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SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA: Description of University and Visits

San Diego State University has changed dramatically since its founding as San Diego Normal School in 1897. Staffed originally by a faculty of seven, SDSU’s faculty now includes 909 full-time members and 660 part-time members. The initial student body of 91 has grown to include some 26,850 undergraduates and 5,843 graduate students. In 2004-05, the university granted 6,325 Bachelor’s degrees and 1,677 Master’s degrees—along with 44 joint doctoral degrees. The university, which in its first years trained elementary-school teachers in a space above an area drugstore, now offers 81 undergraduate majors, 72 Master’s programs, and 16 joint doctoral programs on its rapidly growing campus (occupied since 1931) and at its Imperial Valley and Brawley campuses. In addition to these traditional programs, it offers also a broad range of cooperative programs abroad and joint degrees with other institutions of higher education.

The historic dynamism of SDSU greatly impressed teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In the process of a Capacity and Preparatory Review, a team visited SDSU’s Imperial Valley Campus on October 29, 2004, and then visited the main campus on October 31 through November 2, 2004. A second main campus visit for an Educational Effectiveness Review, the topic of this report, occurred on November 9 - 11, 2005.

The team roster for the 2005 visit is attached as Appendix A. The schedule for the visit is attached as Appendix B. SDSU and WASC agreed upon an
experimental schedule for the 2005 Educational Effectiveness Review. The team read materials and interviewed university representatives on the progress that had been made on each of the recommendations from the Capacity and Preparatory Review. Then, for each of the three themes to be examined during the Educational Effectiveness Review, the team met with SDSU faculty, staff, and students for four facilitated sessions: an initial session that set the context and framed the questions to be examined, a second session that explored one facet of the theme, a third session that explored another facet of the theme, and a concluding session that addressed institutional directions and commitments. For all but the final session of the four sessions arranged for each theme, team members observed SDSU faculty members, staff, and students engaged in discussion in a modified fishbowl format before being invited by the facilitator to join in the discussion.

In the final (fourth) session for each theme, the visiting team member assigned as lead writer for the theme facilitated the dialogue of a large group of combined participants by raising questions with the SDSU faculty, staff, and students that served to clarify institutional thinking and research findings. The discussion also prompted summative reflection on what was learned from the institution’s process of inquiry and self study; what further questions might be pursued; what additional activities, research, or best practices might be considered from the experience of team members; and what the most promising directions for future development might be. Team members found this
experimental schedule useful and effective, and the discussion highly
informative. It enabled all team members to witness the same interactions, rather
than requiring team members to participate in separate interactions and then
brief one another during periodic breaks in the meeting schedule. The
opportunity to discuss and evaluate team and institutional reflections in this
large group setting seemed to move institutional thinking further than more
traditional, evaluative methodology; that is, the group discussion enabled
participants to collaborate on contributed ideas, comment on others, and winnow
the most promising ideas and directions for future institutional consideration.

As it had for its 2004 visit to SDSU, the team established an e-mail account
independent of SDSU e-mail servers, so that any member of the university
community might submit a confidential e-mail message to the visiting team. The
Assistant to the Team Chair monitored the e-mail account and reviewed all
messages with the team and WASC staff liaison during the visit.

The team’s general opinion of San Diego State University is that the
university is home to many faculty members, staff, and students who do
exemplary work. The university’s dedication to and involvement in the life of
the region it serves; its promotion of distinguishing programs—such as
undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity; its expanding student
body and its expanding campus; and its efforts to redefine itself within the
spectrum of educational options available in California, indicate that this is a
pivotal era for SDSU. Framing its institutional mission and direction for all
internal and external stakeholders remains an important task for the university, particularly as it embarks on its first large capital-funds campaign. The visiting team believes that San Diego State University has a noteworthy story to tell. Articulating this story for the public will likely prove to be another of the university’s successes.

After two compelling visits to San Diego State University, the visiting team acknowledges the extraordinary representatives of the San Diego State University faculty, students, and staff who freely gave of their time and shared their views so graciously. The team is particularly grateful for the consideration and guidance of Dean of Undergraduate Studies Geoffrey Chase, who—before, during, and after both visits—aided the team in countless ways. Finally, the team’s members thank SDSU’s seventh president, Stephen L. Weber, for his hospitality and for his frank engagement of the topics that propel San Diego State University into a very exciting future. In many respects, the university in its contemporary form is a realization of President Weber’s vision for it—a vision realized over the course of an uncommonly long and successful tenure in office, one that continues vigorously now.

**IB: Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Presentation and Alignment with the Proposal**

San Diego State University’s Educational Effectiveness Report focuses on three central themes: the balance among access, retention, and graduation;
student learning outcomes assessment; and undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity. The university’s WASC Coordinating Committee addressed these three themes in three reflective essays, complemented by an integrative essay and an essay responding to issues that emerged during the 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review.

SDSU’s Educational Effectiveness Report aligns well with the approach set forth in the university’s proposal and is a natural extension of the topics explored in the 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Report. The team found the report to be thorough and engaging. In some areas of the institution’s Educational Effectiveness Report, most notably in Reflective Essay 1, the team found that institutional evidence and analysis deserved further exploration and scrutiny; these areas are noted below. The team’s additional findings in regard to SDSU’s Educational Effectiveness Report are provided in Section IIA.

IC: Preparatory Review Update

Following its 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review visit to San Diego State University, the visiting team submitted a report of its findings to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This report was submitted, in turn, to SDSU officials—along with a February 28, 2005, letter from WASC Executive Director Ralph A. Wolff to President Weber. This letter addressed five issues for the university to consider as it entered the Educational Effectiveness phase of institutional review: sustaining progress on assessment and learni-
centeredness; continuing efforts to extend and integrate planning; assessing general education competencies; continuing analysis in the balance among access, recruitment, and retention; and continuing progress on integrating the Imperial Valley and Brawley campuses.

In Appendix B of its Educational Effectiveness Report, San Diego State University responded to issues raised both by the visiting team, in its report, and by WASC, in its commission letter. The visiting team continued to explore these issues during its 2005 visit to SDSU — through the 12 sessions described on pages 1-3 of this report and through three other sessions dedicated, respectively, to planning, to the Imperial Valley Campus, and to program review.

Informed by SDSU’s written response to the visiting team’s C&PR report and by the information gleaned during the 2005 visit to the university, the team’s assessment of the five issues highlighted in the WASC commission letter is as follows:

Sustaining Progress on Assessment and Learning-centeredness

The visiting team reviewed the educational effectiveness plans and annual progress reports submitted for the first time in AY 2004-05, the institution’s Educational Effectiveness Report itself, a summary analysis of the annual assessment progress reports, and other analyses that were requested during the site visit. SDSU appears to be on a trajectory to become an exemplar to be
emulated by others, especially in areas such as using undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity.

In reviewing the Educational Effectiveness Report through the lens of the C&PR recommendations, the visiting team offers several observations:

Strong evidence was presented of President Weber's and senior management's attention to fostering linkages among unit-level educational effectiveness planning, cycles of institutional planning, and budgeting and resource allocation. The Provost denied requests in AY 2006 for faculty lines to departments that had not submitted annual assessment reports. In discussions with department and program chairs, it became apparent that this move, which was by no means an easy step to take, had greatly reinforced the notion that linkages were real and consequential. The Provost merits commendation for taking this step. An administrator or unit should be charged with sustaining this momentum. Additionally, efforts should be focused both on aligning rewards with objectives and on the need for programs to help faculty who understandably need assistance in assessing student learning. The visiting team suggests that SDSU regularly convene departmental representatives responsible for assessment, so that they might engage in periodic discussions of progress and best practices. Similarly, the team suggests that SDSU find a way to recognize departments and persons who perform in an exemplary manner in helping the institution attain its goals in regard to assessing student learning.

A cogent discussion and plans for action on academic program review (page 30 of the C&PR Report) is absent from the Educational Effectiveness
Report. In discussion with the Interim Graduate Dean, the Associate Dean for the Division of Undergraduate Studies, and a number of chairs, the temporary cessation of program review due to budget constraints was described to the team. Since this cessation, program review has been fundamentally revised to focus on five themed essays: (1) context setting, (2) analysis of progress, (3) analysis of student learning outcomes and assessment results, (4) analysis of faculty achievements, and (5) analysis of issues that may be impeding progress towards departmental goals. It was evident that this revised process is still in its infancy, and only one review had (at the time of the 2005 visit) been undertaken using these new guidelines. Even so, it was noteworthy that the one external team that has so far undertaken a review of an SDSU department under these new guidelines has requested additional statistical data.

