WSCUC Interim Report

INSTRUCTIONS
Interim Reports are limited in scope, not comprehensive evaluations of the institution. The report informs the Interim Report Committee about the progress made by the institution in addressing issues identified by the Commission.

The Interim Report consists of two sections:
- Interim Report Form and Appendices
- Additional Required Data (as specified on the Additional Required Data form)

Please respond completely to each question on the following pages and do not delete the questions. Appendices and Additional Required Data will be uploaded as separate attachments.

WSCUC is no longer using Live Text for receiving Interim Reports. Institutions will use a free Box.com account to upload the report. Instructions for creating the Box.com account and uploading the report will be provided by email.

REPORT GUIDELINES AND WORD LIMITS
Because the number of issues reported on varies among institutions (the average is four to six issues), the length of a report will vary. However, a typical interim report ranges from 20 to 60 pages, not including appendices. Narrative essays responding to each issue should be no more than five pages each. The total number of pages of appendices supporting the report should be no more than 200 pages unless agreed upon in advance with the institution’s staff liaison. Be sure that all attachments follow a consistent naming convention and are referenced the same way at appropriate places within the narrative. Please name them so that it is clear what they are and what section they refer to, with cross referencing in the narrative. For example, “Attachment 2-1: Mission Statement”, would be used for Criterion 2. Attachments are preferred as PDFs.

Institutions that provide excessive information in their report will be asked to resubmit. Your may wish to consult with your staff liaison as you prepare your report.

Some tips for providing evidence to support your findings:

- Put yourself in the place of a reviewer: what is the story that you need to tell? What evidence supports your story? What is extraneous and can be left out?

- Provide a representative sample of evidence on an issue, rather than ALL of the evidence.

- Consider including an executive summary or the most relevant points of supporting evidence, rather than the entire document.

- If you are referring to a specific page or set of pages in a document, include only those pages, not the entire document.

- If you are providing an excerpt of a document, include the title of the document, and a table of contents and/or a brief narrative to put the excerpt in context.

- If you provide a hyperlink to a web page, make sure the link takes the viewer directly to the relevant information on the page. Do not make your reviewer search for it.
REVIEW PROCESS
A panel of the WSCUC Interim Report Committee (IRC) will review the report, typically within 90 days of receipt. Representatives of your institution will be invited to participate in the conference call review to respond to questions from the panel. Your WSCUC staff liaison will contact you after the call with the outcome of the review, which will also be documented in a formal action letter.

OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW
After the review, the panel will take one of the following actions.

• **Receive the Interim Report** with recommendations and commendations—No follow up required.

• **Defer action pending receipt of follow-up information**—The panel has identified limited information that may be submitted in a short period of time, such as audited financial statements or the outcome of an upcoming meeting of the board. The panel may authorize the WSCUC staff liaison to review these materials without the full panel being brought together again, depending on the nature of the supplemental information.

• **Request an additional Interim Report**—Issues reported on were not adequately resolved or need continued monitoring.

• **Request a Progress Report**—A progress report is less formal than an Interim Report and is reviewed only by the WSCUC staff liaison. A progress report may be requested when institutional follow-up on one or two relatively minor areas is desired.

• **Receive the Interim Report with a recommendation that the Commission sends a site visit evaluation team**—Serious, ongoing issues involving potential non-compliance with WSCUC’s Standards and Criteria for Review may require follow-up in the form of a Special Visit. Note that the IRC panel makes a recommendation for a visit, and the Executive Committee of the Commission or the full Commission decides on whether or not to require the visit.
Interim Report Form

Please respond to each question. Do not delete the questions. Insert additional pages as needed.

Name of Institution: San Francisco State University

Person Submitting the Report: Dr. Jennifer Summit

Report Submission Date:

Statement on Report Preparation

Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

The initial draft of this report was prepared by Dr. Jane DeWitt, Interim Associate Dean of Academic Planning and Dr. Lori Beth Way, Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning. The strategic plan update was coordinated by Alison Sanders, Chief of Staff, who worked with the offices of Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Administration and Finance and the Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning to review and update progress on the strategic plan initiatives. The initial draft of the report was reviewed by the Provost Council Leadership Team (Dr. Jennifer Summit, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Lori Beth Way, Interim Dean Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning; Dr. Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Provost Institutional Analytics; Dr. Alan Jung, Interim AVP Academic Resources; Dr. Sacha Bunge, Dean Faculty Affairs and Professional Development). The revised draft of the report was further reviewed and approved by the Academic Affairs Council¹ and the President’s Cabinet.²

¹ Dr. Jennifer Summit, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs; Dr. Brian Beatty, AVP Academic Affairs Operations; Dr. Sacha Bunge, Dean Faculty Affairs and Professional Development; Dr. Nancy Gerber, Chair Academic Senate; Dr. Mi-Sook Kim, Interim Dean Graduate Studies; Dr. Alan Jung, Interim AVP Academic Resources; Debbie Masters, University Librarian; Dr. Michael Scott, AVP Research and Sponsored Programs; Dr. Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Provost Institutional Analytics; Dr. Lori Beth Way, Interim Dean Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning; Dean Linda Oubre, College of Business; Interim Dean Nancy Robinson, Graduate College of Education; Interim Dean Amy Sueyoshi, College of Ethnic Studies; Dean Guido Krickx, College of Extended Learning; Dean Alvin Alvarez; College of Health and Social Sciences; Dean Andrew Harris, College of Liberal and Creative Arts; Interim Dean Carmen Domingo; College of Science and Engineering)

² Dr. Les Wong, President; Dr. Jennifer Summit, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs; Ann Sherman, Interim VP of Administration and Finance and CFO; Robert Nava, VP University Advancement; Dr. Luoluo Hong, VP Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Daniel Ojeda, University Counsel; Jason Porth, VP University Enterprises; Alison Sanders, Chief of Staff; Leshia Claudio, Executive Assistant to the President.
List of Topics Addressed in this Report

Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

1. Learning Outcomes Assessment. Student Learning outcomes at the course level need to be tied more consistently to learning outcomes at the program level. The program review process should be revised so that the assessment of learning outcomes at the course level and program level will be a more effective part of the review.

2. Strategic Plan: An update should be provided on the Strategic plan’s goals and the university’s success in reaching them.
Institutional Context
Very briefly describe the institution’s background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

Founded in 1899, San Francisco State University (SF State) is the fourth oldest of the California State University (CSU) System of 23 comprehensive, polytechnic and maritime universities that provide access to all students qualified for undergraduate admission. San Francisco State Normal School was originally established as a teacher training college. Authorization to grant BA degrees occurred in 1923 and the university was authorized to offer a liberal arts degree program in 1935, changing its name to San Francisco State College. The first master’s degree was offered in 1949, and full university status was reached in 1972. San Francisco State was first accredited in 1949 and has sustained continuous accreditation since then. Its most recent accreditation cycle concluded in 2013, with accreditation reaffirmed for a 10 year period.

SF State is located in the urban environment of San Francisco and currently enrolls more than 29,000 students, including approximately 26,800 undergraduates and nearly 3300 graduate students.3 Our student body is diverse, with approximately 6.1% of students identifying as Native American, Pacific Islander or African American, 32.9% as Latino, 30% as Asian, 24.2 % as White non-Latino and 6.8% as two or more races. 49% of our students are Pell eligible and 56.7% of our students are female. Approximately 3260 faculty and staff are employed by SF State. In addition to the main campus location on the southwest side of the city, there is a downtown campus and the Estuary & Ocean Science Center located in Tiburon, CA.

SF State’s mission statement (below) reflects our commitment to educational equity and excellence. Faculty and staff are strongly committed to the success of our students. There are 124 baccalaureate degrees offered in 75 academic areas and 105 master’s degrees are offered in 45 academic areas. In addition, SF State offers 23 credential programs, 46 certificate programs and 4 doctoral degrees. In 2016-17, 6,205 Bachelor’s degrees were granted, along with 990 Master’s degrees and 64 doctoral degrees.

San Francisco State University Mission Statement Academic Senate Policy #S15-176
From the heart of a diverse community, San Francisco State University honors roots, stimulates intellectual and personal development, promotes equity, and inspires the courage to lead, create, and innovate.

SF State is a major public urban university, situated in one of the world’s great cities. Building on a century-long history of commitment to quality teaching and broad access to undergraduate and graduate education, the University offers comprehensive, rigorous, and integrated academic programs that require students to engage in open-minded inquiry and reflection. SF State encourages its students, faculty, and staff to engage fully with the community and develop and share knowledge.

Inspired by the diversity of our community that includes many first-generation college students, and the courage of an academic community that strives to break down traditional boundaries, SF State equips its students to meet the challenges of the 21st century. With the unwavering commitment to social justice that is central to the work of the university, SF State prepares its students to become productive, ethical, active citizens with a global perspective.

3 San Francisco State Data Book, 2016; https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Data%20Book%202016%20Final.pdf
Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission’s action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution’s understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue.

1. Learning Outcomes Assessment.

The Commission’s action letter identified that student learning outcomes at the course level need to be tied more consistently to program level learning outcomes, through course syllabi and program review. The letter further suggested that assessment of learning outcomes at the course and program level should be included in the program review process.

During the years since reaffirmation, campus has made good progress towards meeting these goals. Actions taken towards improving the learning outcome assessment process on campus have been taken on several levels, through changes made to the process to propose and revise courses and programs, the annual assessment process and the expectations of the current cycle of program review. These actions represent changes in our practices that have become the new norm and therefore will continue to inform and frame our curricular and programmatic conversations going forward.

A. Course and Program Proposal Process Requires Course and Program Learning Outcomes

The Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning uses an online course inventory management system by Courseleaf to manage the course and program creation and revision process. The course form became available in August 2017 and the program form became available February 2018. The goal of this conversion was to improve the tracking of courses and programs through the approval process, to create a non-paper archive of course content and to synchronize course information with the campus solutions course catalog and bulletin systems. The course form requires learning outcomes be included both at the program and courses level, and further requires that the course learning outcomes be mapped to the program learning outcomes (Appendix 1A). The program form requires program learning outcomes (Appendix 1B). All 122 new courses submitted through the new system to date provided program and course learning outcomes and mapped those course outcomes to program outcomes. Significant revisions to existing courses likewise require inclusion of learning outcomes at the program and course levels. When these courses or programs are revised, the learning outcomes automatically populate the forms, ensuring that the proposer and the reviewers have an opportunity to review the learning outcomes and maps during the revision process.
To ensure that faculty and students are aware of program learning outcomes, we are transitioning away from our practice of archiving learning goals in department files. A database has been created that links to the new course and program forms so that faculty can look up their program learning outcomes and easily include them in their new and revised curricular forms. Additionally, program learning outcomes are being added to the bulletin for each program so that there is public access to this information. The academic planning office collects program learning goals though the annual assessment activity, to populate and update the database.

B. Annual Assessment Activity Focuses Departments on Learning Outcome Assessment

The University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) began discussions in 2014-15 to improve the annual assessment process on campus. These discussions began under the guidance of the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning in an effort to align the annual assessment process with work already being done in departments, and to provide a path to allow departments to engage in an intentional cycle of review and improvement of their programs. The goals of the revised process were to make assessment seem more manageable to busy departments, to explain the assessment cycle in ways that imparted meaning to programs, and to encourage a more reflective and collaborative assessment process. Rubrics created for each assessment template are used by UAAAC to evaluate the submitted reports. UAAACs evaluation and feedback are shared back to the departments, and that feedback has been greatly appreciated by departments not only for the content of the feedback, but the fact that the reports are being reviewed and discussed makes the assessment being done by departments feel valued and supported.

UAAAC approved four templates that were available for program assessment in the 2015-16 academic year (Appendix 2). The templates addressed the creation or revision of mission statements, the creation or revision of program learning goals, the assessment of a learning goal(s), and closing the loop on assessment. A link to resources to guide departments in carrying out each assessment activity was provided and staff in academic planning was available to lead workshops or discuss process with faculty.

In the 2015-16 academic year, 69% of all departments (45 of 65 departments) submitted one or more of the assessment templates, and in 2016-17, 78.5% of all departments submitted one or more of the assessment report templates. In contrast, the older annual assessment process had a much poorer response rate, with 47.7% of departments submitting a report in 2012-13 and 35.4% submitting in 2013-14 (no reports were required in 2014-15 as UAAAC was reviewing and proposing changes to annual assessment that year). Table 1 summarizes the number of assessment reports received, and the distribution of reports by assessment type. The reason why there are more reports than departments in 2015-16 and 2016-17 is because some departments have more than one degree program and submitted a report for each degree program, and some departments submitted more than one report for a given degree program.

Table 1: Annual Assessment Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2015-16 (new process)</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total departments that submitted a report</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reports submitted</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The increase in the number of departments that submitted reports, as well as the increase in the number of reports submitted in 2015-16 and 2016-17 is evidence that departments find the new assessment process useful and relevant. Having a choice of templates allowed programs to decide for themselves which aspect of assessment was a priority for the given year or to select a template that aligned with work already being done in the department, which also increased compliance. The templates themselves ask programs to reflect on how faculty were involved in the assessment process and how results were disseminated to faculty, encouraging the collaborative process to take place. In the first year, most of the programs reviewed and modified mission statements (50% of submissions), which had probably not been shared or reviewed by programs since their last program review.

In the second year, 21 additional reports were provided, and there was a clear shift of assessment activity to the assessment of learning goals and closing the loop in 2016-17 compared to 2015-16 (38% of reports compared to 27% of reports). This suggests that segmenting the assessment process into distinct steps is encouraging programs to follow the path provided. Additionally, the quality and thoughtfulness of the assessment reports has increased greatly over the prior assessment practice. Prior to the assessment templates, programs updated a grid of assessment that essentially allowed them to check a box to report on assessment. The templates now ask departments to reflect on the process used to complete the assessment process, to describe what they learned and to ask them about the next step they want to take in assessment.

For 2017-18, UAAAC approved a fifth assessment template, to create a curriculum map (Appendix 2) so that programs could identify how learning goal content is introduced, developed and mastered across courses in the curriculum. Additionally, the curriculum map activity allows programs to identify the courses and assignments to be used to assess student achievement in particular program learning outcomes (PLOs). The expectation is that programs that have reviewed and modified their program learning outcomes would find this activity to be a logical next step to help them carry out assessment. It is expected that these assessment reports will be used during program review as evidence of student learning and achievement and of the program’s process to review and improve their curriculum.

Further Issues that Remain: Even when willing, the actual assessment process can seem quite daunting to faculty who have never been involved in assessment beyond assigning grades in a course. Resources are provided on the assessment website, but in person support is much more effective. Two workshops have been developed, one on writing learning outcomes and one on developing a curriculum map. These workshops were offered at the faculty retreat in January 2018, and can be presented at department meetings or college councils as needed. A workshop on the practical aspects of assessing program learning outcomes, from identifying assignments, creating and calibrating a rubric, to defining benchmarks and reporting and interpreting results is the next workshop that will be developed. Academic planning works with Associate Deans in colleges and Department Chairs to set up department or college workshop on these topics, or to consult on assessment activities. Working with the Center for Excellence and Equity in Teaching and Learning, a faculty director of assessment will become involved in annual assessment activities to provide a faculty-peer interaction. A goal for this position will be to create an assessment learning community, leveraging faculty expertise to lead workshops for other faculty and to engage in assessment not only at the academic program level, but also at the university.
level with core competency assessment (which was not required during our last institutional review, but is in the new standards).

C. The 7th Cycle of Program Review Puts Learning Outcomes and Assessment at the Center of Curriculum Planning Process

The guidelines for the seventh cycle of program review were adopted by the Academic Senate in April 2014 (Appendix 3A). This policy defines the following campus standards for the seventh cycle:

All reviews will draw on, but not be limited to, annual/biennial programmatic assessments of cumulative student learning that are already in place for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Such assessment, identified as a requirement by the campus, the CSU system, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), includes: the establishment of programmatic learning objectives, the determination of where in the curriculum those objectives, practices, and experiences are being implemented, the development and use of assessment strategies to measure their attainment, and the utilization of findings from the assessment endeavor to structure curricular improvement and enhance student learning. In addition, Academic Senate policies setting out baccalaureate degree practices require that during the Seventh Cycle, APRC (Academic Program Review Committee) should also review the implementation of high impact educational practices, and the development of culminating experiences to the undergraduate degree.

Following the establishment of these guidelines, a taskforce consisting of the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Director of General Education, the Chair of the Academic Program Review Committee and a department chair created the indicators and standards of program success for the 7th cycle review process and a handbook to guide programs undergoing review (Appendix 3B). The goal of the seventh cycle is summarized as “This new cycle intends to provoke programs to engage in meaningful self-reflection, intentional goal-setting, and purposeful planning”, with a focus on the curriculum. The five indicators and standards approved by the Academic Senate in December 2014 are:

1. **Program Planning.** In charting their future within the discipline and the university, programs maintain effective planning processes that assess their successes, challenges, and opportunities. These processes involve the faculty as a whole and build on evidence of student learning and achievement for continuous improvement.

2. **Student Learning and Achievement.** Programs maintain meaningful and specific learning goals that reflect students’ distinct educational needs at every stage of their academic development, from lower division to graduate; they advance high-impact practices and active learning by encouraging and rewarding pedagogical innovation; and they use evidence of student learning to assess and plan their courses and curriculum.

3. **The Curriculum.** A program’s curriculum should reflect the highest standards of academic excellence and alignment with the "Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at San Francisco State University" (RS08-263). Effective curricula lead students along coherent pathway from foundational levels to advanced achievement in the discipline or field, and they seek to meet students' enrollment needs by balancing course offerings across the full range of their curriculum, including (where relevant) general education, major requirements, electives, and graduate courses.
4. Faculty. Faculty are critical to the success of a program. Excellence in teaching and research or professional practice is essential to SF State's distinctive commitment to uniting academic quality and broad access. Programs should strive for faculty diversity, workload equity, and an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and service. Programs should consider how teaching professional activities, and community involvement help the faculty engage with changing directions in the discipline; how the effectiveness of teaching, professional activities, and community involvement is being supported; and how faculty are responding to changes in the university.

5. Resources. Resources are not only financial but also take the form of human resources, schedules, facilities, and external resources; it is imperative for programs to steward these resources with care. Programs that balance their resources deliver a sustainable and high quality curriculum and maintain a supportive and collegial environment; they cultivate and utilize the professional expertise of their staff; they meet students' needs through advising, course planning, and scheduling; and they allocate offices, classrooms, laboratories, and other spaces equitably, to create rich learning environments for all.

The self-studies are required to specifically address each of the five indicators and standards in turn, with prior assessment reports, program review documents and data about students and courses provided to programs. There is a very clear expectation that programs undergoing program review will review evidence of past assessment and program review, trends in student enrollment, graduation and retention in the major, and enrollment trends in courses to prepare their self-study. An example of the use of assessment evidence to guide program revisions is provided in Appendix 3C.

The first cohort of programs was selected for the 2016-17 academic year. Self-studies were submitted in June 2017, external reviews were conducted in Fall 2017 and the Academic Program Review Committee is currently engaged in the review of documents for these programs. Five of the nine programs in the first cohort of have already revised or created courses and revised their curriculum as a direct result of their findings about their courses and programs while engaging in the program review process. The second cohort of programs is writing their self-studies now, which are due in June 2018.

D. New Process Planned to Verify the Inclusion of Learning Outcomes in Course Syllabi

The Academic Senate policy on course syllabi from 2010 describes the requirements for course syllabi (Appendix 4). One of the requirements is student learning outcomes for the course:

- a statement of scope, content, course objectives and student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the course

For general education courses, course syllabi are expected to include:

- the student learning outcomes [SLOs] for the GE area (and/or overlay(s)) for which the course is seeking certification
- any course-specific student learning outcomes
- linkage of all SLOs (GE area, overlay, and course-specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met those SLOs.

Departments have been asked to audit course syllabi for the inclusion of student learning outcomes in Fall 2018, with the expectation that all syllabi will meet this requirement by January 2019. Additionally, course syllabi submitted along with the revised and new course proposals will be reviewed by the curriculum office and academic planning specifically for the inclusion of learning outcomes and returned
if not included. Going forward, this process will ensure the compliance of syllabi with the inclusion of student learning outcomes required by senate policy more consistently.

2. Strategic Planning

The strategic planning process began in June 2013 with the appointment of a Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee. The committee began work with biweekly meetings though the academic year, hosting discussions and inviting campus and the community to explore seven broad themes:

1. Building the San Francisco State Identity
2. Maximizing Student Success
3. the Academic Master Plan
4. The Physical Master Plan
5. Advancing Campus and Community Climate
6. Elevating Institutional Support
7. Emerging Issues

In Fall 2013, theme subcommittees engaged the campus and community through meetings with stakeholders and campus groups, social media and a comment platform. In June 2014, the subcommittee reported their findings from this yearlong information gathering event with the campus community. A draft of the strategic plan, resulting from reflection on themes that emerged from campus and community input, was available to the campus community in October 2014. Feedback from this release improved the strategic plan, which was adopted in 2015.

The strategic plan (Appendix 5A) is anchored by five core values: Courage, Life of the Mind, Equity, Community and Resilience. The plan is divided into a section for each value, and each section describes aspirations, objectives and initiatives associated with each value. The initiatives are designed to advance these five values on campus. A table listing each of the initiatives and associated progress on those initiatives is included in the appendix. The progress made to date on the strategic plan initiatives required broad participation across campus. Units within Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and Administration and Finance took the lead in some areas, and collaboration between these different units was needed for other initiatives.

There are a total of 94 initiatives defined in the strategic plan. As of 3/27/18, work on 14 initiatives are being planned, and work is in progress or completed on the other initiatives (Appendix 5B). Some initiatives were narrowly defined, and so have been completed, while others will have long timelines for completion (construction initiatives), and still others represent a change in process on campus that will require ongoing review and improvement. Highlights of action taken on the strategic plan include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Value</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>1. Develop existing User-Friendly Principles as a framework to further anti-bullying and anti-harassment efforts and to foster a respectful and affirming campus workplace</td>
<td>Creation of the Division of Equity and Community Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Complete a revision of the University Mission Statement to reflect this value and the other key values in this document</td>
<td>Completed Spring 15, Academic Senate Policy S15-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of the Mind</td>
<td>13. Undertake an operational review of campus advising and tutoring to develop</td>
<td>Operational review of advising completed and recommendations being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Value</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greater coordination of services across campus</td>
<td>implemented through the Graduation Initiative 2025. Operational review of tutoring began Spring 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Conduct a review of course offerings, timing and classroom utilization in order to increase student access to our curriculum</td>
<td>Creation of standard time blocks and use of enrollment analysis program to increase student access to courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Strengthen the curriculum review process by emphasizing student needs and fostering interdepartmental collaboration while streamlining program approval and reducing bureaucratic barriers for new program and co-curricular offerings</td>
<td>Curricular review process has been streamlined and modified to align course and program learning goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. Create and support a University Teaching and Learning Commons that will foster interaction among faculty and various academically oriented units within the University. A key goal of this Commons is to create and maximize peer-to-peer networks of teaching and learning expertise to strengthen the quality of teaching, curricula and courses</td>
<td>The Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning created; programming began in Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>45. Implement and prioritize a Course Availability Plan that will ensure student access to the curriculum, with the aim of increasing six-year graduation rates by 15 percent by 2025</td>
<td>Using Ad Astra to predict student demand for courses in order to improve course availability and student access to the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. Implement a First-Year Experience program to provide a high-impact educational practice that can level the playing field for first generation students and for students whose prior educational experiences have not adequately prepared them for college work</td>
<td>A First Year Experience Committee has been formed to improve the experience of first year students on campus through first year seminars and co-curricular activities. The committee is a collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>64. Establish a resource center for SF State students who are undocumented, AB540 or have been granted Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and provide them with information, guidance and support while fostering a sense of community for undocumented students to facilitate their success and pathway to graduation</td>
<td>San Francisco State University established the Dream Resource Center <a href="http://undocugators.sfsu.edu/">http://undocugators.sfsu.edu/</a> (DRC). The DRC supports the undocumented student population including those who may or may not qualify for AB 540. Information about resources that support the academic and personal success of undocumented students may be found at the center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69. Develop programs and services under the auspices of the Mashouf Wellness Center to</td>
<td>Mashouf Wellness Center opened with expanded wellness programming for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Value</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promote community well-being consisting of mental, physical, social and spiritual health components</td>
<td>students, staff and faculty in Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73. Open an Alumni, Parents and Friends Services Center to provide hospitality in an energized, animated atmosphere</td>
<td>Included in Future State, the Campus Master Plan, initiated Spring 17, draft plan in Spring 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>77. Continue negotiations with area mass transit organizations to reduce transportation costs for students, faculty and staff</td>
<td>Gator Pass negotiated with San Francisco MUNI to provide discounted transportation costs to students on MUNI and BART. Implemented Fall 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85. Prioritize the creation and maintenance of state-of-the-art wireless and computing capability that fosters creativity, collaboration and innovation</td>
<td>The Campus Wireless Augmentation – Information Technology Services is performing augmentation of Campus wireless infrastructure to sustain continuously increasing demand for wireless signal availability and higher connection speed across campus. The Campus Network Infrastructure – The Common Network Initiative (CNI) is Information Technology Services’ ongoing effort to maintain campus baseline network infrastructure as technology advances and user needs evolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91. Update the physical master plan to maximize affordable student and employee housing</td>
<td>Included in Future State, the Campus Master Plan, initiated Spring 17, draft plan in Spring 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

Changes in key personnel:

Dr. Jennifer Summit, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Spring 18
Dr. Lori Beth Way, Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, Summer 18
Dr. Sophie Clavier, Dean of Graduate Studies, Summer 18
Phyllis Carter, Vice President of Admin and Finance and CFO, Summer 18
Dr. Amy Sueyoshi, Interim Dean of the College of Ethnic Studies, Spring 18
Dr. Angie Lipschuetz, Acting Dean College of Extended Learning, Summer 18
Dr. Yim-Yu Wong, Interim Dean of the College of Business, Summer 18
Brian Stuart, Acting Dean of Students, Spring 18
Dr. Maria Martinez, AVP for Enrollment Management, Fall 17
Dr. Carmen Domingo, Interim Dean of the College of Science and Engineering, Fall 17
Dr. Nancy Robinson Interim Dean of the Graduate College of Education, Spring 17, search underway Dr. Andrew Harris, Dean Liberal and Creative Arts, Fall 16
Dr. Alan Jung, Interim AVP Academic Resources, Fall 16
Dr. Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Provost Institutional Analytics, Fall 16
Dr. Guido Krickx, Dean College of Extended Learning, Spring 16, retired May 2018
Dr. Alvin Alvarez, Dean Health and Social Sciences, Fall 15
Dr. Ann Sherman, AVP Human Resources, Spring 14
Dr. Luoluo Hong, VP Student Affairs, Spring 14
Dr. Cynthia Grutzik, Dean of the Graduate College of Education, effective August 2018

New initiatives:

Graduation Initiative 2025

In 2015, the CSU Chancellor’s Office launched the Graduation Initiative 2015 to graduate an additional 100,000 baccalaureate students per year over the next 10 years. As part of this initiative, the Chancellor’s Office provided each campus in the CSU system with targets in graduation rates and URM opportunity gap reduction (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. SFSU Graduation Initiative 2015 Student Success Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman 4 year graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman 6 year graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URM Opportunity Gap Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student 2 year graduation rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SFSU Student Success Plan (Appendix 6) engages in six strategies to meet these goals:

1. improved course availability and curriculum
2. coordinated, intrusive and strategic advising
3. broad accessibility and visibility of student success data
4. high-quality student experience in the first year of college for incoming freshmen
5. effective, targeted support services to achieve educational equity (directed specifically at our first-generation, low-income and underrepresented students, with special attention to men of color)
6. faculty hiring and development

These strategies align with initiatives in our strategic plan and provide the means to implement those initiatives. As one example, recommendations from the operational review of advising, a strategic plan initiative, are being implemented though the student success plan. Through the student success plan, the campus is in the process of hiring 19 advisors who are in split roles between the Undergraduate Advising Center and the college-based advising centers. Once fully staffed, the campus will have 9 advisors tasked to work specifically with upper division students to facilitate graduation (graduation specialists), 5 advisors who will coordinate campus-wide advising initiatives between the college advising centers and the Undergraduate Advising Center (college specialists), and 5 advisors who will work with lower division students who are at-risk for not continuing at SF State (retention specialists). To date, the campus has hired 9 of these advising roles, and the goal is to be fully staffed (at 19) before the 2018-2019 academic year begins. In addition to the shared advising roles, we are also in the process of hiring 1 new advisor in the Undergraduate Advising Center to work with transfer students.

