SJSU SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

Graduate & Undergraduate Programs (GUP)

San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0030

Main: 408-924-2447
Fax: 408-924-2444
Email: Undergraduate.Studies@sjsu.edu

May 22, 2015

TO: President Qayoumi
Provost Feinstein
Deans & Associate Deans
Academic Affairs AVPs
FROM: Dennis Jaehne, Accreditation Liaison Officer
RE: WASC Visiting Team Report

Colleagues:

A few days ago we received the Visiting Team's draft report. We first checked for factual errors; then the Cabinet reviewed and approved release. We now have the final report (attached).

Our next steps are straightforward. President Qayoumi will send a formal response and thank you to the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) next week. Technically, the team report is a submission by the Visiting Team to the Commission. President Qayoumi and Provost Feinstein will appear before the Commission on June 18 at their quarterly meeting in Berkeley.

At that time we learn the Commission's official decision about the status of our accreditation for the coming years. The Commission's instructions, backed by findings in the Visiting Team report, will frame and guide our educational quality and student success efforts going forward until the next review.

WSCUC's transparency policy requires that they post the report and the Commission's findings on their website. We will post this report on our website next week and follow up with the official Commission response when it becomes available.

Rest assured that we are not surprised by anything in the report, which reflects and amplifies the commendations and recommendations the team reported at the end of their campus visit in April. We have already begun work on several of the recommendations. Some of our faculty colleagues will be working over the summer with assignments to develop action plans that will guide implementation in some areas in the coming academic year.

We will also convene the WASC Steering Committee at the start of fall semester to review the report and make recommendations for implementation.

I have addressed this to Academic Affairs leadership. I hope the other VPs will also forward as appropriate to their colleagues.
Thank you to all who participated in the many development activities during the preparation of the self-study and team visit.

cc: Nicole Loeser, GUP
Melinda Jackson, Assessment
Brandon White, Program Planning
Michael Kimbarow, Academic Senate
Lynda Heiden, Academic Senate
Jim Harvey, MLML
WASC Steering Committee

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

ACCREDITATION REVIEW

To: San Jose State University

April 13-16, 2015

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Dr. Linda Katehi, Chair, Chancellor, UC Davis
Mr. Les Kong, Assistant Chair, Librarian, CSU San Bernardino
Dr. Gary Ford, Professor Emeritus, UC Davis
Dr. Susan Opp, Associate Vice President, CSU East Bay
Dr. Tracy Poon Tambascia, Associate Professor, USC
Ms. Jane Wellman, Senior Adviser, College Futures Foundation

Dr. Richard Osborn, WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 WSCUC Senior College and University Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission.

The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

San Jose State University (SJSU), situated on 154 acres in downtown San Jose, in the heart of Silicon Valley, is the oldest in the 23-campus California State University (CSU) system —it was founded in 1857 and became the first institution of public higher education in California (California State University web site). SJSU is an institution with a long tradition and an important role within the CSU and in California. Its mission is *"to enrich the lives of its students, to transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society, and to expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship."* Its proximity to Silicon Valley provides it with a great opportunity to not only educate the future citizens of California and of the world but also create a workforce that can be competitive and informed in all professions recognized today and those to be developed in the future.

SJSU is a comprehensive university with eight colleges (Applied Sciences & Arts; Business; Education; Engineering; Humanities & the Arts; International & Extended Studies; Science; and Social Sciences). The university offers programs in a variety of academic and professional fields, and degrees include bachelors, masters, joint doctorate, and doctorate, plus a variety of certificates and teaching, service, and specialist credentials. It offers 73 baccalaureate degrees, and 71 master's degrees. In 2012, SJSU offered its first doctoral level program (a joint Doctor of Nursing Practice program with CSU Fresno). In 2014, SJSU admitted its first cohort to its new EdD program in

Educational Leadership. The academic calendar operates year-round and is organized into a semester system.

SJSU had an enrollment of 31,049 students at the time of submission of its institutional report. As of Fall 2013, nearly 80% of new students come from Bay Area counties (with 45% originating from Santa Clara County), and 92% of new students are California residents. The university is ethnically diverse, with nearly 60% of the students from minority populations (Asians comprise the largest component, at 32%; followed by Hispanics, at 22%). Distinctive from other CSUs, SJSU has a virtually equal distribution between male and female students, and the average age of undergraduate students is 22.7 years. The university is predominately undergraduate in nature, with 83% of all students enrolled (among the top majors are psychology, biological sciences, and business). The top five most popular graduate programs are software engineering, library & information science, electrical engineering, social work, and education.

There are also twelve campus locations for programs. A member of the team visited one of these locations, Moss Landing Marine Laboratories. The report of this visit, as well as the Distance Education Summary is included in the appendices.

The hospitality extended to the team by SJSU was most gracious and appreciated. The team met with a broad cross-section of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The team appreciated the candor, as well as the open and forthright manner in which comments were made in all of its interactions. The institution

provided convenient and comfortable meeting rooms, as well as technical support to assist with the team's technology needs. The team's requests for additional information during the visit were met with alacrity.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

WSCUC first accredited the institution in 1949. Since that time, reviews for re-accreditation have occurred at least once every 10 years. The most recent review period began when the campus submitted its institutional proposal in 2002. In 2011, the WSCUC Commission, in its letter to the San Jose State University President, acted to receive the 2010 Interim Report with commendations and recommendations noted in its letter; and requested that areas discussed in its letter be addressed in the next reaccreditation cycle.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards

San Jose State University has completed the Review under the Standards in a considered and analytical manner. Plans to address a number of areas needing improvement are in development (these are discussed in some detail throughout this report).

C. Component 3: Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their integrity, quality and rigor

SJSU has explored the meaning and integrity of degrees largely through the fairly recent process of developing University Learning Goals (ULGs). There were multiple task forces and groups such as the Mission, Outcomes and Meaning (MOM) group that worked on the development and implementation of ULGs in 2013.

The ULGs generally frame outcomes for undergraduates to include “the traditional depth in a program of study and breadth of knowledge expected of an educated person, as well

as core competencies for lifelong learning and professional success and advancement. They reflect our belief that it is important that SJSU graduates understand and are prepared to engage in civic responsibilities in a globalized world, epitomized by life in Silicon Valley."

The Director of Assessment and the Assessment Facilitators (all faculty roles) at each college have done an exemplary job of supporting departments and faculty in the assessment process. In addition, the facilitators helped programs map Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to the ULGs. In this process, faculty sometimes found the need to adjust PLOs, indicating not only a serious consideration of the learning needs of their students, but also a commitment to aligning programs to the university's broader learning goals. (CFR 2.3)

The general education program has not been reviewed under the Program Planning (program review) process, and the Director of the Board of General Studies (BOGS) noted while general education courses are assessed individually, the program has not undergone review. (See evaluation of Component 6 for additional information.) (CFRs 4.3, and 4.4)

Co-curricular programs in Student Affairs are also assessed and mapped to ULGs. However, some of the outcomes for student services and programs are so specific and disparate that it is difficult to frame or conceptualize broader learning goals for students. It may make more to sense to view student development services and programs through the lens of ULGs and the mission of Student Affairs, than to identify knowledge, skills or dispositions desired for SJSU graduates. Outcomes can be evaluated against current

programming and services, with a plan for addressing co-curricular competencies not adequately covered currently. (CFR 2.11)

Capstone courses have been created in 73% of SJSU programs. Faculty leaders held retreats and offered peer coaching on various ways in which capstones can be implemented. More discussion is needed to identify ways in which core competencies may be assessed through capstone experiences. (CFR 2.2a)

