

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA: Description of University and Visit

San Diego State University was founded in 1897 as a normal school. Today, some 26,853 undergraduate and 6,083 graduate students are enrolled at the university, which granted 6,181 Bachelor's degrees and 1,732 Master's degrees in 2003-2004. SDSU's six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen (entering the university in Fall 1997) is 42 percent. Some 1,684 full-time and part-time faculty teach at SDSU's main campus, at the Imperial Valley Campus, and through Master's-degree programs in Canada and in Taipei; SDSU also prides itself on its 14 joint doctoral programs.

A team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges visited SDSU's Imperial Valley Campus on October 29, 2004, and spent October 31 through November 2, 2004, on the university's main campus. (The team roster is attached as Appendix A. The schedule for the IVC visit is attached as Appendix B, and the schedule for the visit to the main campus as Appendix C.) During visits to the IVC and main campus, team members met with faculty, administrators, and students who discussed the self-study documents and SDSU's capacity to meet its educational mission. On the final day of its visit to SDSU, the visiting team hosted open meetings with faculty, with students, and with staff in order to solicit opinions of the university and its work.

As team members prepared for their visit to SDSU and the Imperial Valley Campus, they received a number of communications via e-mail, fax, and postal

mail; these communications addressed primarily the status of and support for underrepresented minorities on the SDSU campus and the case of a faculty member who was denied tenure. In order to encourage adequate notification regarding these and any other issues, the team established an e-mail account independent of SDSU e-mail servers. SDSU administrators invited any member of the university community to submit a confidential e-mail message to the visiting team via this account. The Assistant to the Team Chair monitored the e-mail account, read all messages, reviewed them with the Team Chair and WASC staff liaison, and brought a selected number of messages to the attention of the entire team. The issues raised in these messages were discussed by the team during its visit, and the team's knowledge of these same issues contributed to this report. In addition, the visiting team considered four Third-Party Comment Forms sent from members of the SDSU community to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

The visiting team acknowledges the collegiality of all with whom it met at San Diego State University and at the Imperial Valley Campus. The team encountered communities that made the team's visits to both locations pleasant and productive. In particular, the team is grateful for the generosity and enthusiastic participation of President Stephen L. Weber; for the excellent guidance and support of Dean of Undergraduate Studies Geoffrey Chase, who coordinated both SDSU's Capacity and Preparatory Review and the team's visit to SDSU; and for the diligence of Dean Chase's many colleagues, who fulfilled

the purpose of the Capacity and Preparatory Review and otherwise aided the WASC team throughout its visit.

IB: Quality of the Capacity and Preparatory Report and Alignment with the Proposal

San Diego State University's Capacity and Preparatory Report focuses on three central themes: student learning; access, retention, and graduation; and undergraduate and graduate education. The university's WASC Coordinating Committee addressed these three themes in eight separate, reflective essays—two essays for each of the four WASC Standards for Review. Reflective Essay 1b, for example, describes SDSU's study abroad and international programs, along with its City Heights Educational Collaborative, in order to illustrate the themes of the review and to document fulfillment of WASC's Standards and Criteria.

The visiting team found SDSU's Capacity and Preparatory Report to be reflective of the challenges faced by the university and its leadership. The report aligns well with the approach set forth in the university's Proposal for its Capacity and Preparatory Review. Similarly, the report documents trends and claims with appropriate data and evidence. *The visiting team commends the university's WASC Coordinating Committee for writing a Capacity and Preparatory Report that reflects an authentic and collective inquiry into topics consequential to the improvement of San Diego State University.*

IC: Response to Previous Commission Issues

In October of 1997, a WASC team visited San Diego State University to examine progress in regard to six issues raised during a visit four years earlier: planning; assessment; faculty issues and governance; the balance of graduate and undergraduate education; diversity; and the Imperial Valley Campus. The 1997 team concluded that the university's planning effort was commendable and should be continued with "a clear plan and an implementation strategy." The team concluded also that SDSU's future assessment efforts should concentrate on learning outcomes.

SDSU's current Capacity and Preparatory Report explicitly addresses many of the six issues raised in 1993. For example, portions of the Capacity and Preparatory Report's reflective essays document assessment efforts, and many of the visiting team's meetings at the university centered on these same efforts. Similarly, the interaction of graduate and undergraduate education—especially in regard to SDSU's research-intensive initiatives—was a focus of reflective essays and of meetings during the site visit.

In general, the visiting team recognized genuine progress at SDSU in regard to these six issues. Section II of this report documents the visiting team's evaluative judgments in response to the Capacity and Preparatory Review's eight reflective essays. These essays, the team's visit to SDSU, and the team's judgments confirm both the university's commitment to good work and the university's changing nature. As Section III of this report indicates, however, the

current WASC team concludes that many of the topics at issue in 1993 and 1997 remain at issue for San Diego State University.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

Standard 1: Defining University Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

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

San Diego State University has implemented a plan for changes in enrollment while simultaneously attempting to improve retention and graduation. Facing enrollment pressures and the unfunded growth of its student body over the past decade, the university limited its enrollment of freshmen and transfers while maintaining Master's degree levels and a small number of joint doctoral programs.

Beginning in 1996, SDSU began a broad consultation process—including decisions made through a strong commitment to shared governance, meetings with San Diego community groups, and regular communication with the Chancellor's Office—to develop an impaction plan to match existing resources with enrollment. Enrollment pressures leading to the decision to declare impaction included an increase of 73 percent in undergraduate applications for admission (from 25,536 to 44,235—for approximately 6,000 to 7,000 spaces) between Fall 1998 and Fall 2004.

In addition to implementing new policies to manage enrollment, the university carried out organizational changes to emphasize the interconnected nature of access, retention, and graduation. In January of 2000, all offices

responsible for these issues (Admissions, Registrar, and Advising and Evaluations) were gathered into a single unit, Enrollment Services.

To promote retention and graduation, additional innovations have been implemented in order to enable each student to review his or her academic status. Degree audits, changes in procedures requiring students to register for their required courses in the first two semesters, the development of a web portal to permit students both to view their progress-to-degree and to receive advising information, the development of four-year Road Maps, and the Transfer Admission Planner (TAP), which provides complete articulation information to the top feeder schools, all reflect SDSU's strong commitment to guiding students from admission through graduation (CFRs 1.7, 2.2, 2.3, 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14).

Retention has improved as a result of changes in admissions criteria, and retention seems likely to continue to improve. Graduation rates are also likely to improve. The Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research (OASIR) provides regular information to the campus community and external agencies on enrollment, continuation rates, and graduation rates (CFR 4.5). *The visiting team recommends that SDSU monitor carefully any future changes in retention and graduation rates. The visiting team recommends also that SDSU analyze the relationship between the institution's more selective admissions criteria and any future changes in the institution's retention and graduation rates.*

The visiting team reviewed county-level data about high school graduation rates – including information on the numbers and percentages of

students who complete the requirements for entry to a CSU campus (known as the A-G requirements). (See Appendix D.) In San Diego County, in 2001-2002 and 2002-2003, only 63 of 262 American-Indian high school graduates, 436 of 2,042 African American high school graduates, and 1,816 of 9,047 Hispanic high school graduates completed the A-G courses required for admission to the CSU system. Thus, American Indians represented 0.6 percent, African Americans represented 4.3 percent, and Hispanics represented 17.9 percent of the total number of San Diego County high school graduates who completed the A-G courses and were eligible for admission to the CSU.

These data regarding completion of A-G requirements for American-Indian, African-American, and Hispanic graduates of high schools in San Diego County are reasonably comparable to eligibility rates for the State of California. Eligibility rates for white students in San Diego County are decidedly different when compared to eligibility rates for the entire state, however. The State of California reports 49.4 percent completion for white students, while San Diego County has a 59.1-percent completion rate.

It is no surprise, then, that white students comprised 52.7 percent of first-time freshman enrollees at SDSU, as of Fall 2003. This majority is a direct result of the large shares of white students inside and outside of San Diego County who are completing the A-G requirements and qualifying for admission.

American-Indian students comprised 0.5 percent of first-time freshmen. African

Americans comprised 3.7 percent. The proportion of Hispanics among first-time freshman enrolled students was 17.7 percent for the same time period.

There appears to have been little change in enrollment demographics as a result of the new, more stringent criteria for admission to SDSU. For example, application and enrollment figures for first-time freshmen have declined very slightly for Mexican Americans and other Hispanics over the past three years. In 2001, Mexican Americans and other Hispanics represented 19.5 percent of applicants and 18.4 percent of enrolled students among first-time freshmen. In 2002, these groups comprised 20.3 percent of applicants and 17.6 percent of enrollees, and in 2003, the shares of applicants and enrollees were 22 and 17.7 percent, respectively.