Campus Master Plan: Future State

In early 2017, SF State launched a yearlong planning process devoted to the revitalization of the university’s physical development. The process highlighted the need to prioritize the construction of new academic facilities, as well as the renovation of some existing ones, and to find ways to offer housing to more of our students, faculty and staff. The university has identified both priorities—better facilities for teaching and research, as well as housing, as being critically important to fulfilling its mission. The housing crisis in the Bay Area continues to have a deleterious impact on our ability to attract and retain faculty and staff. It also impedes student success and graduation. Thus, through the planning process and subsequent implementation, the university will aggressively confront these challenges by delivering new the spaces needed to support these aims.

The campus-wide collaborative planning process has included frequent community meetings, planning charrettes, and targeted sessions with key stakeholders including faculty, deans, student affairs professionals, and others. Additionally, the campus held an “Ideas Week”, a design studio open to the campus community, where architects and planners collected ideas for the campus master plan for incorporation into the proposal. The week-long, iterative process led to innovative concepts and
ensured that students, faculty and staff were able to participate in the planning process. More about the process can be viewed at [http://www.futuresfstate.com](http://www.futuresfstate.com)

Data collected to date confirms that in order to meet anticipated demand over the plan’s fifteen-year planning horizon, the campus will increase its enrollment cap from 25,000 to 30,000 FTE students. Thus, the planning process has led the campus to incorporate the facilities needed to support this growth into its master plan. Throughout the implementation horizon, 2020 through 2035, the university will aim to provide housing for approximately 42% of students and approximately 15% of faculty and staff. Additionally, the project includes approximately 4.7 million gross square feet (GSF) of net new and renovated building space for academic, residential, student life, and indoor athletics uses, semi-public uses, and office and support functions. It also includes outdoor athletics and student recreation space and new residential and replacement parking.

Key projects are expected to include:

- A lecture hall/classroom building, combined with a welcome center as well as new science, business, music, theatre and dance buildings;
- renovation of existing facilities;
- a new student union and health center with dining, social space, and a new health center;
- a new housing community for lower-division students
- a new hotel and conference center;
- a new innovation center for applied research between SF State faculty, students, and industry partners; and
- a 3,500-seat events center in the southern portion of the campus for basketball and other events (e.g., convocations, academic conferences, public lectures, and concerts).

The university will continue to refine the program and seek approval from the CSU Board of Trustees in summer or fall 2019, in coordination with its obligations under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

As the master plan review process continues to progress, two construction projects will break ground in fall 2018. These include a new state-of-the-art creative arts facility, which will house the university’s renowned Broadcast, Communications, and Electronic Arts (BECA) Department, as well as a mixed-use student housing facility, which will provide approximately 550 beds in 170 apartment style units with retail offerings on the ground floor. Both will be ready for occupancy by fall 2020.
Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

1. Learning outcomes assessment

   Great progress has been made towards creating an environment where learning outcomes assessment is the expected norm. The current annual assessment process is a step in the right direction, as it leads departments through the cycle of assessment in a deliberate way and has resulted in higher compliance with annual assessment activity and higher quality assessment reports. Continued outreach to departments to help them plan and carry out that assessment is planned through a faculty director of assessment and the creation of learning communities of faculty assessment practitioners.

   The focus of the 7th cycle of Program Review on assessment and learning outcomes will likewise support the use of assessment as a standard tool for curricular planning.

   A process to confirm the inclusion of course learning outcomes in course syllabi will be implemented next year. Through this practice, we expect to increase the number of course syllabi with course learning outcomes and to make sure that the syllabi are updated as revisions to courses are made.

2. Strategic Planning

   In Fall 2013, SF State launched a Strategic Planning effort (http://planning.sfsu.edu). The final draft was circulated to campus stakeholders in December 2014. Of the 94 short, mid and long term initiatives identified during the strategic planning process, significant progress has been made on 80 of them, with the remaining 14 actively under review or consideration (Appendix 5B).

   A progress update will be provided to the campus in Fall 2018.
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Appendix 1 Course and Program Process

App 1A. New Course Proposal

**Note: Fields outlined in red are required**

Contact(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
<th>Extension:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intended Effective Date:

Subject:

Department/School:

Expanded Course Title:

Abbreviated Title:

30 characters remaining

Expanded Course Title:

100 characters remaining

Special Course Types:

- [ ] Cross-list
- [ ] Generic/Variable Topics

How will this course be funded?

**How will this course advance student time to the degree?**

Major Requirements:

- [ ] Required Major Course (not an option in a list)
- [ ] Option in a List of Required Major Courses
- [ ] Major Elective

General Education, Lifelong Learning & Self-Development:

- [ ] General Education (GE)

SF State Studies:

- [ ] American Ethnic and Racial Minorities (AERM)
- [ ] Global Perspectives (GP)
- [ ] Environmental Sustainability (ES)
Social Justice (SJ)

Community Service Learning:  □ Yes  □ No

Prerequisites:  

Do you want to restrict enrollment by student level if noted as a prerequisite?  □ Yes  □ No

Do you want to restrict enrollment by major/minor/or other program if noted in the prerequisite?  □ Yes  □ No

Academic Planning is working to implement course prerequisite checking for Spring 2019. If you would like the courses listed in the prerequisite field above enforced by PeopleSoft - preventing students who haven’t completed that course from enrolling in the course - select yes.

Do you want Peoplesoft to enforce the courses noted in the prerequisite?  □ Yes  □ No

Coded Restrictions:  No restrictions.

Course descriptions and prerequisites should not exceed 100 words combined. Academic Planning will contact the proposer if the word limit is exceeded. Use abbreviated sentences and passive form.

For example: “Examination of the social political, cultural context in the words of...,” rather than, “This course is intended to examine the most important social, political, and cultural contexts in which the works of the greatest novelist of all time...”

Course Description:

Course Typically Offered:

Components and Staffing Classification
Staffing classifications are linked to weighted teaching units (WTUs) and weekly course hours. Courses comprised of two components may be configured as follows: 1) Lecture with Activity or Laboratory; 2) Seminar with Activity or Laboratory; or 3) Seminar/Demonstration with Activity or Laboratory. Choose one or two components and the most appropriate classification from the pull-down menu. (Note: The Supervision component may not be paired with another component.)

Details of the course classification system are available.

Components

- Lecture
- Seminar
- Activity
- Laboratory
- Practicum
- Supervision

Make sure that Total Units is the sum of one or two classification units as indicated above. For example, if a course is comprised of one classification, the classification units and Total Units will be the same. If the course is comprised of two classifications, the sum of the classification units will be the Total Units.

For fixed unit courses, insert the single value, below. For variable-unit courses, insert the low unit value and the high unit value, separated by a dash “-”.

Total Units: ____________________________

Repeat for Credit:  □ Yes  □ No

Course Outline

Course Topics Help

Course Topics

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) Submitted to Academic Planning can be Found Here. Course proposals that satisfy a General Education, American Institutions, or SF State Studies attribute, but do not fulfill a major requirement should enter "See GE Learning Outcomes Below" in this field. Please include all PLOs even if they do not align with the SLOs below.

Program Learning Objectives

Student Learning Outcomes and Alignment with Program Learning Objectives

Evaluation Procedure To Be Used in Determining Final Grades:
List textbooks/ reading assignments:

Additional Information:

Examples of supporting documents include sample syllabi or consultations completed prior to submission.

Upload Supporting Documentation:

Uploaded Files:

Files To Be Uploaded:
## Program Proposal Form and Attachment

### New Program Proposal

Note: Fields outlined in red are required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact(s):</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
<th>Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intended Catalog Year:

School/Department: Select...

College: Select College...

Funding Source: Select...

Delivery Type: Select...

Level: Select...

Proposal Type: Select Proposal Type...

Degree Designation: Select Degree Designation...

Program Code: [Find...]

Concentration Code: [Find...]

CIP Code: [Find...]

Major Code: [Find...]

Program Title: [Find...]

Total Major Units: Typically 120 units for a Bachelor's degree unless an exception is requested.

Total Units to Degree: [Find...]

If you're proposing a new program, please contact Claude Bartholomew (Claude@sfsu.edu), University Curriculum Coordinator, to obtain the current template for your proposal. Revisions to existing programs can be made directly in the fields below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Proposal Template</th>
<th>Uploaded Files:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Files To Be Uploaded:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Overview and Rationale**

This is the text that will appear in the degree overview tab in the Bulletin.

Provide the program description:

*Format* [Choose]

*Source* [Choose]
### Program Outcomes and Requirements

List the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO #1</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you plan to assess these PLOs?

Program Requirements and Curriculum:

List the curriculum as it should appear in the degree requirements tab of the Bulletin.
## Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Enrollment:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Are new Resources required?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

If no new resources are required, describe how the program will be supported by existing resources:

Please include any consultations with other departments as documented on paper or via email.

**Upload Consultation Document(s)**

- **Uploaded Files:**
  - Files To Be Uploaded:

**Associated Accreditation Bodies:**

**Roadmap:**

A 4-year roadmap is required for all undergraduate degree programs. If possible, also include a 2-year roadmap for transfer students.

- **Roadmap**
  - **Uploaded Files:**
    - Files To Be Uploaded:

**Supporting Documents**

- **Uploaded Files:**
  - Files To Be Uploaded:
Appendix 1B New Program Proposal Excerpt

CSU Degree Program Proposal Template
Revised October 2017

Please Note:

- Campuses may mention proposed degree programs in recruitment material if it is specified that enrollment in the proposed program is contingent on final program authorization from the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

- Approved degree programs will be subject to campus program review within five years after implementation. Program review should follow system and Board of Trustee guidelines (including engaging outside evaluators) and should not rely solely on accreditation review.

- Please refer to the document “Tips for Completing a Successful Program Proposal” (which follows this document) before completing the Program Proposal Template.

1. Program Type (Please specify any from the list below that apply—delete the others)
   a. State-Support
   b. Self-Support
   c. Delivery Type: Fully face to face, fully online, or hybrid program
   d. Fast Track (bachelor’s or master’s only; not already on campus academic plan)
   e. Pilot (bachelor’s or master’s only; not already on campus academic plan; please use pilot proposal template)
   f. Pilot Conversion (please use pilot conversion template)
   g. New Program
   h. Proposal Revision (updating a previously reviewed proposal)

2. Program Identification
   a. Campus
   b. Full and exact degree designation and title (e.g. Master of Science in Genetic Counseling, Bachelor of Arts with a Major in History).
   c. Date the Board of Trustees approved adding this program projection to the campus Academic Master Plan.
   d. Term and academic year of intended implementation (e.g., fall 2018).
   e. Total number of units required for graduation. This will include all requirements (and campus-specific graduation requirements), not just major requirements.
f. Name of the department(s), division, or other unit of the campus that would offer the proposed degree major program. Please identify the unit that will have primary responsibility.

g. Name, title, and rank of the individual(s) primarily responsible for drafting the proposed degree major program.

h. Statement from the appropriate campus administrative authority that the addition of this program supports the campus mission and will not impede the successful operation and growth of existing academic programs.

i. Any other campus approval documents that may apply (e.g. curriculum committee approvals).

j. Please specify whether this proposed program is subject to WASC Substantive Change review. The campus may submit a copy of the WASC Sub-Change proposal in lieu of this CSU proposal format. If campuses choose to submit the WASC Substantive Change Proposal, they will also be required to submit a program assessment plan using the format found in the CSU program proposal template.

k. Optional: Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs and CSU Degree Program Code

Campuses are invited to suggest one CSU degree program code and one corresponding CIP code. If an appropriate CSU code does not appear on the system-wide list at: http://www.calstate.edu/app/resources.shtml, you can search CIP 2010 at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55 to identify the code that best matches the proposed degree program. The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) is a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) publication that provides a numerical classification and standard terminology for secondary and postsecondary instructional programs. The CSU degree program code (based on old HEGIS codes) and CIP code will be assigned when the program is approved by the Chancellor.

3. Program Overview and Rationale

a. Provide a brief descriptive overview of the program citing its 1) purpose and strengths, 2) fit with the institutional mission or institutional learning outcomes, and 3) the compelling reasons for offering the program at this time.

b. Provide the proposed catalog description. The description should include:

1. a narrative description of the program

2. admission requirements

3. a list of all required courses for graduation including electives, specifying course catalog numbers, course titles, prerequisites or co-requisites (ensuring there are no “hidden prerequisites” that would drive the total units required to graduate beyond the total reported in 2e above), course unit requirements, and any units associated with demonstration of proficiency beyond what is included in university admission criteria.
4. total units required to complete the degree

5. if a master’s degree, catalog copy describing the culminating experience requirement(s)

1. **Curriculum** – *(These requirements conform to the revised 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation)*

   a. **These program proposal elements are required:**
      - Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs)
      - Program learning outcomes (PLOs)
      - Student learning outcomes (SLOs)

      Describe outcomes for the 1) institution, 2) program, and for 3) student learning. Institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) typically highlight the general knowledge, skills, and dispositions all students are expected to have upon graduating from an institution of higher learning. Program learning outcomes (PLOs) highlight the knowledge, skills, and dispositions students are expected to know as graduates from a specific program. PLOs are more narrowly focused than ILOs. Student learning outcomes (SLOs) clearly convey the specific and measurable knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors expected and guide the type of assessments to be used to determine if the desired level of learning has been achieved.

      *(WASC 2013 CFR: 1.1, 1.2, 2.3)*

   b. **These program proposal elements are required:**
      - Comprehensive assessment plan addressing all assessment elements
      - Matrix showing where student learning outcomes are introduced (I), developed (D), and mastered (M)

      Key to program planning is creating a comprehensive assessment plan addressing multiple elements, including a strategy and tool to assess each student learning outcome. SLOs operationalize the PLOs and serve as the basis for assessing student learning in the major. Constructing an assessment matrix, showing the relationship between all assessment elements, is an efficient and clear method of displaying all assessment plan components.

      Creating a curriculum map matrix, identifying the student learning outcomes, the courses where they are found, and where content is “introduced,” “developed,” and “mastered” insures that all student learning outcomes are directly related to overall program goals and represented across the curriculum at the appropriate times. Assessment of outcomes is expected to be carried out systematically according to an established schedule, generally every five years.

   c. **Indicate total number of units required for graduation.**
d. Include a justification for any baccalaureate program that requires more than 120-semester units or 180-quarter units. Programs proposed at more than 120 semester units will have to provide either a Title 5 justification for the higher units or a campus-approved request for an exception to the Title 5 unit limit for this kind of baccalaureate program.

e. If any formal options, concentrations, or special emphases are planned under the proposed major, identify and list the required courses. Optional: You may propose a CSU degree program code and CIP code for each concentration that you would like to report separately from the major program.

f. List any new courses that are: (1) needed to initiate the program or (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog descriptions for new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each new course would be at the graduate- or undergraduate-level.

g. Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating likely faculty teaching assignments.

(WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)

h. For master’s degree proposals, include evidence that program requirements conform to the minimum requirements for the culminating experience, as specified in Section 40510 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

i. For graduate degree proposals, cite the corresponding bachelor’s program and specify whether it is (a) subject to accreditation and (b) currently accredited.

(WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)

j. For graduate degree programs, specify admission criteria, including any prerequisite coursework.

(WASC 2013 CFR: 2.2b)

k. For graduate degree programs, specify criteria for student continuation in the program.

l. For undergraduate programs, specify planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.

m. Provide an advising “roadmap” developed for the major.

n. Describe how accreditation requirements will be met, if applicable, and anticipated date of accreditation request (including the WASC Substantive Change process).

(WASC 2013 CFR: 1.8)

**Accreditation Note:**

*Master’s degree program proposals*
Mission Statement Annual Assessment Report

Department ____________________________  College ____________________________

Degree Program(s) ____________________________

Information about the purpose of mission statements and how to write them can be found on: http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources along with some links to SFSU statements.

Mission Statement Rubric – developed and used by the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) to provide feedback to programs about their mission statement.

The program’s mission statement concisely articulates its guiding purpose and identity, clarifies the educational value of its curriculum, and aligns with the university’s broader public mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear statement of program’s purpose and identity, the educational value of curriculum, and its link to university’s mission</td>
<td>Mission statement articulates program’s purpose but may lack broader context</td>
<td>Vague mission statement with little connection to specific program</td>
<td>No mission statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What was your most recent mission statement prior to any revisions?

2. Please describe the process of revising or developing your mission statement. What informed your discussions about your new or revised mission statement (e.g. changes in the profession, new focus of the department)? How were department faculty members involved? Was it developed in department meetings or other gatherings?

3. What is your revised mission statement?

4. Please post your revised mission statement on your department web page.

Given that this year you revised your mission statement, the next step would be to review of your program learning goals in the 2018-19 academic year.
Program Learning Goals Annual Assessment Report

Department ______________________________ College _________________________________

Degree Program(s)__________________________________________________________

Resources about writing measureable program learning objectives/goal/outcomes can be found on: http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources

Program Learning Goals Rubric - developed and used by the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) to provide feedback to programs about their program learning goals.

Learning objectives should reflect the program’s distinct mission in connection with the university’s broader educational goals, as well as aligning with the individual courses in which they are addressed. They should allow faculty to communicate their expectations, students to reflect on their own growth, and programs to measure and improve their educational results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning goals are clear and can be accurately assessed</td>
<td>Learning goals are mostly clear; some can be assessed</td>
<td>Learning goals are present but vague; unclear how an evaluator could determine whether goals were met</td>
<td>Program learning goals are absent or incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every degree program offered by a department (minor, BA, BS, MA, MS) should have its own program learning goals. This report can focus on the learning goals for one program or present learning goals for multiple programs.

1. List your most recent program learning goals prior to any revisions.

2. Please describe the process of revising your program learning goals this semester. How were department faculty members involved? Were the revised learning goals developed in department meetings or other gatherings?

3. What informed your decision to revise your learning goals (e.g. changes in the profession, new focus of the department, outcome of assessment)?

4. What are your new program learning goals?

Give that this year you have revised your program learning goals, the next step would be to either plan how you would assess program learning goals by completing a curriculum map or to assess one of your program learning goals in the 2018-19 academic year.
Assessment Activity Report Due April 20, 2018
Submit a pdf version at https://sfsu.knack.com/ap#annual-assessment/

Curriculum Map Annual Assessment Report

Department ____________________________  College ____________________________

Degree Program(s) ____________________________

Go to http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources for information about curriculum mapping

1. Please present your curriculum map.

2. Who was involved in the development of your curriculum map and how did the work go forward?

3. As the map was being developed, what did you learn about your curriculum as a whole?
   • Were all PLOs adequately supported along the path from introduced to mastered?
   • Did all courses contribute to one or more PLOs?
   • Was there too much emphasis on a few PLOs and not enough on others?
   • Are your courses and PLOs adequately aligned or is some refinement needed?

4. What is the next step you will take as a department to improve your program? For example, do you want to look more closely at the content of courses and how they support the PLOs? Are you ready to identify the course and assignment that will be used to assess a PLO? Do you need to develop new courses or adjust the scope and sequence and/or structure of your curriculum to fill in gaps in fulfilling PLO's and facilitate in student learning?

5. Your curriculum map and program learning goals should not be kept secret! Post them on your department website, put your map up where students can see it, provide it to new faculty and lecturers so that they can see how the course they teach fits into the curriculum. Keep refining the content of courses to better support the curriculum overall and keep refining the map to make sure that every course in the curriculum makes a contribution.

Give that this year you created a curriculum map, the next step would be to assess one or more program learning goals in 2018-19.
Assessment Activity Report Due April 20, 2018
Submit a pdf version at https://sfsu.knack.com/ap#annual-assessment/

Assessment of Program Learning Goal(s) Annual Assessment Report

Department ________________________________ College ________________________________

Degree Program ________________________________

Please see resources about closing the loop and assessing program learning outcomes at the Academic Planning website http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources

Assessment Findings and Analysis Rubric – developed and used by the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) to provide feedback to programs about their assessment findings.

Reports should analyze and summarize the results of the assessment: how well did students meet the program's learning objective(s)? How well did assessment capture that learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings offer evidence that goals were met, partly met, or not met</td>
<td>Findings are mostly aligned with assessment goals and results</td>
<td>Findings unrelated to assessment results</td>
<td>No findings are given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings used to improve student learning and program quality</td>
<td>Findings directed at improving student learning and program outcomes</td>
<td>Findings do not indicate ongoing engagement with student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment of program learning goals should be on a rotation, so that only one or two are evaluated in any given year, but all would be evaluated on approximately a five year cycle.

1. Please list your program learning goals.

2. Which program learning goal did you choose to assess this semester?

3. How was the assessment completed? What evidence did the faculty consider (e.g. written papers, presentations, portfolios)? How were faculty involved in the process of assessment?

4. What did you find? Is the program learning goal being met?

5. What assessment activities do you plan to undertake next academic year?
   • Will you “close the loop” for this finding and work on steps to improve the student learning outcomes based on these findings (e.g. create signature assignments, change the required courses)?
   • Are there other assessment findings from the assessment of this program learn goal that you will report through another assessment findings report?
   • In light of your assessment work, changes in the field, or other influences, do you want to take the opportunity to revise the program learning goals next year (program learning goal report)?
   • Will you move on to assess a different program learning goal (assessment findings report)?
Assessment Activity Report Due April 20, 2018
Submit a pdf version at https://sfsu.knack.com/ap#annual-assessment/

Closing the Loop Annual Assessment Report

Department ___________________________ College ___________________________

Degree Program_____________________

Please see resources about closing the loop and assessing program learning outcomes at the Academic Planning website http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/resources

Use of Assessment for Program Improvement and Planning, or, Closing the Loop Rubric – developed and used by the University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) to provide feedback to programs about their use of assessment findings to improve their programs.

The quality of a program’s assessment is determined by its usefulness and application. While assessment should reveal a program’s strengths, it is equally (and perhaps even more) valuable if it can help programs identify, reflect on, and address areas where continued development and improvement are needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>DEVELOPING</th>
<th>NEEDS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment clearly drives program planning and curriculum development</td>
<td>Assessment results directed toward program planning</td>
<td>Assessment describes the existing program</td>
<td>No use of assessment evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program improvements result from assessment</td>
<td>Program’s curriculum has changed (and changes) as a result of assessment</td>
<td>Assessment used to defend status quo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of program-level reflection on assessment results</td>
<td>Assessment report includes reflection on larger lessons learned from assessment</td>
<td>Assessment is primarily procedural and needs reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Please list the program learning goal that was assessed in your assessment findings report or other assessment activity.

2. What was the finding of that assessment?

3. What was the process through which faculty considered a response to the findings of the assessment (department meeting, department retreat, through a department assessment or curriculum committee)?

4. What changes have you made or are you planning to make in order to address the findings?

5. What assessment activities do you plan to undertake next academic year?
   - Will you assess a different program learning goal (assessment finding report)?
   - Will you address another finding from the assessment of the same program learning goal (closing the loop report)?
   - Is it time to revisit program learning goals (program learning goals report) or your curriculum map (curriculum map report)
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I. Introduction

The purpose of the academic program review process at San Francisco State is to assure University degree programs[1] of the highest quality in the context of the overall curriculum. The review process provides an opportunity for faculty and administrators to clarify the intellectual vision, range, coherence, and currency of each program, examine the effectiveness of its organizational structure, articulate the learning outcomes it inculcates, bring issues needing attention to the University, and assess the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved. The review process highlights efforts by instructional units to ensure and improve program quality, demonstrate how the degree program and curriculum has been revised in response to evolving circumstances and changes in the field, discuss faculty and student resources, and indicate other resources needed to accomplish program goals. The review affords a clear and comprehensive perspective on the program's standing within its discipline, its role in its own College and in the University as a whole, and its consonance with SFSU's mission, CSU plans, and State requirements. Outcomes of each program review are among the factors considered by administrators in decisions concerning the allocation of resources.

A. The Seventh Cycle of Program Review

Over the past thirty-eight years, the University has engaged in six cycles of academic program review, each with its distinctive characteristics. In 2013, the Senior College and University Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) revised its Handbook of Accreditation. The revisions continue two trends initiated in the 2001 Handbook - flexible, need-based program review frequency and focus on degree program outcomes. Campus development of on-going department assessments and student learning outcomes put us in excellent position to follow the WASC trends required for program review. The Seventh Cycle review process will be informed by extant indicators and criteria intended to determine the sustainability and quality of programs. These indicators and criteria are best
construed as normative expectations originating from the degree program unit, college, and University, rather than rigidly prescriptive rules imposed from outside the University. All degree granting programs, whether nationally accredited or not, will need to demonstrate the extent to which University- and program-established standards are being met.

B. A Context of Decreased State Support and Decaying Infrastructure

The Seventh Cycle of review initiates at a time of serious fiscal crisis. Direct state funding for CSU students has declined more than a third since the beginning of the Sixth Cycle. Concomitant with this decline has been an even more serious reduction in monies for the maintenance of facilities and other infrastructure. WASC has repeatedly warned of the danger posed by deteriorating facilities. While the WASC report appropriately lauds SF State for its ability to weather the fiscal crises of the past five years, it also notes that these "fiscal challenges in the State of California have contributed to a deferred maintenance backlog at SF State and other CSU campuses." Seventh Cycle reviews must take particular care to appraise the state of facilities and realistically assess plans for improvements. Appropriate support for graduate programs was a major theme of the Sixth Cycle, and it should likewise be a focus of departments in the Seventh Cycle. Graduate and undergraduate degree programs should describe the research opportunities and creative activities available to their students and assess what support is necessary to maintain these activities as well as their decision-making processes determining the relative share of resources going to undergraduate and graduate programs. It is important for all degree programs to contextualize resource allocation decisions within the context of unit goals with regard to degrees (graduate and/or undergraduate), minors and certificates, contributions to general education, and how they formally decide on their priorities and resource allocations for different degree programs. Quality degree programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels involve students actively in the research, creative work, and other professional development activities of their respective fields and therefore impose significant demands on faculty and departments. Such involvement is imperative for graduate programs. At the undergraduate level, student experiences with research and creative projects distinguish a San Francisco State degree from those of our peer institutions; this aspect of our curriculum is a cornerstone of our Master Plan commitment to "be the nation' preeminent public urban university."

C. Campus Standards for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

During implementation of the Sixth Cycle, SFSU developed general standards for graduate degree programs. These were adopted into the Sixth Cycle handbook. These standards should standards for undergraduate degree programs will be developed and included in the Seventh Cycle Handbook, and incorporated into reviews of programs. All reviews will draw on, but not be limited to, annual/biennial programmatic assessments of cumulative student learning that are already in place for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Such assessment, identified as a requirement by the campus, the CSU system, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), includes: the establishment of programmatic
learning objectives, the determination of where in the curriculum those objectives, practices, and experiences are being implemented, the development and use of assessment strategies to measure their attainment, and the utilization of findings from the assessment endeavor to structure curricular improvement and enhance student learning. In addition, Academic Senate policies setting out baccalaureate degree practices require that during the Seventh Cycle, APRC should also review the implementation of high impact educational practices, the development of culminating experiences to the undergraduate degree.

II. Components of Program Review

Within the context described above, academic program review in the Seventh Cycle will include the following four components:

- Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendations
- External Review and Recommendation
- Program and Dean Response to External Review and Recommendations
- University Review and Decision Processes

A. Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendations

At the start of the Seventh Cycle, representatives from the degree granting units, the College, Academic Planning, and the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) will meet to discuss the (1) review procedures, (2) substantive content of the reviews, and (3) lines of communication for procedural or content questions. Those attending should indicate, if relevant, specific areas or issues needing to be addressed so that these may receive special attention in the review process. After the initial meeting, the administration will provide the academic unit with the most current available data pertinent to the self-study. The faculty of every instructional unit offering a degree program shall prepare a self-study that will serve as a basis for all subsequent levels of review and recommendations. In the case of nationally accredited programs, the periodic accreditation review may stand for the self-study if the substance of the accreditation review coincides with the requirements of the self-study. The unit should delineate and assess each degree program offered, following the latest guidelines in the Handbook for Academic Program Review. The unit's faculty should include student, alumni, and other stakeholder input in the preparation of the self-study. The self-study should describe the history of the program or programs under review since time of last review and identify current strategies for maintenance and improvement. In most cases, the history should be contextualized in the difficult budget situation of these years as well as the overall goals of the instructional unit, which may include contributions to General Education, commitment to minors, certificate programs, and so forth; strategies for the future should be tempered by realism with regard to resources. A useful self-study cannot shy away from self-criticism nor consider the issue of resources the sole source of problems or means of improvement, but neither can a good self-study ignore deficiencies in resources necessary for a quality degree. A useful self-study should also include strategies for improvement beyond
those that require financial resources; these could include collaborations with other departments or units at other universities, work with the community, work driven by existing faculty or by alumni and students. The self-study should be informed by unit planning, including the identification of a mission statement, an assessment of strengths and weaknesses, and the development of goals and objectives for the degree program.[8] Unit heads should strive for widespread faculty participation in the development of the self-study, and ensure all unit faculty members are made aware of all findings and recommendations generated by the review process. The unit forwards its completed self-study to the College Dean for review and signature indicating that the document is ready for external review. The College Dean forwards the self-study to Academic Planning, which then schedules external review

B. Self-Study and Recommendations for General Education

General Education (GE) will prepare a self-study and be reviewed as an instructional unit. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies will serve as "unit head" and "College Dean" for purposes of the review. As this is the initial inclusion of GE within the scope of program review, there must be flexibility in creating measures for GE performance. The self-study should be guided by the principles outlined above, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, in consultation with Academic Planning, the Baccalaureate Requirements Committee, and Academic Program Review Committee, will modify measures as needed to appropriately address these principles. Faculty participation is important in the assessment of GE as it is within degree granting units; the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will strive for participation of faculty on GE committees as well as faculty teaching GE courses.

