January 12, 2009

Mr. Ralph Wolfe
Executive Director
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ralph:

On behalf of California State University, Sacramento, I am pleased to submit our Educational Effectiveness Review Report for review. This report thoroughly and comprehensively examines and assesses the six hypotheses we described in both our Institutional Proposal and Capacity and Preparatory Review respectively. This review has offered us a chance to highlight the various ways we have met the WASC standards for reaccreditation and made visible the significant work we have done to promote student success and learning on our campus. By selecting the themes of academic programs, campus life and community engagement, the review enabled us to reflect collectively upon the core aspects of our educational mission and strengthened our commitment to being the premier campus of choice for students and faculty in our region. This report therefore is truly the product of campus-wide collaboration, engagement, and involvement of faculty, staff, administrators and alumni who served on the committees that provided input for the preparation of the document.

The report is organized into six sections and three appendices. The first two sections offer a summary of our most significant accomplishments and the progress we have made. They also describe the context of a harmonic convergence of opportunities by which the WASC process added momentum to our ongoing efforts to promote a culture of collaboration and evidence-based decision making. In sections 3, 4, and 5 we focus on our analysis of the three themes of academic programs, campus life and community engagement as described in our six hypotheses. In these sections we are able to test the alignment of our institutional values with our practices and demonstrate that Sacramento State is effectively and successfully serving our students and our state. Section 6 is the reflective essay, which recognizes educational effectiveness as an agent of change. It provides a prism through which to sustain our progress, resolve our challenges, and identify our priorities for the next ten years.

The appendices to this report are presented in Appendices A, B, and C. Our response to the WASC Action Letter of July 2007 is fully discussed in Appendix A. The discussion outlines the several actions we have taken to improve areas of concern raised by the Capacity and Preparatory Review Visiting Team and provides assurance of meaningful and sustained improvements in quality assurance processes. Appendix B summarizes the four Standards and Criteria for Review Matrix depicted in the 2001 WASC Handbook of Accreditation. The Matrix enables us to describe our actions from the lens of the educational effectiveness review as well as provide links to online campus resources as evidence of our success. In Appendix C, we include the required data tables: an Inventory of Educational Effectiveness, Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators, followed by the WASC/ACSCU Summary Data Form.

Our report provides a compelling indication of the educational effectiveness of this University both in terms of our mission and the seriousness with which we value the WASC process. The work we are doing provides solid affirmation of our case for reaccreditation as we continue the culture of change to which we are irrevocably committed. It is against this background, with pride in our accomplishments, and assurances that we continue to earn the public trust in our University, that I wholeheartedly submit this report on behalf of all faculty and staff colleagues for WASC review. I look forward to the team’s visit next April confident they will find the campus committed to educational effectiveness that is meritorious of WASC reaccreditation.

Sincerely,

Alexander Gonzalez
President
“Despite the difficult issues we’re sure to confront, we have an exciting and promising year ahead of us. As I said last year, we have to remember that we share a commitment to the success of our students—a simple but powerful fact that motivates and brings us together. It guides our work as we serve our students and strive to make this campus a premier metropolitan university.”

—President Alexander Gonzalez
Fall Address, 2008

Sacramento State’s commitment to providing access to a quality education is manifesting itself in deeper, more important ways than ever before. We are embracing evidence-based decision-making as an institution and exploring ways to better leverage our strong standing in the community.

Since the University’s founding more than 60 years ago, Sacramento State has become a pillar in the capital region. We educate 29,000 students annually, and one in 26 residents in the area is a Sacramento State graduate. Our alumni are leaders in government, business and the community. The University also directly and indirectly contributes more than $900 million a year to the region’s economy each year.

Sacramento State’s impact on both the region and its people is constantly growing, and our engagement in the WASC process is shepherding our focus so we can realize our even greater potential.
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1.0 Introduction

The reaccreditation process at California State University, Sacramento has offered us the opportunity to make visible and reflect on the significant work we have done to promote student success and learning while documenting the evolution of our institutional culture from a culture of compliance to a culture of collaboration and evidence-based decision-making. This report details our educational enterprise and our institutional mission. It allows us to showcase our accomplishments, celebrate our achievements and learn from our mistakes. While we have recognized several areas for improvement, overall, we are eager to highlight the ways our efforts are making a difference to our students and our community.

1.1 Educational Effectiveness Review: Executive Summary

The Educational Effectiveness Review phase of Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation at Sacramento State resulted in a harmonic convergence of opportunities. The University has used the 24 months between the Capacity and Preparatory Report and the Educational Effectiveness Review to examine and strengthen our commitment to a number of transformational initiatives that were already under way and to determine how effectively we were meeting and defining our goals. The result is this report, which documents a consistent and long-standing commitment to the educational enterprise. By testing the alignment of our institutional values with our practices in academic programs, campus life and community engagement, we can now demonstrate that Sacramento State is comprehensively, effectively and successfully serving our students, our state and our region as a destination campus, performing in ways that affirm the public trust. The opportunities, priorities and challenges we have identified and the reflections and actions we have taken over the four-year period since our Institutional Proposal, reveal Sacramento State’s determination to provide our students with a set of quality educational experiences.

This Educational Effectiveness Review illustrates noteworthy successes:

» Significant and meaningful improvements in quality assurance processes. The most evident improvements are in areas that support our commitment to student learning. We revised the program-review process and used annual assessment reports to improve and internalize assessment activities within departments and achieved a verifiable impact on curricular and pedagogical strategies. In addition, our assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals now includes use of a matrix that aligns with goals in General Education, which we expect will lead to the development of a system to standardize and simplify the process.

» Identifiable and irreversible success in the use of strategic planning as the cornerstone for resource allocation and priority-setting. Major segments of the campus have come to understand that the new Strategic Plan is providing us with an indispensable road map for achieving our short-term priorities while complementing the vision of Destination 2010 as outlined in the President’s long-term initiative. The first priority of the Strategic Plan is to make significant progress in student success by improving retention, graduation rates and time to degree. Recent actions by the Strategic Planning Council indicate a growing shift in the culture of the campus to align resources that permit ongoing improvements in this area.

» Structural and qualitative improvements in oversight and use of assessment. We implemented a revised assessment system (see Figure 1), which has increasingly led to enhanced oversight, resources, use of direct and indirect measures, expertise and faculty involvement at the departmental level. These improvements have resulted in an institutional architecture for quality assurance and quality improvements of our curricular and co-curricular programs. The emerging assessment paradigm underscores the need for all programs to transition to the next level of growth: from “emerging” to “developed” and in some cases “highly developed,” as defined by the WASC Commission’s rubric on assessment of student learning.

» Historic advances in University-wide engagement in evidence-based decision-making. We developed a system of accountability and transparency to support strategic planning and the budgeting process through the creation and activities of the University Budget Advisory Council (UBAC). In addition, the Provost has restructured and reformatted the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to make pertinent data to support evidence-based decision-making available and accessible to the campus community. As a result, the new OIR Data Center is a crucial source for planning across the various administrative divisions of the University.

» Substantial improvements in collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Increased collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs has resulted in a greater integration of curricular and co-curricular efforts intended to support the Strategic Plan priorities involving student success. Specifically, admission practices, access to OIR data, creation of new multi-media outreach and
recruitment tools, co-design of messages for students in the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), new strategies to improve retention of at-risk second-year students and implementation of the new Advising Policy are just a few of the initiatives on which Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have cooperated. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these joint efforts are contributing positively to transforming students’ understanding of and appreciation for the University.

» Authentic meaningful engagement of faculty, staff and students in the Sacramento community, the State Capitol and the region. A timely confluence of events has provided both opportunities and incentives to make demonstrable progress in our intentional efforts in civic and community engagement. Indeed, our assessment efforts, improvements in the first-year experience, the increased focus on General Education and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, as well as the greater visibility of the Community Engagement Center, the Center for California Studies, the College of Continuing Education and the Office of Governmental and Civic Affairs have led to more vibrant, productive and engaged campus-community relationships. Recent examples include a historic Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the City of Sacramento, the Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) Pipeline Initiative and Destination 2010 community building initiatives.

» Constructive improvement in campus climate. Sustained collaboration between the faculty and University leadership since 2006 has resulted in significant and productive improvements in campus climate. Anchored in an ongoing commitment to consultative decision-making, the President has put in place structures and processes that have enhanced University governance, transparency and accountability.

Progress in these areas has been crucial in shaping the University’s transformation from a regional campus to a premier public university committed to serving the citizens of California. And as a part of the deep reflection and self-study associated with this WASC reaccreditation, the University recognizes the continuing need to be
responsive to the structural and cultural challenges that remain as we refine our priorities and take note of the opportunities that change brings. In addition to the overview provided above, a more detailed inventory of the campus’s most recent actions, challenges and opportunities is provided in Figure 2, which begins on page 6.

1.2 Transitions and Transformations

Through the past several cycles of engagement with the WASC accreditation process, California State University, Sacramento has consistently demonstrated in both words and deeds that the institution shares significant values with WASC. In particular, like WASC, Sacramento State is committed to serving its public stakeholders, developing and using evidence to underpin institutional decision-making and demonstrating meaningful standards of educational effectiveness and student learning. The current review cycle, which began with our institutional proposal in 2005 and that culminates with the Educational Effectiveness Review Team visit in Spring 2009, has revealed that although we are an institution in the midst of significant transitions, our vision for the future is based on a deep and consistent sense of our strengths, a willingness to acknowledge and remedy our weaknesses and a widespread confidence that we have already met significant challenges as we enhance our ability to prepare our students for the complexities of 21st century life. Again, we have taken advantage of the self-study and peer-review processes to focus our institutional energies on issues that are critical to our educational enterprise. Thus far, the self-study process has served us well.

1.3 Engagement with WASC

This Educational Effectiveness Report reflects the continuation of Sacramento State’s self-study activities in support of reaccreditation. Our last cycle of WASC reaccreditation (1996-1997) focused on the University’s efforts to develop a culture of evidence. The campus used the visit to begin to develop an infrastructure that would support focused attention on institutional educational effectiveness. That report considered a number of themes that were seen as central to that goal—teaching and learning, campus life, enrollment planning, pluralism, academic programs, public life and the capital campus and faculty scholarship. While that experimental self-study began a process to ensure systemic change, those efforts faltered in the ten years that followed.

In our February 2005 Institutional Proposal, Sacramento State described a number of challenges facing the University that suggested that a re-examination of mission and planning would be the most meaningful focus for the reaccreditation process. The choice of three areas of central interest—academic program review, campus life, and community engagement—was intended to provide the faculty, staff and administration with a set of opportunities to re-examine and re-envision the University’s mission and strategic planning processes and structures. Not surprisingly, the three themes of this reaccreditation cycle include threads of many of the issues identified in the 1996-1997 review.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report submitted to WASC in December 2006 revealed the timeliness of the decision to focus attention on the institution’s mission and planning activities. The arrival of a new president and the development of a new leadership team renewed and redirected the University’s discussion of these issues. The immediate impact of these changes was made manifest in the report that focused on the three themes proposed in the Institutional Proposal and described nascent changes to the University’s strategic planning structure: the creation of a Strategic Planning Council (SPC) to replace the Council for University Planning (CUP) and the revision of the University Mission Statement.

Another overarching goal of the capacity and preparatory review process was to provide the campus with an opportunity to develop “a more comprehensive, unified understanding of the data currently being gathered across the University and an enhanced ability to use this data in the strategic planning process.” Similarly, the authors of the Capacity and Preparatory Review intended that the document collect and measure what they called “little dragons”—opportunities for “constructive improvement” of Sacramento State’s abilities to meet and operate within WASC’s four standards.

The WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Team visited the campus in April 2007. At that time, the campus faced significant turmoil. A “perfect storm” of political, governance and budget issues had destabilized the campus community. The Team found that Sacramento State had the processes, procedures and resources in place to meet its mission and WASC’s criteria for reaccreditation. However, the Team also identified a number of “small dragons” that it felt the University would need to “capture and reform” as part of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

In addition to the campus-identified themes, the 2007 Capacity and Preparatory Review Team suggested several additional matters that deserved focused University attention: alignment of budget and planning processes; development and implementation of a consistent and robust academic assessment plan; transparent communication across the University; and renewed emphasis on student success. The specific recommendations offered by the Visiting Team are addressed in detail in Appendix A. Agreeing with the Team that these were critical, the campus rededicated itself to addressing these issues, and we have made
significant progress during the past twenty-four months in each of those areas.

1.4 Changes Since the WASC Team Visit

In many ways, a review of the University’s activities since the Team’s visit reveals the power of WASC’s peer-review model to illuminate institutional issues of both immediate and long-term significance. In the case of Sacramento State, a “harmonic convergence” of opportunities that are, at least on the surface, related to the reaccreditation process (the creation of an Institutional Proposal, Capacity and Preparatory Report and Team visit to the campus) reinforced initiatives that were already under way on campus. Many of these activities and conversations had already begun before the Team visit and have come to fruition in the period between the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Report.

The areas of concern identified by the Visiting Team in April 2007 were certainly no surprise to the Sacramento State community. As a matter of fact in 2004, President Gonzalez addressed a number of them in one of his first official efforts on campus: a call to action articulated in his Destination 2010 vision for Sacramento State. Many of the issues the Team identified had already been recognized by the campus as a result of the activities and findings related to work on the Capacity and Preparatory Report. The campus has fulfilled the promise that underpins both the Institutional Proposal and the Capacity and Preparatory Report, and that is made manifest in this report. The faculty, administration and staff have devoted significant energy and resources to focusing on the University’s mission, developing an atmosphere of transparency and collaboration and re-envisioning and “operationalizing” our values.

1.5 Destination 2010

[Criteria For Review: 1.1 and 1.2]

President Gonzalez’s Destination 2010 initiative encapsulates both Sacramento State’s educational mission and the first of WASC’s four standards for accreditation—“defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives.” Using “action verbs,” Destination 2010 lays out four goals that define the University’s educational mission, delineate our central values and contextualize our campus within its service area:6

- **Fostering Excellent Academic and Student Programs**
- **Building a Welcoming Campus**
- **Creating a Dynamic Physical Environment**
- **Developing Community Support**

These goals have provided a clear foundation and framework for the campus’s progress in a number of areas related to revisions of the University’s mission and core strategic planning activities. Many of the changes at the heart of the Destination 2010 vision have succeeded, and these changes are not merely cosmetic. Perhaps most significantly, success in meeting a number of the Destination 2010 goals has been an outgrowth of the revitalization of the campus strategic planning process. This was not simply re-naming a standing committee or reframing old ways of seeing and doing. Rather, the remaking of the Council on University Planning (CUP) into the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) signaled a dynamic new way of understanding and organizing the ways in which the University made decisions, allocated resources and defined its institutional goals.

1.6 The Strategic Planning Council

Destination 2010’s themes have guided the campus’s re-envisioning of its strategic planning processes and informed this cycle of campus inquiry for the WASC accreditation process. As an outgrowth of our Institutional Proposal, the CUP was reorganized into the SPC, which began working in Fall 2005. A series of forums during the 2006-2007 academic year drew out campus concerns and suggestions, culminating in a well-attended forum jointly facilitated by the Faculty Senate Chair and the Provost. Based on those meetings and the four themes of Destination 2010, the SPC prepared a “core values” document to guide development of the draft Strategic Plan. The SPC worked the draft Strategic Plan through several campus forums, revised, and worked it again, including through the Faculty Senate and Associated Students, Inc., and presented the final draft to President Gonzalez for approval. The President approved the plan in December 2007. That document has been in place almost a year and has led to consistent and collaborative decision-making.

1.7 Organization and Process of the Educational Effectiveness Report

At each stage of the WASC accreditation process, the University consulted with representatives from a variety of on-campus units and stakeholders from the larger community. From the Institutional Proposal phase to the Educational Effectiveness Review, the University has used the reaccreditation process to engage in open and inclusive conversations.

Campus engagement with and participation in the review process for this report was quite extensive. As with past reviews, the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, established the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Committees that consisted of a steering committee known as the lead Working Group...
that was assisted by three subcommittees based on our reaccreditation themes: academic programs, campus life, and community engagement. Some members of these committees were retained from the Capacity and Preparatory Review committees, and others were added to leverage as many perspectives and levels of experience as possible. These committees familiarized themselves with both the WASC requirements for reaccreditation and the campus accreditation hypotheses. They met to identify, review and evaluate data that was relevant and that demonstrates Sacramento State’s educational effectiveness. The subcommittees submitted their materials to the Working Group for analysis, discussion, synthesis and integration in various emerging drafts of the document. Drafts of the report and various data were posted on a website (www.csus.edu/wasaccreditation), which was established and dedicated to support our reaccreditation work and to elicit campus-wide input. Direct input was also obtained from two campus forums, the Faculty Senate retreat and various meetings of the Faculty Senate, the President’s Cabinet, deans, chairs and workgroups within and across divisions such as Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Public Affairs, and Information Resources and Technology. This process resulted in a campus that was fully engaged and keenly invested in our reaccreditation work. In general, the Educational Effectiveness Report follows the structural outline and topics of the Capacity and Preparatory Report, reprising some areas of focus while expanding our self-study in new directions.

This Educational Effectiveness Report provides evidence of Sacramento State’s commitment to quality in teaching and learning across academic, service and co-curricular programs. The bulk of the report documents the intersection of educational effectiveness with the topics identified in the Capacity and Preparatory Report: Strategic Planning, Academic Programs, Campus Life and Community Engagement. The reflective, integrative essay that follows the topical essays synthesizes a number of common themes and concerns that have emerged as the campus has focused on these issues. The recommendations and steps included in the culminating essay outline the long-term process and ongoing work to which the campus is committing itself. As an institution dedicated to organizational and individual learning, Sacramento State will continue to develop and maintain a viable, sustainable culture of inquiry and evidence that prioritizes student learning and success. This self-study, and the focused reflection that the WASC accreditation process has engendered, prompted the University community to recommit itself to ensuring that Sacramento State provides quality in teaching and learning. As a matter of fact, more and more members of the University community see themselves as educators who, directly or indirectly, contribute to the learning that occurs here.

The Educational Effectiveness Report is an important first step to ensuring that our educational mission resonates with the Sacramento State faculty, staff and administration as well as with the larger community that we serve. The WASC accreditation process has offered Sacramento State an opportunity to identify and address the challenges and opportunities that arise from our mission as a public comprehensive university.

1.7.1 The Hypothesis Approach

From the preliminary conception of Sacramento State’s Institutional Report, the University intended its self-study to be framed as an investigation of a series of hypotheses. In the scientific method, a working hypothesis is an assertion or question that is intended to lead to research, examination of results, and either “proof,” or a revision of the hypothesis, based on evidence. That model informs both the conceptualization of our proposal and the methods used by the University in its reviews. The hypotheses were developed to test the alignment of our institutional values with our practice. The hypotheses represent the core concerns of the campus, and in evaluating the results of our educational activities, we intend to evaluate our current activities and goals in the context of these ideals and to use the evidence we have gathered for this report in the spirit of genuine self-examination and to shape our future efforts in these areas.