In regard to program review, and in order to fully implement the values inherent in WASC Criteria for Review 2.3, 2.4, and 2.7, the visiting team suggests that – as the institution moves forward towards actualizing a culture of evidence – it may want to consider developing a minimum set of standardized indicators across departments, to include achievement of student learning objectives, in order to objectify the review process, to promote equitable treatment across departments, and to permit external reviewers to render advice and recommendations based on factual evidence. Questions remain regarding the source of (financial and personnel) support for this work.

In reviewing the annual program assessment reports that were developed and submitted (along with the summary provided of those plans, available at
http://wasc.sdsu.edu/ed_effect/summary2004-05_assessment_reports.pdf), the visiting team noted wide variation in the quality of the plans and the underlying understanding of assessing student learning outcomes, as is to be expected at this stage of implementing educational effectiveness and program-level assessment at SDSU. Some reports, such as those of Liberal Studies, appeared quite well organized and thoughtful. Numerous rubrics were also in evidence (such as Aerospace Engineering, Religious Studies, etc.). In interviews with faculty and chairs, high praise was accorded to the Student Learning Outcome Committee’s rubric-based formative feedback process on each of the reports submitted; the process appeared to be viewed as positive and pivotal in the development of unit-level assessment. According to data supplied by the Division of Undergraduate Studies, only 15 of 84 graduate programs (17.8 percent) have participated in submitting annual assessment reports. These included the College of Business, College of Education, Graduate School of Public Health, Philosophy MA, Information and Decision Systems MS, and Social Work MSW. The assessment of graduate education is a vital assessment topic at any research university, and must be included in an overall program of educational effectiveness. The visiting team therefore suggests, in accordance with Criteria for Review 2.2, 2.4, and 2.7, that all graduate programs be asked to develop and operationalize assessment plans during the next annual cycle.

The visiting team offers these additional suggestions relative to progress on learning assessment: (1) An articulation of an institution-wide philosophy of and
commitment to student success is needed for SDSU to realize its mission fully (see the expectations set forth in Criteria for Review 2.3 and 2.4). (2) The role of Student Affairs in contributing to student learning at SDSU warrants clarification and amplification, consistent with Criterion for Review 2.11. Might some Student-Affairs staff become involved, for example, in working with portfolios and senior theses or capstone projects where it seems appropriate to do so? (See the team’s observations regarding cooperation between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs on pages 47-48.) (3) In order to further its assessment and educational effectiveness agenda, SDSU should consider how these areas of focus might be emphasized during the faculty and staff recruitment processes.

The team’s additional observations regarding assessment and learning-centeredness are recorded in its assessment of Reflective Essay 2 (beginning on page 31) and in Section IIB (beginning on page 38).

Continuing Efforts to Extend and Integrate Planning

The university’s approach to planning reflects in many ways its development during the last quarter-century as a comprehensive university with elaborate arrangements for doctoral study, for international programs, and for the ongoing evolution of its mission, which changed as recently as the last session of the state legislature with regard to the Ed.D. It reflects also the stability of President Weber’s tenure, and his willingness to share responsibility and authority with other officers of the university, perhaps most notably, with the Provost. This combination of durable leadership at the top and support for
institutional dynamism has been rare in the visiting team’s experience. It explains much of the university’s progress in recent time.

That said, no planning model endures for all times, and the university is properly rethinking its approach to various aspects of planning. A major reason is the need to position the university for a major capital-funds campaign that has been a major topic of interest for university personnel on both the 2004 and the 2005 visits to the main campus. The good news in this regard is that the university’s core campaign staff has stature and experience, and that the President has been working with this staff for several years on this undertaking.

Expectations are high. The visiting team heard considerable excitement about the recent renaming of a major campus building in consideration of a major gift. If there is a cautionary note to sound it is that this core staff is small, and that many with whom we talked reported that they know little about the upcoming campaign.

The customary remedy for large expectations about fund raising and limited staff resources is to employ consultants with a record of success in this area, as indeed the university has done. This strategy works if managed well. It also poses challenges because this is a large, complex, loosely structured university whose scale and evolved mission distinguish it in various ways from CSU generally, and thus force it to exercise an unusual amount of self-discipline as it plans its future.
The visiting team offers two suggestions about planning in general and specifically with regard to the upcoming campaign with regard to meeting fully the expectation of Standard 4 and Criteria for Review 4.2 and 4.3: (1) Use the need for a reasonable measure of central planning as a means to unify the institution around its mission. Use the President’s and the Provost’s established capacity to effect change as catalysts to engage broader circles of university constituents in key decisions, and make the processes as transparent as possible. (2) Empanel campus advisory bodies, including both on-campus personnel and donors or community backers, to inform and monitor the work done by consultants engaged to plan the campaign or to supplement the President’s planning. In combination with the enhancement of resources for the core development function and on-going training for deans and others involved in campus planning and in donor cultivation, these strategies should allow the university to retain the best of its current culture while deliberately moving toward what it will be following the campaign.

Assessing General Education Competencies

There is emerging consensus at SDSU that the General Education program needs to be reviewed and revised. The long list of outcomes and goals currently pursued is cumbersome and not readily amenable to measurement, nor is it clear whether the list represents the desired outcomes for a college-educated person in the 21st century. Assessing General Education competencies remains a substantial challenge for SDSU, despite the advice outlined in the visiting team’s report following its 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review.
The team notes that university-level committee structures have now been named to facilitate faculty oversight of General Education. In discussions with faculty, however, team members continued to hear of needs for strong, central coordination of General Education; the desirability of a "czar for General Education" was even mentioned in one meeting.

At the time of the team’s 2005 visit to SDSU, Associated Students was conducting a survey of undergraduates about their General Education experience, prompted in part by a review of the institution’s results from the 2003 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement. The President and Vice President of Associated Students indicated in interviews that SDSU’s student body is highly concerned about gaining the core knowledge, skills, and abilities that are vital to success in the workplace. This survey asks students enrolled in General Education classes, “To what extent has your experience in this General Education course contributed to your knowledge, skills, and abilities in the following areas?” Respondents then rated course contributions in relation to the 18 General Education objectives. When completed in November, this survey is expected to result in some 7,500 responses—a phenomenal record of participation for any campus survey. The results of the pending survey could inform campus discussions about relevant outcomes of General Education; results could prompt implementation of processes to ensure that students have the opportunity to acquire a set of core
General Education skills through, as one faculty member put it, a “coherent pathway.”

SDSU’s Faculty Senate will review the university’s General Education program as well. *It would be useful for SDSU to examine the structures and processes used successfully by other CSU campuses and peer institutions in regard to General Education reform, so that SDSU might determine what worked and what was less successful in other reform efforts.* Key to a productive review of General Education is to design and enact an expeditious process that is consistent with the SDSU culture. Other relevant questions for consideration are these: (1) How might curricular approval processes be shifted to intensify the focus on student learning? (2) Does assessment of General Education outcomes of transfer students need to be considered? (3) What are appropriate benchmarks of performance in General Education? (4) How might out-of-class experiences such as campus employment, off-campus work, service learning, volunteer work, and study abroad (among other experiences) contribute to General Education outcomes? (5) How might Student Affairs as an organizational unit contribute to the review of General Education?

One means to build interest in SDSU’s reform of General Education is to connect reform activity to another important institutional priority for which there is considerable momentum and enthusiasm, such as undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity (or “RSCA”). The visiting team views RSCA to be a potentially distinctive feature of SDSU. Another distinguishing
priority could be study abroad, since large numbers of SDSU students participate annually in study abroad.

In summary, the visiting team sees little evident progress in reducing the number of General Education objectives to a manageable number. Although assessment of General Education objectives remains a challenge for SDSU, more pressing now is the need to review and reform General Education in its entirety—from its philosophical underpinnings, to its structure, to its assessment. After examining the work of peers in regard to lessons and models of past General Education reform efforts, SDSU should first establish a circumscribed timeline for reviewing its General Education program and then enact reform efforts expeditiously, so as not to prolong this process. The visiting team suggests further that SDSU assign responsibility and accountability to a central unit or officer for the review, reform, and oversight of General Education in order to meet the expectations of Standard 2 and Criterion for Review 2.2.

Continuing Analysis in the Balance Among Access, Recruitment, and Retention

The team’s assessment of SDSU’s continued work in regard to this issue is noted in its response to Reflective Essay 1, beginning on page 23 of this report.

Continuing Progress on Integrating the Imperial Valley and Brawley Campuses

Following the 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review visit to San Diego State University and its Imperial Valley Campus, the WASC visiting team
expressed a number of concerns regarding the place and direction of the IVC within the larger university. The visiting team continues to have many of the same concerns following its Educational Effectiveness Review of SDSU, even though there has been progress at the Imperial Valley Campus. Both the IV and the Brawley campuses provide SDSU with considerable resource and coordination challenges, while offering also some very intriguing, productive, and innovative opportunities. These campuses should not be an “afterthought” for SDSU but should be embraced and integrated creatively into the core of the larger university.

