRs 2.4, 2.6).

SDSU's documentation of student performance on several core competencies combined with thoughtful investigations of the curricular structures, processes, and policies that factor into student accomplishment is impressive. Another noteworthy achievement in educational quality is SDSU's investment in creating multiple opportunities for students to participate in high-impact practices. As noted previously, SDSU has an enviable record of recruiting students to study abroad. Currently, 32 of approximately 85 SDSU majors

require an international experience as part of the curriculum, and in 2015, 28% of students graduating from the university had taken part in a study abroad experience.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

SDSU is committed to making student success a key component of every aspect of the undergraduate experience. The team praised the institution for clearly defining student success within its mission and values statements. SDSU made student success a central element within the strategic five-year plan, indicating that student success is at the forefront of improvement efforts, and supported the development of strategic plans within student affairs with specific goals and objectives for student success, including a timeline of accomplishments linked to improvement indicators. These actions exemplify the institution's deep commitment in this area, and this type of planning is a clear indication of the level of commitment of the entire campus to the strategic plan and especially to the area of student success.

SDSU supports its commitment to student success with data analysis, program review, human resources, and financial commitments. The annual compendium on retention and graduation combined with the 2014-15 report on retention and graduation serve as examples of the type of data analysis that have assisted in the recent increases in graduation rates. Again, the strategic plans for student affairs, which present data on enrolled students and the different programs and efforts that support those students, demonstrate that SDSU has an informed understanding of the characteristics of the students it serves (CFR 2.8).

In response to the 2006 Commission letter, SDSU formed action-oriented teams to address concerns about student success (CFR 2.10). The breadth of the institutions' efforts suggests that SDSU is comprehensive in its approach to student success, including academic achievement, graduation, research-strong scholarship, and creative activity that furthers student learning (CFR 2.9). Most commendable is the investment of over $30 million in one-time funding and over $11 million in permanent funds in the student success effort. The team recognizes the institution's shift from a "focus on programs to a focus on student success driven by a thoughtful reliance on data" (CFR 2.8).

SDSU has made a particularly strong effort to collect and analyze student data that informs decision making about initiatives, programs, and policies that have the potential to improve student success. The regular monitoring of disaggregated retention and

graduation rates has afforded the institution the opportunity to address equity gaps in completion and to create special programs for a subpopulation of students to promote success. Of special mention are the programs for commuter students and the residential program for student veterans. Notably, both of these programs can develop into national models for similar institutions in need of addressing the special needs of these students. The team commends the institution for maintaining a strong commitment to student diversity as it increased retention and graduation rates.

Although SDSU has made significant advances in achieving equitable student outcomes, there is more to be realized in terms of assessing student success programs. The team recommends that SDSU assess these programs periodically, identify the program elements that lead to success, and consider the creation of benchmarks for assessing progress in the determination of student success. The team encourages SDSU to more closely align the assessment of co-curriculum programs with the achievement and satisfaction levels of the students served. In this way, the institution can both improve the performance of the programs and also increase the success rates of selected student groups (CFR 2.10). More disaggregated assessment results and the identification of success elements could lead to improvements within the institution as a whole and not just within the special programs, especially for retention and graduation (CFR 2.11). In addition, from an equity standpoint, it is important for SDSU to assess student success and programs at the IVC (CFR 2.13).

SDSU has also dedicated attention to creating high quality learning experiences that reflect the needs and interests of their students and their communities. For example, the institution's faculty-student mentor program in support of undergraduate research has been highly successful by including opportunities for faculty to engage with students in research projects that are of special interest to students and their own communities. The campus also has a high number of students participating in community-based service learning and a range of international programs. The team observed that these tailored, high impact practices demonstrate an awareness of the special needs of the surrounding communities and of the opportunities available for advanced scholarship among its students. Of special interest to the team was the extra support provided for educational opportunity program students through an additional advisor (CFRs 2.13, 2.11).

The team took particular note of the institution's use of an expanded definition of student diversity by recognizing the needs of foster youth, veterans, and commuter

students. In addition, the team was impressed by the institution's community commitment and the establishment of the Sweetwater Compact for Success. This level of inclusion and outreach to underserved communities is particularly laudable, and it is consistent with the social justice values that seem to drive faculty and staff at SDSU. It is especially commendable that this compact was initiated and sustained despite financial pressures on the campus.