Until A-G course completion rates for Mexican-American and other Hispanic graduates of high schools in San Diego County improve, the enrollment-share of non-white students at SDSU may decline more precipitously. The university has engaged in two major partnerships with K-12 schools, families, and communities in order to improve student completion of required courses. These efforts are likely to yield higher eligibility for underrepresented populations in the future.

Reflective Essay 1a describes broad consultation within the university community and concludes that the actions to control enrollment have been positive and appropriate. Nevertheless, the visiting team encountered a number of faculty, staff, and community members who voiced concerns regarding these

actions and the potential ill effects of these actions on the university. Other concerned groups raised questions about what they characterized as a lack of higher-learning opportunities for students in the region traditionally served by SDSU. Coupled with the university's priorities focusing on research, the changes in admissions criteria were sometimes described as a change in mission. Still others perceive these changes as renewed emphases on long-held priorities. Clearly, there is a lack of consensus regarding the effects of changing admissions standards on the mission of the university and on the racial composition of its student body (CFRs 1.2 and 1.5).

The visiting team suggests that SDSU administrators initiate direct conversations with faculty, staff, students, and the San Diego community about the effects of impaction on enrollment, retention, graduation rates, and diversity. These conversations should include discussion of SDSU's extensive work with K-12 schools to improve access for all eligible populations in the region.

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

Globalization. Both the essay and oral reports from the persons responsible for international exchange of students and faculty members document a best-in-class program, one recognized both in San Diego State University's inclusion in recent published studies of such programs and in a recent award given to Provost Nancy A. Marlin for building internationalism into SDSU programs and

curricula. Services to students, including visa support for incoming international students and faculty members, appear to be well-conceived and supported. The number and range of options available to SDSU students are considerable, and they girdle the globe. The university's emphasis on its region is evident in its bilateral exchanges with Mexico. SDSU offers courses and degrees in Mexican universities, and it provides quarters on its campus for courses offered by Mexican universities and for researchers involved in collaborations with local faculty members.

Diversity. There is a partial disconnect between the topics covered in the second half of Reflective Essay 1b, which concentrates on services offered through the City Heights Educational Collaborative, a public/private partnership to improve three schools (an elementary school, a middle school, and a high school) and the university, and the topics introduced by faculty and staff who came to discuss the essay with members of the visiting team. These faculty and staff expressed concerns about diversity and equity services on the campus. They acknowledged knowing about the Collaborative but addressed their remarks to campus as opposed to community matters: safe spaces for minority students; effects of Proposition 209; a recent decline in the number of African-American and other minority faculty and staff; and similar issues (CFR 1.5 and the WASC Statement on Diversity). Essentially, they reported on deficiencies in funding for support and paracurricular programs, particularly those supported by the Associated Students organization rather than by the university directly.

The core complaint about programs supported by the Associated Students seems to be that funding is provided anew each year rather than being carried forward in a base budget. Concerned faculty and staff therefore suggested that permanent funding from the university might better support these programs.

In public comment sessions, the visiting team heard analogous reports about various other programs, including the University Seminars and the fifth-year teacher training programs. The visiting team heard also a report on the evolving Liberal Studies Program, whose leaders felt that this program had not been appropriately considered by the authors of the essays. In these and other instances, the visiting team encouraged speakers to submit their comments by way of the WASC Third-Party Comment web site.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Reflective Essay 2a: The Learning-Centered University

Reflective Essay 2a responds to several of the criteria for review (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.7) and describes San Diego State University's capacity to achieve its core educational objectives. The General Education program, for example, currently follows a broad distribution model that encourages student choice and facilitates transfer to and from the university. This important foundation of the undergraduate program resembles General Education programs at many large public universities, although the SDSU program has a few distinctive elements. It includes interdisciplinary courses that meet a

diversity requirement, for example. The state-mandated requirements for writing, mathematics, American Institutions, and upper-level General Education work are also met through the program. All requirements are spelled out carefully in the catalog, on the website, and in advising materials. A review of syllabi confirms that college-level standards are expected (CFRs 2.6 and 2.12).

Efforts to strengthen the program are evident. There is an oversight committee, the program has a structure that is understandable to students, and specific competencies for graduates (such as critical thinking, civic responsibility, and global awareness) have been identified. The assessment of these competencies remains a challenge, however. Although student satisfaction with the program has been assessed and deemed positive (CFR 2.10), the direct effect of the program cannot be assessed because students can fulfill the program requirements through such a wide variety of courses, because the list of objectives is too extensive, and because the courses are not mapped against specific competencies. To address these problems, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies in collaboration with the General Education Committee is working with many faculty members to clarify the essential outcomes for the program, to reduce the number of objectives to be assessed, and to develop ideas about shared assignments and course-embedded assessment.

The Faculty Senate's affirmation that all syllabi must specify learning objectives starting in Fall 2004 confirms that there will be course-level fulfillment of these initiatives, but it is too early to tell if a manageable and effective

assessment process will be in place in the near future and provide the necessary information to guide improvements in student learning. It may well prove impossible to assess student outcomes directly for the upper-level coursework, “Explorations,” since far too many courses with varying purposes are included. If many programs rely on General Education enrollments to subsidize their majors, any changes in the structure of the program suggested by assessment data may well run into political resistance. Efforts to improve pedagogy that emerge as a result of assessment findings could be more successful.

The broad involvement of faculty and the integrated approach to understanding and strengthening undergraduate education exemplify the ways in which the variety of initiatives led by the office of Undergraduate Studies sets the expectation that faculty should have direct input and a shared responsibility for the overall quality of the experience of students at San Diego State University (CFR 2.4). *Placing administrative oversight for the General Education program in that office might facilitate timely and consistent attention to the General Education program without compromising either the roles of the deans of the colleges offering the courses or the role of the Faculty Senate.*

Assessment of student learning is a focus and a challenge for the majors as well. The university’s commitment to assessment began in earnest in 1998; and progress toward specific program requirements, expected levels of performance, and coherence in programs appears satisfactory – based on an inspection of the catalog, assessment documents, and program reviews (CFRs 2.2 and 2.7). Majors

and minors are not merely a collection of courses but rather are described as in-depth, sustained programs of study. Grading standards seem clear, and efforts to extend General Education competencies throughout the majors are underway – although some faculty report little connection between General Education courses and the major. At the same time, faculty members also recognize that progress on assessment has become both slow and uneven across programs. A review of departmental documents and course syllabi confirms this insight.

San Diego State University is not alone in realizing how difficult it is to change a culture, to shift faculty attention from the performance of individual students to program results, and to make assessment and continuous improvement an integrated (rather than a sporadic) responsibility of all faculty (CFR 2.4). The care that has gone into discussion, training, and planning for assessment has recently been matched by the necessary policies and procedures to ensure that data is systematically gathered, analyzed, and used to make adjustments in programs and pedagogy. The Student Learning Outcomes Committee was tasked with reviewing (with a scoring rubric) reports from 60 departments and providing positive guidance for the coming year. Their efforts, along with those of the Undergraduate Council and University Senate, support attention to the student learning focus and should help assessment gain more traction.

Of particular importance for any university are the processes for regular review of programs with an emphasis on demand, cost, and quality (CFR 2.7). Many of the professional programs are accredited by the appropriate specialized accrediting body. Consequently, these programs appear quite advanced in their attention to assessment and curriculum improvement – since faculty and administrators must regularly map the curriculum against these external standards, review the success of students and productivity of faculty, and make certain that all will learn from the feedback from those reviews. Not all major programs, however, have external reviews. Therefore, SDSU must rely on the integrity and regularity of its internal program review processes to support efforts for continuous improvement. Toward that end, the Provost has recently taken an active role in refining the program-review process, integrating assessment with program review, and requiring annual reports from all units. (The visiting team’s additional remarks regarding departmental assessment are described on pages 28 - 31.)

The importance of planning processes, articulating priorities, and monitoring effectiveness (CFR 4.1) is addressed in this essay as well as in Reflective Essays 3a and 3b. New academic leadership for the colleges has strengthened planning and fostered collaboration across divisions; however, assessment data does not appear to be used consistently to ensure that academic plans are focused on quality and linked directly to the strategic plan for excellence. There is no evidence that assessment of the graduate programs has

been included in the focus on assessment. To some degree, it appears that the academic plans focus primarily on authorization of positions, allocation of resources, and evaluation of new program ideas – whereas the university’s strategic plan is informed by opportunities and desired new directions. The fundamental principle of the new WASC accreditation effort is to assure quality in *all* that is done. Although SDSU has a good track record of doing a great deal with limited resources, its aspirations could be tempered both by realistic assessments of what is sustainable and by resisting the notion that “more is better.”