During its 2005 visit to the university, two members of the WASC visiting team met with a delegation from the IV campus and had an opportunity to review progress since the last visit. The delegation reported the following:

The IVC had recently received a $5.5M Title V grant to develop a 2-Plus-2 program in Nursing and Computer Science. This grant represents a major milestone for the IVC, forging a new partnership with a local community college. Moreover, in the last five years, the IV campus has attracted approximately $15M in grants to support academic and pilot programs, which is undoubtedly an extraordinary achievement.

At the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit, IVC was piloting an Honors program for freshmen; and now, after a complex California State University approval process, IVC has received formal approval to institute the program for five years. This is the only approved lower-division program of
its kind in the CSU, and it covers three majors: Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Liberal Studies.

A long-standing concern at the IVC is the viability and fairness of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure criteria for IVC faculty as compared to faculty on the main campus. A RP&T proposal has come forward that recognizes the special teaching and service demands on faculty at the IVC campus. Faculty took pains to note that they see this policy as temporary or transitional and that—in the long term—they do not want to be held accountable for lower RP&T standards. In addition, faculty described reduced teaching-load requirements as a recent victory that the Dean was able to achieve, while noting that the reduced requirements would not be permanent but would depend on future enrollments and specific curricular needs of the campus.

There was considerable discussion about the lack of ongoing communication and intellectual exchange between the faculties of both campuses. For example, information about research opportunities, academic initiatives, or institutes at the SDSU campus is not systematically shared with IVC faculty, which further disadvantages professional development and intellectual integration within IVC academic departments and within the larger university. The Mathematics Department, in contrast, has developed important and useful linkages (e.g., a video-conference class through the Computational Sciences Institute, occasional virtual office hours, mentoring of junior faculty during the tenure process), as has the College of Education. These initiatives
appear to be department-specific and dependent on the initiative of the IVC faculty. The issue of intellectual isolation is especially important to the IVC faculty because the departments at the IVC are quite small and there are few colleagues nearby with whom to interact.

There are faculty searches in progress for lines in Psychology, Criminal Justice, Mathematics, Teacher Education, and Literacy Studies at the IVC. Although it can be difficult to attract faculty to the campus, additional recruitment is an important step that will have a positive effect both on the intellectual life of faculty in these departments and on the campus’s capacity for research and collaborations.

SDSU’s institutional processes for strategic and other forms of planning do not seem to include the IVC consistently. The IVC faculty and administration report that the campus is not involved in central decision-making processes. This feeling may be due, in part, to the fact that SDSU maintains a master plan for its central campus that is separate from its IVC master plan, which was completed 5-6 years ago. Including IVC personnel in institutional planning processes – especially in preparation for the pending capital campaign – may alleviate feelings of isolation or separation among IVC faculty and administration. Similarly, developing committees and repositories for strategic planning that are joint rather than separate may improve connections between the central campus and the IVC.

There was some discussion of the Brawley campus as well, responsibility for which inevitably taxes the IVC faculty and staff even further as they try to
serve the needs of the Brawley community. Some suggestions were made regarding possible use of technology to link the two remote campuses to the SDSU central campus, along with more targeted library services.

Student Affairs and Associated Students have extended their services over the last year and have developed a strong, close-knit relationship with the IVC community, which is extraordinarily valuable to the quality of the IVC educational environment. The commitment and the involvement of the students with the IVC, especially now that the campus has a freshman population, suggests the possibility for developing a unique, self-reflective, and very productive teaching and learning community.

The visiting team's concluding advice in regard to SDSU's Imperial Valley and Brawley campuses is as follows: (1) Institutional processes, especially planning initiatives, should consciously and consistently include the IVC. Certainly the upcoming capital campaign must incorporate the needs and aspirations that the university and the community have for this campus. (2) The central academic administration needs to encourage departments and colleges, first, to develop communication strategies that systematically include faculty colleagues in the IVC and, second, to ensure that there are policies in place to address professional development, RP&T needs, and institutional involvement at the IVC. (3) Technology is a promising tool for more tightly connecting the IVC, the Brawley Campus, and the central campus. Such connections are essential for faculty, students, and staff to take greater advantage of academic offerings and to explore creative ways to encourage research and ongoing dialogue among these
communities. The team strongly encourages the exploration and development of pilot programs and initiatives that would further connect the campuses and support the educational enterprise in the remote sites.
SECTION II: EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

IIA: Evaluation of the University’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

San Diego State University approached the Educational Effectiveness Review by engaging a broad set of campus constituencies, to ensure that the focus of the review would meet both the aspirations of the entire campus and the expectations of WASC. SDSU’s WASC Coordinating Committee, appointed by President Weber, included 20 faculty, staff, and students who met regularly throughout the process. A smaller sub-group of six members of this Committee met weekly to set the agenda and to ensure campus progress. SDSU’s proposal, Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, and the Educational Effectiveness Review Report were consciously tied to the university’s shared vision statement.

The WASC Coordinating Committee prepared a working paper that identified three key issues of importance to the university: (1) the balance among access, retention, and graduation, (2) student learning outcomes assessment, and (3) the impact of participation in research, scholarship, and creative activity on undergraduate student learning. For each of these themes, campus groups convened to ask questions, to gather and evaluate evidence and methodologies, to document best practices, and to define areas for further review and exploration. Faculty representatives have been engaged with the review at all levels of development, as participants on the Coordinating Committee and as Faculty Senate or college/department members collecting and analyzing data and revising program content in light of student work. The faculty was also in
regular communication about the WASC process, through their participation in
groups addressing the three themes and by engaging in discussion during the
Provost's monthly reports to the Faculty Senate. Student participation was
strong as well; the Dean of Undergraduate Studies met regularly with the
leadership of Associated Students to be certain that they were drawn into the
research as much as possible. These efforts were appropriate, since the multi-
year duration of the WASC review process makes consistent participation of
student representatives difficult to maintain.

The visiting team found SDSU's Educational Effectiveness inquiry to be well-
aligned with the plan of action set forth in the proposal, and the team commends the
campus on the open, reflective tone of the Educational Effectiveness Report. The report
identifies areas where success is evident while acknowledging gaps in progress
toward campus-identified goals. SDSU's thematic approach provided an
opportunity for the visiting team to evaluate the current state of quality
assurance systems at SDSU, in accordance with WASC Standards II and IV. The
thematic essays identify the status of the campus and highlight the challenges
ahead. This approach seems to have focused campus discussions on areas where
most constituencies have a stake, while providing the campus with the
opportunity to reflect on and clarify institutional aspirations.

San Diego State University is progressing well in developing learning
outcomes for its programs, departments, and colleges; and the university has
demonstrated engagement of the faculty as they examined student work,
explored what the assessment data revealed, and determined how that data would be used to improve student learning. The partnerships among the Division of Undergraduate Studies, departmental and college faculty, and the university’s administration are models of shared governance and collaboration as the campus continues its journey toward educational effectiveness.

*Reflective Essay 1: The Balance Among Access, Retention, and Graduation*

San Diego State University recently came under impacted status and previously had placed little emphasis on retention and graduation. Thus, the university, in contrast to many of its peers, stands at the beginning of a process of developing a solid program of institutional research in support of enrollment management and institutional decision-making. Exploring the costs and benefits of impacted programs, for example, would be a fruitful topic for institutional investigation. Similarly, as admission to SDSU becomes increasingly competitive, the university stands to benefit from the creation of admissions yield studies in the near future.

In light of its mission and context, SDSU has clearly identified two key issues for focused study in Reflective Essay 1: the performance of the dual-admit program (an experimental, three-year program) and the performance of community-college transfers (a very large segment of the SDSU student body). Reflective Essay 1 is well-aligned with the plan of action set forth in the Educational Effectiveness proposal—in terms of its formal, thematic basis. The
overall tone of the inquiry is open and honest. The inclusion of both a survey-based research project in the dual-admission program analysis and an interview project in the community-college transfer analysis are positive indicators of focused inquiry relative to educational effectiveness; however, in general, the inquiry as written describes the current state of the institution primarily using descriptive statistics and offers relatively little in the way of well-articulated and designed steps for action.

In terms of the quantitative data supplied by SDSU’s Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research, the evidence falls far short of expectations for a themed institutional analysis. No peer or benchmark analyses are employed. (See the team’s broader remarks regarding the lack of peer analyses, on pages 46-47.) Some conclusions clearly go beyond the data in offering unsupported conclusions, such as, “It is evident from both the statistical data we examined and the interviews we conducted with transfer students that they are consciously choosing to take fewer units per semester due to financial obligations.” No information on student credit hours by native/transfer status or on financial need by native/transfer status was provided in the Educational Effectiveness Report to support this assertion.

