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California State University, Sacramento

Nearly six decades after its founding, Sacramento State has evolved into a highly respected regional institution with more than 28,000 students. We provide access to an education of exceptional quality. Our graduates are leaders in their fields and in their communities. The university’s economic, social and cultural impact is powerful. One in 26 residents of the six-county Sacramento Region is a Sacramento State graduate. The university directly and indirectly contributes more than $900 million to the region’s economy annually. Sacramento State possesses even greater potential. Engagement in the WASC process will prove important in achieving that potential.

1.0 Introduction

The context for this report is a convergence of three major activities that occupy campus attention at this time: engaging in the WASC Process, pursuing Destination 2010, and creating the Strategic Planning Council. None of these initiatives can be considered in isolation from the others. All three focus on pursuit of the university’s mission. The WASC process is the mechanism whereby universities earn reaccreditation. Destination 2010 sets the ambitious goal of transforming Sacramento State into a destination campus of choice for prospective students and employees. The newly formed Strategic Planning Council (SPC) replaces the Council for University Planning (CUP) as the committee responsible for campus strategic planning.

1.1 Engaging in the WASC Process

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) requires that Sacramento State fulfill its core commitment to institutional capacity. In brief, Sacramento State must function with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and with purposeful organizational structures and processes. We must show that we comply with these requirements during the three stages of accreditation: 1) institutional proposal, 2) preparatory review, and 3) educational effectiveness.

The WASC Commission has defined four standards for accreditation:

1. Defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives
2. Achieving educational objectives through core functions
3. Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure sustainability
4. Creating an organization committed to learning and improvement

The WASC standards provide a framework for self-examination and the search for opportunities for improvement within the context of critical internal and external consultation. Each of the four standards is broken down into specific criteria for review (CFRs). Relevant CFRs are listed immediately below the hypotheses in subsequent sections of this report.

WASC expectations, however, are not limited to simply providing evidence that institutions achieve the four standards and their respective CFRs. Such a requirement would imply a purely summative evaluation. Historically WASC evaluations were indeed largely summative. But under current WASC guidelines campuses are encouraged to engage in both summative and formative self-evaluations. Because these two forms of evaluation are somewhat contradictory in purpose, institutions face difficulties in constructing preparatory reviews. Reports must make two different arguments.
These two arguments might be described using the fanciful metaphor of dragons. Dragons can be defined as persistent problems that fundamentally threaten a university’s ability to provide quality instruction. A preparatory review, as considered for purposes of accreditation by WASC, must first demonstrate that the institution is not menaced by any big dragons. That is to say there are no problems of sufficient magnitude so as to render an educational community incapable of achieving the four WASC standards. Such a demonstration meets the summative requirements of WASC accreditation.

Regarding the more recent formative expectations of WASC, the metaphor is extended to the concept of little dragons. Little dragons are smaller-scale problems that limit, but do not vitally threaten, a university’s ability to provide quality education. Little dragons can be viewed as opportunities for constructive improvement, whereas big dragons are serious deficiencies requiring substantial devotion to remediation.

The dual chore for the university during the WASC process, therefore, is to document the absence of big dragons while simultaneously discovering and describing Sacramento State’s little dragons. Hence the placement of this report within the three phases of the complete WASC process: phase I (proposa) designing the process of searching for dragons, phase II (preparatory review) collecting and measuring dragons, and phase III (educational effectiveness) capturing and reforming the little beasts.

1.2 Pursuing Destination 2010

In the spring of 2004, Sacramento State launched Destination 2010. Destination 2010 will guide the university’s strategic planning with the ambition of becoming renowned by 2010. Sacramento State will be a university of choice for prospective students and employees throughout the West—a premier metropolitan university and a destination campus. Destination 2010 is built upon four interlocking objectives: (1) fostering excellent academic and student programs, (2) building a welcoming campus, (3) creating a dynamic physical environment, and (4) developing community support.

1.21 Fostering Excellent Academic and Student Programs

Universities earn reputations as destination campuses because, foremost, they are strong academically. Importantly, they also make student welfare a priority and provide a campus-community experience that is valued for life. Sacramento State places a premium on precisely these elements of the university education. Destination 2010 reflects our ongoing commitment to provide quality academic and student programs. Through Destination 2010 we will foster excellence in academic and student programs.
recognizing diversity as vital to developing the “New California,” recruiting the best available faculty, continually assessing and strengthening our academic and related co-curricular offerings. Recognizing, of course, budgetary constraints, Sacramento State will, nevertheless, push itself to provide the best possible pedagogy. Progress in this area includes:

- Hiring more than 330 new faculty members in the past five years (more than 50 percent of our permanent faculty), all with the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree and all with excellence in teaching as the priority element in their evaluation for future promotion and tenure.
- A reasonably low student-faculty ratio. The average class size at Sacramento State is 30 at the undergraduate level and 18 at the graduate level.
- Expanded opportunities for students to participate in a general-education honors program, learning communities, and freshman seminars.
- Better access for teachers to teaching and learning technology via web-enhanced courses and distance learning options. Sacramento State emphasizes the goal of students graduating with fluency in information technology.
- Easier entry into the university as a freshman or a transfer student. We make every effort to evaluate applications and to notify applicants promptly of their status. We focus upon facilitating progress to graduation with easy-to-follow “mapping to graduation” and web-based queries and answers.

1.22 Building a Welcoming Campus

In addition to its 28,000 students, Sacramento State’s beautiful campus draws more than 100,000 visitors per year. We strive not only to increase the number of visitors to the university, but also to make visits as smooth, safe and enjoyable as possible. The objective of this element of Destination 2010 is to make our campus a source of regional pride, a place visited often and mentioned frequently and positively by a significant portion of the region’s population. Sacramento State will be a welcoming campus for visitors as well as for students, faculty and staff. Through Destination 2010 we will build a welcoming campus by developing beautiful and inviting grounds and facilities, becoming a regional event destination, and offering public-friendly campus retailing. Progress in this area includes:

- An expanding role for Sacramento State as a cultural resource for the region. The university has exceptional event facilities such as the University Union, the Alumni Center, the Julia Morgan House (in midtown), the Aquatic Center (on Lake Natoma), and the Alex G. Spanos Sports Complex. We are known for high-quality events, forums, and exhibits—the U.S. Olympic Trials, the Russian National Orchestra, the 2003 and 2006 Gubernatorial Debate, the Chinese New Year Celebration, and many others. These are complemented by frequent art, theatre and music programs, NCAA Division I sporting events and championships, and public lectures and forums on national, state, and local topics.
- Sacramento State is improving its already beautiful campus with, for example, new directional signage throughout the campus.

1.23 Creating a Dynamic Physical Environment

Sacramento State has exciting plans to enhance its already beautiful campus. Chief among our objectives is the creation of a residential community feeling on campus, development of affordable housing and daycare opportunities for faculty and staff, upgrading of academic facilities, and an open and more systematic connection to the areas surrounding the campus. Destination 2010 is designed to create a dynamic physical environment. Our goal is to improve our infrastructure, provide excellent
instructional facilities and support centers, develop residential options for students, faculty and staff, and build state-of-the-art campus-life facilities. Progress in this area includes:

- Early 2004 brought major revisions to the campus master plan: planned construction of new academic buildings, residence halls for students, a Recreation, Wellness and Event Center complex, extension of the current north quad as a green mall reaching the current Library plaza, consolidated and efficient parking, better transportation flow on the campus periphery, and thoroughfare connections to off-campus sites such as Folsom Boulevard and the rapidly changing 65th Street corridor southeast of campus.

- The Destination 2010 plan calls for a number of new academic buildings over the next decade. Some of these will be built through use of state funds, others through the use of private donations, and others through combinations of funding sources.

- A significant growth in the number of students living on or very near campus from 1,100 to 5,000 is planned. Such a change will foster a new campus community culture.

- Housing for faculty and staff also is a priority. A major part of our effort to continue to attract the best faculty and staff members from across the nation is the provision of affordable housing in a market that has outpaced entry-level faculty and staff members’ ability to purchase a home.

1.24 Developing Community Support

A university can become a destination campus only after it has earned the respect and support of its own community. Sacramento State has done that. Our 180,000 alumni appreciate the quality education they received at our institution. The region views the university as a major asset. We can now raise the bar in communicating our profile of excellence to the public within and beyond the Sacramento region, developing a larger advocacy base to promote our current strengths and aspirations, and winning the confidence of a broad spectrum of donors whose financial support represents an investment in our promise and in the region’s future. Through Destination 2010 we will develop community support by increasing our visibility, expanding our advocacy base, and encouraging broader community financial support. Progress in this area includes:

- Sacramento State has directed additional effort and resources toward encouraging investment from community sources. Financial support of our university takes many forms -- endowed scholarships, professorships, collections and programs, and support of research and of major capital projects.

1.3 Creating the Strategic Planning Council

The stage I Institutional Proposal referenced a strategic planning model known as CUP for Sacramento State’s WASC review. Since the submission of that proposal, however, the campus has chosen to disband the CUP committee. The university’s strategic planning engine is now the Strategic Planning Council (SPC). Although the SPC will serve the same university functions as CUP, the charge, makeup and operating process has changed.

As a result of this change the phase II preparatory review report resembles less the strategic planning process envisioned by the phase I committee and resembles more of a themes-based approach emphasizing the new SPC planning process and the six hypotheses as originally proposed.

The SPC involves every constituency associated with the university. The twelve-member SPC is comprised of the Provost, who chairs the committee; four Vice Presidents (Administration, Human Resources, Student Affairs and University Advancement); four faculty members, including the Chair of
the Faculty Senate and one department chair; one member each from student government; university staff and the community.

The primary purpose of the SPC is to conduct strategic planning and to make recommendations to the President. The major initial responsibility of the SPC is to revise the Strategic Plan for the university and to recommend approval of that plan to the President. In its revision of the Plan, the SPC will seek to combine the initiatives that have been proposed to implement Destination 2010 with elements of the existing Strategic Plan, the hypotheses central to the WASC review, and the CSU System-wide Accountability Measures. With representation from key constituencies, the SPC is uniquely positioned to encourage a culture of evidence while revising the Strategic Plan. Section 2.0 of this report provides additional clarification of Sacramento State’s commitment to planning and assessment, as well as a more detailed account of the transition from CUP to SPC.

SPC is charged with the following functions:

- To inform the university community about the plan and its critical role in decision-making at the department level.
- To develop an assessment process that will measure the university’s progress toward the objectives of the plan.
- To periodically review and recommend updates to the plan.
- To schedule annual presentations of new planning objectives and/or initiatives proposed by the university’s Vice Presidents and provide them with feedback.
- To provide advice to the President as requested.

The newly formed Strategic Planning Council has already been influenced by Sacramento State’s WASC process. During May and June of 2006 the SPC drafted goals in three thematic areas—the same thematic areas included in this report: (1) academic programs, (2) campus life, and (3) community engagement.

### 1.4 Organization and Process of the Preparatory Review Report

The three themes listed above, along with the topic of strategic planning, form the organizational structure of this report. The three themes are expanded into six hypotheses.

1. **Academic Programs:** The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

2. **Academic Programs:** Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.

3. **Campus Life:** The University has in place the processes and institutional incentives to promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning.

4. **Campus Life:** Student Affairs has assessment plans and measurement instruments that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in co-curricular and experiential learning programs.

5. **Community Engagement:** The University fosters strong linkages between Sacramento State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community at-large.

6. **Community Engagement:** The University offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.
The actual WASC accreditation process during this second phase is organized under the direction of Ming-Tung “Mike” Lee, Associate Vice President and Dean for Academic Programs. The Phase II Committee is chaired by Val Smith, former department chair and Professor of Communication Studies. Vickii Castillon from the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides data, research, and organizational support. The four Phase II subcommittees are: Strategic Planning, chaired by Sutee Sujitparapitaya (Office of Institutional Research); Academic Programs, chaired by Jeffrey Brodd (Humanities and Religious Studies) and Ben Amata (Library); Campus Life, chaired by Patricia Grady (Women’s Resources Center); and Community Engagement, chaired by Frank Whiltatch (Public Affairs Office). Jerri McAtee provided staff assistance.

Following a retreat held during the summer of 2005, the four subcommittees spent academic year 2005/06 collecting, analyzing and synthesizing data relative to strategic planning and the six hypotheses. The subcommittees were designed to bring together broad representation from the campus community. A variety of media were used to inform the campus of the Phase II process and its progress.

A second retreat was held during summer 2006 to kick off a series of Fall Semester 2006 activities designed to secure campus reaction to the draft Preparatory Review Report. All levels and constituencies within the campus participated in campus discussion of strategic planning, academic programs, campus life, and community engagement. The Preparatory Review anticipates a WASC review team visit during March 2007.

The remainder of this report is organized into four sections, corresponding to the findings of the four subcommittees, followed by a brief essay. Three of the four subcommittees focused on collecting and interpreting data relevant to the six hypotheses advanced in the Institutional Proposal. The fourth subcommittee considered the topic of strategic planning.
2.0 Strategic Planning

CFRs: 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8

2.1 Commitment to Planning and Assessment at Sacramento State

The 1997 Phase II Sacramento State accreditation report to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) asserted that the university had developed “an institutional commitment to using evidence to improve institutional quality and effectiveness” (p. 97). This commitment has not only persisted in the intervening years but has intensified and expanded to encompass all levels within the university. The university promise to identify evidence of its efforts in strategic areas, analyze that evidence on both institutional and programmatic levels, and use its findings to make planning and resource decisions remains firm.