In addition to the formal processes outlined to strengthen curricula and pedagogy, the campus has a Center for Teaching and Learning. Although a change in leadership, two failed searches, and budget reductions have caused the Center to scale back its programming in recent years – the Center does have the capacity to engage faculty in ongoing inquiry about learning and new pedagogies. Faculty members report limited incentives to engage in research on teaching in terms of tenure and promotion but do appreciate the past work of the Center and easy access to its support, as needed. *To stretch these limited resources further, deans and department chairs may want to consider how they can work with the CTL in order to advance the agenda appropriate to each department. In the same way that some departments have allocated resources to assessment, a close departmental link with faculty development would extend the focus of the CTL beyond support for individual faculty to include more programmatic initiatives.*

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

Reflective Essay 2b aims to respond to several criteria for review (CFRs 2.3, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 3.2, and 3.3) and describes San Diego State University's capacity with regard to university support for student learning, engagement with faculty in scholarship, and the links between faculty productivity and student learning.

SDSU has made the transition from being primarily a teaching university to being a research-oriented university. Indeed, it aims to be a doctoral-extensive university. The academic goals of the university include “support faculty in developing specialized contributions to knowledge, including innovative curriculum and pedagogy responsive to intellectual and professional needs of undergraduate, Master’s, and doctoral students;” “encourage scholarship by students and faculty;” and continue “the expansion of externally funded projects and doctoral programs where appropriate.” Toward those ends, SDSU has in place a wide variety of initiatives to stimulate faculty research, including course release, small grants, sabbaticals, travel money, and support for seeking external funding. The climate of support is strengthened through collaboration among the offices of Graduate and Research Affairs, the SDSU Foundation, Office of Faculty Affairs, and college deans. The proactive work of these offices has led to research centers and a significant amount of extramural funding. The impact (both positive and negative) this increased emphasis is having on undergraduate education and the extent to which this direction is embraced by faculty throughout the university is unclear, however (CFR 2.8).

SDSU faculty understand the importance of developing an integrated individual program of scholarship, teaching, and service; and faculty describe a variety of different models that integrate their research interests into courses, engage students on faculty projects, or make student research and consulting a focus of courses. Although faculty note that department chairs play a significant role in guiding their professional development, they also note that support varies and affects the level of departmental productivity and shared understanding of how research informs teaching in programs (CFR 2.9). The university's position description for the chair emphasizes individual mentoring but does not emphasize the important leadership role in creating a departmental climate of innovation that could engage not just untenured faculty but all faculty in the energizing work of seeking new directions and excellence in curricular, pedagogical, and scholarly work.

There is no question that SDSU employs many highly engaged and productive faculty; a review of C.V.s of recently tenured faculty reveals significant records of publication and of professional and community involvement (CFRs 3.2 and 3.3). The value of research, especially undergraduate research, is described by faculty as a critical part of energized teaching, a model for students of an engaged intellectual life, an important part of preparation for graduate school, and a rewarding vehicle for engaging with colleagues about their discipline. Capturing both the full extent to which students are involved in research and the impact of research on student learning have challenged the

university as it prepared for reaccreditation. Several significant programs, such as the CSU competition and the *SDSU McNair Journal*, provide evidence of the quality of undergraduate research.

Since every program and every student will not be engaged in undergraduate research, some attention might be paid to the variety of other engaging learning experiences – including study abroad, internships, and class consulting – that have the same transforming capacity as research. Lacking formal assessment data, faculty suggest that the benefits of these activities include higher expectations of students for their academic performance. *Using the very recent NSSE data as guidance, an assessment can be made of the degree to which students are involved in at least one of the many special opportunities that SDSU offers.* The NSSE data appears to suggest that students have fewer outside work obligations than at peer universities and might be expected to be more fully engaged on campus.

Concurrent with the changing culture for student learning and research is considerable change in the faculty. After a period of limited hiring, the campus has added many new faculty in recent years and has 75 active searches for this year. Significant numbers of retirements as well as restricted hiring due to budget constraints have reduced the full-time faculty. Thus, rebuilding the faculty with an appropriate balance of full-time and part-time faculty will prove critical to the future of the university.

To connect new faculty to the high performance expectations, many units give reduced teaching loads in the beginning year or two. All faculty may apply

for course release in order to engage in scholarship. Less clear is whether a faculty member can receive reassigned time to engage in developing innovative pedagogy or new courses. Workload policies and promotion and tenure guidelines seem clear; but, as one might expect, not all faculty endorse or understand what is expected of them (CFR 3.3). *On a rapidly changing campus, there is always a need for continuing conversations about expectations and support for faculty – and this is an appropriate time for such conversations at SDSU.*

The workload requirements set out by the Chancellor's Office support flexibility in assignments to promote equity but also allow for allocation of time to priorities. Reflective Essay 2b documents the use of WTUs for service and “instructionally related research” but does not indicate that any significant number of faculty are also using that time for instructional experimentation and innovation as would be permitted by the policy. Campus documents suggest an underinvestment in curricular innovation. For example, the curricular development awards for new pedagogies, such as service learning, seem very limited. University investment in technology, instructional design, and experiential learning do appear to be a priority, however.

What is missing from the essays on Standard 2 is a direct discussion of advising, learning support services, co-curricular experiences, grading practices, and other specific elements implied by CFR 2.3. A review of campus materials provided as documentation indicates a solid commitment to advising, an array of materials available both in print and on the Internet, and appropriate transition

materials available for freshmen as well as transfer students. The attention to web portal services, real-time registration, degree audit, intrusive advising, and the many other support services to students (described on page 7) appear advanced and worthy of note. Students express positive opinions about the overall climate of support and the wide variety of activities that are available, but all students that attended the visiting team's open meeting for students raised questions about the quality of face-to-face advising both in the advising center and at the department level (CFR 2.12). *Assessment of student support coupled with other sources of data, such as from NSSE, could clarify whether there needs to be any further improvements in these areas.*

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

Reflective Essay 3a: Using Our Resources Wisely

Graduate education—especially in doctoral programs—is very expensive and requires creative financing. San Diego State University supports its programs in two ways: through the instructional budget and through grants and contracts administered by the SDSU Foundation. The substantial support received from grants, contracts, auxiliaries, and private donations has allowed the university to develop in ways not typical of a CSU campus. For example, with only small allocations from the Chancellor's Office and no graduate differential in funding of workload, SDSU has been able to bring online 14 joint-

doctoral programs since 1965 and to expand support of both Master's and doctoral students greatly.

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

The absence of state funding to support doctoral programs concerns the visiting team, especially in light of the university's advocacy of these programs (CFR 3.6). Substantial research support does not necessarily translate into adequate funding for the infrastructure required for doctoral study. For example, in FY 2003-04, indirect cost revenue totaled approximately \$15.6 million. The net amount available for distribution to the university was \$1.5 million.

At present, the Graduate Division is becoming more aggressive about university-led recruitment and stimulating new program growth. Assisted by the Graduate Council, it is gathering and analyzing data on the current situation, comparing SDSU to similar universities and conducting focus groups with departments targeted for growth. Using these results, the Graduate Division, guided by the Graduate Council, will build a strategic plan for growth. (Although there appears to be faculty recruitment and vision plans at the departmental level, there is no campus-wide vision statement.)

During the site visit, the team members expressed concern that, given the fiscal realities of the state's enrollment funding, undergraduate needs may be compromised by the university's drive to enhance its doctoral status. State funding formulas, for example, seem out of sync with workload policies that could make all units involved with graduate education self-fund to the detriment of their undergraduate programs or stop offering doctoral work. Similarly, recruiting quality faculty members may prove difficult with instability in state-fund sources or in the absence of a plan of support from alternative funding sources, such as private or grant contract support. *The visiting team therefore recommends that the university plan proactively, rather than react to state budget issues. This could involve developing a comprehensive business plan for funding doctoral programs. A first step in this plan would be a campus-wide integrated plan for growing doctoral programs at SDSU.*

Reflective Essay 3b: An Organization Built Upon Shared Governance

San Diego State University is marked by open and transparent decision-making processes that, until the recent state budget cuts, emphasized multi-year planning and campus/community engagement through shared governance (CFR 3.8).

The campus's primary budget advisory group – the Cabinet Budget Committee (CBC), now renamed the Budget Advisory Committee – consists of the four Vice-Presidents, the Executive Assistant to the President, three faculty members (including the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Resources and Planning), and the President of Associated Students. This body continually reviews new demands upon the budget (whether due to internal adjustments of mission or external demands) and recommends allocations of resources accordingly. Overall, the administration and faculty leadership alike regard the budgetary process developed since 1997 as one of the key strengths of the university.