Although other data regarding retention have been gathered and analyzed, only certain aspects of the complicated retention issue are being evaluated. It appears that few efforts were made to examine the effects of various interventions on student retention, progression, and graduation rates.
These shortcomings may reflect the understaffed nature of the university’s IR unit as well as the institution’s recent implementation of educational effectiveness measures. The visiting team notes, however, that the issue of sufficient resources to ensure appropriate institutional research capability was a topic of concern in its report on the Capacity and Preparatory Review of SDSU. The team reiterates its recommendation that SDSU augment its institutional research capabilities consistent with WASC Criteria for Review 4.4 and 4.5, so that the university can meet its current demands for data analysis and reporting, and prepare to respond adequately to other demands that surely will arise as the university moves its educational effectiveness initiatives forward.

In the university’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report, descriptive statistics are used very selectively, in that the focus is almost exclusively on racial/ethnic demographic analysis, complemented in some instances by cohort analysis by racial and ethnic background. For example, the analysis of the dual-admission program is limited to disaggregation by ethnicity and is silent about other factors known to be of high importance to student enrollment, persistence, and graduation behaviors. A more appropriate analysis of this program’s performance would have been expected in this context, and might nominally have included comparative analysis of program performance by gender, student age, FT/PT employment status, unmet financial need, father's/mother's educational attainment (first-generation college status), major, courses attempted/courses completed, etc. Similarly, no effort is apparent to model
quantitatively transfer student issues such as performance, persistence, progression, and graduation. Quantitative prediction models might be built on first-to-second-year data for one cohort and validated against data available for other cohorts. Such an effort to model behavior might shed light on the fact that SDSU loses approximately 15 percent of its transfers from the first to second year after transfer, and it loses another 7 percent from the second to third year after transfer. It is evident that the first year of transfer to SDSU is a critical time in students' lives and should be the focus of intensive study and intervention.

Overall, the visiting team notes that analyses of current enrollment by gender, by educational goals, and especially by student age were not included in the Educational Effectiveness Report. This is surprising because the university has promoted career opportunities for so many generations of San Diegans, from the era of the GI Bill to the present. On the other hand, during the visit, the visiting team learned that more detailed analyses have been completed and that SDSU's Division of Academic Affairs is working with these analyses.

During a series of four conversations on the themes of access, retention, and graduation, team members met with many SDSU representatives and discussed a wide range of issues affecting retention and graduation at SDSU. One of the first issues that emerged during these conversations was the notion that SDSU's transfer students perceive themselves as a population completely separate from the university's base of "traditional" students (in that transfer students are typically older, participate less often in campus-based activities, and
interact less with other students). Indeed, this theme emerged strongly in SDSU’s Educational Effectiveness Report, from the Sociology 408 interview project of 80 students and the dual-admission survey of 51 respondents. The transfer students with whom the team met made a point of saying that they felt as if they were treated or viewed as different from students who began their undergraduate studies at SDSU. It seems safe to conclude that many transfer students are not nearly as well integrated academically and socially as are their counterparts. They yearn to be better connected, as noted on page 13 of the report. On pages 9-10, the specter of students feeling excluded or “left out of all the fun” is raised as well.

The team heard suggestions for an array of different strategies that may be appropriate for addressing the perceived or real issues facing transfer students. Reframing transfer-student orientation was mentioned as a potential strategy during the course of the interviews, and Student Affairs personnel noted that the results of the interview project (described in the Educational Effectiveness Report) enabled them to develop new approaches to transfer student orientation. In conversations, the students noted that existing orientation programs for transfers are geared toward freshmen, are expensive, and are dominated by campus social organizations. One student said, “Orientation was all about ‘Join, join, join, give back, give back.’ I just want to get my education right, then I’ll get involved.” Transfer students who met with the visiting team appeared far more
concerned about getting accurate academic guidance than about orientation topics, however.

A second and related issue to emerge during the team’s conversations with transfer students was the difficulty they experienced with the transfer process. From student reports, it became evident that some students, some even from as far away as Los Angeles, were having a better transfer experience (in terms of advising, knowledge of majors available, and course transferability) than others coming from major San Diego-area feeder schools, such as Grossmont Community College. Transfer students noted the lack of a true transfer center or bridge program at SDSU, and these students stated that they had frequently received inaccurate advice from their community-college counselors about what courses would or would not transfer. There appeared to be a systemic lack of communication among SDSU admissions officers, SDSU and community-college registrars’ offices, and the counselors at the feeder schools. As one student lamented, “I feel like I’m going to be left behind,” and all the students (albeit a small sample) strongly advocated for a “transfer center” or a similar advising resource at SDSU.

A third issue took shape as the visiting team heard from three groups of staff and faculty about the curriculum roadmaps that have been created as a guide for all students. As one faculty member from the School of Business noted, the roadmaps are only templates, and there are varying requirements (such as a minimum GPA) for declaring different majors that cannot be reflected in the
roadmap templates. Members of the visiting team were told that 80 percent of programs at SDSU are “impacted” programs that have barriers to students’ transitioning to upper-division status. Through extended discussions with faculty and staff, it became evident to the team that requirements for declaring a major and transitioning from lower- to upper-division status were possible causes of an existence of cohorts of pre-major students who are stalled in a pattern of attempting and failing to raise their GPAs high enough to meet entrance requirements for a preferred major and upper-division status. The continued lack of progress of these students toward graduation is potentially having a deleterious effect on SDSU’s graduation rate, rate of individual student success, and prospects for future alumni happiness and financial support.

A fourth theme that came to light during discussions with groups of faculty and staff was the notion that a number of specific, limited efforts at rational enrollment management are underway but that no overarching plan, philosophy, or leadership is currently functional at the institution to manage enrollment. Examples of the disparate, uncoordinated efforts in this regard are as follows: (1) Liberal Studies performs a hand-tally of student credits in order to isolate students with too many credit hours who have not yet declared upper division status; no reliable, institutional method exists for accomplishing the same goal. (2) Student Affairs has begun to implement a new strategic plan that mandates annual assessment plans; identification of transfer, retention, and graduation barriers; and development of plans of action for each unit. (3) The
visiting team heard from faculty and staff that only Enrollment Services has the authority to declare an academic unit "impacted," apparently without the advice and consent of the Faculty Senate or the academic unit in question. (4) SDSU's Educational Effectiveness Report notes, on page 15, that "the University Senate has reconfigured the retention council—an ad hoc group appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Student Affairs—charging it to focus on graduation as well as retention, and making it a permanent subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council." It did not seem that this group had progressed in its discussions or that it had a clear mandate, however.

In conclusion, members of the visiting team found the essay on access, retention, and graduation insufficiently thorough or strategic in its analysis, conclusions, and recommendations for action. *The visiting team believes that the institution needs to reconsider student success as represented by persistence and graduation rates in the context of mission and strategic goals and then conduct comprehensive analyses of student flow and barriers to transfer, retention, and graduation (coupled with more than just passive enrollment and retention data) that will begin to yield between-group differences that may be actionable.* Visiting team members recognized that there is simply no substitute for cogent, supported institutional research in support of retention and transfer studies. *The visiting team recommends (consistent with WASC Standard 4 and Criterion for Review 4.4) that SDSU develop a strategic plan and overarching philosophy for its enrollment management efforts; a strategy for analyzing transfer and native enrollment populations,
in addition to the retention, progression, and graduation of these groups; and a
designated leadership structure for the strategic management of enrollment from
application to graduation. SDSU should develop retention and graduation targets and
strategic plans expressly for its transfer population, which is a sizable and important part
of the SDSU student body, with specific needs, challenges, and opportunities that should
be understood and addressed fully. The university has invested in initial analyses
and thought into access, retention, and graduation issues related to transfer
students—but there is no evidence that the university has incorporated these
important matters into the institutional strategic plan or that it has considered
how the capital campaign may help enhance the academic and educational
experience of these students.

Reflective Essay 2: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: How Well Are We
Doing?

One of the classic ironies about higher education is that colleges and
universities can articulate almost anything about what they do—with the
exception of how well their students are learning. SDSU is on the road to
rebutting this aphorism. The visiting team found Reflective Essay 2 to be
comprehensive, informative, and refreshingly candid. It is clear that the
university is making significant progress in regard to measuring learning
outcomes. Assessing student learning is a high priority for key institutional
leaders, such as the Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, along with
most other deans and many department chairs. SDSU's public pronouncements regarding assessment are supported by decisive action, such as the aforementioned refusal of the Provost to release funds for vacant faculty lines to units that failed to produce and implement an assessment plan. Efforts to use different, direct approaches to measure learning are noteworthy, such as the Sociology 408 qualitative methods class project measuring transfer-student perceptions.

Furthermore, departmental reports and course syllabi show that SDSU has made considerable progress in establishing learning outcomes in many courses and programs. The reports from students and faculty indicate that, when course objectives are clarified and faculty reflect more systematically on what students should know, instructional time is more effective and efficient and students are more satisfied with their learning. Outcomes assessment in certain areas such as the Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies and the Liberal Studies major are very well developed, while in some other areas assessment of learning outcomes is still in formative stages.

