

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To San Diego State University

March 25 to 27, 2026

Team Roster

Carol Christ, Chair
Chancellor Emerita
University of California, Berkeley

Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Assistant Dean, Summer Sessions and Strategic Initiatives
University of California, Los Angeles

Allison Baird-James
Senior Vice President, Administration and Finance
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Brian Haynes
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
University of California, Riverside

Shirley Truong
Interim Director, Institutional Research, Analytics, and Planning Support
University of California, Santa Cruz

Barbara Gross Davis, WSCUC Staff Liaison
Vice President
WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2023 Handbook and Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I– OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	5
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	8

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Response to Previous Commission Actions	10
a. Recommendation 1: General Education	11
b. Recommendation 2: Information Technology and Data Governance	12
c. Recommendation 3: Allocation of Faculty and Staff Positions, Faculty and Staff Development	14
d. Recommendation 4: Assessment and Student Success	16
B. Institution-Specific Theme: Redefining Inclusive Student Success	
a. Expanding Access and Student Preparation	18
b. Academic Student Success	20
c. Holistic Well-Being	22
d. Increasing Career Readiness	24
C. Reflection and Plans for Improvement	26
D. Compliance: 2023 WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements	
a. Standard 1	27
b. Standard 2	29
c. Standard 3	35
d. Standard 4	37
e. Federal Requirements	42

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change) 43

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 43

APPENDICES 46

A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review	
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	
3. Student Complaints Review	
4. Transfer Credit Review	
B. Distance Education Review Form	
C. Off-Campus Locations Review	

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Its Accreditation History

Founded in 1897, San Diego State University (SDSU) is one of the 22 campuses of the California State University (CSU) system and its first to achieve the Carnegie Classification of R1 (Very High Research Spending and Doctorate Production). It included the Mesa Campus (the institution's main campus), located in the Mid-City region of San Diego, CA, and the SDSU Imperial Valley campus (with sites in Calexico and Brawley), as well as other locations through its Global Campus, including Centinela State Prison in Imperial County (BA degrees), Palau Community College in Palau (MA and BA degrees and a certificate), and Tbilisi in the Republic of Georgia (BS and MS degrees). During the week of the team's visit, a new bachelor's degree completion program was approved at Southwestern College in Chula Vista, CA. In Fall 2025, the institution enrolled a total of 43,324 students (37,677 undergraduates and 5,647 graduate students), supported by 6,900 faculty and staff.

SDSU offered 97 undergraduate degree programs, 115 master's degrees, and 30 active doctoral programs, along with 53 undergraduate and 79 post-baccalaureate certificates and credentials. The following seven colleges and one unit offered these programs: Arts and Letters, Fowler College of Business, Education, Engineering, Health and Human Services, Professional Studies and Fine Arts, Sciences, and the Division of Faculty Advancement and Student Success. The SDSU Global Campus, which was a self-supported entity providing mostly online learning, offered the campus's online degrees (6 bachelor's degrees, 18 master's degrees, and numerous certificates and credentials including hybrid programs) and the off-campus location programs in Centinela, Palau, and Georgia.

At the time of the visit, SDSU had broken ground on an additional 132-acre location in Mission Valley, five miles west of the Mesa Campus. The Mission Valley campus plans included 4,600 units of housing and a 1.6 million square foot "Innovation District," to feature collaborations between public and private partners and a shared space with the San Diego Community College District to focus on STEM education. The institutional report cited how SDSU's \$9.7 billion impact on the regional economy was expected to grow another \$3 billion through the activity of this off-campus location.

The team notes SDSU's close relationships with the communities it served, characterized by its participation in the development of economically disadvantaged regions by offering degrees taught in fields aligned educationally with regional workforce demand, such as healthcare in the Imperial Valley. In the new STEM building on the Brawley site, SDSU Imperial Valley planned to offer bachelor's degrees in disciplines to support that region's future extraction of lithium from the Salton Sea. High research volume had earned SDSU the aforementioned R1 status, while its deep relationship with the community earned Carnegie's Community Engagement designation. In addition, the institution attained Carnegie's Opportunity Colleges and Universities status, which recognized the institution's support for the social mobility of its students. SDSU also achieved designations as both a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI).

Following the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025, SDSU had met or surpassed its overall target for first-time freshman student graduation, with a four-year completion rate of 62.2% (fall 2021 entering cohort) compared to 53.5% (fall 2016 entering cohort). The six-year completion rate remained stable at 78.0% comparing the fall 2014 and fall 2019 entering cohorts. The

transfer two-year graduation rate increased two percentage points between the fall 2018 and the fall 2023 entering cohorts (60.1% to 62.0%), and the transfer three-year rates increased two points as well, from 82.8% to 84.9% (fall 2017 and fall 2022 entering cohorts compared). The team's findings regarding achievement of student success measures are found in the Standard 4 section of this report.

The team reviewed SDSU's distance education offerings (examining two degree programs: the Bachelor of Arts in Communication, Applied Arts and Sciences, and the Master of Science in Computer Engineering) as well as the off-campus locations that constituted the SDSU Imperial Valley campus (both the Calexico and Brawley sites). Further details regarding the team's review are found in description of the team's review process below and the appendices of this report. No special follow-up related to substantive change was conducted in connection with this visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

On January 16, 2026, the team received the institution's report, and each team member completed a worksheet with prompts designed to evaluate the following: the report's quality, theme, and subsections; the institution's compliance with the Standards and response to the Commission's recommendations following the last visit; areas of interest to pursue during the visit; additional materials that would be useful in the review; and individuals and groups to interview during the visit. The team's responses were collected in a single document that was summarized and discussed during the team's Zoom conference call on March 2, 2026. During that meeting, the team also discussed writing assignments for the team report, SDSU's accreditation history and status, WSCUC's Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation process, and the

team's deliverables to be produced from the visit. While reviewing the proposed visit schedule, the team designated facilitators for each meeting and determined the process of developing and collecting questions to be asked during each visit session. The team's pre-drafting schedule was set for submitting initial reflections regarding each team member's writing assignments, and other logistics were discussed.

Following the meeting, the team requested and promptly received from SDSU the following additional materials: promotional documents (electronic and print) that assist students in finding research projects or opportunities; recent climate survey and Career Submission Survey reporting; and additional reporting from the appendices of selected program review samples.

On the afternoon of March 24, 2026, the team held its initial executive session of the visit in person, and confirmed the team's assignments for the visit and the team report, discussed the team chair's conversation with the institution's president, which took place in advance of the visit, and summarized the major issues the team expected to explore. The team considered the findings from the distance education and off-campus locations review and examined the schedule of meetings for the visit. After a conversation about the questions to be asked by the assigned team member facilitating each meeting, the contents of the confidential email account prior to the beginning of the visit were shared, as well as how the team would emphasize this resource for anyone in the meetings who wished to provide information and their perspective at any time during the visit. The team established its method for capturing commendations and recommendations during the visit and reviewed its recommendation decision options, including the periods of accreditation and types of interactions that could be recommended. Expectations for team members during the visit and for the preparation of the team report were clarified.

During the visit, the team conducted interviews with the following: the institution's accreditation liaison officer; the leadership and executive staff; the WSCUC steering committee (including its student member); business and financial affairs and enrollment services staff; members of the general education task force, the general education curriculum committee, and other faculty and staff involved in SDSU's general education curriculum; institutional research and information technology staff; leadership of the center for teaching and learning; staff development and human resources staff; faculty and staff involved in assessment and program review; faculty leading academic departments and programs; faculty and leadership involved in research and innovation; Campanile Foundation board members; campus physical and cybersecurity leaders and staff; senate executive committee members; academic affairs and student affairs and campus diversity leadership; staff and faculty whose work focused on the student success themes explored in the institutional report, and – in open forums – faculty, staff, and students (both undergraduate and graduate students) of SDSU. The team took a tour of the campus to highlight locations referenced in the report, such as the SDSU Basic Needs Center. WSCUC provided a confidential email account through which the team received and reviewed messages sent by the institution's students, faculty, staff, and community. On each day of the visit, the team deliberated in executive sessions.

To evaluate compliance with the federal requirements, the team reviewed all materials presented on the Federal Requirements Forms prepared by SDSU, which included the following: CSU and SDSU policy publications, the SDSU Catalog, documentation of curriculum and academic program review processes, the SDSU Syllabus Collection and sample syllabi for courses at undergraduate and graduate levels representing on-line and in-person instructional modalities (including those that do not meet for the prescribed hours, such as internships),

application and admission information, marketing materials for off-campus locations, the SDSU website reporting the cost of attendance, materials published to assist students with career pathways and selecting their major, the Career Services website, incident reporting guidance for students on the SDSU website, student grievance committee procedures, and meeting minutes documenting the establishment of a 10-year period for retention of grievance, complaint, and action records.

On March 23, 2026, the team sent a representative to SDSU's additional locations in the Imperial Valley: Calexico and Brawley. During that visit, the team member met with the following: the dean and Imperial Valley leadership; the dean of student affairs and staff supporting student success; faculty from education, nursing, and psychology; and campus staff representing the dean's office and critical operations areas. The team member toured the new Brawley STEM building and visited an undergraduate course meeting held at the Brawley location. On March 26, 2026, the team held a Zoom meeting with a group of students enrolled at SDSU Imperial Valley. In the Off-Campus Locations appendix, the team documents its review of SDSU Imperial Valley's two sites.

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

SDSU's institutional report organized and presented extensive information and evidence effectively to support the team's review. Hyperlinks to documents and websites throughout the report supplied a compelling basis for the team to evaluate SDSU's success. The team was struck by the thoroughness and detail of the institution's response to the recommendations from the last reaffirmation review in 2016 as well as the institution's dedication to multi-faceted

approaches, cross-campus collaborations, and best practices when addressing challenging issues. The institutional report focused clearly on the components of its theme – redefining inclusive student success – and elaborated on the efforts invested in expanding access and student preparation, academic student success, holistic well-being, and increasing career readiness. During the visit, the team achieved confirmation and corroboration of the institutional report's presentation of the SDSU self-study.

To prepare the institutional report, SDSU began in 2022 with an initial coordinating committee of 34 administrators, faculty, staff, and students to propose the areas to explore in the Thematic Pathway Review, assess progress toward the campus's strategic plan and accomplishments in response to the recommendations from the previous WSCUC review, and gather key data and documentation. This committee's proposed theme received feedback from campus stakeholders before submission to WSCUC for approval. Writing groups were selected from the WSCUC reaffirmation committee, which was formed in 2023 to include a different group of 34 administrators and staff (with some members in common with the former initial coordinating committee), and these writing groups drafted eight sections of the report and gathered evidence for the Compliance with the Standards reporting and federal forms. The result, when the sections were combined, was a 90-page single-spaced document requiring editorial attention from a new WSCUC steering committee of 11 administrators and staff during the 2024-25 academic year, so that the report could attain the size and scope appropriate for this process. Campus review of the report continued with the circulation of the document to the stakeholders for their review and response between June and September of 2025, including the academic deans council, associated students, chairs and directors (retreats and meetings), council of vice presidents, division of research and innovation, graduate council, IT (information

technology) leadership, student affairs and campus diversity, and the university senate. By fall 2025, the broader community reviewed the report, and over 225 individual faculty, students, and staff provided feedback that was incorporated into the final version of the report. The team commends such breadth and depth of participation in the development of the SDSU institutional report.

To shepherd the final stages of the review, which culminated in the accreditation visit, a new 18-member WSCUC steering committee of administrators, faculty, staff, and a student leader was formed for the 2025-26 academic year. Soon after arriving on campus, the team met with this group to discuss the campus's review process and the institutional report. When asked about what occurred on campus as a function of the self-study process, individuals on the committee noted the new interventions to retain undergraduates utilizing more holistic advising strategies, the partnerships that developed across campus, such as those between academic affairs and student affairs, and the volume of change that had occurred through decisions supported by data on campus since the last WSCUC visit. Support for students had improved since the beginning of the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025, accompanied by pride in the results of those efforts, because of how emphatically they put students at the center of the work performed by so many on campus.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Response to Previous Commission Actions

The team finds that SDSU responded effectively and comprehensively to the recommendations cited on the July 8, 2016, Commission Action Letter. Note: The CFRs cited

in the recommendations below reflect the 2013 Standards of Accreditation. The team's assessment of the institution's response references CFRs from the 2023 Standards.

Recommendation 1: General Education

Review the 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 infrastructure to support coordination across academic programs (2013 Handbook: CFR 2.2a).

As a campus of the CSU system, SDSU altered its general education (GE) requirements four times since the last visit to address the systemwide expectations. Amid this imposed change, the institution systematically approached GE reform by prioritizing this curriculum's value and how its value was communicated to students.

SDSU's 2018 GE Reform Task Force determined that new Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) would best guide curriculum revision, and ILOs that emphasized both academic achievement and student well-being were adopted in 2020. Strengths and gaps in the GE curriculum's coverage of these ILOs were identified across programs following a mapping exercise of the ILOs to the latest CSU GE goals and the SDSU degree learning outcomes. Departments were also encouraged to build curricular pathways that reinforced GE competencies and interdisciplinarity – for example, writing instruction was integrated into engineering senior design courses. To provide oversight, SDSU created the Office of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accreditation (CAA), which further improved curricular coordination and the effective implementation of GE.

To help students better understand the value of GE, SDSU's orientation program integrated presentations for new undergraduates about this curriculum. After benchmarking with other institutions, the 2025 GE Task Force gathered advisor feedback and mapped GE skills to career readiness competencies developed by NACE (National Association of Colleges and Employers), which consequently underscored GE's relevance and value to students in both future careers and graduate study. During meetings with faculty and administrators, the team heard about this effort as well as a tool being developed to enable students to select GE courses in active pursuit of particular career readiness competencies they may not have gained through fulfilling other GE requirements. The team commends SDSU for this insightful approach to fulfilling the Commission's recommendation and elevating this component of the undergraduate curriculum. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2)

Recommendation 2: Information Technology and Data Governance

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 can enhance student success (2013 Handbook: CFRs 1.2, 3.5, 4.2).