During its initial assessment of campus materials and during the site visit, the visiting team found what appears to be a strong shared-governance system in place at the university. SDSU also employs well-organized processes that involve a wide range of constituents in fiscal (budget, enrollment management) and physical planning for the university. Faculty have contributed to the analyses of library and physical plant needs. A sound understanding of

budgetary processes and realities appears evident across the university. There has been increasing technology support in all areas.

A shared perception among faculty, students, and staff persists at SDSU that current decision-making processes reflect strong participation of all constituents in developing and implementing the financial plan, master plan, strategic plan, and enrollment planning. On the financial and academic planning side, the continuing shift from a state “agency” model to an “enterprise” model (i.e., increasing non-state sources of revenue) will be essential if the university wants to obtain adequate resources to enhance the quality and size of the faculty (which will be required for enhanced Ph.D. programs). Improving the quality of graduate students and increasing the number of graduate students are not contradictory goals, but implementation of the strategies to achieve the goals will improve chances for success.

Although the university’s ability to capitalize on funding opportunities is admirable, opportunities for resource acquisitions may not always align with stated university priorities (CFR 3.5). When this occurs, growth can emerge in a sporadic pattern that leaves unfunded gaps in program goals and university aspirations.

Similarly, the university could benefit from a better integration of the operating and capital budgeting and planning processes (CFR 4.2). The elements to achieve this integration seem in place, such as the Budget Advisory Committee and the prior multi-year budget planning model. A new process needs to have more active involvement of the

deans in the planning process and more campus-wide (versus localized) priority-setting and resource-allocation processes, however (CFR 4.1).

This integrated approach to planning will become critical as the university embarks on planning for a major capital campaign. Such integration will prove critical in aligning resources needs with potential funding sources. For example, only 35 percent of total university revenues of \$610.8 million came from state appropriations in 2002-03. Grants and contracts awarded to faculty reached over \$130 million in the 2002-2003 fiscal year. Creation of the Campanile Foundation in 2000 has raised the level of private philanthropy. SDSU recorded \$43.3 million in private gifts for 2002-2003.

Overall, in reference to Standard 3 and based both on the university's Capacity and Preparatory Review documents and on interviews conducted during the site visit, the visiting team believes that San Diego State University more than adequately demonstrates that it has a history of financial stability, appropriate independent audits, and realistic plans to eliminate any accumulated deficits and to build sufficient reserves to support long-term viability (CFR 1.8).

As it moves forward, however, SDSU needs to engage in more comprehensive and integrated planning of its operating and capital needs (CFR 4.2). Due to the vagaries of the state's fiscal cycles, the university has performed well in responding to opportunities when they are presented (such as CSU's BAT program or the state-funded capital budget or challenges such as the state-budget reductions of recent years). *In terms of the university's aspirations in the areas of doctoral programs and*

sponsored research, a more strategic and integrated approach to academic and financial planning is required. The goal of launching a major capital campaign both reinforces this need and provides a wonderful opportunity to engage in such an effort.

The decision-making processes that are currently in place, such as the Budget Advisory Committee (formerly the Cabinet Budget Committee) and the multi-year budget planning process provide a solid base to engage in such an activity. *What is now required is integrating the experience of similar or peer universities into the campus planning process. This can be accomplished in two ways. First, as part of a capital-campaign planning process, a readiness review should be commissioned. This review would benefit from lessons learned by comparable universities and a strategic assessment of the university's ability to launch and sustain a capital campaign. Second, the capital-campaign planning process needs to include a comprehensive business plan for both mounting and funding the campaign. This would include FTE staffing plans – including identified responsibilities, space requirements, and support budgets.*

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

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

The evidence presented in Reflective Essay 4a provides a persuasive case that San Diego State University has moved steadily over the past several years toward creating an organization committed to learning and improvement in two areas, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Academic Affairs has conducted Academic Reviews of departments and programs since the 1970s. Presently, reviews are conducted every seven to nine years. In 1999, Reviews were expanded to include discussions of assessment. Departments were given instructions and materials to help them undertake assessment, and support was provided by both the Associate Dean in the Division of Undergraduate Studies and the University Committee on Assessment (UCA). Despite these efforts, SDSU lacked sufficient demonstration of how departments used the results of their assessments to improve their programs.

The Provost implemented Academic Planning in 1998. Academic Planning then focused primarily on determining the allocation of tenure-track positions. Each year, departments prepared a planning document that identified academic goals, described their program alignment with these goals and with the goals of the college and university, discussed curricular and/or hiring changes, and presented a hiring plan.

In 2004, Academic Planning was modified to focus directly on assessment of student learning. This year, an annual report will be submitted to the Provost by all departments that will describe modifications that have been instituted as a result of the assessment of student learning. The content of the Academic Review has also changed. Departments now write five reflective essays, one of which is an analysis of student learning outcomes, including a summary of results and how they were used for program planning and improvement. The

revisions to these processes seem to create the opportunity for reflection and modifications of programs in light of what students are learning.

Conversations among the visiting team, the Undergraduate Dean, and the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies indicated that Academic Plans are not revealing movement to full implementation of assessment. It appears that the Academic Plans are departmental efforts at “planning to plan.” The temporary suspension of program reviews provides an opportunity to focus on the assessment requirements of the revised Academic Planning process. Academic Review, when reinstated, will include the reports of the previous five years of Academic Plans and an emphasis on assessment of learning outcomes.

The long time-line for Academic Reviews, combined with the historic focus on adding faculty positions as a result of the annual Academic Planning, has fostered an environment of periodic reports rather than a culture of data-gathering and collection to advance program improvement. *The visiting team suggests that SDSU integrate the Academic Plans and Academic Reviews in order to limit the workload required of departments and in order to have information in a form that will be relevant to long-term planning for the university (CFR 4.6). Furthermore, the visiting team suggests that SDSU consider a shorter timeline than the current seven to nine years between reviews (CFRs 2.7 and 4.4).*

The university has made a great deal of progress, and the momentum to continue was demonstrated in the visiting team’s meetings with faculty and administrators. *The university should continue implementing revisions in the process*

described above. The visiting team commends the university for its use of evidence in determining what processes worked and in making appropriate course corrections when the data offered less information on learning results than was anticipated (CFR 4.4).

Shared governance seemed strong during these processes. The visiting team's conversations with faculty indicated strong support for the assessment efforts, even if faculty were not always certain about how they would undertake the assessment work in their departments. Staff members in Undergraduate Studies continue to work closely with deans and departments – including individual consultation with departments to ensure greater understanding of the process.

Equally important as the work in Academic Affairs is the work underway in Student Affairs. The area has been reorganized to increase interaction between units within Student Affairs and to align with the efforts in Academic Affairs. These units are cooperating in order to identify the learning experiences of their current programs and to identify other programs that should be offered to students. Plans for the future include mechanisms for assessing outcomes as well as regular opportunities to reflect on evidence and ensure continuous improvement. A Director for Testing, Assessment, and Research (TAR) – hired in March 2004 – will work with directors on refining outcomes, developing activities that align with the outcomes, and developing direct measures of student learning.

The visiting team believes that SDSU's broader efforts in regard to measurement and assessment may be limited by the capacity of the university's

Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research, however. Administrators who depend upon this office's data and analytical capabilities indicated to the visiting team that – particularly as the university continues to develop its culture of measurement and assessment – there are many university units competing for the time and attention of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research. Requests for data analysis can require up to a month to fulfill, and there is little evidence that data requests are prioritized in a strategic fashion. *The visiting team therefore recommends that, as SDSU implements its more ambitious assessment plans, the university explore increasing the analytical and personnel capacity of its Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research (CFRs 4.4 and 4.5).*

Reflective Essay 4b: Assessing Writing Competency and Proficiency

San Diego State University recently redesigned the manner in which all students meet the CSU System's writing competency requirement for graduation. This redesign is due, in part, to the strong commitment among the leadership of the Rhetoric and Writing faculty to the assessment and improvement of the writing skills of SDSU graduates (CFR 4.6). The new writing program seems well-conceived, provides numerous opportunities for assessment of the writing skills of students, and offers ample opportunities for students to remedy writing deficiencies before their senior year. Incoming freshmen take a placement test to determine whether or not they must take remedial writing courses, which, if needed, must be completed in the freshman year. All native

students are required to take a two-semester GE writing sequence. After completing 60 hours, native and transfer students must take the Writing Proficiency Assessment (WPA), which may be repeated once. Students who receive a score of 10 or above on the assessment are considered to have completed the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement, unless their chosen major requires an upper division writing course. (Not all majors have such a requirement.) Students scoring 8-9 on the assessment must take an upper-division writing course (“W” course), either in their major or in another area of study. Students scoring 7 or below are required to take RSW 280 or 281 *and* an upper-division “W” course. The latter two groups of students fulfill the writing assessment requirement for graduation by completing the “W” course with a grade of C or better.