The ULGs expect graduate students to be "held to the same goals with the exception of the broad academic areas typically covered by general education at the baccalaureate level." While PLOs have been created for nearly all undergraduate programs, identifying PLOs for graduate programs is incomplete and ongoing. SJSU openly acknowledged that this process only began recently and that a great deal of work was still needed in assisting faculty graduate program coordinators in framing meaningful and appropriate learning objectives or outcomes for their graduate programs, especially professional masters degree programs. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, and 4.4)

SJSU has spent a commendable amount of time in developing ULGs and PLOs, and that information is now organized and featured on the university web site in such a way that it can be easily found. The institution noted in its self-study that student-friendly terminology and an increased presence of ULGs and PLOs would be beneficial. Increasing the accessibility of this information for students is important. Learning objectives are ineffective if students cannot easily grasp their meaning and application. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.4)

Commendation:

San Jose State University is commended for its extensive work in developing University Learning Goals and Program Learning Outcomes. It has organized and featured this information in a manner that makes it easily found on the university web site. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.4)

Recommendation:

Continue efforts to assess student learning outcomes at the program and university levels with particular focus on the development and assessment of graduate program outcomes that are clearly differentiated from undergraduate learning outcomes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6)

Suggestions:

1. **Examine student development services and programs through the lens of University Learning Goals, rather than identifying skills, knowledge, and abilities desired by San Jose State University graduates. (CFRs 2.11, and 2.13)**
2. **Conduct further discussions among faculty leadership to identify ways in which core competencies may be assessed through capstone experiences. (CFR 2.2a)**

B. Component 4: Achieving core competencies

Essay Four reflected a very detailed and organized approach to describing the plans for assessment of the five core competencies, although not all assessments were scheduled to take place at or near the time of graduation. SJSU is one of the first cohorts required to implement the new core competency requirement, and went above and beyond what was required in assessing more than one area. In particular, the core competencies of Information Literacy and Written Communication received evaluation using direct and indirect assessments, with assessment of Information Literacy being the most highly developed. The team reviewed some of the available reports on the university web site,

but found inconsistencies in length, format and details, making them difficult to read or understand. In addition, evidence of "closing the loop" on assessment of core competencies was difficult to find, which would be expected since there was not much time to implement the requirement. As noted in Component 3, assessment of core competencies through capstone courses is a work in progress. Though retreats and meetings have taken place, more work needs to be done in this area as the university continues to implement WSCUC's core competency requirement. (CFR 2.3)

The work to develop an assessment structure for Written Communication was substantial. Students are required to take the Writing Skills Test after 60 units and before completing 75 units so that writing deficiencies can be identified well before graduation and before students complete upper-division writing courses, designated as 100W courses. The decision to hire two tenure track faculty as writing specialists to oversee the 100W courses and to focus on student writing demonstrated a real commitment to the development of this competency. The 100W courses are offered in many, but not all, disciplines. Team interviews with the faculty directors of Writing Across the Curriculum and First Year Writing provided insights on how SJSU intends to prepare faculty to integrate advanced writing in courses. The directors plan to train faculty fellows, assess results, and build scalable programs that are sustainable.

Assessments in Information Literacy found weaknesses in student learning in specific areas. Information Literacy trainings are offered widely to students who attend general workshops and in classes such as 100W by invitation of the faculty. Online tutorials for Information Literacy also offer an assessment. Through this assessment, librarians

identified a few areas of weakness, including paraphrasing, plagiarism and online searching. Questions will be added to the online tutorial, *Infopower,* to address these areas of deficiency, although it was unclear if associated changes by faculty teaching 100W courses would also occur since the online tutorials are not required of all students. (CFRs 2.3, and 4.2)

Ample information from the 2014 *NSSE* (*National Survey of Student Engagement*) was provided to the team. The 2014 student participation rate was 19%, an increase from the 2011 survey, which had a response rate of 14%. The Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) staff who administered the survey to freshmen and seniors used a different sampling methodology that may have helped increase participation in 2014. A detailed summary provided by IEA noted a number of areas needing attention, including low overall satisfaction with the institution, educational growth, faculty teaching methods, and intellectual challenge. The university has not yet engaged in a thorough discussion and analysis of the *NSSE* results to determine areas of needed improvement, which is highly recommended. (CFRs 2.10, and 4.5)

<u>Commendation</u>:

The decision to hire two tenure track faculty as writing specialists to oversee the 100W courses and to focus on student writing demonstrated a real commitment to the development of the Written Communication competency. (CFRs 2.2a, and 2.3)

<u>Recommendation</u>:

The university should engage in a thorough discussion and analysis of the *NSSE* results to determine areas of needed improvement. (CFRs 2.4, and 4.5)

C. Component 5: Defining and promoting student success

Conceptually, student success at San Jose State University has been thoroughly defined by the Student Academic Support Services (SASS) unit. The university uses the benchmarks and goals for student success that were set for the institution by the Graduation Rate Initiative of the CSU System as their goals, meaning it has set a priority to eliminate attainment gaps for African American, Hispanic, and first generation low income students. SJSU's student population is now over 25% Hispanic, which qualifies the institution for *HSI* (*Hispanic-Serving Institution*) designation. It will be absolutely critical as the institution seeks this designation that it also proactively develops the programs, both academic and co-curricular, that will provide the students with a memorable and successful educational experience and make them productive citizens and accomplished professionals. While the institution celebrates its diversity, the team heard and saw real concerns about the campus climate, from staff, faculty, and particularly from students. Some of this traces to a widely publicized student incident of racial bullying over two years ago, which in the views of many could have been handled more expeditiously and in a more open and transparent manner. The team also heard some concerns about campus safety, an understandable issue due to the university's open campus environment in downtown San Jose. Since the bullying incident there has been an independently-led review of campus climate accompanied by special task forces on African-American and Latino students. The team noted considerable support for the progress that is being made, accompanied by continuing concern that the specific recommendations for change from the task forces have yet to be acted upon. (CFRs 1.4, 2.11, and 2.13)

As reported, overall there have been improvements in graduation rates, and the graduation rate gap between underrepresented students and non-underrepresented students has improved slightly. The causes for improvements in the graduation gap are not clear at this time, but the team acknowledges the recent efforts to address and improve the success of identified students groups, such as the efforts involving the African American and Chicano/Latino Student Success Task Forces. The team remains concerned that campus climate is still problematic, and an area that deserves continued priority attention by the university. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.5)

San Jose State University has electronic dashboards and milestones of student success that are exemplary in their flexibility, transparency and accessibility. The university is commended for the development of a comprehensive set of tools that allow incremental student success to be tracked, rather than having to rely on lagging indicators such as 6-year graduation rates. The tools provide easy access to data that can be disaggregated for undergraduate and graduate students alike. While these data and analyses are powerful tools, it is unclear how widely the university community engages with these data on a regular basis to guide decisions about programs and services that are needed by students. For example, while the report indicates that over 200 new programs, services and initiatives have been implemented by the Student Affairs division over the last 10 years, it is unclear what effects these services have had on student success. Thus the use of data and the integration of co-curricular with curricular programs to address particular problem areas need improvement. While the assessment of learning outcomes of individual co-curricular programs has progressed admirably, the effort seems to lack connection to an over-arching student affairs vision or plan for the future. The development of a

strong student affairs division and strategic plan, including plans for assessing overall effectiveness of efforts, is an imperative for the future success of the students of SJSU. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6)

Academic support services such as an Advising Hub provide easily accessed online information for both prospective and current students and their parents. In addition, outreach and support for students needing developmental coursework have helped lead to impressive remediation completion rates. SJSU has shown a willingness to engage in the use of alternative pedagogies to better support student success, particularly in regard to removing barriers for gateway and bottleneck courses. Some of these efforts, such as the use of *MOOC* (*Massive Online Open Course*)-style courses, have met with mixed success, while other efforts – both curricular and co-curricular – have shown greater success. (CFRs 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.8, 2.9, 2.12, 2.13, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7)

The lack of timely posting of transfer credits and a working degree audit system are areas that need and are receiving attention. These systems are crucial to providing students, both first-time and transfer, with clear roadmaps to degree completion. Updates on the progress of both initiatives need to be evaluated and reported to the university community frequently to ensure the continued success of these efforts. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14)

In terms of achieving student success, San Jose State University is a comprehensive institution with an array of challenges and of exemplary practices. With proper attention devoted to the challenges, and expansion and use of areas of distinction and exemplary practices, the student success goals of the institution are well within reach.