Through the implementation of new positions, administrative structures, and committees, SDSU moved to better secure its digital assets and provide both shared services and IT leadership. The vice president for IT and CIO was hired in 2019 and provided oversight of IT units and campus-wide IT solutions. A new IT governance model was implemented for greater security and the offering of shared services, and in 2021, SDSU hired its new chief information

security officer to lead SDSU's security strategy, governance, and risk management. The IT Governance Council was introduced for university leaders and students to collaborate in examining areas of risk and IT improvements. To consolidate help desk services, the OneIT Community was established, and the university senate's Instructional and Information Technology Committee was formed to address faculty concerns. (CFR 3.1)

SDSU migrated to the systemwide student information system – a mobile-friendly, integrated platform to access financial aid, billing, student records, and other key services, known as my.SDSU. This implementation addressed critical security risks and the viability of financial aid operations; however, this transition also brought significant challenges. Long-term custom tools from the previous system and time-saving automation were lost in the implementation to the new software, which placed a strain on faculty and staff who served students. Lessons learned included an appreciation for the value of effective change management and communication of expectations, as well as the involvement of key user communities in system development. (CFR 3.5)

The data management and analysis resources of Analytic Studies and Institutional Research (ASIR) increased significantly as the unit grew in its extensive service of decision making. With the Statistical Modeling Group (led by faculty) and the unit's staff expansion, ASIR contributed substantially to the quality assurance processes on campus with tools and reports that the team will discuss below in the Standard 4 section of this report. The team commends how ASIR involved SDSU's faculty and researchers as Data Champions, to provide data, analysis, and insight to support academic decision-making, and to prompt institutional responsiveness when technology was applied to solve important challenges.

A central data repository was created through collaboration with campus partners representing all domains of institutional data, and ASIR maintained a resource that facilitated valuable integration of high-quality data for efficient access and utilization in analysis. Data governance guidelines were developed by the cross-divisional Data Governance Technical Working Group to advance the institution's data quality and infrastructure. (CFR 3.5)

Recommendation 3: Allocation of Faculty and Staff Positions, Faculty and Staff Development

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. Enhance efforts to retain faculty and staff through professional development opportunities (2013 Handbook: CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

In 2018, SDSU moved toward allocating faculty positions according to a new process that offered greater transparency, senate consultation, and collaboration. Through academic affairs and shared governance processes, committees local to departments, schools, and colleges received data to inform their prioritization and discussion of tenure/tenure track faculty hiring requests, including student enrollment data, total faculty counts, key ratios, and student completion rates. Unit priorities were communicated to the provost's office, along with instructional data and narrative aligning the requests with the institution's strategic plan.

Participants in an institution-wide faculty hiring retreat considered data and the deans' presentations, followed by a voting process that ranked faculty line requests for central funding. These participants – deans, academic affairs leadership, and members of the senate tenure-track

planning committee – shared with the team how the transparency of this process benefited the campus and proved successful because of the integrity of data informing the recommendations. The president received post-retreat recommendations for hiring approvals from the provost and vice provost, in consultation with the Senate Tenure-Track Planning Committee. Time-sensitive, grant funded, or other exceptional needs motivated a small number of hires that were approved by senior leadership; otherwise, faculty searches proceeded according to policy.

The process for staff position allocation was similarly transparent. Divisional leadership could reallocate staff positions to support operations, and the council of vice presidents prioritized new staff positions in consultation with the senate committee on University Resources and Planning and the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC). The president approved new positions on the advice of PBAC. State budget cuts led to the hiring chill in place at the time of the visit. In response to the decrease in hiring, shared service models and technological tools were implemented to enable efficiencies and to cover work while staff positions remained unfilled. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)

SDSU reported to the team the impact of faculty and staff development opportunities introduced since the last visit. The institutional report emphasized that all divisions provided faculty and staff professional development opportunities; however, two new efforts were highlighted in addition to the faculty development activities in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

One new unit served faculty development needs while the other provided programming and services for staff. The stand-alone Division of Research and Innovation (DRI) was established in 2020 and ran several programs supporting faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. This included DRI's Research Advancement Department, which offered the

Grants Research and Enterprise Writing workshop. This support for the institution's research enterprise accompanied an almost 65% increase in sponsored research over the three years leading into FY25. The Staff Advancement, Leadership, and Development office was created in 2024 to focus on staff professional development. The department focused on programming designed to enhance skills, leadership, and planning for a variety of occupations at different stages of the staff's professional careers. (CFR 3.3)

Recommendation 4: Assessment and Student Success

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 (2013 Handbook: CFR 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 4.2).

Since the last visit, SDSU built a stronger infrastructure to support assessment of both curricular and co-curricular learning. CAA was established in academic affairs in 2020, and the Program Evaluation, Compliance, and Assessment (PECA) unit was created in student affairs and campus diversity. The campus adopted Nuventive as the assessment support system and integrated it with the campus LMS to replace WEAVE. Nuventive facilitated access to course-

embedded learning assessment for student achievement analysis. CAA steadily grew its staff from 2021 to 2024 with hires of an assessment analyst and a director of continuous improvement. The University Library also hired an assessment librarian. Among several priorities, the resulting collaborations with faculty elevated the use of authentic assessments of student learning and took advantage of data collection in the library to evaluate student attainment of information literacy outcomes. (CFR 3.1)

The development of learning outcomes in academic programs advanced significantly since the last visit, with 91% of undergraduate and 84% of graduate programs – including those at SDSU Imperial Valley and Global Campus – reporting assessment findings. Improvements in teaching and learning were realized by several programs. An annual assessment of GE curriculum at the lower division, where the outcomes focus on communication, critical thinking, and quantitative measures, was coordinated by the Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessment Committee, which also facilitated upper-division GE course assessment. Between 2020 and 2025, an impressive 86% of academic programs were reviewed in the external review process managed by CAA. Redesigned self-study guidelines incorporated analysis of learning outcomes assessment and student and faculty success metrics. Curriculum evaluation at SDSU also occurred in response to the CSU Board of Trustees mandate, such that structural impediments to student persistence and completion were identified and removed in selected programs with low conferral of degrees. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 4.5, 4.6)

Advancement in the assessment of co-curricular learning was led by PECA, with its shift from the reporting of program participation data toward the measurement of outcomes and the alignment of co-curricular program assessments with the institution's strategic plan's goals. Hosting the Data Camp workshop enabled greater sophistication in the development of program

outcomes and their assessments through backward design from institutional goals to the best evidence of co-curricular learning success. (CFRs 2.14, 4.1, 4.4)

The Standard 4 section of this report offers further discussion of assessment in the context of quality assurance and improvement; the administration of student surveys to assess belonging, health and safety, and student experiences; and the prioritization of analysis of key outcomes to support the system-wide Graduation Initiative 2025. A deeper discussion of assessment occurs in the Standard 2 section of this report.

B. Institution-Specific Theme: Redefining Inclusive Student Success

Expanding Access and Student Preparation

SDSU prioritized supporting student success, and this intention served as the foundation of the institution's ongoing efforts to expand access and improve student preparation. Several dimensions characterized SDSU's work in partnership with the community. The institution focused its access on both first-time first-year students and transfer students, concentrating on San Diego and Imperial County K-12 schools, community colleges, and community-based organizations that aligned with long-established community outreach programs. Pipelines, enhanced by activities such as tutoring, faculty mentorship, and summer research opportunities, were established. Some of the programs implemented were traditional, such as Upward Bound, a federal TRIO program, while others were specific to an SDSU college, such as Women in Engineering.

Per the California State University (CSU) admission policies, SDSU was an impacted campus and received over 123,000 applications during the most recent recruitment cycle, an increase of more than 30% over the last 10 years. To further support its access efforts while

addressing this competitive admission climate, SDSU engaged in specific initiatives, such as establishing compacts that guaranteed admission for students from K-12 school districts and community colleges who met specified readiness benchmarks. These initiatives included San Diego City College, Southwestern College, and several of the other largest community colleges in the SDSU area, including the Imperial Valley. Addressing math readiness – in particular, preparation for calculus – led SDSU to refine its agreements with local high schools as well as high school districts in southern San Diego County and the Imperial Valley.

A new multifactor admissions review model was deployed for the class entering in 2021, which evaluated student achievements holistically in the context of their origin, to better recognize the accomplishments of applicants from lower income areas within the region. The cross-divisional Enrollment Management Advisory Group – comprised of representatives from across the campus including enrollment management, institutional research, academic affairs, and student affairs – recommended that the admission process consider traditional metrics such as GPA within a review of the specific coursework related to an applicant's proposed major. The initial cohort of entrants after these admission changes attained the institution's highest four-year graduation rate to date: 62% in 2025.

Transfer student access was strengthened not only through relationships with and programs established at regional community colleges but also through the various statewide programs that brought students from high schools, through California Community Colleges, and into campuses within the CSU system. Transfer Admission Guarantees were able to succeed to a greater extent after SDSU's identification of prospective applicants earlier in their community college careers, to ensure they took the correct preparatory courses for successful admission. The institution also introduced supplemental advising for these students and cross-enrollment

opportunities. To improve the information about course equivalencies available for community college students aspiring to transfer, SDSU used one-time funding from the CSU system to create additional articulation agreements with Southern California community colleges and was working to expand such agreements north of Los Angeles.

Finally, a goal for the future Mission Valley campus was to enhance the transfer process further through the utilization of a common academic facility for SDSU and the San Diego Community College District. Community college students were anticipated to participate in educational and workforce development opportunities through this joint effort between the institutions, and eligible students could experience "seamless transfer to SDSU."

Academic Student Success

SDSU demonstrated a deep institutional commitment to student success, reflected in both the investments and the policy changes that it made. The institution concentrated particularly on advising, and these changes to advising were well conceived: the hiring of more major advisors (an increase of 20 positions); much better coordination between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Campus Diversity; the assignment of a Coordinated Care Advisor to all first- and second-year students; and the creation of a First Year Seminar, located both in specific undergraduate degree programs and in community centers. The team applauds these changes. SDSU might now give more attention to the coordination between first- and second-year advising and the advising in programs and departments as discussed below in the Standard 2 section of this report.

SDSU also increased its proactive outreach to students in academic precarity, which was indicated by failure to re-enroll, under-enrollment, late enrollment, holds, and academic notice.

However, the report doesn't specify whether SDSU tried to identify discipline or subject specific barriers to student progress and success, for example, such as differing levels of math preparation. During its campus visit, the team became convinced that SDSU was alert to these issues and was developing strategies to address them.

Devoting attention to tracking student progress toward degree, SDSU implemented Navigate, which the team perceived to be an effective tool. Although challenged by the scalability of high-touch advising in a resource-constrained environment, SDSU used assessment of its Coordinated Care Program, expansion of digital tool utilization, and regular meetings of advisors to optimize the effectiveness of the institution's advising system.

SDSU is doing particularly effective work in identifying policies that may present barriers to student success and in changing those policies in areas such as the timing of tuition payments, registration, and course schedule planning; greater enrollment flexibility in GE courses; the integration of the upper-division writing requirement into major curricula; greater consistency in accommodating religious observance; reframing academic probation to academic notice; and instituting a single fee policy for graduation.

Significantly improved undergraduate outcomes demonstrated the effectiveness of the changes SDSU implemented in both advising and policy. The team commends SDSU for improving aggregated graduation rates for both undergraduate and graduate students.

The institution's creation of a College of Graduate Studies seemed a particularly appropriate development, given its R1 attainment. The College of Graduate Studies began, appropriately, with regularizing and increasing funding for graduate student employment, standardizing policies for culminating experiences, and enhancing advising and mentorship. Although graduate outcomes improved modestly overall, program-specific outcome data would

be more revealing. SDSU would be well served by graduate student success metrics reported by program and a regular series of graduate program reviews. The team recommends that SDSU develop a structured plan for the assessment and continuous improvement of graduate education, encompassing a dedicated enrollment management plan, program evaluation, enhanced student support, and the specific needs of joint doctoral students with UC and other university partners (CFRs 2.4,2.13, 4.5).

Holistic Well-Being

The institution made notable progress in developing a comprehensive, data-informed approach to supporting students' holistic well-being. Over the review period, the university expanded and better coordinated services across departments to address students' academic, financial, psychological, and social needs. These efforts reflected a clear understanding of student success's close link to access of essential resources, a sense of belonging, and supportive learning environments.

A key strength of the institution's approach was its focus on meeting students' basic needs. The recent opening of a centralized Basic Needs Center introduced to the campus a hub for effective, comprehensive wraparound services. The center integrated support related to food security, housing resources, and financial assistance. By consolidating these services, the university enhanced both student access and its ability to track needs and respond strategically. Institutional efforts were guided by survey data and other evidence, which enabled leadership to identify emerging challenges and prioritize resources effectively.

Mental health support was also strengthened through improvements in Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). Efforts to reduce the student-to-counselor ratio represented a

meaningful investment in student well-being and demonstrated responsiveness to growing demand for mental health services. These improvements supported more timely access to care and reinforced the importance of psychological health as a component of student success.

Financial well-being initiatives further illustrated the institution's commitment to holistic support. Implementation of the Aztec Scholarships platform streamlined scholarship processes, enabling the distribution of nearly 100 percent of available scholarship funds during the 2023–24 academic year. This improvement reduced administrative barriers and increased students' access to financial resources.

The institution also recognized that well-being extends beyond basic needs to include belonging and community engagement. Programs designed for specific student populations, along with learning communities, strengthened students' sense of belonging and fostered inclusive campus environments. These efforts supported both social integration and academic persistence.

Academic affordability was another important dimension of student well-being addressed through institutional efforts. The university library's initiative to provide affordable course materials helped reduce financial barriers while ensuring students had access to resources necessary for academic success.

SDSU expanded its focus on career services for both current students and graduates transitioning into the workforce. These efforts, supported by grants and philanthropic funding, aimed to strengthen partnerships with industry, community colleges, and workforce development organizations.

Looking ahead, Phase II of the university's strategic plan emphasized continued investment in student support structures and reinforced the institution's commitment to holistic

well-being. The plan provided a framework for sustaining and expanding initiatives to address students' academic, financial, and personal needs while aligning these efforts with broader institutional goals.

While the institution made significant progress, several areas warrant further attention. Housing affordability remained a concern, particularly for low-income and graduate students. While the institution made progress in addressing basic needs, additional strategies may be necessary to ensure equitable access to affordable housing.

Finally, many institutional responses to emerging needs involved the creation of new programs and initiatives. While this demonstrates a strong commitment to student support, continued program expansion may present sustainability challenges if resources become constrained. Ongoing evaluation, coordination, and prioritization will be essential to ensure that efforts remain effective and scalable.

Overall, the institution demonstrated a strong commitment to supporting holistic student well-being. Through coordinated basic needs services, expanded mental health support, financial aid improvements, and initiatives that foster belonging and academic engagement, the institution made meaningful progress in creating an environment where students could thrive. Continued attention to housing access and program sustainability will further strengthen these efforts.

