

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
To SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

MARCH 6-8, 2013

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Educational Effectiveness Review

Dorothy Leland, Chair, University of California, Merced
Doris Ching, Assistant Chair/Team Editor, University of Hawaii System
Bethami A. Dobkin, Saint Mary's College of California
Karen Graham, Chapman University
Ethelynda E. Harding, California State University, Fresno
Caryn McTighe Musil, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Richard Osborn, Staff Liaison, Western Association of Schools and Colleges

The team evaluated the institution under the WASC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. 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 WASC website

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of San Francisco State University and Visit	3
B. The Educational Effectiveness Review Report:	6
• Alignment with the Proposal	6
• Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report	6
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review	10
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS	17
Essay 1: Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement	17
Essay 2: Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile	27
Essay 3: Improving Student Success in Graduation and Learning	30
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	35
• Institutional Purposes	
• Integrity	
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	40
• Teaching and Learning	40
• Scholarship and Creative Activity	44
• Support for Student Learning and Success	45
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organization Structures to Ensure Sustainability	46
• Faculty and Staff	49
• Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources	50
• Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes	51
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	52
• Strategic Thinking and Planning	52
• Commitment to Learning and Improvement	53
SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	59
A. Outcomes	
B. Commendations	59
C. Recommendations	61

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, MARCH 6-8, 2013

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. The Institution and Visit

Background Information

Founded in 1899, San Francisco State University (SF State) is the fourth oldest of the California State University (CSU) System of 23 comprehensive, polytechnic and maritime universities that provide access to all students qualified for undergraduate admission. SF State's mission statement reflects commitment to quality instruction and support for scholarship and creative activities. Located in the setting of San Francisco, SF State offers baccalaureate degrees in 123 academic areas; 27 credential programs; 35 certificate programs; 62 master's degrees; and 4 doctoral degrees. SF State has 3,149 faculty and staff. Its enrollment of more than 30,000 students includes more than 26,350 undergraduates and nearly 4,000 graduate students.

Accreditation History

SF State has sustained continuous accreditation over six decades. Its accreditation was reaffirmed in 2001 at which time the Commission acted to schedule the Institutional Proposal for the 2-stage review to be received in October 2008, followed by the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) in spring 2011 and Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in spring 2012. In 2011, the Commission received SF State's CPR team report and acted to continue accreditation and reschedule the EER visit from fall 2012 to spring 2013, which is 24 months following the CPR evaluation of spring 2011. The Commission also requested that SF State incorporate in its EER report its response to

issues raised in the action letter regarding ongoing state funding challenges and institutional research.

The EER Visit

The EER visit on March 6-8, 2013 included 30 meetings with various groups and committees selected to provide information and evidence that enhanced the team members' understanding of the institution's practices for evaluating student learning and use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning, alignment of institutional resources with achievement of goals and objectives for educational effectiveness, and program reviews. One team member analyzed the program review of public administration; other programs were reviewed in general through documents and meetings with faculty, administrators, and staff. As described in this report, all of the meetings enhanced the team's understanding of the institution's respective processes and finding of evidence that SF State has taken seriously and established a core commitment to educational effectiveness.

It should be noted that SF State's 2011 CPR and current EER visits coincided with the state of California's most severe financial predicament and unprecedented near-crisis situation that have impacted all of the state's public higher education institutions.

San Francisco State University combined gracious hospitality with presentations of an academic program and faculty and student research projects. A reception hosted by SF State was combined with a poster session of an impressive array of faculty and student research projects funded by various external foundations and funding agencies, and the dinner featured the work of students in SF State's hospitality program. The EER

visit also included a brief tour of SF State's newly renovated award-winning J. Paul Leonard Library.

The EER Schedule and Campus Participation.

Throughout the visit, all official meetings and interviews with relevant groups and individuals were informative, engaging, and meaningful. The 35 faculty and 36 staff who attended their respective open meetings with the team were forthright in relating their experiences and observations of teaching, program review and assessment of learning. Thirty-five email messages were received via the secured email account from students, faculty, and staff. All emails were considered by the team in our deliberations, meetings, and in the preparation of this report to the campus and the Commission.

Review of MBA and EdD Programs

The EER visit included a review of the SF State MBA program (in Nice, France), offered by SF State's College of Business in partnership with the IAE School of Business at the University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis (UNS) in Nice, France. The University of Nice-Sophia Antipolis, founded in 1965, is accredited by the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research and is a public, research university with about 28,000 students located on 13 campuses in Nice and nearby communities. The campus serves about 800 master's and 100 doctoral students and includes a new library.

The SFSU-UNS program was approved by WASC in 2006 and launched its first cohort in 2009. Enrollment has grown from ten students in 2009-2010 to sixteen students in 2012-2013. The program consists of ten advanced business courses, of 48 contact hours each, as required and in conformance with the MBA from SF State's College of Business and is consistent with the original proposal approved by WASC. All courses are

taught in English with use of English-language instructional materials. Four courses are taught at UNS in the fall by UNS and SFSU faculty, and four courses are taught in the SFSU College of Business in the spring. The program consists of a combination of courses taught in traditional face-to-face classroom settings and blended on-line/in-person format using a variety of distance learning technologies. Student evaluations of faculty and the technology used have been conducted after each course, and improvements based on the results of the evaluation have been made in a timely manner. Outcomes assessment of student learning is at the early stages, and intentional steps should be taken to assure that outcomes assessment becomes more ingrained as the program becomes further integrated into the SF State on-campus MBA.

A review of the doctor of education (Ed.D) program in educational leadership, as required by WASC in the fifth year of such programs, coincided with the EER visit. As is consistent with the practice of WASC, the report of the Ed.D review is submitted to the Commission in a separate report.

B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report

Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

SF State's EER themes, *Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement*, *Facing the Challenges of A Changing Faculty and Student Profile*, and *Improving Student Success in Graduation and Learning* reflect the university's seriousness and sincerity in addressing the issues and concerns put forth in its Institutional Proposal and the 2011 CPR review team's report.

Organized thematically, the EER report aligns with the Capacity and Preparatory Review, is consistent with the Proposal, addresses WASC Standards 1 through 4, and

presents an accurate and candid portrayal of SF State. There is evidence that the preparation of the EER report was a university-wide collaboration of campus constituencies who participated actively in the meetings of the Steering Committee and subcommittees that gathered evidence, considered relevant issues, and refined research questions to assure thorough review of SF State's themes of *social justice and civic engagement, the changing university, and student success*, which are congruent with WASC standards, consistent with SF State's Proposal, and indicative that the review was rigorous and sincere in its efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs with a special focus on program review and the alignment of institutional resources to achieve SF State's educational objectives.

As discussed in its EER report, the developing *culture of assessment* at SF State has enabled coherence among curriculum, learning outcomes, knowledge and skills to support students' aspirations. Many of SF State's faculty have discovered the assessment process to be a useful means to measure work, link academic programs to resource allocations, make continuous improvement and progress, and demonstrate achievement of educational effectiveness.

Institutional Proposal's EER Expected Outcomes

Nine educational effectiveness issues were identified in the Proposal with the following *expected outcomes* that were thoroughly discussed in the EER Report:

1. *The values of social justice, equity, and civic engagement permeate the curriculum and research and scholarly activity.*

SF State created opportunities to identify, celebrate, and refine the infusion of social justice and equity in scholarship, teaching, the curricula, and service,

including a forum, review of externally funded projects, assessment of courses, review of institutional assessment data, and evaluation of the 6th Cycle of Academic Program Review. SF State also developed a civic engagement *marketing plan* to increase awareness of the numerous available opportunities. Finally, a content analysis of courses validated that social justice and civic engagement are infused in academic and co-curricular programs.

2. *Enrollment controls will impact student learning.*

Extensive revisions and implementation of policies and practices to improve graduation have been made over the past two years by SF State's *Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI)* task force, and the work of that SSGI task force is already indicating positive results.

3. *Students now learn differently from previous populations of students and SF State will need to adjust its pedagogy, technology, and curriculum.*

SF State has made significant progress in Academic Technology and Operations, resulting in numerous advancements in faculty and student use of technology in teaching and learning, assuring educational quality and integrity, best practices, and reliable technology infrastructures that are integrated within the campus technology environment. Their efforts have been validated by recognition for excellence in several technology-supported learning course delivery systems within the CSU System and national grant programs.

4. *SF State's programs have evolved with the hiring of new faculty, who may be unaware of the changing learning approaches and may need assistance in realigning their teaching approaches to students' ways of learning.*

With more than 50% of its faculty hired since 2000, SF State has conducted needs assessment, surveys, and focus groups to determine the faculty's changing perceptions and concerns. Strategies have been identified and implemented to improve communication and training, support, and mentoring opportunities.

5. *Program assessment results will: a) vary among disciplines and departments; b) student service units will implement learning oriented assessment processes; c) transformational learning occurs outside of the classroom for many students.*

SF State has begun to develop a campus culture of assessment which is being integrated into curriculum planning and development. Student Affairs/Enrollment Management (SAEM) is now in its fourth cycle of outcomes-based assessment that has changed its development and delivery of student services to support the significant out-of-classroom learning experiences of students. Assessment methodology for General Education is currently being developed.

6. *Focus on assessment results and needed changes to the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement and Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Discipline; and 6th Cycle program review.*

SF State has reaffirmed its two-decades of deep commitment to students' writing proficiency. The implementation of its campus-wide Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) now involves writing curricula and pedagogy as well as research on writing by faculty across the disciplines. An indicator of GWAR's positive results is that SF State students write more and show higher levels of confidence in writing than students in comparable institutions, as expressed in the past two NSSE surveys.