Students and faculty members from selected departments (e.g., Exercise and Nutritional Science, Biology, Chemistry, Psychology, and Theatre) persuasively demonstrated to the visiting team that gains in instructional effectiveness and student learning can be realized by focusing on good practices. Other anecdotal reports by students suggest that not all courses include clear objectives or feedback in these areas. Indeed, during the team's very limited
conversations with students, a few reported not only the absence of student learning outcomes from their courses but also an absence of a syllabus. Thus, there is more progress to be made in the consistent implementation of objectives across the university.

Other challenges remain as well, such as convincing circumspect faculty members that focusing time and energy on assessing learning outcomes is a productive investment and will not demonstrably detract from other important research and service activities. According to some, focusing on student learning does not mean forsaking one’s discipline. Assessment, others said, is not a zero-sum game but a substitution of time spent on pedagogical activities. As one faculty member stated, assessment of student learning “adds value to faculty work.” “When you start talking about what you teach,” this faculty member elaborated, “talking about learning outcomes helps center the discussion about what we teach.” Clarifying assignments also seems to focus and raise expectations for student performance, because students are cued to spend time on what is deemed important.

SDSU’s Student Learning Outcomes Committee has been especially helpful in encouraging assessment activities across units. Units receive feedback on their reports, which is not always the case at other institutions. Units uniformly commented that this feedback was especially useful. Collection and use of student performance data is less evident and more difficult to judge, however. This could be an area for further work for the university.
Evidence presented to the visiting team does not indicate how systematically SDSU departments and programs are utilizing student performance data to target and intervene in areas where student performance is below established standards. The effort to address the low portfolio pass rate for Hispanic students in Liberal Studies (described on page 20 of the Educational Effectiveness Report) is one example of an attempt to address a student-performance issue. Also unclear are whether units have established standards for student performance and how those standards align with post-college success in areas other than those where professional competency tests exist.

Section IIB of this report (beginning on page 38) contains the team’s additional remarks regarding SDSU’s work in regard to assessment of student learning.

Reflective Essay 3: The Impact of Participation in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity on Undergraduate Student Learning

SDSU has a long history of involving undergraduate students in a variety of scholarly activities, both inside and outside the classroom. These programs seem to have significant positive effects on students and can dramatically improve their academic success. It is evident that the university is committed to these programs and that the programs fit well into the overall priorities of the university. The value added by these programs to a student’s overall education is significant. That is, these experiences can make a routine undergraduate
experience transformative, by engaging a student in ways that inspire them to recognize and develop previously unknown talents. Undergraduate participation in research, scholarship, and creative activity (or, in the vernacular of SDSU administrators, “RSCA”) is sufficiently embedded in the culture of the institution that, with further investment, it could be a significant differentiating theme for the undergraduate experience at SDSU. (The university will want to develop benchmark data for operational and aspirational peers to determine the actual level of differentiation at SDSU. See the team’s other advice regarding use of peer data, on pages 46-47.) Developing short-term strategic plans and long-term goals for RSCA will be essential to realizing this goal fully. As the institution develops these plans it might consider the following suggestions responsive to Criteria for Review 2.9 and 4.3:

Definition. Reflective Essay 3 describes a variety of activities as “research, scholarship, and creative activity” — when, in fact, these efforts might fall under the broader classification of “experiential learning.” This broader classification might include the following, related activities that present similar opportunities for undergraduates: (1) original research, scholarship, and/or creative activities, (2) service learning, (3) internships, and (4) inquiry-based classroom activities.

It is important to recognize that these can be very different experiences for students, and learning outcomes and assessment tools need to reflect these differences. In particular, the institution should be careful not to over-assess the outcomes of original research, scholarship, and creative activities. Original
research is a process of discovery, and the inherent uncertainties associated with original research should be recognized.

Access. Access to experiential learning experiences, especially original RSCA, does not seem to be a problem for native students. The same may not be true for transfer students, however. At a minimum, there is a perception among some transfer students that their native peers participate in RSCA more easily. In interviews with faculty regarding undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity, two faculty members addressed the exclusion of transfer students from these projects. One faculty member said, “Transfer students don’t get the same experience. They just don’t. They can’t develop the esprit de corps that the [native] students develop.” Another faculty member noted, “With respect to transfer students, we get a mixed bag. Some students come in very well prepared. But if you don’t have the preparatory courses in the sequence, they can lose a lot of time. They have to really hit the ground running when they get here if they want to participate [in undergraduate research, scholarship, and creative activity].” Thus, the impression of the visiting team is that the topic of academic integration would form a highly fruitful theme for ongoing, focused inquiry at SDSU—especially in regard to RSCA. (See the team’s broader remarks regarding the academic integration of transfer students at SDSU, on pages 26-28.)

In alignment with Criterion for Review 2.14, SDSU needs to develop programs to facilitate transfer student involvement in original RSCA (and, perhaps, in other experiential learning experiences). Colleges and/or departments might want to develop
"transfer transition" activities to achieve this goal (perhaps within the context of a more comprehensive, university-wide transfer transition program – addressed on page 28).

Resources. Investment in RSCA should be a high priority for the university – and especially for the capital campaign. An important aspect of this investment should focus on expanding the number of opportunities for students to participate in scholarly activities. Potential areas of investment include, but are not limited to the following: (1) first-generation research scholarships (and scholarships in general), (2) support for faculty mentoring of students, (3) a university-wide symposium that highlights student achievement in these learning experiences, (3) support for travel to conferences, and (4) curricular "feedback."

It is clear that some units (e.g., the Theatre Department) are using assessment data from student involvement in creative activities to improve the effectiveness of the overall curriculum in the major. *All units should be encouraged to use RSCA assessment data in a similar fashion.* The university should evaluate also, as part of General Education reform, how General Education can better prepare students to participate in experiential learning activities in their chosen major.

*Intellectual Property.* The university needs to have a systematic effort in place to communicate and insure that all students, faculty, and staff are fully aware of institutional IP policies that are applicable to all experiential learning activities.
Social Involvement and Transdisciplinary Activities. SDSU has, perhaps, a unique opportunity to develop transdisciplinary experiential learning activities that would directly involve students in addressing important societal issues facing the communities served by the institution. These activities might be modeled on similar disciplinary programs already in place. This could be a very effective mechanism, both for increasing the social involvement of SDSU in the greater metropolitan community and for enhancing the public’s understanding of the importance of scholarly activities to the quality of their lives.

In closing, the visiting team suggests that SDSU pursue opportunities for expanding RSCA opportunities for all students. In an effort to increase the visibility of this compelling work, the university might consider sponsoring a university-wide research symposium that would celebrate the fruits of student-faculty cooperation at SDSU.

IIB: Evaluation of the University’s Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Results

Since SDSU explicitly addressed assessment of student learning in many portions of its Education Effectiveness Report and in many sessions during the team’s 2005 visit to the university, much of the team’s commentary understandably focuses on this same topic. In addition to the team’s evaluation of educational effectiveness systems included in this section, see also the team’s
analyses in Section IC (on pages 6-10) and in Section IIA (on pages 21-23 and 31-34).

Learning Outcomes. With occasional exceptions, the visiting team judges SDSU to have well-developed structures in place to assess student learning. At SDSU, there are many examples of good teaching and learning practices in a variety of units, with increasing amounts of evidence of teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes. The continued development of rubrics across many programs and courses is particularly impressive. While there still is more work to be done in regard to learning outcomes at SDSU, much progress has been made.

The visiting team heard several first-hand accounts of powerful teaching approaches from faculty who had implemented pedagogical projects through the QUALCOMM-funded pICT project. The variety of approaches taken toward integrating information literacy, communication, and technology into student learning demonstrated laudable creativity as well as a strong focus on student learning. The team reviewed authentic examples of student work products and pedagogical approaches, such as: (1) Dr. James Garza’s Communications 103, a presentation course, utilizes streaming video of student presentations to encourage non-evaluative peer comments on student performance via BlackBoard; the streaming video also assists students in reflecting on their own presentations. (2) In a Shakespeare class, pICT was used to help students see how Shakespeare was relevant to their lives. An engineering major produced a
very powerful multimedia presentation to demonstrate how a sonnet helped explain his feelings about his father’s death. (3) The instructor of a chemistry course enrolling 1,000 students per year developed animations to engage students in understanding the mathematics undergirding chemistry problems. (4) A Business Communication faculty member incorporated a blog in an advanced course, developed a grading rubric, and invited the author of a required text to contribute to the blog; students were energized by the approach, and the instructor learned more about contemporary student culture. How to increase the scale of this approach and other, similar approaches is another question, since the course utilizing the blog contained only six students.