Commendation:

The university is commended for the development of a comprehensive set of tools that allow incremental student success to be tracked, rather than having to rely on lagging indicators. (CFR 2.10, and 4.3)

Recommendations:

1. **Proactively develop academic, as well as co-curricular programs to support the needs of underrepresented students at the institution. (CFRs 1.4, 2.3, and 2.11)**
2. **Institutionalize the successful pilot programs developed under the African American Student Success Task Force, and the Chicano/Latino Student Success Task Force. (CFRs 1.4, 2.11, and 2.13)**
3. **Develop a strong student affairs division and strategic plan, including plans for assessing overall effectiveness of efforts. (CFRs 2.11, 2.13, and 3.7)**
4. **Develop a student-centered approach to assess campus climate both qualitatively and quantitatively in a more systematic manner, including dissemination of *NSSE* survey findings. (CFRs 1.4, 2.10, 4.1, and 4.3)**

D. Component 6: Quality assurance and improvement

The institution is commended for having established a program review process known as program planning that is well defined, fully developed and generally well implemented. The process is based on standard procedures having all of the necessary elements, established cycles for review, and posted reports. The elements involved include a self-study report incorporating provided institutional data and an external review, recommendations by the Program Planning Committee (PPC) that are presented to the provost, and finally the formulation of an action plan as described below. The process was re-assessed and revised in 2013. A new template for program planning reports was prepared containing detailed instructions in an attempt to reduce the large disparity in reports received. A timeline for reaching a goal of 100% participation and renewed efforts have been made to ensure that program reviews took place as scheduled, as recommended in the 2011

Interim Report Committee letter. However, as explained below, additional efforts must be made to fully meet these recommendations. (CFRs 2.4, 2.7, 4.3, and 4.5)

The final step in the process is an Action Plan Meeting, inaugurated in 2012-2013, attended by department faculty, its dean, the PPC chair, several associate vice presidents and the provost. The PPC Letter to the provost forms the basis of discussion. This leads to a documented action plan identifying typically the top three to five priorities that are to be addressed by the department. These milestones and a timeline are agreed upon by all parties and the document is signed by the department chair, dean, and provost. In a recent change in the process, the PPC chair is now responsible for monitoring and enforcing progress on the action plan. Future WSCUC reviews should determine if this responsibility has been met. (CFR 2.4)

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of this revised program review process, a review was conducted of thirteen departments that prepared self-study reports in 2012 or 2013, leading to action plans in 2013 or 2014. These departments were Humanities, Art & Art History and English and Comparative Literature (College of Humanities and Arts); Economics, Environmental Studies, Political Science, and Urban and Regional Planning (College of Social Sciences); Chemistry, Geology, and Mathematics (College of Sciences); Kinesiology and Nursing (College of Applied Sciences & Arts); and Business Administration (College of Business).

The program planning process was found to be transparent, with the self-study, PPC and action plan reports posted on the web on a timely basis. The reports of the external reviewers were not posted, but summaries of their recommendations are given in the PPC reports. Of the 15 department reviews in 2013-2014, only two programs missed deadlines, a substantial improvement over past outcomes. Of seven programs listed as currently under review in 2014-2015, as of April 2015, all but one had a self-study report posted as required. Several programs are listed as having been granted an extension but the PPC chair was confident that these programs would be reviewed by the end of the current academic year. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, and 4.5)

Departments uniformly document in their self-study report their strengths, which include their highly dedicated faculty who provide excellent service to their students and the university (however, see *NSSE*). According to the program planning self-reviews, faculty manage and conduct strong undergraduate and graduate programs, develop creative interdisciplinary curricula, provide excellent academic advising services and are responsive to students' diverse needs, interests, learning styles, and career goals. The faculty are engaged and productive in scholarly endeavors. These strengths are echoed and reinforced in the PPC reports to the provost. The institution should be commended for the productivity and performance of the departments and their faculty. Not to denigrate these strong records, the remainder of this analysis of program review will of necessity focus on challenges and shortcomings. (CFRs 2.4, 2.8, 3.1, and 4.1)

The focus of challenges in many of the self-study reports were typically those of perceived inadequacy of resources: faculty, staff, infrastructure and space. The usual argument was that these resources decreased during budget cuts in recent years, leading to increased student-faculty ratios and workload, and that the cuts should be restored. These arguments would have been stronger if they had been accompanied by evidence that student success had been compromised by the inadequacy of resources. Program review does not appear to be an effective process for addressing resource issues, as the action plans reviewed recommended, at most, that departments make requests through alternative processes for increased allocations. In the minutes of a fall PPC meeting, the chair noted issues regarding space and faculty were consistent in most program plans. The PPC made plans to develop a letter to the provost at the end of the academic year alerting him to recurring issues found in most department reports in hopes that solutions can be found for some areas. The action plans reviewed made few recommendations regarding learning outcomes and their assessment. This issue is discussed further in the following section of this report.

Issues of student success, curricula, and numbers of majors were common themes of the recommendations in the action plans. Student success issues included recommendations to consider methods to improve graduation rates; exploring ways to improve advising; and addressing time to degree delays due to class unavailability. Curriculum issues included expanding coverage of topics, reviewing the continuation of multiple program concentrations and considering the revamping and renewing of a certificate program.

Recommendations regarding the number of majors in programs included evaluating efforts to increase enrollment; increasing community college outreach; and in the case of a few programs, reigning in uncontrolled growth. (CFRs 1.2, and 4.3)

The action plans reviewed tended to provide rather passive recommendations rather than firm directives. They suggest reviewing, studying, addressing, considering, or preparing a plan or proposal. The PPC is aware of this and is making an effort to make the recommendations more directive, in a well-advised attempt to improve action plan completion. (CFR 2.7)

From reviewing the program planning self-study reports filed in Spring or Fall 2014, but not yet acted upon by the PPC, a sense of the status of the program review process can be made. The revised template for the program planning reports is much improved. Assessment of student learning is given much greater emphasis. The section on program resources has been moved down to section 5, so this topic was no longer dominating the self-study reports. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.7)

To conclude this review of the program planning process, it appears to be well planned and well conducted, but one that requires considerable expense and effort to achieve modest outcomes. The goals must be clarified and the process made less burdensome and more sustainable. (CFR 2.7)

In annual assessment reports submitted in 2013-2014, all departments had mapped their PLOs to the ULGs. Most departments performed the mapping only at the highest level of

the ULGs, not at the sub-goal levels. In addition, the team notes that many of the courses are evaluated on the basis of grades students earned in the courses rather than on direct assessments of learning, contrary to best practices in learning assessment. The gap that remains to be closed is for programs to own and assess that their graduates are meeting general education outcomes and goals. Progress on this issue should remain an issue for future reviews. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.4)

Having defined PLOs and mapped them to the ULGs, the critical next step for the institution and its departments is to assess the extent to which each of the PLOs are achieved. Program assessment at the institution is an integral part of the program review process, coupled with an annual program assessment report required of all departments. Both the program review and the annual assessment processes have been revised substantially since 2012. To evaluate the effectiveness of these processes, the review that was conducted and described above of thirteen departments that recently underwent program review was extended to consideration of the program assessment element.