C. External Review and Recommendations

The purpose of the external review is to provide each instructional unit with a well-informed, independent analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of its curriculum, its complement of faculty, and its organizational structure as well as an evaluation of the relationship of all of these to the quality of its degree programs. The external review should evaluate program goals and the unit’s success in achieving them, and suggest strategies for implementing recommendations for program improvements. Useful external review demands area expertise, experience with assessment, and knowledge of the larger campus context. Unit faculty members are in the best position to identify appropriate reviewers and should be the first source for suggestions of reviewers. After the instructional unit completes the self-study, faculty, through the chair in consultation with the dean, make recommendations of reviewers to Academic Planning. The list needs to include a brief description of each suggested reviewer as to why they would be a suitable reviewer along with relevant information on the professional background and experience of these individuals; this can take the form of a standard curriculum vitae. Academic Planning strives, within the constraints of scheduling, to select reviewers who are recommended, qualified, and available. Typically, the external review is conducted by a team of two experts, one from within and one from outside the CSU system. For units with graduate programs, at least one reviewer should be from a program
that also offers a graduate degree in the relevant area. Departments and/or nominees will report any conflicts of interest to Academic Planning; conflicts do not necessarily make an external review candidate ineligible. A conflict of interest relationship includes all relationships with actual or perceived direct benefit such as employee, former employee, applicant for employment, paid consultant, award recipient or invited lecturer. Any contracted relationships involving a written agreement and/or compensation should be reported due to the potential impact on decision making. A conflict of interest could also occur due to personal or professional relationship with the department under review. Only conflicts arising from relationships or contracts active in the last five years are relevant as conflicts for the external review process. Academic Planning will receive documents supporting any conflict of interest concerns and forward these to the APRC for their recommendation to the Provost regarding any action. Procedures for the external reviewers' visit are detailed in the Handbook for the Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Review. In brief, reviewers receive a copy of the unit's self-study and supporting documents. They are scheduled to spend parts of two days on campus jointly interviewing students, faculty, staff, and administrators and to prepare a report of findings and recommendations. Reviewers are expected to produce a single report. The reviewers' report is sent to Academic Planning within a reasonable timeframe following the campus visit. Academic Planning forwards copies of the report to the unit and College dean.

D. Unit and Dean Response to External Review and Recommendations

The unit head will distribute the reviewers' report to all unit faculty members. The unit can inform the College dean and Academic Planning of any errors of fact in the report. The College dean will review the external reviewers' report.

E. University Review and Decision-Making

In order to provide a University-wide faculty perspective and to assist in University planning, the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) will study each unit's complete program review file. APRC will also accept additional data and recommendations from the unit and/or dean at this time. If APRC has questions at this point, it can invite the unit and/or dean to a meeting.

The unit or dean may also request a meeting with APRC. In some cases, APRC or units underreview may request the unit attend an APRC meeting to discuss the report for reasons of clarifying outstanding issues in the report. In other cases, APRC may request additional questions be answered by the unit under review.

Subsequent to any meetings, APRC, in conjunction with Academic Planning, will evaluate all recommendations and develop a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM). The CAM will contain commendations, actions to be taken and suggestions for further actions. It begins with commendations on accomplishments by the unit and then specifies actions the unit and/or college will carry out for program improvement, together with timelines for implementation. It may require updates or progress reports on specific issues that may be in flux or otherwise
not have sufficient information for evaluation; these updates are part of the self-study process and must be completed. Further, APRC can offer suggestions of further actions which are not mandatory but which the unit may want to consider. The CAM will be kept on file in Academic Planning and the Academic Senate. It is in effect until the initiation of the next self-study for the unit under review. It is used at the beginning of the next review process to assess the degree to which actions taken effectively improved degree program quality. After development, the CAM should be distributed by Academic Planning to the Provost and the relevant dean and unit to be reviewed for errors of fact. A CAM meeting will be set with Academic Planning, Provost, dean and unit head plus the chair of APRC where the CAM is discussed and signed. Two years after a unit's review and the signing of the unit's CAM, the unit will submit an update on each action step and recommendation in their CAM to Academic Planning, who will pass it on to APRC for possible further action and inquiry. Further action could include questions to the unit or movement of the unit up or down in the program review queue. Subsequent inquiries by Academic Planning and APRC into the unit's progress in implementing action steps and recommendations may take place at their discretion, within reasonable amounts of time.

III. Review of Accredited Programs

For programs that are nationally accredited and undergo periodic accreditation review involving a self-study and a campus visit by an accrediting team, the accreditation review will substitute for academic program review with the following exceptions:

A. All accredited programs, at the time of completing their accreditation self-studies, shall also be required to submit brief documentation to APRC demonstrating performance in regard to the "Indicators and Criteria of Graduate Program Sustainability and Quality". The documentation submitted to APRC shall be supplementary to the main accreditation documents and should address only indicators and criteria not considered in those documents. [9] If standards for undergraduate programs are adopted, units will also need to submit brief documentation to APRC demonstrating performance on those standards as well.

B. Following receipt of notification from the accrediting body that a program has been accredited or re-accredited, APRC will evaluate both the accrediting body's recommendations and the degree program's performance with regard to University quality and sustainability criteria. APRC's conclusions will be incorporated into a CAM that specifies any actions the program will need to undertake, including writing progress reports on any issues that are in flux or otherwise lack information sufficient for review. It may also offer suggestions of further actions which are not mandatory but which then unit may want to consider. No action required by the CAM should contradict the accreditation report unless unit head, dean, and APRC all agree with the CAM requirement. The CAM will be kept on file in Academic Planning and the Academic Senate, It will be in effect until the completion of the Seventh Cycle. It will be used at the beginning of the next review process to assess the degree to which actions taken effectively improved degree program quality.

C. Upon special request of the unit, dean, or Vice President for Academic Affairs, an accredited program shall undergo academic program review in addition to accreditation review. Such a request must specify the ways in which the accreditation review was inadequate for the purposes of program review. The self-study prepared for accreditation may
be adapted or substituted, as appropriate, for the purpose of program review, and the campus visit by the accrediting team may be substituted for the external review provided it was not identified as deficient in the request.

IV. Program Review Schedule

Degree programs are to be reviewed on a needs basis. Degree programs will generally need to undertake a self-study six years after the conclusion of the previous study. APRC, in the CAM, can shorten or lengthen this time for a variety of reasons including thoroughness of the previous review, personnel change or other structural shifts in the degree program, changes to the student body seeking the degree, and so forth. In some cases, APRC may ask for an interim report or a progress report on certain aspects of the program. These interim/progress reports will be required in a specified time frame following the signing of the CAM. The needs-based review logic described above will shift future program reviews away from College-based cycles; the collegiate initiation of reviews described in ILA of this document will give way to a process of continuous dialogue between unit, college, and Academic Planning and APRC. APRC and Academic Planning are jointly responsible for the placement of units to be reviewed on the review cycle; scheduling is guided by this document to prioritize established need and time-since-last-review in queuing self-studies specifically and reviews more generally. The overall queuing order takes into account program quality as seen in the last review, and concerns about or issues within a unit under review. Beyond the queuing order, Academic Planning is responsible for contact with external reviewers and scheduling each program review. To facilitate the academic program review process, programs are provided with support that includes clear guidelines for the preparation of documents, timely access to pertinent data, and self-studies singled out as exemplary by APRC.

V. Special Program Review

Under special circumstances where the normal cycle of continuous review is deemed inadequate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the College Dean, or the unit head may call for a special program review.

VI. Handbook for Academic Program Review

A handbook to guide the Seventh Cycle will be prepared, based on the Handbook for the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review, but eschewing the focus on graduate degree programs. This handbook will incorporate the guidelines required by this policy. Additionally, the handbook will describe specific self-study and external review expectations in regard to those indicators and criteria of program sustainability and quality set forth here and concordant with WASC’s Handbook on Accreditation.
[1] Throughout this document, "degree programs" refers to all undergraduate and graduate degree programs, as well as credential programs not housed in CELIA.


[6] Any instructional unit may request or be requested to begin a self-study for reasons of time since last review or other concerns

[7] This meeting is predicated on #F12-133’s inclusion of release time for APRC members, who would otherwise be unduly taxed by the time demanded by these meetings,

[8] Bachelor of Arts degree programs are reminded to include their complementary studies plan as a component of the requirements for their major.

[9] The campus is currently developing parallel "indicators and criteria of undergraduate program sustainability and quality". Should this effort result in a new University policy, this Guidelines document should be amended to include all accredited undergraduate programs as well.
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Introduction and Overview

This handbook introduces a new cycle of academic program review at San Francisco State. Over the past forty years the University has completed six full cycles, following both external requirements for national accreditation and internal expectations of program quality (as established by WASC and the Academic Senate; see appendix A and p. 5). Regular reviews repay the time and effort that they require by offering programs the opportunity to reflect, self-assess, and plan for the future. Following standards developed and approved by San Francisco State’s Academic Senate and drawing on the peer review of visitors and university colleagues, program review is designed to foster in-depth communication within programs and across the university about how we define and deliver academic quality and ensure the high achievement of our students.

The Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Reviews is structured around standards that are set out in Chapter One and a process described in Chapter Two. The process begins with a self-study, in which a program analyzes evidence of its current status; guidelines for this self-study are detailed in Chapter Three. Following the program’s self-study, an external review brings disciplinary experts to campus to evaluate the program and offer further reflection from a fresh perspective; timelines, plans, and guidelines for external reviews are detailed in Chapter Four. Following the external review and the program’s response, a university review is conducted by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), the guidelines of which are detailed in Chapter Five. The process ends with commendations and an action plan set out in a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM), which is written by APRC and reviewed by the program’s faculty and chair, its College Dean, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs: its chief functions are described in Chapter Six.

In collaboration with the Academic Program Review Committee and following models from the Fifth and Sixth Cycle handbooks, this handbook was prepared by Jennifer Summit, Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning. The task force on seventh cycle standards—Gail Dawson (Chair, Department of Art), Nancy Gerber (Director, General Education), Ann Hallum (Dean, Graduate Division), Genie Stowers (Chair, Academic Program Review Committee), and Jennifer Summit (Dean, Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning)—created the standards document that was approved by the Academic Senate in December, 2014. Provost Sue Rosser offered valuable guidance, as did Trevor Getz, chair of the Academic Senate, Darryl Dieter, director of Institutional Research, and the deans of each of the colleges, together with their associate deans and department chairs.
Chapter One: Program Review Standards

"No sensible decision can be made any longer without taking into account not only the world as it is but also the world as it will be." --Isaac Asimov

A program review cycle offers an opportunity to evaluate and reset programmatic goals while looking ahead to the future. San Francisco State’s past cycles of program review have enabled programs to assess their historic and current status against standards of quality and sustainability for student achievement, curricular offerings, faculty experience, and resource distribution. This new cycle invites programs to build on this base of institutional self-knowledge by engaging in meaningful self-reflection, intentional goal-setting, and purposeful planning. At a fundamental level, it asks what programs mean by success, what success will mean in the future, and how they plan to get from here to there.

Programmatic success can be measured from multiple angles. This cycle will focus on what is arguably the most important object of our collective responsibility: the curriculum. The curriculum is where numerous aspects of a program’s identity and concern come together. It is where we represent and communicate the state of knowledge in our discipline and where we engage, inspire, and assess high-quality student learning; where we balance the requirements of the university with those of the discipline, whether our programs include general education, traditional academic subjects, or specialized professional or graduate training; and where we make the most powerful statement about our priorities through our distribution and balance of resources, including the valuable and limited resource of faculty time and energy. Fundamentally, the curriculum is where a program comes together to tell the story of what it is. By focusing on the curriculum, then, we invite programs to articulate their identity, to evaluate their current achievements in the vital areas of student learning and progress, disciplinary achievement, and resource allocation, and to draw on these foundations as they set, and plan to meet, their highest goals for the future.

In preparation for the formal review process, programs are encouraged to set aside time to reflect collectively on their current status and future plans in view of the five core areas that structure the Seventh Cycle of program reviews: program planning, student learning and achievement, the curriculum, faculty, and resources. As well as structuring the program’s self-study, these five areas will guide the external review and direct the action plan that follows it.

By drawing on the perspectives and experiences of their diverse constituents and stakeholders—including students, departmental faculty, library faculty, administrators, and staff, as well as employers, alumni, and community partners—programs will be well-positioned to ask important questions about their present status and future directions and goals. The seventh cycle provides programs the opportunity to undertake this work, to share institutional wisdom and effective practices with one another, and to contribute to San Francisco State’s mission of leading public higher education in the new century.
Indicators and Standards of Program Success for the 7th Cycle

Program Review

1. **Program Planning**: In charting their future within the discipline and the university, programs maintain effective planning processes that assess their successes, challenges, and opportunities. These processes involve the faculty as a whole and build on evidence of student learning and achievement for continuous improvement.

2. **Student Learning and Achievement**: Programs maintain meaningful and specific learning goals that reflect students’ distinct educational needs at every stage of their academic development, from lower division to graduate; they advance high-impact practices and active learning by encouraging and rewarding pedagogical innovation; and they use evidence of student learning to assess and plan their courses and curriculum.

3. **The Curriculum**: A program’s curriculum should reflect the highest standards of academic excellence and alignment with the “Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at San Francisco State University” (S15-255). Effective curricula lead students along coherent pathways, from foundational levels to advanced achievement in the discipline or field, and they seek to meet students’ enrollment needs by balancing course offerings across the full range of their curriculum, including (where relevant) general education, major requirements, electives, and graduate courses.

4. **Faculty**: Faculty are critical to the success of a program. Excellence in teaching and research or professional practice is essential to SF State’s distinctive commitment to uniting academic quality and broad access. Programs should strive for faculty diversity, workload equity, and an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and service. Programs should consider how teaching, professional activities, and community involvement help the faculty engage with changing directions in the discipline; how the effectiveness of faculty teaching and professional activities are being supported; and how faculty are responding to changes in the university.

5. **Resources**: Resources are not only financial but also take the form of human resources, schedules, facilities, and external resources; it is imperative for programs to steward these resources with care. Programs that balance their resources deliver a sustainable and high-quality curriculum and maintain a supportive and collegial environment; they cultivate and utilize the professional expertise of their staff; they meet students’ needs through advising, course planning, and scheduling; and they allocate offices, classrooms, laboratories, and other spaces equitably, to create rich learning environments for all.
Chapter Two: Program Review Process

At SF State, the schedule for program review and all subsequent modifications are developed by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) with the Office of Academic Affairs and provided to the College Deans.

The term “program” is used throughout this handbook to refer to the academic degree, whether undergraduate or graduate. Minors are also included in this review. The instructional unit granting the academic degree may be a school, department, interdisciplinary program, or program.

The administrator primarily responsible for academic program review is the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning. The College Dean, Dean of the Graduate Division (as appropriate), AVP for Academic Resources, and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs also play key roles in the process. The Associate Dean of Academic Planning coordinates the process of academic program review, working directly with the program heads to explain the review process to their faculty, facilitate the selection of external reviewers, review the final draft of the self-study document, and coordinate the site visit. The Associate Dean of Academic Planning maintains regular contact with the chair of APRC and participates in all APRC meetings.

The program review process is an important part of SF State's culture of shared governance. In this case, the faculty are involved through their own departments engaging in program review and through participation in the Academic Program Review Committee. This Committee, members of which are elected from colleges, synthesizes department and external materials and provides a set of peer review commendations and action steps to be taken.

Accredited Programs

For programs that are nationally accredited and undergo periodic accreditation review involving a campus visit by an accrediting team, the accreditation review will normally substitute for academic program review with the following exceptions:

(a) Following receipt of notification from the accrediting body that a program has been reaccredited, representatives of the instructional unit, College administration, and Office of Academic Affairs will develop a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM) that details agreements reached in the accreditation review. This memorandum will be in effect until completion of the next accreditation review and will be kept on file in the Offices of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate.

(b) Upon special request of the instructional unit, College Dean, and/or Vice President for Academic Affairs, an accredited program shall undergo academic program review in addition to accreditation review. In this event, the self-study prepared for accreditation may be adapted or substituted, as appropriate, for the purpose of program review, and the campus visit by the accrediting team may be substituted for the external review.

The following steps in the process of program review apply to programs that are not subject to external accreditation:

Step One: Initial Planning and Preparation

Before the beginning of the academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs notifies the College Dean of the schedule of programs in that college to be reviewed. An initial planning meeting, chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, will introduce the process. Those present include the College Dean, heads of the college
programs under review, the Associate Dean of Academic Planning, and the chair of the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC). Faculty in the programs under review are informed of the meeting and invited to attend. Priority for scheduling is established by the APRC, in consideration of program review history and program issues.

The initial meeting is designed to provide an overview of the review process, answer questions about the timeline and relevant components, and address any issues that might be unique to the programs present. At the meeting, the Associate Dean of Academic Planning explains his/her role as coordinator of program review, the APRC chair presents information about the university review process following the self-study and external review report, leading to the Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM), and the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning alerts participants to the available data and other resources that will help programs conduct their self-study.

**Step Two: Conducting the Self-Study**

Most of the data that forms the basis of the self-study will be available to programs through data dashboards or will be provided to them in advance of the program review process. Programs may also work with the Associate Dean of Academic Planning to survey their current students, alumni, area employers, and other community partners to provide additional information that will be considered in the self-study.

The self-study report follows the program’s collective engagement with evidence of its current status and questions relating to its future directions. Chapter 3 specifies the evidence and questions that should guide this engagement process. After thorough review and discussion by the faculty, the report is submitted to the College Dean for initial review and comment. Following revisions, the final draft of the self-study report is forwarded to the College Dean, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, and the Associate Dean of Academic Planning. Additional revisions to the draft self-study report are made as needed, and the cover sheet is signed to indicate that the self-study report is ready for external review (though signatures do not necessarily indicate agreement with the recommendations in the self-study report). The unit then provides copies for the subsequent phases of the review process.

**Step Three: External Review**

The site visit by external reviewers represents the program’s primary opportunity for peer review. The program may suggest, but not invite, external reviewers—one of which should come from another CSU campus. The Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, in consultation with the College Dean, will select reviewers, coordinate travel plans, and provide honoraria and travel reimbursements. External reviewers meet with the Provost, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning and (when appropriate) the Dean of Graduate Studies, as well as faculty, staff, and students from the program under review. They are also given opportunities to visit classes, laboratories, studios, and other academic spaces, and to review additional evidence that will allow them to complete their report. The report is submitted by the end of one month following the visit.

**Step Four: Responses to the External Review Report**

Within two weeks upon receipt of the external reviewers’ report, the College Dean and program head may prepare written responses to address the recommendations, correct any perceived misconceptions or errors, and identify points of agreement and possible disagreement. The dean’s response may also address any college issues related to the program that have not yet been adequately considered. Together with the external reviewers’ report, these responses are forwarded to the APRC for further review.
Step Five: Review by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC)

At the next stage, the Academic Program Review Committee reviews the documents from the program review, including the program's self-study report, external report, and any subsequent responses by the College Dean and program head. APRC may also meet with the dean, program head, and other program representatives to discuss the reports and responses. APRC then prepares a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM), including any additional recommendations, and forwards it to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, who sends copies to the College Dean, program head, and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. This process should be completed within a semester following the completion of the program review documents.

Step Six: Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM)

Once APRC has written the CAM, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning sets up the meeting with the Provost, APRC Chair, College Dean, program head, and, where appropriate, the Dean of Graduate Studies. At the meeting, all present review the CAM and its chief recommendations, signifying agreement with its provisions by signing the document. After this meeting, the program makes plans to implement those recommendations.

Two years after the CAM signing, the program submits a follow-up report to APRC outlining the steps taken to implement the CAM provisions. Subsequent follow-up reports can be requested by APRC.

Timeline

The program review typically takes 1-2 years from the first meeting with the program heads to the closing CAM meeting. The self-study should take approximately 1-2 semesters to complete. The external review normally takes place in the semester following completion of the self-study report. After receipt of the external review report and responses from the College Dean and program head, APRC review and reporting takes approximately another semester.
Chapter Three: The Self-Study

The self-study offers programs an opportunity to analyze and evaluate their current goals and objectives, as well as to establish new ones in light of changing conditions. Effective self-studies involve the department as a whole in a collaborative effort. They begin by seeking the perspectives of students, graduates, academic peers, and the community at large, engaging all these constituencies in a serious discussion about the program, especially its curricular content, structure, and quality. As programs begin to engage in the self-study process, they are urged to set aside time for collective reflection and discussion—ideally to include a faculty retreat and other collaborative opportunities—in order to make the process as productive as possible.

Following the initial planning meeting (see Chapter Two, Step One), programs should define responsibilities, set timelines, assign tasks needed to accomplish them, and establish methods of coordination and communication. All faculty members should play an active role in the self-study and should be given the opportunity to provide meaningful input.

The first major step in the self-study is the collection of data and assessment records: data on student progress and achievement will be available to programs through program-specific data dashboards or through the office of Academic Institutional Research; additional information can be collected through senior exit surveys and web-based surveys of current students and alumni. (An overview of data and their sources follows in the next section.) Some information in the collect categories will be provided for you and some will come from departmental records, but all should be attached to the self-study. The preparation of the self-study is an intensive process; its quality and usefulness will reflect the scope and degree of participation from those involved.

Format of the Self-Study

The self-study report should comprise no more than fifty (50) pages, single-spaced, excluding tables and appendices that summarize relevant data and findings. If the program maintains several degree programs, a minor, or concentrations within a single program, the report should describe all of them in a single report, rather than preparing separate reports for each, paying special attention to the relationships between the degrees or concentrations and the distribution of resources and student enrollment among them. (This does not apply to “emphases,” which are primarily advisement tools rather than discrete degrees.) Graduate programs are to be covered as well as undergraduate programs.

Section One: Executive Summary

The self-study opens with an executive summary that previews the report’s major findings. An expected outcome of the self-study process is an updated set of program goals, which should be provided in the executive summary, with a detailed discussion in the report’s final section.

Following the executive summary, reports should include three main sections:

1. A general overview of the program, including context such as its recent history and any discernable trends that affect its students, faculty, or curriculum;
2. A discussion of the program’s indicators relating to the 7th cycle standards;
3. A summary of major conclusions that the program draws from the self-study process, including the program’s plans and goals for future success. (Appendix B: self-study table of contents template.)
Section Two: Overview of the Program

This section should provide a broad overview of the program’s mission, its current stage of development, and any context that will clarify its present status. Possible questions to discuss in this section include the following:

1. What are the defining characteristics of this program? How has the program changed in the last 5-10 (or more) years, and where does it hope to be in the next 5-10 years?
2. If the program has recently surveyed its alumni, current or graduating majors, employers, or other community stakeholders, what information do these surveys yield about the program’s distinctive achievements and most pressing challenges?
3. How does the program fit into the discipline? How does it reflect major disciplinary trends, and what are its particular elements of strength and innovation?
4. What major challenges do similar programs in other institutions face? How have external or internal conditions shaped or affected the discipline? How will these affect the program under review?
5. How does the program advance the broader mission of the university?

Section Three: Program Indicators

Like any academic enterprise, program reviews are grounded in research, reflection, and peer review. The following section presents the major categories for review, accompanied by three sets of prompts: the first indicates information for collection; the second directs the department’s reflection on this information in order to analyze and draw conclusions about its significance. The third asks programs to address both through targeted planning.

3.1: Program Planning

In charting their future within the discipline and the university, programs maintain effective planning processes that assess their successes, challenges, and opportunities. These processes involve the faculty as a whole and build on evidence of student learning and achievement for continuous improvement.

Programs should engage in regular and systematic planning efforts that include both thorough review of their current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges, and realistic but ambitious goals for the future. This work of self-review and planning should involve program faculty and staff as a whole, since its future success will depend on their work together. Regular planning and assessment offer programs the opportunity to engage the big questions of their discipline, to grapple with the hard challenges of the day, and to plan how they will contribute and succeed in the future.

For this section, programs collect and analyze materials relating to their ongoing work of self-assessment, and reflect on the program’s past, present, and future in the context of its distinctive place in the university and the discipline.

Collect:

- Provide the program’s mission statement;
- Include the program’s last five annual assessment reports: describe major curriculum changes that have resulted from these assessments;
- Include CAMs from the 5th and (where appropriate) 6th cycle, summarizing major changes that the program has undertaken since, or as a result of, these reviews;
- Provide any other description and/or evidence of regular planning activity that the program undertakes together, including any comprehensive strategic planning activities.
Reflect:

- How relevant is the program’s mission statement? Does it reflect the program’s current goals, strengths, and achievements? How does it support and advance the university mission statement?
- How does the program conduct regular assessment and use the results to strengthen its curriculum and direct its planning efforts?
- How does the program involve the faculty collectively in assessment and planning?
- How do its planning processes take into account the perspectives of current students, alumni, community stakeholders, and employers?

Plan:

- How will the program strengthen its planning processes and make use of them outside the formal program review schedule?

3.2: Student Learning and Achievement

Programs maintain meaningful and specific learning goals that reflect students’ distinct educational needs at every stage of their academic development, from lower division to graduate level; they advance high-impact practices and active learning by encouraging and rewarding pedagogical innovation; and they use evidence of student learning to assess and improve their courses and curriculum.

For this section, programs are asked to reflect on their existing goals for student learning and to consider whether these adequately capture the experiences of their faculty and students, reflect current understanding of learning in the discipline, allow faculty to improve and support learning in their classes, and communicate the expectations to which students are held. They are also provided with evidence of student progress and achievement and asked to consider how they currently support these and how they will further advance them.

Collect:

- What are the program’s learning goals and what evidence does it regularly seek and consult to assure that students are meeting these goals?
- How many undergraduate majors and minors has your department graduated every year over the last five years? **Time To Degree**
- What is the one-year retention rate of your students? **Retention and Graduation**
- What are the four-year and six-year graduation rates of students in the program (compare to college and university rates)? **Table 1: Retention and Graduation**
- Where and how does the program advance high-impact teaching practices and active learning at all levels of instruction? (What are these practices, and what is their impact?)

Reflect:

- How do the program’s learning goals remain relevant, and how can they be revised and updated? Do students adequately understand and share these goals?
- How has student demand for the major risen or fallen? Are there any significant trends or present or future challenges that can be discerned from enrollment patterns? **Student Flow, Enrollment in Program**
- Over the past five years, where has the program been able to improve student progress, achievement, and graduation? Where might it further improve them? **Average attempted units, Average Attempted Units Fall Only, New Student Profile, High Failure Courses, Time to Degree, Retention and Graduation**
What questions do the rates and trends in student enrollment, retention, and graduation raise for your program? How does the program interpret them? 

Retention and Graduation; Time to Degree, Enrollment in Program

How do your program’s current pedagogical practices meet students’ learning needs? How does your program support pedagogical innovation?

How will the program ensure that its learning goals remain relevant to students’ real needs and levels of achievement?

How will the program advance rates of student retention, progress, and graduation in the future?

3.3: The Curriculum

A program’s curriculum should reflect the highest standards of academic excellence and alignment with the “Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at San Francisco State University” (S15-255). Effective curricula lead students along coherent pathways, from foundational levels to advanced achievement in the discipline or field, and they seek to meet students’ enrollment needs by balancing course offerings across the full range of their curriculum, including (where relevant) general education, major requirements, electives, and graduate courses.