The quality of advising is critical to student success. SDSU has made some improvements in the advising area, and meetings with advisors during the AV confirmed that more attention is being dedicated to this topic. The institution used an analysis of national best practices to begin the development of initiatives in the advising area and more institutional data are being consulted to address issues including the need for analytical course planning and to identify barriers to graduation for students identified as "super seniors" (CFR 2.12).

The team commends the institution for the range of academic policy changes that have been proposed and then implemented with the full support of the University Senate and participating students. SDSU used an analysis of its data to examine problems, change policies, and realize immediate effects on the graduation rate of its students (CFR 2.7). The team recognizes SDSU administrators and especially the group of forward-looking students who voted to assess themselves the fee that would directly impact their retention services -- such efforts require a great deal of cross-communication, cooperation, and confidence in the institution's student and administrative leaders.

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1-4.7)

SDSU exhibits a strong commitment to quality assurance and improvement based on program review, assessment, and the use of data and evidence. Indeed, the institutional report fairly bristles with data. Wisely, the university understands that all such review and assessment must build on universal agreement on what is being measured and requires consistent standards for measurement. In the wake of the recommendations and findings from its last review for reaffirmation, SDSU established that departments and programs would submit semi-annual reports "of how they assess established Degree Learning Outcomes and use findings to identify and implement potential programmatic and curricular improvements."

Examples of the smart use of data and analysis are many. To name but one, a strategic focus on classes with high DFW rates (grades of "D," "F," or Withdrawals from the course) enabled the university to gain a more rapid understanding of the type and nature of challenges to student achievement. The team found multiple instances where data-driven investigations led to deeper discussions and more nuanced understanding of the importance of student readiness, student engagement, and life-work balance in helping students succeed. The last-mentioned derived from a 2013 student survey that focused on the challenges students faced, including financial pressures and family and work obligations. The survey also revealed to the institution a more subtle and complex suite of challenges, leading to a realization that it needed to help students improve not only time management and other study skills, but also to address more diffuse and powerful issues such as diminished academic self-confidence and lack of support from a family that had little or no understanding of what being a college student meant or involved.

The team did find that the effectiveness of the many different schemes and programs for assessment and data collection and analysis was blunted by their sheer number and complexity and the degree of difficulty in their usability, at least as experienced by a number of faculty. The team affirmed the importance of sustaining the university's progress in the assessment of educational effectiveness, but recommends that it be enhanced through the development of a manageable process of assessment that prioritizes outcomes of greatest concern to the campus, for example, underrepresented student success, student success in high DFW courses, and the quality of high impact practices. Furthermore, support is needed to facilitate the full participation of all units and programs in the assessment process, including general education, graduate programs, and the IVC, and for the establishment of a platform for documenting outcomes, results, and actions taken that makes expectations and outcomes explicit and public, and facilitates sharing (CFRs 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 4.2).

The team also found that that there were challenges at the technical and organizational levels that were making it more difficult for the institution to make full use of the rich data it potentially had available to assist decision-making. Administrators, faculty, and, in particular staff, requested strengthened data systems, improved organizational relationships, and new governance infrastructure to ensure the reliable and consistent information and shared analytical tools that are required to support student success. These reforms would lead to improvements in a range of areas including real-time

advising, the assessment of student outcomes, and predictive analytics (CFRs 1.2, 3.5).

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education environment

As the higher education environment continues to change, universities will have to be flexible, responsive, creative, and data-driven. On the academic and student sides, SDSU has made significant strides in the development of a culture of assessment and has put in place a structure and apparatus for supporting assessment activities.

Financially, SDSU shows evidence of stability. It has created a student success fee, raised a record $90 million in fiscal year 2013-2014, and met its campaign goal for 2014. SDSU has extended that campaign by three years with a $750 million target by 2017. SDSU is further diversifying its revenue sources by exploring out-of-state recruitment, continuing education programs, and public-private funding models. Though these accomplishments are commendable, and SDSU has taken strides to tie these efforts to its strategic planning, more needs to be done to ensure long-term planning takes place, especially in light of projected budget shortfalls from the state. For instance, it does not appear as if SDSU has fully explored alternate revenue sources like online and continuing education or executive education, and it is not clear to what extent it has engaged its Mexican neighbors in expanding its course offerings or in recruitment of students.