7. *Successful students have skills to succeed upon entry to college or have learned to navigate the bureaucracy to get needed assistance, while not so successful students lack academic preparation, need remediation, are challenged by job and family responsibilities, and are in highly enrolled majors causing difficulty in getting courses they need.*

Efforts of the Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI) to increase student achievement include data analysis, Milestone Study, AAC&U's high impact practices and learning communities, and collaboration of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The significant rise of the one-year retention rates for fall 2010 entry freshmen indicates a positive direction. Continued efforts are being made to reach students who need greater support for academic success.

8. *SF State noted that students' obligations, that are neither related to school nor their academic preparation, may impact the results of the General Education assessment of student learning.*

Development of an assessment plan has been a challenge in the implementation of SF State's new General Education program. However, SF State is persisting to assure its completion with careful attention to the areas of concern.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)

During the course of its 2011 site visit, the CPR team distilled its report's 18 recommendations to five prioritized recommendations. The following is SF State's responses to the five prioritized and 18 original recommendations with a summary of the progress made regarding each recommendation. The statements of progress were validated through the EER team's review of documents,

meetings with individuals and groups, and other observations during the EER visit, and are further discussed in relevant sections of this report, under the respective standards.

Prioritized Recommendations.

- i. Campus decisions regarding budget cuts should incorporate considerations of the University's mission and strategic priorities. Included in discussions of mission should be an effort to clarify the definition of social justice for the campus.*

After much discussion on preserving the strategic priorities of social justice and civic engagement, SF State determined that defining social justice and equity might create artificial and exclusionary definitions that may not fit within the campus definition. Instead, SF State created opportunities to refine the campus' greater understanding of the infusion of social justice and equity across scholarship, teaching, curricula, and service. This issue is further discussed in section 1.0 of the EER report.

- ii. Academic Affairs and enrollment management should work together to develop methodologies for departments to analyze their optimal size given their current resources, and they should align their academic planning and budgeting within these analyses.*

Shortly following the 2011 CPR visit, the SF State President announced his retirement. Rather than initiate a planning process that might be changed when a new president is selected, the campus delayed any new planning activities until

the arrival of the new president. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the campus has begun to analyze and develop a new process.

- iii. The University should continue the work of the Facilitating Graduation Initiative 2 as planned. The effort should include the incorporation of academic technology into the academic programs as appropriate and the continuation of the new Student Life Initiative. Assessment of the impact of these changes on student learning should be incorporated into these efforts.***

Since Fall 2011, the Student Success and Graduation Initiative has expanded to include faculty who have worked on *high impact practices* over the past year and a half. Many administrative changes have been put in place to assist students in graduating. SF State is continuing data analysis while instituting effective pedagogies. This is further discussed in Section 3.1 of the EER report.

- iv. Changes resulting from recent budget cuts have altered the workload of many faculty members. The role that each Retention Tenure Promotion area (i.e., teaching, professional achievement and growth, and service) in the evaluation of faculty needs to be clarified and evaluated carefully in an era of scarce resources.***

Throughout the EER, the Dean of Faculty worked collaboratively with the Professional Development Council to bring together faculty for conversations regarding RTP, research, and scholarship. Short term and long term plans were developed to address these issues and provide support for faculty. The issues are fully discussed in sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 of the EER Report.

- v. *The University should finalize the new baccalaureate degree requirements and begin the certification of courses, implementation, and assessment of the program as soon as possible. These efforts include continuation of the assessment of GVAR and the new WAC/WID program, which are important elements of the new baccalaureate degree requirements.*

The Baccalaureate Requirements Implementation Committee has engaged in reviewing and certifying new GE courses since Fall 2011, and the university assessment committee has engaged in researching and discussing the assessment process for the new GE program. All departments now offer a GVAR course. Assessment of these classes is ongoing, and a number of faculty are involved with researching and publishing their findings related to the GVAR. This is further discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Responses to Other CPR Recommendations.

1. *Campus decisions regarding budget cuts should incorporate considerations of the University's mission and strategic priorities. Included in the discussion of mission should be an effort to clarify the definition of social justice for the campus. [CFR 1.1, 1.2]*

The EER includes a number of activities intended to preserve the strategic priorities of social justice and civic engagement.

2. *To enable continued support for community based learning, the University should determine whether to award academic credit to students for community based learning. [CFR 2.1, 2.2]*

Credit now exists for service learning courses

3. *A task force should be created to recommend how to increase awareness of civic engagement opportunities for students. [CFR 1.2, 2.2]*

The EER subcommittee on civic engagement developed a plan to increase awareness in this area.

4. *The University would benefit from an ombudsman (an advocate) or office specifically designed to handle discrimination-related issues. [CFR 1.5, 2.13]*

Although the previous president was not in favor of such a position, the current president will revisit this issue.

5. *Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management, located in Student Affairs, should work together to develop methodologies for departments to analyze their optimal size given their current resources, and they should align their academic planning and budgeting within these analyses. [CFR 3.5]*

This recommendation is being addressed in the new planning effort, *Building for Capacity Task Force*, which was just initiated this 2012-13 Academic Year.

6. *The University should continue the work of the Facilitating Graduation Initiative as planned and as required by the CSU. [CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.7]*

As discussed in section 3.1 of the EER report, the SSGI Task Force has worked continuously and consistently on data analysis, pedagogical approaches, and co-curricular programs in the past 18 months, in accordance with the SF State plan and CSU Chancellor's initiative.

7. *The University should finalize the new baccalaureate degree requirements and begin the certification of courses, implementation, and assessment of the GE program as soon as possible. [CFR 2.1, 2.2]*

As noted in section 3.2 of the EER report and major recommendation v (above), SF State has made great strides in both the baccalaureate degree requirements and certification of courses.

8. *The University should continue to implement the GVAR by gathering data on the effectiveness of the GVAR courses on student writing, and make adjustments to the WAC/WID WID program based on data gathered. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6]*

As stated in section 3.3 of the EER report, the GVAR is now fully effectual.

9. *The University should continue to study the issues related to the Level 2 graduate writing requirement and should consider requiring departments to implement Level 2 writing assessment before the culminating experience begins. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6]*

The Council on Written English Proficiency recommended that this recommendation be set aside until the Level 1 writing requirement was fully implemented.

10. *Invest in Institutional Research efforts. [CFR 4.5]*

SF State has hired a new IR director, statistician, and web designer.

11. *Assess the kinds and levels of support required for continued progress in outcomes and assessment of student learning. [CFR 2.3]*

Outcomes assessment remains a concern and is discussed further in the EER team report.

12. *Revisit the RTP policy in order to align these requirements with resources. Resources needed to fulfill the current vision of research and scholarly activities. [CFR 3.3, 3.4]*

This issue is being addressed by the short term and long term strategies developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs in the EER review. See sections 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5.

13. *The Center for Faculty Teaching and Development should develop a clear focus and leadership structure. [CFR 3.4]*

This recommendation was also covered in faculty discussions that are presented in Section 2.2.3.

14. *The charge, composition, and future of UPAC should be clarified. [CFR 4.1]*

UPAC was officially disbanded in spring 2012 after the completion of the College reorganization. The new president will initiate a new strategic planning process during the 2012-2013 Academic Year.

15. *University Advancement should develop a comprehensive planning process by expanding the processes that are in place. [CFR 4.1,4.2, 4.3]*

Over the past year and a half, SF State Advancement has initiated a comprehensive planning process.

16. *The University should provide a comfortable place where faculty, staff, and administration can meet socially. [CFR 3.4]*

The newly renovated library has a Faculty Commons area.

17. *Steps should be taken to address the low morale of faculty and staff due to diminished resources for professional development.* [CFR 3.3, 3.4]

HR has begun a campus-wide Employee Assistance Program to help mitigate low morale. See section 2.6.

18. *The University should continue to incorporate academic technology into the academic program as appropriate and assess the impact of these pedagogical changes on student learning.* [CFR 3.6, 3.7]

Academic technology has been incorporated into the academic program, as discussed in section 3.4 of the EER report.

19. *Student Affairs should continue to develop co-curricular offerings that enrich the SF State student experience.* [CFR 2.3]

As discussed in section 2.1 of the EER report, several new initiatives have been implemented to enhance the student experience in student life, mental health and wellness, and Latino educational effectiveness.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

ESSAY 1. Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement

Defining Institutional Purposes

It is testimony to the institution's unwavering commitment to social justice and, more recently, to civic engagement as core values defining San Francisco State University that the university has chosen this institutional investment as one of the key

themes of their WASC review (1.1). Their ambitious, if not yet reached, goal is that such values will animate all of its graduates in their professional and community lives. The institution is taking steps to make those aspirations more likely. Evidence of institutional commitment to this goal was evident everywhere and in the language and driving spirit of almost everyone the WASC team spoke with during its visit. Additional evidence of the institution's commitment to social justice is offered by the decision to focus in the WASC EER report on student access, retention, and success (1.1). The latter themes are an expression of striving to model social justice within institutional practices as SF State seeks to enact democratic institutional values by working to assure equal access high quality higher education to underserved students in the state of California. The logic of linking a commitment to social justice and civic engagement is reinforced by new research indicating there is a correlation between being engaged in civic and social equity activities and increasing retention, academic achievement, and graduation rates. This is a fortuitous coupling.

That SF State has embraced and found strategies for not abandoning either social justice or civic engagement in the face of the draconian reduction in their overall budget during the difficult economic recession of the past several years is evidence in and of itself of their efforts since the CPR to ensure educational effectiveness in these select areas (4.1). Three notable decisions underscore SF State's commitment to core educational ends. SF State kept the College of Ethnic Studies intact when reducing the colleges by 25%. Then they created important synergies for advancing civic engagement by combining disciplines from what is now the School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE) and placing it in the College with one of the highest enrollments—

Health Sciences—which has an inherent orientation to public service and promoting the general welfare. The third notable decision was to shift the location structurally and physically of the Institute of Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE) so it has an academic home and is more visible to more students.