The Seventh Cycle offers programs the opportunity to realign their curricula with the future of the disciplines and the changing world our students will face on and beyond graduation. How will they respond to the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, within a technological landscape that redefines how we teach and students learn? How will they address the changing face of knowledge in our global society? And, in the face of such ongoing change, how will they prepare all of their students—first-time freshmen, transfers, continuing students, and graduate students—for fulfilling lives of career, community engagement, and active civic participation?

Undergraduate

The undergraduate curriculum consists of several overlapping components: general education, disciplinary courses for students across the university, and a structured sequence of courses that culminate in the baccalaureate. Program review considers all of these together.

General Education represents the university’s core commitment to liberal education, and programs that contribute to general education help advance the knowledge, methods, and skills that every SF State graduate should master. As well as attracting potential majors, general education courses demonstrate the discipline’s relevance to non-majors. They are distinct from courses in the major in their effort to engage and challenge a diverse cross-section of students in broadly resonant ways. They should showcase the signature strengths of a department, including its most gifted teaching faculty, while also serving the university’s mission and shared values articulated in the “Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at San Francisco State” (S15-255).

Undergraduate education in the discipline, whether culminating in a major or minor, should represent the program’s high expectations for student achievement in a discipline’s necessary knowledge base, skills, and practices. Undergraduate degrees should be coherent and well-structured, taking students along clear pathways that lead from foundational to advanced levels of learning and achievement. Required courses must be prioritized and offered regularly and often enough to meet student need and avoid enrollment bottlenecks or graduation delays. Programs will be asked to consider evidence of student progress and achievement in the major and challenged to advance it, where possible, through curricular planning and design.
Undergraduate education at the major level includes university requirements such as GWAR and the undergraduate culminating experience. SF State’s GWAR courses advance the university’s strong commitment to the writing skills of all of our students, as well as its recognition that writing takes place across—and strengthens student thinking in—all the disciplines. This review offers an opportunity for programs to assess and, where needed, strengthen their GWAR courses in order to ensure that students who take them are learning to write and think analytically and to pose and defend arguments appropriate to the discipline.

All programs are required to include appropriate instruction in the technologies relevant to the major, leading to levels of mastery that should be reflected in its learning goals.

Undergraduate students in all majors are also required to undertake a culminating experience that allows them to synthesize the strands of their undergraduate education. Programs should review the coherence of their upper division coursework leading to the culminating experience and consider whether the culminating experience adequately holds all students to the program’s highest expectations of undergraduate education.

Programs should take the opportunity to assess the strength of their commitment to SF State’s significant enrollment of transfer students to ensure that they are provided equal access to coursework and faculty supervision and not needlessly burdened or delayed by excessive prerequisites or entry requirements.

Collect:

- What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum? Why were these courses chosen for GE by the department? How does the program assess their effectiveness? *Table 2; Course Enrollment by Course*
- How do the program’s GE courses meet the “Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate at San Francisco State,” and how are these goals assessed?
- Develop a map or flowchart of the program’s curriculum in the major, illustrating the pathways from entry to graduation that students are expected to take, and differentiating required courses from electives
- Identify how often, when (both in the semester and in the weekly time schedule), and where required courses are offered, including GWAR courses, noting enrollments for the past three years (in matrix form) *Table 3; Course Enrollment by Course (and class schedules)*
- Identify courses that your program regularly offers that are required by other majors (service courses): who teaches these, how often are these taught, and what is their enrollment? *Table 4; Course Enrollment by Course*
- Identify courses that are required in your program but are offered by other departments: who teaches these, how often are these taught, and what is their enrollment? How are your students’ needs communicated to the departments who teach the courses? *Table 5 (class schedules)*
- Identify bottleneck courses (courses required for graduation that regularly attract more students than can be enrolled), describe why they have become bottlenecks for students and describe the program’s strategies for reducing them. *Table 6; Course Enrollment by Course, High Failure Classes*
- Identify efforts to ease the transition of transfer students through articulated courses, Intersegmental, or Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) – Obtain from Articulation Officer. *Table 7*
- Describe the culminating experience requirements for undergraduate majors in your program
- Identify where in the major students receive instruction in technology appropriate to the major and how their learning is assessed

Reflect:

- *How does the program take General Education into account in its curricular planning and development?*
• How do GE courses in the program reach out to non-majors and frame disciplinary methods and knowledge within broader educational contexts? Do they succeed?
• How does the curriculum (both GE and in the major) reflect current and future directions in the discipline?
• In developing each semester’s schedule, how does the program align course offerings with student need? How does the program attempt to avoid bottlenecks and advance student degree progress? Does it balance core requirements with elective courses, and are these evenly distributed among faculty in the program? How does the program assure that required courses are offered frequently enough, and in spaces and times that meet student demand?
• How does the program plan the curriculum with the faculty as a whole? How are decisions about curriculum made? Do all faculty have the opportunity to review and respond to courses that may not be in their area of expertise, but are part of the curriculum as a whole? How is this feedback taken into account in the curricular development process?
• How does the program’s GWAR courses address how writing is done in the field? Has student writing improved as a result of GWAR courses?
• How does the culminating experience represent an appropriate level of achievement for the discipline? How does it prepare students to integrate their disciplinary knowledge and make connections between their general education, major, and elective courses?
• How does the program make it possible for transfer students to enter upper division coursework without burdening them with excessive pre-requisites?
• How are the high impact practices working for students?
• How can the student experience in the degree program(s) be improved?

Plan:
• What are the program’s most pressing needs and challenges in the area of curriculum?
• How will the program revise its curriculum to address those needs and challenges?

GRADUATE (if relevant)

Graduate programs were reviewed in the sixth cycle of program reviews, which asked faculty in graduate programs to reflect on how they met the newly defined “Indicators and Standards of Graduate Program Quality and Sustainability.” The seventh cycle continues and deepens this inquiry by asking programs to consider the place and value of their graduate programs within the broader perspective of their full curriculum. It also invites programs to consider the distinctness of their goals and methods for graduate education within the context of evolving patterns in students’ academic and professional pathways.

Collect:
• Include the Concluding Action Memorandum from the program’s review in the 6th cycle. Describe the program’s efforts to implement the CAM’s recommendation and to assess their effectiveness.
• Identify the average number of applicants, admitted students, and enrolled students in graduate programs for the past five years; identify the percentage of applicants admitted and the percentage of admitted students who actually enroll. Table 8, Enrollment in Program, Retention and Graduation
• What evidence does the program regularly solicit and collect to indicate whether course offerings and schedules address graduate students’ needs?
• How are graduate culminating experiences managed in the program (by topic choice, faculty supervision, WTUs)?
• What mechanisms does the program maintain for tracking, assessing, and responding to graduate students’ goals before graduation and success in meeting them afterwards (i.e., performance on professional exams for licensure or credentials or entry to doctoral programs)? What are the results of this tracking?

Reflect:
• How effectively does the program achieve the university’s standards for graduate programs? How well does the program assess the effectiveness of its response?
• What short- or long-term trends affect graduate admission and enrollment? Explain the factors behind these trends. Do trends in the program’s graduate admissions reflect a sustainable level of demand?
• How are expectations for graduate students set at an appropriate level and distinct from those for undergraduates?
• How well do course offerings and schedules meet students’ needs (particularly those of students with work or family demands)?
• How do graduate culminating experiences follow clear and consistent guidelines and represent adequate levels of achievement?
• How does the program manage the supervision of graduate culminating experiences in a way that maintains both their quality and consistency in faculty workload?
• How are graduate students achieving their academic and professional goals?
• How effectively does the program balance the needs of its graduate students and undergraduates in its curriculum development, planning, and resource allocation? Is one being served at the expense of the other? How does the department decide on the appropriate balance?

Plan:
• How does the program plan to attract and recruit sustainable cohorts of graduate students?
• How will the program adjust the graduate curriculum to meet changes in the discipline and ensure appropriate levels of rigor?
• How can the program improve graduate students’ outcomes?
• How will the program balance the needs of graduates and undergraduates in its curriculum development and planning?

3.4: Faculty

Faculty are critical to the success of a program. Excellence in teaching and research or professional practice is essential to SF State’s distinctive commitment to uniting academic quality and broad access. Programs should strive for faculty diversity, workload equity, and an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and service. Programs should consider how teaching, professional activities, and community involvement help the faculty engage with changing directions in the discipline; how the effectiveness of faculty teaching and professional activities are being supported; and how faculty are responding to changes in the university.

This section considers the distribution of faculty and their contributions within the programs. Programs should distribute faculty workload with sufficient breadth to meet students’ curricular, advising, and supervisory needs. In assessing their faculty resources, programs should review the balance of coursework between different disciplinary areas, graduate versus undergraduate teaching, tenure-line faculty versus lecturers. They should ask whether teaching responsibilities in the department are equitable (for example, are some faculty consistently assigned large lecture classes while others routinely teach only smaller upper division or graduate courses? Are tenure-line faculty involved in teaching in the General Education program? Is the disciplinary expertise of the faculty balanced in a way
that reflects student interests and needs?). How do they maintain a balance of faculty engagement in teaching, scholarship and creative activities at levels appropriate to faculty rank, expertise, and interests?

Of special concern across the university is the need to build and maintain a faculty with diversity in gender, race and ethnicity, and the importance of fostering a productive and supportive working environment for all. Programs bear an important responsibility to mentor and guide tenure-track faculty, particularly in the areas of teaching and scholarship.

In this section, programs will assess the balance of faculty across ranks, specialties, and curricular offerings; faculty workload, mentoring, teaching preparation and support; and programmatic support for faculty scholarship, creative activities, service, and public engagement. Do current faculty represent the optimum diversity of approaches within the discipline? Where might programs benefit from further faculty development and support?

**Collect:**

- What is the distribution of rank, gender, and ethnicity across the faculty?
- Provide CVs for all tenure/tenure track faculty and full-time lecturers and summarize the research and publication, creative works and activities, grant-writing and awards of faculty in the past five years.
- Outline the distribution of faculty across different disciplines, concentrations or emphases.
- Create a teaching assignment matrix for faculty, including lecturers, that lists the number of graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in each course (on average in the most recent four semesters), and what part each course plays in the major, GE, and GWAR curriculum and requirements. **Course Enrollment by Course; Teaching Assignment Matrix Template**
- Create a table summarizing faculty service activities over the past five years. Distinguish between department, college and university committee work and service activities off campus.
- Summarize the department, college and university mechanisms in place to evaluate teaching effectiveness for all faculty teaching in the department.
- Detail the program’s support for new and untenured faculty in assuming the responsibilities of a tenure track position, including any written guidelines for RTP standards that are provided to pre-tenure faculty and any mentorship activities conducted within the department.
- Describe any mechanisms or strategies the department uses to support post-tenure faculty.

**Reflect:**

- How does the program maintain a faculty in adequate numbers and balance to teach the curriculum and maintain program quality? If not, what adjustments are necessary? Given the difficulty of adding tenure-line faculty, how might adjustments to the curriculum make best use of existing faculty?
- Are the program’s faculty sufficiently diverse in rank, gender, ethnicity, and stage of professional development?
- Are all faculty engaged in appropriate forms of professional growth and achievement?
- How is faculty workload balanced, in the ratio of large and small-enrollment courses, required and elective, undergraduate and graduate, lower and upper division? If there is a graduate program, how is the workload balanced across culminating experiences and advising? **Student-Faculty Ratios, Course Enrollment by Course**
- How does the program plan its course offerings to avoid overreliance on lecturers?
- How does the program take care to foster, assess, and support teaching quality?
- How does the program mentor untenured faculty and support the continued professional growth of post-tenure faculty? How does it support its lecturers and where does it integrate them into the program’s structure?
How does the program’s RTP criteria reflect current professional activities and opportunities in the discipline? How do they adequately balance and value the full range of faculty commitments in teaching, research, and service?

Plan:

- How will the program recruit and retain faculty to meet its future needs?
- How will the program support faculty at all ranks—tenured, pre-tenure, lecturer, and adjunct—in the areas of teaching, service, and professional development?

3.5: Resources

Resources are not only financial but also take the form of human resources, time, schedules, facilities, and external resources; it is imperative for programs to steward these resources with care. Programs that balance their resources deliver a sustainable and high-quality curriculum and maintain a supportive and collegial environment; they meet students’ needs through advising, course planning, and scheduling; and they allocate offices, classrooms, laboratories, and other spaces equitably, to create rich learning environments for all.

As well as faculty, a program maintains important resources in its facilities, budgets, and staff, all of which should be carefully stewarded and employed to support the program’s mission. High among its priorities should be student advising, whether of undergraduates (lower division and upper division as well as transfer students) or graduate students. Some advising and tutoring needs are best served by programs themselves; others rely on cross-campus collaboration or referrals to university resources, such as the tutoring programs, EOP, or the University Advising Center.

Programs should carefully consider how they allocate space and time through their scheduling practices, assuring that they facilitate students’ enrollment needs and preserve resources for high-priority items.

A well-functioning department also relies on its professional staff. Staff members deserve professional environments that are respectful and collegial, and programs should take care to maintain fair workloads and reasonable expectations of productivity. Staff members are also invaluable resources for programs undergoing reviews, since their experience often provides continuity across changes in departmental leadership and reflects deep institutional memory and perspective.

Collect:

- Provide an inventory of the program’s resources: include general fund and external sources of funding, space, library collections, staff, IT, and other available resources.
- Conduct a space audit of offices, classrooms, meeting areas, laboratories, or other spaces: when are these spaces used? When are they not used? Describe policies for scheduling and allocating spaces.
- Provide an inventory of faculty advising responsibilities: Does the department require mandatory advising of all students? If so, how is this managed? What percentage of faculty regularly advises students? For faculty who do advising in the department, how many students does each faculty member advise in the undergraduate major or graduate program? How many office hours per week do faculty hold, and how do they use them?
- List university-level resources to which the program directs students to support their academic progress: including library collections, university-level advising, tutoring services, and any others.
- List classes that regularly employ information technology or open-source textbooks and other resources, along with other IT that the program uses.
• List staff and their responsibilities; how is their workload determined? How is their performance assessed and recognized?

Reflect:

• How effectively does the program use existing space? (office space, classrooms, meeting areas, laboratories, other) How might it use it more effectively?
• How is the space maintained? How does the space allow for alternative learning styles/universal design?
• How do the program’s scheduling practices make full use of existing teaching spaces and times in order to meet student demand?
• How effective is department level academic advising for students?
• How do faculty use technology effectively to advance student learning?
• How does the program maintain a supportive and collegial environment for staff? How does it assess and meet staff needs for support and professional development?

Plan:

• Given the program’s existing resources, how might it make best use of them to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff?
• How will the program improve student learning and achievement through advising?
• What changes will the program undertake (to its curriculum, scheduling, resource allocation, or other) to make best use of existing resources?

Section Four: Conclusions, Plans, and Goals

Following the program’s collection of, and reflection on, the above indicators and outcomes—which should involve the faculty as a whole in a collective discussion and analysis—this section asks programs to identify the top priorities that have emerged from this process in the areas of student learning and achievement, curriculum, faculty development, and resource allocation. Which indicators and outcomes would the program single out as evidence of its signature strengths and most pressing challenges? Which attest to the program’s most important achievements in recent years, and which indicate areas for growth and development in years to come? What are the program’s primary goals moving forward, and how does it plan to achieve them? Of the plans that the program identifies, which are the most important and pressing? Which represent longer-term priorities?

Directions for programs with Outside Accreditation

For programs that are nationally accredited and undergo periodic accreditation review involving a self-study and a campus visit by an accrediting team, the accreditation review will normally substitute for academic program review. Accrediting agencies vary significantly in the way they require programs to do self-studies, in their procedures for conducting their external review of the programs being accredited, and in the format of the documents that must be produced by the program under accreditation.

To ensure that the Standards set in the Seventh Cycle of Program Review are met by all programs, including those accredited by an outside agency, the programs are required to submit a copy of the accreditation documents to the chair of APRC, together with a 5-10 page narrative that explains how the Seventh Cycle standards are currently met, and how those standards inform the program’s future goals and plans. Appendix C includes a grid that should accompany the narrative that collates page references in the accreditation documents with indicators and standards in the Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Review.


Chapter Four: External Review

The purpose of the external review is to provide each instructional unit with a well-informed, independent analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of its curriculum, its complement of faculty, and its organizational structure as well as an evaluation of the relationship of all of these to the quality of its degree programs. The external review should evaluate program goals, judge the program’s success—or likely success—in achieving them, and suggest strategies for implementing recommendations for program improvement.

Selection of External Reviewers

The process for selecting external reviewers begins as the self-study preparation gets underway. Program faculty should identify potential reviewers and share that list with the College Dean, who forwards his or her recommendations to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning. Typically, a team of two experts—one from within and one from outside the CSU system—will conduct the external review. External reviewers should provide a thorough, knowledgeable, and constructive critique of the program or programs to be reviewed. The list of potential external reviewers should be accompanied by relevant information on the professional background and experience of these individuals, together with an explanation of why they would be suitable reviewers. Appropriate external reviewers are individuals who are familiar with similar programs and who have a breadth of experience and a national perspective. No reviewers should be recommended who have significant ties to the department being reviewed; department representatives will be asked to complete a Conflict of Interest form describing the ties to individuals within the department. The Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning will issue invitations to the external reviewers and oversee the logistics of the site visit.

The Site Visit

Once they agree to conduct the review, external reviewers work with the Associate Dean of Academic Planning, the College Dean, and the program head to determine the final schedule for the days of the visit. The Office of Academic Planning sends each external reviewer a complete copy of the program’s self-study report, the program review handbook, a checklist of important topics they should review and consider for inclusion in their review, information on travel and lodging arrangements, a campus map, the itinerary for the two-day visit, and the vitae of the other external review team member(s). If evaluators request further information, the Office of Academic Planning attempts to provide it.

The external reviewers normally spend two days on campus. The visit begins with an entrance interview with the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, the chair of APRC, and (as appropriate) the Dean of Graduate Studies. During the visit reviewers also meet with the chair of APRC, as well as with students, faculty, staff, and other constituents of the program, visiting classes, surveying space, and holding meetings with groups as appropriate.

The visit concludes with an exit interview with the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning (and the Dean of Graduate Studies when appropriate), where reviewers summarize their findings verbally and have the opportunity to clarify further any issues that would help them in evaluating the program.
Within a month of the site visit, the external reviewers provide a written report of their evaluation, accompanied by a summary of their reactions to program goals and plans and any new recommendations initiated by them. The steps involved in preparing the external review report include the following.

Reviewers are asked to address the major areas of the 7th cycle (program planning, student learning and achievement, the curriculum, faculty, and resources) and the program’s reflections and responses in the self-study report. They may offer their own recommendations based on their review and assessment of the self-study, discussions with administrators, faculty, students, and staff. A summary listing of the evaluators' recommendations is to be included in the external review report. The external reviewers' report is sent to the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, who distributes it to the program head and dean for responses. Additional copies are held until the time scheduled for review by APRC.

**Responses to the External Review Report by the Dean and Program Head**

Upon receipt of the external review report, the College Dean and program faculty may have two weeks to prepare a response to the external reviewers' report addressing the recommendations in the external reviewers' report and commenting on any differences from the recommendations in the self-study report. As a result of the site visit and discussions of the program faculty subsequent to their preparation of the self-study report, modifications to the original program recommendations may be appropriate. Any changes or additions to earlier recommendations should be commented upon in the program's response to the external reviewers' report. The College Dean's response may address any issues in the self-study report as well as the external reviewers' report. In addition, the dean may wish to address any college issues related to the program that were not addressed directly by the program in its self-study.

**Travel Arrangements and Reimbursement Procedures**

Travel and lodging arrangements for the reviewers are handled by the Associate Dean of Academic Planning. Information on travel, lodging, parking, etc. is included with the self-study and other materials sent to the reviewers approximately three weeks before the scheduled site visit.

While the reviewers are on campus, the Associate Dean of Academic Planning delivers reimbursement forms for the reviewers to sign before they leave. These are then turned over to the Office of Academic Affairs for processing. Receipts for incidental expenses are to be mailed to the Office of Academic Affairs. Upon receipt of the external reviewers' report, the Office of Academic Affairs mails checks for the honoraria and incidental expenses incurred as part of the review process to the external reviewers.
Chapter Five: University Review

The Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) for the Seventh Cycle is an all-University faculty committee whose function is to review and evaluate the efforts of faculty and administrators to clarify the intellectual vision, range, coherence, and currency of each program. In addition, APRC examines the program's organizational structure, reviews the program's learning outcomes, evaluates their indicators of program success, and evaluates program goals and effectiveness. APRC shall outline commendations to the program and a set of actions to be undertaken.

Functions performed by the APRC

For the duration of the seventh cycle of program review, the APRC performs five major functions:

1. Review and approval of the handbook prepared by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning.
2. Communication with the coordinator of program review and the programs undergoing review to ensure the smooth functioning of the review process during the stages discussed in Chapters 1-4 of this manual.
3. The development of the priority list of which programs shall be reviewed in which order.
4. Review and evaluation of program review documents. As soon as all the program review documents are assembled, the Associate Dean of Academic Planning forwards to the APRC copies of each program's self-study, the external review, the dean's and program's responses to the external review, and the external reviewers’ recommendations.

At that time, the APRC forwards any questions it might have, based upon the materials it reviewed, to the program chair. APRC may then offer the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for the program chair to review answers to those questions; the program chair can also choose to submit written answers to the questions to the APRC chair.

The APRC then proceeds to evaluate all data presented to it and develops the concluding action memorandum, and is then reviewed by the Provost.

Discussion of this function can be found in Chapter 6 of this manual.

Oversight of the APRC is primarily the responsibility of the Academic Senate. APRC sends policy recommendations, an annual report, and periodic status reports to the Academic Senate. APRC also may transmit reports and recommendations to other units as appropriate.

APRC Membership

The members of the all-University Academic Program Review Committee are selected as follows:

- Twelve faculty representatives, two elected from each college.
- The Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning and/or the Associate Dean of Academic Planning
- The Dean of Graduate Studies

Each member of the Academic Program Review Committee serves a three-year term. Members may succeed themselves in office, except that no one may serve for more than six consecutive years. The chair of APRC is elected from among committee members. Staff support for APRC is provided by the Office of Academic Planning.
Chapter Six: Action Plan

The fifth function performed by the APRC is the development of a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM) that will guide the program’s development until the next program review cycle. Development of the CAM is based upon the documents, interviews, and accepted implementation plan, as described in Chapter 5 of this manual. The CAM will specify commendations, any actions the unit, program, and/or College is advised to consider or is required to carry out, together with timelines for implementation and consequences resulting from failure to act appropriately.

The CAM will be signed by the department chair, College Dean, chair of APRC, the Dean of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning, the Dean of Graduate Studies (if appropriate), and the Provost or designee. Dissent by any party to the CAM shall be put in writing and attached to the memorandum. The memorandum will be kept on file in the Office of Academic Planning and, to meet WASC requirements for transparency will also be posted online and will be in effect until the completion of the program’s next program review. The memorandum will be used by the Dean of Academic Planning to monitor the effectiveness of program change and adherence to the concluding action memorandum. The memorandum will also be used at the beginning of the next cycle to assess the degree to which actions that had been recommended or required in the previous cycle have been undertaken.

Departments will provide APRC an update of actions taken to implement CAM action steps every two years.
Appendix A: SF State and WASC Program Quality Assurance and Improvement

Prompts: The following prompts may be helpful in getting started, but the institution is not required to follow these prompts or respond to them directly.

- How is student success defined (accounting for both completion and learning), given the distinctive mission, values, and programs offered, and the characteristics of the students being served? (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13)

- How is student success promoted, including both completion and learning? What has been learned about different student subpopulations as a result of disaggregating data? (CFRs 2.3, 2.10-2.14)

- What role does program review play in assessing and improving student success? (CFRs 2.7, 4.1)

- Which programs are particularly effective in retaining and graduating their majors? What can be learned from them? What is the students’ experience like? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10, 2.13)

- How well do students meet the institution’s definition of student success? In what ways does the institution need to improve so that more students are successful? What is the timeline for improvement? How will these goals be achieved? (CFRs 2.6, 4.1-4.4)

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

Successful quality improvement efforts are broadly participatory, iterative, and evidence-based. This component of the institutional report includes a discussion of three basic tools of quality improvement—program review, assessment of student learning, and data collection and analysis—and presents the ways these tools inform the institution’s decision making. In addition, institutions are welcome to discuss other quality improvement approaches that have made a difference, if they wish.

Program review remains a priority for WSCUC. It is a natural nexus and point of integration for the collection of data and findings about the meaning of the degree, the quality of learning, core competencies, standards of student performance, retention, graduation, and overall student success. Because of the commitment of students to their degree programs and the loyalty of faculty to their disciplines, program review has great power to influence the quality of the educational experience. Program review can also provide insight into desirable future directions for the program and the institution.

In addition to implementing systematic program review, institutions are expected to periodically assess the effectiveness of their program review process. They can do so, for example, by reviewing the quality and consistency of follow-up after program reviews; determining the effectiveness with which the program review addresses achievement of program learning outcomes; and tracing how recommendations are integrated into institutional planning and budgeting.

Assessment, along with program review, is an essential tool that supports the goals and values of the accreditation process. “Assessing the assessment” should not crowd out the work of understanding student learning and using evidence to improve it. However, good practice suggests that it is wise to step back periodically, ask evaluative questions about each stage of the assessment cycle, and seek ways to make assessment more effective, efficient, and economical.

Data provide the foundation for effective program review, assessment of student learning, and other quality improvement strategies. However, to have an impact, data need to be turned into evidence and communicated in useful formats. The discussion of data collection, analysis, and use can include, for example, information about resources provided by the institutional research office (if one exists), software used to generate reports, access to data, processes for making meaning out of data (see the WSCUC Evidence Guide for more information), and mechanisms for communicating data and findings.

Prompts: The following prompts may be helpful in getting started, but the institution is not required to follow these prompts or respond to them directly.

- How have the results of program review been used to inform decision making and improve instruction and student learning outcomes? (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4)

- What was identified in the process of examining the institution’s program review process that may require deeper reflection, changes, restructuring? What will be done as a result? What resources will be required? (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.4, 4.6)

- What has the program or institution learned as it carried out assessments of students’ learning? How have assessment protocols, faculty development, choices of instruments, or other aspects of assessment changed as a result? (CFR 4.1)

- How adequate is the institutional research function? How effectively does it support and inform institutional decision-making, planning, and improvement? How well does it support assessment of student learning? (CFRs 4.2-4.7)
## Appendix B: Self-Study Table of Contents Template

### Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0 Executive Summary</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0 Overview of the Program</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 Program Indicators</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Program Planning</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Student Learning and Achievement</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 The Curriculum</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 Undergraduate</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2 Graduate (if relevant)</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Faculty</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Resources</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0 Conclusions, Plans, and Goals</strong></td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: 7th Cycle Table Templates

### Table 1: What are the graduation rates of students in the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (Program)</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (College)</th>
<th>Four Year Graduation Rates (University)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (Program)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (College)</th>
<th>Six Year Graduation Rates (University)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Courses in the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What courses does the program offer in the general education curriculum?</th>
<th>Why were these courses chosen for GE by the department?</th>
<th>How does the program assess their effectiveness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Identify how often, when, and where required courses are offered, including GWAR courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often?</th>
<th>When (Semester)?</th>
<th>When (Weekly)</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>Enrollments for the last 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 4: Identify courses that your program regularly offers that are required by other majors (service courses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify courses that your program regularly offers that are required by other majors (service courses)</th>
<th>Who teaches these?</th>
<th>How often are these taught?</th>
<th>What is their enrollment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>Blank</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 5: Identify courses that are required in your program but are offered by other departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Who teaches these?</th>
<th>How often are these taught?</th>
<th>What is their enrollment?</th>
<th>How are your students’ needs communicated to the departments who teach the courses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Table 6: Identify bottleneck courses (courses required for graduation that regularly attract more students than can be enrolled).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Program’s strategy to reduce bottleneck courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
<td><em>blank</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Identify efforts to ease the transition of transfer students through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articulated courses</th>
<th>Intersegmental</th>
<th>Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fictitious data, for illustration purposes only

Table 8
For graduate programs in the last five years, what is the average number of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Students</th>
<th>Enrolled students</th>
<th>% of students admitted</th>
<th>% of students who actually enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fictitious data, for illustration purposes only
C. Excerpts from cohort 1 self study about assessment

Seventh Cycle Academic Program Review
Department of Anthropology
San Francisco State University
August 2017

Completed July, 2017 by:
Wilczak, Cynthia, Peter Biella, Martha Lincoln, Mark Griffin, Douglass Bailey, and
James Quesada. 2017. Department of Anthropology Seventh Cycle Program
Review. San Francisco State University

The enclosed Self-Study was sent to external reviewers on October 9th, 2017.
3.0 Program Indicators

3.1 Program Planning

DATA

6. Provide the program’s mission statement:

Anthropology Program Mission Statement

Anthropology at SFSU focuses on the study of human beings from archaeological, biological, cultural, and visual perspectives. Faculty at SF State have research programs in the Bay Area, across the United States, and internationally. We bring this experience to the classroom and into the community. The location of the campus in San Francisco, a diverse, cosmopolitan, urban setting, also enables strategic linkages with local premier universities where our students can take courses and pursue advanced graduate studies. Moreover, the San Francisco Bay Area offers countless occupational opportunities in both the public and private sector, ranging from high-tech and bio-technological industries to public social services working with diverse communities. Our setting also provides unique opportunities for students to learn by engaging directly with local resources and institutions.