Increasing Career Readiness

SDSU sought to shape the workforce by leveraging the research and innovation of its faculty, staff, and students with industry partners. Given the high number of first-generation students, SDSU noted that one of its priorities was social mobility, and the institution made significant investments in the Career Services unit. This area developed a dedicated strategic

plan in 2023, which included strategies to prepare students for the workforce and to position the institution as a leader in local workforce development. (CFR1.2)

When learning about the various support and development programs offered by Career Services, the team noticed an absence of focused and centralized advising specifically designated for pre-medical students and for pre-law students within this unit; however, health professions, community engagement, and connections to industry were emphasized. The team also noticed that advancing into academia or graduate school by pursuing competitive fellowships could be promoted among Career Services' offerings. The team suggests focusing academic advising and programming for SDSU undergraduates on the specifics of how to prepare for and pursue selective fellowships as well as these professional school careers.

SDSU Career Services expanded programming through an emphasis on seeking out grant funding, which ultimately totaled in excess of \$3.6 million. The Career Submission Survey, completed in multiple administrations by a total of approximately 25,000 students, detailed information on student career paths and final destination data (CFR 4.3). Nearly 83% of graduating students on the Career Submission Survey reported participation in some form of work experience; 77% reported being employed or continuing their education. (CFR 2.11)

Academic Affairs updated the curriculum of the First Year Experience (FYE) courses. Approximately half of the FYE courses offered career envisioning and planning. Psychology created a course (PSY 201) to help students identify career-related strengths and interests. By academic area, various initiatives were pursued: The College of Arts and Letters designed a program that allowed first-year seminar students to participate in early career seminars; and the School of Business offered robust career services support. SDSU increased efforts through Career Services to support graduate students as well. Additionally, the College of Graduate

Studies created an asynchronous course for graduate students based on NACE Career Competencies that allowed graduate students to earn badges for each competency. SDSU sought to further initiate career development in the curriculum with the addition of 4+1 programs, advanced certificates, and stackable credentials to meet workforce needs.

Career Services was working on its next strategic planning cycle and planned to seek alignment with community colleges and regional workforce development boards. This included both the future Mission Valley and the Imperial Valley campuses. This expansion served as a recent example of the SDSU workforce and career readiness efforts.

C. Reflection and Plans for Improvement

The institution's synthesis portion of the institutional report was a thoughtful account of SDSU's challenges and opportunities. This section was far more specific, however, about the successes of the past than about SDSU's strategies for the future. Little was identified as needing improvement or substantial change. In a resource-constrained environment, SDSU will face choices — about the particular shape of its academic profile and about its research investments. Although the synthesis readily acknowledged the need for more sources of revenue, it did not specify which of these paths offered the most promise. To realize its considerable ambitions, SDSU will require a revenue and reinvestment plan.

D. Compliance: 2023 WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity

Institutional Purposes

SDSU achieved a strong connection to its community throughout the region in fulfillment of the institution's mission to transform lives and transcend borders through education, research, and enriching experiences. In particular, the team notes how the following embodied SDSU's strong contribution to society and the common good: the academic offerings oriented toward regional workforce needs; the institution's achievement of R1 status; and the Mission Valley campus goals of public-private partnerships alongside the development of academic space to be shared with San Diego Community College District. (CFR 1.1)

The team commends how SDSU's institutional purposes informed the institution's strategic plan. The strategic priority "Students at Our Core" had three goals all related to the SDSU self-study theme, redefining inclusive student success. This theme validated how SDSU had been removing barriers to student success through the associated strategic plan activities, most of which completed before the time of the visit. (CFR 1.2)

Integrity and Transparency

As a CSU campus, SDSU adhered to the expectations of its system, with ample publications and other documentation to make transparent and accessible its programs, requirements, services, and costs. Policies governing SDSU's operations, academic goals, programs, and requirements were clearly defined and conscientiously observed. (CFRs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5).

The team noted a statement that SDSU offered in the analysis of strengths and areas of improvement regarding the institution's compliance with the Standards: "The institution recognizes the opportunity to further strengthen communication between leadership, faculty, staff, and students to further reinforce trust, shared governance, and enhance morale and campus engagement." The team could corroborate this area for improvement during the visit. In various meetings and at both the Mesa Campus and SDSU Imperial Valley, faculty, students, staff, and administrators cited that communication was critical for their success, and yet, it had room for improvement. Communication about events and programs, the implementation of policies and systems, and the status planning processes and high-level priorities was reported to fall below what would enable these populations to best utilize the opportunities and resources of SDSU and to most effectively participate in the institution.

The team recommends that SDSU strengthen communication and consultation practices to ensure that faculty, staff, and students feel genuinely informed and meaningfully included in decisions that affect them. (CFRs 1.7, 3.5, 4.8)

SDSU utilized a collaborative approach when preparing the institutional report. This included faculty, staff, students, and many campus stakeholder groups. Details about the self-study process are described above in section IC. (CFR 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success

Degree Programs

SDSU offered a robust set of undergraduate and graduate degree programs with each program listed in the institution's catalog. Entry requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation were clearly articulated in the course catalog. The degree programs at SDSU were appropriate in content and educational objectives as described in the curricula by department website and appropriately evaluated through a clear program review process. Program reviews were conducted every five to seven years and included degree assessment data and departmental data about funding, faculty, and student success. This process was coordinated by CAA in collaboration with faculty and staff in academic departments, data support from Analytic Studies and Institutional Research (ASIR), and when applicable for graduate program review, the College of Graduate Studies. The program reviews ensured the development of core and professional competencies relevant to the level of the degree.

As mentioned earlier, in response to the prior accreditation visit, SDSU strengthened its GE program to align with institutional goals, enhanced integration into the overall curriculum, and developed structural program coordination. SDSU formed a GE Reform Task Force and created Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) with student success metrics. The institution mapped GE goals and degree learning outcomes to the ILOs to determine if students have degree-level subject matter expertise and appropriate core educational competencies. SDSU also formed the 2025 GE Task Force to work on mapping GE requirements to career readiness competencies. The team appreciates the institution's efforts

to make strategic investments that align the curriculum with career readiness and ensure development of the future workforce.

SDSU improved upon assessment of student learning outcomes, which were clearly articulated for each academic program and available at the Degree Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Maps Listing webpage. Since SDSU's prior reaffirmation of accreditation, the institution created an office focused on assessment, led by an associate vice president and dedicated curriculum and assessment staff. To further strengthen and support assessment efforts, a director of continuous improvement position was created and an assessment librarian was hired within the last three years. Faculty have played a significant role in developing an assessment culture across the campus.

Faculty

SDSU's faculty were recognized for their teaching excellence, commitment to service, and high-level research with their recent classification as a doctoral university with the highest level of research activity (R1). In response to prior recommendations, SDSU increased the total full-time equivalent tenure/tenure-track faculty from 721 to 820 between 2014 and 2024. Despite this growth, tenure density decreased by over seven percentage points during this time. As the needs of the campus evolved with its growth at the Mesa, Imperial Valley, and Global campuses and the development of new degree programs and course offerings, additional non-tenure track faculty hires were necessary to support the curriculum.

SDSU had a strong shared governance model. The faculty were active senate members who participated in university governance committees. They exercised effective

academic leadership and ensured that the quality of academic programs and the institution's educational purposes were sustained. The committees included faculty representation from each college or school, in addition to staff and student representatives. The bylaws and policies were clearly articulated on the senate website.

Faculty leadership in assessment was strong at the program and departmental levels. Faculty were involved in creating both course-level student learning outcomes and degree learning outcomes, which were rigorously reviewed by committees at the department, college, and university levels.

Expectations and policies related to faculty research, evaluation, promotion, and tenure were provided by SDSU. The team encourages the university to assess the role of faculty in contributing to teaching and scholarship, acknowledging the tension between faculty research expectations and instructional workload, which is heightened by SDSU's R1 classification. The team elaborates upon the alignment of resources with research and the institution's strategic goals in the Standard 3 section below. (CFRs 2.8, 3.4, 4.8)

Student Learning and Performance

San Diego State assessed student learning outcomes (SLOs) and degree learning outcomes (DLOs) in a structured process across programs, departments, and university-wide reflecting a culture of continuous improvement. Coordinated by CAA, the assessment continuum included creating course-level SLOs when faculty proposed new courses and the development of DLOs by faculty within a program or department. The university used Nuventive, an assessment platform, which was integrated with SDSU's course management system. This allowed faculty access to their course assessment data and the ability to align it

with their program DLOs. Assessment reports from four representative samples of degrees (Accounting BS/BA, Spanish BA, Anthropology MA, Art MFA) were provided by SDSU. The undergraduate reports indicated that graduates achieved stated learning outcomes and standards of performance. At the graduate level, the assessment DLO reports were in progress and assessments were planned for the current or future academic years. All undergraduate and graduate programs had DLOs, with a higher percentage of undergraduate programs reporting assessment results (91%), while 84% of graduate degree programs had assessment outcomes. As the team explains above with its recommendation made in the team report's section addressing the institution's academic student success theme, SDSU must dedicate attention to its graduate offerings, with an emphasis on enrollment management, program evaluation, enhanced student support, and the specific needs of joint doctoral students with UC and other university partners. (CFRs 2.4, 2.13, 4.5)

The team observed improved student success metrics at the undergraduate and graduate levels. One-year retention rates for first-time freshmen and transfer students were consistent and strong. The university made significant progress in aggregated first-time freshmen 4-year and 6-year graduation rates, exceeding both institutional and CSU systemwide Graduation Initiative 2025 goals in the most recent cohort. For transfer students, the 2-year graduation rate for the Fall 2021 cohort also surpassed the campus and systemwide goals. At the graduate level, average GPA and time to degree improved for both master's and doctoral students. The university demonstrated that students made reasonable progress toward and completed their degrees in a timely manner.

SDSU monitored and analyzed undergraduate student outcomes following graduation. The university utilized Lightcast Alumni Pathways to understand career pathways and the

value of a bachelor's degree from SDSU. The Lightcast report was particularly insightful with regard to earning potential and return on investment for SDSU graduates. The data suggested SDSU provided good value to students in career outcomes. (CFR 2.11)

Student Support

SDSU provided a comprehensive set of student support services to foster student well-being and academic and personal success. SDSU implemented a campuswide coordinated approach to advising with coordinated care advising for lower division students and major advising for upper division students. The Coordinated Care Advising model focused on introducing students to advising tools and campus resources and developing a sense of belonging and academic, career, and personal pathway. Major advising assisted students with creating a two-year plan to complete their general education, major, and graduation requirements. Major advisors also provided resources for identifying career options, providing graduate school guidance, and helping connect students to faculty or staff mentors and co-curricular opportunities, such as study abroad programs. The team recommends that SDSU continue developing the advising model to ensure coherent, well-coordinated support across Coordinated Care Advising and Major Advising, with attention to role clarity, staffing, professional development, and career pathways for advising staff. (CFRs 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) Graduate-level advising was not referenced in SDSU's provided materials and was not discussed during the on-site visit. Recognizing that faculty advisors provided mentorship for graduate students, the team still encourages SDSU to include advising needs of graduate students in campuswide advising considerations.

The team appreciates the university's holistic approach to student support and co-curricular programs and services. The Division of Student Affairs and Campus Diversity

(SACD) provided the majority of student support services through multiple departments and community centers. The team noted improvements in many areas of student support, including the reduction in Counseling and Psychological Services counselor to student ratio, low barrier access to Basic Needs services, the increase in distribution of scholarships, and the expansion of SDSU housing. The university's dedicated programming for student support programs and services and wrap-around approach demonstrated its commitment to the success of all students.

PECA was created in 2022 to assess the effectiveness of student support and co-curricular programs and services through survey research and program evaluation. PECA also offered data consultation and workshops. The office had one director and one assessment analyst. PECA developed an assessment plan to measure co-curricular outcomes and aligned program-level assessments with the university's strategic plan. SDSU provided three examples of reviews, two of which focused on student-centered resource centers (Latinx Resource Center, Native Resource Center). These reviews provided an overview of available resources and survey measures of well-being or sense of belonging, support needs, and impacts of programming. The team appreciates the university's efforts in inventorying over 600 programs and developing the SACD Wayfinding dashboard, the third example provided. The institution is encouraged to develop plans to analyze the data and use the information to strengthen campus collaboration and to expand upon areas that foster student success.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures

Faculty, Staff, and Administrators

SDSU demonstrated a structured approach to managing human resources in support of its academic programs and institutional goals. Divisions received baseline staffing allocations and were enabled to retain salary savings from vacant positions, allowing flexibility to address operational needs. New position requests underwent a rigorous review process to ensure alignment with institutional priorities and fiscal sustainability. Student fees supported select student-facing roles, such as counselors and academic advisors, reinforcing a commitment to student success. The institution also used temporary funding for some staff positions to meet evolving needs, though this may pose challenges for long-term stability. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)

SDSU provided professional development and training opportunities through system-level, institutional, and external programs. While these efforts supported employee development, campus climate feedback highlighted ongoing concerns related to workload, access to resources, recognition and rewards, work-life balance, and career advancement, particularly for employees from diverse backgrounds. Concerns regarding employee workload were also consistently expressed by faculty and staff, suggesting that the pace and breadth of strategic initiatives, coupled with continued enrollment growth, may be contributing to employee overextension. (CFRs 3.2, 3.3)

Advising structures further illustrated these concerns. The Coordinated Care Advising unit, which served first- and second-year students, maintained significantly lower advisor-to-student ratios than the Major Advising units serving third- and fourth-year students. Staff in Major Advising units also expressed concerns regarding limited career progression pathways

and insufficient coordination with Coordinated Care Advising. As the team recommends in this report's Standard 2 section, to ensure a high-performing advising staff, SDSU must develop its advising model across all advising units to enhance role clarity, training, and coherence of the approach. The team stresses how this will contribute to both employee effectiveness and student support outcomes. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)

Fiscal, Physical, Technology, and Information Resources

During the visit, areas of concern emerged related to resource adequacy, strategic alignment, and workload sustainability. The institution received state funding on a per-student basis at a lower rate than other CSU institutions, raising questions about the long-term adequacy of financial resources. To support institutional sustainability, the team strongly encourages SDSU to develop a comprehensive financial plan that includes diversification of revenue sources, along with clearly defined targets and timelines. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

In addition, while SDSU experienced rapid growth in research activity and achieved R1 status, it does not yet appear to have a clearly defined strategy for prioritizing research areas. Developing and articulating a focused set of research priorities aligned with institutional goals would help ensure that limited resources are invested strategically to advance the university's research mission. The team recommends that SDSU create a plan that identifies specific research areas for investment, aligns funding and resources with strategic goals, and supports the institution's research mission. (CFRs 2.8, 3.4, 4.8)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

While SDSU established metrics, program review processes, and planning structures, there was an opportunity to more deliberately align these elements so that data consistently informed institutional decision-making and led to demonstrable improvements.