Despite the success of these pICT projects, few had taken the next step of using the assessment information being gathered about individual students and applying it more broadly to the desired student learning outcomes within the course in a systematic fashion. The visiting team commends the university on this project and suggests that further support be made available to faculty undertaking pICT projects, to help them develop systematic assessments of course-level student learning.

The visiting team heard very little about assessment of student learning by Student Affairs staff, except for a project involving residential learning communities using a pre- and post-test design. (For the team’s other remarks regarding integration of Student Affairs into assessment efforts, see pages 47-48.) The team was unable to review the testing instruments, but assessment such as the tests
being administered in the residential learning communities should be encouraged and further explored across the division of Student Affairs.

Substantial revision of writing assessment is evident, with a combination of the Upper Division Writing Exam and the Transfer Writing Assessment into one test for all students, the Writing Proficiency Assessment. Plans to revise the test and to assess student learning in the context of that requirement have evidently been the topic of broad-based discussion on the campus, in line with the suggestion advanced on pages 33 - 34 of the team's C&PR Report.

Teaching and Learning Processes. The visiting team judges the curricula and pedagogy at SDSU to be well-developed with many institutional structures and processes in place. The role of student learning outside the classroom is less well developed, however.

Departmental faculty members are beginning to discuss results with one another as the review of second-year outcomes is examined. At the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, 26 percent of departments were able to describe efforts to improve their programs based on what they learned from their data. At the same time, in the Rhetoric and Writing, Liberal Studies, and Religious Studies programs, over 5,000 students are affected by the demonstrable improvements in teaching and learning that have resulted from this work. Students describe the clear statements of learning outcomes that are expected and how that improves their focus on work; faculty describe their deepening engagement in student learning through changes in course content and
pedagogy. The faculty report that using learning-outcome rubrics, reviewing student work together, and identifying improvements for courses are substitutions in their preparation and teaching time, rather than an addition to what they have done in the past. For these faculty members, there has been a shift in how they organize their time in preparing, teaching, and assessing student work. They have embraced the contributions of assessment.

Faculty acknowledge that—although institutional commitment to assessment is high—the departmental responses range from High Participation to "C" grades (or minimum participation). The visiting team's conversations with faculty and students indicated the need for faculty to look at how courses are approved, how faculty are evaluated, how curriculum delivers what students need to learn, and how faculty development may be enhanced to encourage higher faculty participation at the "B" level.

Curricula and pedagogy are beginning to be aligned with established learning outcomes, with achievement demonstrated in some areas beyond mere completion of designated courses. Most programs have defined learning outcomes and examine student achievement through the use of rubrics, surveys, and other analysis of student work. Building faculty and departmental participation in meaningful assessment of student learning is a next step for SDSU. In addition to its suggestions regarding programs for sharing best practices among faculty and for honoring exemplary participation (highlighted on page 7), the visiting team suggests also that SDSU's academic administration consider ways in
which recruitment, promotion, and tenure policies might reflect the university’s commitment to measuring student learning outcomes, consistent with Criteria for Review 2.8 and 2.9.

Organizational Learning. Moving the campus to engage more deeply in student learning has the full support of the President and Provost. As has been discussed elsewhere in this report, the Provost has made the annual assessment reports a priority for academic affairs. The support provided by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to departments and programs is exceptional. The Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies chairs the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, which reviews the annual assessment reports using a rubric that evaluates the submission on four criteria: (1) focus of student learning assessment for the past academic year, (2) methodology used to examine learning goals and objectives, (3) results and conclusions, and (4) improvement strategies. Each of these components is evaluated as Satisfactory, Developing, or Missing. The committee provides recommendations for improvements and how to access assistance either from the college representative to the committee or from the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. The visiting team commends SDSU for the rigor of the process that takes place through the Student Learning Outcomes Committee, in which Undergraduate Studies and the departments and programs collaborate to advance the institutional structures measuring learning consistent with Criteria for Review 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6.
Learning outcomes have been established for 87 percent of all academic programs. A review of some of the annual assessment reports submitted by academic departments indicates that there are departments with well-developed systems of direct and indirect measures of student work and student satisfaction with programs. As pages 32-33 of this report indicate, however, the visiting team learned that some courses at SDSU feature neither syllabi nor learning outcomes for students to inspect, and efforts will need to continue to ensure that learning outcomes and assessment are consistently implemented across the curriculum.

San Diego State University has engaged in a number of data collection activities and, in the case of the NSSE data, used benchmarks for comparison on performance of students in General Education. The campus began using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in spring 2003. There was evidence of similarity of scores with other doctoral-intensive peer institutions. Scores for the senior cohort on five benchmarks were lower than expected in the Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences, and Supportive Campus Environment categories. The NSSE report was shared with campus administrators, and the Faculty Senate responded by establishing an ad-hoc committee to review the NSSE data, particularly the benchmark responses. A coordinated examination of the data collected seems to be lacking, however. In this regard, see the team’s summary remarks regarding SDSU’s use of peer data, on pages 46-47.
Members of the visiting team examined SDSU’s web-based materials. The team requested and received additional data during the visit. For several of the team’s questions, relevant data was readily available but not always known to the faculty and staff participating in the theme discussions with the team. *As the university continues to review the effectiveness of its educational processes, the visiting team believes that a wide dissemination of the available data will be helpful.*

Systems are in place for enhancing teaching effectiveness and learning results. The campus describes this work as including “a systematic analysis of how well our departments and programs have implemented the student learning assessment process. This process includes specifying learning goals/objectives for each department or program, establishing direct measures of student learning, analyzing the results, and using the data to inform program improvement.”

The university has made good progress in developing the structures and reporting mechanisms about learning outcomes. Administrators acknowledge that they are at the beginning stages of shifting toward a culture of evidence. Reasons given to explain this stage of development are the lack of faculty expertise and comfort at “examining learning at a program level, time and resource constrains, and conflicting messages” regarding how this new area of faculty work fits into the historic division of faculty time between teaching individual courses and engaging in scholarly work.
Overall, the visiting team views SDSU as having well-developed structures and processes in place for evaluating its educational effectiveness.

IIC: Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs

The visiting team’s findings regarding two topics apply broadly to units and programs across San Diego State University:

*Use of Peer Data and Benchmark Analyses.* The team noted a distinct lack of use and awareness of data that compares San Diego State University to institutions that share SDSU’s mission, that are located within the same region, or that accomplish goals to which SDSU aspires. Systematic use of peer analyses for benchmarking is integral both to understanding SDSU’s place within the universe of higher education institutions and to guiding institutional improvement efforts. The relative absence of peer comparison data represented in the report and in conversations during the team’s visit prompted the team to ponder numerous questions. For example, the team wondered what other CSU campuses are under impaction, what the official peer institutions of SDSU are considered to be, and which of these institutions have programs similar to SDSU’s. *The team noted the existence of a strong, centralized Institutional Research office at the CSU system level, and the team encourages SDSU to investigate what system-level data are available through this office that could facilitate ongoing benchmark analyses.*
The sporadic use of benchmarking may prove problematic as the CSU system begins to use external data, such as the National Survey of Student Engagement. As SDSU works toward articulating its differentiating qualities to the public, it will want to document with evidence its accomplishments in comparison to similar institutions of higher education. The visiting team encourages SDSU to implement peer studies during appropriate processes; these might include the pending review of General Education, focused studies on transfer-student experiences, and continuing work in the assessment of student learning.

Cooperation of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Especially in regard to efforts to measure student-learning outcomes, the visiting team made note of lost opportunities for cooperation between SDSU’s Student Affairs and Academic Affairs units. To date, the university’s efforts to measure student learning seem concentrated almost exclusively on the formal academic program—the classroom, laboratory, studio, and theater—largely overlooking the ways in which extracurricular involvement may complement classroom lessons. Since all college students spend the majority of their time outside of the classroom, greater integration of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs will be appropriate and prudent for SDSU, consistent with the expectations of Criteria for Review 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8.

Although efforts are being made to assess the benefits of special residential arrangements on learning (page 40), no analyses are evident in regard to students in other residential arrangements and how learning might differ
among SDSU's large percentage of non-resident students. The visiting team therefore suggests that a comprehensive effort be made to involve Student Affairs in all relevant facets of evaluating educational effectiveness at SDSU.
SECTION III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After completing two informative visits to San Diego State University, the WASC team has come to appreciate the university for what it has been and for what it is rapidly becoming. The university’s faculty, staff, and students demonstrated authentic dedication to the spirit and letter of the WASC process during the 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review and the 2005 Educational Effectiveness Review. Although the team makes note here of topics that merit additional consideration and improvement, it must note also its conviction that SDSU is populated by good people doing good work.