In organizing the campus’s efforts under the WASC reaccreditation process, Sacramento State chose hypotheses that would provide the University with opportunities for deep reflection and the potential for fundamental transformation. In the case of the six hypotheses chosen for this cycle of accreditation, the University intended that each of the three pairs of hypotheses provide generalizations about a set of facts or principles that would lead to discussion of their viability and significance to each of the major areas of our inquiry: academic programs, collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and community engagement. These hypotheses were intended to be general, testable predictions of good practice, used to guide the campus’s investigation of core elements of our mission, Destination 2010 and our long- and short-term planning processes and goals. 11
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT

**ACTIONS**

» Creating an Office of Program Assessment has provided a venue for hands-on consultations, presentations and workshops and has given assessment a physical, a symbolic and a web presence on campus;

» Appointing a Faculty Assessment Coordinator has provided the faculty with a consistent, dedicated expert who can assist programs and individuals in conceptualizing and implementing purposeful assessments to improve student learning;

» Convening a new Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment (PACA) with representation drawn from every college has led to the development of a manual of assessment with a series of assessment plan rubrics and a set of recommendations for improving the assessment process on campus;

» Giving college deans responsibility for program assessment has improved the rigor, oversight and integration of both long- and short-term department assessment activities. This change has enabled deans to work more closely with departments in setting college priorities and in “closing the loop;”

» Devoting focused attention to annual assessment reporting has significantly improved the rate of compliance (from 70% in 2006-2007 to 100% in 2007-2008) and the quality of academic program assessment activities;

» Identifying Priority #2 of the Strategic Plan as the creation and development of an organizational structure and institutional culture that is framed by evidence-based decision-making and purposeful planning has caused Sacramento State to use student learning and program assessment data to shape decisions about program and service enhancements and modifications that further the University’s mission;

» Implementing the first cycle of a Program Review Pilot led seven departments to identify and explore questions of interest with their faculties. As a result, their self studies are evincing greater departmental commitment to the process and are more likely to promote meaningful conversations about and focused examination of student learning, curriculum and program planning;

» Revising the Program Review Process has allowed for the diversity across and between programs to be accommodated in the review process;

» Assessing the General Education Program in the context of the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals has begun to reframe the campus conversation about assessing general education at the program level;

» Providing departments with an annual, updated OIR fact book and improved support for the program review process has encouraged evidence-based discussions of academic programs;

**Challenges**

» Moving General Education Program assessment from a course-based model to program-centered learning objectives and assessment activities;

» Aligning the Sacramento State General Education Program with the framework of the recent Executive Order 1033 from the California State University’s Chancellor’s Office;

» Confronting the meaningfulness and functionality of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals in order to align student learning, the qualities of a Sacramento State baccalaureate degree and institutional values and resources;

» Proceeding with the pilot program review process in a timely fashion and acting on the insights that each cycle provides;

» Involving departments in implementing more efficient, reliable and valid assessments and better using existing resources to enhance the value of current assessment practices;
Designing increasingly meaningful annual assessments means we now face the challenge/opportunity to “close the loop” by developing structures for using this information to affect institutional decision-making;

Supporting the deans in their efforts to develop, maintain and enhance their colleges’ emergent infrastructures for assessment;

Using the internet more effectively as a tool with the potential to support and enhance assessment activities at both the macro and micro levels of the institution and deepen our culture of evidence;

Opportunities

Improving communication between departments and the larger University community to strengthen our General Education and interdisciplinary programs;

Organizing our resources in ways that are most likely to promote student learning, retention and graduation and then examining our activities for improvement and revision;

Eliminating routines and practices that divert faculty attention from the University’s core mission—promoting and supporting student learning;

Conducting focused inquiry into campus structures, policies and activities to better, and more holistically, understand the University’s impact on student learning and development;

Delivering first-year programs that demonstrably affect students’ development throughout their undergraduate years in positive and important ways;

Creating a transfer program that effectively integrates transfer students into majors;

Building a General Education program that students perceive as interdisciplinary and coherent;

Streamlining assessment report processes to avoid duplication of work for programs with external accreditation;

Priorities

Focusing the campus’s attention on our educational intentions as an institution;

Developing clear channels of communication among departments and colleges to exchange knowledge developed from assessment, share data that informs decision-making and pave the way for inquiries about student learning at all levels of the University;

Exploring ways to make assessment more efficient and less resource-intensive;

Applying what we learn to solve problems and meet our challenges;

BACCALAUREATE-LEVEL LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Actions

Assessing GE Area C has revealed that, overall, the University is meeting its learning goals in the Arts and Humanities section of the General Education Program;

Reviewing the General Education Program focused faculty attention on issues of assessment, course review and program planning. A series of forums in Fall 2008 provided faculty members with a chance to raise their concerns in focused ways;

Re-engaging the Faculty Senate in conversation about the General Education Program pattern and course offerings re-opened a discussion of the desirable components of the University-level curriculum and the possibility of developing a common educational experience for Sacramento State students;

Analyzing course-level assessments in various General Education areas has illuminated potential solutions to the challenge of assessing student learning across the program;
Challenges

» Assessing GE Area C’s attachment to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals revealed that the connections between the University-level learning goals and the curricula of both majors and the General Education Program remain underdeveloped;

» Re-examining and reforming the General Education Program’s structure raises faculty anxiety, especially in the context of potential changes to the assessment process as the curriculum is revised;

» Analyzing General Education course assessment reveals inconsistent standards and questionable reliability—developing consistent, common assessments, including rubrics, is our next challenge;

» Developing and implementing a General Education Honors Program assessment plan;

» Continuing progress in our efforts to articulate the Sacramento State General Education pattern with those of the California Community College system is necessary to streamline and harmonize the courses that transfer students bring to our campus;

» Clarifying an appropriate role for departments in General Education/Baccalaureate Learning Goals programming and assessment;

» Improving communication about the rich relationships among majors, General Education, the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, graduate and pre-professional education;

» Considering whether structural issues impede broad, integrative consideration of the educational effectiveness of the General Education Program and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals;

Opportunities

» Deepening the discussion about the desirable components of the University-level curriculum and the feasibility of a common educational experience for Sacramento State students opens the conversation to consideration of recent developments in community engagement theories and pedagogies;

» Reviewing University policy in light of the unevenness of departmental responses to the current requirement that General Education Assessment be included in Program Review;

» Using the PACA and Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA) to help integrate a variety of assessments into a holistic framework for program review;

Priorities

» Developing the connections between the two hypotheses (program review and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals) to strengthen their attachment to discipline-based concerns;

» Developing policies that regulate processes and procedures for creating, revising and refining Baccalaureate Learning Goals;

» Designing and implementing information technology to accommodate data collection, analysis and reporting assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals;

STRENGTHEn COLLABORATIOn BETWEEN ACADEmIC AFFAIRS AnD STuDEnT AFFAIRS

Actions

» Increasing the number of first-year students participating in Freshman Year Program classes that integrate curricular and co-curricular learning;

» Using a grant from Campus Compact, the Community Engagement Center expanded from five service-learning freshman seminars offered in 2005 to the integration of service learning into twenty-one sections of courses in Nursing, Social Work, Ethnic Studies, Child Development, English and Communication Studies;

» Integrating service learning into Educational Opportunity Program seminars has expanded from a single
semester experience into a two-semester sequence in which the majority of students tutor and mentor students from a local middle school;

» **Attempting to improve continuation rates** for first-year students by implementing a Mandatory Freshmen Orientation;

» **Structuring a three-stage Mandatory Advising for Freshmen** to increase their continuation rates;

» **Creating a new Cross-Divisional Retention Task Force** that has identified at-risk groups and recommended remedial actions—for example, in Spring 2009, interventions for second-year students on probation will implemented;

» **Programming for Constitution Week**, a national celebration of the history and significance of the United States Constitution, which was the result of a collaboration between Student Affairs and the Community Engagement Center, drew more than 2,500 students to a screening of “An Inconvenient Truth;”

» **Expanding the One Book program**—which is a partnership between the English Department and the Community Engagement Center, facilitated University-wide discussions centered on a common reading, across the campus to include the peer mentoring program, academic advising and residence hall learning communities through the participation of the Division of Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, the Library and the Sacramento community;

**Challenges**

» **Diminishing resources** challenge our ability to maintain Freshman Seminar as a small class;

» **Meeting enrollment targets** and recruiting eligible students is an ongoing challenge;

» **Maintaining optimum** student/faculty ratios in a reduced-resource environment;

» **Organizing a systematic** way to collect information on the breadth of collaborative activities;

» **Identifying and assessing explicit student-learning outcomes** that derive from the goals of the Freshman Year Programs, i.e., retention and success;

» **Creating a local, adaptable assessment structure for service learning** that goes beyond self-reported data and captures empirical evidence of student learning to provide feedback for future service learning opportunities;

**Opportunities**

» **Enlarging student participation** in Alternative Break, a collaboration among the Community Engagement Center, the Alcohol Prevention Program and Student Activities, which has grown steadily since 2007;

» **Developing a framework for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to collaborate** on a minor or certificate in student leadership;

» **Increasing opportunities for collaboration** among the Multicultural Center, Women’s Resource Center, the Community Engagement Center and academic departments;

**Priorities**

» **Developing an approach to delivering an effective and efficient Freshman Year Program** that maximizes the allocation of resources based on evidence of student learning and improvements in retention and on-time graduation;
IDENTIFY AND MEASURE THE LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE CO-CURRICULAR AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING PROGRAMS OFFERED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS

**ACTIONS**

» Completing two full cycles of Division-wide assessment has revealed what students have learned through their participation in Student Affairs programs and services;

» Using assessment data to inform resource decisions (e.g., reallocating financial and human resources to those areas that are contributing positively to student learning and student success);

» Training Student Affairs staff to use assessment data to make program modifications;

» Implementing ways for Student Affairs staff to broaden and deepen their use of assessment data to inform and shape enrollment decisions;

**Challenges**

» Organizing learning assessment in the Division of Student Affairs to reduce student survey- and focus group-fatigue;

» Training professional staff throughout the Division of Student Affairs is necessary to ensure that there is widespread participation in assessment activities;

» Acknowledging and mitigating the labor-intensive nature of assessment reporting, updated twice a year;

**Opportunities**

» Communicating the Student Affairs model of assessment to faculty as a local example of a process that has been successfully implemented;

» Deepening our understanding of student learning in a co-curricular context to include assessment of student motivation and disposition toward lifelong learning;

» Developing assessment practices that minimize duplication of effort and maximize good uses of time;

**STRENGTHENED LINKAGES AMONG SACRAMENTO STATE, THE CAPITOL AND THE SACRAMENTO COMMUNITY**

**ACTIONS**

» Implementing the foundational ideas of the Destination 2010 initiative to create an institution worthy of “destination” status;

» Signing a historic MOU between the City of Sacramento and University that will allow University students to “immerse themselves in the region’s vital institutions” through service learning and other initiatives;

» Signing an MOU between Sacramento State and the Los Rios Community College District

» Creating the Community Engagement Center, which has facilitated more than sixty-six service-learning partnerships with state, county and city governmental agencies, local school districts and faith-based organizations;
**Challenges**

» **Clarifying** the direct and beneficial linkages (both educational and professional) between students’ campus and off-campus experiences;

» **Collecting** data in a systematic way to more effectively represent the depth and breadth of the campus’s linkages with the community;

**Opportunities**

» **Exploring the variety** of ways in which the Public Policy and Administration Program links to the Capitol;

» **Strengthening the relationships** between academic departments, individual faculty members and the local community;

» **Expanding partnerships** between the College of Education and local school districts, which now number more than thirty;

» **Enlarging and deepening the partnerships** that the Community Engagement Center has developed;

**TRANSFORMATIVE CURRICULAR AND CO-CURRICULAR OFFERINGS TO DEVELOP AND STRENGTHEN STUDENTS’ LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND COMMITMENT TO COMMUNITY AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

**ACTIONS**

» **Studying and working together across divisions** to implement a comprehensive leadership program that will help students develop a skill set that is focused on communication, organization and problem-solving;

» **Discussing and promoting civic engagement** in many places across the campus;

» **Developing and implementing a General Education Honors Program** with a service-learning requirement;

» **Using peer mentors in the General Education Honors Program** provides the mentors with leadership opportunities while they perform significant service;

» **Organizing Alternative Break** to provide students with leadership opportunities while they participate in community service;

**Challenges**

» **Describing the philosophical, pedagogical and programmatic ways** that leadership and civic engagement should overlap, intersect and reinforce each other;

» **Resolving a number of** fundamental issues that have been identified by the campus conversation, including a consistent definition of civic engagement and consideration of the extent to which a civic engagement commitment can be translated into pedagogical change;

» **Developing cooperation in systematic and interdisciplinary ways between departments and colleges** may require institutional support. Innovation is often costly;

**Opportunities**

» **Enhancing the linkages between traditional classroom-based learning and hands-on opportunities to learn in the field** could draw more students into experiences that would give them creative, inspirational opportunities to learn and develop their leadership skills;

» **Implementing a systematic way** to gather University-level program data would allow sophisticated evaluation of both academic and co-curricular activities concerned with leadership and civic engagement;
Priorities

» **Identifying** various activities and initiatives across the campus that support this element of the University mission;

» **Educating** faculty, staff and students about experiential learning.

These following four areas are specifically addressed in the *Educational Effectiveness Review* as they relate to particular hypotheses. Each of the issues raised by the Visiting Team is treated when it aligns with a hypothesis, and so, in many ways, the campus response to the Team's recommendations is embedded in our report. However, in order to provide detailed treatments and evidence of progress in these central, significant components of the University's activities, the recommendations from the Visiting Team's Report are addressed in detail in Appendix A.

### ALIGNMENT OF THE BUDGET WITH STRATEGIC PLANNING

» **Creating two bodies with representation from across the campus** to advise the President on the budget (UBAC—the University Budget Advisory Committee) and strategic planning (SPC—the Strategic Planning Council). The bodies are linked, in part, by a designated faculty liaison;

» **Contextualizing both the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 budget allocations within the Strategic Plan.** The vice presidents were directed to frame requests within the larger, University-wide priorities presented in the Strategic Plan;

» **Using the Strategic Plan’s priorities** in UBAC’s recommendation for budget allocations and reductions in light of reduced resources.

### INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING WITHIN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

» **Implementing a pilot study** to revise the program review process, under the aegis of the Program Review Oversight Committee (seven programs in 2007-2008, seven programs and the five MS programs preparing for ABET accreditation in 2008-2009);

» **Appointing a Faculty Assessment Coordinator** with a dedicated office and support staff;

» **Creating the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment** that has produced a series of recommendations and proposed a manual;

» **Improving the oversight and review of yearly assessment reports** that are now vetted through college deans, analyzed and summarized by the Faculty Assessment Coordinator and reviewed by the Provost;

» **Collecting and analyzing General Education Area Assessment Reports** from departments;

» **Discussing the results of preliminary assessments** aligning the Baccalaureate Learning Goals and General Education in the General Education Policies and Graduation Requirements Committee.

### IMPROVED TRANSPARENCY

» **The President and the Faculty Senate have implemented structures and processes** that have constructively improved campus climate. In addition, the President regularly convenes campus forums reflecting an environment of shared communication and dialogue.

» **Creating the University Budget Advisory Committee** ensures that faculty are part of all discussions and decisions about the University budget;

» **The President partnered with the Faculty Senate** in hiring an external consultant to enhance collaboration between the faculty and the administration;
» The Provost regularly attends Faculty Senate meetings and as a result, is acting as a more effective conduit of information between the faculty and the administration;

» As a result of these efforts, the campus is enjoying a more collaborative, cooperative community.

**EMPHASIZE STUDENT SUCCESS**

» The Provost charged the Office for Institutional Research (OIR) to collect, analyze, present and disseminate data that describe student retention and attrition trends;

» OIR has become an information-rich office. While always a data-rich campus resource, OIR is increasingly using, analyzing and posting data that supports better understandings of our retention successes and challenges;

» A Retention Team was created and has identified the student groups most likely to benefit from interventions. Beginning in Spring 2009, new programs and services will be offered to those groups;

» The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) identified recruitment, retention and timely progress toward the degree as the University’s top priorities for student success;

» Integration of student support service functions into the Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Program (SASEEP) has improved both the delivery and completeness of these services;

» Expansion of Learning Community and Freshman Year Programs as vehicles to enhance retention and focus on the needs of first-year students.
2.0 Strategic Planning

[Criteria For Review: 1.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8]

2.1 Strategic Planning at Sacramento State

At the point that the *Capacity and Preparatory Report* was written, the University planning process was described as “nascent.” While the process’s effectiveness to guide decision-making, resources allocation and continuing improvement cannot be completely assessed yet, there are indications that a number of the changes the University instituted have improved the campus’s efforts to implement its goals. First and foremost, the creation of a Strategic Planning Council (SPC) with a reframed charge and structure has led to a streamlined and refined planning process.

The result is a stronger sense of connectivity between administrative structures and faculty and staff activities that has paved the way for truly evidence-based decision making. The “culture of evidence” that was the goal of the University’s 1996-1997 WASC accreditation activities is finally materializing. A central engine of this transformation was a multi-layered, multi-stage examination of the campus’s sense of its educational mission and a series of conversations about the centrality of student success to the University’s self-conception at every level.

Development of a values-based document opened the way to meaningful assessment of planning and policy decisions and provided a direction for the University’s definition of its efforts. Distilling the March 2004 University Mission Statement, the SPC created a platform from which to launch a holistic examination of the University as an organization dedicated to higher education. The mission, described on the SPC website, reaffirms the University as an institution whose primary goal is to make a difference both in society and in the lives of individuals. This version of the University Mission Statement recognizes the University’s interest in fulfilling its potential to change lives:

> California State University, Sacramento commits itself to providing Access for all eligible students, continually pursuing Excellence in teaching, learning and student support, building upon our already exceptional Diversity such that all members of our community are respected and participate collaboratively on every aspect of University life, enhancing the quality of life in the Region and the state, and instilling Pride in all who view this campus as their own.16

2.2 Institutional Planning and Educational Effectiveness

Within the SPC’s first year, Sacramento State has made significant progress on aligning “academic, personnel, fiscal, physical and technological needs” with “strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.” The Strategic Plan ranks five strategic priorities that the SPC felt represented the “most critical challenges and promising opportunities within a three- to five-year time frame.” Each of the priorities is illuminated by specific goals statements that are intended to lead directly to both implementation and assessment.

The top priority of the Strategic Plan is to “implement a strategically focused, campus-wide effort to improve recruitment, retention and graduation rates.” The University has begun this process by providing resources such as specific OIR fact books to each program annually. Sacramento State has also begun to facilitate campus practices that place recruitment, retention, graduation and student success at the center of all the institution’s efforts. The campus has begun a “Futures Initiative” as an outgrowth of a 2006 campus climate survey to develop processes and principles to guide discussions and decisions focused on plans for both short- and long-term planning.
3.0 Academic Programs

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

[Criteria For Review: 1.2, 2.4, 2.6, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8]

3.1.1 Introduction
Sacramento State's ongoing program-review improvements over the past several years have been driven by its renewed emphasis on the assessment of student learning and widespread departmental dissatisfaction with the process and results of the program-review experience. These efforts culminated in the 2007-2009 Program Review Pilot Study. The 2003-2004 academic year marked a major transition point in the program-review process. Several years of information-gathering and reflection led to the implementation of new policies and procedures. In a significant change, the Faculty Senate adopted new policy guidelines governing the program-review process. All programs undergoing review would now be required to exhibit substantial implementation of assessment. The “Assessment Plan Guidelines” document delineates a three-part assessment process. An unexpected outcome of this policy has been that these guidelines, which are reinforced by the activities of the Office of Academic Program Assessment, have provided an “anchor” in governance that specifies what “good” and “bad” plans look like. The resulting requirement that assessment plans must be in place for program review to take place has had a profoundly energizing effect.