Although the new assessment program appears significantly improved over past practices, the program could be improved in several ways. There are clearly articulated goals and learning outcomes for the GE writing sequence, but the WPA is not linked to those learning outcomes and does not assess the degree to which students have attained the desired competencies. *The visiting team encourages SDSU to remedy this situation by designing a new WPA that is clearly linked to the goals and objectives of the GE writing sequence. Implementing a new WPA would provide the university with an excellent opportunity to involve faculty and staff campus-wide in the discussion of what the university actually expects of its graduates with respect to writing proficiency (CFR 4.7). This also would be an opportunity to*

involve external stakeholders (e.g., employers, alumni) in improving the assessment of the effectiveness of the writing program (CFR 4.8). An anticipated outcome of implementing a new WPA program is that additional university resources may be required to support RSW 280/1.

The visiting team also encourages SDSU to engage in a campus-wide discussion of the merits of requiring that all undergraduate majors have a mandatory upper-division writing requirement that would be fulfilled with a course in the major (or, perhaps, a series of fully integrated writing experiences in the major). Currently, it may be only by chance that a student takes a discipline-based writing course as part of his or her academic program. Of course, this discussion would need to include a thorough assessment of the additional resources (operations and personnel) that would be required to implement such a requirement effectively.

Additional Topics

The visiting team's findings regarding two topics, the Imperial Valley Campus and faculty/staff issues, do not necessarily apply to the themes of the eight reflective essays. The team therefore offers separate responses to these additional topics:

Imperial Valley Campus

The Imperial Valley Campus of San Diego State University was founded to provide degree-completion programs for transfers from community colleges

in the area. A year ago, the IVC admitted 11 honors high school graduates, the campus's first group of lower-division students. In 2004, 28 new freshmen were admitted. Planning includes adding 60 freshmen in Fall 2005.

During the 1997 accreditation cycle, WASC's visiting team noted several areas of concern related to the Imperial Valley Campus. Although the current team found evidence of much progress toward remedying those concerns, the current team also determined that some past concerns and new topics will require the attention of SDSU and its Imperial Valley Campus:

Capacity for change and growth of the IVC student body. The visiting team found evidence of a clear connection between the IVC's definition of university purposes and its efforts to ensure the realization of educational objectives. The IVC has clear goals and is using all of its resources to meet those goals. Especially noteworthy are the efforts to link the IVC with the needs of its local community. The community displays strong support for the campus and operates programs in partnership with the campus.

The IVC has a committed and dedicated group of administrators, staff, and faculty that understands well the overall mission of the university and how to maximize the effectiveness of the resources available to the campus (CFR 1.2). The evidence presented to the visiting team indicates a knowledge and understanding of the actions needed to provide access and programs to promote timely graduation. The visiting team noted a gap between the stated goals for expansion and the capacity for providing additional services to accomplish those

goals successfully, however. *The visiting team therefore recommends that SDSU consider a focused planning process that can set long-range goals for student enrollment for the IVC, while at the same time identifying the instructional and student-support services needed to aid an increasing number of entering students.* The IVC is committed to a county-wide effort to increase college-going rates. As the campus succeeds in this effort, enrollment is likely to rise, since most students are place-bound and rely on the IVC for opportunities to earn a college degree.

The Preparatory and Capacity essays present a strong case that SDSU is moving to create an organization committed to learning and improvement, but the visiting team noted that this steady shift is occurring more rapidly and with greater support on the main campus than at the Imperial Valley Campus. For example, the site visit to the IVC did not reveal a strong support structure for the collection and analysis of data to evaluate the student experience. The IVC will need to increase its student-support services as it grows and as the student body shifts from part-time to full-time and from upper-division to lower-division audiences (CFR 3.6). *The visiting team therefore recommends that SDSU increase the analytical support services at the IVC campus to assist the campus in planning for the expected growth in student enrollment and to provide greater understanding of the student services needed for freshman students.*

Faculty workloads. The 1997 visiting team noted the issue of workloads at the IVC, and this remains a concern. There are 27 full-time equivalent faculty members and 13 part-time equivalent faculty members serving 928 students at

the Imperial Valley Campus. The IVC offers 22 major programs, with the highest enrollments currently in Liberal Studies, Criminal Justice Administration, and Psychology. *There appears to be a need to bolster overall quality of the programs by the addition of full-time faculty (CFRs 2.1 and 3.1).* Where there are only one or two faculty for a program, these faculty not only prepare for a wide variety of courses but also schedule classes and find part-time faculty to provide course coverage. Although class sizes at the Imperial Valley Campus imply greater intimacy of instruction than at the main campus, the overall workload appears far more extensive at the IVC.

In some cases, a single IVC faculty member constitutes the entire faculty of a program area. In one case, a newly hired tenure-track faculty member is the only full-time person in the program area and prepares four different courses each semester. In another program area, one full-time faculty member directs 25 students in the major. The program head in this department has been at the campus for three years and has taught 18 different courses during that time. Students in the major may have insufficient exposure to different perspectives or teaching styles and may be taking a significant portion of their courses from a single faculty member.

Reports from faculty and administrators at the Imperial Valley Campus and at the main campus indicate that, although the standards for promotion and tenure mirror one another at each location, P&T committees consider the workload differences at the IVC in appropriate decisions. Nevertheless, some

IVC faculty voiced concern about how to meet the demands for research productivity, quality teaching, and service. This consternation was especially apparent among junior faculty at the Imperial Valley Campus. IVC faculty also voiced concern that the main campus has shifted its focus to include greater emphasis on research and that this emphasis may disadvantage IVC faculty, who typically focus on teaching and service.

The opening of the new site at Brawley, 22 miles from Calexico, is an additional workload challenge. Faculty will travel back and forth from Calexico and Brawley in addition to their current participation in committees at the main campus. The move to offer four-year degrees in several locations is both an opportunity and a challenge for SDSU and its Imperial Valley Campus. *The team suggests that the administration at both campuses continue a dialogue about workload and other faculty support services at the IVC – including plans for hiring additional faculty.*

In closing, the Imperial Valley Campus embodies the commitment of San Diego State University to providing the population of an economically disadvantaged region with higher learning opportunities. Faculty are enthusiastic about their work and about the IVC mission. The visiting team also met with community college and K-12 leaders who commended the IVC for its range of services to students as well as for the campus's partnerships with the community. Additionally, the IVC faculty reported that the administration of President Weber has been more inclusive and collegial than past administrations.

The IVC faculty also has high praise for the new Dean and sees him as an advocate for their campus. Concerns remain as to whether or not the IVC's capacity limitations can be remedied within the current budget constraints.

Faculty and Staff

San Diego State University appears to possess faculty and staff of remarkable quality and dedication. Retention of untenured as well as tenured faculty does not appear to be a problem (individuals reported a retention rate of untenured faculty of approximately 85 percent). The university implements a rigorous process of faculty evaluation, and the process appears to be fair and equitably applied, with appropriate weighting of teaching, research/scholarship, and service (CFR 3.3). *Nevertheless, the faculty seem to be over-evaluated, and the university might consider streamlining and simplifying evaluation processes (if allowed under CSU System policies and collective bargaining agreements).* Junior faculty appear to understand what the university expects of them, and some units have formalized mentoring programs for junior faculty. *SDSU might consider requiring each academic department to have a formalized mentoring program for junior faculty (CFR 3.4).*

A number of faculty and administrators indicated that a high priority for the university over the next five years must be to "rebuild" the number of tenure-track faculty that have been lost due to retirements and budget reductions

(CFRs 3.1 and 3.2). One individual indicated that, over the past 14 years, the number of track faculty has declined from approximately 1040 to 800 (including the loss of faculty through early retirement) in FY05. (See Appendix E.) *It will be critical that plans for rebuilding the faculty are strategically linked to the highest priorities of the university (e.g., new Ph.D. programs, increased external funding, a capital campaign, undergraduate research, student success). In rebuilding the faculty, SDSU should give serious consideration to recruiting faculty who can contribute to transdisciplinary teaching and research programs, especially at the graduate level. These efforts will, perhaps, require more effective communication among colleges and departments. Achieving the stated goals of increasing the size of the graduate student population (20 percent of total student population), especially Ph.D. students, will require careful attention to developing the resources needed to support high-quality students (more students and better funding per student). Similar attention must be given to rebuilding the staff infrastructure that will be required to achieve the overall goals of the university, including providing appropriate opportunities for staff recognition and rewards for superior performance (CFRs 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4).*

The perceived tension that still exists between the teaching and research missions of the university emerged as a theme again and again during the site visit. It is clear that parts of the SDSU community already are committed to the “research-extensive” model and that others are not (CFR 1.2). *The university needs to define and articulate its vision clearly and consistently, with respect to research and undergraduate/graduate education; and the President and Provost need to communicate*

that vision to the SDSU community repeatedly. In addition, the university needs to translate its vision into tangible rewards for staff and faculty (especially in the tenure and promotion process). The university should continue to stress the importance of the “teacher-scholar” exemplar model – where faculty teaching is enhanced by research and scholarship and vice versa – for faculty at SDSU.