Efforts to define social justice have produced robust discussion, but not resolution other than a current consensus view that social justice best exists as one dean put it “in diversity and plurality.” Thus, while the committee charged to define social justice decided it would remain a more animating principle if not confined, the expectation was that each discipline and department would indeed define it within their contexts as they created learning objectives that had to be measured. Although politically strategic, leaving social justice as all-inclusive risks jeopardizing what might perhaps be an agreement about essential dimensions of social justice that should be driving the alignment of courses, learning goals, and resources. Without a definition or set of common understandings shared across the campus, SF State is likely to have difficulty in assessing what and whether students are learning about important dimensions of social justice. One example can be found within the General Education Requirements that list very specific learning expectations in each of its requirements, except for social justice which is among the most amorphous and limited of the learning outcomes. It shows again in the gap between general education requirements and the Senate-approved baccalaureate degree outcomes. Although the two sets of outcomes can be seen as related, the distinctiveness expressed in the “SF State of Mind” requirements is not as apparent in the language used in the six baccalaureate degree outcomes.

At some point, probably sooner rather than later, the community will need to reconcile the desire for a capacious and ever expansive notion of social justice with the need to assess how effectively students are learning about the dimensions of social justice and can demonstrate designated capabilities. However, it was apparent to the visiting team that social justice language was used easily and with respect by administrators, staff, and faculty alike across a broad swath of people rather than a predictable few. One person argued persuasively that it was “the shared bedrock of values of social justice that kept people together as a community” during this recent period of extreme financial distress and contraction. Another insisted that program review also requires departments and programs to speak to where and how social justice is operating, which seems to be the case in the files examined by the team.

Some aspects of the institution’s definition of social justice appear in language used about how to measure the number of courses with social justice emphases, how to define engaged scholarship, how to assess the effectiveness of the new general education with its social justice and civic engagement requirements, and what learning goals are for graduate students in the Graduate College of Education. Definitions did not seem to be an obstacle for the committee working on civic engagement, which was comfortable with the knowledge, skills, and values itemized by Tom Ehrlich in his influential definition of civic engagement. In the first years of the institution’s WASC committee structure, the social justice and civic engagement topics were combined but for a number of reasons of personnel shifts and size, they were divided for the EER report. It seems wise to bring those twinned principles and practices together again in some regularized way in the coming years to continue to enrich each other and investigate what differences,

complementarities, and similarities there might be in terms of learning goals for social justice and for civic engagement. The ultimate consensus will have an impact on developing multiple student pathways for these values across disciplines, determining what is deemed successful or benchmark levels within different learning outcomes, and how scholarship informed by these perspectives is fully acknowledged or not in RTP. It may be that the SF State community will backload rather than frontload the definitional descriptions of these two key commitments, but it will be important, eventually, to stake some territory about what each is and is not.

Progress on recommendations in CPR

In spite of the decision *not* to define social justice, a great deal of progress has been made in the past two years in addressing other recommendations about these themes. SF State is now, for instance, awarding additional credit hours for specified levels of community-based work (4.1); ICCE has been more aggressive and inventive about how to make students more aware of opportunities to engage with their local, national, and global communities (3.8); the new general education requirements are about to be launched where both values have more visible, across the board affirmation (4.1) ; and a committee has done some research to try to get a handle on how much penetration social justice as a theme occurs in the curriculum and faculty scholarship (4.3). With regard to the latter, the belief expressed in the WASC EER report that they have undercounted social justice courses was underscored on several occasions. The business school, for example, ranked itself far below other schools in its focus on social justice, but its own professional accreditation body commended the school for its emphasis on social justice and diversity. One issue might be that of disciplinary language habits that

might be behind the reference to “leadership” in business be implying leadership for responsible actions in a diverse society. The continuing commitment to discuss the meaning of social justice should probe the disciplinary and differential language used and peel back the more specified meanings implied by each.

Engaged Scholarship

Because research is a distinguishing characteristic of SF State and connected to faculty tenure and promotion, it is important that there is evidence that engaged scholarship is being undertaken and rewarded as revealed by the impressive statistics from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. That 43% of grant projects have a social justice and equity dimension is witness to the vibrant intellectual investigation of the issues and suggests faculty recognize—at least in most of the colleges—that such engaged scholarship is valued.

It is especially noteworthy that through the Scholarship Task Force report, so much progress has been made in moving toward a definition of what public or engaged scholarship actually is and the values that animate it. To do this requires definitions that had been avoided in the first part of the EER document but helpfully laid out in the language for engaged scholarship. Importantly, PACE will be reaffirming in its arena similar guidelines for what engaged scholarship is, so the perspectives and practice run deep within SF State, faculty expectations, and student experiences.

The next frontier for expanding such support and activity for engaged scholarship is illuminated by the breakdown across colleges where there are dramatic disparities (between 13.7% and 100%) in grant projects studying social justice and equity issues. If such learning is to cross disciplines and reach all students, support for its scholarship

needs to penetrate more evenly across colleges. Two exciting new arenas where nationally transformative scholarship and teaching are emerging are business, humanities and arts, and STEM fields, all three of which are lagging far behind their colleagues, at least when using the terms that the EER Social Justice Committee employed to do its course survey. While, in a meeting, the sciences defined social justice to be reflected in reaching a diverse student body, engaged scholarship in the sciences would involve the content of science, the questions posed, and the methodology used which would carry many faculty in that college into new intellectual territory. As a catalyst for generating more coursework related to social justice, civic engagement, and equity dimensions, SF State might consider providing targeted professional development funds in disciplines, such as the sciences, business, and the liberal arts.

Educational Effectiveness Course Offerings and Outcomes in the Curricula

One of the key questions posed by SF State is whether students have ample opportunities through courses for expanding their learning about social justice and equity. One in four courses defines social justice and equity as a focus for disciplinary study. While the study revealed dispersed locations and levels of intensity for social justice investigations, these courses are not offered evenly across the colleges. It appears that the same colleges that had low evidence of engaged scholarship projects also are underrepresented in disciplinary courses that focus on these two institutional core values, though further examination of disciplinary language used should be followed through. Drawing faculty to become part of the academic infrastructure that fosters student learning in their personal and professional lives will be important to achieve in the coming years. Importantly, the result is that those colleges who lag behind in this arena

are depressing more positive outcomes for the institution as a whole and for opportunities where students studying different fields might benefit. So, overall, there appears to be impressive and deep evidence of courses with a social justice dimension offered in several colleges, but that cannot yet be said for all the colleges.

It should be noted that service learning seems to be gaining more traction across more disciplines in the college. Latina Studies has added an extra unit for service learning. Across Ethnic Studies as a college, community-based learning continues to be a distinguishing marker. There also is evidence that the move of ICCE to new centralized space on campus and to the College of Health and Social Sciences has spawned some affinity groups across disciplines, and not only disciplines within CHSS. For example, inclusion of the College of Business among four colleges with a promising new multi-disciplinary focus on social entrepreneurship bodes well for deep penetration of those values across the campus.

In undergraduate education

Full implementation of the new general education requirements might help bridge the moats that seem to make some disciplines and colleges stand apart from social justice and civic engagement learning opportunities for their students. Implementation is now in process after having understandably been slowed by the financial crisis and the shift in presidents. Some of general education's current overlays (American Ethnic and Racial Minorities, Social Justice, Global Perspectives, and Environmental Sustainability) might provide yet another vehicle for reaching into the science course content itself. Some of the new topically clustered upper division courses might also accomplish this same goal of integrating social justice, equity, and civic engagement across the curriculum.

The excitement and specific plans about incorporating high impact practices across the curriculum, which was generated at an Association of American Colleges and Universities summer institute on student success and high impact practices, also promise convergence and integration. One of the high impact practices includes service learning, which will strengthen the civic engagement efforts at SF State. A second one is diversity and global learning, which encompasses SF State's social justice commitments. As one piece of evidence that SF State has moved toward a culture of assessment, their EER report indicates they have already begun to establish some baseline data now so they might measure the impact of the general education program when it is implemented in the coming years (4.4). Using NSSE gets at a few things but the Student Pulse survey seems to go more deeply (4.5). On some issues, SF State begins on a high floor with 69% of students reporting that courses have helped them embrace a personal responsibility to work toward social justice and equity in their communities. Clearly, some very good things are in place to reinforce and cultivate civic responsibility commitments. But, the campus also rightly names that it wants to have a stronger showing in community work with other peer institutions where the institution lags behind a bit despite the growth of this arena in recent years at SF State (4.6).

In graduate education

Within the Doctor of Education (EdD) program, which resides in the Graduate School of Education, social justice and equity concerns were highly valued. In Appendix J, of the five major curricular learning outcomes of the program, one was front and center focused on equity, diversity, and structural inequality, and it cited the longest set of outcomes. In a quick scan of its EdD full time faculty, over 60% specialized in social

justice, equity, and community-based learning areas (3.2). In terms of retention, which is a social justice issue, the EdD program also had a spectacular 100% retention rate for two years with the 2009 cohort of 20 students and while they have slipped to 89%, they are tracking higher than their first 2007 cohort (4.4). It was a bit puzzling that the annual student survey does not seem to ask about social justice or equity issues except in one item: “understand equity issues in my practice.” It fell into the mid range of 50%-69%, which was surprising since social justice seems to be so integral to the program from the documents we were given. Ability to promote community partnerships was rated low—below 50%, but perhaps that is not the methodology that is necessarily as central as other kinds of equity work for the EdD, although it will be important to any school district, administrators and teachers alike, as well as to colleges, which is where many of the graduates end up.

According to the EER report, what is true about the commitment to social justice and equity in the EdD program is true as well in nine of the fifteen graduate programs. Lots of examples were given in theater arts, psychology, geography, history, international relations, and elsewhere. Here, too, there is a commitment to doing a better job of capturing the actual evidence of learning outcomes in the future (4.6). And graduate students across programs were, according to the EER, encouraged to publish on social justice issues.