Each part of the process has a specific purpose. The “Mission, Goals, and Objectives” section requires that the program present a clear link among its mission statement, program goals and student learning objectives. The “Development and Implementing” section mandates that at least two indirect measures and one direct measure be used in assessment of student learning objectives. Finally, the “Using Assessment Results” section specifies that the results of these assessment procedures be used to draw well-reasoned conclusions regarding academic planning, and that the program set forth means by which the effects of this planning on student learning is to be assessed. The program-review process—already in place on campus and occurring at six-year intervals—is intended to provide the University with a regular and logical opportunity to ensure that assessment has been undertaken in a manner that complies with the “Assessment Plan Guidelines.”

In addition to viewing assessment activity as a foundation for self studies, programs also are required to undertake assessment in an ongoing manner. The General Education Program, which represents the University’s core liberal arts and sciences learning curriculum, assessed the Race and Ethnicity graduation requirement in 2001 and 2005 and began a five-year cycle of General Education area assessments in 2001. Assessment plans for all departments and other programs are posted on the Academic Affairs website. The website also contains an annual University-wide summary of assessment. The first such report, drawing on data from 2006-2007, was prepared in Spring 2008 and repeated for data generated in 2007-2008. Similar analyses will be prepared and published each fall.

The Faculty Senate took a central role in conducting the survey and acting to address the concerns it raised in the most positive manner possible, indicating that the Senate views the assessment of student learning as a core prerogative and responsibility of the faculty. However, despite these actions, it quickly became clear that many programs have difficulty planning, implementing and analyzing assessment. Annual assessment reports of the past several years reveal that individual programs are getting up to speed at varying rates with a notable increase in 2007-2008 among the programs that were the furthest behind. The difficulties many programs experience with assessment suggested that program review might offer a vehicle to educate faculty while also offering a structure to drive (and be driven by) meaningful assessment of student learning at the unit level. While it might be reasonable to anticipate that the University as a whole would, over time, increase its compliance with the 2003-2004 assessment guidelines, with a net effect of enhancing reflection on student learning, the Faculty Senate, with leadership from the Program Oversight Committee and the Curriculum Policies Committee, decided to revise key procedural aspects of the program-review process in the same year that the “Assessment Plan Guidelines” were adopted. In an effort to integrate assessment with program review, a revised set of guidelines organizes the steps and roles of each stage of the program review cycle.
### 3.1.2 The Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC)

In Fall 2003, as a result of Faculty Senate action, a significant change transformed the Program Review Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum Policies Committee into the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). The PROC is comprised primarily of the chairs of Program Review Teams currently working on reviews – rather than the former subcommittee that was made up of faculty who may or may not have ever been involved with program reviews. This change was accompanied by a revised charge that greatly facilitated committee reflection on each review while still in process. Increased opportunities to provide feedback to each chair and, by extension to each program undergoing review, enhances all aspects of the review process. A more regular set of feedback opportunities is one of the revision’s most beneficial elements. This restructuring offers department chairs a more direct means of interaction with the subcommittee, and as a result, problems or modifications are revealed more quickly and accurately. The revised structure emphasizes a collaborative and improvement-centered process rather than a surveillance-and-compliance model. At a basic level, this revamped committee approach helps ensure a desired degree of uniformity among reviews. Administrative support, in the form of assigned time for Program Review Team chairs, legitimates the process and enhances faculty receptivity. Additionally, administrative support reinforces the importance of program review and provides resources to enable it to be done well. Participation by a broad array of knowledgeable faculty results in a healthy cross-pollination between University policy and program-level experiences. In sum, the revised process encourages reflection on student learning leading to greater faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

### 3.1.3 PROC Program Review Pilot Study

The implementation of new policies and procedures in 2003-2004 was certainly a significant improvement in the University’s program-review process and in its ability to meet the goals of Hypothesis 1. But compliance with policies and procedures is one thing; meaningful implementation is another. And even if all programs could be said to be in “compliance” technically speaking, it would not necessarily be the case that adjustments to the program-review process have succeeded in meeting one of the University’s chief objectives as stated in Hypothesis 1: to encourage “reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical planning.”

Starting in the 2007-2008 cycle, PROC instituted a pilot study designed to offer departments the opportunity to experiment with different models of program review. The study’s primary purpose is to determine if different processes or structures enhanced the connection between student learning, assessment, reflection and program improvement. The pilot study also is intended to improve the relationship between annual assessment reporting and the six-year cycle of program review. Of the seven departments beginning the cycle in Fall 2007, all chose an option other than the previously mandated self-study format. In the language of the pilot study, all seven chose “Option C: Focused Inquiry” or a variation thereof, clearly indicating the programs’ desire to investigate the issues that they themselves deem most pertinent. Within the pilot study, several changes to the process hold great promise for the ultimate meaningfulness of the process. One is the opportunity for departments to construct their self-studies around issues or concerns of particular importance to them, rather than simply “filling in the blanks” of a standard template. Such a process should improve department buy-in. The pilot study format permits programs to focus time and energy on assessment–having been relieved of the inefficient necessity of collecting data of dubious significance. Another potential improvement is the inclusion of the dean of the college both at the self-study proposal stage and as a consultant to the program-review team.

Especially through PROC’s work, the University continues to strive to improve 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, if faculty do not regard the process as beneficial in the big picture—for example, to enhance reflection on student learning and faculty involvement in planning–program review will be perceived mainly as another hoop to jump through in order to maintain good standing in the University.

Sacramento State continues to work to ensure that the program-review process is as effective as possible. Hypothesis 1 goes a long way toward defining “effective,” with its vision for widespread faculty engagement working to improve vital educational and curricular aspects for all concerned, but especially for students and faculty. PROC is working on revisions that will help facilitate this vision as it re-examines and hones the current policy. For example, PROC has determined that
the current policy assumes too much by way of correspondence between accreditation and program review. Departments sometimes receive accreditation for their undergraduate programs and thereby are granted a successful program review. But this approach has sometimes carried the unintended consequence of graduate programs being ignored by the review process. Some programs’ plans or goals are not directly related to external accreditation. Additionally, the program-review process needs to accommodate the needs of departments and programs whose commitments lie in different directions. On another front, PROC is revising the self-study procedures to encourage wider faculty and institutional engagement. The pilot study has provided a successful foundation within departments to encourage a “living,” systemic process of review and reflection. The experiences of faculty and departments participating in the pilot study have revealed the desirability of improved communication and accountability among the dean, department and review team. PROC is exploring ways to strengthen these channels.

3.1.4 Changes Since the WASC Team Visit
The Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA) and the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment (PACA) were organized to strengthen and promote the campus’s foundational capacity for the sort of assessment that is required for our re-envisioned program-review process. Both are relative newcomers to the campus, but the faculty members and administrators involved in their activities are not. Both OAPA and PACA offer institutional-level structures that, on one hand, provide detailed, concrete assistance and support to assessment on campus and, on the other hand, closely examine challenges to effective assessment processes and practice on campus and offer recommendations for improvement. With OAPA and PACA as engines for the development and evaluation of assessment at Sacramento State, PROC can expect to see improvement in both the quality and quantity of the uses of assessment in self-study and program review.

For example, OAPA’s analysis of the 2006-2007 cycle of departmental assessment reports describes how programs collect and work with evidence.30 The 2007-2008 report shows significant improvement in the quality and meaningfulness of these activities.31 The work of the OAPA and the Faculty Coordinator for Assessment has been crucial to these changes. The consistent presence of a skillful and knowledgeable faculty consultant has provided the campus with a resource whose skills contribute to every level of the campus’s assessment endeavors—course-level, program-level, college-level and institutional-level. This consistency of vision has been a major factor in the progress the campus has made in assessing the effectiveness of student learning at Sacramento State.

The Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment was organized to provide the Provost with recommendations from deans and faculty members as to possible directions Academic Affairs should consider for the improvement of the assessment of student learning.32 An earlier proposal to the Faculty Senate, calling for the creation of a Faculty Senate Committee on Assessment, was voted down, primarily because it was unclear what the charge and activities of such a committee would be, beyond providing an opportunity for “shop talk.” Campus discussions of the preliminary proposal revealed a void in campus leadership on assessment issues. Since its inception in 2008, PACA has developed a series of recommendations. One recommendation suggested the adoption of rubrics to evaluate the quality of program-assessment plans.33 Currently, the use of these rubrics is voluntary, and college deans have the responsibility for approving departmental assessment plans. PACA also recently recommended the adoption of a template the committee developed for annual assessment reporting.34 PACA also has been discussing the potential of campus technology systems as a resource for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of program assessment.

While the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA) has developed as a permanent fixture on campus and will provide support to programs and individual faculty, PACA’s future remains unclear. PACA is an ad hoc advisory committee and has no power to create assessment policy. The Provost must look to the Faculty Senate for such policies. While the University Curriculum Policies Committee might engage in developing assessment policies, there is no specific organization to do so. PACA is a default mechanism for sorting out the potential advantages and disadvantages of concrete assessment practices and the faculty, dean and administrators who sit on the committee have taken their charge very seriously. Clearly, the campus needs broad-based, practical and focused conversations about how and where institutional leadership on assessment should develop in order to effectively undertake evaluation of University-wide academic programs, such as General Education. This discussion has begun and the University General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee is examining options for restructuring the General Education Program to maximize student learning outcomes assessment in the context of the Chancellor’s Office LEAP goal framework.35
Faculty engaged in reflection about program curriculum, teaching and learning may also call on the resources of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). A new director was named in Summer 2008, and while the level of service has essentially been maintained, the new director has been actively redirecting the CTL into some new areas—in line with the Strategic Plan. For example, a major element of faculty training has been the Teaching Using Technology Summer Institute, which in 2007 and 2008 focused on universal design and pedagogy as a support tool. The Summer 2009 Institute will shift toward a new structure, creating a Teaching Institute that will pioneer a format of Teaching Communities that will be more responsive to faculty interests and needs. To more closely support the implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan, the Institute will focus on training faculty in pedagogical skills that facilitate student engagement, retention and graduation. Topics for the 2009 Institute will include teaching large classes, developing hybrid/online classes and teaching General Education classes to non-majors.

The CTL has also begun to have a significant presence on University committees that deal with issues related to instruction and student learning and success. For example, the CTL director is a member of the Academic Instructional Technology Center. Additionally, the director has begun to develop direct and coherent ties with the Faculty Senate. As a function of the Senate, the CTL should have close connections with the Senate initiatives that seek to improve teaching and learning, so that the CTL’s resources and expertise can contribute to the campus’s efforts to improve the University’s curriculum and pedagogy.

3.1.5 General Education Program Review

During the five-year (2003-2008) development phase for General Education assessment planning, forums were held twice a year and an assessment consultant was appointed to help departments develop their plans. All General Education courses participate in a revolving five-year cycle of review by the General Education Course Review Subcommittee that focuses on compliance with specific General Education Area learning objectives. Departments whose courses are found to be out of compliance are given a year to repair and resubmit any problem classes. Non-compliant courses are removed from the General Education pattern after one year. Members of the Faculty Senate General Education /Graduation Requirements Policy Committee (GE/GRPC) are aware that the current course review processes derive from a model that looks at individual courses rather than the GE program as a whole. Currently, the entire program is nearing conclusion of a three-year review process. The faculty and administration have taken part in five open discussions to update and streamline the program. The GE/GRPC is examining ways to more completely assess student learning outcomes through projects like the American Association of Colleges and Universities Compass Project. The AAC&U project matches select campuses in the CSU, the Oregon University system and the University of Wisconsin system to exam and implement “best practices” in General Education.

The General Education Program underwent a self-study and program review between 2006 and 2008. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the GE/GRPC collected assessment data in 87 GE courses. The committee’s Faculty Assessment Consultant, Dr. Elizabeth Strasser, prepared a report that discussed the alignment of the student learning objectives with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Department faculty members were asked for the data generated by implementing their assessment plans as well as for their reflections on what they had learned and whether they planned changes. An analysis of the data the faculty provided revealed six types of direct measures and a variety of indirect measures. The report included analysis of how student learning was measured in various courses and on the compliance of responders in describing their reflections and plans for change. A second thread of analysis considered the types of data used for assessing each Baccalaureate Learning Goal. A summary of the data analyses revealed a great deal of variance in grade distribution among the different learning goals and between lower- and upper-division courses. Although many GE courses are implementing their course-level assessment plans and may even be using the results to improve their classes, the data cannot be used to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the General Education Program holistically. Current practices permit evidence-based course changes, but the University needs to develop an assessment plan that will examine General Education as a program that stretches across a student’s entire career at Sacramento State. The report’s author offered three major recommendations: for standardizing assessment strategies and grading criteria, for more explicitly aligning the GE and Baccalaureate Learning Goals and for simplifying the reporting process.

3.1.6 External Accreditation

In addition to WASC accreditation, a variety of Sacramento State programs are evaluated by external accrediting bodies. The College of Business Administration, the College of Engineering and Computer Science and the College of Education
The pilot study has revealed that program review has the potential to raise issues that have significance at the college and campus levels, issues which are not just of discrete departmental interest. This recognition has led to the development of a standard set of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. Each department receives a fact book of common data sets as it engages in its self-study proposal. Additionally, the department may request other data, as its self-study research question takes shape. As a result, the program-review process combines optimal levels of consistency, in the development of University-wide categories of data, as well as flexibility, offering departments the option of fine-tuning data collection to answer a particular question. This process also has the potential to support college-wide goals, objectives and values to be considered, while encouraging the development of a variety of contexts for departmental decision-making.

3.2 Hypothesis 2:
Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.

[Criteria For Review: 1.2, 1.7, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8]

3.2.1 Introduction
The Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment (PACA) has recognized the importance of attending to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. The committee sees these goals as a compass to guide undergraduate assessment in ways that provide insight at all levels of the institution. As confidence about the practice and meaningfulness of assessment grows on campus, a more comprehensive, University-wide assessment plan is being developed, one that provides coherence to and linkage among all assessment efforts on campus—addressing General Education, the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, goals for the majors and graduate goals within the context of the Strategic Plan.

The student learning goals made explicit in the Baccalaureate Learning Goals are, in part, infused across the University’s curriculum. The annual assessment reports for the 2007-2008 cycle reveal that the faculty is indeed teaching toward those goals and that assessment work that can be conceptually linked to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals is under way.44 The University also has the opportunity to develop a more cohesive and explicit examination of students’ achievement of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Our Capacity and Preparatory Report highlighted three academic
components of the University that have the potential to reveal student attainment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: the General Education Program, the University Writing Programs and the undergraduate major programs.

3.2.2 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the General Education Program

While not specifically referencing the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals, the General Education/Graduation Requirements Policy Committee (GE/GRPC) in consultation with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education has undertaken to assess programmatic student learning in two general education areas included in the Baccalaureate Learning Goals: race and ethnicity in American society and information competence. The graduation requirement for a class that includes investigation of issues of race and ethnicity has been part of the General Education Program since its last major revision in 1991-1992. The requirement was assessed in 2001 and again in 2005. Additionally, information competence became a graduation requirement in 2004. Since the 2006-2007 academic year, formal evaluation of information competence is part of the normal program review cycle. An ad hoc subcommittee of the GE/GRPC reviews department reports and shares its findings with the GE/GRPC.

The program-review pilot study has revealed that an intersection between General Education course offerings and departmental assessment is an important arena for consideration of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. The issues raised by departments’ self-studies and program reviews clearly interface with campus-level concerns of curriculum and student learning. The Report on Assessing Baccalaureate Learning Goals at Sacramento State prepared for the General Education Program drew on eight recent self-studies for data (Anthropology, Criminal Justice, English, Ethnic Studies, History, Music, Psychology and Sociology.) In each of these self-studies, there was a general discussion of both General Education learning outcomes and University Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Two of the report’s major recommendations focus on the issue of the relationship between General Education and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. First, the report recommends that “faculty members who teach GE courses . . . develop a set of shared agreements about some simple assessment strategies that can be applied across-the-board within the GE Areas so that the faculty and external readers can get a reliable sense of what and how well students are achieving in relation to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals.” A second recommendation “concerns the alignment of the GE learning outcomes with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. These need to be more explicitly articulated so that the faculty can readily and reliably assess the Baccalaureate Learning Goals while also assessing their GE outcomes.” Particularly given the recent emergence of active, serious assessment leaders on campus in the OAPA and PACA, these recommendations should not be difficult to implement. Interestingly, data reveal that just 12 of the University’s 56 departments provide 50 percent of the courses in General Education. An outgrowth of these recommendations and growing interest in re-conceptualizing and reorganizing the Sacramento State General Education Program has led to a Compass Proposal and preliminary work on a G.E. READS assessment initiative.

3.2.3 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and Writing Programs

The Baccalaureate Learning Goal that focuses on communication centers on the student’s ability to read, write, speak and listen effectively as well as the ability to respond, with understanding and appreciation of a wide variety of communicative acts. The specific expectations for student achievement of this goal are demonstrated by a student’s ability to:

a) Express ideas and facts in a variety of written and quantitative formats and to a variety of audiences in discipline-specific, work-place, and civic contexts;

b) Comprehend, interpret, and analyze written and oral presentations;

c) Communicate orally in one-on-one and group settings;

d) Communicate in a language other than English;

e) Interpret, analyze, and evaluate ideas presented in a variety of creative formats, including written, verbal and visual.

There is widespread campus consensus that our students need greater instructional support in reading and writing. As a result, the University has committed energy and resources to ensuring that Sacramento State students meet the goal for effective communication. In addition to instruction in oral and written communication, the English Department staffs and supervises the Writing Center, which offers one-on-one help to students with writing problems. Also, beginning in 2006, the campus began to implement changes to the Comprehensive Writing Program. Clearly, these efforts were not undertaken on a whim. Although
faculty members have not been aggregating their data and analyzing performance patterns according to explicit assessment plans, they have been assessing student writing performance.

The Writing Across the Curriculum program (WAC) supports faculty efforts to improve the effectiveness of their students’ reading and writing. WAC’s primary goal is to assist colleges, departments and individual faculty members with all aspects of the teaching of writing and reading in their disciplines, including designing writing and reading assignments, responding to student writing, designing writing assessment and using writing to improve critical thinking. Several annual department assessment reports include discussions of student writing instruction and competence and even how well students are composing academic discourse that evidences critical thinking.

WAC collaborates with other faculty development and support programs on campus and does campus-wide outreach through workshops and a faculty development retreat. For example, WAC presented a campus-wide workshop in Fall 2007, “Designing Successful Reading Assignments,” and in Spring 2008 partnered with the Center for Teaching and Learning to offer a workshop on “Teaching in Large Classes.” The WAC program also publishes a campus-wide newsletter twice each semester.