Both internal and external stakeholders influence our planning and assessment. Internally, institutional-level planning and assessment are driven by the university’s commitment to a broad-based planning process that is informed by the guiding vision of Destination 2010. All key constituencies are involved in the maintenance, assessment, evolution of a strategic plan to guide decision making, resource allocation, and continual improvement.

Program-level assessment is driven by a policy that was first recommended by the Sacramento State Faculty Senate in 1992 and approved by the President. The policy was based on the premise that the process of creating a culture of evidence for planning and assessment would, of necessity, be ongoing and evolving. A revised policy and format were approved for the 1996/97 academic year. At the academic program level, each department and university-wide program prepares a self-study that includes an assessment plan and evaluation of data relevant to the individual unit’s stated goals and desired learning outcomes. The Office of Institutional Research provides much of the data that informs the review process.

An external consultant and an internal program review team review these documents as part of the program review process. Furthermore, in 2000, the Faculty Senate approved a two-year pilot program centered on the definition and use of a set of baccalaureate learning goals to be addressed by the assessment efforts of every academic program. The Academic Programs section of this report provides an in-depth examination of the program review process and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals in the context of hypotheses one and two.

The university has also made great advances in the areas of General Education planning and assessment. These include General Education Criteria and Outcomes that were approved in 2002 and Policies and Procedures for Area Assessment that were approved in 2004. The academic programs section of this report provides an in-depth examination of general education planning and assessment.

Most recently, the Division of Student Affairs, in consultation with the Office of Institutional Research, launched the division's assessment process for all programs and units. The process not only provides valuable feedback and planning tools for those who administer Student Affairs programs, it also helps the Division focus more deliberately on student learning, and it provides more credibility for the Division in demonstrating its role in student development and learning. The Campus Life section of this report provides an in-depth examination of Student Affairs planning and assessment.
Individuals and organizations outside the university community are also interested in our programs and activities. Accrediting agencies such as AACSB, ABET, and the NCAA review our programs on a regular basis. Additionally, the CSU system has undertaken a series of assessment initiatives to support institutional improvement and accountability. Similarly, as a public university, Sacramento State must satisfy the changing expectations of the legislature and citizens of the state of California.

While the university’s commitment to a robust planning and assessment process has remained steadfast, the particulars of these processes are continually evolving to better meet the changing needs of the institution and its programs. To undertake any sort of transformation in an institution as complex as Sacramento State is a challenge. It requires time commitment, energy, and persistence. The faculty, administration, and staff of Sacramento State are committed to focusing their efforts on improving the effectiveness of our educational enterprise – moving us closer to our goal of becoming a top quality, publicly accountable, accessible, regionally-sensitive institution of higher education.

2.2 Changing Face of the Institutional Planning Process

For the last decade the Council for University Planning (CUP) was at the center of the Sacramento State strategic planning process. Its membership consisted of constituencies across the university, including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community representatives. CUP actively addressed university priorities and developed recommendations for future directions for the university. In responding to priorities, CUP served as a vehicle for overseeing and coordinating the university planning process. Each year, CUP analyzed and evaluated assessment data and key performance indicators to determine how well the university was accomplishing its goals, a process that led to recommendations for strategic planning objectives.

In choosing the strategic planning approach for the current WASC review, the Sacramento State WASC Steering Committee determined to examine institutional capacity and educational effectiveness as defined by WASC through the lens of planning. However, in order to focus planning and resources on student learning and to answer the questions posed by the 1997 WASC final report, the steering committee recognized that the planning process would require revision. The revision to the planning process was reported in the Sacramento State WASC Proposal. This process was to have served as structural and procedural support for the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review of the Academic Programs, Campus Life and Community Engagement hypotheses. The Educational Effectiveness subcommittees for each theme were to provide rationales and recommendations for planning objectives and to study the additional sources of planning data that underpinned each theme, much of which was to be collected and analyzed by the Capacity and Preparatory Review Working Group.

However, a subsequent assessment of the planning process determined it was too unwieldy to effectively accomplish its intent because of expansive membership and an elaborate planning, reporting and review structure. A representative sample of existing CUP members were interviewed in an unstructured process focused on three questions: what do you think is going well with CUP, what do you think is not going well with CUP, and what changes would you recommend? The following bullet points summarize responses to the interviews:

- Lack of relevance and credibility of the structure and process to the President’s planning initiatives, decision-making in the departments and colleges, and the campus at large (“CUP was not a player”).
- CUP meetings and processes were not engaging members in “important and current issues” (“People didn’t feel engaged enough to read and think through issues”).
- CUP was “too big and convoluted” (“sheer size” and “bureaucracy of it”).
As a result of the assessment a new planning group, the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), and process were developed. The major initial responsibility of the SPC is to revise the Strategic Plan for the university and to recommend approval of that plan to the President. In its revision of the Plan, the SPC will seek to combine the initiatives that have been proposed to implement Destination 2010 with elements of the existing Strategic Plan, the hypotheses central to the WASC review, and the CSU Accountability Measures. With its representation from key constituencies, the SPC will be uniquely positioned to address their concerns when revising the Strategic Plan.22

These changes in institutional planning have implications for the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review. In a January 9, 2006 letter to WASC Associate Director, Elizabeth Griego, President Gonzalez explained that the primary result is that “the report will resemble less the strategic planning process envisioned by the Phase I committee and resemble more a themes-based approach emphasizing the six original hypotheses found in our proposal.”

While the nascent planning process cannot, at this time, be utilized as a framework for the Capacity and Preparatory Review, we believe the changes we are making will, in time, result in a more robust, responsive, and strategic planning process that will effectively engage and guide university decision making.

Sacramento State has the capacity and commitment to engage multiple constituencies at all levels in thoughtful reflection within strategic planning and assessment processes that are aligned with the strategic objectives, informed by evidence, supported by the Office of Institutional Research, and directed by committed leadership.

Many of our initiatives are newly formed or undergoing transformation. Their effectiveness to guide decision-making, resource allocation, and continuing improvement, particularly with regard to student learning has not been fully tested. It is recommended that the WASC Educational Effectiveness subcommittee will examine the efficacy of our planning and assessment structures and processes to promote continuing improvements that benefit the entire Sacramento State community.

3.0 Academic Programs

Teaching and learning are the primary tasks performed by Sacramento State faculty, staff, and students. Sacramento State values a balance between a liberal arts education and depth of knowledge in a discipline. We seek to leverage our location in the capital of one of the largest economies in the world, as well as our placement in the most diverse state and city in the United States. The university is particularly committed to providing access to higher education for all eligible high school graduates and transfer-ready California community college students. It is equally important to ensure that, once they enroll, these students succeed in their coursework and progress in a timely fashion toward their degrees. Partially in response to the current WASC process the SPC has recently drafted a set of Academic Program related values:23

1. Excellence in teaching and learning
2. Intellectual freedom
3. Inquiry and scholarship
4. Integrity and professional ethics
5. Innovation and creativity
6. Global perspective
7. A liberal arts-based learning experience
8. Professional and applied learning
9. Breadth of academic offerings
10. Collaboration across disciplines
11. Life-long learning
12. Community-based learning, scholarship, and creative activity

3.1 Hypothesis 1
The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

CFRs: 1.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8

3.11 Introduction
The program review process at Sacramento State has undergone significant changes over the past several years. These changes have been driven primarily by a new emphasis on the assessment of student learning. During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Faculty Senate adopted new policy guidelines governing the program review process. All programs undergoing review are now required to exhibit substantial implementation of assessment. This emphasis on student learning has provided opportunities for enhanced faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

3.12 Changes implemented since 1996-97 WASC report
The 2003-2004 academic year marked a major transition point in the program review process, as several years of self-reflection culminated in the implementation of new policies and procedures. The “Assessment Plan Guidelines for Program Assessment” sets forth a three-part assessment process. The “Mission, Goals, and Objectives” section calls for linking a program’s mission statement, student learning objectives, and learning outcomes. The “Development and Implementing” section mandates that at least one indirect and one direct measure be used in assessment of student learning objectives. The “Using Assessment Results” section specifies that the results of these assessment methods be used to draw well-reasoned conclusions regarding academic planning.

These assessment plan guidelines are now an integral part of the program review process. Programs are required to continually undertake assessment. Assessment plans for all departments and other programs are posted on the Academic Affairs website. The program review itself (occurring at six-year intervals) helps ensure that assessment is indeed being undertaken in a manner that complies with the “Assessment Plan Guidelines.” Non-compliant programs face sanctions; typically denial of the normal six-year approval.

All departments submitted assessment plans which were evaluated to determine if they contained the necessary elements noted above. In 2004, department assessment reports were evaluated against the following criteria: level of implementation, activity during 2003-04, student strengths and weaknesses, curricular changes and plans for the upcoming year. A review of this information suggests that programs with outside accrediting agencies were, for the most part, engaging in ongoing assessment. Among programs without outside accrediting agencies the level of engagement in ongoing program assessment was mixed. While some programs had developed and utilized coherent assessment processes others were working to link identified goals and objectives with methods for measuring student learning outcomes related to these goals. Perhaps the weakest area across departments is an institutionalized process for
reflecting upon the data generated by measurement of student learning outcome and subsequently making program improvements based on the results.

The fall 2006 review of assessment reports indicated that departments and programs with outside accrediting bodies are engaged in extensive student assessment. These programs on the whole use an overview of student assessment to inform them as to any needed program improvements. For example, as a result of its writing assessment, Civil Engineering is working with the University Reading and Writing Coordinator, and is providing support for its students in order to improve their writing skills. The Department of Physical Therapy responded to student feedback by increasing unit requirements in two areas. Other programs find adapting individual student data to information useful in program improvements somewhat more cumbersome. Examples of program level change in response to the assessment of student learning outcomes for departments without outside accrediting agencies include the Department of Government and the Division of Criminal Justice. In response to relatively weaker performance in some areas of writing, the Department of Government has initiated conversations among faculty on the development of writing assignments to address these areas. The Division of Criminal Justice has instituted pre-requisites for upper division courses in an effort to better sequence the curriculum.

Along with adopting the “Assessment Plan Guidelines” in 2003-2004, the university overhauled key procedural aspects of the program review process. A revised set of guidelines sets forth the steps and roles for all involved in program review. Among the significant changes was the transition from the Program Review Subcommittee, made up of faculty who may or may not have been involved with program reviews, to the Program Review Oversight Committee, composed mainly of the chairs of Program Review Teams currently working on reviews. This has facilitated committee reflection on each review while still in process, with opportunities to provide feedback to each chair and, by extension, to each program undergoing review. This new committee structure enhanced all aspects of the review process. Administrative support, in the form of assigned time for Program Review Team chairs, helped legitimate and enhance the receptivity of the process for faculty. Participation by a broader array of faculty from a pool of review team members resulted in a healthy cross-pollination between university policy and program-level experiences. In sum, the revised process was designed to encourage reflection on student learning leading to greater faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development. This revamped committee approach also created consistency among reviews.

Beginning with the 2006-2007 academic year, a faculty member has been provided six units of release time to serve as the University Assessment Coordinator. One of the activities of this person will be to consult with the program review teams regarding the assessment component of the program review process. This person will be able to provide guidance to teams and departments in critically evaluating and suggesting improvements to the departmental assessment process.

3.13 Current considerations and concerns

The implementation of new policies and procedures in 2003-2004 was a significant advancement in the university’s program review process and in its ability to meet the expectations of Hypothesis 1. But implementation of policies and procedures is one thing; full compliance is another. And even if all programs could be said to be in “compliance” technically speaking, the program review process was not succeeding in every case to meet the university’s chief objectives in Hypothesis 1: to encourage “reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical planning.”

The Program Review Oversight Committee continues to work towards improving the program review process, matching optimal policies and procedures with less tangible factors that help to encourage faculty engagement. Perhaps the most important factor in this regard is the general faculty perception of the nature and purpose of the program review process. No matter how tactically effective the policies and procedures, so long as faculty do not regard the process as beneficial in the “big picture” – that is, for enhancing such things as reflection on student learning and faculty involvement in planning – program
review will be perceived mainly as another hoop through which to jump in order to maintain good standing in the university.

A review of assessment plans and activities contained in both the program review self studies and in assessment reports provided to Academic Affairs indicates that a continuing area of weakness is in linking assessment to program improvement. A new reporting template for annual assessment reports is being piloted in the fall 2006 semester. Our initial focus has been on programs that do not have outside accrediting agencies. This template directly asks departments how they have used the results of their assessments for program improvement. It is hoped that a more formal and straightforward method of reporting assessment data will lead to a more coherent linkage between goals, objectives, learning outcomes and program assessment and improvement. We have discovered that for many departments this linkage is clear and they are able to clearly articulate learning outcomes, assessments, results and program actions in response to results. Of equal benefit, however, has been that the template has served as a focus for working with departments who are struggling with the assessment process. As a result of discussions with departments we have held two workshops on assessment during the fall semester and plan more for spring semester 2007.