Forum on social justice and equity in the academy

Finally, the decision to hold a university wide forum on social justice and equity in the academy is one more way to spark involvement, emphasize commitments, and push colleagues and students alike to think more comprehensively about where such

learning could reside. The two panel questions about how one's field defines social justice and equity and how each is manifested in faculty work are both excellent questions that can lead to a creative examination of how to root such learning in specializations and move ever so slowly toward that elusive SF State definition of what the community means by social justice. It would expand the boundaries in the next discussion to include students as active voices on panels contributing through their intellectual agency to the overall understanding of what social justice in particular actually is to them. The same could be done for student affairs professional staff who should be tapped to discuss how social justice manifests itself and is measured in their work and in their scholarship.

ESSAY 2: Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile Responding to Changing Student Demographics

The SF State Educational Effectiveness Review Report notes: "SFSU's student enrollment data for the past 10 years reveal an institution changing in size, ratio of undergraduate and graduate students, and racial and ethnic demographics." Additional data suggest behavioral changes among students as well: "Enrollment data and NSSE results reveal that, while maintaining some commuter campus characteristics, SFSU has become a residential university where students work fewer hours and spend more time on campus." Recognition of these changing student demographics has led to intentional efforts at retention for more traditional undergraduate students, and campus support units are to be commended for effecting changes "needed to serve the growing student population." (CFR 2.3, 2.10, 2.13). Activities include social and event programming for undergraduate and an emphasis on student health and wellness driven by data on student behavior and satisfaction.

SF State is particularly well suited to deal with diverse and traditional undergraduates given the institution-wide emphasis on access, equity, and opportunity. Social justice values are expressed in the context of student support and intentional efforts to improving the persistence of low-income and first-generation students. Efforts at addressing the evolving student needs appear to have already positively affected student retention, with first-time, first-year student retention improving from 74.9% in 2007 to 80.1% in 2011, and some closing of the gap in graduation rates between white, non-Latino students, and under-represented minorities (CFR 2.10). Although living communities for students have yet to be fully developed, the Metro Academies approach might be used to further aid in student retention and success. The Metro Academies appears to be a fully realized learning community approach, with linked course for two years and student support services (e.g., financial aid, counseling, tutoring, academic advising, faculty collaborations on pedagogy and practice). The program is too new for ample outcome data, but early indications of improved first-year retention are promising.

The increasingly residential campus has also forced reconsideration of student curricular needs, such as the necessity of offering more lower-division course offerings. Collaboration among academic units has enabled the Office of Academic Resources to meet many of these emerging needs. Faculty and staff recognize that some of the general education “overlays” of social justice and civic engagement, and aspirations to extend service learning to lower division students will pose challenges for faculty workloads.

Changing Faculty Demographics and Faculty Development

This section of the EER Review Report identifies changes to the external environment that have affected faculty teaching, scholarship, and service. As the report

notes, both significant faculty turnover and the recent hiring of new faculty have resulted in an influx of faculty at the assistant and associate professor ranks. Furthermore, at the same time that students are becoming residential, faculty members are increasingly commuting greater distances. The campus is thus working to promote collaboration and community at a time of resource and physical challenges.

The 2011 CPR Team report recommended that faculty research and creative activity “be given more investment and alignment,” including various types of professional development support and “a change in the culture of expectation that research and creative activity are worthy.” The EER team noted several areas of substantial progress regarding faculty development, particularly in the support and recognition of research and creative activity. Efforts have included a faculty research and creative activities retreat with over 200 participants; numerous recognition events, work groups, and meetings in the new Faculty Commons; and robust attention to development in the use of instructional technology. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs reports an increase of \$9.1M in Research and Development expenditures since 2007, despite a net loss of over 100 faculty. Finally, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development has engaged in targeted research, such as faculty focus groups, to determine the type of support most appropriate and beneficial based on the career arc of faculty, leading to the launch of mentorship programs for newly tenured associate professors and faculty conversation groups to promote collaboration, across both programs and faculty ranks (CFR 3.4).

This support of faculty is commendable given the financial exigencies of the recent past. Several administrators noted the impact of faculty connecting their own

scholarship and creative activity with the work of students, and the support for community engagement activities resulting in benefits to local groups. These faculty/student collaborations are also resulting in external grants and national recognition. At the same time, however, some of the faculty seek greater clarification about the level of support for teaching and changes in departmental-level retention, tenure, and promotion criteria (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

Staff Morale

Since 2011, SF State has continued to respond to morale issues resulting from attrition, increased workplace roles and responsibilities, salary compression, and the general stress of uncertainty created by repeated budget contraction. The Employee Assistance Program may be providing some relief, and SF State has continued to use promotions and reclassifications to address some of the equity concerns of staff. During the visit, staff emphasized the importance of recognition, mobility, and internal promotion to improve morale and expressed the desire for more opportunities to participate in governance of the University, consistent with the social justice mission of the institution. SF State has yet to use assessment measures to determine the effectiveness of efforts to improve staff morale, such as workplace satisfaction or other surveys of campus climate.

ESSAY 3. Improving Student Success in Graduation and Learning

SF State is to be commended for the enthusiasm of its response to the CSU mandate to improve student retention and graduation rates and to decrease the discrepancy between success rates of underrepresented minority students and those of the student body as a whole. Between 2005 and 2010, six-year graduation rates improved

from 43% to 50% for non-underrepresented minority students and from 31% to 43% for underrepresented minority students. More directly attributable to recent efforts is the improvement of the first year freshman retention rate from mid-70% in the previous five years to 81.1% for the Fall 2010 entry class. The effectiveness of the Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI) to enhance student success and improve graduation rates reflects strong collaboration between Academic and Student Affairs. Furthermore, efforts in this area provide a model for the use of internal research to drive decision-making (CFR 4.4, 4.5). Early attempts to enhance student success captured low-hanging fruit – policy actions that could be taken without requiring intensive faculty involvement or changes in the classroom. The Milestone Study provided such convincing evidence of the value of programs providing academic support to targeted communities of learners that “Metro Academy” programs are being developed within academic programs and will target one-fourth of the incoming freshmen (CFR 2.10). While the EER mentions efforts to develop a “culture of graduation” among students and faculty, this work seems to be in very early stages and could benefit from comprehensive planning as well as the preliminary marketing that is already in place.

More directly related to the classroom experience is the plan to foster the development of high-impact practices (HIPs) <http://www.aacu.org/meetings/psr09/documents/HighImpactPractices.pdf> as presented to a team that attended an AAC&U-sponsored conference. The HIP study group is first proposing expanding the number and breadth of first-year experience courses and later, as has been recommended in the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) report and approved by the Academic Senate, implementing capstone classes within the

majors. Additional HIPs (learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, and service or community-based learning) are already in place or are a good fit with the SF State culture. Consistent with SF State's experience with the Metro Academy, common features of HIPs include small cohorts of students working together across disciplines with high student engagement and personal responsibility. Over time, the campus may want to consider systematic expansion of some of these HIPs similar to recent efforts to develop the GVAR. SF State might particularly want to explore actions that could raise their NSSE survey results on service learning to reflect the value the campus places on service learning and community-based learning (CFR 2.4).

As evidenced by NSSE results and internal assessments, the new GVAR has been a notable success. All programs have developed disciplinary courses that emphasize writing and build on two introductory composition courses. To support the discipline-based writing courses, the emphasis in the introductory course has been shifted from literary to research skills. The campus is providing additional support for students and both marketing to and support of faculty. Faculty members are beginning formal assessment of student writing skills and students, faculty members, and the writing directors are engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning around efforts to improve student writing (CFR 2.9). These studies show that the progression of writing courses results in substantial improvement in student writing skills as student writing in the disciplines becomes more sophisticated with more technical vocabulary, more complex sentences, the use of specialized research methods, and greater awareness of disciplinary ways of thinking and understanding. Impressively, the research indicates that

students transferred what they learned in the sophomore composition class, especially strategies for composing papers and reading difficult texts, to their disciplinary writing courses. The work on improving student writing could serve as a model for other efforts to adopt or expand high impact practices and to expand faculty use of pedagogical strategies that have been shown to improve student success, especially for at-risk and underrepresented minority students. Student achievement of the Educational Goals for Baccalaureate Achievement at SF State will depend upon faculty adoption of sophisticated teaching approaches, many of which are difficult to use effectively without encouragement and support (CFR 3.4).

SF State is a leader in academic technology with special expertise in the areas of Moodle programming, lecture capture, and e-portfolio implementation. Working with an external consultant and the provost's Academic Operations Officer, technology units are streamlining their services to avoid duplication, reduce costs, and make it easier for clients to access their services. Academic Technology provides responsive service and many training opportunities for faculty using a very effective team-based support model, and faculty participation in training has increased dramatically over the past three years (CFR 3.4). Faculty sophistication has improved such that several faculty members have requested more advanced project-based learning opportunities in which they would develop materials for their own classes. Overall, faculty and student active use of the learning management system exceeds the national average.

Program Review and Assessment

SF State has many fine academic programs (CFR 2.1). Products of recent program reviews demonstrate that program faculty and the Academic Program Review Committee

take program review seriously. However, formalized outcomes assessment was not a strong component of the most recent set of reviews, and programs vary widely in the extent to which they document their effectiveness or use data on student learning to improve courses and curricula. In response to the previous WASC accreditation review, the current program review cycle, carried out college-by-college, focuses on graduate programs. While synchronized review results in less frequent improvement of the review process, it also facilitates revision of the process between cycles. Such revision, as well as modifications of committee structures or responsibilities, is needed for the next review cycle so that outcomes assessment and the use of student learning outcomes data can become integral to program review (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7).