If the program planning process results for the thirteen departments reviewed are representative of all departments, several conclusions can be made regarding assessment of student learning by the institution. PLOs have been defined for the majority of programs and they have been mapped and aligned to the ULGs, although these are under revision in some programs. Full descriptions of direct assessments of PLOs are lacking for most programs. In several programs, the student assignments that were to be used to assess the PLOs, which include writing assignments, laboratory reports and examination questions

in specific courses are described. However, typically missing were the rubrics to be used to judge the performance of the students on these instruments. For some programs, it was reported that diagnostics were conducted and the numerical results for these diagnostics were given, but the diagnostic itself was not described. There is often an admission that more effort is required in PLO assessment. For most programs, some conclusions about shortcomings in student learning are provided, but the evidence for these conclusions is missing. Changes are often made in courses or curricula in attempts to improve student learning, but methods for assessing the impact of these changes are not described. The Program Planning Committee letters to the provost consistently recommended full development of PLOs, alignment with ULGs and full development of direct measures of PLO assessment. However, the action plans often made no mention of PLOs or assessment, which is a significant failure of the program planning process. The Program Planning web site describes program planning as "a future-oriented process based on program assessment." It does not meet this description if action plans do not specify the use of direct assessment methods when these have been shown by the self-study reports and the PPC committee reports. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, and 2.7)

The institution is actively engaged in improving assessment processes as indicated by the appointment of a faculty assessment director and faculty assessment facilitators to guide assessment practices (see also evaluation of Component 3, above). The university is to be commended for this approach. (CFRs 2.4, and 4.5)

Annual reports of assessment activities are required of all degree programs. While these reports have been required for several years, revisions to the process have been implemented since 2012. Guidelines were revised to delineate more clearly the assessment process and requirements. The Program Assessment web site was revised to provide links to resources needed to develop a sound assessment process and to prepare the annual report. A review of several of the reports submitted in 2013-2014 showed considerable progress in defining PLOs, mapping them to the ULGs and the curriculum and an assessment schedule. Progress often ended at this point, with plans to devise and implement assessment strategies during the following year. The assessment committee provided feedback on these reports and departments were to use this feedback to improve curricula, pedagogy, and/or assessment methodology for future annual assessments. This is a recently revised process, so it should remain an issue of future reviews. (CFRs 2.3, and 2.4)

Another element of assessment requiring review is that of General Education, overseen at the institution by the Board of General Studies (BOGS), a faculty committee. The Guidelines for General Education, American Institutions, and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) were revised in Spring 2014, with an implementation date of Fall 2014. Each course coordinator is to prepare a brief annual report documenting the assessment of each GE (General Education) course. All of a department's GE courses are to be reviewed during the normal program planning cycle. The first GE reports under the new guidelines were submitted in Fall 2014 and as of April 2015, BOGS was beginning to review these reports. The BOGS review and recommendations are to be

included as an attachment to the Program Planning letter to the provost, to be considered for inclusion in the Program Planning Action Plan. Thus, the process for GE review is just being defined and implemented, so assessment of the GE program should be a topic to be addressed in an interim review of the institution. (CFR 2.4)

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) provides assessment information, decision support, and analysis to support the mission of the institution. The IEA web site provides a broad range of institutional data, organized in categories by students, courses, assessment, retention/graduation and other reports. The office provides a rich set of required data elements for each program review and for the annual assessment reports. (CFRs 4.1, and 4.2)

Commendation:

The institution is commended for having established a program review process known as program planning that is well defined, fully developed and generally well implemented. (CFR 2.7)

Suggestion:

The goals of the program planning process should be clarified and the process made less burdensome and more sustainable. (CFR 4.3)

E. Component 7: Sustaining financial viability and planning for the changing environment for higher education

This section presents an assessment of San Jose State University's performance with respect to CFRs 3.4, 3.5, and 4.7, concerning finances, technology resources, and anticipating changes for the future affecting planning, programs and resources.

The fiscal context facing the institution is such that the last ten years has been a time of unprecedented resource instability and challenge at SJSU as it has for higher education across the country. The *California Master Plan*, while nominally still intact, has ceased to be a meaningful anchor for state funding policies for higher education in California. While California has adopted general goals to increase postsecondary access and degree attainment, these have yet to be translated into specific policies that serve to guide resource allocation in the state. The great recession of 2007-2008 caused unprecedented reductions to public funds, accompanied by precipitous tuition increases. At San Jose State University, this meant budget cuts, faculty and staff layoffs, and reductions in funds necessary to meet student demand. The budget cuts fell particularly hard on the academic program at SJSU, which by 2012 had increased its reliance on part-time faculty to among the highest levels in the CSU system. The reductions in tenure track faculty positions inevitably hurt the teaching programs, through expansions in class size and elimination of class sections. The institution is now impacted in all programs, meaning that admissions requirements are increasing for all students, both new freshmen and transfer students, and priority is given to students from within the local service area of the university.

Since 2013, with the passage of Proposition 30, state funds have once again started to increase modestly, but not enough to replace lost 'base' funding nor to meet current student demand. The *California State University Board of Trustees* has implemented a policy designed to protect academic quality by imposing strict enrollment caps on campuses that exceed targets for resident student admissions. Until recently, campuses that exceeded those targets were required to return tuition revenues from "excess" enrollments to the system.

The depth of the budget problem has led to some positive fiscal policy changes for the CSU and for SJSU that remove long-standing constraints on the institution's ability to manage resources through new regulations. Campuses now retain tuition revenues previously held by the state as one important example. CSU still does not enjoy the same degree of autonomy for institutional fiscal control as does the UC (University of California), but the long history whereby the CSU was treated as a state agency for resource management is over. These new regulatory freedoms will allow greater decentralization of fund management including budget planning for all the CSU campuses.

Despite these positive changes, the long-term trajectory for new state and tuition funding remains somewhat grim. It appears likely that annual increases in revenues will scarcely be enough to cover fixed costs, much less to meet enrollment demand and provide for program enrichment. San Jose State University will need to look for alternative sources of revenue, and must continue to find ways to reduce costs and to increase efficiencies if it is to be successful in maintaining access, improving success and expanding programs to

meet the needs of the region. It will also likely continue its evolution away from a traditionally funded 'state' institution into a financial structure more like private nonprofit institutions. This will require continued pursuit of new sources of unrestricted revenues, and will also require continued transition in budget practices to encourage multiyear fiscal planning. (CFRs 3.4, and 4.7)

In this environment of severe fiscal constraint, the team finds substantial evidence that SJSU's leadership team has been both responsive and responsible in evolving fiscal policies and practices to recognize these new realities. Since 2012, leadership has eliminated a lingering $12 million operating budget deficit. Plans are in place to continue to expand international enrollments, and aggressive fundraising plans are in place for philanthropic and research funding. The structural budget deficit has been eliminated. Fund balances are positive, and financial ratios are healthy. The university has additionally addressed lingering budget reductions in academic programs by embarking on an aggressive plan to increase new faculty hires by 63 new fully funded faculty 'lines.' This will result in a major transition in the composition of the San Jose State faculty, and with that a profound opportunity for reenergizing the campus with a new generation of teacher scholars. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 3.6, and 4.7)

SJSU's leadership has also addressed budget deficits in the academic program through an infusion of funds back into Academic Affairs. With that, the provost and president have implemented a new budget allocation system, with delegations of authority to deans over the management of their budgets, and a budget allocation model that distributes funds using an induced course load model that is based on historic enrollment patterns and costs

differentiated by level of instruction. It is an analytically sound and fair basis for funds allocation, and should over time improve both transparency and reliability in academic budgeting at the campus. (CFRs 3.4, and 4.7)

In this environment of generally positive forward budget momentum, the team has found a number of areas of some concern, and these are commented on below.