WAC Director Dan Melzer has been an important campus resource. He has collaborated with the English Department Writing Programs Coordinator to organize meetings of English 20: Sophomore Composition teachers to discuss and pilot a new writing in the disciplines-focused English 20. Melzer also joined the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Committee to help with a pilot of the new version of the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE) and the development of the new adjunct small-group tutorial course for Writing Intensive courses, 109X. Melzer coordinated with the Common Management System software, Learning Skills, and the English Department to oversee changes that will reduce remediation and time to degree. The flow chart in the appendix of the 2007 report outlines the Comprehensive Writing Program changes to be implemented at the lower division in Fall 2008 and the upper division in Fall 2009.

This focused, rich, and fruitful work on writing instruction and student learning has produced an integrated infrastructure for assessment (see Figure 1). Many faculty members are quite knowledgeable about writing assessment, and formal procedures for assessment like the GWAR have been enhanced.

### 3.2.4 Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the Disciplines

Program review, as organized in the pilot study, and annual assessment reporting allow departments to attach their programs to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals by offering them the opportunity to focus on issues that might reflect the applicable student learning outcomes. While many departments are probably already meeting a number of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, it will be necessary to get them to recognize that they are “players” in any conversation about these elements of the University curriculum. Many faculty members believe their role is to focus on the learning goal of “competence in the disciplines” and believe that the other five goals are the responsibility of the General Education Program.

Other faculty members believe that a significant amount of the knowledge, skills and dispositions described by the Baccalaureate Learning Goals is infused in their program curriculum. The Faculty Senate needs to clarify the relationship of the goals to the various elements of a baccalaureate education and identify those responsible for its assessment.

Similarly, the relationship between the Baccalaureate Learning Goals and graduate preparation is an undeveloped thread of analysis that has the potential to offer important insights into the adequacy both of the goals and students’ acquisition of the knowledge, skills and values the goals support. In Fall 2008, the Provost and Interim Dean of Graduate Studies created a Graduate Advisory Council. One of the Council’s first efforts will be to create graduate program learning outcomes. Once this work is completed, linkages and assessment strategies across the baccalaureate and graduate programs can be established.

### 3.2.5 Summary

The WASC process has facilitated a review of the GE learning outcomes and their alignment with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals. The result is a new level of understanding of the tools, desired outcomes and improved practices that would best underpin University-level learning goals. Drawing on the analysis of the Report on Assessing Baccalaureate Learning Goals at Sacramento State, it is clear that considerable work is under way in assessing GE learning outcomes and that the GE goals are being explicitly met. Moreover, examination of the annual program assessment reports shows that some programs are using their annual assessments to also report on their successes in implementing GE assessment and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Importantly, the report notes that “programs have been consistently collecting and using their assessment data anywhere from one term through
12 terms, essentially paralleling the chronological implementation of assessment plans by GE Areas,” (p.12). It is recognized that the next level of effectiveness will be to more explicitly align GE learning outcomes with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. But this next step will be achieved in the context of a more engaged faculty that is now very evident on campus. Additionally, the Writing Across the Curriculum program has resulted in fairly sophisticated faculty understandings that can help refine both institutional-level assessment strategies and improve program-level assessment. And in much the same way, the campus has come to understand why and how graduate-level assessment must be further developed.

It is reasonable to assert therefore that the University’s progress on this hypothesis is steady and the University has discovered potential areas for further refinement. We have learned from our past experience that a more focused, integrated specific set of assessment strategies needs to be developed in order to better demonstrate that our students are effectively achieving the Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Such a focused examination is both possible and likely in light of the recent Chancellor’s Office Executive Order 1033, which has the potential to provide system-based context for Sacramento State’s General Education Program and Baccalaureate Learning Goals.
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.

[Criteria For Review: 2.9, 2.11, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8]

4.1.1 Introduction
The University’s Capacity and Preparatory Report aptly described the evolution of Student Affairs from a service-oriented division into a learning-centered unit. As that report made plain, Student Affairs embraced a definition of learning that focused on the whole student and that would engage students in an ongoing, multifaceted process that included both knowledge acquisition and personal development. In doing so, the division drove the campus’s interest in this hypothesis. This includes the ways in which those charged with co-curricular learning and those whose primary responsibility was for the University’s traditional academic curriculum could collaborate to integrate and augment a student’s entire university experience. This Educational Effectiveness Review highlights the effectiveness of this collaboration and shows how it is beginning to shape a “comprehensive, transformative, holistic” sense of the educational enterprise at Sacramento State. 57

Interestingly, although this integrative paradigm is a relatively new element of co-curricular planning, it has been a foundation theory of General Education at Sacramento State. For example, GE Area E: Understanding Personal Development provides a logical framework for course-based offerings from Student Affairs. Area E’s learning goals “enhance the student’s understanding of the development of the individual as an integrated physiological, psychological, and social being.” The specific Area E learning goals require that, “Students will:

1. Recognize and critically examine the development of the individual as an integrated physiological, psychological, and social being.

2. Be able to identify the internal and external influences that interact in human development and behavior within the context of the human life span.

For courses enhancing understanding of the self as a physiological, social and psychological entity, address the following criteria statement:

1. Critically examine their own individual behavior in relationship to topics as social and natural environment, human sexuality, nutrition, health, stress, family, aging and death.

For courses developing an art or skill, addresses the following criteria statement:

1. Examine and create ways, through the acquisition of a recreation, avocation or artistic skill, that will enhance their own life long understanding of their development as an integrated physiological and psychological entity.” 58

Student Affairs professionals instruct in a number of General Education Area E classes. The greatest number of Area E sections is offered by the Freshman Seminar, a course that draws on the resources of academic departments, the Division of Student Affairs and the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education in Academic Affairs. Of the 56 sections of the Freshman Seminar offered in Fall 2007, 25 were taught by instructors with primary appointments in Student Affairs. In 2008, 64 sections of Freshman Seminar were offered, 23 taught by Student Affairs staff, including an Associate Vice President for Student Affairs.

A convocation is held each August, just before the start of the fall term for all Freshman Program instructors, staff, administrators and student peer mentors. In 2008, the convocation was held as part of a regional First Year Experience conference. 59 A second meeting for all Freshman Seminar instructors is held each January. These meetings have a variety of formats, including curriculum workshops, roundtable discussions, assessment presentations, working committee meetings and regional or system-wide conference events. Survey data from the August 2008 conference indicated that 93 percent of respondents would recommend the conference to their peers.

4.1.2 Processes
Despite the fact that collaboration is reflected in the professional philosophy and practice in Student Affairs and in certain pedagogical strategies in the General Education Program, the culture of collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs is an emergent, rather than established, strength. Granted, pockets of collaboration exist across the campus, especially among individual Student Affairs staff and faculty members who have come to know each other and work together well.
However, while there are collaborative programming efforts like Alternative Spring Break and Constitution Week, there is little institutionalized collaboration between the two divisions. Nonetheless, this is changing. For the past several years, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (the Provost) and the Vice President for Student Affairs have partnered publicly and purposefully on key issues, especially the development of the University’s Strategic Plan. Working with the Strategic Planning Council, these two administrators identified recruitment, retention and time-to-degree (the same issues raised by the WASC Visiting Team) as the most critical issues facing the University. They continue to bring together staff from all levels of each division to address key, macro-level concerns. And this collaboration has never been more prominent or important than it is today.

Specific examples of Student Affairs/Academic Affairs collaborations include:

» Staff in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs work together to revamp admission deadlines and other important processes;

» Staff in Admission and Records work closely with academic deans and department chairs to include them in recruitment and retention activities (e.g., college fairs, major fairs, Preview Day);

» Staff in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs co-design messages that introduce students to support programs for traditionally under-enrolled populations;

» Academic Affairs’ Office of Institutional Research staff work with Student Affairs leaders to broadly disseminate relevant retention data (especially to student support areas);

» Partnership between Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and Public Affairs leading to the creation of a new, multimedia recruitment website;

» Senior-level administrators and directors from both divisions developed a new retention program focused on the needs of second-year students on probation that will begin in Spring 2009;

» The Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) publicly supported a recommendation to the President from UBAC (University Budget Advisory Committee) that the University preserve—to the extent possible—the funding of Student Affairs amid statewide budget pressures.

4.1.3 Recreation, Education and Service

In the Capacity and Preparatory Report, Student Affairs described its intention to enlarge its role in the University, while continuing to provide its traditional services. The increasingly well-developed conceptual and practical links between the units’ educational, service and recreational functions support the comprehensive nature of the many kinds of learning that are the goals of Student Affairs and the entire University. In this way, the division offers many programs that promote educational effectiveness. The collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs brings curricular and co-curricular learning together in ways that enhance the educational effectiveness of student learning both inside and outside the classroom.

4.1.3.1 Recreation

For example, the co-curricular Recreation Program at Sacramento State is a coordinated effort by three units of the Division of Student Affairs—Recreational Sports, Peak Adventures and the Aquatic Center—that provide students, faculty and staff with recreational opportunities that promote campus involvement, personal growth, health and wellness, social engagement, team-building, leadership opportunities and good sportsmanship.

Recreational Sports

Recreational Sports coordinates and directs wide-ranging programs designed to meet the diverse needs of the campus community. Specifically, this department oversees intramurals, sport clubs, recreation clubs, fitness classes, informal recreation opportunities and special events. Approximately 3,000 students per week participate in one or more of these activities. Program evaluations and student learning assessments are administered regularly to ensure that the programs meet the high expectations of staff and participants.

Surveys of participants indicate that:

» 80 percent believe the program is well-organized and meets their expectations;

» 76 percent say that participation has helped them improve self-confidence and reduce stress. This same group also felt that their activities helped them get along with diverse groups of people, improved their social lives and fostered their team-building skills;

» 74 percent indicate that participation has, in some way, contributed to their success in the classroom.

In addition to providing programming, Recreational Sports offers employment and educational opportunities for students. More than 45 student employees complete extensive training in CPR/First
Aid, customer-service and area-specific skills such as sports officiating and front-desk operations. Student workers are also groomed for supervisory positions in that they are given additional responsibilities and mentored to become effective leaders, managers and members of work teams.

Sport clubs offer Student Affairs another fruitful set of educational opportunities. A collaboration between Recreational Sports and the Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism Administration (RPTA) allows officers and participants in the sports club program to earn one to three academic credits in independent study. RPTA is part of the College of Health and Human Services. Recreational Sports also has experimented with a “sportsmanship assessment program” that quantitatively “rates” participants in targeted sports to address a troubling trend across the nation related to the decline of sportsmanship. For example, all teams that participate in flag football and basketball are rated on sportsmanship during each game. Only teams with suitably high sportsmanship ratings are allowed to advance to the playoffs. Teams with low ratings are contacted early in the season and made aware of the potential consequences of continued poor sportsmanship. These interventions have led to positive changes in behavior, and there has been visible increase in the level of sportsmanship in these programs.63

ASI Peak Adventures

Peak Adventures, a program of Associated Students, Inc., strives to fulfill its mission of adventure education and leadership development through a variety of recreational activities, including guided outdoor trips, “back-to-nature” training sessions and team-building “ropes” courses on campus. Programs are designed for individuals, small groups and larger structured activities. Peak Adventures also provides supplemental instruction for courses offered across the campus.64 A Peak Adventures experience will prompt students to learn about themselves through their relationships with the outdoor environment.

One of the most popular Peak Adventures programs is the “Challenge Center Ropes Course” that promotes team-building and hones communication skills. Sacramento State has had a ropes course since 1991. The Office of Human Resources and the College of Continuing Education regularly use the course to develop the leadership skills of their staffs and to enhance student learning. Recently, ASI has been collecting learning outcome data on the extent to which program and course student learning goals have been met by participation in this program.65

Sacramento State Aquatic Center

The Aquatic Center is a cooperative operation of Sacramento State’s Associated Students, Inc., the University Union, the California Department of Boating and Waterways and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The Aquatic Center provides high quality boating and safety programs through education, recreation and competition. Sacramento State students have unique opportunities for experiential learning through credit-bearing courses in sailing, windsurfing, rowing and wakeboarding/waterskiing. The Center also provides instructional support for RPTA 32: Recreation Activity Leadership, RPTA 100: Recreation and Leisure Lifestyle Development and RPTA 122: Perspectives on Leisure.

All three of these recreational programs foster student engagement, leadership skill development, team building and they support the offerings of various academic departments. The collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs activities has been enhanced by the ways in which recreational programs link with the University’s academic goals and mission.

4.1.3.2 Education

First Year Programs

First Year Programs at Sacramento State includes the Learning Communities Program and the Freshman Seminar Program. The Learning Communities Program pairs General Education classes and other courses into a format intended to facilitate student learning and University community-building.66 The Freshman Seminar, “Becoming an Educated Person,” has been designated as a lower-division General Education course, meeting the criteria of Area E: Understanding Personal Development. The Freshman Seminar connects developmental and content learning to ensure that the course provides students with a strong foundation for setting and achieving educational goals. Both departmental faculty members and student service professionals act as course instructors, and Freshman Seminar faculty meets every year in convocations to share best practices and ensure multi-section congruence. These meetings highlight the ways in which integrative learning and cross-divisional congruence benefit students and bolster the University’s retention and graduation rates.67

Day-to-day operations are overseen by the Director of First Year Programs, a faculty member with release time, and the Coordinator of First Year Programs, a staff member from the Advising Center. The Coordinator of First Year Programs hires, trains and supervises thirty-five student peer mentors who support learning communities and freshman seminars.68 The peer mentors meet with the faculty
programs with Student Affairs and better service to program provides integration of freshman academic both Fall and Spring semesters (phases II and III). The (phase I), and thirty minute advising appointments in program includes mandatory freshman orientation new mandatory advising program. This three-phase In Summer 2006, Student Affairs implemented a includes four professional staff, six faculty advisors and four student peer advisors. Currently, the Academic Advising Center in General Education advising, which is a major training in holistic, developmental advising and six units of assigned time during a rotation of four semesters. The faculty advisors undergo intensive and a small cohort of faculty advisors who receive in General Education advising, which is a major element of the Center’s service to students. The faculty members return to their departments with enriched skills, contacts and information, where they act as important resources for their colleagues and students. Currently, the Academic Advising Center includes four professional staff, six faculty advisors and four student peer advisors.

In Summer 2006, Student Affairs implemented a new mandatory advising program. This three-phase program includes mandatory freshman orientation (phase I), and thirty minute advising appointments in both Fall and Spring semesters (phases II and III). The program provides integration of freshman academic programs with Student Affairs and better service to the students. The Academic Advising Center’s efforts in the Freshman Advising Program are enhanced by active, ongoing coordination with departmental advising efforts.

Student Affairs and Academic Affairs also collaborated to create an intensive probation advising program that tackles the major predictor of attrition after the first year.

4.1.3.4 Summary
While educational effectiveness is a natural concern of Academic Affairs, educational activities are also infused throughout the programs that make up Student Affairs. Sacramento State’s co-curricular programs have been designed and implemented to support student learning, to facilitate graduation and to promote personal development. As a result, these programs bear directly or indirectly on the University’s educational effectiveness. While a number of co-curricular programs at Sacramento State continue to be delivered solely by the Division of Student Affairs, increasingly, curricular and co-curricular education requires collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs on student learning both inside and outside the classroom.

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.

[Criteria For Review: 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8]

4.2.1 Introduction
Given Sacramento State’s bipartite mission of excellence and access, both the University, in general, and the Division of Student Affairs, in particular, place high priority on programs and services that support and enhance student learning and success. At Sacramento State, “student success” ultimately relates to retention and graduation rates. However, as research in the field reveals, improvements in retention and graduation correlate with the level of connection among students, faculty and staff; the students’ sense of belonging and being part of the campus; and access to academic and support programs with the potential to increase classroom performance levels.69 Cognizant of these predictors of student success, Division of Student Affairs staff members actively promote their programs. It is not surprising then, that these same predictors and priorities serve as the cornerstone of the division’s mission and vision.

In 2005, the newly appointed Vice President for Student Affairs, after consultation with the 18 senior directors, constituted a committee of seven mid-level
staff with the review and revision of the division's mission and values documents. The resulting document and inclusive process that was initiated and sustained by the staff has formed the basis of the assessment activities undertaken by the division.

With the input of more than 400 Student Affairs staff, the division adopted vision and mission statements that built on the campus's distilled mission statement and Destination 2010 initiative:

**VISION:** As a vital component of a destination campus, Student Affairs will be a recognized leader in fostering student learning, growth, retention and success at the University and beyond.

**MISSION:** The Division of Student Affairs at Sacramento State meets the diverse needs of our students by offering programs, services and opportunities that empower students to reach their unique potential as learners, as contributing members of their communities and as responsible leaders.

These two important statements of the division's goals are the natural outgrowth of the unit's agreed-upon core values:

**INTEGRITY:** We pride ourselves on being honorable, trustworthy and credible.

**COLLABORATION:** The interactive partnerships we forge with members of the division, the University and the community enable us to created meaningful learning experiences for our students.

**EMPOWERMENT:** We help students to develop the knowledge, skills and attributes needed to shape their futures.

**RESPECT FOR DIVERSITY:** We cultivate a culture of civility where the open exchange of ideas and respect for all people are paramount.

**SERVICE TO STUDENTS:** We strive to deliver programs, policies and services in a timely, respectful manner.

These value, mission and vision statements are more than slogans. Taken both individually and in concert, they express Student Affairs' commitment to a learning focus that prioritizes student success. Moreover, the division has made an explicit and active commitment to promoting, measuring and evaluating student learning. These assessment and effectiveness activities are clearly and positively linked to the division's sense of its vision, mission and values.

A structured, ongoing process of assessment of student learning in Student Affairs is framed by coordination between the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Working with OIR, Student Affairs directors are expected to engage each year, with their staffs, in a six-step assessment process. The steps include:

- Writing (and as necessary, revising) a departmental mission statement that is directly aligned with the University and division mission statements;
- Formulating broad planning goals;
- Identifying measurable program objectives and student learning outcomes;
- Collecting and analyzing data
- Making data-driven decisions that become part of any established culture of evidence

The division developed a specific reporting template that ensures that consistent information is collected and disseminated. In this regard, directors have very little flexibility in what they must include in their reports--annual performance reviews explicitly refer to staff engagement with all six elements of the process. Nonetheless, directors do have significant latitude in determining how they will complete each step. In making decisions about program goals, outcome identification, measurement and analysis, the directors are encouraged to solicit both staff and student “user” input.

### 4.2.2 Progress and Improvement

When the campus Institutional Proposal was written four years ago, Student Affairs had no comprehensive assessment plan in place. This fall, the division is entering its third complete student-learning assessment cycle and finds itself prepared to reflect on and review the effects of this effort.

During this cycle of reaccreditation, Student Affairs has transformed its self-reporting student satisfaction program into a learning outcomes-based system. Today, all 18 units have developed student learning outcomes and one or more direct measures. Moreover, in the vast majority of cases, evidence suggests that learning objectives are being met. Even in situations in that the program learning goals have not been reached, evidence reveals that students are learning in the co-curricular programs offered by Student Affairs.