As one means of ascertaining evidence to measure faculty perceptions of the program review process, the Curriculum Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate undertook a survey in spring 2001. The results of this survey proved helpful in the revision of policies and procedures that culminated in the 2003-2004 changes. Recommendations included that the process be shortened and streamlined, that accreditation review should be coordinated with program review, and that the number of questions in the self-study should be reduced. The survey revealed a general impression among faculty that the program review process was more burdensome than meaningful. Such an impression clearly indicates a degree of discontent that likely negatively affects faculty participation in the process. The survey also revealed that respondents who had served on a program review team were more likely to evaluate the process positively. Recommendations included shortening and streamlining the coordination of program review and reducing the number of questions in the self-study. During spring semester 2006 the Program Review Oversight Committee commissioned a focus group of faculty members with broad experience in the department review process. The results are currently being analyzed.

Hypothesis 1 goes a long way towards defining “effective,” with its vision for widespread faculty participation. The Program Review Oversight Committee currently is working on revisions that will help facilitate this vision, as it reexamines and hones the current policy. For example, the committee has determined that the present policy assumes too much by way of correspondence between accreditation and program review. Departments, for example, sometimes receive accreditation for their undergraduate programs, and thereby are granted a successful program review. Unfortunately, this approach has meant that graduate programs have been ignored by the review process. On another front, the committee is revising the self-study procedures to clarify expectations and to encourage wider faculty participation.

3.2 Hypothesis 2

Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.

CFRs: 1.2, 1.7, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8

3.21 Introduction

In response to the 1996-97 WASC Report, a faculty task force developed a set of six Baccalaureate Learning Goals that were adopted by the Faculty Senate:

1. Competence in the disciplines
2. Analysis and problem solving
3. Communication
4. Information competence
5. Cultural legacies
6. Values and pluralism

In 2004, the university resolved to assess learning goals. Hypothesis 2 is a challenge to review the current status of this assessment process.

While the Baccalaureate Learning Goals permeate most every facet of the university, the most tangible evidence with regards to outcomes is found in three main segments of the university’s curriculum: the General Education Program, various writing programs, and the undergraduate majors.

3.22 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the General Education Program

An assessment plan, similar to the “Assessment Plan Guidelines” described above with reference to Hypothesis 1, was also implemented for the General Education Program. It requires that syllabi and assessment plans for all GE courses be submitted to the General Education/Graduation Requirements Policy Committee on a five-year cycle. Each assessment plan must identify the linkage between the course-specific learning outcomes and the GE goals and learning outcomes for that course’s area. Course proposal forms for all GE areas are available online. The GE learning outcomes themselves were developed during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 academic years through close consultation with faculty across the university. The outcomes were approved in spring 2002.

The General Education Program assessment plan provides a substantial means of assessing the degree to which general education courses meet the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Aside from competence in the disciplines, which naturally lies outside the purview of GE, the Baccalaureate Learning Goals are evenly distributed across GE areas. The assessment plan effectively ensures that all GE courses (456 as of fall 2005) have appropriate methods of assessment in place. Significant challenges in assessment of General Education nevertheless persist.

Appropriate means and methods typically result in the collection of useful data; but actually implementing meaningful change in response to the data is not necessarily guaranteed. It is difficult to force changes, at least in the short term. Courses, however, are reviewed for compliance every five years. Six courses were removed from the GE list for noncompliance during 2005-2006. Another significant challenge involves the prominence of multi-section courses. Even given that the GE proposal for such a course has been approved, the fact that it is taught by a variety of faculty complicates the assessment process.

There is some evidence that the university has overcome such challenges. For example, the General Education Race and Ethnicity in America Requirement underwent assessment in fall 2004. Along with effectively combining quantitative and qualitative forms of evidence, the assessment incorporated an admirable degree of reflection on results. Regarding the challenge of multi-section courses, an innovative approach has recently been undertaken by the Freshman Seminar program (this course satisfies Area E of the GE requirements). The multi-section challenge is especially acute here, for there are some sixty sections of Freshman Seminar taught across campus – all of them committed to meeting the learning objectives of Area E. The faculty agreed before the beginning of the semester (fall 2005) to an essay question for the final exam, based directly on a specific Area E objective. Then, five faculty were paid to read a sampling of essays and to grade them using a rubric. The data derived from this sampling are complemented by a student survey, yielding a useful combination of evidence for the purposes of assessment.
In keeping with its mission and its university-wide cohort of faculty participants, the General Education Program can be expected to continue to spark initiatives as the university strives to enhance assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

Assessment of the GE learning goals implicitly includes assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, but there is also overlap at the level of assessment activities. It would help to make the relationship between the two sets of goals more explicit. This would help maintain focus on the “big picture” and the foundational principles that ought to guide the university’s entire curriculum. Baccalaureate Learning Goals are ideals; but we don’t have structures for explicitly assessing them.

**3.23 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and writing programs**

Key elements of the university’s writing programs constitute parts of the General Education Program including the Writing Intensive, college composition, and second semester composition requirements. There are also writing requirements attached to both lower- and upper-division GE courses. In addition, the Sacramento State Writing Center conducts writing workshops on ten different writing topics each semester.

The writing programs tend to focus attention on the Baccalaureate Learning Goals of communication and information competence. Faculty and staff engaged with writing programs have devoted considerable attention to developing and implementing assessment.

University Reading and Writing Coordinator Dan Melzer, in “An Overview of the Literature on University Baccalaureate Writing Programs and Writing Assessment” identifies longitudinal studies on college student writing that support the major curricular components of the university’s writing programs. Studies indicate benefits of a first-year composition course; our English 1A is required during the freshman year. These studies further indicate that such a first-year course is especially effective when linked together with discipline-specific coursework. Our university has developed an extensive Learning Community program; many of the communities link English 1A with one or two other courses.

Longitudinal studies also show that students who do not maintain practice in writing regress as they enter the major. Our university requires a writing-intensive course, most often taken by students in their junior or senior years. The writing-intensive courses are spread across the curriculum, but they have a common set of requirements, including a minimum of 5,000 words of writing assignments, feedback, and writing instruction.

Prior to enrolling in any writing-intensive course, students must either have passed the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE) or successfully completed English 109E/109W. These courses are the common option for students who have taken the WPE twice without passing. Percentages of passing scores on the WPE from 1995/96 to 2002/03 ranged from 64% to 73%. While such a time-limited format has some flaws, the WPE does have some advantages for the purposes of assessment. The data is concrete, and we can be reasonably certain that the exams are the students’ own work. Our WPE is graded using a scoring rubric, which helps ensure a holistic appraisal and thus a fairer approach in the face of such a wide variety of students. It should also be noted that the grading is carried out by a group of faculty from many disciplines. This broad representation reinforces the importance of student writing throughout the university and provides those faculty who participate with an enhanced sense of writing pedagogy.

A working group of the Council for University Planning (CUP) initiated an assessment project centered on five theme planning objectives. The first was to improve student writing skills. The data derived by the university’s Office of Institutional Research remain relevant and useful. The strategy regarding the writing skills objective is summarized in the “Academic Programs Planning Objective Progress Report” (fall 2004).
The 2003/04 CUP Action Plan recommended an in depth study to assess the relationship between a student’s history of composition instruction and demonstrated writing skill on the WPE, in English 109, Advanced Study (now called Writing Intensive) and upper division writing courses within the major. This new endeavor was referred to Academic Affairs and to the Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Reading and Writing.  

Important aspects of the assessment project are ongoing (e.g., a longitudinal study that tracks approximately 75 of our students from freshman composition through their Writing Intensive courses). Other aspects have yielded data that are helpful for our assessment efforts at present. For example, surveys of student perceptions indicate that Sacramento State is somewhat above the 2000-2002 ACT norm regarding whether their university experience helped them improve writing skills.  

3.24 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the majors  
All six of the goals are relevant for most of the undergraduate majors, integrated in various ways within department mission statements and learning objectives. The first of the six Baccalaureate Learning Goals is “Competence in the disciplines.” Clearly, consideration of the majors is a crucial component of assessing learning outcomes and their relationship to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Given the variety and diversity of the undergraduate majors, however, deriving a meaningful summary statement in this regard is difficult. Examining a representative sampling of majors provides some indications of success as well as opportunities for improvement. Among the best examples of using assessment to improve instruction are the departments of Chemistry, Computer Science, Kinesiology, and Sociology.  

Of the six baccalaureate learning goals, competencies in the discipline is the most strongly addressed in assessment plans. In addition, departments generally report students as developing competencies in their disciplines. However, specific attention is also given to communication, particularly written communication and to analysis and problem solving. Most departments see their students as making good progress in written communication and as having adequate mastery of the basics of writing. Departments are also addressing information competence through competencies linked directly to their respective disciplines and report, in general, strong learning in these areas. However, analysis and problem solving are areas of relative weakness for many students according to recent self studies completed as part of program reviews. Departments report that they are working to address these weaknesses within their programs.  

The individual majors should be expected to pursue the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, by way of their mission statements and their student learning objectives. Improvement in this regard could be nurtured by the program review process, which could more directly assess this relationship.  

And, of course, the existing Baccalaureate Learning Goals themselves will be subject to future review. Other goals might need to be included. One example would be technological literacy.  

Given the impact of technology on our everyday lives, it is important that students develop an understanding of technology, and its power, potential and limitations. All Sacramento State graduates should be scientifically and technologically literate in or to more fully participate in today’s technologically driven society.  

3.25 Summary  
The Planning Objectives Progress Reports produced by the Office of Institutional Research illustrate the university’s capacity for assessing the learning outcomes of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, in addition to the means relating to the “writing skills” objective discussed above. Another of the objectives correlates quite directly with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: Develop, as appropriate, learning outcomes for global awareness and increase the coverage of global and international issues in the
curriculum. Finally, one of the objectives speaks directly to the general drive towards enhancing assessment: Increase the number of academic programs that use learning outcomes assessment to make program improvements.44

In fall 2004, the Office of Institutional Research produced a planning objectives report that treats several “Key Performance Indicators,” five of which correlate closely with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals:45

- Breadth and Quality of Undergraduate Curricula
- Curricula that incorporates Baccalaureate Learning Goals
- Encouragement and rewards for student and faculty achievement
- Use of technology to enhance academic program quality and improve access to the University
- Academic Planning across Departments and Colleges

In addition, two areas of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) bear strong correlation to Baccalaureate Learning Goals – “Thinking critically and analytically” and “Using computing and information technology.” The survey was administered to a random sampling of Sacramento State students in the spring semester of 2004. In the “Educational and Personal Growth” section of the survey, students were asked “to what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development” with regard to various areas. In both cases, seniors responded more positively than did freshmen (with means of 3.25 versus 3.06 and 3.13 versus 2.84).46

4.0 Campus Life

High quality student support services like academic advising, career counseling and financial aid are essential to our efforts to improve student retention and facilitate progress to graduation. These services must be accessible to all students and available at times when classes are offered. Every part of our organization needs to be working together toward student academic success. The time for institutional “silos” has passed. Instead we must promote real partnerships across divisional lines that will efficiently and effectively enhance student achievement. To this end the SPC has drafted a new set of university values related to campus life:47

1. Excellence in teaching and learning
2. Accessibility
3. Opportunity
4. Diversity
5. A holistic university experience
6. Life-long learning
7. Community-based learning, scholarship, and creative activity
8. Our vibrant campus life
9. Our welcoming, supportive campus community
10. Our beautiful, dynamic physical environment
4.1 Hypothesis 3

The university has in place the processes and institutional incentives to promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning.

CFRs: 2.9, 2.11, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.8

4.11 Introduction

“Higher education is in the throes of a major transformation.” 48 This assessment was offered by the American College Personnel Association in its 1996 ground-breaking report, The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs. This study examined the factors influencing this transformation, and explored how student affairs professionals could intentionally create the conditions which would serve to enhance student learning and personal development. Characteristics that identified “learning-oriented” Student Affairs divisions were proposed, and prominent among them were the concepts of collaborative relationships and shared responsibilities with Academic Affairs for student learning outcomes.

In 2002 the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators joined with the American College Personnel Association to release a major treatise on learning and the academy, entitled Learning Reconsidered: A Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience. 49 Widely accepted ideas about conventional teaching and learning were re-examined and the question was posed, “Do current organizational patterns in higher education support student learning and development in today’s environment?”

A new definition of learning was proposed as “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development processes that have been considered separate, and even independent of each other.” 50 New research, changing times, and the needs of today’s emerging generations of students were cited as the basis for the fusion of traditionally very separate and distinct categories of academic learning and student development into an integrated, comprehensive vision of learning as a transformative process that is centered in, and responsive, to the whole student.