1) Continued disconnect between public policy and academic and financial sustainability. While much has been done at SJSU to address academic priorities and to put the university on a more sustainable fiscal base for the future, there is still a problematic gap between the institution's public mission of access and student success and the reality of current and likely future state funding for the institution. This is not a problem that is unique to SJSU: it is a system issue, and must be addressed at the system level. The policies that penalize campuses for exceeding enrollment caps, while designed to protect academic quality, also have the consequence of penalizing institutions that try to do more to find ways to increase efficiencies and to deliver high quality programs at reduced costs. The impaction policies have likely already hurt campus efforts to increase diversity, and this will only get worse over time. Of greatest concern, the team learned that these caps have resulted in SJSU turning away some significant number of incoming community college transfer students who have successfully completed the course sequence to 'guarantee' their transfer to a CSU campus. To be sure, these students may be accommodated at another CSU campus, but policies to ensure that and to protect transfer guarantee enrollments have not yet evolved at SJSU. (CFRs 1.6, 2.14, and 3.4)

2) SJSU has increased international student enrollment by nearly 42% in just the last three years, and has plans to continue increases in the future.

This growth has resulted in a welcome infusion of unrestricted new tuition dollars that represent the greatest area of discretionary revenue within the SJSU budget. Greater cultural diversity from international students is educationally beneficial to the institution, and can help to anchor plans for expansion in graduate enrollments and in sponsored research and economic development. The institution must also ensure that these students are appropriately supported both in the curricular and co-curricular environment, to ensure that they are able to get the classes and support services, specifically those tailored to the distinct needs of international students, they need to progress to degrees. (CFRs 1.4, 2.5, 2.8, and 2.11)

3) The institution has five auxiliary 501(c)3 organizations, each with an independent board of directors: the *Research Foundation*, the *Tower Foundation* (for philanthropy), the *Student Union*, the *Associated Students*, and the *Spartan Shops*.

No other CSU campus has this many auxiliary associations. There is general understanding that the regulatory climate in the SJSU and elsewhere in the CSU may have justified the creation of auxiliaries in the past, as necessary to provide autonomy necessary for successful fundraising in a highly competitive and entrepreneurial funding environment; but the recent changes in controls in SJSU mean that there is no longer a regulatory rationale for independence for these auxiliary organizations. The auxiliaries carry very high fixed costs, as each maintains its own administrative and financial infrastructure. It appears that the reimbursements of indirect costs to the campus to pay for maintenance and facilities are less than they should be. The potential for the organizations to operate competitively rather than collaboratively is high, particularly in the

overlap in responsibilities between the *Research Foundation* and the *Tower Foundation*. Moreover there is a potential gap between the fundraising goals of these associations and the strategic research priorities for the campus as a whole. While absolute consolidation of auxiliaries may not be a practical possibility (the Education Code requires a separate auxiliary for the *Associated Students*), opportunities for greater consolidation of services and for improved coordination of fundraising efforts across the auxiliaries should be pursued. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, and 3.6)

In the Fall of 2011, under the leadership of the then new president, the institution undertook a very public effort with a very aggressive timeline to develop a strategic plan, called *Vision 2017*, that outlines the strategic goals and objectives for SJSU (San Jose State University web site). While the vision process was public and bold, the very short timeline that was followed to form that vision has left many faculty feeling not engaged in the process which they do not think they own, even if they do not disagree with the elements of the vision. (CFRs 4.5, and 4.6)

Adding to this perception, the extensive transition in leadership has made implementation of this plan more difficult than it should have been. For example, many of the staff mentioned, that due to the very high leadership transitions felt in the past four years, *Vision 2017* has not been operationalized to allow the various units to work towards achieving the common goals and objectives outlined in the plan.

SJSU has a legacy of respect for academic freedom and strong shared governance which is also visible in the expectations of the faculty for open and transparent participation in governing the university successfully. A number of actions early in the president's tenure,

including the accelerated timeline for the development of the strategic plan and an early commitment for substantive investment in information technology infrastructure, without enough participation from the faculty senate, led to substantial complaints by the faculty senate and the request from the CSU Chancellor of a review of SJSU's policies and practices in relation to shared governance. In response to this, the university organized two major retreats between the faculty and administration that led to the clear articulation of expectations from both sides. This incident is indicative of a lack of trust between faculty and administration that needs to be addressed and the need for transparency on both sides. The development of a stable top leadership and a continuous effort for outreach to the faculty has the potential to bridge the gap between administration and the faculty senate. For example, the faculty extensively mentioned their satisfaction with the continuous outreach of the provost. They hope for similar efforts to take place by the new permanent members of the administrative leadership team. (CFRs 1.7, 4.5, and 4.6)

The institution is committed to transparency and the new provost, along with the president, are working hard to accomplish this. However, there is a need to develop trust among and across the various community groups and towards the administration to be able to address the challenges faced by this leadership team. (CFR 1.7)

The university has drastically increased the number of international students but there is a sense that the needs of the incoming international students are not receiving the attention they should either in student support services or in assuring them of access to required courses. The team heard some acknowledgement that more needs to be done to invest in appropriate supports for international students. However the team saw little evidence of

real planning or action to address the needs of international students. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, and 2.13)

SJSU provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. The university provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture. (CFR 3.5)

Criteria for Review 4.7 seeks information about ways that the institution is positioning itself for positive change and growth in an environment of rapid change in postsecondary education. Finances are changing rapidly, student demographics have and will continue to change, faculty are changing, and academic delivery models are changing. San Jose State University was an early and visible proponent of experimentation in technology-mediated instruction via its piloting of the *Udacity* and *EdX* models for delivering courses. The early experiment with *Udacity* appears not to have been successful, either as measured by student outcomes and evidence of learning or in finances. The use of *EdX* as part of a flipped course model met with much greater success. The decision-making process for choosing these particular models of innovation may not have been as systematic as it perhaps should have been. Nonetheless, the team applauds the initiative

and the willingness to explore new ways to deliver education in a more cost-effective and educationally sound way in the future. The fact that the first SJSU experiment with *Udacity* was not successful is less concerning than not having experimented at all in the first place. (CFR 4.7)

Commendations:

1. **The institution has succeeded in eliminating the budget deficit and for creating a modest surplus which allows the university to make important investments. (CFR 3.4)**
2. **The institution is to be commended for the development of analytically-based measures that aid in the allocation of resources. (CFRs 3.4, and 3.6)**

Recommendations:

1. **Continue steps toward stabilization of leadership at the cabinet level. As part of this effort, maintain progress toward clarification and improvement in processes of shared governance between president, cabinet, and senate; and address issues of siloed decision making across divisions of the institution. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8)**
2. **Devote adequate time to thoughtfully engage the campus community in improving and refining the strategic plan so that the entire campus community has ownership of the plan. (CFRs 4.5, and 4.6)**
3. **Improve enrollment management to ensure adequate staffing to accommodate incoming transfer students, especially those with 'guarantees' consistent with state policy. (CFRs 2.14, 3.1, and 3.4)**
4. **Address resource needs associated with growth in international student enrollments to ensure that they receive appropriate curricular, co-curricular, and student services support. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 3.1, and 3.4))**
5. **Address fragmentation across auxiliaries that present potential problems vis a vis leveraging resources, integration of fundraising consistent with academic priorities, and integration of research activities with campus-based efforts to advance research and innovation administrative/overhead. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, and 3.6)**

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations:

1. San Jose State University is to be commended for its outstanding work in preparation for the WSCUC visit and great organization during the on site visit. The attention to detail by the staff was especially appreciated.