Assessment of an entire academic program is more complex than for a single expectation and requires several components and many programs have risen to this challenge. However, not all course syllabi currently include learning outcomes and departmental acceptance of outcomes assessment has been uneven (CFR 2.3). Although program review is the purview of the faculty, progress will depend in part on building a process that leads to real consequences. This will require a commitment by academic leadership at the college and university level, as well as by the faculty.

Several university-wide curricular initiatives are in place. The GVAR course proposal and outcomes assessment processes provide an example of good use of outcomes assessment. Baccalaureate degree requirements have been approved and the Assessment Advisory Committee is working to translate them into assessable forms. Courses proposed for the new general education program include student learning outcomes aligned with GE outcomes, though processes and a structure to evaluate student

achievement of those outcomes must be tested and in place by Fall 2014 when the program is to be implemented (CFR 2.4, 2.6). Several indirect measures of student learning are being used to good effect, including the NSSE and a student survey linked to course registration. While these provide valuable information, they cannot replace faculty engagement with direct measures of student learning.

SF State is committed to the use of data to inform decisions. Examples abound of the use of data gathered using surveys, analytics, or observation (CFR 2.10). The core mission of the institution, helping students learn, merits more systematic analysis leading to continued improvement.

STANDARD 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate and clearly and proudly define the essential values and character of San Francisco State University. This is especially evident in SF State's strong mission statement in which the traditional values of excellence in instruction and intellectual accomplishment is intertwined in repeated and emphatic ways with the value of diversity, broad access, and a commitment to the "cultural mosaic of the city of San Francisco and Bay Area." Those purposes are more explicitly articulated in SF State's strategic plan of 2005-2010 in which its core values of equity, social justice, and engagement of its intellectual, social, and cultural resources in partnership with its local community are identified as the first and sixth of seven goals.

Evidence of progress towards those goals are manifested in SF State's highly diverse student body and faculty, its increased efforts to document how well its students across different categories are succeeding academically and graduating, its support of

scholarship that addresses social justice and diversity issues, and the visibility of social justice courses that are increasingly complemented by a growing number of service learning and community based courses dispersed widely, though not evenly, across the six colleges. Additional evidence of progress toward SF State's goal is the participatory level of engagement in the WASC CPR and EER, as well as in routine shared governance that is robust at the university, both of which speak to the fifth strategic goal of participating fully in the college. Finally, evidence of progress toward the stated goals can be found in the achieved implementation of a broad based writing program at the graduate and undergraduate level through which student writing competencies can be assessed which is an enactment of the second strategic goal to make writing central. Evidence of the operational practices and their widespread accessibility to the SF State community can be found in the Human Resources, Safety, and Risk Management websites. (CFR 1.1)

The educational objectives are clearly recognized and increasingly consistent throughout the institution. Evidence of progress in this arena can be measured by the processes that are in place for accountability in this regard from all parts of the university. The 2005-2012 Strategic Plan listed measurable outcomes by its seven goals and strategies for achieving those objectives. Academic programs are required to submit their education objectives annually. SF State develops indicators for achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels. For example, departments are required to submit annual reports that articulate their educational objectives, faculty in each course are to articulate learning objectives in syllabi at the course level, and Academic Program Review is done across the campus in

regular six year sequenced schedules. The latter reflects the typically strong participation of faculty and staff leadership across the university. All of these materials are made public, as are data on student achievement, which are collected and assessed in a more comprehensive, strategic, and routine manner. The latter, in turn, is more automatically used to inform improvement in achieving educational objectives. (CFR 1.2)

The strategic goal's commitment to participatory engagement across the campus is enacted in the tiered and largely collaborative ways the faculty, staff, and administration share governance, listen to one another, and evince a respectful interaction as they deliberate about how to address different issues at the university. The last five years have tested the sturdiness of shared leadership in difficult times and under great duress. From the team visit it appears that the equivalent of Hurricane Sandy on the west coast nearly devastating public higher education in California has left SF State still standing and its leadership system stronger than ever across levels. Faculty and administrators alike expressed concern that system policy precluded a fully equivalent leadership body for staff, and for this reason, some "faculty" leadership committees pointedly include staff representation to bring in all voices and tap all leaders.

There are strong infrastructures for leadership through standing committees, ad hoc committees, college and departmental leadership, and student affairs leadership and the opportunities for informal leadership appear equally vibrant. The expectations for high performance and accountability are pervasive across the board. The existing policies for reviewing the president, academic administrators, and department chairs are available on multiple places on the SFSU website. (CFR 1.3)

SF State’s mission statement articulates its aspiration toward an “environment for learning that provides respect for and appreciation of scholarship, freedom, and human diversity.” That oxygen encourages a healthy open, engaged campus culture and robust discussions about issues of significance and conviction. The website makes this university-wide commitment visible to all as do the Guidelines for Academic Freedom and Responsibilities designed for faculty, staff, and students. The university’s Academic Freedom Committee responds to incidents that come before it of alleged infringement of academic freedom. The university has due process procedures for grievances in place which are disseminated in the university’s bulletin and faculty manual. (CFR 1.4)

SF State is the gold standard for its commitment to diversity as an educational, intellectual, and talent resource and for living out that value in daily demonstrable ways. Its mission statement, most recent strategic plan, central themes of the WASC review, educational objectives, scholarly production, curricular programs, and co-curricular life—are all manifestations of not merely aspiring to be responsive to diversity but embracing it wholeheartedly as the intellectual and civic lifeblood of the university. Evidence of *walking the walk* and not simply *talking the talk* is found in the diversity of the student body by many markers and at higher percentages than most other comparable institutions. It is found in the hiring policies that have resulted in a diverse faculty and staff far exceeding the usual percentages at comparable universities. Finally, it is manifested in the hiring of diverse staff.

The Office of Human Resources monitors compliance with the Affirmative Action policies in place, but one gets the sense that at SF State the hiring is done not out of compliance but out of recognition of the ways in which diverse leadership and talent

contribute to a vigorous, dynamic academic community. The new general education program in the midst of being implemented offers one more testimony to the manifestation of commitment to the value of diversity. (CFR 1.5)

By all apparent evidence, SF State operates autonomously without affiliations with any particular political, corporate, or religious organization and with education as its primary purpose. As a public institution within the State of California, its function and practice are to offer educational opportunities and credentials to its students. (CFR 1.6)

The WASC team saw evidence that SF State's academic goals, programs, and requirements were articulated clearly and are visible in several forms to students from the university bulletin to departmental websites, and to the SF State overall website. There is evidence that indicate its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion and that students are treated fairly and equitably through published policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, and refunds. While the severe cuts in resources have made it challenging for some students to get all the courses they need to graduate, the Undergraduate Advising Center and academic departments work to help students map a timely path to graduation. The university has also devised a program called the registrar's roadmap that helps students map a path in their chosen degree area. The intensified focus within and pressure from without on graduation rates will make timely graduation periods all the more likely to be met.

In terms of grievances and human subject procedures, the SF State Academic Senate has developed policies on both. To supplement this, the University has designated a compliance officer and office for the protection of human and animal subjects.

Financial transparency and procedure are demonstrated by the fee refund schedules posted online by the SF State Bursar's Office. (CFR 1.7)

The WASC team noted that the finances were regularly audited by external agencies and SFSU has fair, published, and enforced processes related to students', faculty, and staff rights which are published and enforced. Student Affairs has a student complaint office while the Academic Senate produced the grievance policies and procedures for faculty and staff. (CFR 1.8)

From the openness, receptivity, and seriousness with which the university has communicated with the WASC team in preparation for this visit, the team believes the larger Accrediting Commission is experiencing a similar thoroughness and positive response. The appointment of the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development as the liaison with the visiting team and the Commission is evidence of the institution's having put the review process in capable, conscientious hands. (CFR 1.9)

STANDARD 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

SF State's educational programs are appropriate for their levels, and faculty numbers are sufficient to ensure quality. The quality of academic programs is monitored through an internal program review process that enforces the institution's explicit and high standards for curriculum, faculty, and enrollment. The current program review standards (which are being applied to graduate programs) consider, among other issues, numbers of students and faculty as well as the quality of curriculum. Twenty-eight academic programs are also subject to discipline specific external accreditation. (CFR 2.1)

Entry-level expectations for undergraduate students, both first-year and transfer, are clear and clearly communicated in the SF State Bulletin. Entry-level expectations and admissions procedures for graduate students are accessed through program web sites. Graduate entry qualifications are being revised at the university level. Structured curricula, including explicitly defined general education requirements, clearly sum to more than a simple accumulation of credit or units. (CFR2.2) Learning outcomes are discussed under CFR 2.3.

SF State offers 78 baccalaureate degrees in 123 academic areas (78 academic areas and 45 areas of concentration), providing in-depth programs of study. Both the current and planned general education programs are consistent with CSU policy, geared towards core learning requirements, and include upper division courses. SF State is especially skillful in offering programs that actively foster “an understanding of diversity, civic responsibility...” The new general education program will allow students to complete their 9 units of upper division breadth requirements in one of three ways: 1) complete one of nine topical perspective areas, 2) complete an integrated studies option, or 3) study abroad. The recently approved baccalaureate degree outcomes include competencies for lifelong intellectual endeavor, breadth in principal domains of knowledge, human diversity, ethical choices, and integration and application of knowledge. (CFR 2.2a.)