The team’s advisory statements are italicized in the previous pages. Otherwise, the team’s major findings and recommendations are as follows:

Assessment of Student Learning. As is the case with its Student Learning Outcomes Committee (page 43), SDSU is accomplishing much to demonstrate what and how its students are learning. SDSU might consider convening institutional representatives responsible for learning assessment, for comparative discussions of their work (page 7). These persons and the institution’s assessment agenda might benefit from recognizing exemplary assessment work (page 7), as the faculty recruitment and advancement processes might benefit from modification to recognize the importance of assessment within SDSU’s learning community (pages 42-43). Assessment efforts would be advanced and strengthened if extended to graduate programs (page 9) and to Student Affairs work (pages 10 and 47-48).
General Education. As it begins to review and revise General Education, SDSU should consider assigning central responsibility for General Education to a single officer or unit. Once commenced, the review process should be expedient and informed by lessons learned at peer colleges and universities (page 15).

Imperial Valley and Brawley Campuses. Although improved since the C&PR visit, the Imperial Valley campus merits more time and attention from SDSU's central administration. Including the IV and Brawley campuses in planning efforts, encouraging faculty collaboration across campuses, and building technology links among the campuses are options for ameliorating the sense of isolation experienced by IVC faculty and staff (pages 19-20).

Institutional Research. As it did following its C&PR visit to SDSU, the team recommends that the university dedicate additional resources to its IR unit, so that the university might benefit from an increased analytical capacity (page 25), particularly considering the benefit to be gained from benchmarking peer and aspirational institutional data.

Admission, Retention, and Graduation of Students. The university lacks a controlling philosophy, plan, and leadership authority that govern the way it admits, retains, and graduates students. Study and action to improve admissions processes (especially for transfer students) and efforts to enhance student persistence probably would be more effective and efficient with these structures in place (pages 30-31). The visiting team noted two groups that deserve attention in this regard: transfer students, many of whom are
encountering difficulty both as they enter SDSU and while they navigate the university (pages 26-28), and other students who are steadily accruing credits but not graduating due to academic obstacles (pages 28-29). The visiting team’s concern regarding these two populations is great, so the team recommends that, as soon as possible, SDSU launch a comprehensive study of these groups and begin to address their issues and concerns.

*Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity.* Among the most distinctive features of SDSU, RSCA would benefit from expansion. The university might exploit RSCA through a university-wide symposium and through targeted growth during the pending capital campaign (pages 37 and 38).

The visiting team believes that addressing the above recommendations will enable San Diego State University to distinguish itself, to meet the expectations of an expanding student body, to document its successes for internal and external stakeholders, and to continue its history of dynamic progress.
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**APPENDIX B: SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS VISIT TO SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY WASC EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS SITE VISIT SCHEDULE**
**NOVEMBER 9 – NOVEMBER 11, 2005**

**Wednesday, November 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SDSU van pick-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10–10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>GMCS 602 (Team Room)</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Geoffrey Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For new Team members, campus tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For returning Team members, document review in Team Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:30–11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>GMCS 602 (Team Room)</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Geoffrey Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pat Patterson, Associate Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review schedule. Orientation to Team Room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Document review in Team Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lunch and orientation meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12:30–1 p.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SDSU WASC Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss context for Site Visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACCESS, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION

**1:15–1:45 p.m.**  
**LA 4450**  
- **Bonnie Zimmerman,** Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (facilitator)  
- **Ethan Singer,** Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
- **Bonnie Anderson,** Assistant Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies  
- **Janet Castro,** Director, Office of New Student and Parent Programs  
- **Chrys Dutton,** Director, Office of Financial Aid & Scholarships  
- **John Penrose,** Chair, Enrollment Management Subcommittee, Senate Academic Policy and Planning Committee  
- **Anne Donahue,** Chair, Senate Diversity, Equity, and Outreach Committee  
- **Darlene Willis,** Dean of Students  
- **Eric Rivera,** Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs  
- **Stephen Roeder,** Dean, Imperial Valley Campus  
- **Tanis Starck,** Director, Center for Community Based Service-Learning (Exploratory Review I facilitator)  
- **Linda Newell,** Faculty, School of Social Work (Exploratory Review II facilitator)

**Setting the Context, Framing the Questions**
In this meeting, administrators and faculty will discuss the institutional-level issues that emerged as a result of the work that led to the Educational Effectiveness Report. This meeting also gives participants, including the Visiting Team, the opportunity to raise their own questions. Questions from the Educational Effectiveness Report include:
- What did and did not work well in transfer students' experiences before and after coming to SDSU and what changes could improve these experiences?
- What short- and long-term indicators would allow us to assess progress toward graduation?
- What institutional supports and challenges exist in producing the data we need to inform decision-making to improve graduation and retention rates?
- How might the Graduation and Retention Subcommittee work to ensure that all campus programs responsible for improving graduation and retention rates interact, share data, and plan together to increase our effectiveness on these issues?

**8**  
**1:45–2:30 p.m.**  
**LA 4450**  
- **Tanis Starck,** Director, Center for Community Based Service-Learning (facilitator)  
- **SDSU transfer students**  
  - **Brieanna Harb**  
  - **Issel Tapia**  
  - **Fernando Martinez**  
  - **Joshua Wells**  
  - **Joey Stinovik**  
  - **Stacey Rossi**

**Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions I**
- Group of transfer students from local community colleges will discuss what did and did not work well in their transition to SDSU, as well as their experience here. Discussion to include what changes might assist with access and retention and graduation rates.

**9**  
**2:30–2:45 p.m.**  
- **Visiting Team**

**Break**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10 2:45–3:30 p.m. LA 4450 | • Linda Newell, Faculty, School of Social Work (facilitator)  
• Undergraduate Council’s Graduation and Retention Subcommittee:  
  • Steven Henriksen, Associated Students  
  • Bonnie Anderson, Assistant Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies  
  • Rosa Moreno, Special Assistant to the Vice President, Division of Student Affairs  
  • Kathleen Kreftler, Professor, Marketing  
  • Sally Farris, Director, Analytical Studies & Institutional Research  
  • Rey Monzon, Director, Student Testing, Assessment and Research  
Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions II  
• Using the CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation’s Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree and/or data tables of retention and graduation rates in disaggregated form, members of Undergraduate Council’s Graduation and Retention Subcommittee will discuss indicators (short- and long-term) that may be useful to the campus. |
| 11 3:30–3:45 p.m. | • Visiting Team  
• Break |
| 12 3:45–4:45 p.m. LA 4450 | • All Access, Retention, and Graduation participants  
Future Directions, Institutional Commitments |
| 13 4:45–5:45 p.m. President’s office | • Visiting Team  
• Stephen Weber, President  
• Nancy Marlin, Provost  
• Academic Deans’ Council  
• WASC Coordinating Committee  
• Cheryl Fisher, Director, Office of Diversity & Equity  
• Jeff Schmemel, Director, Athletics  
• Chris Manigault, President, Associated Students  
• Theresa Mendoza, VP for University Advancement  
• Sally Roush, VP for Business and Financial Affairs |
| 14 6 p.m. University House | • Reception |
| 15 7–7:30 p.m. | • Visiting Team  
• SDSU van drop-off |
| 16 7:30–9 p.m. Hotel restaurant | • Visiting Team  
• Working Dinner |
| 17 9–10 p.m. Hotel | • Visiting Team  
• Draft preliminary report |
Thursday, November 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 a.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• SDSU van pick-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8:30–9 a.m.</td>
<td>Team Room</td>
<td>• Visiting Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**

- Ellen Quandahl, Associate Professor, Rhetoric and Writing Studies (facilitator)
- Susan Levy, Associate Professor, College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts (Student Learning Outcomes Committee)
- Pat Dintrone, Assistant Dean, College of Business Administration (Student Learning Outcomes Committee)
- Susan Shuckett, Associate Director, Residential Education
- Linda Holler, Professor, Religious Studies (WASC Coordinating Committee)
- Dan Kitchen, Faculty, College of Education (WASC Coordinating Committee)
- Patrick Papin, Interim Dean, College of Sciences
- Paul Wong, Dean, College of Arts and Letters
- Joyce Gattas, Dean, College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts
- Jon Cawthorne, Associate Dean, Library (Exploratory Review I facilitator)
- Glen McClish, Professor, Rhetoric and Writing Studies (Exploratory Review II facilitator)

Setting the Context, Framing the Questions

In this meeting, administrators and faculty will discuss the institutional-level issues that emerged as a result of the work that led to the Educational Effectiveness Report. This meeting also gives participants, including the Visiting Team, the opportunity to raise their own questions. Questions from the Educational Effectiveness Report include:

- What support do faculty need to be able to understand and improve the focus on program-level student learning?
- How can SDSU make student learning central to our planning and decision making?
- How might we structure academic planning and program review processes to highlight student learning as central to decision-making and resource allocation?
- How might the curricular approval processes be shifted to intensify the focus on student learning?
- How can the process of student evaluation of faculty intensify the focus on student learning?