2. The institution is to be commended for the energetic commitment of the leadership, faculty, and staff for moving the campus forward with initiatives to ensure continuous improvement. (CFRs 3.6, and 3.10)

3. The institution has succeeded in eliminating the budget deficit for creating a modest surplus that allows the university to make important investments. (CFR 3.4)

4. The institution is to be commended for the development of analytically-based measures that aid in the allocation of resources. (CFRs 3.4, and 3.6)

Recommendations:

1. Continue steps toward stabilization of leadership at cabinet level. As part of this effort, maintain progress toward clarification and improvement in processes of shared governance between President, cabinet and senate; and address issues of siloed decision-making across divisions of the university. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8)

2. Devote adequate time to engage the campus community in improving and refining the strategic plan so that the entire campus community owns the plan. (CFRs 4.5, and 4.6)

3. Continue efforts to assess student learning outcomes at the program and university level with particular focus on the development and assessment of graduate program outcomes that are clearly differentiated from undergraduate outcomes. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, and 4.4)

4. Improve enrollment management to ensure adequate academic staffing to accommodate incoming transfer students, especially those with ‘guarantees’ consistent with state policy. (CFRs 2.14, 3.1, and 3.4)

5. Address resource needs associated with growth in international student enrollments to ensure that they receive appropriate curricular, co-curricular, and student services. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 3.1, and 3.4)

6. Develop a student-centered approach to assess campus climate both qualitatively and quantitatively in a more systematic manner, including dissemination of *NSSE* survey findings. (CFRs 2.10, and 4.5)

7. Institutionalize the successful pilot programs developed under the African American Student Success Task Force, and Chicano Latino Task Force. (CFRs 1.4, 2.11, and 2.13)

8. Address fragmentation across auxiliaries that present potential problems vis a vis leveraging resources, integration of fundraising consistent with academic priorities, and integration of research activities with campus-based efforts to advance research and innovation administrative/overhead. (CFRs 1.7, 3.4, and 3.6)

Appendices

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW CHECKLIST

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Where is the policy located? http://info.sjsu.edu/web-dbgen/narr/static/schedules/credit.html
	Comments: The senate policy can be found at: http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/S12-3.pdf
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: All course update requests require submission of a current syllabus at which time credit hours, learning outcomes, and required policy statements are present. Credit hour assignments are reviewed by the Program Planning Committee every five years as part of the program review process. College Associate Deans review a sample of courses from each department each semester and create a record of any deficiencies noted, along with the date corrected.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Class schedule published each semester and found at: http://info.sjsu.edu/web-dbgen/splash/schedules.html. Class meeting time report showing discrepancies are posted at: http://www.sjsu.edu/academicscheduling/Academic_Scheduling/Class_Meeting_Time_Report/. This report helps programs make required adjustments during the schedule building period.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 10
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Both
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters
	What discipline(s)? Biology (BIOL 10), Business (BUS2 90), Communication (COMM 041), English (ENGL 71), Health Science (HS 261), American Studies (AMS 1A), Anthropology (ANTH 13), Chemistry (CHEM 1A), Electrical Engineering (EE 250), Psychology (PSYC 1)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Extremely well-detailed syllabi
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 5
	What kinds of courses? Internship, laboratory, clinical, independent study, fieldwork
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters
	What discipline(s)? Justice Studies (JS 181), Electrical Engineering (EE 97), Nursing (NURS 147A), Kinesiology (KIN 286), Psychology (PSYC 243)
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Equivalent work well documented in syllabi
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 10
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? BA, BS, BFA, MA, MS, MSW, MUP
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors, Masters
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology, Art, Biological Science, Communication Studies, Economics, English, Geology, Nutritional Science, Social Work, Urban Planning,
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☒ YES ❒ NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Gary Ford
Date: October 28, 2014

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments: SJSU adheres to Title 34 policies of the U.S. Department of Education pertaining to sex and race discrimination in recruitment and admissions procedures. In addition, the institution also adheres to section 66270 of the California Education Code, which prohibits discrimination in higher education. http://www.sjsu.edu/hr/employee_rights/eo_laws/index.html	
Degree comple-tion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: SJSU provides prospective students graduation and retention rates data, which may be found at the Institutional Effectiveness & Analytics (IEA) web site http://www.iea.sjsu.edu/RetnGrad/ Basic registration as well as all miscellaneous fees associated with enrollment at SJSU are available to students at the Office of Bursar's web site http://www.sjsu.edu/bursar/fees_due_dates/tuition_fees/fall/index.html	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employ-ment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments: SJSU provides information regarding career services and internship opportunities through its Career Center. http://www.sjsu.edu/careercenter/parents-prospective-students/ SJSU's Hiring Employers Report provides information regarding major employers who have hired SJSU graduates at http://www.sjsu.edu/careercenter/employers/salary-data/sjsuHiringEmployersReport_2012-131.pdf	

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed
By Les Kong

Date: April 24, 2015

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment	Verified Yes/No
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	Yes
	Comments: Yes, the policies and procedures are available through SJSU's Student Conduct and Ethical Development web site at http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/policies/	
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: SJSU follows procedure based on CSU Executive Order 1097, see www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/docs/EO-1097.pdf The institution also has a process addressed students' disputes of grades, as well as grievances against university employees, see www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/docs/S14-3.pdf	Yes
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: These policies, procedures, and processes have been in place for a number of years, and SJSU has adhered to these when student complaints occur.	
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? SJSU maintains records at the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development, and the Office of Ombudsman.	Yes
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: Complaints are tracked and monitored by at the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development, and the Office of Ombudsman.	Yes
	Comments:	

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)
See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed
By: Les Kong

Date: April 24, 2015

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? Yes	Yes
	Is the policy publically available? If so, where? http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F68-25.pdf Also: http://info.sjsu.edu/web-dbgen/narr/catalog/rec-11749.11819.html	Yes
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? http://transfer.sjsu.edu/	Yes
	Comments:	

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Gary Ford
Date: October 28, 2014

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories
Type of Visit: WSCUC Review
Name of reviewer/s: Dr. Susan Opp
Date/s of review: February 25, 2015

1. Site Name and Address

   Moss Landing Marine Laboratories
   8272 Moss Landing Road
   Moss Landing, CA 95039
   831-771-4400, http://www.mlml.calstate.edu/

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WSCUC)

   Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML) was formed in 1966 and serves as the MS Marine Science program for a consortium of seven CSU campuses: East Bay, Fresno, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose and Stanislaus. The current 60,000 sq ft main lab was occupied in 2000, and consists of four classrooms, a seminar room, library, 11 research labs, offices, shop, running seawater aquarium, and storage area. MLML is considered an offsite location of SJSU because, as a marine lab, additional resources are needed to support its complex marine science program, which includes diving, vessels, and a seawater system.

   MLML offers undergraduate and graduate courses in marine science, and offers a Master of Science in Marine Science degree through each of the seven consortium campuses. There are nine TT/T faculty positions, one of which is also the Librarian. There is a Director (administrator) and staff that support a full complement of resources typically found on the main campuses (e.g. library, IT services, facilities operations, safety officers, vehicles, financial services, and student services).

   In a typical year, there are 70 – 90 graduate students matriculated in the MLML Marine Science MS program, and an additional 5 – 10 consortium undergraduate and graduate students taking courses at MLML. Most students in the program live in the vicinity and fulfill all of their MS degree requirements at MLML, rarely visiting their home campus.

   MLML is administered by SJSU, such that CSU funds to support MLML are administered by SJSU. MLML generates about $15 – 19 million in contracts and grants per year for research funded by NSF, NOAA, Sea Grant, State of California, and these funds are administered by the SJSU Research Foundation. All of MLML's TT/T faculty members have appointments and retreat rights to SJSU. A Governing Board consisting of administrators and faculty members from each of the consortium campuses oversees the curriculum and provides oversight regarding budget, future directions, and operations of MLML.

   MLML's integration of a robust research community with an educational program has created a world-class marine science program in central California.