At the master’s degree level, 62 majors are available, along with 4 applied doctorates. The graduate culture is strong, with high expectations for research and participation in professional and national associations. (CFR 2.2b)

Good progress is being made in stating and communicating expectations for general education and at the university level. The SF State Academic Senate recently approved baccalaureate degree outcomes (see CFR 2.2a) and indicated target points in the curriculum for outcomes assessment. The baccalaureate degree outcomes are being translated into learning outcomes by the University Assessment Advisory Committee. Learning outcomes are in place for the new general education program to be implemented Fall 2014. Nearly all academic programs have developed learning outcomes. However, course level outcomes are not yet included in all course syllabi. (CFR 2.3)

SF State has made development and dissemination of expectations for student learning a recent focus. As already mentioned, Academic Senate has recently approved baccalaureate degree outcomes. The faculty is responsible for establishing and reviewing the attainment of learning outcomes. However, processes for outcomes assessment of student learning and program review are currently not well integrated. (CFR 2.4)

The Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement provides a strong example of engaged learning including providing students with feedback on their work as do many of the course expectations prescribed for general education courses. Some academic programs employ a number of effective pedagogical approaches such as service learning, case analysis, and project-based learning and many have developed rubrics for assessing student learning. The extent to which rubrics used for program level outcomes assessment are also used to provide feedback to students is not clear from the materials we reviewed. (CFR 2.5)

For the baccalaureate degree outcomes and general education program, evidence that students have attained stated levels of achievement will depend upon embedding student learning outcomes in faculty standards for assessing student work. For the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement, rubrics are used to assess student work and to gather information across students for improvement of both assessment and pedagogy. Since academic programs vary so much in their stage of development and use of student learning outcomes, it is difficult to determine the extent to which student learning outcomes are embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work. (CFR 2.6)

The program review process is carried out college-by-college in cycles, with the procedural updates taking place between cycles. In response to the last WASC accreditation review, the focus of the current (sixth) cycle was graduate programs. The next review cycle must provide for better integration between outcomes assessment and program review. All course syllabi will need to include student learning outcomes. (This may require modifications to the forms used to submit courses, as well as revision of some existing syllabi.) While not every course needs to address each of the program learning outcomes, the outcomes must be achieved across the curriculum as a whole. SF State is encouraged to take advantage of the newly adopted requirement for a capstone course in each major. The faculty can analyze their students' ability to integrate and apply disciplinary knowledge and use the results as evidence of their program successes as well for program improvement. In addition to self-study reports, program review relies upon disciplinary experts as external reviewers. Program review is supported by a data set provided by the Institutional Research Office. Most programs take the review process

seriously and produce reflective self-studies. The Program Review Committee performs thoughtful and thorough analysis of each program. (CFR 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity

As at many other institutions, SF State has increasingly promoted faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities. The CPR report noted, “The role that each Retention Tenure Promotion area (i.e., teaching, professional achievement and growth, and service) plays in the evaluation of faculty needs to be clarified and evaluated carefully in an era of scarce resources.” Since that report was issued, professional development and support activities for faculty members have emphasized faculty scholarship, broadly defined. These activities include retention, tenure and promotion workshops to clarify expectations for scholarship, post-award grant workshops, and symposia. The extent to which curricular and instructional innovation are valued and supported is less clear, but impressive work is being done around the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement and student success in STEM fields. (CFR 2.8)

Scholarship, teaching, student learning and service are not always clearly linked. However, the College of Health and Social Sciences is developing a “collective vision for scholarship” that “affirms scholarship that leads to positive social change and addresses critical societal problems by advancing both knowledge and practice.” The School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement is developing retention, tenure, and promotion guidelines that will recognize engaged scholarship and notes that “the role of the academy is not static and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines and between campus and community change over time. PACE will continue to support scholars in all of these traditional as well as emerging practices.”

As SF State continues to increase its emphasis on disciplinary scholarship, strengthening connections and synergies among the various faculty roles will become even more important. (CFR 2.9)

Support for Student Learning and Success

Collection and analysis of data are SF State strengths. The Pulse survey taken prior to class registration is an efficient, effective, and flexible way to ask students about their attitudes, needs, satisfaction, and the campus climate. Exit surveys at the undergraduate and, newly, graduate levels provide information over time, while NSSE lets the campus compare itself to peer institutions. The Student Success and Graduation Initiative is a stellar example of gathering data to inform decisions. Disaggregated data obtained in the Milestone Study have led to evaluation of the effectiveness of programs targeting at-risk students and the implementation of additional support programs. (CFR 2.10)

Student Affairs has been extremely active in assessing the impact of its programs. Each department within Student Affairs has developed and posted <http://www.sfsu.edu/~vpsa/assessment.html> student learning outcomes (although this is more difficult when the program's connection to student learning is indirect). At the team's interview, they heard that the existence of formal outcomes helps the many student employees in Student Affairs understand the importance of what they do. In response to the increasingly residential nature of the student body, Student Life is offering more on-campus programming, making use of needs assessments to determine areas of focus. (CFR 2.11)

The students with whom the team met were, obviously, engaged in campus life and indicated that it was relatively easy for them to find information about the services they needed. New student orientation is in place and easily found through a link from the university home page. Information about academic advising is easy to find on the Undergraduate Studies website. (CFR 2.12)

Through the Student Success and Graduation Initiative, the campus has sought every opportunity to facilitate students' paths to graduation, including mandatory advising, declaration of major by 70 units for students who enter as freshmen and the first semester for transfer students (enforced through access to priority registration), and, in some departments, academic roadmaps showing semester-by-semester course registrations. (CFR 2.10)

Students have access to a wide range of services, including academic advising, health services, financial aid, disabilities programs, leadership opportunities, recreational events and living/learning accommodations. Student services are available under one roof at the One Stop Student Services Center. The newly completed J. Paul Leonard Library provides traditional access to information, but is well designed to allow group study, computer use, and even multimedia production by students. (CFR 2.13)

The California State University has been working with community colleges to facilitate transfer. SF State provides clear information on admission for transfer students on its web site < <http://www.sfsu.edu/future/apply/transfer.html>>. (CFR 2.14)

STANDARD 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organization Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Without doubt, the recent fiscal crisis in the State of California has exemplified the importance of this standard. Faced with deep cuts in state funding over the period of several years, SF State was challenged to apply its shrinking resources strategically and to evolve new organizational structures in order to protect the institution's purposes and educational objectives, and to preserve a high quality environment for learning. SF State approached this challenge thoughtfully, and it appropriately engaged the campus community in identifying the best courses of action to take under very difficult circumstances.

Between 2008 and 2010, \$625 million (21%) was cut from the CSU budget and, as a consequence, \$47.5 million was cut from SF State's budget allocation. Additional cuts were sustained in 2011-2012, with no clear end to California's fiscal crisis in sight. The Governor's budget for 2012-2013 called for a further mid-year cut of \$250 million to the CSU budget if a temporary tax measure known as Proposition 30 did not gain voter support through California's ballot initiative process. SF State's share of this additional potential cut was approximately \$17.4 million.

Fortunately, the Governor's tax initiative passed, and SF State was thus spared the threatened mid-year budget reduction. The Governor's proposed budget for 2012-2013 also contains some potential good news for the CSU and its member institutions, including SF State. This proposed budget includes modest increases in the State allocation over the next four years, with the tradeoff that the CSU not raise tuition during this period. The proposed budget also includes an additional \$125 million for the CSU to partially allay the loss of a tuition fee increase that the CSU rescinded, per agreement with the Governor, when Proposition 30 passed. Finally, the proposed budget includes

another \$125.1 million for the CSU, of which \$10 million is to be used for online course development and the remainder for “core instructional activities.”

SF State addressed its significant fiscal challenges by finding opportunities for permanent cost reductions, through temporary “emergency” measures such as faculty and staff furloughs, and student tuition fee increases. In December 2009, the institution established the University Planning Advisory Council (UPAC), which was charged with analyzing ways to streamline efforts and become a stronger and yet leaner institution firmly grounded in its core values. UPAC issued a request for proposals to the campus that elicited over 100 proposals. These proposals provided direction to the committee as it focused on ways to address SF State’s structural budget shortfall consistent with meeting institutional objectives and maintaining a quality learning environment. UPAC made a number of important recommendations for achieving permanent cost savings, many of which have now been implemented, including reorganization from 8 to 6 colleges.

One of the strengths of SF State is a palpable sense of pride in the institution, its mission, and its commitment to social justice. These shared values surely helped to guide the institution through extraordinarily difficult times and served as an anchor for institutional decision-making.

Early in his tenure, the current president recognized that SF State will need to increase philanthropic support, and he has already laid the groundwork for the institution’s first capital campaign. This includes re-engaging alumni with their alma mater and reaching out to the San Francisco business community that has significantly benefitted from the employment of SF State graduates. An initial and more limited

scholarship campaign has been launched as a building block for a more comprehensive fundraising effort.

Faculty and Staff

Not surprisingly, the fiscal challenges faced by SF State have impacted faculty and staff. Temporary cost savings were achieved through attrition as many faculty and staff who left the institution were not replaced. This impacted staff workloads somewhat unevenly across the campus. Although SF State did not reduce the number of class offerings during the years of budget cuts, lecturers taught more of those classes. In 2009 there were 783 tenure track faculty at SF State in comparison to only 706 in 2012. Similarly, in 2009 there were 271 lecturers in comparison to 407 in 2012.

With at least temporary relief from additional near-term reductions in state funding, SF State will now be able to recoup some of its losses in faculty and staff positions. Some staff positions are being reclassified consistent with expanded duties, and the institution has significantly increased the number of faculty positions open for recruitment during the current academic year. (CFR 3.1)

SF State boasts a faculty with impressive credentials. Importantly, open-ended survey questions indicated a shared commitment to students and respect for colleagues among SF State faculty. The survey also found that SF State faculty had concerns about the impact of budget cuts on class size, teaching, professional development, and service. New faculty, in particular, are worried about how to balance the demands of increased teaching and service with higher expectations for research and grants. Faculty concerns about aligning tenure and promotion criteria with institutional expectations about faculty contributions to teaching, service, and research or creative activity were also voiced

during the most recent campus visit of the WASC team. SF State will need to continue to address this issue through appropriate governance processes. (CFR 3.2, 3.3)

Despite its fiscal challenges, SF State enhanced campus-based professional development opportunities for faculty, most notably in the areas of faculty mentoring, collaborative conversation groups, and academic technology. Over the past three years, faculty participation in training opportunities provided by Academic Technology has increased significantly. This participation is a tribute to faculty commitment to teaching effectiveness.