Strengthening this alignment would enhance the institution's ability to effectively allocate resources and achieve its strategic goals. The team notes that continued attention to long-term financial planning, research prioritization, workload sustainability, and advising coordination will be important to ensure ongoing institutional effectiveness and resource alignment. (CFRs 3.10, 3.11)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

Standard 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement

Quality Assurance Processes

During the visit, the team found a highly functioning array of institutional research and assessment units that provided insight for the campus's decision-making needs. Learning outcomes assessment was performed and supported by professionals and faculty through resources and training offered by CAA. The lean and high-performing staff of this unit, coupled with the student learning outcomes and assessment committee, engaged with faculty to develop departmental assessment skills and resources, to fulfill the expectations of program review processes, and to bring student achievement data to where it was needed in support of quality assurance. Academic departments undergoing program review every five to seven years pursued learning outcomes assessment projects as part of their continuing

improvement of the program outcomes defined by their curricula. The team met with Assessment All-Stars, faculty who had conducted particularly effective evaluations of student learning and program performance and effectively applied the results of their analyses to program improvement. Specific instances of analysis findings were shared with the team, as well as the impact of this work in effecting change. (CFRs 4.1, 4.5, 4.6)

SDSU's primary student survey – the Well-being Improvement Survey for Higher Education Settings (WISHES) – was used to gauge campus climate through prompting samples of students on a frequent basis via a sample split by month to collect data regarding student experiences and reactions to issues in their environment. PECA, located in Student Affairs and Campus Diversity, administered the WISHES instrument and offered coaching in the best use of data in evaluating student interventions and supporting retention and degree completion. Recent advances in reporting the findings from WISHES were shared with the team, including departmental breakdowns in the reporting of student responses. The team suggests that these departmental reports of WISHES data be shared between the student affairs area and academic affairs areas, for inclusion in the portfolio of statistics that inform academic program review. Given the importance of acknowledging student experience as a component of academic program success, the collegial nature of the units involved indicated to the team that such a venture would add value to the review process and forge effective partnerships to further student outcomes. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3)

The analytic studies and institutional research office (ASIR) served as the advanced institutional research enterprise on campus. ASIR performed critical reporting and analytical functions, developed dashboards in response to campus decision-making needs, and participated extensively in conducting research to support specific campus initiatives. Both

public-facing and internal dashboards reported data that followed the student pathway to degree (e.g., the admission funnel, term outcomes, persistence, retention, and degree completion), course-related data and outcomes, and faculty workload and appointments. Leaders in this area shared with the team how collaborations on campus improved processes and responses to the challenges students faced while persisting at SDSU. The director of student success analytics shared the strategy of determining what can be done early in students' time at SDSU to intervene and influence future outcomes like graduation – not to react "too late" – which resonated with the team as an effective call to action. Under the assistant vice president, ASIR had developed a repository of data tools and links for the campus, including dashboard tutorials, a data glossary, a data resource map, and a data request decision tree. The team commends both the broad range of their work and the impact of their effort to enhance both data access and use at SDSU. (CFR 4.4, 4.5)

Dashboards created by ASIR provided detailed disaggregated reporting for the measures of student success, such as persistence and graduation rates. SDSU's accomplishments in support of student completion were clearly expressed in the positive trend data the team reviewed. In particular, however, the team notes that some of the gaps found among the graduation and persistence rates of comparison groups persisted and would benefit from additional attention and intervention. While many comparisons of student groups showed a narrowing of the performance difference from their comparators, the team encourages SDSU to press onward with further strategies like those behind the institution's success in the CSU Graduation Initiative 2025. Such dedicated effort could accomplish further increases in student completion measures. Given the variance in experiences and outcomes for students according to groups identified in the data, the team recommends that

SDSU ensure that all student populations achieve comparable graduation outcomes, with particular attention to the success of Pell-eligible students. (CFR 4.2)

Institutional Improvement

The team reviewed multiple instances of improvement at the institution that hinged on decisions informed by institutional research, assessment, and other forms of inquiry. The center for teaching and learning (CTL) invested continuous inquiry into the effectiveness of teaching practice and student learning achievement. Supported by CAA, its assessment analyst, and its director of continuous improvement, faculty used the Nuventive system to document their assessments and results and describe pedagogical improvements that led to higher student achievement. The team reviewed materials from that system incorporated into the academic program review process and noted the variety of outcomes and approaches that were utilized, as well as where and when instructional change led to improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.5, 4.6)

During a meeting with staff and faculty who led the support of student success, the team learned about the proactive outreach strategy for finding and contacting students experiencing "precarity factors" identified through the research. Among other approaches, LMS engagement reporting became the basis for faculty contacting students in online courses to promote better learning, and predictive modeling for courses and interventions was used to identify what was effective. An evaluative framework was discussed in the student success meeting as a means of exploring how to determine program effectiveness by making a logic model available to the campus. The model would articulate what programs, interventions, and initiatives were working on campus and how they were evaluated. Data

scientists on campus were slated to undertake a subsequent analysis plan intended to advance the improvement of campus processes and student experiences through organization and presentation of this information. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.5)

Enrollment expansion has occurred not only on SDSU's Mesa Campus but also in the Imperial Valley, and the institution has expressed an intention to grow enrollment further by opening the future Mission Valley campus. With a successful five-year strategic plan now entering its second phase, the campus has demonstrated experience in setting goals, establishing initiatives, and subsequently measuring accomplishments to evaluate progress. The team stresses the importance of such strategic planning activity for the locations that will accommodate additional enrollment growth. Targeted planning exercises would inform the parameters of what must be established to succeed in increasing enrollment at these off-campus locations. Developing such strategy could avoid strained resources and compromised student experience. The team heard from SDSU Imperial Valley students, for example, about their experience of the campus infrastructure, which they felt did not accommodate the daily needs of students effectively. The absence of on-campus dining options and of substantial dedicated space for students to foster their community was a point of challenge for the students. The possibility for them to participate in events at the Mesa Campus was limited by distance and the availability of organized transportation. (CFRs 3.1, 3.6, 4.8)

Two bachelor's degree programs already offered by the Mesa Campus (electrical engineering and chemistry) will be available at SDSU Imperial Valley at the new Brawley STEM building; however, a limited number of faculty hires were in process for assignment at this location. Effective advising and academic support for students in such rigorous

programs will be important to ensure their persistence, retention, and completion. (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4, 3.6)

Considering the list of off-campus locations in WSCUC's records for SDSU, the team found the Brawley site of SDSU Imperial Valley designated as a branch campus, when the "Imperial Valley" location (the Calexico campus) came closer to attaining that status. Three locations listed with WSCUC were described in the institutional report – Palau, Georgia, and Centinela State Prison – while others in WSCUC's records were not referenced. The team strongly suggests that SDSU update the records with WSCUC that describe the institution's off-campus locations and the degree programs associated with them, to ensure that they are categorized appropriately as active additional locations or branch campuses.

Further, the team recommends that SDSU engage in deliberate strategic planning for the campus's additional locations, prioritizing Imperial Valley and any emerging sites, with emphasis on enrollment management, infrastructure, academic staffing, and support services across all locations. (CFRs 1.2, 2.13, 3.4, 4.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

Federal Requirements

SDSU provided documentation of the institution's compliance with the federal requirements, which can be reviewed in the Federal Forms appendix of this report. All materials and websites linked to the forms documented SDSU's compliance regarding credit hour, marketing and recruitment, and transfer policy.

The team reviewed two off-campus locations and a sample of distance education degree programs. Both reviews confirmed that the institution was performing well in these areas; detailed results are included in the appendix.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS (such as Substantive Change)

No other topics were pursued by the team's review.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This comprehensive review embodied SDSU's intentionality by conscientiously addressing the recommendations from the last Commission Action Letter, offering substantial evidence of the institution's compliance with the Standards, and pursuing themes related to student success. The team finds SDSU fulfilled its outcomes and framed a future of committed effort to achieve its high-priority goals as a consequence of this review. The team offers these nine commendations and six recommendations.

Commendations:

The team commends San Diego State University for:

1. Expanding access and student preparation through establishing K-16 partnerships throughout the local region.
2. Improving aggregated graduation rates for both undergraduate and graduate students.
3. Expanding its definitions of academic student success outcomes to reflect a more comprehensive and inclusive understanding of student achievement.

4. Reshaping general education in meaningful ways that better serve student learning and success.
5. Increasing career readiness by creating career tracks that provide students with clear and purposeful pathways beyond graduation and exploring how to associate career competencies with courses and programs.
6. Ensuring holistic well-being by providing strong wrap-around services for both residential and commuter students.
7. Leveraging data, metrics, and assessment findings to inform policy decisions and drive continuous improvement in academic programs that advance student success.
8. Growing research productivity despite limited resources to achieve R1 status, reflecting a strong commitment to scholarly excellence.
9. Building strong and productive collaborations with the City of San Diego and with the Imperial Valley.

Recommendations:

The team recommends that San Diego State University:

1. Ensure that all student populations achieve comparable graduation outcomes, with particular attention to the success of Pell-eligible students. (CFR 4.2)
2. Continue developing the advising model to ensure coherent, well-coordinated support across Coordinated Care Advising and Major Advising, with attention to role clarity, staffing, professional development, and career pathways for advising staff. (CFRs 2.12, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)

3. Develop a structured plan for the assessment and continuous improvement of graduate education, encompassing a dedicated enrollment management plan, program evaluation, enhanced student support, and the specific needs of joint doctoral students with UC and other university partners. (CFRs 2.4, 2.13, 4.5)
4. Create a plan that identifies specific research areas for investment, aligns funding and resources with strategic goals, and supports the institution's research mission. (CFRs 2.8, 3.4, 4.8)
5. Strengthen communication and consultation practices to ensure that faculty, staff, and students feel genuinely informed and meaningfully included in decisions that affect them. (CFRs 1.7, 3.5, 4.8)
6. Engage in deliberate strategic planning for the campus's additional locations, prioritizing Imperial Valley and any emerging sites, with emphasis on enrollment management, infrastructure, academic staffing, and support services across all locations. (CFRs 1.2, 2.13, 3.4, 4.8)

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Distance Education Review Form
- C. Off-Campus Locations Review

A. Federal Compliance Forms

Overview

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with federal regulations affecting institutions and accrediting agencies¹:

1. Credit Hour Review Form
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
3. Student Complaints Review Form
4. Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Institutions submit these forms with links to evidence when submitting their self-study report. During the Accreditation Visit, teams evaluate the evidence provided and submit the completed forms as appendices to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

¹ Under WSCUC 2023 Standards of Accreditation, Standard 1, CFR 1.8, institutions must abide by Commission policies and procedures and commit to honest and open communication with the Commission.

1 - Credit Hour Review Form

Under federal regulations, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §600.2

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

- 1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-
 - i) It reviews the institution's-
 - a) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and
 - b) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and
- 2) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

Except as provided in [34 CFR 668.8\(k\)](#) and [\(l\)](#), a credit hour is an amount of student work defined by an institution, as approved by the institution's accrediting agency or State approval agency, that is consistent with commonly accepted practice in postsecondary education and that--

- 1) Reasonably approximates not less than:
 - i. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different period of time; or
 - ii. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph 1.i. of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours; and
- 2) Permits an institution, in determining the amount of work associated with a credit hour, to take into account a variety of delivery methods, measurements of student work, academic calendars, disciplines and degree levels.

See also WSCUC [Credit Hour Policy](#).

Material Reviewed	Institution provides links to materials to be reviewed (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
Policy on credit hour	Link to institutional policy on credit hour: CSU Definition of Credit Hour policy SDSU Catalog Policy	Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ___ NO Comments: The policy is easily accessed online at both the campus and systemwide levels.

Process(es) for periodic review of credit hour	Link to description of process for periodic review of credit hour: Curriculum Proposal & Review Process Academic Program Review Process	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)? X YES ___ NO Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ___ NO Comments: https://caa.sdsu.edu/resources/files/curriculum/policies/csu_definition_of_credit_hour.pdf Periodic review of credit hour assignments are conducted during academic program review. Also, SDSU's curriculum committees review all new courses and all course modifications for credit-hour compliance. For new courses, committees review at the following levels: department, college, dean, University undergraduate or graduate curriculum, general education if appropriate, Senate Executive, and Senate; for course major modifications, the committees are the same except Senate Executive and Senate are information items rather than action items.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Link to recent schedule of on-ground courses: Public Class Schedule	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES ___ NO Comments: A sample of on-ground courses queried demonstrated they meet for the prescribed hours.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for on-ground and distance education courses	Link to at least 1-2 syllabi from each degree level and mode of delivery. SDSU Syllabus Collection ANTH 101 - Online E E 200 - In-Person CJ 320 - In-Person (Imperial Valley) BIOL 352 - In-Person RELS/HUM 411 - Online SLHS 511 - In-Person EDL 610 - Online (Global Campus) ACCTG 790 - In-Person AUD 891 - Online	How many syllabi were reviewed for each degree level and mode of delivery? 6 undergraduate level courses (2 online; 4 in-person); 3 graduate level courses (2 online; 1 in-person) What discipline(s) were the courses from? Anthropology; electrical engineering; criminal justice; biology; humanities and religious studies; speech, language, and hearing sciences; educational leadership; accounting; audiology. Did the material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ___ NO Comments: The syllabi indicated the amount of work for these courses adhered to the prescribed hours warranted for the credit to be awarded.

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).	Link to at least 1-2 syllabi from each degree level. SDSU Syllabus Collection MGT 401 - Internship DPT 895 - Clinical Internship COMPE 470L - Lab THEA 499 - Special Study NURS 797 - Research	How many syllabi were reviewed for each degree level? 3 undergraduate level courses; 2 graduate level courses What kinds of courses were reviewed? Internship, lab, special study, and research. What discipline(s) were the courses from? Management; physical therapy; computer engineering; theater; nursing. Did the material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ___ NO Comments: Credit was awarded appropriately given the equivalent amount of work was performed for the prescribed hours.
---	---	--

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Date: March 11, 2026

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices. Under WSCUC policy***, an accredited institution bears final responsibility for ensuring the quality and integrity of all activities conducted in its name, including advertising, marketing, and/or recruiting communications outsourced to unaccredited entities.