Colleges and universities were encouraged to establish specific student outcomes that reflect this integrated view of learning. Although variations in student outcomes, administrative structures, division of responsibilities, and assessment methods would be expected, based on institutional differences, a central theme remains consistent regardless of institutional type, student demographics, or campus culture. That theme is the establishment of vibrant educational partnerships among members of the academic faculty and student affairs professionals in which all campus educators share broad responsibility for achieving defined student outcomes. 51

The Division of Student Affairs has embraced this new definition of transformative learning and is committed to developing partnerships with the academic faculty that foster successful student outcomes. During the 2005-06 academic year, all 18 departments and programs of Student Affairs focused on developing, implementing, and assessing observable and measurable goals that included at least one goal with a specific learning outcome. Anecdotal information abounds that highlights the important impact Student Affairs has on student learning outcomes; however there is minimal empirical data to support those claims. As will be addressed relative to the next hypothesis, Student Affairs at Sacramento State is committed to changing that fact.

The Division of Student Affairs 52 provides an array of services and programs that foster student learning and dedication to character and personal development that embody the values of the Sacramento State. Departments and Programs within the unit include:
4.12 Process

To explore the hypothesis, two fundamental questions were identified. First, does university policy currently include structures and processes that enhance collaboration between the staff of Student Affairs and the staff of Academic Affairs? Second, does university policy currently include reference to means of enhancing the probability of collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs?

Step 1: Each Student Affairs director and program coordinator was asked to complete a survey that provided information about their collaborations with Academic Affairs. A range of collaborative relationships exist between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Information regarding those programs and departments was further developed and examined as case studies.

Step 2: To assist in developing and reviewing the case studies, the committee developed a model which explored collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The elements of the model are:

- Context—the unit and where it fits in the greater scheme
- Collaboration—bridges, both informal and formal
- Incentives and Disincentives—motives, problems, issues (organizational, cultural, economic, structural etc.)
- Criteria—regarding the unit
- Conclusions/Recommendations—regarding collaboration and student learning outcomes

Step 3: Existing university policies were searched for reference to practices and organizational structure that relate to the collaboration between the staff of Student Affairs and the staff of Academic Affairs.

In addition, three focus groups were conducted to provide additional perspectives. One focus group included faculty who had been actively involved in collaborations with Student Affairs departments. A second focus group included administrators/leaders of Student Affairs programs. A third focus group consisted of staff from departments which have historically moved, in terms of their “organization home,” between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

4.13 Education versus Services and Recreation

The University’s understanding of the educational process and of learning itself has changed over time. Learning is no longer viewed as a passive corollary of classroom teaching. Students shouldn’t simply absorb material presented in lectures or textbooks. The new concept of learning recognizes the essential function of personal development. Students engage as whole persons with multiple dimensions and unique personal histories. Magolda (1996) noted that a successful learning experience result in an increase cognitive awareness as well as an increased sense of personal maturity.
Earlier models of learning reflected a separation of cognitive and experiential learning, assigning the cognitive involvement to the Academic Affairs side of the house, while Student Affairs addressed the experiential side through services and recreational opportunities. The current leadership of Student Affairs views this as a dated model. Student Affairs believes this model does not promote collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Some faculty, however, believe the distinction between “cognitive and experiential learning” is a false dichotomy. Many academic departments not only offer, but require, experiential learning in the form of labs, clinical practica, student teaching, studio courses, field work, and internships. The faculty further argue that even those activities designated as experiential learning require cognition to make meaning from the experience. Experiential learning requires that students plan, apply knowledge and skills to new situations and tasks, describe, remember, and evaluate their experiences. Higher education expects students to think, write, and talk about what they have learned. That cannot be done without cognition.

These faculty conclude that what would make sense is not a dichotomy between cognitive and experiential learning but a distinction between academic and personal learning or intellectual development and personal development.

Regardless of the labels, with Student Affairs sharing some of the responsibility for teaching and learning, a new model is emerging. Student Affairs and Academic Affairs are viewed as partners in the educational process. This model of collaboration also illustrates that “bridge building” may be instituted by either side. We see both divisions centered and focusing on the educational interests of the student. This does not mean, of course, that Student Affairs ceases to provide the traditional services, extra-curricular and recreation programming; rather it suggests an expanded role for Student Affairs.

4.14 Case Studies

Examination of data revealed a continuum in the development of the collaborative relationships between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Some programs have well constructed “bridges” and effective systems and structures in place that nurture and support the relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. In other cases the connections are more tenuous. Case studies of several collaborative relationships illustrate the range of collaboration and provide some insight into what elements are needed for a successful collaboration.

4.15 Freshman Seminar

The Freshman Seminar program provides a clear example of an effective collaborative relationship between faculty members and several departments within Student Affairs. The seminar is a three-unit course that satisfies a general education requirement (Area E) and is offered under several different academic departments and is open to all students, but is especially geared to incoming freshmen. There are specifically identified learning outcomes that are common to all the seminar courses. Student Affairs departments/programs that participate in Freshman Seminar include: Alcohol Education Program, Financial Aid, Multi-Cultural Center, Student Activities, Career Center/Cooperative Education, Health Center, Psychological Counseling Services, and the Women’s Resource Center.

The learning objectives demonstrate an effective link between teaching, learning, scholarship, and service as well as the integration of academic goals with co-curricular programs to support the students’ personal growth and development. The Freshman Seminar instructors submit course syllabi and meet for discussion and training each semester to maintain quality control regarding the curriculum, and the evaluation process includes students, instructors, and Student Affairs staff. A committee of instructors reviews assessment papers written by students every other year to determine whether the course objectives are being met. Follow-up data indicate that freshmen who complete a Freshman Seminar class have higher grade point averages, and exhibit higher retention and graduation rates, than freshmen who do not participate in the Freshmen Seminars.
A formal evaluation and assessment procedure ensures that the needs of the students, as well as the program goals, are being met. The number of sections of Freshman Seminar increases each year, but many more sections are needed if the program is to accommodate all first-time students on campus. Faculty and departmental incentives for participating in the Freshman Seminars need to be considered to support growth and continued development of this successful program.

### 4.16 Service Learning

Another example of a successful collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs is “service learning,” which combines service objectives with learning objectives in an activity that changes both the recipients and the provider of the service. Structured opportunities link service component to self-reflection, self-discovery and the acquisition of skills, and knowledge content. Service learning provides a clear example of how “experienced based” learning can be incorporated into a course curriculum.

A model of an effective service learning arrangement is the collaboration between the Child Development Department in the College of Education and the ASI Children’s Center. The Children’s Center serves as a site for students enrolled in Child Development courses (CHDV 32, CHDV 132) to fulfill course requirements of supervised field work. The Center also serves as an on-campus resource for students with other academic course requirements for observation and/or research assignments.

The collaborative relationship between the Department of Child Development and the ASI Children’s Center has a clear, prescribed structure which includes well-defined roles and responsibilities for each partner and is focused specifically on students’ application of child development theory to child care practices. Assessment of students’ learning is structured into the curriculum and evaluated by both the instructor and placement supervisor.

Assessment of the partnership and process would provide an opportunity for thoughtful review and recommendation on how the partnership may work more optimally and/or validate what is working well already. Issues around the lack of recognition and compensation of the Children’s Center staff for: (1) time spent training and supervising student interns; and, (2) advising and mentoring students interested in obtaining their Child Development Permit need to addressed and resolved.

### 4.17 Cooperative Education

Perhaps the best example of straddling Academic Affairs and Student Affairs is the Cooperative Education program. The Cooperative Education program is administered through Student Affairs and coordinators in the colleges who are Career Center employees. Coordinators work directly with faculty on developing new Co-op opportunities. Coordinators also provide advising to students about Co-op. Faculty are responsible for grading student performance. Both coordinators and faculty engage in publicizing the program and recruiting students.

The Cooperative Education program organizes and facilitates partnerships between faculty and employers. This endeavor provides upper division and graduate students with paid, degree-enhancing, professional work experience.

This mutually beneficial relationship between Sacramento State and the community encourages student growth by providing opportunities that link classroom theory with work experience. Cooperative Education empowers students to make informed career decisions and move toward achieving an advantage in a competitive job market while earning academic credit.

Co-ops differ from internships in that internships can be paid or unpaid, may or may not be for credit, and a student at any class level may participate in an internship. Co-ops are always paid, are for credit, and
are for Junior, Senior, or Graduate students. Co-ops are high-level positions that allow students to apply what they have learned in their field.

4.18 Special Events Programming

An example of collaborative relationships from the opposite end of the spectrum is in the area of Special Events Programming. Carried out by several separate departments of Student Affairs (e.g. the Women’s Resource Center, Multi Cultural Center, and Unique Programs of the University Union), such programs collectively help create “campus life,” but do so from a slightly different perspective. Their relationships with the academic departments are fluid and tend to be structured around specific events in question. Rarely are the program goals integrated with identified academic goals although the programs often supplement/challenge ideas or information presented in the classroom. There is no shared process of quality control, and the role of evaluation in the constant process of improving the programs is just being developed at this point in time. As the evaluation process develops, the involvement of all stakeholders will be included in the plans.

The potential to fortify the bridge between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs through these collaborations does exist. In those cases where personal and localized relationships between faculty members and student affairs staff are the basis for the collaborations, there is more of an integration of goals and purpose resulting in a platform from which to build assessment and evaluation measures.

4.19 Summary and Recommendations

From these case studies, it appears that collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs varies from program to program. In some cases the collaboration seems to be well established and enduring. In other cases collaboration is fluid and developing. Yet in other cases collaboration is limited to special events or circumstances.

Where collaborations are most successful in affecting student learning, certain elements are present. These necessary elements include partnership in the responsibility for student learning, the development of shared goals and outcomes, effective evaluation and assessment strategies which include input from all stakeholders, and the process of incorporating evaluative/assessment information into continued program development.

Two major findings resulted from the committee’s investigation of the hypothesis. First, there is a relative absence of university policies and institutional structures that support collaboration between the departments in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Without an institutional framework that supports and encourages collaboration, collaborative efforts are left to the efforts of individual faculty or Student Affairs staff who find intrinsic value in such efforts. At best, this results in a hit or miss approach to fostering collaboration. An exception to this finding is the Freshman Programs Committee, which is co-chaired by the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs and the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies in Academic Affairs.

Second, the common perception among faculty is that the functions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs are distinctly different and that they share little common ground according to many of the faculty surveyed. Academic Affairs is responsible for learning, while the primary responsibilities of Student Affairs are services and recreation. When student learning does occur as the result of participation in the programs of Student Affairs, that learning is an unintentional consequence. These perceptions were noted repeatedly in the faculty focus groups.

The belief that Academic Affairs is the sole source of learning at the university can pose a serious threat to collaboration between academic and nonacademic units. A paradigm shift from this traditional view to a more holistic view seems to be occurring on campuses across the country. Sacramento State’s Division of Student Affairs has embraced this holistic view and is energizing the paradigm shift on our campus.
However, without the support of university policies and practices that encourage collaboration between the two divisions, the paradigm shift will not be successful and sustainable.

### 4.2 Hypothesis 4

*Student Affairs has assessment plans that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in co-curricular and experiential learning programs.*

CFRs: 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8

#### 4.21 Background

Sacramento State has long been dedicated to providing an undergraduate experience that promotes the holistic development of our students. Towards that end, Sacramento State offers programs and services that help students translate their in-class learning to real-life situations, enhancing students’ sense of self and well-being, fostering their interpersonal skills, increasing their comfort in working with people different from themselves, enabling them to practice their civic responsibilities, and helping them explore professional and career options. For the most part, the twenty or so programs and departments within the Division of Student Affairs successfully facilitate these efforts.

While some programs within Student Affairs evaluate their activities, there has been, in the past, no coherent assessment structure for this division, and there has not been institutional support for such a structure. Moreover, a regular cycle of program review has not been developed despite the published assessment policy. The policy states, “Assessment will become part of the program review process (this includes both Academic Program Review and Student Services Review), and as part of the program review process it will tie into the planning of the unit.” Once fully implemented, the newly developed assessment program will effectively identify and assess the learning outcomes occurring in the Campus Life area as well as the entire Student Affairs Division. The Student Affairs Assessment web site can be found online.

#### 4.22 Process and Exemplar

In the fall of 2005, Student Affairs Assessment was implemented to gather, analyze, and interpret data that would help describe the “effectiveness” of Student Affairs’ programs and departments. As used here, effectiveness includes the assessment of student learning outcomes as well as the assessment of other key factors (cost-effectiveness, satisfaction, meeting clientele needs).

The design of the assessment process is based upon the work of Nichols (1998) and Nichols & Nichols (1998) who developed a “five column model” of assessment as well as additional considerations developed by the University of Central Florida Office of Operational Excellence and Assessment Support.

#### Six Step Model of Student Affairs Assessment

1. Mission Statement
2. Unit Goals
3. Objectives /Outcomes
4. Measures
5. Results
6. Use of Results

Source: Adapted from Nichols (1998), Nichols & Nichols (1998), and University of Central Florida Office of Operational Excellence and Assessment
Step 1 Mission: The mission represents an expanded statement of purpose. The unit’s mission statement must be consistent with the university's mission statement. Units should be able to see how the mission statement of their unit complements the identified mission of the university.

The Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) mission calls for the official governing body of Sacramento State students and through operation and sponsorship of programs and services meets the varied needs of students. We provide experiential education, leadership opportunities, student representation, various business and recreational services, campus life programs and activities that support the campus and greater Sacramento community.