Component 8: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

SDSU is to be commended for continuing the positive momentum and not resting on the laurels of achievements from the previous reaffirmation cycle. The institution has made considerable improvements in retention and graduation rates while also increasing the diversity of the student body and closing achievement gaps. It has demonstrated success in fundraising, proven financial savviness in face of deep cuts in state appropriations, expanded study abroad participation, pushed forward capital improvements, maintained a high volume of research grants, improved outreach to underserved local communities, and supported its faculty as they expand their own and undergraduate research opportunities.

Most importantly, SDSU has focused tremendous energy on creating the infrastructure necessary for a transparent and data- or evidence-based decision-making culture, and this has served to push forward a comprehensive strategic plan. This plan embodies the next steps for SDSU as an institution, particularly in the short-term. This

accreditation review serves to point out areas to consider for growth and long-term planning.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SDSU thoughtfully approached their comprehensive review as an opportunity to showcase its progress in student success and move quality improvement efforts forward during a period of fiscal challenge. The review process appears to have helped the institution reflect on its successes and look forward.

Commendations

The team commends SDSU for the following accomplishments:

1. the deep dedication of faculty, staff, administrators, and student leadership to collaboration and transparency as they work in partnership to lead student success.
2. improvements in retention and graduation rates while increasing the diversity of the student body and closing achievement gaps.
3. development of a comprehensive strategic plan with broad participation from university stakeholders.
4. remarkable success in fundraising.
5. capital improvements designed to strengthen student success, particularly the facilities for addressing the needs of commuter students.
6. maintaining a high volume of research grants and contracts in a very competitive national environment.
7. astute financial management to maintain the quality of the university while mitigating the deep cuts in state appropriations.
8. implementation of an integrated program of high impact practices, including undergraduate research and study abroad, and adopting policies that require these experiences for undergraduates.
9. outreach to underserved local communities.

Recommendations

The team recommends that San Diego State University:

1. Review its general education program to (a) strengthen its alignment with institutional goals, (b) enhance its integration into the overall curriculum, (c) improve understanding among students as to its purposes; and (d) create an effective administrative structure to support coordination across all academic programs (CFR 2.2a).

2. Develop or strengthen systems, organizational relationships, and governance infrastructure involved in both information technology and data management such that faculty and staff have ready access to reliable and consistent information and shared analytical tools – perhaps via a data warehouse – that are required to support student success, from real-time advising, to the assessment of student outcomes, and predictive analytics (CFRs 1.2, 3.5, 4.2).

3. Develop, via an appropriately consultative process, a plan for allocating faculty and staff positions to address multiple and competing needs, among them: a commitment to student success, the enhancement of diversity, support of existing graduate programs, and the development of new initiatives. The team also recommends the university enhance efforts to retain faculty and staff through increased professional development opportunities (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

4. Sustain and enhance its progress in the assessment of educational effectiveness through the development of a manageable process of assessment that prioritizes outcomes of greatest concern to the campus, for example, underrepresented student success, student success in high DFW courses, and the quality of high-impact practices. Furthermore, support is needed to facilitate the full participation of all units and programs in the assessment process, including general education, graduate programs, and the IVC, and for the establishment of a platform (WEAVE or an alternative) for documenting outcomes, results, and actions taken that makes expectations and outcomes explicit and public, and that facilitates sharing (CFRs 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 4.2).

Appendix 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☒YES ❏ NO
	If so, where is the policy located? https://newscenter.sdsu.edu/universitysenate/files/04800-SDSUPolicyFileJuly2015(1).pdf
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	Comments: See Schedule of Classes for past, present, and upcoming course offerings at https://sunspot.sdsu.edu/schedule/search.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? Six
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? ❏ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ☒ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? American Indian Studies, Biology, Chemistry, Business Administration, Religious Studies, Teacher Education
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? Eight
	What kinds of courses? Internships, laboratory, practicum
	What degree level(s)? ❏ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ❏ Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Political Science (internship), City Planning (internship), Geography (internship), Business Administration (internship), Child and Family Development (Laboratory), Geological Sciences (Laboratory), Music (Practicum), Exercise and Nutritional Sciences (Practicum)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Six
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Four BA/BS and one MA/MS, one PhD
	What degree level(s)? ❏ AA/AS ☒ BA/BS ☒ MA ☒ Doctoral (Joint)
	What discipline(s)? Chemistry, Bioinformatics & Medical Informatics, Economics, Media Studies, Rhetoric and Writing, History
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☒ YES ❏ NO
	Comments:

Reviewed and Verified by: Cecilia Conrad
Date: 03/24/2016

Appendix 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: Also meets guidelines from national organizations representing admissions and recruitment officers.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: See MyMaps for all undergraduate degrees at https://sunspot.sdsu.edu/pubred/!mymap.disp See program-specific information within the Graduate Bulletin (http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/bulletin/) See semester fees for undergraduate and graduate courses at http://bfa.sdsu.edu/fm/co/sfs/registration.html
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ☒ YES ❑ NO
	Comments: What information, and where it is presented, varies by program, with venues including the General Catalog (undergraduate) and Graduate Bulletin (see links above) as well as program websites. SDSU provides information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified through multiple sources, including the General Catalog and Graduate Bulletin, Career Services' "What Can I Do With This Major" webpage, and the various academic programs' websites. In addition to these web-based resources, academic programs also provide such information through their curricular structure and student advising. SDSU gathers information about the employment of its graduates through a survey of graduating seniors each semester regarding employment and salary information. In addition, SDSU contributes regularly to the broader salary survey produced the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). The most recent available reports for these local and national surveys are available at Career Services' Salary Survey page. The campus does not have a centralized database for placements of students graduating from advanced degree programs. Also MyMaps does not give students an good indication of how long it takes to complete the degree requirements listed in this database. The campus may consider using the services of the alumni association or the development offices as a means to present additional career options for SDSU graduates.

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Completed and Verified by: Francisco Hernandez
Date: 03/24/2016

Appendix 3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's
student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Student Complaint Procedure is presented in General Catalog (p. 479) and Graduate Bulletin (p. 64, 68). Nondiscrimination Policy is presented in General Catalog (p. 462-464) and Graduate Bulletin (p. 56-58)
	Comments: Student Complaint Procedure Office of the Ombudsman Student Services East, Room 1105 619-594-6578 http://www.sa.sdsu.edu/ombuds Here is the information published for students: The California State University takes very seriously complaints and concerns regarding the institution. If you have a complaint regarding the CSU, you may present your complaint as follows: 1. If your complaint concerns CSU's compliance with academic program quality and accrediting standards, you may present your complaint to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) at http://www.wascsenior.org/comments. WASC is the agency that accredits the CSU's academic program. 2. If your complaint concerns an alleged violation by CSU of a state law, including laws prohibiting fraud and false advertising, you may present your claim to the campus president or Office of the Ombudsman, Student Services East , Room 1105, 619-594-6578, http://www.sa.sdsu.edu/ombuds. The president or ombudsman will provide guidance on the appropriate campus process for addressing your particular issue. If you believe that your complaint warrants further attention after you have exhausted all the steps outlined by the president or ombudsman, or by WASC, you may file an appeal with the Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs at the CSU Chancellor's Office. This procedure should not be construed to limit any right that you may have to take civil or criminal legal action to resolve your complaint. Complaints of harassment and discrimination that fall under the protected categories are referred to the Office of Employee Relations and Compliance for further investigation.

Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Student complaints against faculty related to grade appeals, unfair treatment, administrative and academic policy are filed with the Ombudsman. Student complaints related to discrimination, harassment, or other protected categories are filed with Employee Relations and Compliance. Student-to-Student Complaints are filed with the Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities and investigated by a Judicial Officer.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? Office of the Ombudsman; Office of Employee Relations and Compliance; Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☒YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Complaint records filed with the Ombudsman are kept for eight years; statistical information to evaluate trends is compiled and reviewed on a yearly basis. • Complaint records filed with Employee Relations and Compliance • Complaint records filed with the Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Reviewed and Verified by: Francisco Hernandez
Date: 03/24/2016

Appendix 4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? ☒ YES ☐ NO If so, where? General and program-specific policies are presented in the General Catalog (http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/quickref.html) and in the Graduate Bulletin (http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/2015-16/Graduate/Graduate%202015-16.pdf)
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? ☒ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

> (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

> (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.
Reviewed and Verified by: Francisco Hernandez
Date: 03/24/2016

Appendix B. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT

Institution: SDSU
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Francisco Hernandez
Date/s of review: Spring, 2016

Date/s of review:

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed[7]. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1.   Site Name and Address

   Imperial Valley Campus
   720 Heber Ave.
   Calexico, CA 92231

2.   Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

   12   bachelors degrees; 4 masters degrees; designated as a Standalone campus by WSCUC; in operation since 1959; all degree programs are on-site (no distance education programs); enrolls over 800 students; approximately 50 faculty members, 20 of whom are full-time faculty.