To that end, the Anthropology Department offers a rigorous program with practical training in four sub-fields, identified as dynamic applied specializations. These both reflect the strengths of the faculty and prepare students for practical and creative occupational opportunities in the San Francisco Bay Area. The four subfields the department is committed to are:

- Medical anthropology: culture and medicine, public health, human rights, community-based participatory research, and health of migrant populations;
- Visual representation: ethnographic and applied film making, critique of visual ideology, origins of art, still image and photography;
- Bioarchaeology: contextualized skeletal and dental analyses, health of past populations, and osteology in a medico-legal context; and
- Political Archaeology: historical archaeology, indigenous/native archaeologies, political uses of the past, ancient political systems, the archaeology of the contemporary past.

Our students explore the theoretical foundations and ethical obligations of the discipline, gain an appreciation for diversity in lifeways, and acquire an understanding of how anthropology can benefit their own communities. Our department creates opportunities for students to practice experiential learning, carry out hands-on field research, and develop independent research. The training students receive reflects the University mission of serving communities, promoting mutual respect, and fostering social responsibility.

7. Include the program’s last five annual assessment reports: describe major curriculum changes that have resulted from these assessments.

Starting in 2010, our programs have undergone regular assessments under the direction of the Undergraduate and Graduate Coordinators. In addition to a major curriculum revision in 2012 for the Undergraduate program and in 2015 for the Graduate program, the following actions were taken in response to our program assessments.

Undergraduate:

a. Full review of learning goals in our core courses and the development of basic standard syllabi. All tenure-track faculty agreed upon the shared standards; sample syllabi are to be utilized to ensure that new adjunct instructors are fully aware of the goals to be met for these courses.
b. Clear articulation of where Program Learning Goals (PLGs) are to be met in the curriculum. We continuously review these articulations; all new course proposals are required to state the specific PLGs that will be met and faculty assessments ensure that they comply with our stated PLGs.

c. Development of practices that foster greater continuity across the curriculum in the program’s goals to strengthen student research and writing skills. After the GWAR (Anth 305) course was implemented in 2011, the Undergraduate Coordinator oversaw the implementation of the course through meetings with the GWAR instructors; in them, she discussed pedagogy and implementation of the GWAR. The group conducted portfolio assessments of students’ written work in Ant 305. As a result of this pedagogical discussion, the following changes were made in 2012: 1) restructuring of course assignments; 2) improved coordination with the learning assistance center; 3) incorporation of in-class peer review; 4) changes in the page lengths of assignments to promote a more gradual build-up to the final and more in-depth writing assignment; 5) changes in weighting of the assignments to reward improvements in writing. In 2013 portfolio assessments of student writing helped to identify the areas where the GWAR was successful in improving student writing and where weaknesses still remained. Given that a single, one-semester course cannot be expected to provide students with all the research and writing skills needed for proficiency, in consultation with the GWAR instructors, the Department instituted policies to increase the continuity of training across the curriculum in 2014. This included: 1) sharing of GWAR developed resources such as peer review forms and grading rubrics for use in other upper division courses; 2) the development of a Department writing handbook to be used in all course with writing components so that expectations and core writing resources (websites, recommended resources and strategies) are the same across the program; 3) identification of the skills that needed the most reinforcement in other courses, particularly the courses in Area 2 Methods and Practicum. This program assessment is ongoing and a similar program of consultation between the GWAR instructors and the undergraduate coordinator was begun in Spring 2017 to reevaluate our progress and consider other strategies for further improvements.

d. Restructuring of our Visual Anthropology program to elevate it to a full subfield on par with archaeology, cultural/medical anthropology and bioarchaeology (previously within the cultural/medical anthropology subfield). Since 2015, new courses have been introduced at the 100-, 300-, elective and graduate levels in visual anthropology. We are currently working on a complete curriculum revision to make these courses part of the core, Area 1 and elective distribution requirements.

The full learning assessment reports from the last 5-years are included as supplemental files to this document. The changes in the graduate program are extensive and directly link to the CAM reports from the 6th cycle as summarized in question #8.

8. Include CAMs from the 5th and (where appropriate) 6th cycle, summarizing major changes that the program has undertaken since, or as a result of, these reviews.

The 5th Cycle Academic Program Review, conducted in 1999-2001, took place at a time when the Department relatively large cohort of core faculty, was responsible for considerable outside resources (i.e., Treganza Museum, NAGPRA Program, Tiburon Romberg storage facility, etc.), and was housed in the old Science Building in which plant facilities were poorly maintained. The recommendations were both positive and negative. On the positive side, the external reviewers acknowledged that the Anthropology faculty had maintained its focus regarding primary needs (i.e., new faculty positions, more laboratory space, increase number of upper
3.2 Student Learning and Achievement

DATA

15. What are the program’s learning goals and what evidence does it regularly seek and consult to assure that students are meeting these goals?

Learning Goals for the UG Major

I. Diversity: Demonstrate an awareness and knowledge of a culturally and biologically diverse world. (Intro Core Courses 100, 110, 120; elective courses)
   a. Describe the field of anthropology and its objectives.
   b. Demonstrate knowledge of how culturally informed beliefs, behaviors, and perspectives vary between diverse global societies.
   c. Demonstrate understanding of how anthropologists study diversity in race/ethnicities, class, gender identity, and age.
   d. Demonstrate comparative understanding of how material culture and symbolic representations vary across diverse societies over time.
   e. Explain the basic processes of biological evolution and the general course of human evolution.

II. Theory: Understand the fundamental principles of the four subfields. (Anth 300, Area 1 Theory and Foundations; upper division requirement in 3 of the subfields)
   a. Characterize the distinctive theoretical and methodological approaches of anthropology.
   b. Critically examine one’s own cultural and social identities and understand how those identities shape beliefs and attitudes.
   c. Understand major causes of social inequality and how to address them through civic engagement.
   d. Articulate a scientific understanding of human biological diversity and the ethical concerns arising from studies of that diversity.
   e. Demonstrate knowledge of past and present human biocultural systems, including ecological relationships, social and cultural organization, and processes of cultural change.

III. Method: Use theoretical knowledge to critically analyze and interpret anthropological evidence. (Area 2 Methods and Practicum - Culminating Experience/Capstone courses)
   a. Understand research project design and the role of data analysis or qualitative analysis.
   b. Present opposing viewpoints or alternative hypotheses on various anthropological issues.
   c. Gather and interpret information from diverse sources, including local resources of the Bay Area where relevant.
   d. Demonstrate applied skills in at least one of the subfields of anthropology.
   e. Write concisely and logically, incorporating relevant data and knowledge.

Evidence that our students are meeting departmental learning goals is collected in our regular assessments. Group I Diversity learning goals cover basic knowledge in the field and were assessed in 2011 by analysis of key concept questions embedded in final exams. Other assessments over the last six years have focused on the GWAR courses (2012, 2013, and 2015) and on Area 2 Methods and Practicum courses (2011, 2012, 2015, and 2017). While the faculty have discussed and reviewed course content and expectation for the Group II learning goals in the Area 1 Theory and Foundations courses (2012) and utilized a survey of student self-assessment in meeting these outcomes (2015), we have not collected direct assessments for Group II. It will be a priority to include these measures in the 2017-18 assessments.
POLICY ON COURSE SYLLABI

Justification

This policy updates Academic Senate Policy #F10-257 (Policy on Course Syllabi), which updated #S08-90 (Policy on Course Syllabi) and Academic Senate Policy #F07-244 (Syllabus Disability Statement Policy), which established requirements for course syllabi.

The purpose of this revision is to set forth a statement regarding student disclosures of sexual violence and Title IX responsibilities for all syllabi. This revision will provide students with tools and guidelines regarding SF State faculty and staff reporting obligations in terms of information regarding sexual violence. These statements will be required to be added to all syllabi.

Policy

1. Guidelines covering syllabus use in courses

Students shall receive a written syllabus (digitally or in hard copy) by the first course meeting or, in the case of courses taught online, it will be available to them when the course opens.

During the semester, students shall be notified in writing (digitally or in hard copy) of any substantive changes in the course syllabus. Colleges, schools, departments, or programs may specify additional syllabus requirements for their courses.

1. Basic information for all course syllabi
All course syllabi shall include:

1. the instructor’s name, office location, office phone number, office hours, and contact information;

1. the course title and number;

1. a statement of scope, content, course objectives and student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the course;

1. a list of texts and materials to be used throughout the course, including any additional fees or costs;

1. a description of the grading policy;

1. a description of the teaching methods to be employed; and

1. any additional statements required by Academic Senate Policy.

1. **Courses within the University-wide requirements (i.e., General Education and overlay requirements)**

In support of the university baccalaureate degree requirements policy and undergraduate baccalaureate goals, additional information will be required on all undergraduate course syllabi proposed for inclusion in the GE program, including:

1. the student learning outcomes [SLOs] for the GE area (and/or overlay(s)) for which the course is seeking certification;
2. any course-specific student learning outcomes; and;
3. linkage of all SLOs (GE area, overlay, and course-specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met those SLOs.
1. **Courses within the major**

All new undergraduate and graduate course syllabi submitted for inclusion within a major program shall align course objectives and outcomes to the mission statement or objectives of the major.

1. **Statements required by Academic Senate Policy**

All syllabi shall include statements required by Academic Senate Policy, including the university’s statement regarding disability access: *Sections enclosed by brackets may be updated by the appropriate administrator without senate action.*

1. **Disability access**

Students with disabilities who need reasonable accommodations are encouraged to contact the instructor. The [Disability Programs and Resource Center (DPRC)] is available to facilitate the reasonable accommodations process. The [DPRC] is located in the [Student Service Building] and can be reached by telephone (voice/TTY 415-338-2472) or by email (dprc@sfsu.edu).” ([http://www.sfsu.edu/~dprc](http://www.sfsu.edu/~dprc))

1. **Student disclosures of sexual violence**

SF State fosters a campus free of sexual violence including sexual harassment, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and/or any form of sex or gender discrimination. If you disclose a personal experience as an SF State student, the course instructor is required to notify the [Dean of Students]. To disclose any such violence confidentially, contact:

[The SAFE Place - (415) 338-2208; http://www.sfsu.edu/~safe_plc/]

[Counseling and Psychological Services Center - (415) 338-2208; http://psyservs.sfsu.edu/]

For more information on your rights and available resources: [http://titleix.sfsu.edu]
This policy replaces Academic Senate Policy #S10-257 (Policy on Course Syllabi) and Academic Senate Policy #F07-244 (Syllabus Disability Statement)
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Introduction

FOUNDED IN 1899 as a teachers college, San Francisco State University remains united as a community of learners in our passion for academic excellence, intellectual discovery, creative and critical inquiry and educational equity. SF State maintains a proud history of commitment to social justice and opposition to oppression and marginalization, which lives on through the work, scholarship and community engagement of its students, faculty, staff and alumni.

AT SF STATE, diversity and pluralism form the conditions of intellectual advancement, creativity and innovation. As we work with students to prepare for life and work in a complex and increasingly transnational society and seek to expand the boundaries of human understanding through our scholarly work, SF State is well positioned for the educational challenges of the 21st century.

IN JUNE 2013, President Leslie E. Wong appointed the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee (SPCC) and charged the committee to conduct a broad-based and collaborative strategic planning effort to establish SF State’s institutional priorities for the years ahead. The charge to the planning committee identified seven themes: Building the San Francisco State Identity, Maximizing Student Success, the Academic Master Plan, the Physical Master Plan, Advancing Campus and Community Climate, Elevating Institutional Support and Emerging Issues. Those themes served as points of entry to engage the campus and community, and subcommittees explored those themes in detail during the 2013-2014 academic year. Theme subcommittees engaged the campus and community through a variety of ways including special events, meetings with key stakeholders and campus groups, social media and a customized platform (at Neighborland.com). In June 2014, the subcommittees detailed their findings and insights in reports that were shared with the campus community.

DURING THE SUMMER OF 2014, the SPCC analyzed the theme subcommittee reports and released a draft strategic plan. The SPCC then solicited feedback on the draft plan through the Make Your Mark event and through conversations with various groups and stakeholders. That feedback yielded numerous improvements, and the SPCC is thankful that SF State’s new strategic plan benefits from the generosity of students, colleagues and friends who have shared what they care about as well as the challenges they face and their strategies for overcoming them.

EMERGING from the University’s long-standing commitments to teaching, learning and social justice, the new strategic plan is anchored by five core University values: Courage, Life of the Mind, Equity, Community and Resilience. The plan highlights aspirations and objectives within each of those core value areas, and it offers initiatives to deliver on the objectives. The strategic plan and all of its components should be read within the ongoing context of our institutional commitment to shared governance. The new strategic plan establishes our institutional priorities.

THE INITIATIVES offered by the plan promise to advance these priorities. These initiatives are ambitious. They reflect a collaborative spirit that will strengthen our community while we identify new ways to think and work together. The success of the plan rests upon the talented community of people who are SF State. The plan will serve as a living document that offers direction and inspiration to our future leadership without overly proscribing the outcome of our shared decision-making.
Courage

COURAGE FOLLOWS FROM AND ENABLES PRINCIPLE. Courage propels our willingness to be different and unique — to establish ourselves as a university with a distinct mission and character, rather than a follower in the pattern of others. Courage allows us to hold difficult conversations in broad forums and undergirds our commitment to social justice, to shared governance, to academic freedom and to student, faculty and staff activism. Courage recognizes that innovation involves risk and failure, and it embraces change and adversity as opportunities. Courage fortifies our efforts to question conventional wisdom and explore controversial issues in the name of deeper understanding; it energizes our commitment to academic freedom. We celebrate people of intellect and humanity who take positions of principle and stand by them despite academic and social pressure. Courageous scholars form fruitful and respectful partnerships with local and international communities while submitting academic insights to the test of practice, forming new knowledge. The courageous are aware of their vulnerabilities, but they are not resigned to victimization. Courage creates the condition and chief outcome of an education of substance — the ability to “own one’s own mind.”

Aspirations

+ To stand up for our core values.
+ To embrace change and adversity as opportunities.
+ To recognize that innovation involves risk and sometimes mistakes and nurture a culture of innovation that celebrates provocative failure as much as success.
+ To encourage responsible citizenship and responsive leadership.
+ To create an environment in which all members are confident that their ideas will be heard and their right to share them is honored.
+ To celebrate the acts of courage we commit and witness every day at SF State: in teaching, in learning and in fulfilling our commitments to ourselves, our families and our communities.
+ To support and inspire faculty to be courageous in teaching, to take risks in scholarship and to model for students the public-facing, scholarly and activist work that defines the legacy and academic mission of SF State.

Objectives

1] SF State will maintain, develop and sustain programs and activities that leverage the linguistic, cultural and social diversity of our students, faculty and staff to advance our mission and education goals.

2] SF State will develop structures to create learning opportunities for students to respectfully engage with diverse views and collaborate in the classroom with faculty and peers, on campus and with the community.

3] SF State will create resources to support entrepreneurial professional activities and scholarship in a variety of forms.
SF State will promote a system of recognition and rewards that reflects our unique, mission-driven contributions to research, scholarship and teaching. We will encourage critical, rigorous work in a variety of traditional and non-traditional career profiles and trajectories. We will help faculty to follow rewarding individual and collaborative pathways that produce bold scholarship aligned with our University mission and our educational goals.

Initiatives

Short-Term

+ Develop existing User-Friendly Principles as a framework to further anti-bullying and anti-harassment efforts and to foster a respectful and affirming campus workplace. (Objective 1)

+ Conduct an Annual Employee & Student Satisfaction Survey and get feedback on campus feelings of intellectual safety (e.g., are people encouraged to share diverse, uncommon and controversial ideas?). (Objectives 1, 2)

+ Complete a revision of the University Mission Statement to reflect this value and the other key values in this document. (Objectives 1, 2, 4)

+ Establish, through the leadership of the University Corporation, a social venture capital fund to support the entrepreneurial projects of students, faculty, staff and alumni that advance our mission and educational goals. (Objectives 2, 3)

+ Establish an Academic Senate task force to assess how congruent current faculty-oriented incentives, assessments and rewards are with the mission and core values of the University. (Objective 4)

Mid-Term

+ Foster a diverse and lively marketplace of ideas by creating a long-term enrollment plan that reflects our University mission and values and that is aligned with our budget, including setting specific goals for groups such as international students, out-of-state students and under-represented communities. (Objective 1)

+ Fine-tune the University retention, tenure and promotion policy through the shared governance processes of the Academic Senate and encourage departments to revisit their policies to ensure that they match the current and future variety of faculty work. In the process, we will improve scholarship and teaching by offering faculty a clearer vision of their career pathways and better support for reaching their objectives. (Objectives 1, 4)
Reorganize technology resources and perspectives around the goal of creating maker cultures, where technology is institutionalized as a medium of innovation and creativity. This initiative will include: faculty and staff training, domains, individual server space and tools for the collection, curation and manufacture of student and faculty work; the creation of such new physical spaces as incubators, fabrication labs and hacker spaces and such virtual spaces as social platforms and open-source archives. (Objectives 2, 3)

Prioritize the creation and maintenance of state-of-the-art wireless and computing capability that fosters creativity, collaboration and innovation. (Objectives 2, 3)

Develop closer formal and informal relations among faculty, staff, students, alumni and the neighboring tech industry and tech communities. This will include: formal and informal collaborations, lectures and symposia, student internships, hack-a-thons, tech boot camps and faculty and professional residencies. (Objectives 2, 3)

Increase interaction between academic departments and the industries and career tracks they support by developing a University-wide program to bring professionals from various industries to meet with faculty. This program would ideally be tied to the development of paid internship opportunities for students. (Objectives 2, 3)

Catalog and maintain a list of SF State outreach programs so community-based scholars can coordinate and complement one another. (Objectives 3, 4)
BY DEFINITION, THE UNIVERSITY IS AN INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY that aspires to encompass the richness and breadth of human knowledge. SF State’s academic mission advances a distinct commitment to critical and collaborative thought, intellectual pluralism and action. SF State’s faculty are both dedicated teachers and engaged professional practitioners and scholars; teaching is enlivened by faculty who create new knowledge in their academic fields, professional practice and community engagement, while faculty research and practice are sharpened and their stakes clarified through the privilege of teaching new skills to students at all levels. We embrace a reciprocal relationship between the University and the world and between experience and knowledge that is captured by our motto, *Experientia Docet*. We value learning that is not bounded by the classroom, archive or campus but takes place in myriad forms and locations. We nourish and recognize intellectual achievement across a range of academic, creative and professional spheres, both traditional and forward-looking. And we affirm the life of the mind as a continued source of meaning, purpose and commitment for all members of our intellectual community.

**Aspirations**

- To make the process of learning visible and meaningful to students by clarifying our goals for student learning and achievement.
- To create opportunities for active, experiential learning at every level of students’ education.
- To encourage interdisciplinary intellectual community and exchange for students, faculty and staff.
- To create opportunities for students to engage in authentic research and creative work with experts in their fields.
- To enable our students and faculty as scholars to excel academically according to the highest standards of their fields and to provide similar support for staff in their professional development.
- To foster in our students the curiosity that will lead to lifelong learning.

**Objectives**

1. SF State will align our courses and our curriculum with our sense of mission, our values and our goals for student learning.
2. SF State will endeavor to strengthen our graduate programs, integrate graduate students into the life of the University and give graduate students valuable career and teaching experience.
3. SF State will empower faculty and departments to set high standards for excellence in professional achievement appropriate to their fields and provide sufficient resources to support such activity, including appropriate workload relief for scholars to excel in pure research, applied research, creative works or other excellence in professional practice.
4) SF State will invigorate the intellectual environment for faculty, staff, students and local communities by multiplying sites of interaction and collaboration, lowering barriers to participation and providing support for lifelong learning and professional development. We will be recognized as an indispensable source of innovation and creativity for the city, region and state.

5) SF State will become a national leader in innovative teaching, scholarship and creative activities that build on our strengths, including the scholarship of teaching and learning, experiential learning and scholarly teaching.

**Initiatives**

**Short-Term**

- Undertake an operational review of campus advising and tutoring to develop greater coordination of services across campus.  
  *(Objective 1)*

- Conduct a review of course offerings, timing and classroom utilization in order to increase student access to our curriculum.  
  *(Objectives 1, 2)*

- Create new degree road maps that help our students succeed at the University and in life.  
  *(Objectives 1, 5)*

- Strengthen the curriculum review process by emphasizing student needs and fostering interdepartmental collaboration while streamlining program approval and reducing bureaucratic barriers for new program and co-curricular offerings.  
  *(Objectives 1, 5)*

- Review opportunities for developing or revising graduate programs to serve our graduate students’ needs for teaching and professional experience.  
  *(Objective 2)*

- Implement a review to study avenues for supporting research and other professional excellence, including ensuring appropriate workload, resources, incentives and support for collaboration with students.  
  *(Objectives 2, 3, 4, 5)*

- Implement a review to ensure that the campus hiring and retention, tenure and promotion policies are aligned with the wide variety of standards for professional excellence across different departments and units.  
  *(Objectives 3, 4, 5)*

- Foster diverse perspectives and facilitate such learning environments by heavily recruiting underrepresented, transnational and international students as well as staff and faculty of different backgrounds to the classrooms and campus community.  
  *(Objective 4)*

- Revise our retention, tenure and promotion policies to match the current and future variety of faculty work and roles while delivering a new, flexible vision of professional development and scholarly teaching tailored to the strengths of our campus and embracing work that may not fit traditional models.  
  *(Objectives 4, 5)*
+ Begin to implement high-impact teaching-oriented projects such as brown-bag academies, teaching- and learning-oriented symposia and faculty mentoring strategies in preparation for a Teaching and Learning Commons.  
(Objectives 4, 5)

+ Develop a “Master Teachers” initiative that uses new media (video, website, etc.) to publicize, share and celebrate SF State faculty’s excellence in teaching and learning.  
(Objectives 4, 5)

+ Develop and implement a series of Open Campus Days, a regular series of on- and off-campus events that invite local communities and leaders to engage with SF State faculty, staff and students to share knowledge, demonstrate projects and solve problems.  
(Objectives 4, 5)

+ Implement a five-year faculty and staff hiring plan that will allow us to align our faculty and staff to meet the needs of our students and our communities, increase faculty and staff diversity and advance our curriculum and University mission. Units will consider the core values and mission of the University in drafting position requests and making hiring decisions.  
(Objective 5)

Mid-Term

+ Establish a new University Academic Center that unites tutoring, academic advising and career advising and creates new writing and math centers.  
(Objective 1)

+ Expand high-impact and experiential overseas opportunities for faculty, staff and students, especially non-traditional and underrepresented students, at all stages of academic study.  
(Objectives 1, 4)

+ Align course and programmatic learning goals in support of a coherent, student-centered curriculum.  
(Objectives 1, 5)

+ Develop and implement a colloquium series that brings together faculty, community leaders and high-profile guests to debate and explore contemporary issues in culture, science and society.  
(Objectives 4, 5)

+ Seek external funding to create University Scholar and Teacher fellowships that will direct the work of master teachers, accomplished scholars and creative faculty into high-impact projects that enable them to mentor peers, engage with the community and extend the mission of the University in new directions.  
(Objectives 4, 5)

+ Create and support a University Teaching and Learning Commons that will foster interaction among faculty and various academically oriented units within the University. A key goal of this Commons is to create and maximize peer-to-peer networks of teaching and learning expertise to strengthen the quality of teaching, curricula and courses.  
(Objective 5)
Long-Term

+ Build and support a University Academic Center that will house a Teaching and Learning Commons, tutoring and other academic support services as well as spaces for meeting, collaborating and presenting.
  *(Objectives 1, 4, 5)*

+ Create a platform to open source our knowledge and resources and to distribute, publicize and share the fruits of higher learning with each other, our constituencies and the world.
  *(Objective 4)*

+ Seek external funding to create and support an Idea Lab/Institute for Advanced Study that will recruit leading intellectuals and artists from across the nation and world to collaborate with SF State faculty and students.
  *(Objectives 4, 5)*
Equity

SF STATE’S DISTINCTIVE IDENTITY is founded on our commitment to equity. The principles of fairness and inclusion guide our educational mission, our institutional practices and our relations with the community around us. Our commitment to equity fosters an environment of respect, diversity, support and dignity for all of our members — faculty, staff and students. A commitment to equity: sees educational access and academic quality as reciprocal goals; affirms that resources are distributed according to need; empowers students who make the world a better place; and eliminates barriers to success.

Aspirations

+ To redress inequities and increase educational access by reducing educational and opportunity gaps, improving completion rates and increasing the availability of high-quality courses.

+ To fulfill our equity mission and support the needs of our diverse student population by re-examining and, where appropriate, reorganizing our curriculum, teaching practices, mentoring, community engagement, internships and advising practices.

+ To proactively prepare students living within the six-county local area by expanding our collaborative work with the local school districts.

+ To attract and retain the best faculty and staff by making SF State a fair and equitable place to work, which will in turn increase student success.

+ To support faculty excellence in teaching, research and professional practice endeavors, as together they are essential to SF State’s distinctive commitment to uniting academic quality and broad access.

+ To promote campus professional achievement and growth, creative works and curricula that are connected to a rich history and contemporary culture of student life and service and that recognize, include and nurture multiple forms of equity on campus as they relate to a variety of identities.

Objectives

1] SF State will eliminate the gap in graduation rates between historically underrepresented students and non-underrepresented students and increase our six-year graduation rate for all first-time freshmen and transfer students by 15 percent. This will be our primary focus, and we will become the CSU’s flagship campus for educational opportunity.

2] SF State will address the discrepancies in our academic labor force by instituting a comprehensive professional development program for lecturer faculty and by assessing equity within the tenure and tenure-track ranks. We will become a national model for integrating contingent faculty into the academic life of the University.
3] SF State will strengthen and expand Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles to: 1) assessment, 2) institutional policies and practices, 3) media and technology, 4) course curriculum and 5) pedagogical approaches. UDL principles address accessibility and equity issues by minimizing educational barriers while maintaining rigor and high learning expectations for all students.

4] SF State will ensure that all students have universal coverage and access to a wide range of quality health care and preventative services on campus.

5] SF State will expand professional opportunities for faculty and staff to make the campus a workplace of choice. We will become known as the most exciting and rewarding academic workplace in our region.