Step 2 Unit Goals: Goals are broad statements that describe the overarching long-range intended outcomes of an administrative unit. These goals are usually not measurable and need to be further developed as separate distinguishable outcomes, that when measured appropriately, provide evidence of how well you are accomplishing your goals. They are primarily used for general planning and are used as the starting point to the development and refinement of outcomes. Source: “Administrative Assessment Handbook” University of Central Florida. The following are the ASI goals:

- Serve as the representative entity for Sacramento State Students
- Provide students with experiential education
- Provide students with leadership opportunities
- Provide business and recreational services

Step 3 Planning Objective/Outcomes: Unit Objectives and learning outcomes are specific statements that describe desired results identified by an administrative unit. They are derived from the goal statements of the unit. They relate to the operations and processes of the unit and to intended knowledge and behaviors that a student having used the services provided by the unit should demonstrate.

ASI sees its mission as basically a “learning lab” for Sacramento State students. Most scholars believe that students increase their understanding of theory and principles covered in the classroom setting when given the opportunity to apply and experience them in the context of activities and services of ASI. The goal is for more faculty, from diverse disciplines, to direct their students to ASI programs as an ideal place to complete “applied” assignments such as observations, interviews, projects or exercises. These considerations formed the basis for the following ASI objective of increasing the use of ASI programs by faculty to provide students with opportunities to experience the connection and value of applying theory to practice. Specifically:

- Increase number of faculty and student participants who complete “applied” assignments in ASI programs by 10% as of January 2008.
- Increase the number of departments with faculty and students who complete “applied” assignments in ASI programs by 10% as of January 2008.
- Achieve and maintain an 80% or greater frequency of “satisfied” or “very satisfied” responses by faculty and student participants by January 2008.
- Develop a model for partnership with faculty to identify and meet specific student learning objectives using Child Development courses CHDV32 and CHDV132 student internships in ASI Children’s Center by June 2007.
- Apply the student learning objectives model to at least 10 more courses by June 2008.

Step 4 Measures: The considerations for Objective/outcome 1 formed the basis for the following ASI measures.
• Distribute and collect “ASI Survey of Current Student and Faculty Participants” during the Fall 2006 session.
• Use compiled data to establish “baselines” for number of faculty and students participants by February 2007.
• Use compiled data to establish “baselines” for number of different departments participating by February 2007.
• Use compiled data to determine level of faculty and student satisfaction with ASI participation, stated in percentages, by February 2007.
• Distribute and collect “Survey of Prospective Faculty” by August 2007.

4.24 Summary and Implications for Educational Effectiveness

Student Affairs has made progress in establishing the initial cycle for assessing student learning in programs and units. However, the ongoing capacity to support the assessment process is not in place. It is highly recommended that the Division of Student Affairs develop a division-wide infrastructure to support and sustain the assessment program. Similar to academic program review process, this infrastructure would include staff to oversee the program, resources such as training and workshops to develop in-house expertise and a visible presence in widely communicated and well understood policies, plans, and procedures. Ownership, buy-in, and trust among participating programs and an organized manageable administrative strategy are essential components of an effective assessment program. The development and maintenance of a quality assessment program and a vibrant assessment culture will take time and a great deal of thought. It is recommended that the Student Affairs Division proceed incrementally and methodically to build a strong assessment plan.

5.0 Community Engagement

Sacramento State is committed to connecting teaching and learning with real world experience. We desire to link the campus community to the unique opportunities presented by our location in the State Capital. We need to continue to develop curricular and co-curricular programs that will fulfill this commitment. Tangible incentives, for example, such as added recognition and weight in ARTP policies or giving workload credit will be required to free up faculty schedules for greater participation in community engagement activities. The SPC has recently drafted the following university values related to community engagement:58

1. A holistic university experience
2. An informed, engaged society
3. Life-long learning
4. Community-based learning, scholarship, and creative activity
5. Advancing the greater Sacramento Metropolitan Region
6. Our role as a cultural resource and repository
7. Our location in California’s Capital
8. Our excellent, distinctive programs
9. Our welcoming, supportive campus community
As the above list demonstrates, Sacramento State has a clearly stated goal of becoming a more engaged campus. In pursuit of this goal two hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis 5 addresses external relationships, those off campus with the surrounding community, while hypothesis 6 focuses on student learning – academic, civic and personal. This division of hypotheses into an emphasis on the external versus an emphasis on the internal captures the way Sacramento State has traditionally perceived the issue of engagement – as two independent efforts, one initiated from off-campus and one with its impetus from on-campus. In that context dividing the theme into two hypotheses may perpetuate this notion. A more holistic view of “engagement” that encompassed both internal and external opportunities might better symbolize community engagement. Nevertheless, organization of this document dictates a separate treatment of the two hypotheses.

Community engagement, or more accurately, Community and Civic Engagement, encompasses a broad range of activities, skill sets, and outcomes. These hypotheses also suggest a sense of connectedness among students, the campus, and the community at large, regardless of the programmatic or pedagogical approach. For simplicity this report uses the term engagement.

5.1 Culture, Infrastructure and Incentives

Nationally, criteria for evaluating the progress or success of a university in the area of engagement are still emerging. Attempts to assess outcomes have come from the Carnegie Classification for Engagement and the American Democracy Project audit criteria. The criteria can be considered as falling under three broad categories: culture, infrastructure, and incentives.

Briefly, there are good indicators that the campus is becoming a more engaged university. Key institutional documents and the WASC process highlight this trend. Successful programs and activities exist across campus, begun by individual faculty, student groups, staff, and departments. The Center for California Studies, described later in this report, is an excellent example of such a program.

What appears to be missing, however, is the infrastructure to support and encourage engagement activities and incentives to facilitate moving in the direction of meeting the SPC goals described above. This is reflected in the disconnected nature of current activities and the lack of significant campus-wide or cross-division efforts. In short, the campus is not particularly intentional about its engagement efforts at this point.

5.11 Culture

Definitions of engagement vary considerably across the campus. There are at least three separate reasons for engagement: attracting resources, contributing to the community, and enhancing student learning. While these may ultimately be complementary, the lack of a clearly shared definition is problematic. Important campus documents such as the Strategic Plan, Destination 2010, and the WASC Phase I Institutional Report vary in language and focus. Many of the Sacramento State objectives are consistent with engagement, but an absence of a shared definition results in overlap and voids.

We were the first CSU to establish a two-tier faculty awards program for outstanding service to the community (2003), and the first to establish an annual reception for service learning community partners (2003). Annually, each college may nominate one individual to receive the Community Service award and one individual may receive the lifetime service award. Outstanding alumni are recognized annually. Although the award does not specifically focus on service, many of the alumni are high-profile members of the community playing important public roles.
Publications and public statements reflect strong interest and activity in engagement across the campus. The *September 2004 University Strategic Plan* included a Community Engagement theme for the first time. Engagement was likewise selected for the first time as a theme for evaluation in the 2004-08 WASC Accreditation process. The revised mission statement (2004) does not explicitly reference engagement, but it includes several indirect references. Finally, as noted, Destination 2010 includes several engagement-related goals.

Data about campus activities is fragmented into several different survey instruments without a central focus. The one survey instrument designed to collect information from community members about campus impact has not been repeated in at least five years. The university would benefit from a focused campus-wide assessment process that measures experiences, skills and knowledge obtained through curricular, co-curricular and extracurricular activities.

Finally, engagement efforts remain largely individual efforts, not well coordinated, purposeful, or campus-wide. However, the university is currently making a commitment to expand and deepen its engagement. Electing to be evaluated on engagement by WASC is compelling evidence of that commitment, and evidence also of valuing the benefits that greater engagement can bring.

### 5.12 Infrastructure

No one senior administrator has engagement as a major element of his/her responsibilities. Rather, individuals have either particular program areas or narrowly defined responsibilities that rarely require coordination across divisions. The university would benefit from an infrastructure that systematically supports and promotes campus-wide engagement activities (both external and internal) and has the ability to coordinate activities across student and academic affairs. Oversight should be done from a senior level and not “wedded” to a particular division.

There is excellent infrastructure to support service learning. The campus has an active Office of Community Collaboration (OCC), and the Career Center includes a strong cooperative education program. However, the course designation process allowing students to identify service learning is under-utilized.

The Center for Teaching and Learning and OCC are working to expand their offerings and jointly sponsor them. The university should pursue this strategy. The large class of junior faculty is also requesting additional development opportunities centered on engagement. Focusing on research that connects the community and the classroom is sometimes difficult to undertake. Training and support in this area could have significant payoffs as these faculty members mature.

Measures of engagement for this study and the American Democracy Project audit were gleaned from multiple instruments including surveys of students, faculty and staff. Like the audit of community members, many of these surveys have not been completed in some time. A return to more careful and frequent measurement is requested. A more cohesive assessment of engagement will be helpful.

Budgetary allocations for engagement activities are seen most prominently in support of the Office of Community Collaboration with additional small amounts of money supporting activities such as the American Democracy Project. The WASC evaluation process has already had the effect of highlighting the importance of better coordination, and funding has been allocated for a new project integrating civic learning into freshman programs.

### 5.13 Incentives

Faculty members receive mixed signals about engagement. We were one of the first CSU campuses to explicitly endorse research on issues of public concern in our University RTP policy (2002). But there is...
profound inconsistency from college to college regarding what is acceptable for inclusion in the community service category of Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) and how it will be valued in decisions. Given the primacy of the department and college in RTP, this inconsistency is important.

Almost half the current faculty are untenured and are learning what is expected from them at Sacramento State. This is an optimal time to clearly define expectations of engaged faculty members. Recruitment measures do not consistently mention engagement. Discussion by the SPC of changing the RTP weights attached to community engagement (the community service category) is most welcome.

Research support is prioritized for meritorious projects and the faculty is currently engaged in a discussion about whether traditional research is favored over applied research. The outcome of this discussion may have an impact on whether money is more readily available for applied research that includes engagement and impact on the community.

The campus program review process requires that departments describe “community” service of faculty in the self-study. This is a good start but there are no minimum expectations specified and staff are not included.

Incentives for students are difficult to create. We believe that the incentives will need to come from a campus culture that values engagement and infuses it throughout the students’ academic and co-curricular experience, putting a premium on encouraging faculty and staff commitment to engagement.

5.2 Hypothesis 5

The university fosters strong linkages among Sac State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community at-large.

CFRs: 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.4, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8

Table: Community Engagement: Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An Engaged Campus</th>
<th>Current Status of Sacramento State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Definitions of what constitutes engagement would be similar, consistent and widely known – service learning, community service, civic engagement, internships, field experiences, etc.</td>
<td>Varieties of definitions of engagement vary across campus. Official documents vary in language and focus and there is no agreed upon definition or understanding of engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Engagement would be a highly valued and visible dimension of campus life</td>
<td>Engagement is valued by many across campus, but the valuing of engagement is not institutionalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Engagement would be celebrated at many university events</td>
<td>Currently, the university is downsizing its many awards programs. However, Distinguished Service Awards are given to faculty and alumni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Engagement would be explicitly and intentionally woven into various strategic planning processes and documents</td>
<td>Currently, issues of engagement are discussed in the Destination 2010 document and in the Sacramento State Strategic Planning Document (2004) pages 16-17. Engagement is also implied in terms of the economic impact of CSU on the Sacramento region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### An Engaged Campus

1. Engagement is coordinated and promoted from the highest levels of university administration to the department level. Campus centers and institutes have interconnected goals and activities. Data collection is institutionalized across Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and individual colleges and departments. Media for students, faculty, staff and alumni are managed through an interactive, on-line system.

2. Access to the university and its resources from the external community would be clear. For example, a clear portal links the university with the community.

3. Support for faculty and staff development, implementation, and evaluation of engagement activities is readily available and often utilized.

4. Expectations of engagement are included in recruitment materials for students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Engagement is featured in orientations for new students and employees.

### Current Status of Sacramento State

Institutionally, engagement occurs in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Informally, faculty and departments are connected to corporations, municipal agencies and community-based organizations. In Academic Affairs, the Office of Community Collaboration\(^{67}\) links faculty to Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and the American Democracy Project (ADP).\(^{68}\) The Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs\(^{69}\) oversees OCC and ADP. Colleges have community and civic engagement through tutoring, service learning, internships, arts and philanthropic activities through student clubs and organizations. Activities, however, are not coordinated across colleges. In Student Affairs, engagement occurs through the Career Center\(^{70}\) complete with cooperatives and internships through an on-site database. ASI offers opportunities through community projects.\(^{71}\) Evaluation of student engagement occurs through Office of Institutional Research surveys\(^ {72}\) and measurement of the university’s impact on the region.\(^{73}\)

External community organizations often report that they have a difficult time accessing the right department, program or office.

Historically, the main source of support has been through OCC. Individual faculty have sought financial support through the CSU Chancellor’s office of Service Learning (e.g., the Learn and Serve Grant coordinated by Greg Marks in Ethnic Studies).

Some recruitment materials for faculty and staff may include references to a candidate’s ability to make external connections with corporate, municipal, and/or community-based organizations. Increased visibility is one of the key Destination 2010 goals.
An Engaged Campus

Current Status of Sacramento State

1 Rewards programs for faculty and staff.

No explicit rewards, apart from university awards for service, are provided to Faculty and Staff. Incentives for tenure and promotion are linked to "service," but not necessarily engagement as we envision this term. The UARTP document, section 5.05 and subsections G & H address criteria for "Contributions to the Community and Contributions to the Institution," both of which imply some form of engagement.