3.   Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

SDSU Strategic Plan

SDSU Institutional Report

Campus Catalog,

2015-16 Imperial Valley Campus Bulletin

Imperial Valley Strategic Plan

Interviews:

Associated Students [Chair: David Lopez]

Academic Affairs [Chair: Carlos Herrera]

---

[7] See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Student Affairs [Chair: Miriam Castañon]

Imperial Valley Campus Executive Council

Business Affairs [Chair: Martha Garcia]

Staff Council [Chairs: Norma Aguilar, Aracely Bojorquez, Adrian Gonzalez]

Faculty Council [Chairs: Richard Neumann; Elizabeth Cordero]

Community Relations and Development [Chair: Valorie Ashley]

Dean Gregorio Ponce

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	SDSU has followed up on recommendations from different committees except the key recommendation SDSU address concerns about the feeling on the off-campus site as being treated as an after-thought in consideration of the overall institution's operational and planning processes.	SDSU follow-up on the concerns of the off-campus administration and staff regarding the lack of consideration of their needs.
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)	These areas were not covered during the visit.	
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The SDSU campus is highly visible on the off-campus site. The off-campus site is governed by all of the same policies and procedures as the main campus. The off-campus staff participates in the governance structures of the institution and the students can participate in all main campus activities.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5,	The IVC site has a physical plant specifically developed to provide for in-person instruction and student support services. The campus provides ample space for	

3.1, 3.5)	faculty/student interaction as well as student/student interaction.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	The off-campus site provides a full slate of student academic and co-curricular services. These services mirror the services available on the main campus. In addition, off-campus students can use services on the main campus. No data on the effectiveness of these services were available at the time of the visit.	Data in the form of student surveys, campus studies, or peer institution that address the effectiveness of the different programs and services aimed at improvement and meeting student needs.
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Courses on the off-campus site are taught by a core of 20 full-time faculty supported by part-time and adjunct faculty available from the area is specialized areas. All of the academic oversight for the off-campus programs is handled by the off-campus faculty with the support and guidance of the faculty on the main campus. All of the off-campus faculty hold joint appointments on the main campus and participate the faculty governance structures. The off-campus faculty uses the same process and procedures of curriculum development and assessment as the faculty on the main campus. The main campus has developed a process for assessing student learning that is used by the off-campus faculty.	Off-campus faculty are concerned about the level of consultation and assessment of their needs in the development of some of the processes and procedures associated with the assessment of student learning. They desire more consultation.
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)	All courses are developed and approved by SDSU-IVC faculty. The oversight and evaluation processes and policies of the off-campus offerings are conducted in the same manner as those of the main campus.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to	Campus data indicate that students enrolled in the off-campus degree programs have a higher rate of graduation/retention than students	

programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	enrolled on the main campus. This is note-worthy because the income profile of the off-campus students is significantly lower that that of the main campus students.	
Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	The faculty at the off-campus site is required to meet the same standards, policies and procedures as the faculty on the main campus.	Comparable data between the off-campus site and the main campus on student learning outcomes.
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	The campus did not present any information on how the main campus evaluated the overall effectiveness of the off-campus site.	