On the whole, there is evidence that academic support units, such as the Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development, use appropriate data in decisions to launch new training opportunities and services as well for evaluation and improvement purposes. Although Human Resources also launched new professional development programs for staff, this area will benefit from an improved use of appropriate data, including staff surveys and focus groups, in designing and evaluating its programs. (CFR 3.4)

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources

The fiscal challenges in the State of California have contributed to a deferred maintenance backlog at SF State and other CSU campuses. The availability of dollars for major capital projects has been severely limited as well. Fortunately, funding for the SF State library addition was already in the pipeline before the fiscal downturn, and the completed facility now offers flexible, collaborative spaces for students and faculty as well as for instructional support units such as Academic Technology. This facility is a fitting physical reflection of the value that the institution places on building a collaborative, mutually supporting culture for student learning. (CFR 3.5)

SF State has a robust academic technology portfolio, with an array of tools capable of enhancing the student learning experience. This was detailed in the CPR and cited as an area where SF State often leads the nation. SF State's information resources are weaker in areas such as institutional research. For example, SF State still lacks a data warehouse and hence must pull information from a large number of databases. This has hampered the ability of SF State to conduct analytic studies critical to a number of institutional effectiveness efforts.

While SF State believes that the CSU conversion to People Soft Campus Solutions will obviate the need for maintaining a local data warehouse system, it is nonetheless taking reasonable steps to implement an interim data warehouse solution. It has increased the staffing in the Office of Academic Institutional Research from three to eight, and this unit has been given the control and flexibility to independently generate ad hoc or canned reports and in depth analysis to support institutional needs. The unit is currently developing consolidated data snapshots and relevant data fields, both needed to develop an interim data warehouse that will include student enrollment/grade data, application/enroll/admit data, degrees/graduation data, placement test data, financial aid data, and remediation data. (CFR 3.6, 3.7)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

SF State has made improvements in its organization structure since the CPR, most notably by creating a more robust and comprehensive IR function and by clarifying roles and responsibilities for its IT and Academic Technology divisions. These improvements promise to bring new efficiencies, improve analytic capacity, reduce redundancy, and enhance support for teaching and learning. (CFR 3.8)

The 25-member Board of Trustees for the CSU has authority over curricular development, use of property, development of facilities, and fiscal and human resources management. It appoints the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors for the system and the Presidents for the campuses as chief executive with clear delegated responsibilities. The CSU Board of Trustees routinely reviews institutional data in multiple areas and demonstrates a commitment to institutional effectiveness through various policies and directives that include institutional performance areas and success indicators. (3.9, 3.10)

SF State has a strong faculty governance system and the WASC team found that faculty across the institution are committed to the institution's mission and students, even though they sometimes disagree on policy and action. Governance bodies, including governing boards, foundation boards, and faculty assemblies can benefit from periodic self-assessments of their own effectiveness, which can reveal areas for change and improvement. (CFR 3.11)

STANDARD 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement
Strategic Thinking and Planning

During the 2008 Institutional Proposal and 2011 CPR phases of the accreditation process, SF State demonstrated a strong tradition of commitment to strategic planning with broad involvement of faculty and other constituencies. In its CUSP I (Council of University Strategic Planning 1994-2004) and CUSP II (Council of University Strategic Planning 2005-2010) processes, there was evidence that SF State had engaged multiple constituencies and incorporated planning to align academic, student services, personnel, research and scholarship, fiscal, physical, and technical needs. Quantitative and qualitative data were applied to inform its strategic planning in past years, as evident in the extensive documents on

its WASC website and EER report. The institution held its strategic planning efforts in abeyance in the period of transition from its former president to the current president, who arrived at SF State in August 2012 or just six months prior to this accreditation visit.

Nonetheless, the visiting team noted that sufficient processes already have been established to demonstrate that strategic planning with broad representation continues to be a priority in SF State's current administration. At the time of this campus visit, there was evidence that the presidential transition is complete and the university is prepared to begin a comprehensive 15-month strategic planning process with the intent to solidify its institutional priorities and align budget decisions. Efforts for resuming strategic planning were evident throughout the visit in meetings with the president, administrators, faculty, and staff. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Commitment to Learning and Improvement

Policies and Practices toward a Culture of Evidence and Improvement

In 1999, SF State's Academic Senate adopted a policy to establish the University Academic Assessment Advisory Council (UAAAC). In 2002, the Senate established a policy on assessment. SF State employs institutional, academic program, and student affairs assessments. Institutional assessment includes national surveys, such as NSSE and FSSE. SF State conducts campus surveys, such as the Pulse Survey and Exit Survey, as well as surveys mandated by the CSU system, including the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). There is evidence that SF State uses assessment results in varying ways to inform program changes and improvements.

Institutional Research Capacity

SF State's expansion of its Office of Academic Institutional Research (AIR) has significantly increased AIR's capacity, enabling it to produce an institutional data book and

electronic newsletter, as well as raise its level of sophistication of analytics for graduation and retention. On the other hand, AIR continues to be challenged by its lack of access to a data warehouse, which has negatively affected its efficiency in preparing reports. SF State is converting to the People Soft Campus Solutions (CMS) software, which is expected to eliminate the need to maintain a local data warehouse system. However, the AIR staff have been cautioned by their counterparts at other campuses, who are familiar with CMS, that there are limitations to the software. AIR is, therefore, very prudently and commendably taking necessary precautions to seek an interim data warehouse solution to provide data needed by Institutional Research during the transition to the CMS system. (CFR 4.5)

A culture of inquiry and evidence is developing at SF State. Indicators of progress toward assessment of educational effectiveness are evident in the nearly two-thirds of SF State's academic programs, such as Cinema (MFA), kinesiology (BS), sociology (BA), philosophy (BA), and other approximately two-thirds of programs that demonstrate full commitment to the process and have used assessment results to inform their curricular revisions and improvements, and are at *developed* or *highly developed* levels of assessment, as defined by WASC.

There is evidence of SF State's commitment to assessment and inquiry for improvement. A number of faculty members have participated in WASC's annual Academic Resources Conference to increase their knowledge, understanding, and use of tools of assessment, and several have attended the advanced WASC Assessment Workshops. Moreover, SF State's Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development had a leadership role as facilitator of recent WASC assessment retreats, which signifies the commitment of SF State to assessment and inquiry for improvement and the *in-house*

expertise that has evolved as a result. This investment in training and expertise has enabled the Office of Academic Planning and Development to provide training for faculty and staff on writing outcomes and constructing rubrics. Another evidence of commitment to improvement is the attendance by a group of faculty and administrators at an AAC&U conference on High Impact Practices (HIPS), which resulted in their development of an action plan that was incorporated into SF State's Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI). Further evidence is that all departments have written and published student learning outcomes, and nearly all departments have developed a methodology of assessment. Finally, formal program review processes are in place for the academic programs and, by and large, the findings have been used to improve student learning.

As delineated above, there are many positive indications that characterize SF State as a campus that embraces assessment for teaching and curriculum improvement. Yet, SF State continues to face challenges that impede its progress and expedience toward being a campus that is fully committed to quality assurance at all levels, where faculty throughout the institution engage in inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and where the faculty as a whole consistently use the outcomes of assessment for improvement of learning, curriculum, and pedagogy.

SF State forthrightly discusses both its progress and issues associated with academic program assessment in its EER Report and supporting materials that were requested by the visiting team. The team noted that, while the institution has made substantial progress in assessment and program review, and although most faculty now accept assessment as an expectation and are developing a positive outlook toward the value of assessment and review, there are a few departments that remain resistant to assessment of their programs, primarily

because of differing perspectives and values among sub-disciplines, or a departmental culture of *individualism*.

The departments are at various stages of initial, emerging, developed, and highly developed stages of assessment. More than 60% of SF State's programs have assessment plans that are at a *developed* or *highly developed* status, as determined by the institution employing the WASC Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes, faculty involvement, and level of analysis as exhibited in the assessment reports. The institution continues to work with those departments whose progress in program assessment is lagging, and it continues to develop the assessment plan for general education.

Academic Program Review and Assessment

SF State has developed a formal process of program review for the purpose of assurance that its degree programs are of the highest quality, as well as for articulation and assessment of the effectiveness of their intended learning outcomes. Academic program review is governed by policies of the Academic Senate, including Guidelines for the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review, Indicators and Standards of Graduate Program Quality and Sustainability, and All University Academic Program Review Committee. The process intentionally provides opportunities for faculty, administrators, and staff to clarify the intellectual currency of each program, examine the effectiveness of the program's organization and structure, and articulate and assess the effectiveness of the intended learning outcomes. The Sixth Cycle Program Review focused on the quality, currency, and sustainability of SF State's graduate programs, as well relationships between the endeavors of the undergraduate and graduate programs, in applicable departments.

The team reviewed the institution's methods of conducting sustained evidence-based inquiry on how it is achieving its purpose, educational mission, and student learning goals; how the data collected in the inquiry process are used to make improvements to student learning, the program, and the institution; and how the data are used to inform and develop strategic thinking, strategic planning, and institutional priorities. Based on its comprehensive review through meetings, interviews, and examination of the files, the team concluded: that the institution is committed to the process of iterative improvement and does engage faculty and staff at all levels in ongoing program and campus-wide discussions on educational effectiveness and institutional purpose.

Student Affairs and Co-Curricular Assessment

Since 2009, Student Affairs/Enrollment Management (SAEM) has engaged in four cycles of outcomes-based assessment, which has resulted in a transformation of SAEM's methods of conception, development, delivery, and evaluation of its programs and services. Under the leadership of a SAEM associate vice president, the division employs strategic planning, conducts monthly meetings for coordination of assessment activities, and provides workshops on assessment for its leaders for the purpose of continuing to measure its work in terms of student learning.