### 4.2.3 Summary

After completing two cycles of assessment, Student Affairs program directors identified and responded to three issues related to their assessment efforts. First, several directors expressed concern that the training for entry- and mid-level staff did not prepare...
them to engage in program assessment activities with a strong sense of confidence or preparedness. Recognition that “comprehensive” assessment must include staff at every level, the division began to offer additional training, hiring a retired annuitant, the former Director of Institutional Research, to provide training to unit directors at several retreats.

A second set of concerns arose when directors of service-centered departments (financial aid, admissions and records) raised legitimate concerns that a learning emphasis might compromise the division’s commitment to accurate, timely and efficient delivery of centrally important services to students. Gradually, a meaningful balance of learning functions and service functions has been identified by these units.75

A third, more personal set of concerns was raised by some staff who continued to fear that program assessments merely masked “secret” personnel evaluations. Addressing this misunderstanding is crucial if program assessment is to be effective and meaningful. While there is certainly a link between successful programs and high-performing staff, the connection is neither linear nor consistent. Some program efforts are experimental and such risks do not always “pay,” although they can still yield meaningful information and support both staff and student learning.

As the campus reviews this hypothesis, it is clear that the Division of Student Affairs has, in a relatively short time, consciously, efficiently and effectively developed a culture of assessment that is grounded in an authentic commitment to student learning and success. Each of the unit’s component programs has formulated learning outcomes and collected data related to their efforts. The division contributes in significant ways to the University’s mission of excellence and access. In many ways, the division’s efforts clearly reflect the University’s motto: “Leadership begins here.”
5.0 Community Engagement

5.1 Introduction
After the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the subcommittees examining the pairs of hypotheses had come to similar conclusions. When considering the work of individual members of the campus community, the University was justifiably proud. But when considering the institution’s coordination of those efforts and the levels of support and direction from the administrative structures, the University had much to do. The areas of civic and community engagement were no exception. Effective examples abound, including several areas where Sacramento State is a state leader, but a shared focus remained elusive. Considered through the lens of educational effectiveness, Sacramento State’s efforts are moving toward a holistic definition of its educational and service mission that draws on two main streams: community engagement and civic engagement. The confluence of our interest in our relationship to our service region, our assessment efforts, developments in the first-year experience, the LEAD project and our focus on General Education and the Baccalaureate Learning Goals is promising. While not stated in the same terms, these areas share an interest in engaged learning and student development that aligns well with civic and community engagement.

5.2 Hypothesis 5:
The University fosters strong linkages among Sacramento State, the Capitol, and the Sacramento community at large.

[Criteria For Review: 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.4, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8]

5.2.1 Introduction
A timely confluence of events has provided opportunities and incentives to make progress on civic and community engagement. Their selection as a theme for this WASC review was intentional, designed to spark conversation and support progress. Two themes have emerged from the campus-wide conversations that have focused on developing a rationale for undertaking community engagement efforts. First, as an institution of higher education, the University has an obligation to prepare students to participate constructively in civil and political society. This responsibility is central to the institution’s educational mission. Second, as a public institution, Sacramento State has a special duty to serve the regional community. Occasionally, each of these themes seems to compete for primacy as the University wrestles with institutionally meaningful definitions of civic and community engagement.

Bridging the Institutional Proposal hypotheses and the Educational Effectiveness Review, Sacramento State has defined two of its core characteristics as “metropolitan university” and “destination campus.” The Strategic Plan says, “Metropolitan universities are responsive to diverse community needs. Thus we combine research-based learning with practical application and create partnerships with external organizations.” Ideally, sensitivity to and support of community needs provides two-way benefits. While access to the University’s human resources and expertise profits the region, how will the University be reimbursed? For example, if faculty members are providing service in the community, how can they bring that knowledge back into their classrooms? If a student is learning to be engaged through a campus-sponsored project, can that learning also benefit the community? Sacramento State believes the answer is “yes,” but it seems increasingly clear that natural and meaningful linkages will not occur without thoughtful facilitation at the institutional level.

5.2.2 Linking the University and the Sacramento Community
Recognition of this need for macro-level coordination has led the University to broaden and deepen its activities in this arena. Both the Development Office and the Office of Research and Contracts have been active partners with departments and individual faculty in seeking funding for projects that enhance our students’ educational experiences. For example, the Development Office has facilitated a grant from a local organization that supports campus-based activities of the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics. The University has also made significant commitments to local workforce development through programming provided by the College of Continuing Education. The College of Business Administration has organized three centers to provide consultations and educational opportunities to the local community. The Center for Small Business offers free management assistance to
approximately 100 businesses in the Sacramento area each year. The Government Accounting Institute coordinates research, education, consultancy and services to improve public sector finance, accounting, fiscal management and budgeting. The Insurance Education and Research Program also offers educational services to the local community.

On the program and course level, many partnerships between Sacramento State and local organizations benefit our region. A representative example is Sociology 102B, in which students conduct surveys and prepare an annual regional report. The Ethnic Studies Department organized the 65th Street Corridor Collaborative Project. Additionally, the campus offers programs that meld field and community service experiences. The College of Education Urban Teacher Education Center is a community-oriented, field-based program for teacher preparation designed to prepare future educators for urban schools and communities. The focus is on low-income, highly diverse schools and communities within the Sacramento City Unified School District.

Enhancing and enriching this commitment is an outgrowth of the campus goal of improving its status as a “destination campus.” The University is committed to playing a significant role in the culture of the region and equally committed to forging strong connections to the community. The Strategic Plan describes the University’s goal to “invite students, faculty, staff, alumni and other members of the community to participate together in campus life.” Engaging with the community through programming such as the Martin Luther King celebration, the One Book program and the Festival of New American Music demonstrates the campus’s commitment to community engagement in service of its educational mission.

5.2.3 The Community Engagement Center

Community engagement, as a broad term inclusive of civic learning, service learning and political engagement, is founded on the idea that public education plays an important role in the development of citizens who are motivated, knowledgeable and skilled enough to participate effectively in both the social and political sectors of community life. A brief review of the national context helps provide perspective on the educational values associated with the community and civic engagement movement. During the 1990s, a community service and volunteerism movement took hold in K-12 education and eventually spread to colleges and universities. The premise seemed to be that students who volunteered would develop skills and a general interest that would make them more likely to become involved in their communities as adults. As the movement took hold in educational settings it became clear that service alone was not enough, and that a more explicit linking of service experiences to classroom learning increased learning in both classroom and service settings.

---

**Figure 3**

A diagram illustrating the integration of academic study, practical experience, and civic engagement.

"I would never have imagined that writing could be an important and critical part of being engaged in the community. I have always thought that offering your services and time, which did not include writing, was being engaged. Now I know that even writing can make a difference. This project has definitely taught us about a community issue that we knew nothing about, not even its existence, yet has opened our eyes, minds, and hearts to another world, and has given us the opportunity to express concern and offer help through writing.

Lastly, but not at all the least important, this project has helped us grow as individuals, and as attentive citizens, to become more aware of the different layers in our communities: people in the community, businesses, social/public services, law enforcement, health care services, and politics just to name a few."

—Loselea Naufau, reflecting on her ENGLISH 118 service learning experience
To enhance student learning and heighten student’s social and political awareness, the pedagogy of service learning developed throughout the nation. In 2000, the State of California followed suit by awarding the California State University system funds to develop service learning on each of its 23 campuses. Sacramento State’s Office of Community Collaboration was assigned this charge. Over the past five years, the service learning movement has evolved to encompass activities captured by terms such as “civic,” “political engagement,” and “civic learning.” In recognition of the spectrum of engagement from individualized service learning to institutionalized community engagement, the majority of California State University campuses have changed their names from service learning offices to centers for community engagement (or some variation thereof). The Sacramento State Office of Community Collaboration evolved along with this national movement and in May 2007 changed its name to the Community Engagement Center.

The Community Engagement Center strives to empower Sacramento State students to develop and use the skills necessary to become “engaged” citizens in the community. From this perspective, the various aspects of engagement—community service, service learning and civic engagement, etc. (See Figure 3)—are existing on a developmental continuum that provides students with individual and collective opportunities to be “engaged.” Sacramento State students are making an impact. In the 2007-2008 academic year, service learning, Alternative Break, and Students in Service participants contributed 93,724 hours of service to the Sacramento region. Using the national volunteer index of $19.51 per hour, Sacramento State students’ service to the community was valued at more than $1,828,555.

The Community Engagement Center’s vision is: “That every Sacramento State student participates in a minimum of two community and/or civic engagement opportunities during the undergraduate academic career.”

Through resources, referrals and connection, the center “facilitates learning and engagement by linking campus and community for mutual benefit.” (mission statement of the Community Engagement Center)

The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification and President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll applications both focus on the status of community engagement as demonstrated by community service, service learning and internships. As a matter of fact, in describing the University’s status as a metropolitan university, the Strategic Planning Council explicitly refers to the institution’s goal to “educate students to become informed and actively engaged members of society.”

5.2.4 Linking the University and the Capitol

Sacramento State has a unique position in the California State University. Working to take full advantage of the campus’s status as “the capital campus,” Sacramento State has included a special focus in its Strategic Plan—one committed to taking full advantage of the opportunities our location offers to our campus and external stakeholders.

The Center for California Studies

One important illustration of the University’s commitment to utilizing the resources offered by the presence of the State Capitol in our service area is the Center for California Studies. The Center is a pre-eminent educational resource, offering programs that provide opportunities for interaction with the state government at all levels. For instance, the Center created and administers the Faculty Fellows Research Project, which links the policy research needs of California policy-makers with the research resources of the California State University system. Each year, CSU faculty members undertake policy research at the specific request of the state Assembly, state Senate, and the governor. From its inception in 1994 until 2007, the project has distributed more than $750,000, funding more that 64 separate projects by more than 71 faculty members from 13 CSU campuses.

At the request of the California Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts, the Center initiated, coordinated and remains closely involved with the development and implementation of two Judicial Administration programs—a Certificate in Judicial Administration and a master’s degree in Public Policy with a Concentration on Judicial Administration. The Center also partners with the University of Southern California Sacramento Center in offering the Legislative Staff Management Institute. Sponsored by the National Conference of State Legislatures, the institute is one of the nation’s most respected legislative staff leadership and management training programs. Each session has about 35 participants from 25-30 states. The Center also administers the Capital Fellows Program, a nationally recognized post-graduate programs offering opportunities to prepare for public service careers, through engagement with the state Assembly, Senate, Governor’s Office and Judicial Council, while simultaneously obtaining a graduate-level education in public policy and state government. Since 2000-2001, there have been 64 fellows each year, chosen from a pool that averages about 1,000 applicants.
for California Studies also administers the Panetta Congressional Internship Program for Sacramento State students, the Federal-State Relationships Fellowship, the Sacramento Semester Program, a CSU-wide undergraduate internship program and the Sacramento Superior Court Judicial Internship Program.

In addition to its public policy-based mission, the Center for California Studies holds the California Election Archive, the only statewide data archive that collects, tabulates and reports candidate and ballot measure results for local elections, providing a valuable resource for scholars, communities and state and local governments. The Center also sponsors the annual California Journalism Awards and the annual Envisioning California Conference, which supports one of the Center’s basic goals:

To inspire an understanding and appreciation of California and its history, cultures, economy and demographics by promoting the interdisciplinary field of California Studies and enriching Center projects with a sense of California Studies.95

**Office of Governmental and Civic Affairs**

Sacramento State organized the Office of Governmental and Civic Affairs in 2007 to facilitate and coordinate campus relations with local, state, county and federal officials and agencies, providing information in response to specific requests. In addition, the Office of Governmental and Civic Affairs is engaged in building community relationships and partnerships to advance Sacramento State and the regional community the University serves.96 For example, the office has developed partnerships with K-12 schools and community and non-profit groups to promote college preparation, college access and student achievement. This branch of the University collaborates with the Sacramento-area Congressional delegation to identify and secure federal resources for students, faculty and staff and coordinates the campus response to local, state and federal legislative proposals.

The Office of Governmental and Civic Affairs has organized a number of events that showcase the University’s engagement with the community. In the past year, the Sacramento State campus was the site of a Clean Energy Showcase and Venture Expo, a STEM summit and the 2008 State of the City address.97

### 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.

([Criteria For Review: 2.9, 2.11, 2.12, 3.4, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8]

#### 5.3.1 Introduction

If the development of an active and knowledgeable citizenry is part of the University’s educational mission, then a natural question arises: How are students different when they leave the institution, and what educational value has been added? Sacramento State is approaching this question in an innovative manner. Relying on research from diverse disciplines, the University is focusing on the development of a core set of engagement skills. Engaged individuals are interested or motivated by an issue. They are connected to a network of decision-makers. And they have the skills to make effective contributions. As the Baccalaureate Learning Goals suggest, a large portion of a student’s academic experience focuses directly and indirectly on generating interest in a broader world. Focusing on and expanding the quality and number of opportunities offered to students to develop their engagement skills is, increasingly, at the center of the University’s agenda.

#### 5.3.2 Civic Engagement

Sacramento State is beginning to imagine a developmental scheme that ensures multiple opportunities for experiences and learning that reinforces a core set of community and civic engagement skills. The creation of this structure is encouraging close collaboration between the Division of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and highlighting the institution’s purposeful development of a constellation of rich student experiences. Different units on campus clearly have more contact and therefore more opportunities to create experiences at different times in a student’s progression:

For example, First Year Programs (FYP) is focused largely on students in the classroom, many of whom are relatively “unskilled.” FYP, then, is logically focusing on developing initial competencies, introducing students to opportunities on campus and bringing students closer toward the “participant” box in the assessment tool shown in Figure 4. The Division of Student Affairs, on the other hand, has historically focused some effort on encouraging participation, but the bulk of its efforts are in the participant and leader boxes, developing leaders from participants. In the long run, linking the
efforts of FYP to connect students to participation opportunities with the efforts of Student Affairs to provide rich participation opportunities and leadership pathways will be both efficient and logical.

The Strategic Plan also correctly identifies the need to prioritize and focus our community based-efforts more carefully. Many advisory committees, regional chambers of commerce, arts and cultural associations, professional organizations and government entities within the Sacramento region have made clear that they wish us to be a regional resource as well as an excellent educational institution. Sacramento State has a tremendous opportunity and the potential to be a full and active partner in regional social, cultural and economic development. To do so, we must focus our energies and choices to maximize our impact. To the extent that we can respond to increasingly complex regional issues and needs in ways that involve multiple sectors of the University, we enhance the institution’s connection to the region. Efforts to hone our external focus are occurring in two major venues—first the Strategic Plan Implementation Committee assigned this priority, and second, the Futures Initiative discussion that will be unfolding over the Spring 2009 term. In both venues, teams are reviewing data about community needs and goals, mapping those to our own strengths, and working to find the areas that offer the most promise for our campus to make meaningful contributions.

Two strands of engagement activities need to occur for the campus to be successful in this effort. First, there must be clear outcomes associated with the efforts students undertake. Our focus on assessment, and the work being done in curricular and co-curricular areas, is enriching these activities. At the University-level we expect to focus on a core set of “civic” skills, those skills that allow one to participate in a meaningful fashion in civic, political and public life—communicating, organizing, thinking critically, and making decisions collectively. It turns out that these skills dovetail very nicely with the core skill sets being developed in General Education, First Year Programs and the LEAD initiative.

The Strategic Plan places engagement as one of a limited number of priority items for the coming five years. Projects such as the Civic Learning Initiative (CLI) have built bridges between otherwise independent programs. This initiative of the CSU Chancellor’s Office began in 2004 and focused on integrating the considerable momentum behind the service-learning and first-year program movements, encouraging explicit civic learning in the first year. The initial Sacramento State CLI team included the service learning director, the undergraduate programs’ director, representatives from the Division of Student Affairs and two faculty members. The CLI required that the campus create a shared definition of success in civic learning, no small feat for this diverse group. From that effort has come an impetus to integrate civic learning in First Year Programs that includes faculty development, targeted programming for first-year students and steps towards re-designing the assessment measures for freshman seminar classes.

The intentional introduction of civic skill development at Sacramento State has been in place for roughly two years, and it is increasingly part of the way many programs and instructors organize their efforts. For example, some Freshman Seminar instructors infuse civic skills throughout their curriculum. There are also plans for more comprehensive delivery of community experiences in the new upper division General Education Honors Program. And finally, the skill discussion is being brought to the University General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC) in hopes that a wider range of courses will include civic skill development and community engagement experiences.

---

### Figure 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant status\Experience arenas</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unengaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome goal is students who are participants or leaders in campus and community level activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University has a commitment to extend its efforts beyond those students who are on the campus. For example, the Center for California Studies has developed the LegiSchool Project, a premier, national award-winning civic education collaboration between the California Legislature, the Center and Sacramento State. Each year, LegiSchool’s televised Town Hall Meetings, on-line dialogues, essay contests and summer high school student internships reach approximately 10,000 high school students across the state. LegiSchool’s mission is to engage young people in matters of public policy and state government by creating opportunities for students and leaders to meet and share ideas on issues of importance to Californians. In doing so, LegisSchool fulfills the Center for California Studies’ mandate to support civic education, by motivating high school students to take a lifelong and active interest in public life and the political process.

Civic skills are acquired and improved through repeated use. Both curricular and co-curricular activities are being slowly and self-consciously infused with civic skill-developing experiences. The understanding of skill acquisition as a developmental process has led to the conclusion that providing students with multiple experiences that require use of civic skills will strengthen the skills, increase the legitimate sense of efficacy of students and ultimately allow students to transfer those skills to other arenas including work, community and political environments.

5.3.3 Co-curricular Programs and Leadership Training

In addition to academic programs and courses that focus on leadership and civic engagement skills, the Division of Student Affairs is active in this arena. A number of co-curricular programs include the development of student leadership skills. For example, the Orientation/Peer Advisor Training Program recruits student leaders and works to enhance and strengthen their effectiveness. But perhaps one of the strongest examples of the campus’s commitment to provide students with opportunities to develop their leadership skills and express a commitment to the community and civic engagement is Associated Students, Inc. (ASI). An important element of this co-curricular education program is the opportunity for students to learn leadership skills through participation in student government. ASI has developed a mission and values statement, which reads, “Associated Students Incorporated provides: experiential education, leadership opportunities and support services to our growing community. We achieve this through: integrity, teamwork, commitment, passion, purposefulness, community support, excellence, service, diversity, and professionalism.” As a unit affiliated with Student Affairs, ASI has created a process for strategic planning, a strategic plan, assessment goals and a rubric for assessment. A leadership certificate program is being planned through ASI.

Additionally, the Center for Community Engagement supervises the campus’s relationship to the AmeriCorps Students in Service program. This program meets critical community needs by engaging higher education students in service and fostering an ethic of civic responsibility. Through the program, students are introduced to local, regional and national service-learning opportunities, resulting in a regional network of student leaders committed to serving and strengthening their local communities.