2 Academic program review linked to engagement

National Accreditation of some departments across campus (e.g., Recreation and Leisure Studies) requires a broadly defined engagement component.

3 Budget priorities linked to engagement

President Gonzalez continues to work on strengthening community/university partnerships and linking these partnerships with budget issues.

A wide range of activities are undertaken every year that focus on engagement both on and off campus. The College of Continuing Education (CCE) is the largest and most active example of Sacramento State’s community engagement efforts.

The College of Continuing Education is committed to the growth and development of the Sacramento Community and its citizens. Given Sacramento State’s proximity to the State Capital, we have a long tradition of close collaboration with state agencies as well as local municipalities. CCE provides a wide variety of courses, workshops, certificate programs, seminars and conferences that meet local and regional needs. CCE works directly with both campus experts and local leaders that develop training programs to keep the CSU "working for California."

The College of Continuing Education has worked with the community since 1951. CCE audiences include both individuals and organizations. Programs provide elements of theory, practice, and application. Non credit courses are geared specifically to the special interests of the Sacramento community; while off campus degree programs provide access to educational opportunities for non-traditional students and those for whom travel to our main campus is not possible.

The Osher Lifelong Learning Institute, for example, is geared towards active adults over 50 years of age. Osher offers a wide variety of low cost, non credit classes, networking opportunities, and linkages to the Sacramento community. A sampling of past courses includes: Sacramento Theatre and Music Samplers, Internet Vacation Planning, Introduction to Digital Photography, and Natural Tools for Health and Well-being.
CCE also provides a wide variety of contract training services to local and state governments, as well as to private industry. We offer both prepackaged and customized training in areas such as management consulting, needs assessments, strategic planning, information technology, leadership development, and project management. We currently provide training to several of the State’s largest agencies, including the Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation, Department of Social Services, Caltrans, the Department of Motor Vehicles, and the California Highway Patrol. Through these various agencies and programs, CCE provides training to thousands of state workers each year. The CCE Project Management Certificate Program was recently awarded the Project of the Year Award, and was named the Program Provider of the Year.

When the State of California Training Center was eliminated several years ago, the College of Continuing Education stepped in to provide alternative options for the training of state employees. In this innovative outreach, CCE formed focus groups of executive level leaders and asked them about their challenges and needs for training. Out of this effort, an Advisory Board was formed to assist CCE in designing training programs to meet their specific needs.

CCE also provide training in the private sector; clients have included Raley’s Supermarkets, and Sutter Health Foundation. CCE also offers a series of web based professional development courses designed specifically for government professionals.

Unfortunately, the university does not sponsor engagement activities that offer enough opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to work together, or opportunities for faculty and staff, beyond those who have a few very specialized skills. Nor is there a systematic focus on university-wide priorities developed after consultation with the community.

5.3 Hypothesis 6

The university offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to community and civic engagement.

CFRs: 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.4, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8

5.31 Co-curricular Programs

There are many examples of good individual co-curricular programs. As the university moves toward becoming “intentional” about its efforts, existing programs will prove an excellent source of model programs and qualified, knowledgeable faculty and staff. The addition of clear university-wide engagement learning goals that are linked to curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities and a developmentally appropriate learning model will complete this effort.

5.32 College of Continuing Education

Once again, the College of Continuing Education (CCE) is engaged in a variety of efforts to promote leadership skills. Some of these outreaches include our Leadership for the Government Executive Program. Created in part by Will Bush (Undersecretary, State and Consumer Services Agency), J. Clark Kelso (Chief Information Officer, State of California) and David A. Gilb (Director, Department of Personnel Administration), this seven month training program is aimed at executive and upper level managers from across state agencies.

In the private sector, CCE is in its tenth year of offering Leadership for the New Millennium, a twelve week interactive executive series designed to assess and develop key leadership skills. By integrating theory and practice, the program equips leaders to address critical issues impacting their organizations. Over 300 leaders in the region have participated in this challenging series. Some of these luminaries include: Janis Heaphy, Publisher and President of the Sacramento Bee; Roger Valine, President and CEO
of Vision Service Plan; Van Johnson, President and CEO of Sutter Health; and Michael Ziegler, President and CEO of PRIDE Industries.

### 5.33 Center for California Studies

The Center for California Studies is a public service, educational support, and applied research institute of Sacramento State. It is dedicated to promoting a better understanding of California's government, politics, peoples, cultures and history.

Founded in 1984 and located on the capital campus of the California State University, the Center possesses a unique trust: to bring the resources of the state's largest university system to the service of public discourse, civic education and state government.

The Center's proximity to the State Capitol and access to the expertise of faculty throughout the 22 campuses of the CSU provide a unique opportunity to combine multi-disciplinary educational resources with government and community service.

The Center administers the Jesse M. Unruh Assembly Fellowship, Executive Fellowship, Judicial Administration Fellowship, and the California Senate Fellows programs. These programs, known collectively as the Capital Fellows Programs, are nationally recognized. During the current academic year the 18 Assembly Fellows, 18 Senate Fellows, 18 Executive Fellows and 10 Judicial Administration Fellows receive an outstanding opportunity to engage in public service and prepare for future careers, while actively contributing to the development and implementation of public policy in California. The ranks of former fellows and associates include a Justice of the California Supreme Court, members of the United States Congress and the State Legislature, a deputy director of the Peace Corps, corporate executives, and local government and community leaders.

The Center is one of the state's only multi-disciplinary, university-based institute which addresses California policy issues.

### 5.34 Conclusion

There is a very good base of activities, committed people, and support from the administration. This base has yielded a wide array of promising programs, courses, extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, and community-based efforts.

The campus can better maximize those efforts by creating a coordinating infrastructure with a clear set of incentive structure and then more consistently assessing the effectiveness of our efforts. The infrastructure needs to consciously integrate Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. What remains is to set a more strategic purposeful course and then support, institutionalize and monitor the activities that have begun.

Our students seem to be welcomed into community venues for community-based experiences, but community partners consistently express a desire for a more coordinated placement process. Some of the more high profile locations receive numerous uncoordinated requests from faculty and staff to place students with them.

Similarly, there is considerable faculty involvement in various sectors of the community but faculty will sometimes stumble on each other in a community site, only to learn that they are providing similar types of programs without knowledge of the other. Much of the engagement work of centers and institutes goes largely unnoticed in the community. Our alumni programs have been growing and efforts to improve them should be sustained.
6.0 Concluding Essay

6.1 Big and Little Dragons

Tests of the six hypotheses by each of three working groups yielded the expected result: Sacramento State is not menaced by any big dragons. The working groups did not find persistent problems that fundamentally threaten the university’s ability to provide quality instruction. Quite the contrary, this Preparatory Review repeatedly illustrates superior effort by faculty, staff, and administrators to provide students with an excellent education.

In every area of investigation, however, small dragons were discovered. The four working groups identified many of these little beasts, and now passes them on to the Educational Effectiveness working groups to pursue. Opportunities for constructive improvement exist for each of the six hypotheses:

1. *The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.*

Many departments continue not to use the assessment process to collectively reflect on student learning. Faculty often remain skeptical of assessment. Among programs without outside accrediting agencies the level of engagement in ongoing program assessment is weak. Some departments continue to find it hard to link identified goals and objectives with methods for measuring learning outcomes. Once those links are formed, many departments face difficulty in taking the next step of improving programs based upon the results. This is where streamlining the program review process might prove helpful.

2. *Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.*

Among the six baccalaureate learning goals students are mastering some goals much better than others. Competency in the discipline heads the list for most departments. Improvement in the goal of information competence is on the agenda for many departments. University attention has been somewhat focused on communication with some admirable measurement success. Assessment of cultural legacies and values/pluralism has seen infrequent assessment attention. Lastly, analysis and problem solving show up as small dragons for several disciplines.

3. *The university has in place the processes and institutional incentives to promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning.*

Collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs varies from program to program. In some cases the collaboration seems to be well established and enduring. In other cases collaboration is fluid and developing. Yet in other cases collaboration is limited to special events or circumstances. Members of the Campus Life Study Group believe that collaboration is limited by an absence of university policies and institutional structures that support collaboration between Student Affairs’ departments and Academic Affairs. This study group also faults the common perception among faculty that the functions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs are distinctly different.

4. *Student Affairs has assessment plans and measurement instruments that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in co-curricular and experiential learning programs.*

The Student Affairs Division has made progress in establishing the initial cycle for assessing student learning in programs and units. However, the ongoing capacity to support the assessment process is not
yet in place. The study group recommends that the Division of Student Affairs develop a division-wide infrastructure to support and sustain the assessment program.

5. The university fosters strong linkages between Sacramento State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community at-large.

6. The university offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.

There are good indicators that the campus is becoming a more engaged university. On all three criteria by which the working group judged community engagement (culture, infrastructure, and incentives) work, however, remains to be done before the campus can call itself fully engaged.

### 6.2 Top-Down versus Bottom-Up Solutions

All four working groups arrived at roughly the same two conclusions: (1) Sacramento State has little difficulty in demonstrating high quality instruction when considered as products from individual faculty, staff, and administrators; (2) Sacramento State’s bureaucratic structures, particularly those designed to mandate and implement learning on campus, are often unclear and more often insufficient.

Regarding the first of these two conclusions, individuals and ad hoc teams with ownership of specific courses, programs, departments, colleges, centers, etc. are exemplary. The following examples are excerpted from the work of the four subcommittees:

- “This new committee structure enhanced all aspects of the review process. Administrative support, in the form of assigned time for Program Review Team chairs, helped legitimate and enhanced the receptivity of the process for faculty.”

- “Examining a representative sampling of majors provides some indications of success as well as opportunities for improvement. Among the best examples of using assessment to improve instruction are the departments of Chemistry, Computer Science, Kinesiology and Health Science, and Sociology.”

- “The Freshman Seminar program provides a clear example of an effective collaborative relationship between faculty members and several departments within Student Affairs. Student Affairs departments/programs that participate in Freshman Seminar include: Alcohol Education Program, Financial Aid, Multi Cultural Center, Student Activities, Career Center/Cooperative Education, Health Center, Psychological Counseling Services, and the Women’s Resource Center.”

- “A model of an effective service learning arrangement is the collaboration between the Child Development Department in the College of Education and the ASI Children’s Center. The Children’s Center serves as a site for students enrolled in Child Development courses.”

- “We were the first CSU to establish a two-tier faculty awards program for outstanding service to the community (2003), and the first to establish an annual reception for service learning community partners (2003).”

- “There is excellent infrastructure to support service learning, the campus has an active Office of Community Collaboration and the Career Center includes a strong cooperative education program.”
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The second common finding, however, is that Sacramento State’s bureaucratic structures often fail to successfully mandate and implement learning on campus. This second conclusion uniformly led the four subcommittees to call for new or improved campus bureaucracy:

- “It is recommended that the WASC Educational Effectiveness subcommittee examine the efficacy of our planning and assessment structures and processes to promote continuing improvement that benefits the Sacramento State community.” (Strategic Planning)

- “Baccalaureate Learning Goals are ideals; but we don’t have structures for explicitly assessing them. We implicitly assess them through such capacities as GE learning goals assessment. Enhancing explicit connection between assessments of GE goals we need more effective institutionalization of these ideals as set forth in Baccalaureate Learning Goals.” (Academic Programs)

- “There is a relative absence of university policies and institutional structures that support collaboration between Student Affairs’ departments and Academic Affairs. Without an institutional framework that supports and encourages collaboration; collaborative efforts are left to the efforts of individual faculty or Student Affairs staff who find intrinsic value in such efforts.” (Campus Life)

- “The ongoing capacity to support the assessment process (in Student Affairs) is not in place. It is highly recommended that the Division of Student Affairs develop a division-wide infrastructure to support and sustain the assessment program.” (Campus Life)

- “What appears to be missing is the infrastructure to support and encourage engagement activities and incentives to facilitate moving in that [good programs and activities] direction. This is reflected in the disconnected nature of current activities and the lack of significant campus-wide or cross-division efforts. In short, the campus is not particularly intentional about its engagement efforts at this point.” (Community Engagement)

- “The infrastructure needs to consciously integrate student affairs and academic affairs. What remains is to set a more strategic purposeful course and then support, institutionalize and monitor the activities that have begun.” (Community Engagement)

But does Sacramento State actually need new top-down “structures” to sustain quality instruction? Might the university be better served by the continued bottom-up efforts of individual faculty, staff, and administrators? After all, as the Community Engagement working group put it, “There are many good programs and activities being undertaken across campus by individual faculty, student groups, staff and departments.”

Perhaps the appropriate role for more centralized entities within the university (e.g., President’s Cabinet, Strategic Planning Council, Dean’s Council and Faculty Senate) might be to establish campus values and visions for academic programs, campus life, and community engagement. Having painted the vision, the centralized offices might then invite innovation in pursuit of the broader goals then finance, encourage and coordinate such efforts by individuals, teams and virtual organizations.