Material Reviewed	Institution provides locations of materials to be reviewed	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
**Federal regulations	Link to policy or description of student recruitment practices: Application Information	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? X YES ___ NO Comments: As a CSU campus, SDSU follows all federal regulations on recruiting students.
Degree completion and cost	Link to marketing materials about degree programs and costs: Admissions Handbook Financial Aid Cost of Attendance	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? X YES ___ NO Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? X YES ___ NO Comments: All related information is available on the SDSU website.
***Outsourcing advertising, marketing, and/or recruiting	Link to advertising, marketing, and/or recruiting communications produced in conjunction with an unaccredited entity: Recruitment in India: https://www.univassist.com/ Direct Marketing to Domestic Students through EAB: https://eab.com/solutions/enroll360/ Strat Comm Marketing through BKV: https://www.bvk.com/	Does the institution outsource any advertising, marketing, and/or recruiting of programs with an unaccredited entity? x YES ___ NO Are the communications from the unaccredited entity consistent with institutional materials? x YES ___ NO Comments: The unaccredited entities provide institutionally-produced and internally-approved materials.
Careers and employment	Link to marketing materials about careers and employment available to graduates: Career Pathways for Students Exploring Majors Career Services	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES ___ NO Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? X YES ___ NO Comments:

		Web resources are offered by SDSU to provide this information for students.
--	--	---

*§602.16

**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.

***[Agreements with Unaccredited Entities Policy](#). See also [Agreements with Unaccredited Entities Guide](#).

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair

Date: 3/14/26

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. WSCUC [Complaints and Third-Party Comments Policy](#) requires that an institution have a process for receiving and handling complaints and grievances by institutional personnel or students. Records of complaints and grievances are to be retained by the institution until the next scheduled comprehensive review to allow the review team an opportunity to review the records, as appropriate. WSCUC 2023 Standards of Accreditation, Standard 1, CFR 1.4, requires institutions to maintain appropriate operating policies and business procedures, including timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances.

Material Reviewed	Institution provides locations of materials to be reviewed	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
Policy on student complaints	Link to policy for handling student complaints: CSU Executive Order 1095 CSU Executive Order 1098 SDSU Policy excerpts: Student Grievance The Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? X YES ___ NO If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? X YES ___ NO If so, where? On websites, including the Catalog: https://catalog.sdsu.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=1005&hl=%22transfer+credit%22&returnto=search#student-complaint-procedure-complaints-regarding-the-csu- https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/17647883/latest/ https://sacd.sdsu.edu/student-rights Comments: The Catalog explains processes depending on the nature of the complaint; other resources elaborate on particular types of complaints.
Process(es)/ procedure	Link to procedure for addressing student complaints and evidence of adherence to procedure: Reporting an Incident Student Grievance Committee Procedures	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES ___ NO If so, does the institution provide evidence that it adheres to this procedure? X YES ___ NO Comments: Offices are available for students with complaints and forms are available online for submitting complaints. Procedures are published online and pursued with the participation of designated parties.

Records maintenance and tracking	Link to description of how and where student complaints are maintained and tracked/monitored over time: SDSU Policy excerpts: Student Grievance	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? X YES ___ NO If so, where? In the Office of the Student Ombudsman within a case-management system. Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? X YES ___ NO Comments: Student case files are maintained and tracked by the Office of the Student Ombudsman within a case-management system.
Records retention	Link to description or policy regarding retention of records of complaints and grievances: SDSU Policy excerpts: Student Grievance	Does the institution retain records of complaints and grievances at least until the next scheduled WSCUC comprehensive review? X YES ___ NO Comments: SDSU's practice at the time of this visit was to retain records for 10 years for the following categories of grievance/complaint/action: formal claims of discrimination filed through the civil rights office; student grievances and disciplinary actions filed through the Ombudsperson and resolved through the Student Grievance Committee; and probationary and disciplinary actions. Further, SDSU is compliant with the CSU records retention policies and requirements.

*\$602.16

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Date: 3/20/26

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's transfer credit policy and practices. Under WSCUC policy**, institutions must publicly disclose transfer of credit policies and criteria regarding acceptance of credit earned at another institution.

Material Reviewed	Institution provides locations of materials to be reviewed	Review team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
Transfer Credit Policy(ies)	Link to policy for receiving transfer credit: CSU Transfer of Credit Policy CSU Transfer & Articulation Guidance SDSU Catalog University Policies: ● Academic Credit Through Coursework ● Academic Credit Through Examination ● Academic Credit for Non-Collegiate Instruction ● Academic Credit for Military Service	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? X YES ___ NO If so, is the policy or procedure publicly available? X YES ___ NO Where? Online policy statements and guidance are offered by the CSU system and are published in the SDSU Catalog: https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/16316539/latest/ https://transferprograms.calstate.edu/transfer-programs-policy/transfer-and-articulation-policy-guidance https://catalog.sdsu.edu/content.php?catoid=11&navoid=1005&hl=%22transfer+credit%22&returnto=search#academic-credit-through-coursework 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? X YES ___ NO Comments: This is available in the Catalog. Does the institution have written criteria explaining their evaluation process for awarding credit based on prior learning experiences, such as military service, paid or unpaid employment, and other demonstrated competency or learning? X YES ___ NO Comments: This is available in the Catalog.

Transfer credit policy implementation	Link to evidence of implementation of transfer credit in accordance with published criteria (at least three credit records with student identifying information removed): Transfer Record - Student 1 Transfer Record - Student 2 Transfer Record - Student 3	How many transfer credit records were examined? Three. What discipline(s) were the credit records from? A wide variety of disciplines including history, political science, sociology, English, communication, mathematics, art, humanities, psychology, chemistry, economics, business, finance, music, accounting, anthropology, geography, spanish language and culture, and philosophy. Did the evidence demonstrate that transfer credit was awarded in accordance with published criteria? X YES ___ NO Comments: Transfer credit process are implemented according to policy and the published criteria.
---------------------------------------	---	---

*§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.

**WSCUC [Transfer of Credit Policy](#)

Review Completed By: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair
Date: 3/14/26

B. Distance Education Review Form

Overview

Institutions must have WSCUC approval to utilize distance education in the delivery of any of its programs in any amount, and are required to seek WSCUC approval for programs where 50% or more of the program can be completed through distance education. The institution's use of distance education in the delivery of its programs is reviewed as part of a comprehensive evaluation of the institution including an Accreditation Visit or a Seeking Accreditation Visit.

Distance Education is defined as:

Education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor or instructors and to support **regular and substantive interaction** between the students and the instructor or instructors, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies that may be used to offer distance education include:

- The internet;
- One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband, fiber optic, satellite, or wireless communication devices;
- Audioconference;
- Other media used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed in this definition

In keeping with federal expectations, WSCUC requires institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs to demonstrate "Faculty-Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction" and "Academic Engagement" as defined by the federal regulations (see Code of Federal Regulations §600.2).

Regular and Substantive Interaction is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment, consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes at least two of the following:

- (i) Providing direct instruction;
- (ii) Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework;
- (iii) Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency;
- (iv) Facilitating a group discussion regarding the content of a course or competency; or
- (v) Other instructional activities approved by the institution's or program's accrediting agency.

An institution ensures regular interaction between a student and an instructor or instructors by, prior to the student's completion of a course or competency -

- (i) Providing the opportunity for substantive interactions with the student on a predictable and scheduled basis commensurate with the length of time and the amount of content in the course or competency; and
- (ii) Monitoring the student's academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.

Academic Engagement requires active participation by a student in an instructional activity related to the student's course of study that –

(1) Is defined by the institution in accordance with any applicable requirements of its State or accrediting agency;

(2) Includes, but is not limited to -

- (i) Attending a synchronous class, lecture, recitation, or field or laboratory activity, physically or online, where there is an opportunity for interaction between the instructor and students;
- (ii) Submitting an academic assignment;
- (iii) Taking an assessment or an exam;
- (iv) Participating in an interactive tutorial, webinar, or other interactive computer-assisted instruction;
- (v) Participating in a study group, group project, or an online discussion that is assigned by the institution; or
- (vi) Interacting with an instructor about academic matters

Student Identity Verification – In keeping with federal policy, WSCUC requires institutions that offer distance education to have processes in place through which the institution establishes that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit. To meet this requirement, the institution must employ, at its option, methods to verify the student who participates, such as:

- A secure login and pass code
- Proctored examinations
- New or other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

In so doing, the institution must make clear in writing at the time of enrollment or registration that it uses processes that protect student privacy and notifies students of any projected additional charges associated with the verification of student identity.

Institution instructions:

The institution includes this form with background information and links to evidence when submitting their self-study report. Institutions will fill in:

Section A if the institution offers distance education programs approved by WSCUC (one or more programs will have distance education modality indicated in the WSCUC web site directory) or are 100% distance education institutions;

OR

Section B if the institution utilizes distance education in the delivery of programs that do not rise to the level of a WSCUC approved distance education program.

Review team instructions:

Teams evaluate the evidence provided to begin their investigation, then use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Review teams append a completed copy of this form to the team

report for all reaffirmation visits and for other visits as applicable. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Recommendations section of the team report.

SECTION A: For institutions with approved distance education programs:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Programs and courses to be reviewed (please list)

Programs:

- Bachelor of Arts in Communication, Applied Arts and Sciences
- Master of Science in Computer Engineering

Courses:

- COMM 420: Quantitative Methods in Communication
- COMM 485: Communicating Leadership
- CS 635: Advanced Object Oriented Programming
- Comp E 671: VLSI Testing (formerly listed as E E 671)

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)

In AY 2024–25, SDSU Global Campus delivered 500+ educational offerings across online, hybrid, and on-campus formats, including 47 academic credit programs and 10 professional development credit programs, alongside third-party training and other portfolios. At the time of the visit, the for-credit portfolio spanned 6 bachelor's and 15 master's degrees, as well as graduate certificates and minors. Two bachelor's degrees and 3 master's degrees were offered in the hybrid modality according to the CSU definition of hybrid. Please note: The programs listed for SDSU on the WSCUC website indicate a higher count of distance education degree programs because of CSU policy regarding online course-taking within the CSU system and the potential for students' distance education study to cross the 50% online threshold in their completion of the degrees. The online degree programs offered by the SDSU Global Campus account for the online programs described above (i.e., the 6 bachelor's and 15 master's degrees).

Global Campus served approximately 10,000 total students in 2024–25 (including Summer 2024), with approximately 7,900 unique incremental students after eliminating duplication with SDSU main-campus operations. Within that population, approximately 1,900 were enrolled in for-credit programs (Fall 2024 reporting). This reflects roughly 50% headcount growth over five years compared to the ~1,250 for-credit headcount in 2020. On an FTE basis, Global Campus increased from 993 (2020) to 1,400 (Fall 2024)—approximately 40% growth.

SDSU Global Campus is the successor to SDSU's long-standing continuing education unit, formerly the College of Extended Studies, with an institutional service history of approximately 70 years. SDSU has been offering distance learning programs for over two decades.

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

SDSU Global Campus provided the team access to two courses from each of the two programs under review. Access was granted as read-only “observer” access to recently archived, completed course sections. This approach allowed the team to review the full course design and structure (modules, assignments, assessments, and learning activities) and to view documented evidence of regular and substantive interaction (e.g., instructor-initiated announcements, discussion facilitation, feedback on graded work, and other instructional communications) as it occurred during course delivery.

The team met with the Dean of Global Campus through his participation in two group meetings. The team reviewed the Global Campus website, the LMS instance of the four courses described above, and the institution's responses to the prompts below. During meetings that took place during the site visit, the team confirmed and corroborated the information provided to support this appendix. Additional materials were reviewed including those designed to support instructional development in the online modality, documents provided by academic senate regarding approval of degree programs, academic program review protocols, assessment reporting that captures measures of student achievement of learning objectives and competencies, the Quality Learning and Teaching (QLT) Rubric, relevant credit hour reporting and analysis related to the programs being reviewed, degree program enrollment reporting as well as retention and graduation rate data, the student evaluation and course feedback processes that are part of SDSU's quality assurance mechanisms, faculty-initiated regular and substantive interactions evidence in the courses reviewed, SDSU's Engagement Roster resources, the institutional disclosures webpage, professional licensure and certification disclosures, and state authorizations attained.

Lines of Inquiry	Institution responds to questions and provides links to evidence (materials should be exhibits in appendices)	Review Team members enter findings and recommendations as appropriate
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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?	Distance education at SDSU is conceived as a mission-extending modality. Transcending borders and transforming lives is a core component of our aim. Through our online programs, we bring SDSU to the world by expanding access to SDSU academic programs for learners balancing work, family, and other commitments, while maintaining SDSU's academic standards. SDSU Global Campus (launched in 2019 from the former College of Extended Studies) positions itself as the primary entity responsible for expanding access to SDSU programs. Administratively, SDSU Global Campus operates as a self-support unit of SDSU Academic Affairs reporting to the Provost with a centralized structure that partners with SDSU's other academic colleges/schools to ensure distance education is academically integrated. For-credit online/hybrid degrees are generally designed, developed, and delivered by the same SDSU faculty/instructors and use the same curriculum/rigor as on-campus offerings; many programs are explicitly described as being offered in partnership with SDSU colleges. Planning, funding, operationalization: ● Planned: Developed collaboratively with academic units (college/school partners) with modality defined at the program level (online vs. hybrid) and aligned to adult/working professional needs while preserving SDSU academic quality and faculty governance through home departments/colleges. ● Funded: Operates on a self-support model (program revenues/fees rather than state general fund appropriation for the unit), and Global Campus returns substantial resources back to SDSU. ● Operationalized: Centralized Global Campus teams support end-to-end delivery, including recruitment/outreach, admissions advising, student support, and program infrastructure, while instruction remains anchored in SDSU academic schools/departments and faculty.	Distance education was well-established as an extension of the institution's in-person programs into the online modality. The team noted a high level of academic integration of the distance education programming at SDSU with the academic colleges and schools. Academic quality was maintained through the same faculty teaching the courses in-person and online, with faculty governance operating through the programs' home departments and colleges.