Coordination of the campus’s efforts is evidence of a particularly important and still-emerging area. The LEAD project, initiated by Student Affairs, is seeking a unified focus on developing future leaders. Building on a theoretical framework that contains many of the skills previously identified, LEAD is working to integrate curricular and co-curricular programs into a common framework. Assessment efforts can then be integrated and aggregated at the University-level. Because so many of the desirable skill sets also cut across programs, the LEAD group has begun working with a small number of individuals who are heavily involved in developing curriculum-based engagement opportunities. Among these campus leaders, the University General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee (GEP/GRC) chair, the FYE director, and the campus coordinator of the American Democracy Project have been the most active and committed. In addition, LEAD is working with Academic Affairs, faculty and staff to develop a minor and certificate program in Student Leadership. The Community Engagement Scholar, who was appointed by the Provost in January 2008 is working with the Faculty Assessment Coordinator and a team of cross-disciplinary faculty to develop student learning outcomes centered on engagement.

5.4 Summary

In preparing the Capacity and Preparatory Report, it seemed that hypotheses 5 and 6 were artificially separated into internal and external perspectives. As the campus has focused on educational effectiveness, a new understanding of the relationship between the two hypotheses is now
emerging. What are now understood as mutually supportive dual missions—to educate our students and to serve our community—are at the root of the two hypotheses proposed in our community engagement theme. The unifying concept is that of an “engaged campus,” which intentionally bridges those two efforts. Sacramento State’s distinctive focus on civic and community engagement, and the improving intentionality of those efforts, hold significant promise for other objectives articulated in the Strategic Plan, that the campus is actively pursuing. Accomplishing the goals embedded in those hypotheses requires a continuing focus on the areas identified in both the Capacity and Preparatory Report and the Educational Effectiveness Report—culture, infrastructure and incentives.

Shared understandings must be developed, policies must be modified and approved and eventually a culture shift must occur. Charles Lindblom famously said that there are three ways to change human behavior: 1) authority, although as the University recognizes that superficial compliance does not work for meaningful change, we are not relying on this mechanism; 2) barter, again, not a good strategy for we have little to barter with; and finally, 3) changing beliefs. The latter is the most long-lasting but also the most difficult to obtain. Our relatively slow progress reflects a deep commitment to changing our culture and our willingness to take the additional time to do it effectively.
At the end of the Capacity and Preparatory Report, the author set the stage for the Educational Effectiveness Report by stating, “a WASC imperative has been achieved: Sacramento State is collectively considering a fundamental educational question.” In fact, in the period since that report and WASC Team’s visit, the campus has actually been considering a set of fundamental, existential questions, the answers to which have the potential to effect the institution for years to come: Who are we, What do we stand for, Where are we going, where do we want to go?

Sacramento State has long valued both access and excellence, but a balance between these two goals is often difficult and costly to maintain. Still, the University has started important conversations about campus priorities. Rather than continuing to commit equally to both, the campus has begun to more explicitly identify a “set point” for each (access and excellence) while maintaining a clear vision of Sacramento State as an institution of demonstrated excellence with a strong commitment to access. This process of definition, identification and planning has been driven, in large measure, by a new strategic planning process, the revision of the campus Strategic Plan and, in part, by this timely reaccreditation process.

The difficulties that have prevented the University from achieving its desired level of progress on these issues are a result of the steady state of change that has characterized higher education in the last decade. Certainly, in many ways, the past ten years have been full of changes for our campus, the CSU system and the State of California. Change is messy and often painful. But periods of change are often preludes to re-invention and revision. As this Educational Effectiveness Report reveals, this has certainly been the case at Sacramento State. For example, since the last WASC accreditation cycle, Sacramento State has seen the retirement of a president who served the campus for many years; the appointment of a president with a new vision for the university; changes in upper administration that included two provosts; the arrival of a significant number of administrators who were completely new to the campus; a turnover in the faculty that involved the retirement of almost half those who were on the campus; a turnover in the faculty that involved the retirement of almost half those who were on the campus during the last WASC review and the appointment of several hundred new tenure-track faculty members. In many ways, the campus’s history in the past decade has been characterized by transition, change and some occasional conflict.

In retrospect, it’s clear that conflict leads to change and dissatisfaction leads to a sense that the only alternative is to abandon the old way of doing things. The result for Sacramento State has been the development of a campus-wide focus—educational effectiveness—and an explicit set of values that are now supported by a mission and vision that provide a framework for both organizing and evaluating our efforts.

The WASC reaccreditation cycle has led the campus to refocus on the “big picture” and enabled our community members (both internal and external) to get an overall view of how they—and others—fit into the organization. Framing our institutional enterprise within a set of concerns focused on educational effectiveness has led Sacramento State to engage with a series of questions and goals that have already recast our efforts for the foreseeable future.

One immediate result of this re-envisioning has been the development of a more holistic view of the University as an organization, allowing for increasingly reflective and analytical thinking. This shift has created improved linkages and collaborations across campus. A dramatic example of this change is the development of the University’s new Strategic Plan, Vision Statement and Core Values and the Strategic Planning Council’s efforts to extract a “distilled” mission based on the University’s 2004 Mission Statement. The “new” Mission Statement, included in the Strategic Plan asserts that,

California State University, Sacramento commits itself to providing Access, for all eligible students, continually pursuing Excellence in teaching, learning, and student support, building upon our already exceptional Diversity, such that all members of our community are respected and participate collaboratively in every aspect of University life, enhancing the quality of life of the Region and the state, instilling Pride in all who view this campus as their own.

This mission provides the University with a context within which to celebrate our successes and examine the lessons we’ve learned. The Strategic Plan has been developed to help the University understand how far the institution has come, how it can continue to improve and how far it has to go to meet its goals. Ultimately, the University’s strategic planning document articulates a sense of the campus community’s shared purpose. If used consistently, it will also provide an easy-to-understand context for making effective decisions in a complex world.

How might this framework of making decisions based on educational effectiveness be manifest? Consultations with a variety of stakeholders have produced a
remarkably consistent vision of a University in which the hypotheses developed in our Institutional Proposal have been proved. We can now look ahead to see how Sacramento State is positioned to advance our core mission of student learning in the key areas of academic programs, campus life and community engagement:

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
Because the University has put in place processes and structures that emphasize quality assurance and quality improvement in our academic programs, crucial ongoing improvements will result in:

» A program-review process that operates within an expanded definition of “student learning,” one that includes considerations beyond disciplinary mastery and knowledge acquisition. Instead it would see learning as a holistic transformative activity that integrates academic content with student life experiences;

» Faculty articulating high levels of expectation for student learning and students having a clear understanding of each program’s educational goals. As a result, students would know not just what they needed to do, but what and how, what it looks like to do well and what opportunities for intellectual and personal growth are available to them;

» Assignments and courses being thoughtfully planned over an entire program in order to facilitate student demonstrations of their abilities to produce, revise and use knowledge;

» Milestone projects embedded in the curriculum, offering faculty and students occasions for reflection and opportunities to ensure that program learning goals are being met;

» Enhanced technological tools that support assessment activities and analyze meaningful information, further enabling faculty members to focus their energies on designing increasingly more effective instructional strategies and sequences grounded in evidence of student learning;

» Sacramento State being recognized across the nation as a teaching and learning community.

Similarly, the discussions and activities that are under way to more effectively ensure that our students are achieving the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals is moving towards a paradigm shift that is focused on strengthening higher-order learning. As this process continues to unfold:

» The learning experiences of Sacramento State students will increasingly undergo some fundamental changes. Students will experience, and be aware of, an intellectual path across the General Education Program and the majors, running from a Freshman Experience course to a Senior Capstone that integrates the essential components of the institutional learning goals;

» Program curricula will be designed to promote the development of both disciplinary and interdisciplinary thinking, knowing, and doing over several semesters;

» Faculty and students will increasingly engage in authentic, meaningful collaborative inquiries that cross semester, instructor and disciplinary boundaries in ways that inspire culminating presentations and performances;

» Students will have the opportunity to reflect on their own learning and thought processes over time within the context of clear and valid criteria and will self-assess at milestones in their own development;

» Sacramento State students will demonstrate a strengthened and deepened sense of civic and ethical responsibility, both locally and globally;

» The University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals will be increasingly “mapped” and integrated into several of our academic and co-curricular programs.

CAMPUS LIFE
In very clear terms, Sacramento State has demonstrated the efficacy and success of putting in place the processes and institutional incentives that now promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning. Over the next ten years, this collaboration will propel:

» A cultural shift. The University will emphasize the intrinsic value of creating and maintaining collaboration. We know from current practice that such collaboration augments and supports student learning and student success. We will continue to build a collaborative model to develop and support initiatives for recruitment, retention and graduation;

» Staff and faculty into focusing more on the benefits of integrating academic and co-curricular learning.

Meanwhile the Division of Student Affairs has developed assessment plans that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in co-curricular and experiential learning programs. As progress in this area continues, the division is committed to build on current practice to ensure that:

» Student Affairs assessment plans include consideration of the effectiveness of integrating curricular and experiential learning with the University’s more traditional academic programming;
Assessment of Student Affairs programs employs increasingly sophisticated benchmarks of effectiveness and as a result, program assessments demonstrate developmental learning at various stages of a student’s involvement.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

In view of the vibrancy and dynamism manifest in the University’s efforts to foster and promote stronger ties with the Capitol and the Sacramento community at-large, a more focused outcome will see:

» Programs like the LegisSchool Project and the Capital Fellows Program continue to attract the best students in the state;

» The Center for California Studies retaining its pre-eminence as a locus for professional training in public and government policy and staffing;

» The University Appointment, Retention and Promotion policy integrating a specific, mission-based definition of community service;

» The University playing a central and recognized role in community activities and initiatives.

A related, but critical, outgrowth of deeper involvement in the community will also enrich the wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs through which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to community and civic engagement. In very meaningful ways, Sacramento State:

» Students will increase the quantity and quality of their active participation in activities that strengthen their leadership skills;

» Alumni will become more actively and broadly engaged in the civic and political life of their communities.
These, and other, indications of the current direction of this University provide a solid affirmation of our case for reaccreditation. As we reflect on the major successes that have contributed to our educational effectiveness, we can see that the University has purposefully begun a cultural change that will enrich the learning experience of our students, faculty and staff far into the future.

In very profound ways, organizational learning has occurred and continues to shape how we define ourselves and how we see ourselves serving our students and our region. Sacramento State’s development from an institution that was “emerging” in the areas of strategic planning and assessment into a University that is much more “developed” in its focus on measures of educational effectiveness to drive decision-making and resource allocation is a telling feature of our future.

Our development is not complete, and we know it. However, this Educational Effectiveness Report reveals that, taken as a whole, the hypotheses demonstrate our increasingly cohesive efforts, and the progress we have made in improving the clarity of our vision of our future and the principles that will underpin our efforts. Individually, our hypotheses represent important work, both completed and left to do, and illustrate our consistent efforts to improve.

California State University, Sacramento has engaged in this process seriously and with a commitment to building a model community of teaching and learning. The process that began with our Institutional Proposal and continued through our Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2006 has resulted in transformational changes that have led this University to make major advances in fulfilling its mission and realizing its vision.

The ongoing conversations that the reaccreditation process required will ensure adherence to the fundamental pillars on which we will continue to build as an educational enterprise. Although we recognize, as most institutions do, that the pace of meaningful change is slow, our ongoing progress will motivate and invigorate the campus to take on the remaining challenges. For now, however, we have taken actions that are intrinsically foundational, relate to existential questions of mission and effectiveness, and achieved success. Against this background, we can claim that Sacramento State is committed to educational effectiveness as defined and shaped by:

» Focusing on student success as demonstrated by retention and graduation;
» Ensuring a quality educational experience through assessment and improvement;
» Increasing strategic decision-making by proactive and collaborative planning;
» Acting as careful stewards of our financial resources, anticipating problems, investing in our priorities and becoming a destination campus;
» Engaging our institution and our external stakeholders in planning for our future;
» Improving our organizational functioning by encouraging administrative integration and collaboration, improving the transparency of our information and decision-making processes, educating our selves about complexity of our undertaking, and developing leadership at every level of the institution.

As Sacramento State completes this stage of WASC reaccreditation, it does so with a firm grounding in the issues surrounding educational effectiveness, and with a renewed sense of purpose, direction and commitment. §
Appendix A

RESPONSE TO WASC TEAM CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW REPORT
A.1 Introduction
The Visiting Team’s *Capacity and Preparatory Review* emphasized that Sacramento State was a campus in transition and that success in negotiating the transition’s stresses would depend on improved transparency among campus stakeholders and a clear sense that all levels of decision-making were driven by public evidence. Since the Team’s visit, the campus has made great strides in these areas, and each of the specific issues raised by the team has benefited from broad discussion and specific actions arising from a clarified and commonly held vision of the University’s mission and goals.

A.2 Assessment at Sacramento State
The University has implemented sound structures and dedicated meaningful resources that have made significant improvements in the culture and quality of assessment of academic programs and student learning over the past two years. By building an assessment system and increasing commitment and buy-in, we have created a whole new enhanced landscape for continuous development and improvement. Notably, the actions taken so far provide realistic expectations for assessment of student learning outcomes on this campus to be highly developed in process and quality into the foreseeable future. The quality and quantity of annual assessment reports offer compelling evidence that our new assessment system is bearing fruits in so many different ways. Although some challenges remain, the University leadership continues to systematically establish and enforce appropriately negotiated and locally owned assessment practices that are leading to greater successes in closing the assessment loop.

The following paragraphs summarize and discuss the measures we have taken in response to the WASC action letter of 2007.

**WASC Commission action letter:** Develop mechanisms for promoting and overseeing student learning.

**Sacramento State’s action:** We have been enormously active in creating processes and structures to strengthen this area and have evidenced progress. Specifically, Academic Affairs:

- Offered the faculty a variety of assessment workshops;
- Provided department chairs, deans and others with feedback on assessment plans and reports;
- Consulted with program assessment coordinators and others about the design and implementation of assessment plans;
- Presented assessment information to departments;
- Worked with a program-review team to examine the pilot program review study procedure;
- Collaborated with the Director of Information Resources and Technology and the Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning on projects;
- Began work with the Community Engagement Scholar on development of a direct assessment for service learning;
- Worked with the University Writing and Reading Coordinator on plans for an undergraduate and graduate assessment of writing competence;
- Engaged administrators and faculty leaders in General Education in the development of a GE READS proposal to build an assessment system that informs curriculum and instruction in academic literacy;
- Collaborated with the Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Education and the Director of Information Resources and Technology to launch a pilot technological platform for assessing teacher credential candidates and sparked informal discussions within the campus community about assessment that reflect a hallmark of real organizational learning.

- In addition, the Faculty Assessment Coordinator has developed a website that chronicles the work of the office and offers the campus community information about assessment.
- In Spring 2008, the Provost named members
from across the campus to the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment (PACA) as a mechanism to provide him with recommendations regarding academic program assessment. The committee is evidence of the institutional awareness that governance issues and assessment must be addressed in a formal and collaborative manner. It is chaired by a past Faculty Assessment Coordinator, with faculty from each of the Colleges, a dean and representatives from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. PACA has done much over the past year to promote assessment. Meeting biweekly to discuss issues of immediate and long-range importance, this committee has:

» Developed a manual for academic program assessment plans that spells out the elements of a plan as well as the features of good plans, and several departments (e.g., Family and Consumer Sciences, Social Science subject matter program) have begun to use the rubrics to revise their plans;

» Recommended to the Provost that the campus adopt a common annual reporting template to be filled out electronically.

» PACA is currently interested in seeking external funding to develop assessment projects like the GE READS initiative and a service learning assessment package. To this end, the committee is engaged in a needs assessment on campus.

WASC Commission action letter: Create a central entity for moving the University’s assessment agenda forward.

Sacramento State action: This suggestion prompted one of the first extended discussions in PACA in Spring 2008, as the committee struggled with the definition of a “central entity.” A response to this suggestion, however, had been made months before PACA ever met. The Provost and his colleagues in Academic Affairs established the Office of Academic Program Assessment and the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment, which have worked collaboratively to identify and address the difficulties of making progress on an assessment agenda in higher education.

Part of moving an assessment agenda forward at Sacramento State involves understanding obstacles in the path, and the faculty members who have taken on responsibility for serving in OAPA and on PACA have begun to identify those obstacles, not as a nexus for complaints, but as a blueprint for action. To strengthen our ability to move the campus assessment initiatives even further, we recognize the need for either an existing committee or subcommittee of the Senate to take charge of formulating and supporting new assessment policies. Some of this governance work has already begun in the revisions of policies governing program review (e.g., the PROC Program Review Pilot Study).

Another issue has arisen as a result of these efforts, and it relates to improving the technological infrastructure for institutional assessment. OAPA set this as the theme for the 2008 assessment summit, which began serious discussions about applications and possibilities. Given the acute budget constraints on campus, we have begun to explore ways to modify and adapt existing technology to support institutional assessment.

WASC Commission action letter: Focus attention on a need for effective structures and processes for oversight of academic program assessment.

Sacramento State action: We have taken steps to develop greater effectiveness in this area. By bolstering the role of our deans in annual assessment reporting, we achieved a change in both structure and process.

Prior to the action letter, individual departments carried out assessment plans and wrote their assessment reports in relative isolation. By July 1, each department chair was expected to submit an annual report to Academic Affairs. After the action letter, the Provost worked with the deans to strengthen their role in assessment activity. Now, college deans are responsible for approving department assessment plans and for approving and submitting annual assessment reports to Academic Affairs. This change not only increased the quantity of annual reports submitted over the past two years, but it also improved the quality of these reports.

The campus knows that the work of establishing effective structures and processes for oversight is not over, but this new role for college deans has had important and positive consequences and will become the backbone of increasingly better oversight as time passes. The fact that the Provost has made funds available to the deans to support assessment development in the Colleges even in a hostile budget climate is evidence of our unprecedented commitment to making progress in this area. Furthermore, the Office of Academic Program Assessment, another budget allocation that bespeaks a serious level of intentionality, is envisioned as a hands-on resource for faculty, not as a threatening arm of the accreditation police. Deans who see a need for professional development or, indeed, any form of development of assessments now have a resource from which to draw for support with no strings attached. OAPA also provides the deans with a yearly summary and analysis of assessment activity across all of the Colleges for comparative purposes; thus, the deans have information about the work of their colleagues and can base their decisions in part on local norms and practices.
WASC Commission action letter: Address the issue of communication of good practices.

Sacramento State action: Our first assessment summit provided faculty with the opportunity to learn about the ways technology can enhance assessment activity and generated much interest, with more than 80 campus employees, including faculty, chairs, deans and assessment coordinators in attendance. As discussed previously, interest in technology led to summer demonstrations from commercial vendors. As plans stand right now, our upcoming assessment summit will focus on crafting shared definitions of some basic assessment terms, such as measurable learning outcomes, rubrics and the like, as a way to make sure that all of us in assessment-related roles on campus are speaking the same language. Departments will present their learning outcomes in public sessions and then engage in discussions about what we value regarding learning. The OAPA assessment newsletters give the campus community fresh information about current assessment initiatives, and the OAPA website offers web links for exploring initiatives on other campuses in more depth. We are aware that some of our best-kept secrets include the really good assessment work that some of our colleagues are doing. We know from the annual reports that this work is going on. As time passes, a goal we share is to provide regular avenues for sharing these practices among ourselves and, in the long run, with the larger education community.

Sacramento State action: The OAPA website offers web links for exploring initiatives on other campuses in more depth. We are aware that some of our best-kept secrets include the really good assessment work that some of our colleagues are doing. We know from the annual reports that this work is going on. As time passes, a goal we share is to provide regular avenues for sharing these practices among ourselves and, in the long run, with the larger education community.