SECTION III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As one student noted during a meeting with the visiting team, “stagnant” is not a word that one would use to describe San Diego State University. The adoption of impacted status and the attendant implementation of more selective admissions criteria, the development of university assessment efforts intended to measure student learning outcomes, and the initiatives to transform the university into a more research-intensive university are examples of the significant changes taking place at SDSU.

In the midst of all of this change, the visiting team finds generally that SDSU possesses considerable excellence in its human capital. The university is home to a community of dedicated faculty, students, and staff – all of whom appear genuinely dedicated to fulfilling SDSU’s commitment to higher learning.

The visiting team’s advisory statements are italicized in the previous pages. The team’s major findings and recommendations focus on SDSU’s potential areas for improvement, as the university embarks on the significant changes noted in its Capacity and Preparatory Report. These major recommendations fall into the following categories:

- 1. Mission.* As commentary on pages 9 - 10 and 40 - 41 indicates, the visiting team heard repeated concerns from SDSU faculty, staff, and community members that the university’s mission is adrift. SDSU’s initiatives to focus on research especially contribute to opinions by some that the university is abandoning its traditional mission – serving the San Diego community through a

commitment to undergraduate and graduate teaching, by offering degrees through the Master's degree, and by awarding doctoral degrees jointly with UC institutions. The visiting team recommends that, as SDSU adds complementary goals and programs, the university should make certain that it continues to meet its mission and that it should communicate this commitment regularly to university and area communities.

2. *Strategic Planning.* The visiting team noted multiple instances in which true long-term planning is needed at SDSU. Strategic planning will be important as the university integrates operating and capital budgets (pages 26 - 27) and allocates funds to support university priorities (pages 39 - 41). Similarly, SDSU will need to determine its long-term curricular priorities as it forecasts the additional of faculty lines within departments (page 40). The visiting team therefore recommends that SDSU adopt greater strategic thinking in all of its initiatives. Especially important will be SDSU's ability to plan strategically for its pending capital campaign (pages 27 - 28).

3. *Assessment.* Although SDSU has made considerable progress in creating a culture of measurement and assessment, the visiting team notes many areas for improvement. (See, for example, pages 7, 20, and 22.) The university's ability to document student learning through measurable results has yet to be proven. Current assessment efforts, such as those implemented in SDSU's Writing Program, should be aligned with other, broader assessments of student learning (page 33 - 34). At the program and department levels, the visiting team

recommends that multiple evaluation and review processes should be simplified or streamlined (page 30). Additionally, the visiting team notes that SDSU's Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research seems to have reached its capacity to serve the multiple (and sometimes competing) demands of university units that are simultaneously attempting to document and measure progress with data (pages 31 - 32). For this reason, the visiting team recommends that SDSU consider making additional investments in the personnel and analytical capacity of its institutional research unit.

4. Imperial Valley Campus. The visiting team notes that SDSU's campus in Calexico has reached its capacity to accommodate many changes. First, the IVC is witnessing changes in its student body, as it begins to service an increasing number of first-time, first-year students. The visiting team recommends that the IVC increase its student-support services and infrastructure as the campus's student body grows and changes. (See page 36.) The IVC's faculty workload has been an area of concern since the last WASC team's visit to the campus (pages 36 - 38). Concerns regarding faculty workload persist—because current workload patterns may compromise the variety and quality of student instruction; may require long-distance travel among the Calexico, Brawley, and main campuses; and may lead to concerns regarding the application of tenure and promotion policies for IVC faculty.

The visiting team believes that implementing the above recommendations will improve San Diego State University's ability to fulfill its statutory mission,

will provide vision as the university implements change, will enable the university to document its ability to educate its students, will bolster the university's teaching capacity in the Imperial Valley, and will generally extend the university's history of excellence in serving the state and the San Diego community.

SECTION IV: PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW

When the WASC team returns to San Diego State University in 2005, the visiting team will look for evidence of the effectiveness of many of the impressive programs described in SDSU's Capacity and Preparatory Report and during the team's 2004 visit to the university. The team offers the following insights as to how SDSU's WASC Coordinating Committee might prepare for the Educational Effectiveness Review. These insights fall into the same four categories outlined in the visiting team's major recommendations (pages 42 - 45):

1. Mission. The visiting team asks SDSU and its WASC Coordinating Committee to prepare preliminary reflections and plans for continuing to fulfill the institution's traditional mission. Similarly, the visiting team asks for preliminary reflections and plans for communicating to SDSU constituents and to the San Diego community how the institution will continue to fulfill its mission as it adopts complementary goals and initiatives (CFR 1.2).

2. Strategic Planning. The visiting team asks SDSU to document preliminary steps for implementing effective, integrated strategic planning and budgeting that supports and reflects the university's priorities. Plans for the university's pending capital campaign should be outlined similarly, to demonstrate alignment of fund-raising goals with the strategic direction of SDSU.

3. *Assessment.* During its site visit, the visiting team noted that SDSU's plans to measure student learning are just beginning to be implemented. During the Educational Effectiveness Review, the visiting team will look for increased evidence that all programs are implementing the full assessment process: giving consistent attention to specifying objectives, determining the courses in which they will be addressed, establishing direct measures of outcomes, analyzing the assessment data, and implementing program improvements (CFR 4.7). To accomplish this, more faculty must value assessment of student learning as an essential part of their work – and there must be an institutional commitment to find additional ways to structure, support, and recognize the emphasis on assessing and improving student learning results. Similarly, an understanding of the extent of research and its contribution to student learning should be in place by the Educational Effectiveness Review (CFR 2.5).

4. *Imperial Valley Campus.* The team suggests that SDSU consider a separate Educational Effectiveness essay for the Imperial Valley Campus, to enable the IVC to focus on its educational programs and the objectives of its students. The Educational Effectiveness Review may provide an opportunity for the IVC to identify specific learning outcomes for its graduates that take into account the unique nature of its programs and services to the community.

APPENDIX A: TEAM ROSTER



Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

TEAM ROSTER

San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-4805
(619) 594-5842

Date of Visit: October 31- Nov 2, 2004
Review

Type of Visit: Capacity and Preparatory

Chief Executive Officer:
Stephen L. Weber, President

Accreditation Liaison Officer:
Geoffrey W. Chase
Dean, Division of Undergraduate

Studies

WASC Staff:
Elizabeth Griego, Associate Director

WASC Chair:
John T. Casteen, III
President
University of Virginia
P.O. Box 400224
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4224
(434) 924-3337
FAX: (434) 924-3792
e-mail: jtc@virginia.edu; lch5x@virginia.edu

Assistant to the Chair*:
L. Cameron Howell
Assistant to the President
University of Virginia
P.O. Box 400224
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4224
(434) 924-4088
FAX: (434) 924-3792
e-mail: lch5x@virginia.edu
**Responsibilities for compiling the team
team report and assisting Team Chair.*

WASC Members:
Ann S. Ferren
Professor of Educational Studies
College of Education and Human Development
Box 6959
Radford University
Mailing Address
213 River Pointe
Radford, VA 24141
(540) 831-5782
FAX: (540) 831-5059
e-mail: aferren@radford.edu

Francisco J. Hernandez
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
University of California, Santa Cruz
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
(831) 459-2474
FAX: (831) 459-2760
e-mail: fjh@cats.ucsc.edu

James A. Hyatt
Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
210 Burruss Hall (0148)
Blacksburg, VA 24061
(540) 231-6235
FAX: (540) 231-4265
e-mail: jahyatt@vt.edu; chenault@vt.edu

Louanne Kennedy
Emeritus Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Northridge
Mailing Address:
120 North Doheny Drive, Unit 203
Los Angeles, CA 90048
(818) 677-2957
FAX: (818) 677-5530
Cell: (818) 469-3631cell
e-mail: louanne.kennedy@csun.edu

David Young
Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Mail Code 1701
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 871003
Tempe, AZ 85287-1003
(480) 965-3391
e-mail: david.young@asu.edu