As a former chair of the Faculty Senate, Christy Jensen, put it, “One insight I had was linked to the Advising Initiative where we could have requested that departmental proposals show linkage to Student Affairs units such as the Career Center. We [administrative structures] articulate the goals/values and then make resources available to make those things happen.”

The contrary position, as suggested at various times by some working groups, is to put into place the policies, processes and structures necessary to address opportunities raised in this report. As noted by the
Campus Life Working Group, “Without an institutional framework that supports and encourages collaboration; collaborative efforts are left to the efforts of individual faculty or Student Affairs staff who find intrinsic value in such efforts. At best, this results in a hit or miss approach to fostering collaboration.”

The choice between improved top-down structures and processes versus better support for bottom-up innovations becomes an important question for Sacramento State to consider. And, of course, the status quo (not moving far in either direction) remains an option. The question is a little like the decision every campus must make when providing walkways. Do landscape architects plan sidewalks for subsequent cementing then erect barriers to walking on the grass? Or do facility managers allow students to trample the most efficacious paths then pave over the worn areas?

Regardless of the eventual decision to be reached, a WASC imperative has been achieved: Sacramento State is collectively considering a fundamental educational question. Contemplating this question, our WASC Educational Effectiveness Steering Committee can stand in front of Sacramento State’s version of Robert Frost’s two roads diverging in front of a yellow wood. The institution’s choice will, no doubt, “make all the difference.”
APPENDIX A: Response to the Prior WASC Report

In the nine years since the last WASC re-accreditation review, this regional comprehensive university has grown approximately 28%, from 18,060 full-time equivalent students in fall 1996 to 23,156 in fall 2006. Sacramento State has experienced major changes in its administrative leadership. Dr. Donald Gerth retired after 19 years as President, and Dr. Alexander Gonzalez became Sacramento State’s 11th President. President Gonzalez has named new Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Administration, Finance, Student Affairs, and Advancement. Sacramento State has also seen substantial turnover at the Dean level.

These sweeping changes in administrative leadership come at a time when Sacramento State, like all California public universities, is facing major budget cuts and difficulties in meeting enrollment targets. Sacramento State has also begun two major strategic planning initiatives: Destination 2010 and the Strategic Planning Council (SPC).

The WASC review presents Sacramento State with an opportunity to focus on three thematic areas: academic programs, campus life, and community engagement to address the core commitments of institutional capacity and educational effectiveness as they relate to these themes. The three areas are broken into six hypotheses. Several of the hypotheses were crafted with the 1996-97 WASC Report in mind. We believe that by adopting this approach we will be able to address the core commitments of institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.

Responses to the 1996-97 WASC Report

In its 1996-97 reaccreditation review report WASC observed that conversations on the Sacramento State campus had begun to focus on substantive educational issues, including assessment of student learning. WASC’s Accrediting Commission report noted evidence that the academic administration was supporting and encouraging programs and faculty members to learn more about assessing student outcomes and about faculty roles in learning-centered institutions. Furthermore, the report also noted that faculty members were taking advantage of these opportunities.

In years since that final report, Sacramento State has actively addressed the challenge of becoming a place where learning outcomes are as integral a part of university life. Both the conversations and faculty participation in assessing student learning have not only continued, but have become part of the campus culture at Sacramento State.

In its 1997 final Report, WASC posed four questions.

1. How appropriate are current assessment instruments and what new assessment instruments need to be designed by faculty to assess student learning outcomes?

The WASC Report made three suggestions: (1) continue efforts to clarify the language of the emerging culture shift, (2) increase efforts to provide a broad base of expertise about assessment and how it can be useful in departments and among faculty and staff, and (3) focus both assessment and improvement activities in a way that permits ongoing work and sustained effort.

In response to the issue of faculty-designed tools to assess student learning outcomes, the Sacramento State campus community has been deeply involved in developing outcomes assessment strategies for department majors and the General Education program. A General Education assessment cycle has been established and implemented. During spring semester 2004 the Faculty Senate approved a proposal to incorporate student learning assessment, as well as assessment of departments’ General Education offerings, into each academic department’s Program Review, thereby establishing a mechanism for
seamless ongoing review and reflection on student learning within academic program centers and in
Academic Affairs. Departments submit annual assessment reports for majors in their programs. These
assessment processes have been integrated into periodic program reviews. Section 3.12 of the current
report speaks directly to the assessment issue.

2. What infrastructure does the university need to put into place to assure its continued progress as an
institute publicly committed to teaching and learning?

The 1996-97 WASC Report noted that the university had begun to develop “a more robust infrastructure
to ensure the continuation of these assessment efforts.” The WASC Report acknowledged that the
Council for University Planning (CUP), a campus-wide advisory body, played an important role in
linking budget, planning, and assessment. As noted, the former CUP has been replaced by the SPC. The
university believes that the SPC can more nimbly respond to infrastructure needs related to teaching and
learning. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 speak directly to this question.

The WASC re-accrediting review process provides the opportunity to direct the strategic planning process
and to reflect on data trends in student learning.

3. How can the university—or various schools and departments—define effective teaching more
comprehensively so that it includes responsibility for curricular design as well as professional
practice with student learning as the goal?

This very question was the impetus for Hypothesis #1 in this report. Sacramento State has responded to
the issue through revisions in the process and standards used in Program Review process as well as the
process used for General Education Course Review.

After several years of discussions among faculty who attended a variety of state, regional, and national
conferences and training sessions on Student Learning and Assessment, a revised Self-Study and Program
Review Process and Standard was developed, and the final version was approved in 2004 by the Faculty
Senate. The revised Program Review involves a three-part assessment process: (1) demonstrated linkage
between department mission, program-level goals and learning outcomes, with specific courses designed
to facilitate student achievement of those outcomes; (2) the use of data from one indirect and one direct
assessment measure to assess student learning of these outcomes; and (3) an assessment-driven faculty
reflection process that opens considered discussion and encourages change.

A similar process was implemented for the General Education program: faculty teaching general
education courses must submit (to a faculty General Education/Graduation Requirements Course Review
Subcommittee) their course syllabi, and submit an assessment plan to the General Education/Graduation
Requirement Policy Committee. The plan must specify the linkage of General Education goals and
learning outcomes to course-specific versions of those learning outcomes, and the assessment methods
and criteria used to evaluate and reflect on student achievement of these learning outcomes.

In the years since the last WASC review, Sacramento State has been deeply committed to developing and
strengthening faculty expertise, involvement, and responsibility for assessing student learning.
Developing ways of defining effective teaching remains an ongoing issue, and the Center for Teaching
and Learning has been active in developing faculty mentors to work with new faculty in a formative
assessment and reflection process. We believe it is important for Sacramento State to continue its efforts
to define effective teaching. We propose to use this WASC Re-accreditation Review to identify new
ways in which we can address these important ongoing issues.

4. The final issue raised by the 1996-97 WASC Report asked Sacramento State to consider “What is the
University’s definition of the baccalaureate degree, including general education, the major, writing
and other skills?”
In response to this issue a faculty task force worked for two years to develop a set of Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the Faculty Curriculum Policies Committee last year recommended that we assess the outcomes. This recommendation was sent to CUP and recommended to the President as a Planning Objective. As a consequence, this objective will become a major focus of the Academic Programs emphasis for both the Preparatory (hypothesis #2) and Educational Effectiveness Reviews.
### Appendix B: Criteria for Review Matrix

#### Evidence on the WASC Criteria for Review to Support the Capacity and Preparatory Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1 Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. Institutional Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1. The institution’s formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character. | The mission statement of Sacramento State is appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly defines our values and character. The mission statement is well publicized in university publications and web sites. | • Sacramento State Catalog: Mission  
• University Web Site: Mission |
| 1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives | In 2004 the university launched the Destination 2010 initiative. This vision serves to guide our planning process. Academic Affairs, Business Affairs and the Division of Student Affairs have developed strategic planning documents which include detailed objectives and strategies. The University has also developed and implemented efforts to assess student learning of educational objectives in both general education and academic programs. | • Destination 2010  
• Strategic Planning Council: Destination 2010 Strategic Plans  
• GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
• Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
• Student Affairs: Destination 2010 Strategic Plan |
| 1.3. The institution’s leadership creates and sustains leadership systems at all levels that are marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability. | Sacramento State has committed to effective leadership that requires careful and regular evaluation. All Executive and Management Personnel Plan (MPP) personnel are reviewed annually. The periodic review of administrative performance provides an opportunity for the campus community to provide input and comment on MPP personnel performance. | • University Manual: Periodic Review of Administrative Performance |
| **1B. Integrity** | | |
| 1.4. The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing. | Sacramento State has published policies on academic freedom of faculty and students. | • University Manual: Academic Freedom Policy |
| 1.5. Consistent with its purposes and character, the institute demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices. | Sacramento State has established policies reflecting the importance of diversity to our community. Our faculty, staff, and student demographics reflect the diverse population of the region we serve and our educational objectives focus on the development of positive social attitudes, values and behaviors and understanding of the diversity of human experiences and cultures. | • Nondiscrimination Policy  
• Hiring Policy  
• OIR/Faculty and Staff Data  
• Sacramento State: Top Third in Diversity  
• Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals.  
• Destination 2010: Academics |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WASC Criteria for Review</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Expected Outcomes &amp; Existing information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.6. Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. | Sacramento State university is one of twenty-three campuses of the California State University (CSU) system. The CSU is responsible to a Board of Trustees which is, in turn, responsible to the Governor of California. The Board of Trustees determines regulations governing the system, publishing them in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 5. The chief executive of the CSU is the chancellor, currently Dr. Charles Reed, supported by the Chancellor’s Office and advised by his staff and by the Council of Presidents of the various campuses. The Chancellor’s Office, in consultation with the campuses, sets overall policy, allocates state funding of the system, and negotiates all collective bargaining agreements with the various unions. Within this framework, the University operates to fulfill its educational mission with appropriate autonomy through the collaborative efforts and shared governance of the University administration and the Faculty Senate. | ▪ Faculty Senate  
▪ CSU Web Site |
| 1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion; and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds. | Sacramento State publications, informational materials and established policies clearly articulate our academic goals, programs and services to students and the community, demonstrate that our programs can be completed in a timely manner, and exhibit our commitment to fair and equitable treatment of students. | ▪ Destination 2010: Academics  
▪ Human Subjects Policy  
▪ Student Complaint Hearing Policy  
▪ OIR: Graduation Analysis  
▪ OIR: Retention Analysis |
| 1.8. The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. | Sacramento State demonstrates sound operational processes, business practices and appropriate responses to grievances and complaints as evidenced in established policies and procedures. | ▪ Complaint Policy  
▪ Hearing Procedures  
▪ Administration and Business Affairs |
| 1.9. The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission to undertake the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures Including all substantive change policies. | Sacramento State is fully committed to an honest and open relationship with the Accrediting Commission and endeavors to comply with standards and criteria for review. The institution has obtained great benefits from advice that indicated in the 1999-97 WASC Report. | ▪ WASC Page |

**Standard 2 Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions.**

2.A. Teaching and Learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1. The institution’s educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. | Sacramento State is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and for teacher education by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; the University is also a member of the National Council of Graduate Schools and the Western Association of Graduate Schools, and is on the list of approved colleges by the American Association of University Women. Many academic programs are also individually accredited. As demonstrated in academic program assessment plans and program portfolios, each department and university-wide program prepares a self-study that includes an assessment plan and evaluation of data relevant to the unit’s stated goals and desired outcomes. These documents are reviewed by an external consultant and an internal program review team as part of the program review process. | ▪ Accredited Programs  
▪ Undergraduate Programs  
▪ Graduate Programs  
▪ Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
▪ Program Review documents  
▪ OIR: Faculty/staff |
| 2.2 All degrees —undergraduate and graduate —awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. | As evidenced by its General Education Outcomes, Baccalaureate Learning Goals, individual program expectations, and established policy, Sacramento State University has well defined expectations and requirements for its programs. | ▪ General Education: Expected Outcomes  
▪ Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals  
▪ Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
▪ University Manual—Graduation Requirements  
▪ Graduate Program Requirements  
▪ Graduate Studies |
| 2.3 The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution’s curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum. | Sacramento State University educational expectations are clearly articulated in the structure of its General Education program, eligibility criteria, degree requirements, advising policy, and library instructional services. Sacramento State is also committed to providing students a variety of opportunities through experiential as well as distance and distributed learning. | ▪ Sacramento State Catalog: GE Program Structure  
▪ Admissions: Eligibility  
▪ Degree Requirements  
▪ Advising Policy  
▪ Graduate Admissions  
▪ Library Instructional Services  
▪ OCC Web Page: Service Learning  
▪ Distance Education Web Page |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC Criteria for Review</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.4 The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations. | Sacramento State University learning expectations are developed by members of the university community and shared within the community through University publications, presentations, and web sites. Faculty take responsibility for developing, reviewing and evaluating attainment of university and program objectives through the program review process. | • Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals.  
• GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
• Sacramento State Learning Outcomes |
| 2.5. The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. | Each program has developed learning expectations and demonstrates how they engage students in learning within program review and program portfolios. | • Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
• GE Portfolio: Outcomes |
| 2.6. The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work. | The University grading policy clearly articulates expectations for student learning. General education assessment provides the opportunity to ensure that the program is meeting its stated objectives. Through program portfolios, each program ensures that expectations for learning are embedded in the curriculum. | • Grading Policy  
• Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
• GE Portfolio: Outcomes |
| 2.7. In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such review. | Board of Trustees regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. These self studies are to conform to a common University format, including implementation of the university assessment policy and utilize data supplied by the University for program planning and evaluation. | • Program Review Policy  
• Self Study Guidelines  
• Sacramento State Learning Outcomes |
| 2.B. Scholarship and Creative Activity | Through the ARTP process, faculty development programs, and funding opportunities, the University demonstrates that it values, supports, and promotes scholarship and instructional innovation. | • ARTP Policy  
• Research and Sponsored Projects  
• Faculty Development  
• Faculty Funding Support |
| 2.9. The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service. | Academic Affairs Destination 2010 Goal 3 emphasizes excellence in both teaching and learning. It is guided by the assumption that an engaged faculty sets high standards, teaches students well and learns with those students. An engaged faculty can be maintained through support for professional development in scholarly activity, encouragement to explore and utilize academic technology in and out of the classroom, ongoing enhancement of pedagogical skills and providing opportunities to link the campus to the community and the professional world. Goal 4 recognizes that the reallocation of internal resources and the development of external resources through sponsored research and gift development are essential to ensure a margin of excellence for instruction, faculty and staff development, technological necessities and library enhancement. | • Goal 3: Enhance Excellence in Teaching and Learning  
• Goal 4: Develop Resources to Support Instructional Needs |