The following representational results illustrate positive outcomes of SAEM's use of the assessment process: 1) Student Outreach Services (SOS) collaborated with the School of Nursing on basic criteria for the major and transfer admissions; 2) the athletics department uses the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) to meet its goal of distributing resources equitably between men's and women's teams; 3) residential life awareness and educational training program utilized pre- and post-surveys to measure

gains of student residents' knowledge of the negative impact of alcohol and drug abuse; and 4) informed by the assessment process of the need to increase the number of students who persist toward wellness by attending critical follow-up counseling sessions, Counseling and Psychological Services imposed a \$20 fee, which resulted in a 20% increase in attendance at follow-up counseling sessions. Other program revisions and improvements were made in student involvement and career center, campus recreation, disability programs, educational opportunity program, financial aid, registrar, student health services, enrollment management, testing, admissions, and other programs.

The team found that SF State is committed to learning and improvement. However, as SF State is already aware and has noted in its EER Report, while the institution has made notable progress toward developing a culture of inquiry and evidence, further work is required in order for the institution as a whole to demonstrate commitment to learning and improvement, and SF State must act intentionally to: 1) assure that programs that are currently at the *initial* and *emerging* levels will advance to higher levels of assessment in a timely manner, and that 2) the institution will expeditiously implement its general education program and develop a valid and meaningful assessment of GE. (CFR 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

Outcomes

The primary purpose of the WASC visiting team was to determine how well San Francisco State University is fulfilling its mission and the alignment of its goals and objectives for the effectiveness of its educational programs. In light of the recent arrival of the current president, the team was impressed with the administration, faculty, and

staff for their intentional preparations to re-commence with strategic planning and institutional development. The team found evidence that the institution clearly fulfilled the outcomes of the comprehensive review.

Commendations

The team presents the following commendations in recognition of the achievements of San Francisco State University, as discussed in Section II of this report:

1. The team commends San Francisco State University for the richness of information provided during the WASC review process, and for the intentional efforts of the campus leadership to ensure the sustainability of important areas of focus beyond the WASC review.
2. The team commends SF State for the widespread, continuous, and generative participation of faculty, staff, students and administration in the WASC self-study.
3. The team commends SF State for the palpable pride in its identity and mission, and for the resiliency with which it coped with significant resource losses during a prolonged recession.
4. The team commends SF State for its continued leadership in California and the nation in cultivating a diverse student body, faculty, and staff,
5. The team commends SF State for the strength of its commitments to social justice, which serves as the institutional lodestar and provides the impetus for ongoing and educationally meaningful conversations across disciplines and between diverse internal constituencies.

6. The team commends SF State for its strong commitments to students and their academic achievements, for its investments in student learning and civic engagement, and for the active and dedicated engagement of Student Affairs/Enrollment Management in the assessment process.
7. The team commends SF State for its attentiveness to the importance of weaving themes, perspectives, and inquiries about social justice, equity, and civic responsibility through individual courses, across all colleges, and in the design of the general education program now in its final stages of implementation in 2014
8. The team commends SF State for its focus on creating opportunities for student academic collaborations as evidenced in the planning and design of new library space.
9. The team commends SF State for responding to the CPR recommendation to further advance Academic Technology, reflected through improved coordination of enterprise systems, services and support, high tech learning spaces, media production facilities, and professional development opportunities.
10. The team commends SF State for significant progress despite significant financial constraints in implementing its Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement, which is a strong example of identifying a teaching/learning priority, modifying the curriculum to reflect this priority, providing support for implementation, and using results of assessment to make improvements.
11. The team commends SF State for its frequent use of data to drive decisions, and for grounding teaching as well as institutional problem-solving in intellectual inquiry.

12. The team commends SF State for its strong ethos of participatory engagement and commitments to inclusiveness.
13. The team commends the president and his team for responding to the pressing need to increase philanthropic support by initiating viable strategies for building the endowment and increasing annual giving.
14. The team commends the faculty and staff, the majority of whom have taken the initiative to learn and apply assessment, inquiry, and program review to assure the highest quality of degree programs at SF State.

Recommendations

The following recommendations reflect the conclusions of the review based on evidence, as discussed in Section II of this report:

1. The team recommends that San Francisco State University continue to develop learning outcomes assessment through continuous improvement cycles, integrate this into the program review process, and focus on strategies for making best uses of program review for program improvement.
2. The team recommends that SF State continue robust interrogations about the interconnections and differences between social justice, civic engagement, and global learning in order to map out purposeful student pathways to a range of capabilities necessary for work and community life in our diverse democracy and interdependent world.
3. The team recommends that SF State strengthen its support for faculty and staff development and continue to be attentive to how investing in high impact pedagogies such as service learning, learning communities, project based

- learning, and intercultural dialogue can increase student retention, achievement, and graduation rates.
4. The team recommends that SF State continue to focus on strategies to alleviate special challenges faced by SF State faculty & staff such as housing costs and long commutes. Addressing these particular challenges may become more important as the full-time residential SF State student population grows and student support needs change.
 5. The team recommends that SF State consider increasing meaningful opportunities for staff to be involved in institutional decision making processes through a representative body and for otherwise recognizing the importance of staff contributions to advancing the mission of the university.
 6. The team recommends that SF State continue discussions related to achieving alignment of tenure and promotion criteria with institutional expectations regarding faculty contributions to student learning inside and outside of the classroom.

Team Report Appendix
CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Institution: San Francisco State
 Kind of Visit: EER
 Date: 03/01/2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all CPR, EER and Initial Accreditation Visits. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	
	Comments: SF State uses the California State University System policy. (attached)	Yes
Process(es)/ periodic review	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)?	In development
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	
	Comments: The process for periodic review is in development. We have met with the associate deans and chairs and with their input developed the attached rubric. We will use an interim methodology until we develop a permanent approach. We are currently researching the method used by some of the California Community Colleges, which a number of our faculty recommended. See an explanation of the interim approach below.	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? Yes	Yes
	Comments: The schedule of classes is published each semester and indicates the number of hours for face-to-face, labs, internships, and clinical placements	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	In development
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	
	Comments: Our interim plan is for chairs to examine all online/hybrid and independent study courses using the attached rubric. Our permanent solution for the review will specify the sampling required. The SF State online policy will be amended to include the review process.	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet	What kinds of courses? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	In development

for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	
	Comments: The only type of course, in addition to online/hybrid that does not specify the hours is independent study. Independent study courses will undergo the same rubric review as online/hybrid.	

Academic Affairs
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer
562-951-4710 / Fax 562-951-4986
Email esmith@calstate.edu

October 4, 2011

Code: AA-2011-14

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents

FROM: Ephraim P. Smith 
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: CSU Definition of Credit Hour

Historically, the California State University has used the equivalent of the Carnegie Unit for measuring and awarding academic credit that represents student work and achievement. In the CSU, the credit hour measure we have used has also been consistent with requirements of our accreditor, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

As of July 1, 2011 federal law (600.2 and 600.4) now requires all accredited institutions to comply with the federal definition of the credit hour, which appears below. The federal definition is consistent with CSU practice, but is defined systemwide for the first time. Effective immediately, for all CSU degree programs and courses bearing academic credit, the “credit hour” is defined as “the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

1. 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 amount of time; or
2. at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work,

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”

As in the past, a credit hour is assumed to be a 50-minute (not 60-minute) period. In courses, such as those offered online, in which “seat time” does not apply, a credit hour may be measured by an equivalent amount of work, as demonstrated by student achievement. WASC shall require its accredited institutions to comply with this definition of the credit hour; and it shall review periodically the application of this credit-hour policy across the institution, to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, appropriate to degree level, and that they conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education.

ES/clm

cc: Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
CSU Executive Staff
CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
CSU Vice Presidents of Finance
CSU Vice Presidents of Student Affairs
CSU Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
CSU Deans of Graduate Study
CSU Deans of Undergraduate Study
CSU Directors of Financial Aid
Mr. Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Dr. Philip Garcia, Senior Director, Analytic Studies
Dr. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research and Resources
Mr. Dean Kulju, Director Financial Aid Services and Programs
Dr. Christine Mallon, State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy
Dr. Margaret Merryfield, Senior Director, Academic Human Resources
Dr. James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
Mr. Jim Spalding, Director, Summer Arts Program
Ms. Sheila Thomas, State University Dean, Extended Education
Mr. Leo Van Cleve, Director, International Programs
Dr. Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Dr. Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs



Credit Hour Audit for Online/Hybrid and Independent Study Courses

The chair will review each online/hybrid and independent study course syllabus to determine whether the course meets the minimum requirement of 15 contact hours per unit, as per Carnegie Policy.

Course Name: _____

Course Number: _____

Instructor: _____

Department: _____

Chair: _____

Date: _____

Meets Contact Hour Equivalency	Credit Hour Audit Criteria
Yes / No	1. Sharing Content (i.e., Readings, lectures, presentations, videos)
Yes / No	2. Engagement (i.e., discussions, email exchanges, web conferencing, group work, project based work, peer review, virtual office hours)
Yes / No	3. Assessment (i.e., formative feedback and revisions, quizzes, exams, portfolio development)
Yes / No	Overall Assessment



STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW: TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: San Francisco State University

Date: May 14, 2013

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. 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.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Comments: The policy and procedures for Student Complaints are outlined in Senate Policy at the following location: http://senate.sfsu.edu/content/student-grievance-procedures SF State also has a grade appeal policy and procedure outlined in Senate Policy at the following location: http://senate.sfsu.edu/content/policy-principles-and-procedures-regarding-graduate-admission-students-three-year-bachelors	Yes
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments:	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?	Yes
	Comments: Records on student complains at kept by the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs. Records on grade appeals are kept with the Grade Appeal Committee	