Initiatives

Short-Term

- Develop a Long-Term Enrollment Plan that identifies program capacities, bottlenecks and the necessary resources to anticipate and serve student demand. (Objective 1)

- Authorize the Student Success and Graduation Initiative Task Force to design and implement an Early Alert System to identify and support students who, without that support, might otherwise not complete their degrees. (Objective 1)

- Assess the staffing and quality of student success programs and services in order to provide SF State students with the best possible support. (Objective 1)

- Design and implement a system of University Equity Awards. These awards will recognize significant curricular, programmatic and administrative efforts to advance the values of fairness and inclusion. We will become a campus that encourages and celebrates our commitment to equity. (Objectives 1, 2, 5)

- Conduct analyses of the tenure and tenure-track faculty to assess their experience of equity on campus. Analyses will include both internal assessments and independent external assessments that will be conducted in collaboration with relevant campus faculty groups. (Objective 2)

- Broaden and expand the Employee University Program so that the professional development opportunities it provides are accessible to all University employees. (Objectives 2, 5)

- Conduct a comprehensive review of hiring, employment practices and University policies (including job classification and salary equity) related to non-tenure track faculty and staff, and communicate the results of that review broadly. (Objectives 2, 5)

- Create a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Task Force charged with increasing awareness of both physical and cognitive accessibility of campus and curriculum information and resources. (Objective 3)
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Design and initiate an annual survey to assess the quality of the work environment and the level of employee satisfaction.  
(Objective 5)

Mid-Term

Coordinate tutoring, academic advising and career advising in a new University Academic Center.  
(Objective 1)

Implement and prioritize a Course Availability Plan that will ensure student access to the curriculum, with the aim of increasing six-year graduation rates by 15 percent by 2025.  
(Objective 1)

Implement a First-Year Experience program to provide a high-impact educational practice that can level the playing field for first-generation students and for students whose prior educational experiences have not adequately prepared them for college work.  
(Objective 1)

Implement an integration and engagement plan for non-tenure track faculty designed to make SF State a national model of just and fair non-tenure track faculty employment. Provisions of this plan will be ensured through appropriate revisions to SF State’s policy on Temporary Faculty.  
(Objective 2)

Expand universal coverage and access to quality health care and preventive services (e.g., physical therapy, screenings, health education/promotion, wellness programs).  
(Objective 4)

Establish benchmarks and targets for employee satisfaction that create institutional incentives for continued improvement in the quality of the employment experience.  
(Objective 5)
Community

WE BELIEVE WE CAN TEACH AND SUPPORT STUDENTS in educationally purposeful ways when we collaborate with each other and the larger community; we care about and support academic freedom and freedom of speech; we create the space for pluralism and counter stories; we reinforce the tenets of equity and live and learn in ways that are principled and just; we respect the abilities of all students, faculty and staff and provide opportunities for community members to develop a strong sense of self-worth, care and respect for others; and we believe in developing strong partnerships that will support the pursuits of our students, faculty and staff within the local, national and global communities.

Aspirations

+ To provide the space for a community that is educationally purposeful, open, just, disciplined, culturally responsive and caring.
+ To provide students with opportunities to think critically and broadly about the concept of community and the impact they have on society.
+ To create a strong, mutually supportive community among students, alumni, faculty and staff that serves as a model within the CSU.
+ To embrace diversity and provide SF State’s diverse community (alumni, students, faculty and staff) with opportunities to develop a sense of affinity for the institution.
+ To provide meaningful opportunities for students to engage with faculty and staff outside of the classroom.
+ To improve community partnerships and celebrate the successes that develop from those partnerships.
+ To explore and secure support which will help address the affordability factor facing many students, faculty and staff.
+ To appreciate and recognize students, faculty and staff for their positive community impact.

Objectives

1] SF State will create a campus culture where students, staff and faculty are valued, respected, taken care of and treated fairly. As a consequence, they will want to engage, reciprocate and contribute to the well-being and advancement of the SF State community.

2] SF State will increase our engagement and responsiveness to student, staff and faculty concerns and heavily invest in infrastructure, virtual platforms and facilities that foster freedom of speech, intellectual exchange and social interactions.

3] SF State will strengthen an academic community based on collaboration, consultation, critical reasoning and diversity.
4] SF State will support students, alumni, faculty and staff and advocate for social justice, human dignity and environmental justice within our local and higher education communities.

5] SF State will strengthen opportunities for students, faculty, staff and alumni to engage with the community outside campus.

**Initiatives**

**Short-Term**

+ Design and initiate an annual survey to assess the quality of the work environment and the level of employee satisfaction.  
  *(Objective 1)*

+ Launch a University-wide student, employee and alumni communication campaign that listens to their concerns on both virtual and non-virtual platforms and commit to addressing these concerns in a timely fashion.  
  *(Objectives 1, 2)*

+ Continuously review and update student and employee orientation, advising and mentoring materials to cover all aspects of academic and professional success at SF State.  
  *(Objectives 1, 2)*

+ Establish a Student Engagement Task Force, recognizing that engaged and empowered learners feel a sense of belonging and confidence in their ability to contribute in class, on campus and within their communities.  
  *(Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4)*

+ Launch a “Giving Back” campaign to encourage student organizations to contribute a portion of their fundraising to struggling charities or non-profit organizations.  
  *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Develop the necessary infrastructure to support and expand community-building, co-curricular activities (e.g., athletics, health/recreation/wellness, service learning, internships, study abroad).  
  *(Objectives 1, 5)*

+ Expand student organizations, peer-to-peer programs and services focused on community-building and student leadership.  
  *(Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)*

+ Increase the current level of student and employee services by opening a Faculty and Staff Club, student nap rooms and short-term, low-cost child care for students, faculty and staff.  
  *(Objective 2)*

+ Pursue an athletics plan that sees athletics as part of academics, that focuses on athletes as students first and coaches as faculty, that acknowledges the benefits of athletics in terms of wellness and success and that offers student-athletes the tools they need to thrive as learners and members of the SF State community.  
  *(Objective 2)*
+ Increase use of existing open space (e.g., grass fields, plazas) to facilitate social interaction (e.g., activities, events, recreation).
   *(Objectives 2, 5)*

+ Assess the status of global, transnational and international commitments on campus and study ways to further foster a global mindset and engage the campus in global social issues, such as justice and equity, to infuse these issues into the curriculum and strengthen our international partnerships and our support for short-term and long-term academic exchange of students, faculty and staff.
   *(Objective 4)*

+ Develop a corporate relations portal with a menu of services as a way to offer SF State staff and faculty expertise to businesses in the Bay Area and beyond.
   *(Objective 4)*

+ Establish an annual marketing campaign that highlights SF State student and employee community services and the impacts of our efforts.
   *(Objective 4)*

**Mid-Term**

+ Develop significant funding to support faculty and staff leaves (including sabbaticals) and assigned time for mission-aligned projects that engage domestic and global communities.
   *(Objectives 1, 2, 4)*

+ Establish a resource center for SF State students who are undocumented, AB 540 or have been granted Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and provide them with information, guidance and support while fostering a sense of community for undocumented students to facilitate their success and pathway to graduation.
   *(Objectives 1, 3, 4)*

+ Develop a successful athletic program that will foster SF State spirit, stimulate pride and encourage identification with SF State. Use enhanced athletics programs to leverage support from the Bay Area community and further long-term bonds and connections with alumni and retired employees.
   *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Proactively cultivate mentorship between alumni, emerging student leaders and new SF State students, in collaboration with faculty and staff. Ideally, these relationships would continue to enrich the professional lives of students and alumni well into their professional lives.
   *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Create a legacy event and traditions that create meaningful community connections between alumni, faculty, staff and students and promote a sense of belonging and community.
   *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Expand high-impact and experiential overseas opportunities for faculty, staff and students, especially non-traditional and underrepresented students, at all stages of academic study.
   *(Objectives 1, 4)*
+ Develop programs and services under the auspices of the Mashouf Wellness Center to promote community well-being consisting of mental, physical, social and spiritual health components. *(Objectives 1, 5)*

+ Establish collaborative relationships with local, regional and global organizations through aligning and integrating their needs into curriculum and facilitating student work-experience opportunities with them, such as internships, consulting projects and practicum. *(Objectives 2, 4)*

**Long-Term**

+ Work closely with faculty, staff, colleges, the Alumni Association and the Office of International Programs to build long-term, meaningful relationships with transnational and international students and alumni as critical members of the SF State community who contribute to the richness and diversity of our community. *(Objective 1)*

+ Work closely with faculty, staff, colleges and the Alumni Association to build long-term, meaningful relationships with underrepresented students and alumni as critical members of the SF State community who contribute to the richness and diversity of our community, in the process creating the space for pluralism and counter-stories, cultural and linguistic awareness, diversified learning opportunities, internships, sponsorships, programs and the like. *(Objective 1)*

+ Open an Alumni, Parents and Friends Services Center to provide hospitality in an energized, animated atmosphere. The center could contain event space, gift shops, short-term housing, etc. and could be the starting place for tours, orientations, etc. *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Work closely with faculty, the Alumni Association and the Office of International Programs to build long-term, meaningful relationships with students and alumni in other countries. Provide opportunities for these students and alums to participate and contribute in exchanges, internships and excursion programs. *(Objectives 1, 4)*

+ Cut the ribbon on the University Academic Center, an attractive physical space that will centralize student support services (tutoring, advising and internship coordination) and host such community-building initiatives as: peer-to-peer faculty mentoring, maker spaces for faculty and faculty-student work, public venues for symposia and conferences, as well as informal socializing, meeting spaces for faculty interest groups and advisories. *(Objectives 2, 3)*
Resilience

RESILIENCE IS THE ABILITY TO RECOVER AND ADAPT quickly to difficulty or challenges and transform adversity into opportunity. It is a quality enhanced by intentional planning premised on the sociocultural, environmental and economic systems of sustainability, and it is magnified by the ability to anticipate challenges that lie ahead. As the pace and unpredictability of change accelerate in the 21st century, resilience is increasingly indispensable. In this climate, a quality higher education that promotes radical and nimble thinking fosters resilience in people and families. We also recognize that we play a central role in the resilience of our community and the world, not only as the result of the contributions that our graduates make, but through our scholarship, activism and community-engaged work. As we confront such problems as environmental sustainability and climate change in our classrooms and labs, we recognize our responsibility to help forge resilience in the communities we serve.

Aspirations

+ To empower students with an education that instills the value of sustainability and provides the ability to be innovative and nimble in confronting challenges.
+ To model environmental sustainability on our campus that is exportable to our communities beyond the campus.
+ To foster a recognition among students, faculty and staff of the resources they produce and consume as they engage the campus and the community.
+ To celebrate the full range of cultural traditions and multiple ways of knowing.
+ To graduate students who are aware of the power that their education plays in their personal resilience and who value the public good produced by a community of educated people.
+ To develop an identity both locally and beyond as a campus that is engaged in its community and in doing so is essential to its resilience.

Objectives

1) SF State will become a nationally recognized leader in campus environmental sustainability.
2) SF State will develop philanthropic and entrepreneurial income streams that appropriately support the intellectual work of students, faculty and staff, regardless of state budget decisions, with the goal of bolstering institutional sustainability.
3) SF State will expand and support programs and services that contribute to personal resiliency (e.g., advising, career counseling, health/wellness and tutoring services and programs).
4) SF State will develop its faculty, curriculum, research and programming to become a national leader in mitigating the effects of climate change and fostering community resilience.
SF State will be a champion and advocate at the regional level in the areas of affordable housing, transportation and economic development on behalf of students and SF State employees.

**Initiatives**

**Short-Term**

+ Create a timeline and set benchmarks for campus sustainability goals that will set the path to ensure that SF State leads the CSU in campus environmental sustainability. Additionally, the University will continue to align our auxiliary investment policies with our environmental sustainability commitments. *(Objective 1)*

+ Continue negotiations with area mass transit organizations to reduce transportation costs for students, faculty and staff. *(Objective 1)*

+ Establish a system of incentives for innovative and entrepreneurial activity on campus. *(Objective 2)*

+ Develop an overall plan for the strategic alignment, sustainability and facilities management of satellite campuses, including the Downtown Campus, the Romberg Tiburon Center and proposed Bay View/Hunters Point locations. This will include ensuring that future investments in satellite locations are in line with the mission of the University, incorporate the needs and viewpoints of all stakeholders and meet financial benchmarks set by the campus and CSU. *(Objective 2)*

+ Develop a comprehensive alumni engagement plan to reconnect our graduates with the exciting things that are happening on campus. *(Objective 2)*

+ Establish targets for employee philanthropic support of the University, while acknowledging differential abilities to give within our diverse community. *(Objective 2)*

+ Review University forms and business practices to reduce bureaucracy and increase clarity and efficiency. *(Objective 3)*

+ Consider prioritizing environmental sustainability and resilience within the faculty-hiring plan. *(Objective 4)*

**Mid-Term**

+ Secure area-wide mass transit passes for all SF State students by fall 2018. *(Objective 1)*

+ Prioritize the creation and maintenance of state-of-the-art wireless and computing capability that fosters creativity, collaboration and innovation. *(Objectives 1, 2)*
Authorize the University Corporation to consider establishing a venture capital fund to support entrepreneurial projects of students, staff, faculty and alumni. (Objective 2)

Work with campus and external innovators to establish maker-oriented laboratory spaces to foster creative applications of scholarship. (Objectives 2, 4)

Address compensation levels and housing opportunities in light of San Francisco’s cost of living. (Objectives 2, 4)

Develop the necessary infrastructure to support and expand programs and services that foster academic and personal resiliency (e.g., academic and career advising, counseling, health/recreation/wellness, tutoring). (Objective 3)

Initiate planning for a Center for Climate Change Resilience that will sponsor leading-edge, community-engaged research activities in support of local and global communities facing the impact of global climate change. (Objective 4)

Update the physical master plan to maximize affordable student and employee housing. (Objective 5)

### Long-Term

- Open a new, state-of-the-art Science building on the main campus that provides the high-quality teaching, research, laboratory and collaborative space that 21st century students, faculty and staff need. (Objectives 1, 2, 4)

- Continuously upgrade academic technology to ensure classrooms and labs are consistent with or better than the industry standards of specific fields of study. (Objective 3)

- Launch the Center for Climate Change Resilience. (Objective 4)
Provocations

The following provocations were derived from initial campus and community input. They were expressed through the theme area reports and served as inspirations for the initiatives aligned to each of the five core values. They continue to be important reflection points for this living document.

**Courage**

- Do we encourage, support and respectfully engage those who assert opinions and positions that are different from our own and sometimes difficult to hear?
- Do we challenge ourselves to speak, listen and act in ways that support our highest values as individuals and members of a community?
- Do we through our pedagogical practices, curricula and campus engagement activities, encourage students to think critically, speak courageously and own their own minds?
- Do we seek to foster honest, responsible and responsive dialogue in our academic structures and communities, thereby creating models for civil society?
- Do we embrace pluralism and counter-stories, or do we privilege single stories?
- Do we embrace a culturally responsive perspective that promotes accepting, embracing and learning about others and creating equity opportunities for students, staff and faculty?

**Life of the Mind**

- Do the forms and spaces of our teaching encourage active, rather than passive, learning?
- Do we facilitate students’ access to experiential learning opportunities?
- Do our curricular planning practices allow students ample opportunity for intellectual exploration and growth?
- Do our academic structures encourage intellectual community and exchange across the disciplines and throughout the campus?
- Do our retention, tenure and promotion processes recognize the full range of faculty achievement in creative and professional venues as well as traditional academic ones?
- Do we assume that all people think, learn and communicate in the same way?
San Francisco State University Strategic Plan

Equity

- Are the values of inclusiveness, equity and justice infused in the curriculum and across all campus operations?

- Do we have a sufficiently broad and sophisticated set of pedagogical perspectives and support structures that can be deployed to meet the needs of our diverse student population?

- Is our ability to offer the crucial combination of access and quality impeded by a lack of resources devoted to University-wide pedagogy development, tutoring and advising?

- Do budget decisions and resource allocations align with our commitment to equity?

- Do we have a plan in place to support the financial and housing needs of a diverse faculty, staff and student population in this expensive region?

- Does technology, including online education, offer pathways to greater access, or does it threaten to compromise equity and the quality of the education we can offer?

- Does the lack of current technologies in our classroom and work setting restrict our ability to provide students with access to the tools of use in professional practice?

Community

- Are we satisfied with the current level of student engagement? How do we plan to strengthen student engagement?

- Are we willing as an institution to invest in infrastructure that will provide opportunities for students, faculty and staff to engage in purposeful activities and interactions (curricular and co-curricular) that will increase their congruence with the community?

- As the physical master plan is reconsidered, is the University willing to, despite cost, ensure that future renovations and building on campus will include informal community gathering spaces that are intentional by design?

- In what ways and to what degree do we as an institution intend to assess the campus voice and quality of services? Furthermore, how do we intend to apply what we learn from those assessments?

- How will we celebrate our successes and how will we communicate those successes to the larger community?

- As we begin to look outward, beyond the campus community, to what degree will we engage with the San Francisco community (and beyond), and what can be done to improve the cohesiveness of our outreach activities?
Resilience

+ Do we have the appropriate structures and incentives to foster interdisciplinary collaboration that addresses emerging challenges?

+ Do our alumni see SF State as a key contributor to their personal resilience, and how great is their commitment to ensuring institutional resilience?

+ Do students, faculty and staff have an appropriate understanding of the funding and economic models that contribute to institutional sustainability?

+ Do our systems of rewards appropriately incentivize work that fosters resilience in our institution and our community?

+ Does our surrounding community appreciate the contributions that SF State makes to community resilience?

+ Do our alumni stand as exemplars of resilience in their communities?
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Update to SF State Strategic Plan- May 2018

Core Value: Courage

Courage Objectives

1. SF State will maintain, develop and sustain programs and activities that leverage the linguistic, cultural and social diversity of our students, faculty and staff to advance our mission and education goals.

2. SF State will develop structures to create learning opportunities for students to respectfully engage with diverse views and collaborate in the classroom with faculty and peers, on campus and with the community.

3. SF State will create resources to support entrepreneurial professional activities and scholarship in a variety of forms.

4. SF State will promote a system of recognition and rewards that reflects our unique, mission-driven contributions to research, scholarship and teaching. We will encourage critical, rigorous work in a variety of traditional and non-traditional career profiles and trajectories. We will help faculty to follow rewarding individual and collaborative pathways that produce bold scholarship aligned with our University mission and our educational goals.

Courage Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term initiatives</th>
<th>Courage Objective</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop existing User-Friendly Principles as</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>Academic Senate Resolution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a framework to further</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/anti-bullying-resolution">http://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/anti-bullying-resolution</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>anti-bullying and anti-harassment efforts and to foster a respectful and affirming campus workplace</th>
<th>Creation of the Division of Equity and Community Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conduct an Annual Employee & Student Satisfaction Survey, and get feedback on campus feelings of intellectual safety (e.g., are people encouraged to share diverse, uncommon and controversial ideas?) | Campus Climate Assessment: San Francisco State University has engaged the services of Rankin & Associates Consulting to conduct an institutional campus climate assessment. The project is entitled, “An Examination of the Learning and Living Environment for faculty, staff, and students at San Francisco State University.” Led by Dr. Susan Rankin, a professor in education policy studies and college student affairs at Pennsylvania State University and a senior research associate at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, the objective of the project is to, “Provide San Francisco State University with institutional/community information, analysis, and recommendations as it relates to climate.” Project outcomes include: “San Francisco State University will learn how students, faculty, and staff experience and perceive the climate for living and learning at San Francisco State University and how the community responds to them (e.g. governance issues, pedagogy, curricular issues, professional development, inter-group/intra-group relations, respect issues, etc.) “Based on the “Transformational Tapestry Model,” the project will engage all aspects of the campus community and will utilize focus groups and a generalized survey to conduct an internal assessment. The results of the assessment will inform data-driven action and strategic planning to realize institutional climate transformation. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policy/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete a revision of the University Mission Statement to reflect this value and the other key values in this document</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>Academic Senate Policy S15-176 <a href="https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/revision-mission-statement-policy">https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/revision-mission-statement-policy</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish, through the leadership of the University Corporation, a social venture capital fund to support the entrepreneurial projects of students, faculty, staff and alumni that advance our mission and educational goals</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>Completed. In partnership with University Corporation, the University launched a fund to support faculty, staff and student innovation. Relying on existing policy, and in an effort to operationalize it, the university established the Patent Evaluation and Innovation Committee (PEIC), which will assess opportunities to commercialize IP and ascertain whether it is in the best interest of the university to secure a patent on any particular innovation, and in some instances, consider whether to recommend that the university provide seed funding to innovative projects likely to lead to valuable IP. The $100,000 fund has already provided support to secure a patent in partnership with a member of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an Academic Senate task force to assess how congruent current faculty-oriented incentives, assessments and rewards are with the mission and core values of the University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Under consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division of Equity and Community Inclusion, will foster this important project.”

### Mid-Term Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster a diverse and lively marketplace of ideas by creating a long-term enrollment plan that reflects our University mission and values and that is aligned with our budget, including setting specific goals for groups such as international students, out-of-state students and under-represented communities</td>
<td>The Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and the Provost co-chair the campus Strategic Enrollment Management Committee. Additionally, the Division of International Education <a href="http://oip.sfsu.edu/">http://oip.sfsu.edu/</a> developed, and received cabinet endorsement, for a strategic international student recruitment plan. <strong>Black Unity Center created Fall 2017:</strong> Part of the University’s new <a href="http://oip.sfsu.edu/">Division of Equity and Community Inclusion</a>, the Center was created to provide a common space for SF State’s students of African descent to connect with one another between classes, to obtain tutoring and counseling and to organize and attend cultural programs. <strong>ASPIRE (Asian American and Pacific Islander Retention and Education)</strong> Launched in Fall 2016, aimed at improving retention and graduation rates of high-need, low-income students. The goal of the ASPIRE program is three-pronged: improve and expand the University’s capacity to serve high-need Asian American and Pacific Islander students, as well as low-income, degree-seeking undergraduate students; improve the learning environment; and improve the retention and graduation rates. The program is a collaboration between the College of Ethnic Studies and Student Affairs and Enrollment Management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Rebound Expansion (A program of Associated Students):** Beginning Fall 2016, San Francisco State University is leading a statewide effort to expand college access for formerly incarcerated individuals. Seven California State University campuses – Bakersfield, Fresno, Fullerton, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino and San Diego – are establishing programs modeled after SF State’s **Project Rebound**. Established in 1967 by the late Dr. John Irwin, a formerly incarcerated individual who became an SF State sociology professor and internationally recognized advocate for prisoners’ rights, the program helps those who have spent time in jail or prison earn college degrees, drastically reducing the likelihood they will return to incarceration.

| Fine-tune the University retention, tenure and promotion policy through the shared governance processes of the Academic Senate and encourage departments to revisit their policies to ensure that they match the current and future variety of faculty work. In the process, we will improve scholarship and teaching by offering faculty a clearer vision of their career pathways and better support for reaching their objectives | (Objectives 1, 4) | Ongoing through Academic Senate via Faculty Affairs Committee. The creation of CEETL ([S17-243](https://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/retention-tenure-and-promotion-policy-0)) helps with the teaching part of this. The discussed revisions of the charge for the University Research Council and Professional Development Committee will also be relevant. Faculty Affairs is working with Departments to revise their Retention/Tenure/Promotion criteria |
perspectives around the goal of creating “maker cultures,” where technology is institutionalized as a medium of innovation and creativity. This initiative will include: faculty and staff training, domains, individual server space and tools for the collection, curation and manufacture of student and faculty work; the creation of such new physical spaces as incubators, fabrication labs and hacker spaces and such virtual spaces a social platforms and open-source archives

The Server Virtualization – Ongoing. Information Technology Services leads the effort to virtualize servers at SF State. The conversion of physical server to virtual server has dramatically increased the capacity of campus data storage and improved overall IT services, providing the computing and communication resources that facilitate campus operations. With the VMware virtualization infrastructure upgrade, our virtual servers can now provide 2,140Ghz of CPU power, 14Tb of RAM, 230Tb of disk space, and 10GB of network connectivity. Currently, SF State’s Data Center has achieved 96% virtualization with 365 virtual servers and 14 physical servers, which is one of the highest among all CSU campuses. Our goal is to reach 100% virtualization by 2019.

Modopalooza 2018 – Information Technology Services is partnering with Modo Labs to host Modopalooza, a mobile application (app) competition, at SF State in spring 2018. This event is a unique opportunity for SF State students, faculty, and staff to hone their app development skills and brings a potential for innovation and collaboration to the University. Participants will be granted access to the no-code Modo Campus engagement platform where they will create their apps. By providing a competitive environment for teams to work towards learning, executing coding and app building, we foster a greater technological literacy of mobile application creation processes. This event requires no prior knowledge of app design or development, and enriches technology literacy as well as give students hands-on creative ownership of the SF State mobile app.
<p>| Prioritize the creation and maintenance of state-of-the-art wireless and computing capability that fosters creativity, collaboration and innovation | The new Science Building is programmed to include maker space to support these collaborations. |
| Centralization of Enrollment Management Technology Services: The goal of the project was to realize greater efficiencies by assigning technological staff and resources to appropriate teams within ITS, while keeping business process ownership and functional expertise in the units assigned to carry out the various student processes. |
| <strong>The Campus Wireless Augmentation</strong> – Information Technology Services is performing augmentation of Campus wireless infrastructure to sustain continuously increasing demand for wireless signal availability and higher connection speed across campus. As of December 2017, the network team completed Phase 3 of the installations and doubled the number of access points for wireless connectivity across campus, providing for faster wireless access, more connectivity, and more reliable services. At a time when connectivity and speed of internet access are central to education, improving SF State’s wireless network has proved valuable. This project is anticipated to complete in May 2018. |
| <strong>The Campus Network Infrastructure</strong> – The Common Network Initiative (CNI) is Information Technology Services’ ongoing effort to maintain campus baseline network infrastructure as technology advances and user needs evolve. The program provides for the refresh of each... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus network infrastructure on a cyclical basis to ensure that the network infrastructure continues to keep pace with technology and meet the changing needs of CSU students, faculty and staff. Major project milestones include installing parallel infrastructure, performing campus data center network equipment refresh, tracing and replacing network cables for all existing network equipment in campus telecommunication rooms, replacing network gear in all existing network equipment in campus telecommunication room, and completing campus wireless core infrastructure refresh. Currently, SF State is undergoing Phase 4 of its upgrades.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Campus Master Plan includes recommendations for a new Data Center, designed in a STAR topology. This means the all of the network connections that connect different buildings to the network terminate to the data center. The data center is usually centrally located to keep all connections approximately equal in distance, and co-location with the renovated and expanded Central Plant is recommended. The Data Center would be safe from water intrusion, have redundant and reliable power, and could be hardened to the level necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop closer formal and informal relations among faculty, staff, students, alumni and the neighboring tech industry and tech communities. This will include: formal and informal collaborations, lectures and symposia, (Objectives 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Leadership Fellows Program <a href="http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/programs">http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/programs</a> through the Career Services &amp; Leadership Development <a href="http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/">http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Internships, Hack-a-Thons, Tech Boot Camps and Faculty and Professional Residencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase interaction between academic departments and the industries and career tracks they support by developing a University-wide program to bring professionals from various industries to meet with faculty. This program would ideally be tied to the development of paid internship opportunities for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog and maintain a list of SF State outreach programs so community-based scholars can coordinate and complement one another</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Value: Life of the Mind**

**Life of the Mind Objectives**

1) SF State will align our courses and our curriculum with our sense of mission, our values and our goals for student learning.

2) SF State will endeavor to strengthen our graduate programs, integrate graduate students into the life of the University and give graduate students valuable career and teaching experience.
3) SF State will empower faculty and departments to set high standards for excellence in professional achievement appropriate to their fields, and SF State will provide sufficient resources to support such activity, including appropriate workload relief for scholars to excel in pure research, applied research, creative works or other excellence in professional practice.

4) SF State will invigorate the intellectual environment for faculty, staff, students and local communities by multiplying sites of interaction and collaboration, lowering barriers to participation and providing support for lifelong learning and professional development. We will be recognized as an indispensable source of innovation and creativity for the city, region and state.

5) SF State will become a national leader in innovative teaching, scholarship and creative activities that build on our strengths, including the scholarship of teaching and learning, experiential learning and scholarly teaching.