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

The SJSU WSCUC review team member met with the SJSU Dean of the College of Science, the Director of MLML, and separately with groups of graduate students, faculty and staff at MLML. In addition to providing a tour of the MLML facilities, the Dean of the College of Science provided extensive information about the history, organization and funding of MLML. The reviewer also examined retention and graduation data for MS Marine Science students relative to other graduate students at SJSU via the SJSU IEA website.

All faculty, staff, administrators and students associated with MLML were clearly highly dedicated to the location and the educational program provided. While all expressed concern about potential fiscal uncertainties, it was clear that overall MLML provides an outstanding educational experience for its students.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.6)	MLML helps to fulfill the consortium campuses' and specifically SJSU's missions by providing a high caliber master's program in marine science that enriches students' lives, educates students and provides them skills for applying their knowledge in the service of society, and builds their knowledge through research and scholarship. The MLML program and site are specifically capable of doing so due to MLML's ideal location for the study of marine science, and its robust research and educational program. Administratively, MLML operates within the structure of SJSU. MLML is conceived of as a department within in the College of Science, and the MLML director serves as a department head, reporting to the Dean of the College of Science. The director is responsible for all MLML operations, including the academic and research programs. The MLML Chair oversees the faculty and academic program, and reports to the director and Dean of the COS at SJSU. Faculty members follow the SJSU RTP process. The MLML director also reports to a Governing Board consisting of administrators and faculty members from each of the 7 consortium campuses. The Governing Board is also responsible for overseeing the academic program and providing oversight for MLML's budget, operations, and future directions. Operationally, MLML is many ways self-sufficient, as required by its off-campus site. It has the resources needed to support the academic and research programs including: library, IT staff, facilities staff, health and safety staff, fiscal staff, program staff, vehicles, vessels, dive program, and a seawater system. In addition, MLML is at present financially stable, supported by two primary sources: state funding through the CSU administered by SJSU, and indirect return from its robust contracts and grants that are administered by SJSU Research Foun-	MLML is not a typical off-campus site in that it has a single degree program (MS Marine Science) and dedicated faculty (who hold appointments through SJSU). The "consortium" of CSU campuses that originally conceived of MLML seems to have dwindled to the point that only two CSU campuses, San Jose and Monterey Bay, have much student presence at the site. Despite the fact that nearly half of the graduate students are now from CSU Monterey Bay, MLML continues to be considered an off-campus site for SJSU. It is somewhat troubling that MLML now is considered a "department" within the College of Science because this undoubtedly leads to an unbalanced administrative structure for the college, with both a department chair and an administrator (director) at MLML, not to mention a separate governing board, extensive and specialized facilities, staff and even a librarian faculty member at MLML. Thus, it is recommended that the placement of MLML within the administrative structure of SJSU be given careful consideration, that the role of MLML in the overall strategic plan of SJSU be clarified, and that where possible, fiscal uncertainties be addressed.

	dation. MLML practices responsible budgeting, including yearly contributions to a reserve account. In addition, it is engaging in efforts to augment its financial support from philanthropic sources. While MLML is financially stable at present, a decrease in state funding or instability and unpredictability in its overhead return could damage its long-term viability. MLML is currently engaged in a strategic planning process, involving the MLML community, SJSU, and the Governing Board in an institutional reflection process and development of priorities and directions for the future.	
Connection to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)	The Dean of the College of Science, the AVP for Research, and other administrators at SJSU provide oversight of MLML education and research activities through interactions with the MLML Director. While MLML maintains its own student handbook and program policies, all of these policies fit within the policies of SJSU and the other consortium campuses. In addition, each student matriculated in the MLML master's program is beholden to the program policies at his or her home consortium institution. The graduate program coordinator articulates the policies of SJSU and the other consortium campuses and ensures compliance in collaboration with home campus staff. MLML regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement and provides this information to SJSU. In addition, program assessment information, including student and program learning outcomes and assessment reports, are posted to the MLML and SJSU websites. The graduate program coordinator in collaboration with the Chair oversees students to ensure timely progress toward their degrees. Due to the off-campus site and the consortium model, students matriculated in the MLML program are from multiple institutions. In addition, because they can complete all of their degree requirements at MLML, they rarely if ever are on-site at the home institution. As such, students as a whole are not well integrated into	MLML students are very deeply committed to their off-campus site but have very little connection or commitment to their main CSU campus, aside from needing to follow the policies of their home campus. Needing to follow two sets of policies – those of MLML and of their home campus – could create issues and confusion for students, but the dedicated advisors at MLML actively guide and counsel students while maintaining contact with the home campuses. Thus, this arrangement "works" but any loss of staff support for students could be highly detrimental to students.

	the life and culture of the home institution.	
Quality of the Learning Site. How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)	There is a strong interdisciplinary, community-based atmosphere of learning and research at MLML. The excellent location of MLML, the fabulous physical and intellectual resources, and the culture of exploration and success provide MLML a well-deserved reputation for excellence. The small size of MLML and distance from SJSU creates a sense of community that fosters close collaboration among students and faculty. MLML is transparent in its operations in that administratively reports to SJSU, and is bound by the institution's policies and procedures. Regular reporting and strong lines of communication ensure this working relationship. In addition, MLML also reports to the Governing Board, which provides additional oversight.	
Student Support Services. CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? *EER:* What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)	MLML has a fully functional and excellent set of resources to support students: library, vessels, IT services, Graduate Program Coordinator, fulltime faculty, student offices, etc. that provide the primary needs of the students. Students can seek additional services at the home campuses, and an agreement between MLML and CSUMB enables all MLML students to use student services (health center, gym, etc.) provided by CSUMB.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)	There are 9 fulltime TT/T faculty members at MLML that are fully engaged in the oversight of the curriculum and teaching of all classes. The fulltime faculty members develop and assess the student learning objectives.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) [Also submit credit hour report.]	The faculty, in consultation with students (former and current), develops the curriculum, which is reviewed and approved by the Governing Board. In addition, the program and courses must go through the standard approval and evaluation process at each of the 7 consortium campuses. This ensures that they are comparable or more rigorous in content, outcomes, and quality to those on the main campus.	

Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	MLML tracks all students as they progress through the system and after they have graduated. We have initiated a process to inform students and their major advisor as to the progress of the student, and there are means to ensure effective communication of the expectations and accomplishments.	Planning documents as well as meetings with students, faculty, staff and the director, all indicated concern about the long time to degree of MLML MS Marine Science students. Indeed, a comparison of the 3-year graduation rate of MS Marine Science students with all other Masters students from SJSU indicates that MLML graduation rates are lower and more variable (but note there are complicating factors of small sample sizes). However, 5-year graduation rates of MLML MS students are quite similar to those of the main SJSU campus. Thus, MLML is commended for its focus on reducing time to degree, even though the reviewer did not find this to be a serious concern.
Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? *EER*: What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)	The student learning assessment process at MLML follows that used at SJSU. As required by SJSU, MLML has a 5-year plan for assessing program learning outcomes, and provides annual reports on learning outcomes to SJSU. The MLML Chair, faculty, and program staff meet with SJSU assessment faculty and administrators for feedback and assistance.	
Quality Assurance Processes: CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? *EER:* What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)	To ensure quality of MLML's program and courses, all SJSU on-campus processes for quality assurance are employed at MLML. Courses and programs must go through SJSU campus approval and assessment processes, students must adhere to the institution's polices and procedures, MLML must provide regular reports to SJSU on student success, and MLML must participate in SJSU's program assessment. In addition, program staff, faculty, and administration report to SJSU and oversight is provided by the Dean of the College of Science, the AVP for Research, and other administrators at SJSU through interactions with the MLML Director.	