<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	Distance education students are deeply integrated into SDSU's institutional life. This means they have essentially the same identity, systems access, and core student support ecosystem. In some cases, Global Campus provides an added "wraparound" layer tailored to online/hybrid realities. Every student is automatically enrolled in a Canvas homeroom to ensure full inclusion in their academic program. Students are welcomed and encouraged to attend campus-wide and department-specific events, from welcome week to commencement and alumni events. • Shared SDSU digital backbone: Global Campus credit students activate an SDSUId and use the same institutional platforms as campus-based students (e.g., <i>my.SDSU</i>, <i>Canvas</i>, <i>Career Service</i> and <i>SDSU Library</i> access). This anchors students within SDSU's communications, academic workflows, and official processes. • Access to university-wide services and resources: Distance education students have access to a comprehensive range of support services, including academic advising, financial aid counseling, and specialized technology assistance for online learning via their SDSUId. Students can utilize Student Disability Services, career services via <i>Handshake</i>, counseling/psychological services, and the Basic Needs Center for food and crisis assistance. • Library and research integration for remote learners: Online students use their SDSUId for off-campus access to SDSU Library and Software resources (to include academic journals and databases) and AI tools—critical for academic belonging and parity in coursework. • Co-curricular engagement opportunities: Global Campus promotes events and workshops and delivers a New Student Online Orientation via Canvas, creating structured touchpoints for community-building and institutional norms. Online students are also welcome to join a variety of on-campus activities.	The same services and systems offered to in-person students were available to students enrolled in online programs. Resources such as library and research opportunities were the same for distance education students, and these students participated in community-building and co-curricular activities both remotely and on campus.
---	---	---

<i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	Global Campus courses are delivered through the Canvas Learning Management System (LMS) on a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) cloud-based platform, securely hosted by Amazon Web Services (AWS). Instructure (the company that operates Canvas SaaS) performs daily backups of the learning environment and LMS data to the cloud, also managed by AWS. Canvas supports a full spectrum of academic and communication functions, including delivering media in multiple formats, facilitating discussions, enabling students to submit assignments, and supporting faculty in grading those assignments and providing robust feedback (including the use of assessment instruments such as rubrics or automated grading for exams/quizzes). Courses are designed to support frequent interaction between faculty and students as well as student-to-student engagement. This is accomplished through activities such as online discussion boards, peer reviews, and group assignments/activities, as well as through built-in communication tools such as announcements and discussions—all of which happen via the Canvas LMS and built-in learning tools/applications that reside within the Canvas learning infrastructure. The learning platform (Canvas LMS) is supported by dedicated technical staff at Global Campus and by additional support from central SDSU IT Support.	SDSU's Canvas LMS was backed up daily and was supported by IT staff of the global Campus as well as central IT. Canvas promoted learning and interaction between students and faculty (and among students). Course design supported communication and the opportunity for robust feedback between students and faculty.
---	---	--

<i>Student Support Services:</i> 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?	Student support services capacity (advising, counseling, library, computing, academic support) and effectiveness: Advising: SDSU Global Campus provides a dedicated, end-to-end advising model tailored to online learners, including Outreach Representatives (pre-admission), Admissions Advisors (eligibility and onboarding), and Student Success Advisors (ongoing support for undergraduate, graduate, and certificate students) accessible via phone, Zoom, walk-in, and email. SDSU Global Campus uses a proactive advising model to promote student success, retention, and timely degree completion. Undergraduate degree completion students are assigned an academic advisor at entry who works with them to create a comprehensive academic plan mapping their path from first enrollment through graduation, including course sequencing, term-by-term course load, and alignment with prerequisites and remaining degree requirements, while considering individual circumstances. Upon entry into a graduate program, students work with an academic advisor in coordination with the Faculty Director to develop a structured academic plan that maps their progression from initial enrollment through graduation. This planning process includes recommended course sequencing, appropriate term-by-term course loads, and alignment with program requirements and academic milestones, while also considering each student's professional commitments and individual circumstances. Advisors maintain ongoing communication with students throughout the program to monitor progress, provide guidance, and coordinate with faculty leadership when needed. This integrated advising approach ensures graduate students receive consistent, informed support throughout their distance education experience. To evaluate advising effectiveness and target interventions, we monitor program-level academic performance indicators each term, including: total enrolled, LMS engagement data, number and percentage on academic probation, number and percentage disqualified, average term GPA, and average term units completed. These metrics drive proactive outreach (e.g., early check-ins, academic planning, and escalation to targeted supports) for students showing risk signals. This approach has contributed to a measurable reduction in the number of students placed on performance-based	SDSU Global Campus provided advising, counseling, academic support, and other services that were well-suited for the students' pursuit of the online modality with special attention to degree level. Students were tracked with monitoring of their engagement and their academic performance to inform interventions offered to enhance their success. Consequently, the data showed that fewer students were experiencing academic distress and that more students were retained and graduate.
--	--	---

	academic notice and has strengthened retention and progression for online students. Counseling / Well-being: SDSU's Counseling & Psychological Services (C&PS) offers individual counseling, group therapy, workshops, and related supports; campus wellness resources explicitly include virtual and telephone counseling appointments, which are appropriate to supporting learners in the distance modality. Library: Online students use their SDSUId for off-campus access to SDSU Library and Software resources (to include academic journals and databases) and AI tools—critical for academic belonging and parity in coursework. Computing/Instructional Tech: Global Campus students receive access (via SDSU ID) to core platforms and software used for online delivery (e.g., Canvas, Zoom, Microsoft 365, and other academic tools), and SDSU IT provides a Virtual Help Desk via Zoom, tickets, and chat-based support aligned to distance delivery. Our IT team measures service performance through ticket volume by channel, first-response time, time-to-resolution, and platform reliability metrics for core systems used by online students (Canvas, authentication, collaboration tools). These KPIs are monitored to reduce the risk of downtime and ensure remote learners can access course materials and assessments without interruption. Academic support: The Student Success Center at Global Campus engages with all degree-seeking students to support them in their journey. This is described in detail in the first bullet point above. Additionally, SDSU provides modality-appropriate academic support, such as online writing tutoring through the Writing Center's online tutoring environment.	
--	---	--

<i>Faculty.</i> 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?	Who Teaches Distance Education Courses Distance education courses are taught primarily by SDSU faculty from the relevant academic department. Instructor Selection The Department Chair and Faculty Director of the program select instructors for each course. Instructional assignments remain under academic departmental control. Course Authors & Instructors Courses are typically developed by faculty who have already taught the course on campus and bring established expertise in the subject matter. In most cases, the faculty member who teaches the course in the on-ground modality is also selected to author and teach the distance education version. If the original faculty author is unable to teach, the Faculty Director appoints a replacement, typically from among the department's qualified faculty. Only in limited cases are external instructors appointed, such as Professors of Practice or other discipline-qualified professionals who meet institutional faculty hiring standards. This model ensures that distance education is fully integrated within the department's academic structure rather than operating as a separate instructional unit. Faculty Orientation, Support, and Integration The institution provides structured onboarding and ongoing support to ensure that distance education faculty are fully prepared and integrated into the academic community. Instructional Design (ID) Onboarding Faculty receive onboarding support from the Instructional Design team, including: ○ Training in online pedagogy ○ Best practices for asynchronous instruction ○ Accessibility and universal design guidance ○ Use of the learning management system Ongoing Professional Development Regular workshops and training sessions are offered to support: ○ Effective online engagement strategies	Academic departments selected instructors for their online courses, and these faculty were frequently the instructors for the in-person instances of their online courses. With distance education integrated into the departments – not standing as a separate enterprise – faculty developed these courses and were trained for their online instructional assignments. With distance education courses offered to mirror in-person courses, assessment of student learning remained equivalent across modalities.
--	---	---

	○ Assessment in online environments ○ Emerging instructional technologies ● Academic Integration Because instructors are departmental faculty, they generally remain integrated through: ○ Participation in department meetings ○ Involvement in curriculum discussions ○ Engagement in program assessment and accreditation activities Distance education faculty are therefore academically and professionally embedded in the same structures as on-ground faculty. Faculty Role in Curriculum Development Faculty are integral in curriculum development in our distance education programs. ● With rare exception, courses are developed as mirror images of their on-ground counterparts in: ○ Program Outlines of Record ○ Course Outlines of Record ○ Learning outcomes ○ Academic rigor ○ Scope and content ● Faculty: ○ Responsible for course syllabi ○ Develop and produce instructional materials ○ Create assignments and assessments ○ Ensure alignment with program learning outcomes Instructional designers provide pedagogical and technical support, but academic responsibility remains with the faculty and department. Faculty Role in Assessment of Student Learning Faculty play a central role in assessing and improving student learning in distance education. ● Faculty: ○ Responsible for course-level assessments	
--	---	--

	○ Use rubrics aligned with program outcomes ○ Participate in program assessment cycles ○ Contribute to data review during program review and accreditation processes Because distance education courses are generally structured as mirrored offerings, assessment methods and standards are equivalent across modalities.	
--	---	--

<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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.)	Design of Distance Education Programs and Courses Distance education programs and courses are developed within the academic departments that house the corresponding on-ground degree programs. Responsibility for academic quality, curricular integrity, and academic standards resides with the faculty. At SDSU Global Campus, courses follow a course authorship model, in which faculty design and develop course content for online delivery. This includes lecture materials, assignments, learning activities, assessment methods and rubrics, and the selection of textbooks and third-party instructional resources. The majority of faculty authors are tenured or tenure-track and are hired from within SDSU. Each distance education program is: • Designed by department faculty with subject-matter expertise • Led by a designated Faculty Director • Supervised by the Department Chair, who ensures alignment with departmental standards, student learning outcomes, and disciplinary expectations Faculty retain full ownership of curriculum, learning outcomes, academic rigor, and assessment methods. The instructional modality (online, hybrid, or other distance format) does not affect the department's academic authority. Courses designed for online delivery are intentionally developed to mirror the rigor and academic quality of face-to-face courses. Faculty course authors work closely with experienced Global Campus Instructional Designers over a 6–8 month development period to ensure that learning outcomes, assessments, and instructional activities are equivalent to those of in-person SDSU courses. Approval Process All distance education programs follow the same shared governance and curricular approval pathways as on-ground programs. The process includes: • Departmental Approval: Faculty review and approve course and program proposals, including curriculum, learning outcomes, and instructional modality.	The academic departments housing the degrees and courses developed the online programs and courses, which were subject to the same shared governance approvals as in-person academic programs (typically, as implementations of existing in-person programs). Support from Global Campus Instructional Designers ensured alignment of the course design with the Quality Learning and Teaching rubric. Academic program review evaluated the performance of the online courses through the same processes and mechanisms used for in-person instruction and academic programs. Substantial effort was invested in ensuring the comparability of learning objectives, academic quality, and content between the in-person versions and online versions
--	---	---

	● College-Level Review: The College Curriculum Committee and Dean review academic coherence, faculty resources, and alignment with college priorities. ● Partnership with Global Campus: Academic departments collaborate with Global Campus to ensure: ● Instructional design support aligned with evidence-based online pedagogy ● Compliance with distance education regulations ● Integration of student services and support for online learners During this phase, Global Campus Instructional Designers support faculty in aligning course design with the Quality Teaching and Learning (QLT) Rubric, the CSU system’s standard for high-quality online course design. ● University Governance Review: Proposals are submitted through Modern Campus Curriculum, the university’s official curriculum management system, and reviewed by: ● University Curriculum Committee ● Academic Senate (as required) ● Provost’s Office Chancellor’s Office Approval: Final approval is sought from the Chancellor’s Office when required, particularly for degree programs or modality changes. Distance education programs are typically approved as mirror-image modalities of their in-person counterparts, ensuring equivalence in program structure, required courses, and academic expectations. Evaluation and Continuous Quality Assurance Distance education programs and courses are evaluated through the same institutional quality assurance mechanisms as on-ground offerings, supplemented by formal online course design review processes. Program Review Cycles Academic program review includes analysis of student learning outcomes, retention, completion rates, and assessment data, regardless of modality. Course-Level Assessment	of the courses and degrees.
--	---	-----------------------------

Faculty assess student learning outcomes using embedded assignments, exams, projects, and rubrics aligned with course and program goals.

Instructional Design and Delivery Review

All Global Campus online courses are evaluated using the [Quality Learning and Teaching \(QLT\) Rubric](#), which reflects exemplary practices in online course design and delivery.

- Instructional Designers are required to hold an advanced certification in Reviewing Courses Using the [QLT Rubric](#), via the CSU Chancellor's Office.
- Each course is designed to meet at least 24 core objectives (out of 52 total objectives) defined by the QLT Rubric.
- These objectives ensure courses are:
 - Accessible and compliant with WCAG 2.2 AA standards
 - Clearly organized with intuitive navigation
 - Aligned across learning outcomes, activities, and assessments
 - Inclusive of diverse perspectives and culturally responsive materials
 - Supportive of student resources and services
 - Built using appropriate and pedagogically sound technology

Once course development is complete, a second Instructional Designer, not involved in the original design, conducts an independent review to identify strengths, areas for improvement, and any critical deficiencies. A course is considered complete only when it demonstrates the required core QLT objectives.

Faculty Evaluation and Student Feedback

Online teaching effectiveness is evaluated through:

- Student course evaluations
- Departmental review of instructional practices

Distance learners participate in the same institutional evaluation processes as on-ground students, and results are used for continuous course and program improvement.