| 2.C. Support for Student Learning | On a regularly scheduled basis, the University gathers information about student needs, experiences and satisfaction. This information is used both for University planning and program review. | • Assessment Surveys |

| 2.10. Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs, experiences, and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success. | The Division of Student Affairs has developed a Destination 2010 Strategic Plan that describes the ways that the Division will work to actualize Destination 2010. It not only describes exciting programs and services that will make Student Affairs a "Destination Division," but it also reflects an engaged process that allowed each and every department within the Division to conceptualize, confirm, and challenge what it does now and what it will do in the future to bring 2010 to life. | • Student Affairs: Destination 2010 Strategic Plan |

| 2.11. Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student, professional and personal development. | The University catalog is a primary resource for understanding University and program requirements. Departments also provide valuable information to students both on-line and in person. A variety of advising resources are available to students to ensure that they receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements. | • Sacramento State Catalog: Academic Programs  
• Departments and Colleges  
• Academic Advising Resources |

| 2.12. The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements. | | |
| 2.13. Student support services —including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information services —are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers. | A wide variety of services designed to meet the needs of our diverse community are available to students through the Division of Student Affairs. University Computing, Communications and Media Services provide a comprehensive set of support services and resources to faculty, staff, and students to allow them to effectively and efficiently use campus computing, communications, and networking resources to enhance their work environments and in the various roles they perform within the University. Library Instructional Services unit promotes the use of library resources as an array of teaching/learning tools and assists students, scholars and community users in developing and fostering information seeking and evaluation skills. The means to achieve this goal can be realized through a combination of instructional sessions, tours, online tutorials, or personal consultations that allow the student scholar to learn via a format that matches their learning style. | • Student Affairs  
• Computing, Communications, and Media Services  
• Library Instructional Services |
|---|---|---|
| 2.14. Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements | Clear and accurate information is provided to transfer students in the University Catalog and through Outreach, Admissions and Records. The impact of policies and procedures on transfer students is monitored by data collected in the Office of Institutional Research and through the CSU Accountability Process. | • Sacramento State Catalog: Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations, Transfer Centers  
• Admissions and Records: Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations  
• Outreach, Admissions and Records: Transfer Students  
• OIR: Fact book  
• Strategic Planning Council: CSU Accountability Process |

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

| 3.A. Faculty and Staff | The University employs 1,130 staff and 140 administrators to support its educational mission. | • University Facts |
3.2. The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.

In Fall, 2005, there were a total of 363 (25%) tenured and 351 (24%) probationary faculty (including FERP). There were also 103 (7%) temporary full-time faculty, as well as 648 (44%) temporary part-time faculty. A total of 772 (52.8%) were male, while 691 (47.2%) were female.

In terms of the Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) that strictly represent a faculty member's classroom teaching workload (not supervision), a mean of 10.23 WTUs were taught by full-time faculty, 10.35 by probationary faculty, 12.43 by full-time temporary faculty, and 6.05 by part-time faculty.

3.3. Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.

The University ARTP process emphasizes the value the University places on providing quality instruction, and the recognition of service and outreach of faculty in the region.

The University has made faculty workload a key priority and has as a goal of the Academic Affairs Destination 2010 Strategic plan the goal to “More fully recognize workload in advising, community service, research, thesis and project supervision.”

3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.

Individual departments provide a variety of opportunities for faculty development. The Center for Teaching and Learning is a rich resource for faculty. The Center provides several programs such as Faculty Mentoring Faculty, Pre-tenure and Teaching Strategies, and Faculty Mentors Supporting Faculty using Technology. The University also provides several funding opportunities for faculty development such as Research and Creative Activity Awards, Pedagogy Enhancement Awards, and travel assistance.

3.B. Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

3.5. Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kind of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.

University Business Affairs has developed a Strategic Plan and goals and measures that are aligned with the vision of Destination 2010, WASC standards and CSU Cornerstones and are designed to promote optimal utilization of fiscal and physical resources to support and maintain our educational mission.

Regular Town Hall briefings held by the President apprise the community of fiscal and physical resource issues that impact the University.

- OIR: Faculty/staff
- ARTP Policy and Periodic review of tenured faculty
- Goal 3: Enhance Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- Sacramento State Learning Outcomes
- Center for Teaching and Learning: Faculty Services
- Funding Opportunities
- Research Administration
- Destination 2010: Business Affairs Strategic Planning
- Destination 2010: Business Affairs Goals and Measures
- University Budget
- Facts and Figures
- General Fund Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.6. The institution holds, or provides access to information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kind to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution’s purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2005 the University opened the new Academic Information Resource Center. The building is home to University Computing and Communications Services (UCCS) and the University Telecommunications Services (UTS). This is a natural migration pathway considering the &quot;like and kind&quot; services and operations common among the voice, data and video technologies. The building also includes academic support space, self instructional computer lab and discipline specific computer labs. The Computing Lab offers 87 work stations 16 group work stations, 5 group study rooms, 10 laptop stations, and 1 copier. The Academic Information Center is a state-of-the-art information technology environment. Its purpose is to address the academic needs of on-campus and off-campus students into the 21st century by providing an ideal setting for learning transformation. Furthermore, the campus community has access to a wide range of facilities and services provided by University Computing and Communication Services and University Media Services. The University Library holds and provides access to information resources and provides services to support distance education and campus based instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Information Resource Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computing Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Media Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Services</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7. The institution’s information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Academic Information Technology Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, responsible for the development of policy on academic related information technology. In 2004 Faculty senate approved a strategic plan for information technology and the committee’s recommendations for classroom information technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Senate: Information Technology Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computing, Communications and Media Services</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.C. Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8. The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided by the Vision of the Destination 2010 initiative, administrative units within the University have developed strategic planning processes to support effective decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Strategic Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration and Business Affairs Strategic Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Affairs Strategic Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9. The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10. The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution; together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able, to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11. The institution’s faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution’s educational purposes and character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

| **4.A. Strategic Thinking and Planning** | **4.1.** The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate. | The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) involves every constituency associated with the University. Its primary purpose is to review and to make recommendations to the President regarding planning and action priorities at the University level. The major initial responsibility of the SPC will be to revise the Strategic Plan for the University and to recommend approval of that plan to the President. At the academic program level, each department and university-wide program prepares a self-study that includes an assessment plan and evaluation of data relevant to the unit’s stated goals and desired outcomes. These documents are reviewed by an external consultant and an internal program review team as part of the program review process. |
| | | **• Strategic Planning Council**  
| | | **• Sacramento State Learning Outcomes** |
| | **4.2.** Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution. | In its revision of the Strategic Plan, the SPC will seek to combine the initiatives that have been proposed to implement Destination 2010 with elements of the existing Strategic Plan, the hypotheses central to the WASC review, and the CSU Accountability Measures. With its representation from key constituencies, the SPC will be uniquely positioned to address their concerns when revising the Strategic Plan. |
| | | **• Strategic Planning Council**  
| | | **• Key Planning Resources** |
| | **4.3.** Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning. | Once the revised University Strategic Plan has been approved, the SPC will develop an assessment process that will measure the University’s progress toward the objectives of the Plan. |
| | | **• Strategic Planning Council** |
4.B Commitment to Learning

4.4. The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

The obligation for assessment of student learning comes from many internal and external constituencies, including the U. S. Department of Education, regional and national accreditors, the CSU system, and Sacramento State. All are responding to a government-wide call for universities and schools to engage in a process of continual self-examination and reflection with the goal of improvement. As an institution of higher education we, along with universities and colleges nationwide, are being asked to demonstrate that our students have developed desired knowledge, skills and abilities upon graduation. In essence, this is what is meant by accountability.

Responding to the call for accountability, academic program assessment was a major component of the Cornerstones project of the Chancellor's office. The CSU Chancellor's Office is asking campuses to address accountability and responsibility for thirteen fundamental institutional performance areas. Among them are the quality of baccalaureate and graduate degree programs, and post-baccalaureate program, if offered. Each campus has to report annually on progress made.

Also responding to the call for accountability, the University has an assessment policy which directs departments to have an assessment plan that includes outcomes, methods for evaluating outcomes, and responses to the outcomes.

- Academic Affairs: Policies and Procedures
- Academic Affairs: Assessment and Planning
- Sacramento State Learning Outcomes
| 4.5. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of the institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution’s purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data. | The mission of the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is to enhance University effectiveness with information to support planning, assessment, policy formation, and decision making. In fulfilling this mission, the OIR collects, preserves, edits, analyzes, and interprets significant and meaningful information and disseminates it in a timely and effective manner. The OIR is responsible for the design and production of routine and ad hoc reports for internal constituencies, federal, state, and other external agencies. The OIR is charged with the development and maintenance of an integrated database that incorporates University historical data from multiple sources in ways that inform and advise University policy. In support of the Strategic Planning Council and academic program review processes, the OIR is responsible for the design and implementation of analytic studies of internal and external constituencies and the development of assessment reports and accountability requirements. The OIR provides assistance to students, faculty, and staff in conducting research to support University themes, initiatives and accomplishments, planning priorities, and special projects. | • OIR: Web Site |

| 4.6. Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning. | In 2004 the University launched the Destination 2010 initiative. Spearheaded by President Gonzalez, this vision serves to guide our planning process. Academic Affairs, Business Affairs and the Division of Student Affairs have developed strategic planning documents which include detailed objectives. The University and academic departments have developed and implemented efforts to assess student learning of educational objectives in both general education and majors. In the fall of 2005, the Division of Student Affairs, in consultation with the Office of Institutional Research launched the Division’s assessment process for all programs and units. The process not only provides valuable feedback for the staff and faculty who administer Student Affairs programs, it also helps the division focus more deliberately on its role in student learning. | • Destination 2010 • Strategic Planning Council: Destination 2010 Strategic Plans • GE Portfolio: Outcomes • Sacramento State Learning Outcomes • Student Affairs Assessment |


4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.

|  | The Center for Teaching and Learning provides activities and services that help individuals, departments, and programs to identify and achieve their desired level of teaching excellence. The Center seeks to achieve this mission through one-on-one consultation with faculty members, presenting workshops for both departments and the campus community on a variety of college teaching issues, referral to and about partnering with other support offices for assistance outside the Center’s area of service, and publications about university teaching. The Center director also consults with departmental chairs and committees and college and campus administrators on faculty development issues. More than simply assisting instructors to solve current problems, it is the goal of the CTL to assist them to choose the issues on which some effort will achieve the greatest results, to help them to expand their repertoire of teaching approaches and practices, and to aid them in reaching a higher level of teaching competence. This includes addressing issues of student cultural and linguistic background, as well as diversity of prior preparation and differing learning styles. Another CTL goal is to promote a climate of collegiality which inspires, nurtures, and rewards self-directed faculty efforts toward professional development and which supports an expansion of the level, frequency, and available venues for campus conversation about teaching. |
|---|---|---|
| | | Center for Teaching and Learning |
4.8. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.

Academic Program Alumni Surveys are used to assess the quality and effectiveness of Sacramento State educational programs and support services. The results are used by departments and programs in the self-study portions of Academic Program Review.

University Alumni Survey is used to assess the quality and effectiveness of Sacramento State educational programs, support services, a detailed employment, and education history. The have been used to inform the Sacramento State University planning and assessment process.

The Public Life Survey is used to assess the regional perception of Sacramento State in the following areas: culture/arts, human and social services, education, economic development, and public policy.

Academic Programs also utilize employer surveys to assess the quality and effectiveness of their programs.

- Survey instruments
- Sacramento State Learning Outcomes
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Section 6.09 of the National Recreation and Park Association Council on Accreditation Document states: “There shall be adequate opportunities related to practical learning activities including, but not limited to, observation, volunteer participation and practical experiences related to course work.”