APPENDIX B: SCHEDULE FOR IMPERIAL VALLEY CAMPUS VISIT

WASC Site Visit Schedule
Imperial Valley Visit
Friday, October 29

Geoffrey Chase, Accreditation Liaison Officer and Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies will pick up team members at the airport and deliver them to the hotel		
7:00 – 8:00 a.m. Breakfast at hotel; team members on their own		
8:00 – 9:45 a.m. Drive to Imperial Valley Campus, Steve Roeder, Dean, Imperial Valley Campus; Roger Dunn, Faculty member, Psychology		
	Louanne Kennedy	Francisco Hernandez
10:00 – 11:00 a.m.	Steve Roeder, Dean 3 Division Chairs [Olga Amaral, Breena Coates, Barry Stampfl] Steve McNett, Associate Dean	Student Affairs Group: Miguel Rahiotis, Acting Assistant Dean Dana Murphy, Faculty Member Geoff Chase, ALO
11:10 – 11:55 a.m.	Arts & Sciences Division Faculty Group Geoff Chase, ALO	Steve Roeder, Dean Steve McNett, Associate Dean
Noon – 1:30 p.m. LUNCH: Miriam Ungson, International Program Coordinator; Faculty Members; Community Members		
1:40 – 2:25 p.m.	Education Division Faculty Group	Meeting with students
2:30 – 3:15 p.m.	Business Administration, Public Administration, & Criminal Justice Administration Division Faculty Group Bill Payne, Librarian	Irma Martinez, Director of Business Services Sue Nichols, Grants Development Director John Renison, Director of Advancement
Drive back to San Diego and to airport in time for a 7:00 p.m. flight Dean Steve Roeder, Roger Dunn		

APPENDIX C: SCHEDULE FOR MAIN CAMPUS VISIT

WASC SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Sunday, October 31

Airport pick-up	Louanne Kennedy: Nancy Marlin, Provost	Francisco Hernandez: James Kitchen, Vice President for Student Affairs	John Casteen, Cameron Howell: Geoff Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies	David Young: Paul Wong, Dean, College of Arts and Letters	Ann Ferren: Geoff Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies	Elizabeth Griego: Patricia Patterson, Associate Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies	James Hyatt: Sally Roush, Vice President for Business and Financial Affairs
4-6 p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus tour (Dean Chase) • Visit Team Room (GMCS 602) • Meet WASC Planning Committee (Geoff Chase, Roger Dunn, Dan Kitchen, Patricia Patterson, Carol Venable, Bonnie Zimmerman) 						
6-7:30 p.m.	Dinner (Monterey Whaling Company at Hilton Hotel)						

Monday, November 1

7-8 a.m.	Breakfast in CH 3318 (President Stephen Weber and Provost Nancy Marlin)					
8-8:40 a.m.	Meeting in CH 3318 with WASC Coordinating Committee (Sandy Bernstein, Glen McClish, Ellen Quandahl, David Ely, Gloria Rhodes, Fred Kolkhorst, Natalie Pearl, Anita Harbert, Roger Dunn, Geoff Chase, Patricia Patterson, Chris Procello, Evette Castillo, Joe Shapiro)					
8:40-9:40 a.m.	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335)</p> <p><u>Institutional Purposes & Essay 1a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Cook, Executive Director, Enrollment Services • Ethan Singer, Associate VP for Academic Affairs • Cezar Ornatowski, Chair, Academic Policy & Planning 	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640)</p> <p><u>Institutional Purposes & Essay 1a</u></p> <p>Retention Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evette Castillo, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs; • Cathie Atkins, Associate Dean, College of Sciences and Director of Information, Communication & Technology Program; • Cindi Avery, Director, Residential Education. 	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318)</p> <p><u>Integrity & Essay 1b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost Nancy Marlin • Alan Sweedler, Assistant VP for International Programs • Ron Moffatt, Director, International Student Center 	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402)</p> <p><u>Integrity & Essay 1b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty from international programs: Jim Gerber (Latin American Studies), Doreen Mattingly (Women's Studies), Laura Hall, (Special Education) 	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S)</p> <p><u>Teaching and Learning & Essay 2a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat Patterson, Chair, Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Committee • Members of SLO Committee: Claudia Angelelli, (College of Arts and Letters), Pat Dintrone, (College of Business Administration), Olga Amaral (Imperial Valley Campus), Susan Levy (College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts) 	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323)</p> <p><u>Organizational Structures and Decisions & Essay 3b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vice Presidents Sally Roush (Business & Financial Affairs), James Kitchen (Student Affairs), and Theresa Mendoza (University Advancement) • Lena Rodriguez, Assist. to the President for Exec. Affairs • University Senate: Fred Hornbeck, Chair, & Glen McClish, Vice Chair • Mark Thayer, Chair, Academic Resources & Planning Committee • Kelli Kedis, President, Associated Students

<p>9:50–10:50 am</p>	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335)</p> <p><u>Institutional Purposes & Essay 1a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eric Rivera & Janet Castro (New Student and Parent Programs) • Reggie Blaylock, Interim Director, EOP/Ethnic Affairs • Melody Kilcrease, Director, Freshmen Success Programs • Jung Choi, Director, Honors Program • Evette Castillo, Assistant Dean of Students 	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640)</p> <p><u>Institutional Purposes & Essay 1a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated Students Executive Officers: Kelli Kedis (President), Tim Frick (Executive Vice President), Jarad Sanchez (VP of External Affairs), Brian Ascencio (VP of Finance) • Jim Kitchen, VP for Student Affairs 	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318)</p> <p><u>Integrity & Essay 1b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anne Donadey, Chair, Diversity, Equity & Outreach Committee • Cheryl Fisher, Director, Office of Diversity & Equity • Greg Toya, Coordinator, Cross-Cultural Center • Chris Manigault, VP of University Affairs, Associated Student 	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402)</p> <p><u>Faculty & Teaching Staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terry Cronan, Past Chair, University Retention, Tenure, & Promotion Committee • Brock Allen, Director, Center for Teaching & Learning 	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S)</p> <p><u>Scholarship and Creative Activity & Essay 2b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Council: Doreen Mattingly (Women’s Studies), John Clapp (Social Work). • WASC Coordinating Committee Group 3 members: David Ely (Finance), Fred Kolkhorst (Exercise & Nutritional Sciences), Natalie Pearl (Pub. Admin.) 	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323)</p> <p><u>Fiscal, Physical and Info. & Essay 3a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Cook, Executive Director, Enrollment Services • Javier Gudino, Director, Enrollment Services
----------------------	--	---	---	--	---	--

<p>11 am– 12 p.m.</p>	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335)</p> <p><u>Scholarship and Creative Activity & Essay 2b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fred Kolkhorst, Dept. of Exercise & Nutritional Sciences, with Chris Garcia (student) • Chris Glembotski, Biology, with Marissa Aillard (student) • Audrey Hokoda, Child and Family Development, with Zenia Palmeno (student) 	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640)</p> <p><u>Support for Student Learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rita Gajoli, Director, Office of Advising & Evaluation • Chrys Dutton, Director, Financial Aid • Selma Reed, Associate Director, Advising 	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318)</p> <p>Preparation Time</p>	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402)</p> <p><u>Teaching and Learning & Essay 2a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathy Williams, Professor, Biology • Cheryl Mason, Assistant Director, School of Teacher Education • Stephen Colston, Associate Professor, History • Eric Riggs, Assistant Professor, Geoscience Education 	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S)</p> <p><u>Teaching and Learning & Essay 2a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Farnan, Director, School of Teacher Education • Ann de Peyster, Interim Director, Graduate School of Public Health • Kathleen Fisher, Professor, Biology 	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323)</p> <p>Staff Affairs Committee Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Cademy, Programmer/Analyst, Social Science Research Laboratory • Rebecca Cox, Department Secretary, Mathematics & Statistics • Tom Dowdy, Physical Plant • Jane Vidal, Assistant Director, Enrollment Services
<p>12– 1:30 p.m.</p>	<p>Lunch in LA 4450 (President Stephen Weber, Murray Galinson)</p>					