WASC Commission action letter: Develop comprehensive assessment.

Sacramento State action: In fact, the archives of annual assessment reports, together with annual summaries of the entire collection, available on the Academic Affairs website document the effort and seriousness with which we have acted in this regard. Undoubtedly, as the assessment initiative moves ahead and brings about clarity of purpose and practice, the campus community will develop a panoply of strategies for sharing, using and determining the impact of annual assessment reports. For now, however, we are proud of the faculty’s accomplishment with the leadership of the deans in producing this electronic medium for sharing assessment results. In terms of the use of these data, we have focused attention on identifying what, precisely, we are doing in the name of assessment and have used the reports as a lens. A future goal is to develop the capacity to share actual raw data across programs to provide for more abstract and broadly meaningful analyses of data clusters.

WASC Commission action letter: Assessment results need to inform planning and budget.

Sacramento State action: The Provost has advised the deans that requests for new faculty positions in academic departments should be based in part on “closing the loop” on assessment findings. In addition, all requests for new courses and new programs must include a rationale based on assessment findings and use of institutional data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. These actions are in line with the Strategic Plan, which places primary attention on retention efforts and student success. Such efforts receive high level budget considerations in annual campus discussions about the budget. There has been, therefore, substantial progress from just two years ago, and as the campus culture changes, these practices will become increasingly embedded in our institutional processes.

Sacramento State action: We have heard this call and understand it well. Our present strengths include a growing level of confidence about and capacity for assessment within our undergraduate majors. Given the significant variation in program purposes, sizes and shapes at Sacramento State, we are pleased with our progress and will draw on it as the basis for assessment work at higher institutional levels. We also are proud of the work our Division of Student Affairs has done since 2005; the presence of a model of excellence on campus offers a range of tangible and intangible benefits. We are aware that we have much work to do to build reasonable, useful and doable assessment systems for General Education and for our graduate programs.

This work has been given increased prominence in light of the CSU Chancellor’s Office requirement that all campuses certify writing competence for both undergraduates and graduate students. Fortunately, campus leaders are actively transforming curriculum, instruction and assessment in General Education and are on the verge of accomplishing great things. The Faculty Senate recently voted to convene a new Graduate Advisory Council to attend to graduate business; it is expected that an early effort by this Council will include developing student learning outcomes. The University Reading and Writing Committee just completed a redesign of the writing competence assessment system and is proposing a fresh, curriculum-embedded strategy that offers much promise in terms of a comprehensive assessment system. With respect to the issue of comprehensive assessment, we are poised to move ahead. While it is unfortunate that the financial situation within the entire system right now does not allow for the free flow of funds for this work, at Sacramento State, we are confident that we will make the best use of our resources to reach the goal of comprehensive assessment.
A.3 Financial Resources and Strategic Planning

The 2007 WASC Commission action letter’s call to the campus to meaningfully align financial resources with strategic planning was in harmonic convergence with the efforts of the President and the new Provost to create a higher level of transparency and accountability in the budgeting process and the need for budget decisions to be in line with the strategic goals of the University. The action letter gave the campus additional impetus and momentum to put in place critical processes and structures that have significantly transformed the University’s practices and culture in the areas of budget decisions and strategic planning. Specifically, the President established two University-level committees, the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) and the Strategic Planning Council (SPC). The creation of these two committees was intended to support a higher level of transparency and general understanding of the University budget across campus. Additionally, both the SPC and UBAC were charged with the task of making recommendations to the President on budgeting that were consistent with the University’s strategic priorities. Both committees have been fairly successful in meeting these objectives, and as a result there have been substantial improvements in broad-based identification of our strategic priorities and constructive recommendations on the budget. As a result, the University has evidenced positive outcomes in the five areas identified in the WASC action letter related to financial resources and strategic planning: the need for transparency; measures that align planning and budget; initial attempts at multi-year budgeting; allocating resources based on agreed-upon priorities; and engagement of faculty and others in budget, planning and reporting. Specific actions in each of these areas are discussed below:

» Need for Transparency: Addressing the need for transparency is highlighted in both the work of UBAC and SPC. This need was most evident during the 2006-2007 academic year, when the campus faced major budget decisions deriving from a structural funding deficit. President Gonzalez determined that this situation provided an opportunity to involve various campus constituencies in the budget decision process. Accordingly, in December 2006, the President announced the establishment of a University Budget Task Force (www.csus.edu/aba/budget) and involved the campus community in the budget process in order to determine the extent and sources of the deficit. The goal of this action was to ensure input from the campus in the University’s distribution of its financial resources and to make budget information clear and accessible to every sector of the campus. Members of the Budget Task Force included faculty, staff, administration and student representatives.

Upon the completion of its assignment, the President accepted the recommendations of the Task Force, thereby denoting both credibility of the process and the seriousness of his commitment to transparency. This historic action on the Sacramento State campus ushered in a new reality anchored in evidenced-based decision-making and guided by campus-wide engagement in the process.

In May 2007, the President strengthened and deepened this commitment to transparency in the budget process through the creation of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) (www.csus.edu/aba/budget/university_Advisory_Budget_Committee_Composition_and_charge.pdf). UBAC is a University-level committee that advises the President and his Cabinet on budget allocation decisions. Drawn from a broad spectrum of the campus community, members of UBAC include faculty members selected from the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), department chairs and the Faculty Senate. Other committee members are appointed from the administration and various staff and student groups with an Ex-Officio support staff to the committee. A core function of UBAC is to “facilitate development of a highly transparent, informative, and participatory campus general fund budgeting process” (www.csus.edu/aba/budget/university_Advisory_Budget_Committee_Composition_and_charge.pdf).

In the period since its inception, on average, UBAC has met weekly during the regular semester. Most importantly, the recommendations of UBAC have helped inform budget decisions and have made a positive contribution to campus climate. In October 2007, UBAC began work on a draft to establish goals for annual budget reporting in an attempt to both standardize and clarify the importance of transparency in the process (www.csus.edu/aba/budget/ubac/annual_report_format_goals).

Well before the WASC Visiting Team arrived on our campus in 2007 and well before UBAC was created, the new Provost had identified an obvious need for the University to have a meaningful, collaboratively developed strategic plan that would reflect agreed-upon priorities for both annual and multi-year budgeting. In part, major segments of the campus did not understand the distinction between the new President’s vision of the Destination 2010 initiative and the need to focus on the important short-term priorities in support of our educational effectiveness and core values in the face of growing budgetary challenges. Thus it was critical to respond to this situation with the development of a strategic plan focused on short-term priorities, yet complementary
to achieving the vision of Destination 2010. To facilitate this process, the President established the Strategic Planning Council led by the Provost (www.csus.edu/spc/SPCMembers.htm) with a broad-based membership representing faculty, administration, staff and students. SPC took its charge seriously and worked consistently over an 18-month period in a process that attracted broad University community input, to produce the University’s Strategic Plan (www.csus.edu/acaf/2007CSUS_StrategicPlan.pdf), which was accepted by the President in December 2007.

In its first annual report on the status of implementation of the Strategic Plan (www.csus.edu/spc/SPC_Annual_Report.pdf), the Committee reported progress to the President in three main areas: coalescing shared understanding and ownership of the plan’s goals among the various divisions of the University; resource decisions increasingly focused on achievement of goals identified in the strategic plan; and development of more detailed short-, medium- and long-term plans by the lead Cabinet member in conjunction with cross-divisional campus teams. As a result of progress in these areas, SPC anticipates further progress by the end of 2008 on initial efforts to develop benchmarks to assess progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

**Align Budget and Planning:** In January 2008, President Gonzalez convened a historic event on the Sacramento State campus with a joint meeting of UBAC and SPC co-chaired by the respective chairs of both committees. The joint meeting identified the primary strategic goal of improving recruitment, retention and graduation rates and the importance of incorporating SPC goals into the budget process. The committees reported that the “key is to use the Strategic Plan to alter the culture by broadening the audience, encouraging involvement, and continuously using the University’s strategic goals as the touchstone for major decisions” (www.csus.edu/aba/budget/ubac/UBAC_and_SPC_Meeting_Notes_1_25_09.pdf).

As a result of this alignment, we have begun to see obvious and public collaboration between (1) the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in structuring enrollment, retention and graduation success efforts to accomplish the major priority of the plan, and (2) efforts by the Administration and Business Affairs, Information Resources and Technology and University Enterprises, Inc. to integrate the new Strategic Plan into their divisional planning. These actions and ongoing conversations indicate a growing shift in the culture to align all campus functions toward the educational effectiveness goals indicated in the Strategic Plan.

**Multi-year Budgeting:** Serious budget instability in state resources for higher education, the shrinking pool of uncommitted funds to support existing and new program initiatives, the need to move resources as exigencies develop and the alignment of UBAC with SPC have produced the realization that any serious planning now must be made based on multi-year scenarios. The increasing volatility of the budget, even within each fiscal year, requires that the University provide as much stability as possible in an otherwise financially unstable environment. The best mechanism for that is foresight in planning. As a result, last year, the Provost presented to the Faculty Senate a budget report that for the first time looked three years out, putting in scenarios for years 2 and 3 while retaining the integrity of the Strategic Plan priorities. This practice is expected to continue each year in budget discussions.

**Resources for Agreed Upon Priorities:** Although the University budget is facing severe challenges, there is emphasis on the use of uncommitted funds to support our retention, graduation and student success goals. For instance, in Academic Affairs, the Provost has dedicated funds to improvements in assessment of student learning outcomes; Student Affairs is using resources to support intensive advising for at-risk students; and Information Resources and Technology (IRT) is using a comprehensive planning methodology to determine resource allocations based on their relationship to campus strategic goals. The resulting project list is published on the IRT website. These ongoing actions reflect a commitment to use scarce resources to support agreed-upon priorities of the campus.

**Engagement of faculty and others in budget, planning and financial reporting:** In addition to the several progress areas discussed earlier on transparency and accountability, the Provost has restructured and reformatted the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) to make pertinent data available and accessible to the campus community to support evidenced-based decision-making. OIR has established the Data Center to house and report all information compiled throughout the year to support planning and evaluation by the various divisions on campus (www.oir.csus.edu/data_center/default1.cfm). Most importantly, the Data Center has added a University Dashboard to provide important indicators of educational effectiveness and student learning at Sacramento State. As a result, most budget and planning decisions are being made based on pertinent use of the data. For example, in program reviews, enrollment management, student success initiatives, the work of the Retention Task Force, collaborations between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, hiring
requests for new faculty positions by deans, and increasingly, department curriculum planning draws on information supplied by OIR.

These actions are now increasingly internalized in the changing culture of the campus, and they underscore both the value of the WASC Commission action letter in prompting self-reflection and change and, at the same time, the campus’s recognition of the need to strengthen capacity to support the institution’s educational mission. Sacramento State has demonstrated that our strategic planning efforts and financial resource management are more closely aligned than at the time of our Capacity and Preparatory Review. We have also strengthened and demonstrated our commitment to communicate with and involve the entire campus in our efforts to achieve educational effectiveness.

A.4 Student Success and Diversity

A.4.1 Introduction

Even a cursory glance of the University's Strategic Plan will verify that the University views student success and diversity as issues of paramount concern. Three of the five strategic priorities (Nos. 1, 2, and 4) are dedicated primarily to these two phenomena, and this appendix describes these planning priorities and reviews some of the key actions and opportunities associated with each of them.

A.4.2 Strategic Plan Priorities

Strategic Plan Priority 1: Implement a strategically focused, campus-wide effort to improve recruitment, retention and graduation rates.

Goal 1: Foster an academic and campus-life culture whereby recruitment, retention, graduation and student success in all its forms are embraced and pursued as the responsibility of the entire campus community – faculty, staff, students and alumni.

Actions:

» Provide data on recruitment retention, and graduation rates to campus community.
   We have begun to disseminate fairly sophisticated data on all elements via the Department Fact Books available on the Academic Affairs website. Program reviews now use these data in assessing progress and problems in academic programs. Data on applications, admissions, yields and so forth are available but not as readily as they might be. We are now working at promoting their use.

» Hold campus forums to focus attention on the importance of recruitment, retention and graduation rates to fulfillment of campus mission and financial stability.

The features of mission and budget have been systematically addressed in population-specific forums such as Student Affairs managers and staff; Associated Students, Inc.; academic deans; and department chairs. We need now to move the discussion up a level so that it is part of the larger campus community culture. This should be accomplished via the Futures Initiative.

» Seek statements of commitment and strategy to improve recruitment, retention and graduation rates from campus representational bodies (e.g., Faculty Senate; University Staff Association; Associated Students, Inc.; Alumni Association), eight colleges and the library and campus administrative divisions. This will be addressed via the Futures Initiative.

» Commission a work group of faculty and staff members, students, alumni and administrators to compose a concise definition of “student success” that lends itself to strategic planning and assessment of outcomes. This will be addressed via the Futures Initiative.

Goal 2: Enhance and better integrate campus efforts to improve recruitment, retention and graduation rates.

Actions:

» Blend Academic Affairs and Student Affairs divisional planning, implementation and monitoring efforts to improve recruitment rates.
   Cross-divisional enrollment and retention teams now address planning and implementation issues. These include the First Year Programs Committee, the Advising Policy Implementation Team and Retention Task Force;

» As a sub-group of the First Year Programs Committee, Freshman Seminars and Learning Communities are planned, implemented, taught and assessed by staff from both divisions;

» New communication and outreach plans involve both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs personnel;

» Enrollment targets (general and segmented) are now jointly determined by Student Affairs and Academic Affairs professionals;

» Student Affairs and Academic Affairs jointly worked to reduce exceptions to minimum admission standards.
Beyond this, and more specifically, Student Affairs:

- Enhanced early admissions processing for freshmen applicants—Fall 2008 admission decisions commenced in October 2007, and the vast majority were completed in March 2008 (several months ahead of the previous year);
- Systematically increased recruiting in Southern California and the East Bay—a new “Dream Team” of young admissions professionals were hired in January 2008 to recruit outside the Sacramento region. To date, these individuals have completed well over 100 additional high school visits in Southern California and the East Bay area;
- Joined the Western University Exchange Program to increase out-of-state admissions;
- Instituted “Intent to Enroll” and orientation outcomes tracking;
- Eliminated a credit evaluation backlog for transfer applicants—prior to Fall 2008, credit evaluations for prospective and new transfer students were more than a year behind. This backlog was eliminated by February 2008, and now newly admitted transfer students receive their credit evaluation within 60 days of admission;
- Established and adhered to new application and final documents deadlines;
- Continued limited lower-division admission efforts;
- Planned “CSU First” outreach for high school counselors to promote students starting here as freshmen rather than as coming as transfers.

**Implement a practical plan to address the major variables associated with attrition of first- and second-year students that includes attention to differences in attrition rates across student demographic categories.**

Our analysis of Sacramento State data indicates that the distribution of first- and second-year attrition across student demographic categories can best be addressed through a focus on students at high risk of or on academic probation. As a result, the campus:

- Enhanced the mandatory orientation program for freshmen;
- Continued the mandatory advising program for freshmen;
- Improved student services for freshmen and transfers;
- Further developed learning communities;
- Will institute probation-intensive advising and “intrusive follow-up” for second-year students (special hiring in progress);
- Targeted high-risk groups and others for “early alert” interventions.

The campus also committed to implement a practical plan to address the major variables that are associated with the attrition of transfer students. Such a plan must include attention to differences in attrition rates across student demographic categories. Our analysis of Sacramento State data indicates that the distribution of transfer student attrition across student demographic categories will be addressed through the focus on students at high-risk of or on academic probation. The campus is taking the following steps to meet this goal:

- Improved student services for freshmen and transfers, including world class service training has been completed for all Student Affairs staff in enrollment management departments. Telephone routing systems have been completely redesigned to reduce the number of students who are not able to access service via telephone. A new student service model is being developed to re-engineer all services offered through enrollment management offices;
- Planning for a mandatory transfer advising program;
- Planning for probation-intensive advising and “intrusive follow-up” for first-semester community college transfer students;
- Planning “early alert” interventions for first-semester community college transfer students.

**Goal 3:** Through the combined efforts of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, construct a focused and cost-effective plan to implement the new University Advising Policy.

**Actions:**

- The University Faculty Senate passed a comprehensive advising policy for undergraduate students in December 2007.

Through this new policy, the faculty identified and formalized a significant change in both the meaning and goals of academic advising...
Faculty expanded the Statement of Philosophy at the beginning for the policy to focus on the caring engagement of campus faculty and staff to “provide students with an integrated network of advising resources and support.” A number of new advising goals are outlined in the policy. In addition, specific responsibilities are detailed for students, faculty advisors, the Academic Advising Center, academic programs, admissions and records and University administration. Lastly, the new policy requires that effectiveness of advising be monitored and identifies necessary conditions for improvements to advising.

In order to fully adopt this new policy, a cross-departmental team was formed in early 2008 to develop an implementation plan. After completing an in-depth review of the new plan, the team began to assess the current state of advising. As a result of this assessment, a gap analysis will be performed to identify required advising activities already in progress across campus and areas that must be implemented.

» Utilize extant University data to assess link between retention and graduation rates; will our efforts at improving retention rates also improve graduation rates?

This is an ongoing data collection and analysis project. To date, we have established that freshman seminars, learning community courses and living in campus housing improve retention and graduation rates. We are now following freshman cohorts to determine the outcome of mandatory advising.

» Develop undergraduate and graduate recruitment targets that reflect a sustainable balance of academic excellence, access, demand, systematically managed growth, workforce development and campus capacity.

Within the context of the Futures Initiative, a work group of faculty and staff members, students, alumni and administrators will be charged with developing a general statement of integrated priorities regarding appropriate balance among academic excellence, access, demand, systematically managed growth, workforce development and campus capacity.

» Develop recruitment targets and plans that reflect integrated priorities.

Achieve a six-year graduation rate of 46 percent (currently at 41 percent) for first-time freshmen and a four-year graduation rate of 62 percent (currently at 57 percent) for transfer students by 2012-2013.

» Develop a “reasonable” statement of desired percentage growth within the national context of universities with features, challenges and aspirations similar to ours, and within the context of recommendations by experts in the field of improving graduation rates.

A study of comparable institutions, enhanced by a consultation with experts at Noel Levitz resulted in a set of markers of annual progress toward the campus’s goals for 2010-2013 and the identification of a “correction” process, should annual markers differ from expected outcomes. On the advice of consultants from Noel Levitz, markers of annual progress toward achievement of 2012-13 goals were set at 1 percent gain per year. The key now is to monitor retention rates each year and to integrate them with curricular choices so that retention goes hand-in-hand with progress toward completion of major requirements. Beyond this, in light of present economic climate, we anticipate additional increases in the graduation rate as a result of a “speed up” of students toward degree completion.

» Set appropriate goals for graduation rates and time-to-degree completion for our graduate programs.

The campus has begun to meet this goal by organizing a Graduate Advisory Council to recommend equitable and practical average graduation rate goals and average time-to-degree completion goals for current graduate programs. The Graduate Advisory Council will also be charged to recommend short- and long-term timetables and plans for achievement of average graduation rate and average time-to-degree completion goals for current graduate programs.