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: San Jose State University
Name of reviewer: Les Kong
Date/s of review: April 25-26, 2015

1. Programs and courses reviewed:

   BIOL-10 (The Living World), BUS2-134A (Consumer Behavior), BUS5-140 (Fundamentals of Operations Management), EDSE-218B (Autism Spectrum Disorders), ENVS-152 (Global Distribution of Goods and the Environment), FREN-170 (Translation and Comparative Stylistics of English and French), JS-101 (Critical Issues and Ideas in Justice), LIBR-254 (Information Literacy and Learning), LIBR-280 (History of Books and Libraries), PSYC-1 (General Psychology), RELS-122 (Magic, Science, and Religion), and SMPD-283B (Regulatory Affairs II – Regulations for Medical Devices and Diagnostics).

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

   The university offers six graduate degree programs through distance education: MLIS (Library and Information Science, CSU Self-Support); MLIS (Library and Information Science, CSU State Support); MPH (Public Health, CSU Self-Support); MS (Medical Product Development Management, CSU Self-Support); MS (Occupational Therapy, CSU Self-Support); and MS (Archive and Records Administration, CSU Self-Support). A review of total FTE enrollment in distance education courses (CSU State Support programs), from 2009-2014, shows a 45% increase (2009: 936 FTE; 2014: 1359 FTE). A review of total FTE enrollment in distance education courses (CSU Self-Support programs), from 2009-2013, shows a slight decline of 8% (2009: 654 FTE; 2013: 604 FTE). SJSU's first distance education program began in 2008, with the Library and Information Science program. Instruction is asynchronous, with group chats, threaded discussions, pre-recorded video lectures, and embedded library resource content in the Canvas LMS platform.

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

   Reviewed the twelve courses listed above in #1; San Jose State University, 2014-2015 Catalog; SJSU Web site; and documentation, entitled, "Distance Education Programs for WASC review."

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?	Through its distance education offerings, SJSU provides flexible learning opportunities for those individuals whose situations do not permit traditional on-ground attendance at the university. This is in alignment with SJSU's mission: *"To enrich the lives of students, to transmit knowledge to its students along with the necessary skills to apply it in the service of our society, and to expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship."* Five of the six programs offered via distance education are self-supporting, and are administered through the College of International and Extended Studies.	
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?	SJSU has ~400 student-run clubs and groups, however, it is clear that these skew primarily to the traditional, on-ground student. Athletics events and other campus activities are similarly targeting the traditional student. Due to the potentially diverse geographical distribution of students in the DE program, opportunities for integration into the life and culture of SJSU appear to be limited.	This is an area which should be explored in more depth at future visits. In reviewing the sample of online courses, there was evidence of considerable support (academic and student services) from the institution, however, the reviewer saw little in the way of co-curricular opportunities for the distance education learner.
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?	SJSU's distance education programs are well supported by its Academic Technology – eCampus unit. The Canvas learning management system provides a robust environment for both students and faculty.	
Student Support Services: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?	SJSU's Advising Hub serves as a gateway to an array of advising and counseling services to support students. Librarians are "embedded" in the Canvas LMS, provide online interactive resource guides (known as "Libguides"), and are readily available for assistance. Academic Technology -- eCampus provides assistance to students relevant to computing services (via online ticketing systems, email, phone, or walk-ins). The	

	Student Academic Success Services (SASS) group houses a number of units for academic support – Academic Advising & Retention Services, Peer Connections, and the Writing Center, to name a few.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?	A combination of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty (specific statistics not available at time of review) teach courses in the various distance education programs. Academic Technology – eCampus offers support to faculty, including opportunities to attend in-person and/or online workshops covering a variety of technologies (Canvas, Criterion, WebEx, Camtasia, Qualtrics, Turnitin, and Respondus, to name a few). Faculty also can meet (on-campus or online) one-on-one with an instructional designer. During courses faculty may also seek support via one-on-one consultations, workshops, online ticketing systems, email, or by phone. Faculty who are involved in curriculum design and assessment may consult the Center for Faculty Development, which makes available resources for best practices. The assessment of SLOs is facilitated by the Learning Mastery Gradebook feature available in Canvas.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)	Programs and courses are designed by faculty in consultation with instructional designers. SJSU Senate Policy F13-2 states that "online degree programs shall be reviewed in accordance with the usual Program Proposal process." Online courses are approved through the regular curriculum review process, following the same process as any new course. Accordingly, all distance education programs and courses must be comparable in content, outcomes, and quality to on-ground offerings.	

Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?	As students progress through the MLIS program, the School of Information examines three key transition points relevant to retention rates. The first is students' completion of LIBR 203, which helps to determine suitability for the online environment. Retention and Pass Data (Fall 2010 – Spring 2015) indicate a range of retention rates (from a low of 81%, Spring 2012; to a high of 91%, Spring 2015) and pass rates (a low of 98.5%, Fall 2010; to a high of 99.8%, Fall 2014). The second transition point focuses on students' performance on obtaining a passing grade ("B" or better) in each of the core classes. Students failing to earn at least a "B" grade are placed on administrative probation, and are given one more chance to take the class before they are disqualified from the program. A review of data of students' performance in these core courses indicates that MLIS students are exceeding the iSchools' faculty target of 85%. The third transition point concerns students' completion of the culminating experience (either an e-Portfolio or a thesis). Between Fall 2010 and Spring 2013, 11 students selected a thesis. Four have completed; one has withdrawn from doing a thesis; the others are in progress. From Fall 2010 to Spring 2015, the pass rates for e-Portfolios ranged from 88% (2010) to 92% (2015). Students who obtain a No Credit have one more chance to take the e-Portfolio class. Those students who fail on the second attempt are disqualified from the MLIS program. Between Fall 2010 and Spring 2014, there were six disqualifications due to failing to produce a satisfactory e-Portfolio after two attempts. Similarly, there are two key decision points that have been identified for the MARA program. Students must pass a required new technology workshop, that helps to determine their suitability for the online environment. Retention and pass	Follow up on retention and graduation data relevant to the other distance education programs should be performed at a future visit.

	data (Fall 2011 to Spring 2015) indicate a range of retention rates (from a low of 70.5%, Spring 2014; to a high of 100%, Spring 2013) and pass rates (from a low of 89%, Fall 2013; to a high of 100%, for all other semesters). The second decision point focuses on students' obtaining a passing grade ("B" or better) in core classes. The MARA program provided students different options as to core classes during the varying periods of time (Fall 2008 to Spring 2015. Retention rate data was available only for first-time Graduate students for the Fall 2012 Cohort. Comparability to other SJSU or CSU programs is complicated by the fact that the School of Information is 100% online for all its programs, and, so there is no within-program on-ground comparison group. The MLIS and MARA programs at SJSU are the only ones of their kind in the CSU. Another complicating factor is that most masters degrees are 30 unit programs, however, SJSU's MLIS and MARA degrees are, respectively, 43 and 42 unit programs. No data was available to review for the other distance education degree programs.	

Student Learning. How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?	As discussed previously, according to SJSU Senate Policy F13-2, all distance education courses and programs must be comparable to on-ground offerings. Online programs undergo the same assessment process as do traditional programs. The MLIS program uses the culminating e-Portfolio to assess students' mastery of all program learning outcomes prior to graduating from the program. PLOs are mapped to ULGs. Learning outcomes are also explicitly listed in each course syllabus. Program assessment reports were reviewed, and depending on students' level of mastery of PLOs, curricular changes are considered.	
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	There was not sufficient time to address this issue.	This should be explored at a future visit.
Quality Assurance Processes: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?	Faculty are encouraged to participate in SJSU's quality assurance program. Online courses that have been taught at least once qualify to participate in the CSU Quality Assurance Grant. This grant funds *Quality Matters* training, as well as webinars. Courses are also reviewed by a faculty leader and a faculty peer. These reviews and the resulting feedback may then be used by faculty for course redesigns.	