Appendix C: Distance Education Review-Team Report
Institution: San Diego State University
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Francisco Hernandez
Date/s of review: Spring, 2016

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs[8] and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

TE655 Sociocultural Foundations of American Education (Req. course for MA in Education, Elementary/Secondary)
TE709 Inclusive Excellence (Req. course for MA in Education, Elementary/Secondary)
TE790 Seminar in Teacher Education (Elective course for MA in Education, Elementary/Secondary)
EDL650 Professional Learning and Growth Leadership (Req. course for MA Ed. Leadership)
EDL680 Seminar for Change and Information Technology Architecture (Req. course for MA Ed. Leadership)

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

Degree	Major	Concentration	Delivery
MA	Education	Learning Design and Technology	Fully Online
MS	Regulatory Affairs	—	Fully Online
MS	Rehabilitation Counseling	—	Fully Online
MS	Hospitality and Tourism Manag.	—	Hybrid
MAT	Master of Arts in Teaching	Elementary Education	Hybrid
MAT	Master of Arts in Teaching	Secondary Education	Hybrid
MA	Education	Educational Leadership: Postsecondary Education	Hybrid
MA	Education	Educational Leadership: PreK-12	

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

---

[8] See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

SDSU Strategic Plan

SDSU Institutional Report

University Catalog, Online Course Schedule, University Website, Academic Senate Policies, Academic Senate Meeting Minutes, Course Syllabi,

2012 ITS Strategic Plan Report

Distance Learning Website information on mission, policies, and online resources.

Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Checklist on Distance Learning Courses.

ITS Website information on infrastructure, training, software provided, and services provided.

Interviews:

ITS and distance education committee of the Academic Senate

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	The institutional report points to the growth of online/hybrid courses as a means to accommodate more students with fewer faculty. In the face of this challenge, SDSU took several key actions to ensure that students were able to enroll in the classes they needed to meet program requirements. These actions included increasing class size, constructing 500-seat lecture halls, and ***supporting the development of hybrid and online modes of instruction***. At the same time the university implemented these actions, there was a sustained focus on student learning and assessment as noted earlier in the institutional report and processes for the approval of hybrid and online courses have been implemented to ensure those opportunities meet the university standards for student learning (CFR 4.7). The campus policy on distance learning reads:	

	"Any department or faculty group offering distance education programs (those in which more than half of the courses are offered through distance education) is expected to meet Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requirements and be guided by policy established by the University." (statement from the policy)
	
	From the statement of principles:
	    Each program shall provide the opportunity for substantial, personal, and timely interactions between faculty and students and among students.
	
	    Students shall have adequate access to library and student services.
	
	    The university shall offer appropriate training and support services to faculty who teach distance education courses and programs.	

Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	All students taking online courses have access to student services and student activities as do the in-person students on the campus. Most of the students taking online courses are also taking in-person courses.	The campus may want to consider providing a centralized database of all student services provided especially for on-line students.
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Both the learning platform and the academic infrastructure are very conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students. The campus uses Bb and associated technologies to track student interaction with the course and faculty. The technology support structure provides access and training on all software offerings.	
Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	All enrolled students have access to all of the campus offerings, activities, and services either in person or through online technologies.	Not clear on what support is offered to students enrolled in online degree programs not living near San Diego.

Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	ITS provides extensive training to all instructors in the use of learning technologies. All online courses are approved through the faculty review and governance structures. The faculty review process provides curriculum development guidance through its website and through department resources. Instructors for online courses come from the full-time and part-time pool of faculty affiliated with SDSU academic departments. All online courses meet the campus policies on student progress and learning outcomes.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	See Above The campus revised the policies on distance education to include online and hybrid courses in 2014. These changes highlighted the need to change definitions of distance education and distance learning to reflect the changing instructional modalities and to provide policy guidelines for the development, evaluation and approval of these courses. http://go.sdsu.edu/universitysenate/files/03140-maysenagenda14.pdf The campus reports that an analysis of 21 cases comparing pre-CDI f2f sections with post-CDI online sections of the same curse by the same instructor revealed no significant difference between the % of DFWs for f2f and online sections.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	Data on retention and graduation for online programs was not made available for the visit. However, the institution presented data on the percentage of students who received Ds, Fs, or Withdrew from comparable online and onsite courses. Results revealed no statistically significant differences.	Need retention data on online courses and degree programs.

45

Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	The campus assesses student learning in a manner similar or the same as that for the in-person courses.	
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	The campus has in place contracts and contract appropriation guidelines that that provide guidance on the arrangements with outside vendors regarding the infrastructure, delivery and development/instruction of online courses. The campus provides guidance on the development/instruction of courses and uses CSU and state guidelines for arrangements with outside vendors.	
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	The campus assures the quality of the distance education and online programs through the regular quality control processes for all academic offerings. These assurances include periodic peer review, internal program reviews, course approvals, and assessments of student learning.	

Rev 3/2015