<p>1:40– 2:40 p.m.</p>	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335) Preparation Time</p>	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640) Preparation Time</p>	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318) <u>Strategic Thinking and Planning & Essay 4a</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theresa Mendoza, VP for University Advancement • Kim Hill, Associate VP for Development </p>	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402) <u>Faculty & Teaching Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonnie Zimmerman, Associate VP for Faculty Affairs </p>	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S) <u>Commitment to Learning & Essay 4b</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sally Farris, Director, Analytic Studies & Institutional Research • Ethan Singer, Associate VP for Academic Affairs </p>	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323) <u>Fiscal, Physical, and Info. & Essay 3a</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony Fulton, Director, Facilities Planning & Management </p>
<p>2:50– 3:50 p.m.</p>	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335) <u>Organizational Structures and Decisions & Essay 3b</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past and current Senate Chairs: Gene Lamke, Bonnie Zimmerman, Patrick Papin, Fred Hornbeck </p>	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640) <u>Fiscal, Physical, and Info. & Essay 3a</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connie Dowell, Dean, Library and Information Access • Jon Cawthorne, Associate Dean, Library and Information Access • James Frazee, Associate Director, Instructional Technology Services </p>	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318) <u>Strategic Thinking and Planning & Essay 4a</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deans Tom Scott (Sciences), Skip Meno (Education), Paul Wong (Arts & Letters), David Hayhurst (Engineering), and Gail Naughton (Business Administration) </p>	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402) Preparation Time</p>	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S) Preparation Time</p>	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323) <u>Fiscal, Physical, and Info. & Essay 3a</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sue Blair, Associate VP, Human Resources & Risk Management </p>

<p>4-5 p.m.</p>	<p>Louanne Kennedy (CH 3335)</p> <p><u>Strategic Thinking and Planning & Essay 4a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geoff Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies • Jan Andersen, Interim Dean, Graduate Division 	<p>Francisco Hernandez (SS [West] 2640)</p> <p><u>Support for Student Learning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doug Van Sickle, Acting Dean of Students, Student Affairs • Eric Rivera, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs 	<p>John Casteen (CH 3318)</p> <p><u>Strategic Thinking and Planning & Essay 4a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost Nancy Marlin 	<p>David Young (Extended Studies Center, Room 402)</p> <p><u>Commitment to Learning & Essay 4b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glen McClish, Chair, Rhetoric & Writing • Ellen Quandahl, Associate Professor, Rhetoric & Writing 	<p>Ann Ferren (LA 2250S)</p> <p><u>Commitment to Learning & Essay 4b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cezar Ornatowski, Chair, Academic Policy & Planning • Pat Ditrone, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee 	<p>James Hyatt (AD 323)</p> <p><u>Fiscal, Physical and Info. & Essay 3a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sally Roush, VP, Business & Financial Affairs
<p>5:30-6:30 p.m.</p>	<p>Reception at University House (President Stephen Weber; Provost Nancy Marlin; WASC Coordinating Committee [Sandy Bernstein, Geoffrey Chase, Sandra Cook, Evette Castillo, Adelaida Del Castillo, Roger Dunn, David Ely, Anita Harbert, Linda Holler, Dan Kitchen, Fred Kolkhorst, Glen McClish, Chris Manigault, Patricia Patterson, Natalie Pearl, Chris Procello, Ellen Quandahl, Gloria Rhodes, Joe Shapiro, Carol Venable, Bruce Westermo, Bonnie Zimmerman]; Kelli Kedis, President, Associated Students; Theresa Mendoza, VP for University Advancement; Jim Kitchen, VP for Student Affairs; Sally Roush, VP for Business and Financial Affairs; Dean Tom Scott, College of Sciences; Dean Skip Meno, College of Education; Dean Paul Wong, College of Arts & Letters; Dean William Byxbee, College of Extended Studies; Dean David Hayhurst, College of Engineering; Dean Joyce Gattas, College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts; Dean Gail Naughton, College of Business Administration; Interim Dean Marilyn Newhoff, College of Health & Human Resources; Dean Steve Roeder, Imperial Valley Campus; Dean Connie Dowell, Library & Information Access; Interim Dean Jan Andersen, Graduate Division; Community Members: Jack McGrory, Robert Price, John Moores, Ron Fowler)</p>					
<p>7-9 p.m.</p>	<p>Working dinner (Monterey Whaling Company at Hilton Hotel)</p>					

Tuesday, November 2

7–8 a.m.	Breakfast in Team Room (GMCS 602)		
8:30–9:30 a.m.	Team Room		
9:40–10:40 a.m.	<p><u>Compact for Success and City Height Collaborative</u>: John Casteen and Francisco Hernandez (CH 3335)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Pumpian, Executive Director, City Heights Educational Collaborative • Skip Meno, Dean, College of Education • Ethan Singer, Associate VP for Academic Affairs 	<p><u>General Education</u>: Ann Ferren and Louanne Kennedy (CH 3318)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Banks, Chair, General Education Committee, and GE Committee members (Madhavi McCall, David Kimbrough, Bonnie Scott) • Dean Paul Wong, College of Arts and Letters • Dean Joyce Gattas, College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts • Cathie Atkins, Associate Dean, College of Sciences 	<p><u>Graduate Programs</u>: James Hyatt and David Young (LA 4450)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan Andersen, Interim Dean, Graduate Division • Graduate Council members: Judy Price (College of Sciences), Patricia Geist-Martin (College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts), Glen McClish (College of Arts & Letters), Jose Castillo (Computational Science Research Center), Lucinda Rasmussen (College of Health & Human Services)
10:50–11:50 a.m.	<p><u>International Programs</u>: Anne Ferren and Francisco Hernandez (LA 4450)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provost Nancy Marlin • Alan Sweedler, Assistant VP for International Programs • Ron Moffatt, Director, International Student Center • Steven Loughrin-Sacco, Chair, International Business • Edith Benkov, Chair, European Studies • Allen Greb, International Security and Conflict Resolution • William Byxbee, Dean, College of Extended Studies 	<p><u>Undergraduate Research</u>: David Young and James Hyatt (CH 3335)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Scott, Dean, College of Sciences • Educational Effectiveness WASC Coordinating Committee Group 3 members: Joe Shapiro (College of Extended Studies), Sandy Bernstein (College of Sciences), and Fred Kolkhorst (College of Professional Studies & Fine Arts) 	<p><u>QUALCOMM Institute for Innovation and Educational Success</u>: John Casteen and Louanne Kennedy (CH 3318)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean David Hayhurst, College of Engineering • Dean Skip Meno, College of Education • Dean Geoffrey Chase, Division of Undergraduate Studies • Kim Hill, Associate VP for Development

12 –1 p.m.	<p>Open forums:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students: Council Chambers (Aztec Center) ▪ Staff: Backdoor (Aztec Center) ▪ Faculty: Extended Studies Center Building, Room 206
1–2 p.m.	Lunch in Team Room
2–3:30 p.m.	Team Room
3:30–4 p.m.	Exit interview in CH 3318 with President Stephen Weber
4–4:30 p.m.	Exit interview in CH 3318 with President Stephen Weber ; Provost Nancy Marlin ; Theresa Mendoza , VP for University Advancement; James Kitchen , VP for Student Affairs; Sally Roush , VP for Business and Financial Affairs; Ethan Singer , Associate VP for Academic Affairs; WASC Coordinating Committee

**APPENDIX D: SAN DIEGO COUNTY AND CALIFORNIA 12TH GRADE
PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES COMPLETING ALL REQUIRED
COURSES FOR ADMISSION TO CSU OR UC 2001-2002 AND 2002-2003**

	2002-2003 San Diego County High School Graduates		2002-03 San Diego County High School Graduates Completing All A-G Required Classes		2002-2003 California High School Graduates		2002-2003 California High School Graduates Completing A-G Required Courses	
American Indian	262	0.9%	63	0.6%	3,120	0.9%	717	0.6%
African American	2,042	7.1%	436	4.3%	24,855	7.3%	6,046	5.3%
Hispanic	9,047	31.6%	1,816	17.9%	116,724	34.2%	25,049	21.9%
Asian	1,622	5.7%	892	8.8%	35,407	10.4%	19,841	17.4%
Pacific Islander	238	0.8%	52	0.5%	2,343	0.7%	595	0.5%
Filipino	1,783	6.2%	814	8.0%	10,978	3.2%	4,796	4.2%
White	13,434	46.9%	5,978	59.1%	144,664	42.4%	56,425	49.4%
Other/Not Stated	230	0.8%	67	0.7%	3,006	0.9%	725	0.6%
TOTAL	28,658	100.0%	10,118	100.0%	341,097	100.0%	114,194	100.0%

APPENDIX E: FALL 1990-FALL 2004 ACTUAL TENURE-TRACK/FERP HEADCOUNT AND PROJECTED TENURE-TRACK/FERP HEADCOUNT FROM 2005/06 - 2014/15

FALL 1990-FALL 2004 ACTUAL TENURE-TRACK/FERP HEADCOUNT AND PROJECTED TENURE-TRACK/FERP HEADCOUNT FROM 2005/06 - 2014/15