Life of the Mind Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term</th>
<th>Life of the Mind Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake an operational review of campus advising and tutoring to develop greater coordination of services across campus</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>Operational review of advising completed (<a href="https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Operational-Review-of-Undergraduate-Academic-Advising.pdf">https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Operational-Review-of-Undergraduate-Academic-Advising.pdf</a>); implementation in Campus Student Success Plan (<a href="https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/SF-State-Student-Success-Plan-4-28-17.pdf">https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/SF-State-Student-Success-Plan-4-28-17.pdf</a>); new campus advising plan adopted (<a href="https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Campus-Wide-Advising-Model.pdf">https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Campus-Wide-Advising-Model.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring operational review occurring Spring 2018 – Fall 2018 (including external review); outcome will be an overall campus tutoring plan like we have a campus advising strategy now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a review of course offerings, timing and classroom utilization in order to increase student access to our curriculum</td>
<td>(Objectives 1, 2)</td>
<td>Initiated through the Student Success and Graduation Initiative Task Force, then to Academic Policy Committee. Standardized Time Block Policy (<a href="http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/colleges/liberal-creative-arts/anthropology/ba-anthropology/roadmap/">S17-277</a>) will be implemented beginning Fall 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new degree road maps that help our students succeed at the University and in life</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 5)</td>
<td>The Division of Undergraduate Education &amp; Academic Planning and Curriculum Office have created four year degree roadmaps for all academic programs. (<a href="http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/colleges/liberal-creative-arts/anthropology/ba-anthropology/roadmap/">http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/colleges/liberal-creative-arts/anthropology/ba-anthropology/roadmap/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen the curriculum review process by emphasizing student needs and fostering interdepartmental collaboration while streamlining program approval and reducing bureaucratic barriers for new program and co-curricular offerings</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 5)</td>
<td>Division of Undergraduate Education &amp; Academic Planning and Curriculum Office implemented Courseleaf software to streamline new course proposal process and curricular changes; diagram of process (<a href="https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Course-Workflow-Template.pdf">https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/Course-Workflow-Template.pdf</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review opportunities for developing or revising graduate programs to serve our graduate students’ needs for teaching and professional experience</td>
<td>(Objective 2)</td>
<td>Integrating graduate students into the life of the University and providing graduate students valuable career and teaching experience. Increased review and management of Graduate Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a review to study avenues for supporting research and other professional excellence, including ensuring appropriate workload, resources, incentives and support for collaboration with students</td>
<td>(Objectives 2, 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Proposed restructuring of the Professional Development Committee, University Research Council and CEETL. Collaboration between Faculty Affairs and the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a review to ensure that the campus hiring and retention, tenure and promotion policies are aligned with the wide variety of standards for professional excellence across different departments and units</td>
<td>(Objectives 3, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs is reviewing data on retention. Faculty Affairs is also reviewing Retention/Tenure/Promotion criteria to make sure they are updated every five years, per Senate Policy and that the changes are in line with standards of professional excellence in every category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster diverse perspectives and facilitate such learning environments by heavily recruiting underrepresented, transnational and international students as well as staff and faculty of different backgrounds to the classrooms and campus community</td>
<td>(Objective 4)</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs is spearheading an initiative partially financed by a Chancellor’s Office grant to have mandatory training for all search and hiring committees with the goals of increasing diversity in faculty applicants’ pools, inclusion in the interviewing process and equity in retention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise our retention, tenure and promotion policies to match the current and future variety of faculty work and roles while delivering a new, flexible vision of professional development and scholarly teaching tailored to the strengths of our campus and embracing work that may not fit traditional models</td>
<td>(Objective 4, 5)</td>
<td>To be addressed by the Faculty Affairs Committee (Academic Senate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>(Objective 4, 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Begin to implement high-impact teaching-oriented projects such as brown-bag academies, teaching and learning oriented symposia and faculty mentoring strategies in preparation for a Teaching and Learning Commons | CEETL (Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning) [https://senate.sfsu.edu/content/center-teaching-faculty-development-advisory-board-ctfd](https://senate.sfsu.edu/content/center-teaching-faculty-development-advisory-board-ctfd)  
Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL) is facilitating 3 of the Year of Conversation work groups this Fall 2017. CEETL is preparing to launch in Spring 2018 a range of programing including workshops, reading groups, an open classroom initiative, and a summer institute on evidence-based teaching.)  
The College of Health and Social Sciences has trained the Fall 2017 and Fall 2016 new faculty cohorts through the Metro faculty development on social justice pedagogy. |
| Develop a "Master Teachers" initiative that uses new media (video, website, etc.) to publicize, share and celebrate SF State faculty’s excellence in teaching and learning | CEETL (Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning) is preparing a website that will amplify and celebrate the faculty’s excellence in teaching and learning and that will help faculty navigate the range of excellent existing professional development of teaching opportunities already on campus.) |
| Develop and implement a series of Open Campus Days, a regular series of on- and off-campus events that invite local communities and leaders to | Under consideration through Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Enrollment Management. |
engage with SF State faculty, staff and students to share knowledge, demonstrate projects and solve problems

Implement a five-year faculty and staff hiring plan that will allow us to align our faculty and staff to meet the needs of our students and our communities, increase faculty and staff diversity and advance our curriculum and University mission. Units will consider the core values and mission of the University in drafting position requests and making hiring decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-term Life of the Mind initiatives</th>
<th>Life of the Mind Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Establish a new University Academic Center that unites tutoring, academic advising and career advising and creates new writing and math centers | (Objective 1) | Academic Affairs, Advancement, Capital Planning?
Student Advising and Learning Center
Career Services & Leadership Development
http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/: The Offices of the Dean of Students, created a state-of-the-art student services office for Career Services & Leadership Development. While this move does not fully accomplish the stated initiative, it represents an initial investment in creating student-centered spaces.

The findings of the advising operational review address this coordination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Expand high-impact and experiential overseas opportunities for faculty, staff and students, especially non-traditional and underrepresented students, at all stages of academic study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Objective 1, 4)</td>
<td>Through the Office of International Programs <a href="http://oip.sfsu.edu/">http://oip.sfsu.edu/</a> In Academic Year 2017-18, 42 San Francisco State University students received Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarships, a federal award administered by the U.S. State Department, the most of any institution of higher education in the nation. Gilman Scholarships support the participation of students who are first generation, underrepresented minorities and or disabled, in study abroad programs. The Office of International Programs recruited and coached students to successfully apply for the Gilman Scholarship and other funding opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>Align course and programmatic learning goals in support of a coherent, student-centered curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Objective 1, 5)</td>
<td>The Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning has with the support of the Academic Senate UAAC committee instituted annual assessment reports to UAAAC <a href="http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/reports">http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment/reports</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>Develop and implement a colloquium series that brings together faculty, community leaders and high-profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Objective 4, 5)</td>
<td>AY 2017-18 Year of Conversation <a href="http://senate.sfsu.edu/content/year-conversation">http://senate.sfsu.edu/content/year-conversation</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guests to debate and explore contemporary issues in culture, science and society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seek external funding to create University Scholar and Teacher fellowships that will direct the work of master teachers, accomplished scholars and creative faculty into high-impact projects that enable them to mentor peers, engage with community and extend the mission of the University in new directions</th>
<th>(Objective 4, 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and support a University Teaching and Learning Commons that will foster interaction among faculty and various academically oriented units within the University. A key goal of this Commons is to create and maximize peer-to-peer networks of teaching and learning expertise to strengthen the quality of teaching, curricula and courses</td>
<td>(Objective 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of CEETL’s primary goals for the year is to become the hub of all professional development of teaching and learning on campus. Quality of Curricula and Courses: Teagle Foundation grant to SFSU (Faculty Planning and Curricula Coherence) supported 20 departments in revision of curricula over 3 years, culminating in a conference called Redesigning Our Majors. Student Success in the Majors grants has supported 19 programs in the redesign of courses or curricula to better support student success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long-Term**

<p>| Long-term Life of the Mind | Life of the Mind | Update (Complete/Underway) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build and support a University Academic Center that will house a Teaching and Learning Commons, tutoring and other academic support services, as well as spaces for meeting, collaborating and presenting</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 4, 5)</td>
<td>Academic Affairs, Advancement, University Enterprises / CPDC Development efforts to build the Student Advising and Learning Center (SALC) are under way. This physical space will unite the advising, tutoring, and other academic service centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a platform to open source our knowledge and resources and to distribute, publicize and share the fruits of higher learning with each other, our constituencies and the world</td>
<td>(Objective 4)</td>
<td>Box at SF State – Information Technology Services implemented Box at SF State, a cloud-based, collaborative storage service that can be used to securely share documents with faculty, staff, students, and community member, as well as with non-SF State individuals. This ITS service makes it easy to upload content, organize files, share links to files, and manage file and assign permission levels in order to collaborate with other Box users. It features a 500GB storage quota for individuals, 2TB storage quota for departments, 5GB individual file size uploads, and file backups. Files in Box can be accessed and worked on from anywhere, anytime from any device, which allows for more opportunities to collaborate and learn regardless of location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek external funding to create and support an Idea Lab/Institute for Advanced Study that will recruit leading intellectuals and artists from across the nation and world to</td>
<td>(Objective 4, 5)</td>
<td>The Idea Lab could be the driver for the Innovation Center, shown adjacent to the new science building in the Campus Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collaborate with SF State faculty and students

Core Value: Equity

Equity Objectives

1) SF State will eliminate the gap in graduation rates between historically underrepresented students and non-underrepresented students and increase our six-year graduation rate for all first-time freshmen and transfer students by 15 percent. This will be our primary focus, and we will become the CSU’s flagship campus for educational opportunity.

2) SF State will address the discrepancies in our academic labor force by instituting a comprehensive professional development program for lecturer faculty and by assessing equity within the tenure and tenure track ranks. We will become a national model for integrating contingent faculty into the academic life of the University.

3) SF State will strengthen and expand Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles to: (1) assessment, (2) institutional policies and practices, (3) media and technology, (4) course curriculum and (5) pedagogical approaches. UDL principles address accessibility and equity issues by minimizing educational barriers while maintaining rigor and high learning expectations for all students.

4) SF State will ensure that all students have universal coverage and access to a wide range of quality healthcare and preventative services on campus.

5) SF State will expand professional opportunities for faculty staff to make the campus a workplace of choice. We will become known as the most exciting and rewarding academic workplace in our region.

Equity Initiatives
### Short-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Equity Initiatives</th>
<th>Equity Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Long-Term Enrollment Plan that identifies program capacities, bottlenecks and the necessary resources to anticipate and serve student demand</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>Strategic Enrollment Management Task Force. Budget Advisory Council in Academic Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize the Student Success and Graduation Initiative Task Force to design and implement an Early Alert System to identify and support students who, without that support, might otherwise not complete their degrees</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>Student Success and Graduation Initiative Committee, adopting EAB for advising and student support. EAB will allow the campus to implement an Early Alert System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the staffing and quality of student success programs and services in order to provide SF State students with the best possible support</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>In process. The Stupski Foundation grant is funding the assessment of which components of the Metro College Success Program are effective in order to expand most cost-effective interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement a system of University Equity Awards. These</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 2, 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
- **Campus Student Success Plan** identifies units for investment to expand support for retention and graduation efforts. See also [SSGI website](#).
- **Student Affair and Enrollment Management Graduation Initiative 2025 Staffing:** Positions include: 3 staff in the Office of the Registrar, 1 New Student Programs manager, 1 Student Activities & Events director, 2 career counselors in Career Services & Leadership Development, and 1 One-Stop Coordinator in the Division of Enrollment Management.
awards will recognize significant curricular, programmatic and administrative efforts to advance the values of fairness and inclusion. We will become a campus that encourages and celebrates our commitment to equity.

Conduct analyses of the tenure and tenure track faculty to assess their experience of equity on campus. Analyses will include both internal assessments and independent external assessments that will be conducted in collaboration with relevant campus faculty groups.

Broaden and expand the Employee University Program so that the professional development opportunities it provides are accessible to all University employees.

| Objective 2 | After the first phase of the initiative on diversity, equity and inclusion in hiring, Faculty Affairs will gather data experience on equity through surveys and other qualitative assessments methods. |
| Objective 2, 5 | The Employee University Program - Established in 2013, SF State's Employee University (EU) developed an inclusive, holistic, diversified and free learning management program available to all university employees. EU, a winner of the 2015 California Higher Education Conference (CHEC) Focus on Efficiency Award, was designed by Human Resources to be responsive to the wishes of our employee population, and to create opportunities for learning. 270 employees attended the 2015/2016 academic year, and more than 95 percent of class participants indicated that the instructors and courses were effective. By engaging the staff, faculty and administration talent across the campus, EU provided all employees with equal access to high-quality training opportunities and the means by which to advance their careers and personal lives. EU is currently being |
evaluated and adjusted for further future development, focused on alignment with performance opportunities.

The Emerging Leaders Program – In 2014, Ann Sherman, former Senior Associate Vice President of Human Resources, created a program that focuses on SF State’s emerging and developing leaders. Funded by generous grant from Eustace-Kwan Family Foundation, the Emerging Leaders Program provides a fulfilling career path for employees across multiple disciplines. Individuals are nominated to participate in the 12-month program based on their potential to advance to enhanced leadership roles. The program’s class design incorporates best practices for adult learning – six monthly lessons and a campus project, and implements a framework for individuals to bond with one another through commonality, diversity, and collaboration. 49% of the first cohort participants (2015/2016) and 43% of the second cohort participants (2016/2017) received a promotion, in-class progression or in-range progression from the commencement of the program. The Emerging Leaders Program was also recognized by the 2016 CHEC Focus on Efficiency Award.

| Conduct a comprehensive review of hiring, employment practices and University policies (including job classification and salary equity) related to non-tenure track faculty and staff, and communicate the results of that | (Objective 2, 5) | Analysis and assessment of salary benchmarks conducted through Human Resources. |
review broadly
Create a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Task Force charged with increasing awareness of both physical and cognitive accessibility of campus and curriculum information and resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability Programs and Resource Center, Longmore Institute on Disability, All-University Committee on Students, Faculty &amp; Staff with Disabilities, Academic Technology, Center for Excellence and Equity in Teaching and Learning, Division of Equity and Community Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design and initiate an annual survey to assess the quality of the work environment and the level of employee satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mid-Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-term Equity Initiatives</th>
<th>Equity Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate tutoring, academic advising and career advising in a new University Academic Center</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>The Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning is working with Career Services &amp; Leadership Development <a href="http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/">http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/</a>, ongoing coordination. Development efforts to build the Student Advising and Learning Center (SALC) are under way. This physical space will unite the advising, tutoring, and other academic service centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Implement and prioritize a Course Availability Plan that will ensure student access to the curriculum, with the aim of increasing six-year graduation rates by 15 percent by | (Objective 1) | The Division of Undergraduate Education and Academic Planning is using <a href="http://www.ad-asta.com">Ad Astra</a> to predict student demand for courses in order to improve course availability and student access to the curriculum. Since the strategic plan has been developed, the CSU set |
| 2025 | graduation goals for each CSU campus. SF State's 2025 six-year graduation goal is 69%. The <a href="https://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/foundations-of-excellence-first-year-experience-task-force-report.pdf">SF State Campus Student Success Plan</a> outlines how we'll meet that goal. The Student Success and Graduation Initiative Task Force is charged with overseeing the implementation of the campus student success plan. |
| Implement a First-Year Experience program to provide a high-impact educational practice that can level the playing field for first generation students and for students whose prior educational experiences have not adequately prepared them for college work | (Objective 1) First Year Experience committee has been charged by the Academic Senate. CEETL has been in conversation with members of the FYE Committee about how professional development of teaching and learning will be an important element of a successful First Year Experience. Student Affair and Enrollment Management First Year Experience (FYE) administrator has been hired as well as a FYE Faculty Director to implement the recommendations of the year-long campus-wide Foundations of Excellence review of the first year experience of SF State students. The FYE will be integrated into the Lower Valley Community, which will house first-year students. |
| Implement an integration and engagement plan for non-tenure track faculty designed to make SF State a national model of just and fair non- | (Objective 2) Faculty affairs, Academic Senate, Human Resources CEETL has 2 Fellows and 2 Ambassadors who are non-tenure track faculty focused on developing CEETL’s |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure track faculty employment. Provisions of this plan will be ensured through appropriate revisions to SF State’s policy on Temporary Faculty</th>
<th>Climate and resources to support lecturer faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand universal coverage and access to quality healthcare and preventive services (e.g. physical therapy, screenings, health education/promotion, wellness programs)</td>
<td>(Objective 4) The Division of Student Affairs restructured health and wellness services to better reach students who are not regular users of the direct services provided by Counseling &amp; Psychological Services (CPS) and Student Health Services (SHS). Prevention educators from CPS and Health educators from SHS joined together to create a new unit: Health Promotion &amp; Wellness (<a href="http://wellness.sfsu.edu">http://wellness.sfsu.edu</a>). HPW staff work to connect with the 20,000 students who pay the SHS Fee but do not use the services of CPS or SHS. Staff employ evidence-based strategies to provide students with health and wellness programming on a variety of topics including: sexual harassment/health, AOD/smoking cessation, mental health, men’s health, nutrition, and housing/food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish benchmarks and targets for employee satisfaction that create institutional incentives for continued improvement in the quality of the employment experience</td>
<td>(Objective 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Value: Community**

**Community Objectives**
1. SF State will create a campus culture where students, staff and faculty are valued, respected, taken care of and treated fairly. As a consequence, they will want to engage, reciprocate and contribute to the well-being and advancement of the SF State community.

2. SF State will increase our engagement and responsiveness to student, staff and faculty concerns, and will heavily invest in infrastructure, virtual platforms and facilities that foster freedom of speech, intellectual exchange and social interactions.

3. SF State will strengthen an academic community based on collaboration, consultation, critical reasoning and diversity.

4. SF State students, alumni, faculty and staff will support and advocate for social justice, human dignity and environmental justice within our local and higher education communities.

5. SF State will strengthen opportunities for students, faculty, staff and alumni to engage with the community outside campus.

**Community Initiatives**

**Short-Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Community Initiatives</th>
<th>Community Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and initiate an annual survey to assess the quality of the work environment and the level of employee satisfaction</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>In Fall 2017, San Francisco State University formed a new division to promote equity and inclusion, advance social justice, improve the campus climate for all students and facilitate intercultural and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch a University-wide student, employee and alumni communication campaign that listens to their concerns on both virtual and non-</td>
<td>(Objectives 1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
virtual platforms and commit to addressing these concerns in a timely fashion

<p>| Continuously review and update student and employee orientation, advising and mentoring materials to cover all aspects of academic and professional success at SF State | (Objectives 1, 2) | Returning to a University Convocation in the fall rather than a Faculty meeting. CEETL did a thorough review and revision of New Faculty Orientation that was successfully facilitated in Summer 2017. A new Advising Hub has been implemented for orientation and advising materials. Implemented a new five week training program for all new campus academic advisors. |
| Establish a Student Engagement Task Force, recognizing that engaged and empowered learners feel a sense of belonging and confidence in their ability to contribute in class, on campus and within their communities | (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4) | This has been largely charged to the new FYE Committee (cross-campus university committee). |
| Launch a &quot;Giving Back&quot; campaign to encourage student organizations to | (Objectives 1, 4) | University Advancement partnered with Student |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives 1, 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Develop the necessary infrastructure to support and expand community-building, co-curricular activities (e.g., athletics, health/recreation/wellness, service learning, internships, study abroad) |

Office of International Programs [http://oip.sfsu.edu/](http://oip.sfsu.edu/) included this in their strategic plan for study abroad.

The Mashouf Wellness Center [http://dos.sfsu.edu/mwc](http://dos.sfsu.edu/mwc) opened in August 2017 and is an exciting, state-of-the-art, 118,700 square-foot facility, supporting general well-being by providing recreation and wellness programs and activities for the SF State campus. The Mashouf Wellness Center is a student-driven wellness center guiding development through transformative activities, creating a sense of belonging within our community, and being a key partner in integrating health and wellness across the University. The design intentionally reflects a multi-functionality of space to facilitate various activities and support student well-being.
support “a little something for everyone”, providing recreation, wellness, and event space to support activities and programs appealing to our diverse student body.

**Senate Academic policy** created rules for risk management (as required by a CSU Executive Order) of academic internships that is being implemented by ICCE starting Fall 2018.

The Campus Master Plan anticipates:
- New outdoor and indoor space for recreation
- New athletics venues, including an events center
- A new student union and health center, located on the Quad
- A greatly expanded social and study space program, offering open seating, gathering areas, study rooms, coffee shops, late-night food venues, etc.
- New landscapes that include much-needed places to sit, study, and socialize

<p>| Expand student organizations, peer-to-peer programs and services focused on community-building and student leadership | (Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) | ICCE continues to expand academic internship and community service learning opportunities. <strong>SF Build</strong> and the <strong>Center for Math and Science Education</strong> oversee supplemental instruction in the College of Science and Engineering. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase the current level of student and employee services by opening a Faculty and Staff Club, student nap rooms and short-term, low-cost childcare for students, faculty and staff</th>
<th>(Objective 2)</th>
<th>The university, in partnership with the Academic Senate and University Enterprises, will open a University Club in Fall 2018. The club, which will be located in the Cesar Chavez Student Center, will provide a much-needed space for faculty, staff, and administrators to gather. Associated Students provides low-cost childcare services for students through the Early Childhood Education Center <a href="http://asi.sfsu.edu/asprograms/ecec/">http://asi.sfsu.edu/asprograms/ecec/</a>. Mashouf Wellness Center and Health Promotion and Wellness are exploring options for student nap spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pursue an athletics plan that sees</td>
<td>(Objective 2)</td>
<td>As of Fall 2017, the average cumulative GPA of SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletics as part of academics, that focuses on athletes as students first and coaches as faculty, that acknowledges the benefits of athletics in terms of wellness and success and that offers student-athletes the tools they need to thrive as learners and members of the SF State community</td>
<td>State's student-athletes was over 3.16. In fall 2017, sixty-four Gators achieved a 3.5 or higher with all 12 teams represented in that number. Through Winter 2018, twenty-six SF State student-athletes to the CCAA All-Academic Teams and two wrestlers were named to the RMAC Wrestling Honor Roll. Both cross country teams earned the USTFCCCA All-Academic Award. Men's basketball and women's soccer each had a student-athlete named to the CoSIDA Academic All-District First Team in their respective sports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increase use of existing open space (e.g. grass fields, plazas) to facilitate social interaction (e.g., activities, events, recreation) | (Objectives 2 and 5) | The opening of the Mashouf Wellness Center in Fall 2017 creates a second outdoor recreation field adjacent to the wellness center building and across the street from the West Campus Green, which opened in 2012. The co-location of indoor and outdoor recreation vastly improves the opportunities for students to come together and interact socially. 

The Campus Master Plan currently underway provides well-placed sites for plazas, open space, and recreation fields near centers of campus activity. 

In the short term, the campus will fund a site furnishings initiative to add new exterior seating (chairs, tables, lounge chairs, etc.) across campus. This would be an immediate and highly visible response to the needs identified by students. |
Assess the status of global, transnational and international commitments on campus and study ways to further foster a global mindset and engage the campus in global social issues, such as justice and equity, to infuse these issues into the curriculum and strengthen our international partnerships and our support for short-term and long-term academic exchange of students, faculty and staff

| Objective 4 | Office of International Programs [http://oip.sfsu.edu/](http://oip.sfsu.edu/) included this in their strategic plan for study abroad |

Develop a corporate relations portal with a menu of services as a way to offer SF State staff and faculty expertise to Bay Area businesses and beyond

| Objective 4 |

Establish an annual marketing campaign that highlights SF State student and employee community services and the impacts of our efforts

| Objective 4 |

### Mid-Term Community Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-term Community Initiatives</th>
<th>Community Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop significant funding to support faculty and staff leaves (including sabbaticals) and assigned time for mission-aligned projects that engage domestic and global communities</td>
<td>(Objectives 1, 2, 4)</td>
<td>(Complete/Underway)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Establish a resource center for SF State students who are undocumented, AB540 or have been granted Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and provide them with information, guidance and support while fostering a sense of community for undocumented students to facilitate their success and pathway to graduation | (Objectives 1, 3, 4) | Academic Senate passed a resolution supporting DACA and the Dream Center) ([https://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/support-rights-sf-state-community-members-who-have-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals](https://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/support-rights-sf-state-community-members-who-have-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals))

San Francisco State University established the Dream Resource Center [http://undocugators.sfsu.edu / (DRC). The DRC supports the undocumented student population including those who may or may not qualify for AB 540. Information about resources that support the academic and personal success of undocumented students may be found at the center. Throughout each year the DRC provides a series of leadership & professional opportunities, financial aid resources, connections to legal support and informational workshops to give undocumented students the information they need to continue succeeding on campus. All students, parents, staff, faculty and community members are welcome at the DRC. |
<p>| Develop a successful athletic program that will foster SF State spirit, stimulate pride and encourage identification with SF State. Use enhanced athletics programs to leverage support from the Bay Area community and further long-term | (Objectives 1, 4) | National-caliber programs bring higher visibility: Men’s basketball was ranked in the Top 25 in 2016-17 and women’s outdoor track &amp; field has been ranked as high as No. 1 in the nation in 2018. In 2017, women’s track &amp; field won the NCAA Division II National Championship in the 4x400m relay. The wrestling program has also sent a national qualifier |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonds and connections with alumni and retired employees</th>
<th>Every year except 2017 since the 1964-65 season. Facility Improvements: Enhanced facilities help SF State to attract and retain competitive student-athletes. Improvements have been made to the Main Gym, Maloney Field, and SFSU Softball Field. A generous gift made possible the renovation of the George and Judy Marcus Athletic Performance Center, which benefits all of SF State’s student-athletes with weightlifting and cardio equipment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactively cultivate mentorship between alumni, emerging student leaders and new SF State students, in collaboration with faculty and staff. Ideally, these relationships would continue to enrich the professional lives of students and alumni well into their professional lives.</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 4) Career Services &amp; Leadership Development: <a href="http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/">http://careerservices.sfsu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a legacy event and traditions that create meaningful community connections between alumni, faculty, staff and students and promote a sense of belonging and community</td>
<td>(Objectives 1, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand high impact and experiential overseas opportunities for faculty, staff and students, especially non-traditional and underrepresented students, at all stages of academic study</td>
<td>(Objectives 1, 4) Office of International Programs <a href="http://oip.sfsu.edu/">http://oip.sfsu.edu/</a> - Gilman Scholars. SF State is number one in the nation in winning the Gilman Scholarships, for under-represented students studying abroad, and number two in the nation in the number of students participating in long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop programs and services under the auspices of the Mashouf Wellness Center to promote community well-being consisting of mental, physical, social and spiritual health components. (Objectives 1, 5)

Establish collaborative relationships with local, regional and global organizations through aligning and integrating their needs into curriculum and facilitating student work-experience opportunities with them, such as internships, consulting projects and practicum. (Objectives 2, 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Community Initiatives</th>
<th>Community Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with faculty, staff, Colleges, the Alumni Association and the Office of International Programs to build long-term, meaningful relationships with transnational and international students and alumni as critical members of the SFSU community, who contribute to the richness and diversity of our community</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>University Advancement and the Office of Alumni &amp; Constituent Relations have established relationships in Asia with a special focus on Taiwan and Hong Kong. The SF State Taiwan Alumni Chapter is the model program. The Taiwan Alumni Chapter established an endowment to support students from Taiwan studying at SF State. Similar chapters are planned for Hong Kong, Tokyo and South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with faculty, staff,</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>The Alumni Association has established the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and the Alumni Association to build long-term, meaningful relationships with underrepresented students and alumni as critical members of the SF State community who contribute to the richness and diversity of our community, in the process creating the space for pluralism and counter-stories, cultural and linguistic awareness, diversified learning opportunities, internships, sponsorships, programs and the like</td>
<td>Latino/Raza Alumni and Black Alumni Chapters to provide lifelong engagement with the University. Chapter members also provide support and mentoring with underserved students on campus. The Alumni Association and the Office of University Development also coordinated with LGBTQ faculty leaders this year to hold SF State’s first LGBTQ-focused alumni event, in addition to Advancement’s annual leadership in helping to organize an SF State contingent for the city’s international Gay Pride Parade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open an Alumni, Parents and Friends Services Center to provide hospitality in an energized, animated atmosphere. The Center could contain event space, gift shops, short-term housing, etc and could be the starting place for tours, orientations, etc</td>
<td>Included in Campus Master Plan. May be co-located with the welcome center (19th and Holloway) or with the hotel and conference center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work closely with faculty, the Alumni Association and the Office of International Programs to build long-term, meaningful relationships with students and alumni in other countries. Provide opportunities for these</td>
<td>The University has started preliminary plans to establish an alumni and visitors center on campus as part of the University’s comprehensive campaign, Bold. Thinking: The Campaign for SF State. Our working goal is to raise $150 million by 2020 for university and college initiatives, including an alumni center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Objectives 1, 4)</td>
<td>University Advancement, in partnership with the Office of International Programs, established its first partnership with a university in Baja California in 2015. The SF State and CETYS program provides for faculty and student exchanges between our two campuses. This is SF State’s first partnership with a university in Mexico. The bi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and alums to participate and contribute in exchanges, internships and excursion programs.</td>
<td>national university partnership will provide a model for engaging with other key institutions in Mexico and Latin America.</td>
<td>Cut the ribbon on the University Academic Center, an attractive physical space that will centralize student support services (tutoring, advising and internship coordination) and host such community-building initiatives as: peer-to-peer faculty mentoring, maker spaces for faculty and faculty-student work, public venues for symposia and conferences, as well as informal socializing, meeting spaces for faculty interest groups and advisories. (Objective 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Core Value: Resilience**

**Resilience Objectives**

1. SF State will become a nationally recognized leader in campus environmental sustainability.
2. SF State will develop philanthropic and entrepreneurial income streams that appropriately support the intellectual work of students, faculty and staff, regardless of state budget decisions, with the goal of bolstering institutional sustainability.
3. SF State will expand and support programs and services that contribute to personal resiliency (e.g., advising, career counseling, health/wellness and tutoring services and programs).
4. SF State will develop its faculty, curriculum, research and programming to become a national leader in mitigating the effects of climate change and fostering community resilience.