Comparability to On-Ground Offerings

	Distance education programs are fully comparable to their on-ground counterparts in content, learning outcomes, and academic quality. Specifically: ● Identical Student Learning Outcomes Online and in-person programs share the same program and course learning outcomes. ● Equivalent Curriculum Required courses, credit requirements, and academic standards are consistent across modalities. ● Faculty Governance and Oversight Courses are taught by qualified SDSU faculty under the same departmental hiring, evaluation, and governance structures. ● Consistent Assessment Standards Grading policies, academic integrity expectations, and performance benchmarks are equivalent. The modality differs only in the method of instructional delivery, not in academic substance, expectations, or rigor. See Credit Hour Report for each of the courses under review is available.	
--	---	--

<i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?	Global Campus distance education courses are designed to meet the federal requirement for <i>faculty-initiated, regular, and substantive interaction</i> while supporting a primarily adult, working student population. Courses are largely asynchronous but are not self-paced or correspondence-based; instead, they are structured around consistent instructor presence and engagement throughout the term. Global Campus uses the CSU Quality Teaching & Learning (QLT) framework to guide course design and instructional expectations. Instructor presence and interaction are core design principles, with faculty responsible for initiating contact, guiding learning, and supporting student progress. Faculty-Initiated and Substantive Interaction Faculty initiate interaction with students on or before the first day of class, establishing instructor presence and setting expectations for communication and engagement. Substantive interaction includes instructor activities that are directly related to course content, learning outcomes, and student performance, such as: • Communicating course expectations, availability, and office hours through the syllabus and course announcements. • Facilitating and engaging in discussion forums by posing prompts, responding to student contributions, and clarifying concepts. • Providing instructional content and guidance, including interactive lectures using tools such as PlayPosit and Canvas Studio. • Assessing student work using clear rubrics and providing individualized, actionable feedback. • Posting announcements or sending messages that address emergent issues, common themes observed in student work, reinforce key concepts, or support student progress. • Sharing examples of student work or annotated solutions and inviting student questions and discussion. • Conducting brief learner check-ins or reflections to better understand student needs and support learning.	Faculty-initiated, regular, and substantive interaction were ensured by SDSU through structuring each course around the instructor's consistent interaction and engagement with students throughout the term. Compliance with expectations regarding this interaction was monitored through policy, course review, training of online instructors, and adherence with course design standards. Activities that constitute student/instructor substantive interaction were detailed by SDSU and include facilitation of discussion forums with students, assessment of student work that includes individualized feedback, and brief check-ins with students to evaluate the extent of their learning and any needs that may surface.
---	--	---

	Regular Interaction and Expectations Interaction is regular and ongoing across the term through structured weekly modules and recurring instructor engagement. Faculty are expected to maintain an active presence by responding to student communications within 48 hours, participating in course discussions, grading assignments promptly, and holding office hours. Monitoring and Compliance Compliance with RSI expectations is supported through clear instructional policies and course design standards. Expectations for instructor presence, response times, and early outreach are communicated to faculty and reinforced through course design aligned with the QLT framework. Course reviews and program leadership oversight focus on ensuring that courses are structured to support regular and substantive interaction.	
--	--	--

Academic Engagement. How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?	Global Campus ensures compliance with the federal requirement for <i>academic engagement</i> by clearly defining qualifying activities, embedding them into course design, and documenting engagement through Canvas analytics. Compliance is monitored by both faculty and the Student Success Advising team at Global Campus. Advisors closely track student activity and performance, and proactively reach out when a student has not logged in for an extended period, misses assignments, or demonstrates low performance on quizzes or coursework. Advisors then work directly with the student to provide support, identify challenges, and help reestablish consistent academic engagement. Prior to each term, the Global Campus Student Success team communicates federal academic engagement requirements and acceptable activities to faculty. Instructional Design reinforces these expectations through pre-term communications and via their course design guidance. Activities That Constitute Academic Engagement Academic engagement in Global Campus courses includes student participation in activities that demonstrate active involvement in learning, such as: • Completing an introductory discussion board in which students engage with course content and peers. • Submitting a Getting to Know You survey in which students communicate learning goals, prior experience, and support needs directly to the instructor. • Participating in discussion boards, collaborative assignments, or group work that require interaction with course materials and classmates. • Submitting academic assignments, quizzes, or other graded learning activities aligned with course outcomes. These activities are intentionally embedded early in the course to establish engagement and verify student participation. Monitoring and Documentation Academic engagement is documented primarily through Canvas activity data, including assignment submissions, discussion participation, and gradebook entries. Engagement is tracked through an automated system in Canvas, but instructors are also prompted to monitor student activity within their courses.	Qualifying activities that demonstrate academic engagement were clearly defined and were monitored in their implementation into Canvas courses. Instructors and staff tracked student activity in the LMS and their academic performance, with the interventions proactive and designed to restore engagement.
---	---	--

	Administrative and instructional analytics provide additional visibility into engagement patterns when needed. Additional information on engagement activities and documentation is available through SDSU's Engagement Roster resources: https://my.sdsu.edu/guides/engagement-roster	
--	---	--

<i>State Licensure Requirements.</i> Describe, as appropriate, the institution's process for disclosing to students how state licensure requirements are met by distance education programs, whether licensure requirements are not met by programs, or whether the institution has not determined where licensure requirements are met by the programs.	SDSU addresses professional licensure disclosures for distance education through a combination of institution-level consumer information, program-level licensure determinations, and location-based enrollment compliance. At the institution level, SDSU maintains a centralized Institutional Disclosures hub that publishes federally required consumer information and directs students to underlying disclosures and contacts for additional detail: https://www.sdsu.edu/institutional-disclosures. For professional licensure and certification, SDSU provides a two-tier disclosure process for distance education programs that are intended to lead to licensure/certification or are commonly pursued for licensure/certification. First, SDSU publishes a centralized Professional Licensure and Certification Disclosures webpage (https://globalcampus.sdsu.edu/student-resources/out-of-state-students-state-authorization-status/licensure-disclosures/) that explains licensure requirements vary by state/territory and provides program/state determinations using three categories: Meets, Does Not Meet, and Not Determined/Unable to Determine, along with student responsibility, relocation guidance, and contact information. Second, for licensure-pathway programs, SDSU also posts a program-specific licensure notice directly on the applicable program webpages (e.g., within the "How to Apply" section) that summarizes the relevant determination(s) and links students to the centralized disclosures page for the full details (example program page: https://globalcampus.sdsu.edu/program/education/ma-educational-leadership-opasc-combo-program-sdsu/). Separately, for location-based enrollment compliance, SDSU Global Campus publishes a state-by-state authorization status list and closely monitors authorization laws in every state, including where SDSU is not currently accepting applications from certain locations. This page serves as the public-facing mechanism for where SDSU can offer distance education by student location, and the online application is configured to restrict submission from states where SDSU is not authorized to operate: https://globalcampus.sdsu.edu/student-resources/out-of-state-students-state-authorization-status/.	SDSU engaged in appropriate disclosure processes regarding state licensure requirements for distance education programs (e.g., how the requirements were met by the programs, whether they were not met by the programs, and whether SDSU had not determined where licensure requirements were met by the programs). This effort included compliance with state authorization status reporting requirements.
---	---	--

<i>Student Identification Verification and Privacy.</i> What is the institution's process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification? What precautions are taken by the institution to protect technology from cyber security intrusions on its or outsourced systems? Are additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity disclosed at the time of registration or enrollment?	SDSU Global Campus verifies both the identity and academic history of students prior to matriculation into distance education degree programs, including the programs under review herein. During the admissions process, applicants' prior academic history is verified through the National Student Clearinghouse to confirm previous enrollment and degree completion, as applicable. SDSU further verifies student identity in distance education primarily through account-based authentication into university systems, with additional controls for high-stakes assessments, and it manages privacy/cybersecurity risk through a CSU-aligned security program, centralized IT Security Office controls, and formal third-party risk/access processes. Student identification verification (who is taking the course/assessment) - Secure login + multi-factor authentication (MFA): Students access core academic/administrative systems (e.g., my.SDSU and Canvas) using their SDSUid credentials, with Duo MFA as an added identity factor. The my.SDSU login guide explicitly describes SDSUid login followed by Duo options (push/call/passcode). - Assessment integrity tooling (as applicable): SDSU supports Respondus LockDown Browser for exams (locks down the testing environment) and, when required by an instructor/course, Respondus Monitor (webcam/microphone recording during an exam). Cybersecurity and privacy precautions - Program governance and standards alignment: SDSU's IT security framework adopts the CSU Information Security Policy and Standards and SDSU supplemental policies/guidelines (grounded in ISO-aligned practices). - Third-party / outsourced risk management: The IT Security Office conducts Vendor Risk Assessments to ensure vendors have appropriate safeguards for university data, and SDSU operates a Third-Party Vendor Access process to ensure vendor access is secure, controlled, and compliant with CSU/campus security policies.	Identity verification was handled through systems and review processes both in advance of matriculation and subsequent to enrollment (via secured system login using authentication). Assessment integrity tools were also used to lockdown browsers during exams and to monitor students through the creation of recordings. To protect from cybersecurity intrusions, SDSU used the appropriate programs, controls, and processes. Local licenses and instances of software rendered unnecessary any student charges to be associated with verification, outside of potential messaging costs levied by the students' mobile carriers during MFA.
--	---	--

	Student charges and disclosure • MFA costs: SDSU states Duo licenses for students are covered by SDSU IT Security; any SMS/voice charges are the student’s mobile-carrier charges if they choose those methods. • Proctoring/verification tool charges: SDSU directs students to download and use the SDSU version of Respondus LockDown Browser when required, and identifies webcam recording requirements when Monitor is used.	
--	---	--

<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> 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?	Retention and Graduation (SDSU Global Campus online students) Data collected. SDSU collects and reports standard retention and completion metrics for online students through the same institutional data infrastructure used for on-campus students. Core metrics align with SDSU Analytic Studies and Institutional Research (ASIR) and CSU Chancellor's Office reporting conventions and include: term-to-term continuation/retention, unit accumulation and academic progress, course success and D/F/W rates, academic standing (good standing/probation/disqualification), and degree completion outcomes (graduation rates and time-to-degree). Where applicable, metrics are also analyzed by student type (first-time freshman, transfer, graduate), enrollment intensity (full-time/part-time), and other key student characteristics used in system reporting. How data are monitored. These data are collected, visualized, and analyzed through institutional reporting tools (including Tableau dashboards) that support routine monitoring at the program and course levels. Dashboards are used to track trends over time, identify risk signals early (e.g., drops in academic momentum, increased probation), and target proactive interventions. What the data show. For the B.A. Communication, online delivery is relatively new (approximately four years of operation). The 2 Years or Less graduation rate for the distance program was 75% for the initial cohort compared to 73.5% for the on-ground program for students who began in 2021. Subsequent 2-year graduation rates continue to be within three percentage points of the on-ground rates. The academic probation rate for this program is consistently below 5% since fall 2023 while the academic probation rate for the on-ground program ranged from 5.5-9.3% during the same time period. For the MS in Computer Engineering, online delivery is relatively new (approximately two years of operation). As a result, graduation-rate metrics are not yet fully representative of steady-state program performance because most students are still progressing through the degree pipeline. For both programs, early indicators therefore emphasize leading measures — persistence/continuation, course success, term GPA, and unit completion—rather than cohort graduation rates alone.	Data available to describe student retention and graduation were consistent across the modalities of the programs (online or in-person). The two programs reviewed were relatively new, but retention and graduation rate data seemed comparable across modalities for the undergraduate program, and academic probation occurred at a lower rate in the online program reviewed, compared to the equivalent in-person program. The graduate program was too new for a degree-completion comparison. Targeted outreach during the monitoring of student performance statistics led to referrals for student support and other interventions. Student performance among groups within the program was compared, and benchmarks were
--	--	---

	Disparities. SDSU disaggregates retention and progression indicators by student characteristics used in institutional and CSU reporting (e.g., entry pathway, enrollment intensity, and other equity-relevant groupings) to identify differences in persistence, course success, and academic standing. Any observed gaps are treated as targets for outreach and support design (e.g., advising engagement, academic support referrals, and course-level improvements). Comparability. Where comparable on-ground versions exist, SDSU evaluates online offerings for comparability using shared learning outcomes, common course/program requirements, and student success indicators (course success, persistence, progression). Program outcomes are also interpreted in the context of CSU and broader online benchmarks where those are available through system and institutional comparative reporting. How concerns are addressed. When trends indicate risk (e.g., elevated D/F/W rates, increased probation, slowed unit accumulation), Global Campus and academic units use a continuous improvement approach that includes proactive advising outreach, targeted academic support referrals, and course/program adjustments informed by dashboard data.	identified from among other programs in the CSU system and beyond.
--	--	--

<i>Student Learning.</i> 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?	Global Campus online programs assess student learning using the same program-level and course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) as their on-ground counterparts. Courses follow the same approved program and course outlines, ensuring alignment in learning expectations across modalities. While learning outcomes remain consistent, some modular objectives and assignments may be adapted or optimized for the online environment to promote engagement and effective learning in asynchronous formats. Assessment of Student Learning Student learning in online courses is assessed through a range of direct measures aligned with course and program outcomes, including: • Discussion boards • Quizzes and exams • Group and individual projects • Essays and research papers • Student presentations Assessments may be reviewed by instructors, peers, or both, depending on the learning objectives and course design. These assessment methods are comparable to those used in on-ground courses, with adjustments made as needed to support online delivery while maintaining equivalent rigor and expectations. Assessment Results At the course level, evidence of student learning is reflected in grades, the quality of student work, submission patterns, grading timelines, and the types of assessments used. Faculty and program leadership review student work and course performance as part of ongoing instructional and curricular discussions. While assessment results are not always synthesized into formal outcome reports at the Global Campus level, they inform instructional decisions and course refinement. Comparison Across Modalities and Improvement Comparisons between online and on-ground student learning outcomes may occur at the program level, though these comparisons are not always systematic and vary by program. The primary focus remains on ensuring that students meet shared learning outcomes, regardless of modality.	Learning assessment processes were consistent between distance education modalities and in-person instruction. Student work product is reviewed and evaluated for learning outcome attainment, and findings inform course and program development and refinement. With comparability attained between in-person and online course offerings, assessment findings were discussed during academic program review processes designated through shared governance.
---	--	--

	Improvements to online courses and programs are informed by multiple sources, including CSU Quality Teaching & Learning (QLT) course reviews, student feedback, instructor reflection, and program-level discussions. These processes support continuous improvement while maintaining alignment with institutional learning expectations.	
<i>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 Agreements with Unaccredited Entities?</i>	No. SDSU does not use any external vendor for course instruction, curriculum ownership, or substantive course development/delivery functions. Instruction and academic oversight remain with SDSU faculty and the responsible academic unit. Vendor involvement is limited to foundational enterprise infrastructure that supports online delivery (e.g., the university's LMS and related standard instructional technology platforms used campuswide). These tools function as an IT-enabled delivery infrastructure rather than third-party provider of academic content or instruction. Vendor tools in use at the time of the visit include: Access Pearson, Admin and Course Analytics, Canvas Chat Tool, Canvas Commons, Canvas New Quizzes / Quizzes 2, Canvas Plagiarism Framework by Turnitin (LTI 2.0), Canvas Roll Call Attendance, Canvas SCORM, Canvas Studio, Cengage Learning, Cidi Labs, Elevate Data Sync (formerly Kimono), Google Assignments, Google Drive LTI (Legacy Edu Apps), Gradescope by Turnitin, Lucidspark, McGraw Hill Campus, Mediasite, Packback, Pearson, PlayPosit, Poll Everywhere, ReadyGO: Course Lifecycle Management System, RedShelf, Respondus LockDown Browser, SAGE Vantage, Springshare, TidyUP: Course Cleanup Tool, Top Hat, Turnitin, Youtube LTI (Legacy Edu Apps), Zoom, and zyBooks. Accordingly, there are no program-specific arrangements with unaccredited entities that would trigger or implicate the WSCUC policy on Agreements with Unaccredited Entities.	Neither program reviewed used vendor products beyond the campus's LMS.