20 9–9:30 a.m. LA 4450
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:30–10:15 a.m. | LA 4450 | * Jon Cawthorne, Associate Dean, Library (facilitator)  
* People, Information, and Communication Technology (pICT) Project faculty:  
  * Cathie Atkins, Director, pICT  
  * Eniko Csomay, Assistant Professor, Linguistics & Oriental Languages  
  * Hong-Chang Liang, Assistant Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry  
  * Marie Flatley & Sandra Hernández-Aguirre, Information and Decision Systems  
  * James Garza, Chicana and Chicano Studies |
| 10:15–10:30 a.m. |        | * Visiting Team  
* Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions I  
* People, Information, and Communication Technology (pICT) Project faculty-student pairs will discuss how faculty can assess student work in terms of acquisition of desired knowledge, skills, and abilities. In addition to addressing questions on student learning, the conversation will include how this funded project has allowed faculty to focus on the relationship between curricular reform and student learning. |
| 10:30–11:15 a.m. | LA 4450 | * Glen McClish, Professor, Rhetoric and Writing Studies (facilitator)  
* Fred Hornbeck, Chair, Senate  
* David Kimbrough, Professor, Geological Sciences (Senate GE Committee)  
* Bonnie Scott, Professor, Women’s Studies (Senate GE Committee)  
* Chris Manigault, President, Associated Students  
* Dennis Kramer, Vice President of University Affairs, Associated Students  
* Brian Spitzberg, Professor, Communication (General Education faculty)  
* David Christian, Professor, History (General Education faculty)  
* Phoebe Roeder, Coordinator, Liberal Studies |
| Break |
| 11:15–11:30 a.m. |        | * Visiting Team  
* Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions II  
* Members of the Senate and the Senate’s General Education Committee, Associated Students, and faculty who teach GE courses will discuss the importance of and challenges to assessing student learning at the program level. |
| 11:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m. | LA 4450 | * All Student Learning Outcomes Assessment participants  
* Future Directions, Institutional Commitments |
| Break |
| 12:30–1:30 p.m. | Team Room | * Visiting Team  
* Lunch |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Setting the Context, Framing the Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 1:45–2:15 p.m. LA 4450</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natalie Pearl, Associate Professor, Public Administration &amp; Urban Studies (facilitator)</td>
<td>In this meeting, administrators and faculty will discuss the institutional-level issues that emerged as a result of the work that led to the Educational Effectiveness Report. This meeting also gives participants, including the Visiting Team, the opportunity to raise their own questions. Questions from the Educational Effectiveness Report include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Bernstein, Professor, Biology (WASC Coordinating Committee)</td>
<td>- How do departments assess whether students have acquired RSCA skills by the time they graduate? How do students know when they have acquired these skills? (The emphasis will be on an analysis of common goals, not necessarily discipline-specific skills.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Shapiro, Associate Dean, College of Extended Studies (WASC Coordinating Committee)</td>
<td>- What institutional supports and barriers exist for involving undergraduates in RSCA? What would it take to get where we want to go with RSCA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connie Dowell, Dean, Library and Information Access</td>
<td>- What is the cost? How does it affect faculty load? Are resources spread equally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie Zimmerman, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Hayhurst, Dean, College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marilyn Newhoff, Dean, College of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gail Naughton, Dean, College of Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Riggs, Associate Professor, Department of Geological Sciences (Exploratory Review I facilitator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Ely, Professor, Finance Department (Exploratory Review II facilitator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 2:15–3 p.m. LA 4450</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Riggs, Associate Professor, Geological Sciences (facilitator)</td>
<td>Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Glembotski &amp; Patrick Avila (Biology)</td>
<td>- Departmental faculty-student pairs will discuss how student work is evaluated and related to overall departmental RSCA outcomes. The conversation will not center on the work itself, but the way the work is evaluated and informs student learning, departmental decisions, and overall university educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Cronan &amp; Ian Villalta (Psychology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fred Kolkhorst &amp; Dan Cannon (Exercise and Nutritional Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Cirino &amp; Adam Parker (Theatre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 3–3:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Team</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30     | 3:15–4 p.m.  
**Exploratory Review, Engaging the Questions II**  
- This mix of departments all have well-established RSCA outcomes and have expressed concerns about barriers and difficulties. The group will engage in a conversation about how they have or have not linked undergraduate RSCA to student learning outcomes, and what specific resources they would need to move RSCA forward in their department.  
- **David Ely**, Professor, Finance Department (facilitator)  
- Department chairs/directors/representatives:  
  - Diane Borden, Communication  
  - Philip Greenfeld, Anthropology  
  - Terry Frey, Biology  
  - Karen May-Newman, Mechanical Engineering  
  - Don Robin, Speech, Language, and Hearing  
  - Carl Winston, Hospitality and Tourism  
  - Claire Murphy, Psychology  
  - Nick Reid, Theatre, Television, and Film | LA 4450      |                                                            |
| 31     | 4–4:15  
- **Visiting Team**  
- **Break** |              |                                                            |
| 32     | 4:15–5:15 p.m.  
**Future Directions, Institutional Commitments**  
- All Undergraduate Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity participants | LA 4450      |                                                            |
| 33     | 5:15–5:45 p.m.  
- **Visiting Team**  
- **SDSU van drop-off** |              |                                                            |
| 34     | 6–7:30 p.m.  
- **Working dinner**  
- **Visiting Team** | Hotel restaurant |                                                            |
| 35     | 7:30–9 p.m.  
- **Draft preliminary report**  
- **Visiting Team** | Hotel         |                                                            |
# Friday, November 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• SDSU van pick-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>8:30–9:15 a.m.</td>
<td>Team Room</td>
<td>• Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>9:30–10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>CH 3318 (President’s Conference Room)</td>
<td>• Planning: Discussion will center on progress in this area since Capacity and Preparatory Review Site Visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• John Casteen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• David Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stephen Weber, President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nancy Marlin, Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Theresa Mendoza, VP for University Advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sally Roush, VP for Business and Financial Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ethan Singer, Associate VP for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fred Hornbeck, Chair, Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kim Hill, Associate Vice President, Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tony Fulton, Director, Facilities Planning, Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9:30–10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>GMCS 418 (Math Department Conference Room)</td>
<td>• IVC: Discussion will center on progress in this area since Capacity and Preparatory Review Site Visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Janina Montero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Louanne Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Steve Roeder, Dean, Imperial Valley Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Steve McNett, Associate Dean (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Olga Amaral, Chair, Teacher Education (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Richard Ryan, Professor, Public Administration (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diana Verzi, Associate Professor, Arts and Sciences (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Miguel Rahiots, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dolores Rivera, Registrar (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sue Nichols, Grant Development Director (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Victor Lara, President, Associate Students Council (IVC) student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Norma Aguilar, Vice President, Associated Students Council (IVC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lena Rodriguez, Assistant to the President for Executive Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:30–10:30 a.m. | GMCS 217 (Chemistry Department Conference Room) | • Joseph Hoey  
• George Kuh  
• Representatives from departments being reviewed this or next academic year:  
  • Steve Colston, History  
  • Terry Frey, Biology  
  • Nikhil Varaiya, Finance  
  • Gerald Monk, Counseling and School Psychology  
  • Ida Rigby, Art, Design, and Art History  
  • Jan Andersen, Dean, Graduate Division  
  • Pat Patterson, Associate Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies  
  • Dan Finnegan, Chair, Senate Academic Policy and Planning Committee | • Program Review: Discussion of the role of program review in furthering efforts to focus on student learning outcomes. |
| 10:45–11:45 a.m. | LA 4450 | • Visiting Team  
• Stephen Weber, President  
• Nancy Marlin, Provost  
• Academic Deans Council  
• Murray Galinson, Chair, CSU Trustees  
• Ralph Pesqueira, Board Member, The Campanile Foundation Board (not confirmed) | • Reaccreditation and public accountability: Discussion of how the reaccreditation process can be used to demonstrate public accountability. |
| 12 p.m. | Team Room | • Visiting Team | • Lunch |
| 12–4 p.m. | Team Room | • Visiting Team | • Document Review. Writing. |
| 4–4:30 p.m. | President’s office | • John Casteen  
• Stephen Weber, President | • Private exit interview with President Weber |
| 4:30–5 p.m. | LA 4450 | • Visiting Team  
• Stephen Weber, President  
• Nancy Marlin, Provost  
• Theresa Mendoza, VP for University Advancement  
• Rosa Moreno, Special Assistant to the VP, Student Affairs  
• Sally Roush, VP for Business and Financial Affairs  
• Ethan Singer, Associate VP for Academic Affairs  
• Lena Rodriguez, Assistant to the President for Executive Affairs  
• WASC Coordinating Committee | • Visiting Team presents preliminary report |