5. SF State will be a champion and advocate at the regional level in the areas of affordable housing, transportation and economic development on behalf of students and SF State employees.

**Resilience Initiatives**

**Short-Term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Resilience Initiatives</th>
<th>Resilience Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a timeline and set benchmarks for campus sustainability goals that will set the path to ensure that SF State leads the CSU in campus environmental sustainability. Additionally, the University will continue to align our auxiliary investment policies with our environmental sustainability commitments.</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>The University Corporation has conducted a comprehensive review of its investment policy and its asset allocation. Through this effort, U Corp has prioritized maintaining a socially responsible investment policy and its holdings reflect this. In keeping with the SF State Foundation’s leadership in socially responsible investing, in 2015, the Foundation established its first Green Fund with $5 million. This fund is composed of investments in alternative energy and other sources that are environmentally sound. In November 2016, the Foundation teamed up with the University to complete the Sustainability Tracking, Assessment &amp; Rating System (STARS) report. SF State received a Silver rating from the Association for the Advancement for Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) and an “innovation credit” for the carbon footprint calculator that the Foundation developed. Office of Sustainability is currently updating its STARS application. The University will submit this application in the Fall 2018 with the hope of achieving Gold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning and Design worked with local sustainability consultants, Urban Fabrick, to jointly develop the Sustainable Development Framework. This framework outlines the campus standards and guidelines for future construction projects. The campus has adopted LEED Gold as the minimum rating for current building projects (Holloway and Creative Arts).

The campus subscribes to an integrative design and planning process, including a community engagement component, that leads the campus toward a resilient and regenerative future. The master plan for the Estuary & Ocean Science Center at Romberg Tiburon Campus will follow this process.

The Office of Sustainability has embarked upon an update to the 2010 Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action and Sustainability Plan will set a timeline and outline projects that will help the campus achieve climate neutrality.

| Continue negotiations with area mass transit organizations to reduce transportation costs for students, faculty and staff | (Objective 1) | In partnership with Associated Students and other departments, Fiscal Affairs launched the Gator Pass, the first ever universal student transit pass in the Bay Area that provides significant discounts on both San Francisco Municipal Transit (Muni) and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART). The program is based on the adoption of a mandatory student fee through a student-led referendum process. Students' identification cards now... |
The University’s Office for Strategic Communications and Marketing is providing support to the alumni office in developing a marketing and communication plan to effectively connect and engage the university’s 260,000 alumni of record.

<p>| Establish a system of incentives for innovative and entrepreneurial activity on campus | (Objective 2) | Completed, see Courage Objectives |
| Develop an overall plan for the strategic alignment, sustainability and facilities management of satellite campuses, including the Downtown Campus, Romberg Tiburon Center, and proposed Bay View/Hunters Point locations. This will include ensuring that future investments in satellite locations are in line with the mission of the University, incorporate the needs and viewpoints of all stakeholders and meet financial benchmarks set by the campus and CSU | (Objective 2) | Planning and Design completed a historic resource evaluation for RTC / EOS Center in early 2018, as a first step prior to embarking on a comprehensive Campus Master Plan. |
| Develop a comprehensive alumni engagement plan to reconnect our graduates with the exciting things that are happening on campus | (Objective 2) |  |
| Establish targets for employee philanthropic support of the university, while acknowledging differential abilities to give within our diverse community | (Objective 2) | As part of building a culture of philanthropy on campus, we established a goal to reach 100% participation in philanthropic giving by the University’s leadership, including the Cabinet and deans. Philanthropic support by the university’s leadership will set the example and foundation to launch a faculty staff campaign in 2018. |
| Review University forms and business practices to reduce bureaucracy and increase clarity and efficiency | (Objective 3) | <strong>Quality Assurance Process Improvement Program</strong> – Administration &amp; Finance is working to continuously improve its processes and customer service in an effort to make the work we do as a university more valuable, streamlined, and efficient. As an important part of this effort, the Quality Assurance Team is launching a DocuSign pilot program within A&amp;F to assess how using electronic signatures can help us improve SF State as a whole. In reviewing forms for use in DocuSign, the Quality Assurance team has reached out to various departments to facilitate making their business processes more streamlined and user-friendly. This initiative has prompted departments to reevaluate their forms and processes and will result in improved clarity and reduced processing time. Utilizing electronic signature will also lower transaction costs, enhance productivity, and increase employee satisfaction, as employees can contribute to meaningful work that will impact SF State. |
| Consider prioritizing environmental sustainability and resilience within the faculty-hiring plan | (Objective 4) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-term Resilience Initiatives</th>
<th>Resilience Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure area-wide mass transit passes for all SF State students by fall 2018</td>
<td>(Objective 1)</td>
<td>Completed- Gator Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prioritize the creation and maintenance of state-of-the-art wireless and computing capability that fosters creativity, collaboration and innovation | (Objective 1, 2)      | **The Campus Wireless Augmentation** – Information Technology Services is performing augmentation of Campus wireless infrastructure to sustain continuously increasing demand for wireless signal availability and higher connection speed across campus. As of December 2017, the network team completed Phase 3 of the installations and doubled the number of access points for wireless connectivity across campus, providing for faster wireless access, more connectivity, and more reliable services. At a time when connectivity and speed of internet access are central to education, improving SF State’s wireless network has proved valuable. This project is anticipated to complete in May 2018.  
**The Campus Network Infrastructure** – The Common Network Initiative (CNI) is Information Technology Services’ ongoing effort to maintain campus baseline network infrastructure as technology advances and user needs evolve. The program provides for the refresh of each campus network infrastructure on a cyclical basis to ensure that the network infrastructure continues to keep pace with technology and meet the changing needs of CSU students, faculty and staff. Major project milestones include installing parallel |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorize the University Corporation to consider establishing a venture capital fund to support entrepreneurial projects of students, staff, faculty and alumni</td>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with campus and external innovators to establish “maker”-oriented laboratory spaces to foster creative applications of scholarship</td>
<td>Objective 2, 4</td>
<td>The new Science Building is programmed to include maker space to support these collaborations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address compensation levels and housing opportunities in light of San Francisco’s cost of living</td>
<td>Objective 2, 4</td>
<td>Housing for up to 30% of faculty and staff is included in the Campus Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop the necessary infrastructure to support and expand programs and services that foster academic and personal resiliency (e.g. academic and career advising, counseling, health/recreation/wellness, tutoring)  

(Objective 3) 

The [Campus Student Success Plan](#) will result in the hiring of 27 additional academic advisors that will focus on both lower division students as well as those nearing graduation. The Campus Student Success Plan also outlines increased resources for mental health professionals. The operational review of tutoring will be complete in December 2018 and will provide recommendations for how best to move forward to support students with tutoring services across the campus.

Initiate planning for a Center for Climate Change Resilience that will sponsor leading-edge, community-engaged research activities in support of local and global communities facing the impact of global climate change  

(Objective 4) 

Update the physical master plan to maximize affordable student and employee housing  

(Objective 5) 

SF State has received final approval for a new student housing community, which will help to address the housing shortage on campus. The new facility will open in Fall 2020.

Additionally, the university is in the process of updating its Campus Master Plan, with a focus on access to housing for up to 40% of students and up to 30% of faculty and staff.

**Long-Term**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term Resilience Initiatives</th>
<th>Resilience Objectives</th>
<th>Update (Complete/Underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open a new, state-of-the-art Science building on the main campus that provides the high-quality</td>
<td>(Objective 1, 2, 4)</td>
<td>Included in Campus Master Plan. Working with an architect consultant, SF State has completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching, research, laboratory and collaborative space that 21st century students, faculty and</td>
<td></td>
<td>a feasibility and program study for the new Science building. The university is now working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff need.</td>
<td></td>
<td>on a funding model to support implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously upgrade academic technology to ensure classrooms and labs are consistent with or</td>
<td>(Objective 3)</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better than the industry standards of specific fields of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch the Center for Climate Change Resilience</td>
<td>(Objective 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Student Success at San Francisco State means holding our students to high expectations and offering them the support they need to reach them. As a campus with a social justice mission at our core, we maintain excellence and equity to be fundamental and interlinking values: we want to see our students graduate with degrees that represent learning experiences of the highest possible quality, inclusive of all of our students.

Toward these ends, our campus plan is structured around six strategies:

1. improved course availability and curriculum;
2. coordinated, intrusive and strategic advising;
3. broad accessibility and visibility of student success data;
4. high-quality student experience in the first year of college for incoming freshmen;
5. effective, targeted support services to achieve educational equity (directed specifically at our first-generation, low-income and underrepresented students, with special attention to men of color);
6. short- and long-term planning for faculty hiring and development tied to curricular need and student success.

Rationale for Long-Term Plan

Our long-term campus plan aims to advance student learning and achievement, improve student retention and graduation rates, and eliminate any opportunity gaps affecting our first-generation, low-income, and traditionally underserved students. Institutional research has enabled us to identify the following key targets for our plan to improve student success:

**Time to Degree.** When asked “Will you have graduated in the time you expected?” 41% of respondents to the most recent Senior Exit Survey respond that they will not, an increase of five percentage points over the preceding year. Of those students reporting a delay, 46% attribute it to an inability to enroll in required courses. When asked to identify “the one thing that, if changes were made, would have improved your overall SF State experience the most,” 38% cited course availability; an additional 18% cited advising. A lack of available courses is compounded by a lack of quality advising, which could help students navigate the complicated course selection and enrollment process; together, these challenges contribute to student attrition and delay time to degree. By addressing both, we expect to reduce attrition, speed students’ time to degree, and increase our four-year graduation rates significantly.
Unit Load. Currently students graduate from San Francisco State with an average of 135 units—which represents 15 units more than the 120 units required for the baccalaureate by Title V (the equivalent of taking an extra semester). In four years of surveys, 42% of students reported taking courses that were not needed for graduation because required courses were unavailable. In addition, nearly half (49%) of surveyed students reported never seeing an advisor for help selecting and enrolling in courses, which further exacerbates the problem. We have also identified that in some cases the curriculum is a barrier to student progress to degree. By addressing course availability, inadequate advising and curricular redesign, we expect to significantly reduce graduates’ average unit loads—along with the costly delays that they represent.

Probation. Although most students who leave SF State without degrees do so in good academic standing, students who fall under academic probation are particularly vulnerable to attrition. Our institutional research reveals that over 22% of FTF and 18% of new transfer students are placed on probation, most in their first term at San Francisco State. These students’ outcomes are discouraging; of those students placed on probation, 72% leave without completing a degree. Particularly discouraging is the evidence of inequitable outcomes that probation manifests with students of color overrepresented (at 36% African American, 26% Latino/a, and 21% Asian American). We need to help these students before they reach the crisis point of probation. We plan to do so by improving our ability to identify and reach out to students at earlier stages of academic difficulty in order to get them the advising and tutoring resources that they need; working with faculty and colleges, we will also promote course redesign and supplemental instruction in courses with high failure rates in order to improve student learning and achievement. Finally, the Academic Senate recently passed campus policies to help students recover from probation. Starting Fall 2017, students who retake classes can replace a failing grade with a passing grade without permanently affecting their grade point average. We also revised our campus probation policy to require students on probation to see an advisor before they can register for classes.

Retention in the Lower Division. Most of our students who leave without achieving degrees do so in the lower division, with 34% of our first-time freshmen leaving before starting junior year. Evidence suggests that lower-division attrition results from a variety of factors, including a lack of engagement at both the curricular and co-curricular levels. Following a systematic and campus-wide analysis of the first year, we aim to address the causes of lower-division student attrition by improving the academic, social, and emotional experiences of our students across the university. Simply put, engaged students persist. When we challenge our students with high expectations—and offer them the individualized support they need to meet them—we see them succeed at the highest levels. We should ask for—and offer—nothing less.
Six SF State Strategies for Student Success

San Francisco State’s campus-wide Student Success and Graduation Initiative has identified the following strategies to improve student achievement, persistence, and graduation:

1. Course Availability and Curriculum
   In senior exit surveys, students consistently report “course availability” as one of the top two barriers to their timely graduation; indeed, a diagnostic report reveals that 46% of the university’s undergraduate courses are filled at or above 96% capacity, corroborating students’ complaint that many courses that are required for graduation are inaccessible to them.5

   Our campus strategy to increase course availability includes three components: 1) data-informed analysis of student course demand to enable effective curricular planning; 2) a fully-funded curriculum, including increased funding for lecturers, GTAs, and tenure-line faculty to teach required courses in high-demand major and general education requirements; 3) support for programs to analyze and restructure their curriculum and course pedagogy—with a special focus on pre-requisites, requirements, quantitative reasoning, and electives—in order to reduce students’ excess unit load and advance their progress to degree, academic achievement and success.

   These plans require the following resources:
   1. A tool to predict and analyze student course demand (Ad Astra Platinum Analytics; purchased with 2015-16 Student Success and Completion Initiative (SSCI) funds, which is a permanent allocation; additional funding sought to expand user training to department chairs and associate deans)
   2. Funding for additional sections of high-demand courses, which will require hiring additional faculty (to be determined)
   3. Support for programs to undertake curriculum revision (some efforts funded until 2017 with grants from Teagle and Keck Foundations as well as SSCI funds, additional funds are need)
   4. Funds to support the expanded Center for Educational Equity and Learning programs and services to assist with and complement faculty efforts to review and revise course pedagogies to better align with student success and graduation outcomes.

2. Advising
   The second-most identified barrier to timely graduation, according to the same senior exit surveys, is inadequate advising.6 In response, Academic Affairs conducted an operational review of advising in 2015-16, which utilized student surveys, focus groups, and analysis by external consultants. The final report
concluded that advising at San Francisco State is understaffed, uncoordinated, and unwelcoming or inaccessible to students; the report then offered cogent recommendations for building an integrated, strategic campus-wide advising system.\(^7\)

In response, we plan to hire new advisors in both the central Undergraduate Advising Center and the college-based resource centers who can share data and up-to-date knowledge about advising best practices and university policies and structures affecting student success. Advising that takes place in other administrative units will also be reevaluated. We have also begun to raise funds to renovate our central advising center into a more accessible and welcoming space for students in one-on-one and group advising sessions. And we are attempting to improve our data capacity (as well as the training necessary to advising staff) in order to facilitate a more strategic, case-management-based advising system that can direct help where it can best meet student need (as detailed in the next section). We also will strive to proactively identify students in need of assistance earlier in each academic term so that we can deliver “just in time” intervention and more structured, intrusive support.

The short-term plan monies allowed us to hire the equivalent of 10 FTE Graduation Specialists. They are already making a difference. The Graduation Specialists have reached out to students who should be graduating soon given their number of units earned. Just since January 2017, they’ve sent 5,966 emails, made 2,307 phone calls and met with 584 students as part of our high unit project. Prior to their advising appointment, 39% of students said they strongly agreed that they knew the university requirements to graduate. After the appointment, 97% of students strongly agreed or agreed. As noted below, we would like to make the Graduation Specialists permanent positions.

Additionally, the three temporary Student Affairs and Enrollment Management staff we were able to hire with short-term funds have been integral to processing graduation applications more quickly so that students have adequate time to take any courses that they additionally need, but may not have realized that they needed. With permanent funding, we hope to keep these important staff members.

These plans necessitate the following resources:

1. Hiring a minimum of 27 new advisors across the campus, including 6 advisors jointly appointed in each college and the Undergraduate Advising Center, who can be trained in e-advising and student success data management; 5 advisors to serve in the six colleges as retention specialists, focused on lower-division students (with one in each of the four largest colleges and one shared between the two smaller colleges); 10 advisors to serve as graduation specialists, focused on upper-division students (with two each in our four largest colleges and one in each of our two smaller colleges); 2 new advisors serving full-time in the Undergraduate Advising Center
focus on undeclared students and students changing majors, and 4 new career counselors serving in Career Services in the Dean of Students Office. (5 of the 27 have been hired with SSCI funds)

2. One-time support to complete renovation of the Undergraduate Advising Center and to renovate College Resource Centers in the College of Science and Engineering (COSE), the College of Health and Social Sciences (CHSS), and the College of Business. ($1.2 million of estimated $6 million already raised through grants and donors; additional funding sought.)

3. Student Success Data
Our plan to develop a more strategic advising system necessitates a responsive, accessible platform that makes student success data available to departments, colleges, and the central administration in order to monitor and address student degree progress. While the CSU Dashboards have been helpful in several ways, at the campus level, we need a technology solution that will enable more effective data analytics and predictive analytics to inform strategic decision making. Ideally, data will be captured in “real time” and longitudinally in the following ways:

- By class cohort, to track impact of large scale interventions over time
- By targeted student communities, to ensure that we close and keep closed any achievement gaps
- By major/program, to ensure ongoing curricular and co-curricular improvements are achieving intended goals and outcomes
- By courses/sections, to help improve teaching and learning outcomes

This plan requires the following resources:

1. Ongoing support for the student success platform EAB Student Success Collaborative, with additional support to train advisors, chairs, and other college administrators in data-driven student success efforts. (source not yet identified)

2. Support for a campus-wide data warehouse

4. The First Year of College
San Francisco State experiences its highest levels of attrition in the lower division, when 34% of our beginning FTF students leave without a degree before beginning their junior year. Institutional research has identified a number of factors that contribute to this unacceptably high attrition rates (in addition to course availability and advising):

1. Academic and social engagement: our campus NSSE results reveal disappointing levels of engagement among students overall, especially in the first two years of college, which we hope to address by scaling up our high-impact practices and advancing a high-quality student experience across the curriculum and co-curriculum; this will necessarily involve concerted efforts by both faculty and staff across the campus.

2. Poor fit with major: many of our students declare a major prematurely, without adequate guidance about appropriate majors that would align with
their goals and skills, contributing further to low engagement, underperformance, and attrition. Improving our lower-division curriculum, advising for undeclared students and career counseling will address this need;

3. **Sense of belonging**: with a campus that is extremely diverse, we will provide more purposeful, accessible and frequent opportunities for students to engage in meaningful ways around issues of inclusion, intersections of identity and social justice, as well as global community citizenship and service-based learning, which the research has shown can be powerful conduits for student connection, while also helping to improve the campus climate; goal is that students’ interests and values are supported and affirmed

4. **Bureaucracy**: Surveys of students consistently identify campus “bureaucracy” and “runaround” in the student-facing functions and units as a source of anxiety and discouragement. By better understanding the many points and levels at which students engage with the university, as well as identifying and resolving points of both overlap and inconsistency, we intend to create a more welcoming, user-friendly environment for beginning students and others.

5. **Health and wellness barriers**: The most prevalent health-related factors that SF State students report as negatively impacting their academic performance include: stress (31.4%), anxiety (20.8%), sleep difficulties (20.1%), and depression (15.7%). We have also found that our students, as many in CSU, struggle with food and housing insecurities. Faculty and staff across campus report that students’ mental health is affecting their learning, and that improved counseling resources are needed to meet students’ needs.

While San Francisco State historically served as a transfer institution, its growing numbers of entering first-time freshmen (including many from Southern California) require a new level of attention that involves a broad-scale culture-change on our campus among faculty, staff, and administrators. Similarly, an intentional shift from being a primarily commuter institution to one that increasingly serves students who live on campus requires us to restructure our models of campus life and student community, as well as organizing when and how we deliver instruction and student amenities.

To enhance our capacities to improve student engagement, new personnel resources needed include but are not limited to: (1) student organization advisers who will coach, mentor and develop student leaders and future leaders; (2) experienced student activities and events professionals who know how to involve students actively in the planning, delivery, and evaluation of comprehensive student programs, both small and large scale; and (3) health, including mental health, and recreation professionals to improve student wellbeing, decrease stress and increase active learning capacities (4) a first-year faculty director to collaborate with the FYE director being hired in Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and (5) faculty resources to teach first-year seminars and meta-major courses. Work should be
planned and delivered to purposefully close the student engagement gaps identified in our own NSSE survey results, particularly with lower-division/first year students. Implemented effectively, these programs can produce higher than predicted graduation rates.\textsuperscript{9}

To effect these changes, we have contracted with the John Gardner Institute to undertake a campus-wide “Foundations of Excellence” program over the next two years, beginning Fall 2016. We expect this program, which involves broad collaboration and inquiry across the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs & Enrollment Management, to help us better understand the experience of beginning students from a holistic, integrated perspective, while also fostering coalitions of faculty, staff, and administrators dedicated to advancing lower-division student success.

Foundation of Excellence committees are starting to share their recommendations, which include the need for a FYE Faculty Director, more advisors, an organizational structure around supporting first year students, increased coordinated programming for first-year students, and the consideration of first year seminar courses. Once we have a strategic plan for the first year for students at SF State, we will need funds to implement the plan.

We have also secured Keck Foundation funding to create a meta-major pilot in health-related fields in order to retain students by helping them consider majors outside of our highly impacted programs such as Nursing and Kinesiology. The funds have allowed us to redesign essential pre-requisite courses to increase student success. Permanent resources will enable us to scale this pilot and continue its coordinated approach.

This plan necessitates the following resources:
1. Foundations of Excellence contract (funded with SSCI allocation, shared across AA and SAEM)
2. Supplemental funds for meals, campus events, campus retreat
3. FYE program manager (to be hired by SAEM with SSCI funds)
4. FYE Faculty Director
5. Additional health, including mental health, and recreation professionals
6. Faculty resources to teach first year seminars and meta-major courses

\textbf{5. Targeted Support Services}

We are committed to eliminating any and all opportunity gaps, which represent our greatest barriers to educational equity and to our achievement of the social justice mission that stands at our university’s core.

Because first generation and/or low income students are often underserved, campuses that enroll a significant number of such students must invest in high-quality, responsive programs that promote and sustain students’ academic and social integration and achievement. We know that targeted support works: our long-
running Metro College Success Program, which enrolls first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students in learning communities with integrated tutoring and academic support, achieves five-year graduation rates of nearly double the university’s average. We are addressing our opportunity gaps by expanding Metro academies in the colleges, while also expanding our targeted support services to reach more students outside Metro.

Our low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented students currently lack a sense of belonging on our large, urban campus. In order to foster community and deliver targeted support on the co-curricular level, the campus is launching a search for a Director of Human Relations, with expected hire date by July 1, 2017. That inaugural incumbent will begin campus climate assessment efforts and initiate program planning to increase opportunities for meaningful engagement around issues of diversity and dialogue across difference, as well as strive to support civil discourse, reduce stereotype threat and promote intercultural learning. The Academic Senate has also been hosting faculty workshops on difficult conversations beginning in Spring 2017.

Another grant-funded campus program, SF Build, aims to reduce stereotype threat and improve student performance. Its researchers and practitioners have designed an intervention and studied the positive results,—especially among students of color. The Student Success and Graduation Initiative Committee (SSGI) has reviewed that research and now seek to implement the intervention for all new students. (We anticipate little cost to doing this.)

This plan necessitates the following resources:

1. Expansion of Metro academies across the campus (currently partially funded through the Governor’s Innovation Award but in need of permanent funding to support additional faculty, staff, advisors, and peer mentors)
2. Expansion of tutoring, particularly in writing and math (currently funded through SSCI; additional support sought)
3. Expansion of supplemental instruction aligned with high failure-rate courses (currently funded through grants but in need of permanent funding)
4. Expansion of the newly established Office of Human Relations (currently funded in part through SSCI; additional funding is needed to sustain programming expenses and additional educators/support staff)

6. Faculty Hiring and Development

In order for SF State to accomplish any of our SSGI goals, we need to have faculty in adequate numbers and with optimal training. We know that faculty play a key role in student retention. As faculty members work with students inside and outside the classroom, they make an important difference in students’ academic and social engagement and their experience of belonging and connection.
As a campus, we intend to implement a hiring strategy that will deliver the curriculum and meet student needs in highly-enrolled major programs. An intentional hiring plan will reduce bottlenecks and reduce students’ time to degree. Increasing course availability—one of our primary goals in this student success plan—is not possible without additional faculty.

As well as hiring more faculty, we seek to support our faculty’s engagement in their roles as teachers and mentors through professional development for tenure-track faculty as well as lecturers. Each of the six colleges at SF State created its own college student success plan through the collaborative efforts of faculty, staff, administrators, and students. A common theme across a wide range of disciplines was the need for faculty development. This theme recognizes the central role that faculty play by delivering high-quality education through the use of active classroom techniques, engagement in diverse classrooms with difficult dialogues, implementation of supplemental instruction, and tireless efforts to deliver a pedagogy consistent with the mission of social justice.

Currently we have three new campus- and college-level initiatives that target faculty professional development. Based on the assessment of these programs, our long term Campus Success Plan will expand on those elements of these programs that demonstrate to have an effect on student engagement and retention.

A group of six faculty members is working across colleges to investigate the effectiveness of applying social justice pedagogy, with a special grounding in stereotype threat reduction, to three sections of undergraduate Introduction to Research and Statistics courses in three different departments, compared to sections of the same course without a social justice pedagogy intervention. We selected this course because the math/quantitative reasoning components of the class are susceptible to stereotypes about women and historically under-served students lacking skills in this area. We are measuring sense of belonging in the course and the major, vulnerability to stereotypes, and course grades as outcomes.

In the College of Health and Social Sciences, the Dean is implementing a year-long Faculty Learning Community for the recently hired probationary faculty. The focus of the FLC is on social justice pedagogy. The goals are to provide new faculty with knowledge, self-awareness and skills to teach on a diverse campus and in a diverse classroom environment. Many of our newly hired faculty and lectures will not have had this experience. The FLC includes a range of pedagogy trainings, opportunities for course development, and faculty mentoring. In the program, through professional and personal development, faculty expand their roles as teachers, scholars, mentors, and advisers to have a positive effect on student learning, retention, and student success.

The university has launched a new Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL) that will uphold and scale out this commitment to engaged pedagogy in service to a social justice mission. CEETL aims to coordinate efforts
across the campus to assess pedagogy needs, develop programming, provide faculty mentoring, offer training in academic technologies to tenure track faculty and lecturers. The Student Success and Graduation Initiative Committee has identified lecturer turnover as a problem for retention. Beginning with CEETL but continuing throughout the colleges, we will improve support and inclusion for lecturers, in keeping with the important roles they play in educating our students and upholding our institutional values.

This plan necessitates the following resources:
1. funds to hire tenure track faculty
2. funds for CEETL (a) to expand the number of tenure track and lecturer faculty fellows; (b) to offer lecturer stipends for professional development projects during the summer
3. Programming in CEETL through hands-on workshops and faculty learning communities to support faculty development across the career span.

This long-term plan to improve student outcomes by addressing course availability, advising, student success data, the first year of college, student support, and faculty hiring and development will mobilize faculty, staff, administrators, and others who care about San Francisco State and its students. We have already made considerable investments as a campus; by directing future funding toward these identified areas of need, we expect to achieve dramatic improvements in our retention and graduation rates.
According to the most recent NSSE report, SF State students experience significantly lower levels of engagement than their peers at other campuses within comparative CSU, Carnegie Class, and NSSE 2013 and 14 campuses, particularly on measures of “Campus Environment,” including both “Quality of Interactions” and “Supportive Environment.” National Survey of Student Engagement, Engagement Indicators: San Francisco State University (NSSE 2014). http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/NSSE14%20Engagement%20Indicators%20SF%20State%29.pdf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Advising Center</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>SJSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(plus 3 vacant)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Professional Advisors</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>SJSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>SJSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Advisors to Student Ratio</th>
<th>SF State</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>SDSU</th>
<th>SJSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:1834</td>
<td>1:1100</td>
<td>1:1250</td>
<td>1:1038</td>
<td>1:1024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SF State Senior Exit Survey (San Francisco State: February 5, 2016), 3
| Academic Institutional Research, Summary of Highlights from Surveys and Studies, 2009-14 (San Francisco State University, 2015), 7.
| Summary of Highlights from Surveys and Studies, 2009-14, 4.
| According to the most recent NSSE report, SF State students experience significantly lower levels of engagement than their peers at other campuses within comparative CSU, Carnegie Class, and NSSE 2013 and 14 campuses, particularly on measures of “Campus Environment,” including both “Quality of Interactions” and “Supportive Environment.” National Survey of Student Engagement, Engagement Indicators: San Francisco State University (NSSE 2014). http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/NSSE14%20Engagement%20Indicators%20SF%20State%29.pdf
| SF State Senior Exit Survey, 5.
| SF State Operational Review of Advising.

American College Health Association. American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment II: San Francisco State University Executive Summary Spring 2016. Hanover, MD: American College Health Association; 2016.