<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> 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?	Global Campus quality assurance processes are intentionally designed to address the distinct pedagogical and delivery considerations of distance education while maintaining alignment with SDSU's academic standards. Online courses and programs are not treated as separate or parallel offerings; they are fully embedded within SDSU's academic structure and anchored in the same colleges, departments, and program leadership as on-ground offerings. Quality Assurance for Distance Education SDSU has adopted the CSU Quality Teaching & Learning (QLT) framework as its primary quality assurance mechanism for online and hybrid instruction. At Global Campus, the QLT framework is used specifically to evaluate the design, delivery, and instructional effectiveness of distance education courses. The framework provides modality-appropriate standards that address online course structure, alignment, accessibility, instructor presence, assessment, and student engagement. All Global Campus courses undergo a structured QLT-aligned design process, including independent review by a second certified instructional designer. This process ensures that courses meet established quality benchmarks for online learning before delivery and supports ongoing refinement over time. Programs offered through Global Campus mirror approved SDSU degree programs, including shared learning outcomes, curricular expectations, and academic oversight. Program and department leadership play an active role in shaping, reviewing, and improving online offerings, ensuring that distance education remains consistent with disciplinary standards and institutional expectations. Evidence of Educational Effectiveness Multiple sources of evidence are used to evaluate the educational effectiveness of distance education courses and programs, including: • Course quality reviews are conducted using the QLT rubric, with documented strengths and areas for improvement. • Student evaluations and feedback, which are reviewed by program leadership and the Global Campus Student Success team to inform instructional and programmatic decisions.	The same quality assurance processes were applied consistently across program modality and distance education programs compared to in-person programs.
--	---	---

	● Assessment of student work, including grades and evaluation of assignment quality, aligned with shared course and program learning outcomes. ● Program-level oversight, where faculty and academic leadership review course performance, instructional approaches, and student experience. ● Post-completion indicators, such as employment and alumni pathway information, which provide additional context regarding program effectiveness and alignment with workforce outcomes.	
--	--	--

Name of reviewer/s: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair

Date/s of review: March 15, 2026

Revised April 2023; October 2025

C. Off-Campus Locations Review

Institution: San Diego State University

Type of Visit: Reaccreditation – Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair

Date/s of review: March 23, 2026, and March 26, 2026

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. 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

San Diego State University – Imperial Valley
720 Heber Avenue
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 or additional location by WSCUC)

[SDSU Imperial Valley](#), a WSCUC additional location, was founded in 1959 in Calexico, and was known as the Imperial Valley Campus until 2018. The SDSU 2020-25 strategic plan expanded investments in SDSU Imperial Valley, including increased faculty, academic programs and student support infrastructure. The site offers 12 bachelor's degrees, 3 master's degrees, as well as teacher credentials and minors. As of fall 2025 there are 1131 undergraduate and 175 graduate students enrolled, and 63.73 FTE faculty. Additional SDSU IV data can be accessed on the Analytic Studies & Institutional Research ([ASIR dashboards](#)). SDSU Imperial Valley campus includes both locations: Calexico and Brawley.

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

On-site visit:

A member of the review team visited the Calexico and Brawley locations on Monday, March 23, 2026, to tour the sites and to meet with faculty and staff. A meeting with undergraduate students studying at SDSU Imperial Valley was conducted via Zoom on March 26, 2026.

The on-site meetings were held with the dean and campus leadership; the dean of student affairs and staff supporting student success including representatives from the student success and retention center, associated students, and the academic learning center; faculty from education, nursing, and psychology; campus staff representing the dean's office and critical operations areas; and two leaders of SDSU Mesa Campus areas whose work directly supports the SDSU Imperial Valley campus (the vice provost of academic affairs and the director of program evaluation, compliance, and assessment)

The team member toured the new Brawley STEM building and visited an undergraduate course meeting being held at the Brawley location.

Materials examined during this review included the institutional report and its exhibits and linked evidence; the campus website; WSCUC records regarding SDSU's off-campus locations, the previous reaffirmation review's reports and Commission Action Letter; the SDSU strategic plan; statistical dashboards reporting enrollment and student success data for SDSU Imperial Valley; and the SDSU Catalog describing the SDSU Imperial Valley academic offerings.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	SDSU IV is not a newly approved site.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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 1.1, 3.1, 3.6, 4.1)	As mentioned in the self-study, SDSU IV is a strategic investment in educational opportunities in rural and underserved communities in the Southern California region. SDSU conceives of SDSU IV as an extension of goals and objectives currently pursued by SDSU overall. SDSU IV is incorporated into the strategic plan activities in the “ <u>We Are SDSU</u> ” plank.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> 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 1.5, 2.10, 4.3)	SDSU IV students are involved in Associated Students in the Imperial Valley to ensure local student representation, which oversees student organizations and conducts events in Calexico and Brawley. Associated Students at IV and SD co-host leadership opportunities and events The SDSU IV <u>Cross-Cultural Center</u> intersects with other centers in Student Affairs and Campus Diversity.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> 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 2.5, 3.1, 3.6)	SDSU IV is incorporated into the <u>administrative structure</u> through the dean, and budgetary oversight is conducted through the <u>budgetary procedures</u> adhered to throughout SDSU. The physical space at SDSU IV is an instructional facility equipped with smart classroom technology to facilitate new technology and best pedagogical practices. SDSU IV is supported by a local IT team that prioritizes course instructional support. Interactive videoconferencing allows students in Imperial Valley to access courses and instructors on the San Diego campus.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Student Support Services.</i> 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 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.6, 3.10, 4.34.1)	SDSU IV students have access to resources on the SDSU campus through a variety of onsite and remote options including access to counseling and mental health services, food pantry, and advising. There are also extensions of the <u>Library</u> and <u>student services</u> at SDSU IV. Student Services are incorporated into the assessment structure within Student Affairs and Campus Diversity.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Faculty.</i> 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 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.8)	There are both contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty at SDSU IV: in fall 2025 there were 85 contingent faculty, 16 tenure-track faculty, and 14 tenured faculty (ASIR dashboard). SDSU IV faculty have designated seats in the University Senate and participate in a local Faculty Council on a monthly basis; the IV faculty also are included in their respective discipline department/school at the San Diego campus to be involved with curriculum development and administration. SDSU IV programs are assessed independently from the San Diego campus programs in Nuventive, to ensure disaggregated data about SDSU IV students.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 4.2)	SDSU IV programs are primarily “mirrored” from the San Diego campus programs with few minor adjustments. Programs and courses are approved based on the curriculum process through the shared governance procedures. Programs and courses at SDSU IV are held to the same standards of content and outcomes as those delivered at the San Diego campus. Department Chairs and Associate Deans from the various colleges represented at SDSU IV are consulted on course modalities (face to face or online preferences), learning outcomes, and course expectations.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> 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 programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)	All <u>student data</u> is disaggregated by campus: San Diego and Imperial Valley. Historically, Imperial Valley has primarily enrolled ~300 new upper-division transfers per year. Their retention and 2-year graduation rates typically exceed those of students on the SD campus and 4-year rates are very similar. First-time full-time student enrollments have historically been limited to only several dozen students per year (compared to more than 6,000 FTFT on the SD campus), leading to rates that can have wide deviations from year to year due to the small number of students. SDSU IV has expanded its 4 year degree options and now has more first year students, raising student enrollment from 800 transfer students to 1300 lower division, upper division, teaching credential students, and graduate students. SDSU IV has a strong sense of belonging and helps students complete their degrees through faculty and staff engagement and support.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Student Learning.</i> 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 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)	Programs have the same assessment requirements at Imperial Valley as they do at San Diego. The assessment data is entered in the assessment platform <u>Nuventive</u>. San Diego campus has 85% of programs with assessment results, with 80% student success; Imperial Valley programs have 88% programs reporting results, with 87% student success.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> 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 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)	SDSU IV is held to the same quality assurance processes as SDSU: faculty and staff interact with the San Diego campus regularly and student support services are incorporated into the San Diego processes, see Exhibit 2.07 for an example.	No follow-up necessary.
--	---	--------------------------------

Revised, August 2023

C. Off-Campus Locations Review (Continued)

Institution: San Diego State University

Type of Visit: Reaccreditation – Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair

Date/s of review: March 23, 2026, and March 26, 2026

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. 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

SDSU Imperial Valley – Brawley

560 CA-78

Brawley, CA 92227

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 or additional location by WSCUC)

SDSU Imperial Valley – Brawley is an additional location included in the SDSU-IV structure, as such the enrollment and faculty are considered a part of SDSU-IV. Data is not disaggregated to the level of the Brawley location. The Brawley location was established in 2004, primarily to support the SDSU-IV Nursing program. The site was expanded to two buildings with the [Sciences and Engineering Lab](#), which opened in 2025. This expansion coordinated with the addition of majors for SDSU-IV of Chemistry and Electrical Engineering, which were strategically selected to support the region's [Lithium Valley](#) projects. Nursing and Public Health courses are also offered at the Brawley location. Additional information about SDSU IV in general can be accessed on the Analytic Studies & Institutional Research ([ASIR dashboards](#)).

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

On-site visit:

A member of the review team visited the Calexico and Brawley locations on Monday, March 23, 2026, to tour the sites and to meet with faculty and staff. A meeting with undergraduate students studying at SDSU Imperial Valley was conducted via Zoom on March 26, 2026.

The on-site meetings were held with the dean and campus leadership; the dean of student affairs and staff supporting student success including representatives from the student success and retention center, associated students, and the academic learning center; faculty from education, nursing, and psychology; campus staff representing the dean's office and critical operations areas; and two leaders of SDSU Mesa Campus areas whose work directly supports the SDSU Imperial Valley campus (the vice provost of academic affairs and the director of program evaluation, compliance, and assessment)

The team member toured the new Brawley STEM building and visited an undergraduate course meeting being held at the Brawley location.

Materials examined during this review included the institutional report and its exhibits and linked evidence; the campus website; WSCUC records regarding SDSU's off-campus locations, the previous reaffirmation review's reports and Commission Action Letter; the SDSU strategic plan; statistical dashboards reporting enrollment and student success data for SDSU Imperial Valley; and the SDSU Catalog describing the SDSU Imperial Valley academic offerings.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?	SDSU IV Brawley is not a newly approved site.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> 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 1.1, 3.1, 3.6, 4.1)	As mentioned in the self-study, SDSU IV is a strategic investment in educational opportunities in the Southern California region. SDSU conceives of SDSU IV as an extension of goals and objectives currently pursued by SDSU overall. SDSU IV, which includes the Brawley location, is incorporated into the strategic plan activities in the “ <u>We Are SDSU</u> ” plank.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Connection to the Institution.</i> 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 1.5, 2.10, 4.3)	Brawley students, similar to SDSU IV students, are involved in Associated Students in the Imperial Valley to ensure local student representation, which oversees student organizations and conducts events in Calexico and Brawley. Associated Students at IV and SD co-host leadership opportunities and events The SDSU IV <u>Cross-Cultural Center</u> intersects with other centers in Student Affairs and Campus Diversity.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> 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 2.5, 3.1, 3.6)	SDSU IV-Brawley, as a part of SDSU IV, is incorporated into the <u>administrative structure</u> through the dean, and budgetary oversight is conducted through the <u>budgetary procedures</u> adhered to throughout SDSU. The physical space at Brawley consists of two instructional buildings – one of which is the recently added Lab space. SDSU IV is supported by a local IT team that prioritizes course instructional support. Interactive videoconferencing allows students in Imperial Valley to access courses and instructors on the San Diego campus.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Student Support Services.</i> 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 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.6, 3.10, 4.34.1)	SDSU IV students have access to resources on the SDSU campus through a variety of onsite and remote options, including access to counseling and mental health services, food pantry, and advising. There are also extensions of the <u>Library</u> and <u>student services</u> at SDSU IV in Calexico. Student Services are incorporated into the assessment structure within Student Affairs and Campus Diversity.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Faculty.</i> 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 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.8)	There are both contingent and tenured/tenure-track faculty that teach at Brawley; these faculty are considered as part of the SDSU IV structure. SDSU IV faculty have designated seats in the University Senate and participate in a local Faculty Council on a monthly basis; the SDSU IV faculty also are included in their respective discipline department/school at the San Diego campus to be involved with curriculum development and administration. SDSU IV programs are assessed independently from the San Diego campus programs in Nuventive, but the SDSU IV programs are not disaggregated to the Brawley campus level.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> 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, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 4.2)	SDSU IV Brawley programs are primarily “mirrored” from the San Diego campus programs with few minor adjustments. Programs and courses are approved based on the <u>curriculum process</u> through the shared governance procedures. Programs and courses at Brawley are held to the same standards of content and outcomes as those delivered at the San Diego campus. Department Chairs and Associate Deans from the various colleges represented at SDSU IV are consulted on course modalities (face to face or online preferences), learning outcomes, and course expectations.	No follow-up necessary.

<i>Retention and Graduation.</i> 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 programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)	All <u>student data</u> is disaggregated by campus: San Diego and Imperial Valley. Unique data only about Brawley students is not disaggregated in the same way. Historically, Imperial Valley has primarily enrolled ~300 new upper-division transfers per year. Their retention and 2-year graduation rates typically exceed those of students on the SD campus and 4-year rates are very similar. First-time full-time students enrollments have historically been limited to only several dozen students per year (compared to more than 6,000 FTFT on the SD campus), leading to rates that can have wide deviations from year to year due to the small number of students. SDSU IV has expanded its 4 year degree options and now has more first year students, raising student enrollment from 800 transfer students to 1300 lower division, upper division, teaching credential students, and graduate students. SDSU IV has a strong sense of belonging and helps students complete their degrees through faculty and staff engagement and support.	No follow-up necessary.
---	---	--------------------------------

<i>Student Learning.</i> 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 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5)	Brawley programs have the same assessment requirements as they do at SDSU IV and San Diego. The Brawley assessment data is entered in the assessment platform <u>Nuventive</u>, but not disaggregated from the SDSU IV programs. San Diego campus has 85% of programs with assessment results, with 80% student success; SDSU IV programs have 88% programs reporting results, with 87% student success.	No follow-up necessary.
<i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> 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 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)	Brawley is held to the same quality assurance processes as SDSU: faculty and staff interact with the San Diego campus regularly and student support services are incorporated into the San Diego processes, see Exhibit 2.07 for an example.	No follow-up necessary.