Strategic Priority 2: Create and sustain an organizational structure and culture that facilitates evidence-based decision-making and purposeful planning in all important endeavors.

Goal 1: Develop and utilize unit-level measures of progress for critical unit functions that further the mission of the University.

Actions:

» On an annual basis, University divisions should identify critical goals that are tied to the University’s mission and Strategic Plan.

Division heads meet on a quarterly basis with the President to identify and refine key University goals, with the relationship of each goal to the
Strategic Plan clearly identified. A concerted effort is made to engage in collaborative planning that coordinates efforts to mutual benefit and eliminates inefficiencies and duplication of effort. The resulting critical goals are further used for the allocation of resources to ensure accomplishment of identified critical goals.

On at least an annual basis, units within divisions should identify unit goals consistent with the University and division strategic goals. Unit goals should set quantifiable targets, identify needed resources, include practical action plans and provide measures for assessment of outcomes.

Administration and Business Affairs (ABA) uses a comprehensive Balanced Scorecard methodology to identify unit goals, as well as to set targets, action plans and assessment methods for each unit goal. Quarterly progress is reported. ABA also conducts comprehensive assessments of customer satisfaction across ten ABA functions, and also facilitates satisfaction surveys for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Information Resources and Technology (IRT) utilizes a comprehensive division-wide project planning methodology, guided by a Project and Policy Manager. Critical goals for information technology are gathered both internally and from each campus division. Each project goal is scored based on the criticality of its relationship to campus strategic goals, resources and outcomes are assigned, and assessment measures are identified. The resulting project list is prioritized and published in searchable form on the IRT website.

Student Affairs has been instrumental in implementing the NASULGC/AASCU Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) program. A key element of the VSA is the College Portrait, which uses a web-based “dashboard” to display summary information about Sacramento State student characteristics, undergraduate success and progress rates, retention, cost of attendance, undergraduate admissions, and degrees and areas of study, among other data elements. The heart of the VSA, from the student perspective, may be the nine Institution Choice Buttons, which allow prospective students to explore nine areas of University life, selected on the basis of input from a sample of entering freshmen. Student Affairs also identified at least two student learning outcomes for each of its 20 departments. In addition to student learning outcomes, the division has identified goals, quantifiable targets and specific means of assessment for each function, tied to campus strategic goals.

Goal 2: Use student learning and program assessment data to shape decisions about program and service enhancements and/or modifications.

Actions:

» Develop a prototype method to demonstrate how performance-based learning outcomes assessments can be tied to individual courses, made for each individual student in those courses and aggregated for program unit and University reporting.

Academic Affairs and Information Resources and Technology are developing a pilot set of tools for this purpose by prototyping methods for assigning and assessing learning outcomes at the course level within a prescribed set of College of Education courses. Effort is being made to use common tools already available on campus (e.g. SacCT) and methods that are easily scaled and adapted by other academic units.

» Develop methods to support academic decision-making by collecting and reporting program assessment data at the college and unit level.

The College of Education has developed a matrix of program assessment data used college-wide and is working with data warehouse personnel on methods for storing and reporting that information using new reporting and analytic tools recently acquired. Student Affairs has completed (in summer 2008) two full rounds of comprehensive planning and assessment. As a result, the division now has collected at least two years of solid data, and it is using its analyses of the data to “close the loop.” In other words, the division is making program improvements and modifications directly based on its findings and conclusions.

Goal 3: Engage colleges and departments in coordinated, data-driven academic planning processes.

Actions:

» Develop a comprehensive data warehouse that allows for self-use reporting of data used for academic planning at the University and unit levels.

Comprehensive data warehouse capability has been acquired, with initial implementation focused on gathering data used for campus-wide enrollment planning. A collaborative inter-institutional
approach is being taken, based on similar work taking place at CSU East Bay and CSU Chico. Initial steps are to facilitate self-use reporting of common day-to-day and annual enrollment reports. Later, we plan to gradually add more unit-specific data. Academic data in the data warehouse is supported by robust analytic tools and dashboard capability used for high-level planning.

The University’s Enrollment Management officer should convene regular meetings with key stakeholders to update them on enrollment trends, share enrollment data and discuss ideas and plans for creating a full-fledged enrollment management plan and process at Sacramento State.

Many of these meetings occurred during summer and fall 2008. Attendees typically include appropriate vice presidents, OIR staff and managers across several departments. The Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs then bring key findings and issues to the President’s Cabinet and to the entire Administrative Council.

Strategic Priority 4: Build and sustain a vibrant learning community derived from the strength and vitality of our diverse campus.

Goal 1: Foster an inclusive environment that stimulates ongoing, respectful dialogue to address the evolving complexity and diversity in our region and on our campus.

Actions:

- Develop a sustainable and thriving Multi-Cultural Center Program.

The Multi-Cultural Center has recently undergone facility and programmatic enhancements. An internship program is currently in development to help student leaders create an inclusive center environment, conscious of historically under-represented peoples’ struggles and our diverse communities. The Center’s goals include facilitation of opportunities for purposeful collaboration around issues of diversity, social justice and cross-cultural awareness. Collaborations with faculty include: event programming, film series, inclusion trainings, mural project and consultations for diversity graduate school opportunities. Additionally, the Center is committed to providing resources to help support multi-cultural, cross-cultural and community-building initiatives. In the service of this goal, the Center established welcome mixers during the fall semester for historically underrepresented communities to connect on common ground across constituencies.

Goal 2: Develop curricular and co-curricular programming that builds upon the diversity of the campus and the region.

Actions:

- Foster greater levels of collaboration among programs such as the College Assistance Migrant Program, the College-Based Educational Equity Programs, the Educational Opportunity Program, the Faculty Student Mentor Program and the Services to Students with Disabilities Program. Academic Affairs recently created a Director for Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Programs (SASEEP) to facilitate and supervise the integration of programs focused on the needs of underrepresented, low-income, first generation and disabled students. In addition to fortifying collaborative efforts among the programs, three common goals were developed:

  1. Improve the retention and graduation rates of at-risk students;
  2. Show outcomes of such progress being made within the scope of SASEEP as evidenced by program activities, program components and program evaluations;
  3. Better educate the campus regarding progressive steps being made in the unit and make our programs more visible and central to the campus.

Among SASEEP’s notable accomplishments: 1) the development of a set of recommendations for the improvement of campus climate for students of color; 2) a recent proposal to define educational equity more broadly to the campus as a means of promoting diversity education, awareness, cultural dialogues and interpersonal relatedness; 3) promotion of the use of an Educational Equity Score Card to raise program accountability for the performance rates of students of color. As a result of the Educational Equity Score Card initiative, the Colleges will develop retention plans to promote graduation success among underrepresented students. Each College will also complete an inventory of their educational equity best practices, providing for greater campus coordination of the services provided to educational equity students.

- Ensure that the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) is offering programs that strengthen student’s connection to the campus.
The University held a one-day event designed to welcome parents and students accepted to Sacramento State for the fall semester. This is an opportunity for staff to introduce themselves to the families of CAMP students and to provide an overview of financial-aid and housing assistance in a bilingual mini-workshop specifically tailored to the needs of CAMP students and their families.

Additionally, a CAMP study center was developed to teach and reinforce good study habits by providing an environment conducive to studying, writing and tutoring. CAMP students are required to log five hours of study time within the center to help them meet the academic demands our campus requires. Students have access to four peer-mentors that provide tutoring assistance for both English and math studies from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Five computer terminals are also available for general word processing.

CAMP students take part in a series of three workshops that highlight different aspects of successful transition to University life. These workshops are offered in the fall semester and allow students to interact in smaller groups and discuss the vital ingredients for success as freshmen, with a special emphasis on CAMP. In the spring semester, the CAMP students are reunited in one class. This larger gathering of students expands on the fall semester by highlighting potential career paths through guest speaker presentations and workshops.

» Ensure that the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) supports students’ transition to college and their learning.

Transition programming is a major element of EOP’s activities. Students have the opportunity to attend a six-week Summer Bridge Program to assist them in advancing in their developmental coursework. A leadership component has recently been incorporated into Summer Bridge to expose students to key skills in problem-solving, conflict resolution, cross-cultural communication, self-advocacy and leadership dynamics. Note: Currently Summer Bridge students have higher course pass rates in their EO 665 courses than students taking the same classes during the regular semester. The Summer Bridge student retention rate also surpasses that of other first-time freshmen.

Entering EOP students participate in a fall learning community and have an assigned tutor and mentor. An EOP learning community has been organized in each of the seven Colleges. All of the students in the program participated in a community-engagement activity to promote the concept of service learning and to emphasize the importance of drawing on community resources. First-time freshmen EOP students are also enrolled in ETHN 98 to facilitate their transition to the Colleges in order to help them with decision-making related to career and major options. EOP has instituted a more formalized “undeclared program” to assist students with major declaration and exploration processes. The program includes collaborative activities with the Career Center, workshop formats, an undeclared advising questionnaire and on-line resources.

EOP has developed an intensive and focused effort to retain students on probation and academic disqualification. Such interventions include close follow-up on student contracts, connections made by our student interns with students and ongoing meetings with students to ensure accountability for their academic progress by designated counselors. Tutoring in the EOP Center was increased to include English and math as well as 15 other subject areas. Students also have access to a dedicated computer lab to ease the completion of course assignments.

Continuing EOP students also have access to EOP programming. A walk-in program has been implemented to provide advising and counseling services to continuing students in the program. An EOP Student Leadership Organization was created to provide a platform for students to connect and engage with the program. Leading in Excellence, Activism, and Diversity (LEAD) hosts events for students in order to promote their social integration into campus life. As part of this attention to the needs of the student as a whole person, EOP has just begun to work with the Alumni Center to expand its alumni database to match current students with alumni in the community to promote professional growth and job-shadowing opportunities.

» Ensure that the TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) program continues to support low-income and disabled students.

In 2007-2008, 50.3 percent of the TRIO SSS program’s students were both disabled and low-income. The TRIO SSS program provides supplemental and remedial instruction in mathematics, writing and academic course support for underprepared and disabled students. Additionally, classes are offered to students with learning disabilities in academic success skill development, computer access and course support, ensuring that learning disability issues
are addressed. As a result of the TRIO program, there has been increased use of alternative texts and better access to course materials for disabled students through expanded off-campus resources, such as Book Share and Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic (RFBD), and the establishment of loan program for digital talking book equipment to support alternative media. Additionally, staff members have been provided with training in Braille and e-text production. These efforts have enhanced the program’s work to improve the institutional climate. TRIO SSS was a significant contributor to the University’s Accessible Technology Initiative and has arranged disability awareness activities to foster the development campus access and support for disabled students.

In addition to improved academic access, TRIO SSS has enhanced financial support for these students through its efforts to inform eligible students and the Scholarship Office of Information targeted to students with disabilities. TRIO SSS has also worked to improve the college-work connection by mentoring its students through the Federal Workforce Recruitment Program and educating campus staff to issues related to disability.

- Support improved retention through the Faculty Student Mentor Program (FSMP) and College-based efforts.

Students participating in FSMP were provided with a variety of support, including mentoring, tutoring, venues for better navigation of major fields of study and other resource-gathering opportunities. Many Colleges also offer services which enhance retention, ranging from introductions to the academic disciplines to research and test-preparation opportunities. A number of the Colleges are expanding their efforts to include activities like “Meet the Dean” and College Open Houses, orientations to majors and adjunct tutorials. Development of supportive relationships with faculty, students and staff and development of the knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary for successful completion of an academic major are central elements of student success.

- Improve collaborations between Sacramento State EOP and Los Rios Community College EOPS to facilitate successful transfer of low-income students.

In Fall 2009, an EOP learning community will target Los Rios Community College EOPS students in order to ensure a successful transition to University life and academic expectations.

**Goal 3: Improve the recruitment process.**

**Actions:**

- **Working with Public Affairs and other units, enhance recruitment materials.**

Sacramento State has developed a DVD on the campus and community which can be given to applicants. Planning is under way for a “Future Employees” section on the campus web page. This would tout the advantages of employment with Sacramento State as well as highlight the diverse campus and Sacramento region. It would also contain links to various campus and community web sites.

- **Raise the level of awareness of the importance of campus (students, faculty and staff) diversity to student success.**

Plans to meet this goal include the development and dissemination of data-driven information on this topic and integration with required search committee training. Additionally, there are plans to develop a “Diversity at Sac State” web page.

- **Enhance key components of the existing hiring process and develop options for structural changes to maintain a campus focus on diversity.**

Specific ideas include:

- Promoting a robust College focus on developing and sharing successful faculty/administrative hiring strategies;
- Developing in-depth recruitment plans for each position;
- Committing to early searches, particularly for faculty positions;
- Developing, whenever possible, flexible language in vacancy announcements;
- Focusing on assessing candidates’ success in working with a diverse campus community in the screening and hiring process;
- Improving the return rate for applicant flow questionnaires;
- Holding administrators and departments responsible for implementation.

**A.4.3 Retention Planning Work Team**

The work team is led by Ed Mills, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Enrollment Management and Student Support. Within the structure of this team, collaborations have occurred.
between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to 1) examine for several months campus retention data and trends, 2) to identify dropout predictors and their respective program populations, 3) to identify appropriate interventions for such target groups and 4) to examine the level of resources required to meet the retention needs of Sacramento State students. The data generated and analyzed by this group is intended to advance the goals of a larger, more representative campus Task Force on Retention and to lead to the development of a campus Retention Plan that will strategically guide the University in achieving even greater levels of student success.

A.4.4 Summary
As the campus’s Strategic Plan makes clear, student success has been a long-term aspiration and achievable goal for the University. At Sacramento State, the institutional goal of student success has been defined as the ability to engage in the academic community in an autonomous and self-regulated fashion. At a simplified, macro level, the University uses information on scholastic success and graduation as the primary measures of success. However, student success also entails more intimate, personal goals such as supporting students’ abilities to embrace diverse modes of learning, gain cultural awareness and develop leadership skills that arise from the application of key academic skills and values.

These core skills include effective navigation of the academy as a result of access to campus resources, anchoring one’s success in college and the acquisition of a knowledge-base to understand multiple disciplines from a broad perspective, while gaining an in-depth understanding of a major area of study. The development of these skills translates into the employment of strategies that promote a set of foundational and transformational educational values such as experiential learning, self-advocacy, community engagement, lifelong learning, technological savvy and the ability to become an agent of change in the larger democratic society. The result is a student who is socialized and acculturated into the institution of higher education and who also manifests self-confidence, motivation and an attitude to adapt and adjust that can be successfully transferred to experiences in the larger community outside the University. Although this is an expansive construct of student success, it encapsulates what it means to be an educated person and what it means to be a graduate of Sacramento State. These educational goals are well aligned with the Destination 2010 goals that focus on fostering excellence in academic programming and developing a campus that welcomes a diverse student population.
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## APPENDIX B: CRITERIA FOR REVIEW MATRIX

### EVIDENCE ON THE WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW TO SUPPORT THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</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>1.A. 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 defines our educational values as access, excellence, diversity, and enhancing the quality of life in the region. | Sacramento State Catalog: Mission  
University Web Site: Mission |
| 1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. | In 2004, the University launched the Destination 2010 initiative. This vision has infused our strategic planning processes at the program and University levels. The University has also developed and implemented efforts to assess student learning of educational objectives in general education, departmental programs and co-curricular activities. | Destination 2010  
President’s Communication  
Provost’s Communication  
Strategic Planning Council: Destination 2010 Strategic Plans  
Office of Institutional Research  
GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes  
Assessment at Sacramento State  
Student Affairs: Destination 2010 Strategic Plan  
GE Assessment Report  
2008 Assessment Summary  
2007 Assessment Summary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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  
Appointments, Retention, Tenure, Promotion (ARTP Policy)  
Human Resources |
| 1.B. 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.  
The University’s commitment to the principles of academic freedom is evidenced by the absence of controversy centered on this issue within the campus community. | University Manual: Academic Freedom Policy  
Faculty Senate |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. | Our educational objectives focus on the development of positive social attitudes, values and behaviors and an understanding of the diversity of human experiences and cultures. | Strategic Plan  
Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes  
GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
Destination 2010: Academics  
Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Programs  
Equity Program Assessment Reports  
Serna Center  
Ethnic Studies  
Foreign Languages  
C.O.D.E. (Senate Committee)  
Services to Students With Disabilities  
Multicultural Center  
McNair Scholars  
Center for African Peace and Conflict Resolution |
| 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 is one of 23 campuses of the California State University (CSU) system. 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 the context of the mission of the CSU system, the University operates to fulfill its educational mission through the practice of shared governance by the University administration and the Faculty Senate. This principle of collaboration has primacy over any corporate, political or religious support or influence. | Faculty Senate  
CSU Web Site  
Access to Excellence  
University Web Site: Mission  
Business office practice policies  
Development practices policies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Sacramento State publications, informational materials and established policies clearly articulate our academic goals, programs and services to students and the community. Various policies and their revisions demonstrate Sacramento State’s commitment to facilitating both the completion of our programs in a timely manner, and the fair and equitable treatment of students.</td>
<td>Destination 2010: Academics Fees and Refund Schedule Academic Policies for Students OIR: Graduation Analysis (update) OIR: Retention Analysis (update) Grade appeal process Student Judicial Process Mandatory advising Human Subjects Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Sacramento State demonstrates sound operational processes, business practices and appropriate responses to grievances and complaints as evidenced in established policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Complaint Policy Hearing Procedures Administration and Business Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The current reaccreditation cycle has provided the University with an opportunity to revisit its mission and core commitments. Sacramento State has demonstrated an honest and open relationship with the Accrediting Commission and endeavors to comply with standards and criteria for review.</td>
<td>SAC STATE WASC Page Appendix A (Response to CPR team recommendations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**2.A. TEACHING AND LEARNING**
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. Additionally, 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.

The University operates within CSU educational frameworks, including Executive Orders and system-wide policies and procedures related to baccalaureate and graduate degrees.

Many academic programs are also individually accredited.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Sacramento State is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Additionally, 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. The University operates within CSU educational frameworks, including Executive Orders and system-wide policies and procedures related to baccalaureate and graduate degrees. Many academic programs are also individually accredited. 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.</td>
<td>Accredited Programs Undergraduate Programs Graduate Programs Sacramento State Learning Outcomes Program Review documents OIR: Faculty/staff (updated) CSU Executive Orders Self-study/Program reviews Assessment reports (2007, 2008) Annual Assessment Summary 2006-2007 Annual Assessment Summary 2007-2008 Student Affairs student learning outcomes and assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 has well-defined expectations and requirements for its programs that result in student learning. | General Education: Expected Outcomes  
Sacramento State Catalog  
English Placement Test/Entry-Level Mathematics test standards  
Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement revisions  
First Year Programs/Freshman Seminar/Learning Communities  
Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals  
Report on Assessing Baccalaureate learning Goals  
University Manual—Graduation Requirements  
Graduate Program Requirements  
Graduate Studies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 has embedded expectations for student learning and student success across the curriculum. Similarly, policies and practices associated with eligibility, graduation and advising support are clearly and publicly contextualized within the University’s educational mission. | GE Learning Goals  
Admissions: Eligibility  
Sacramento State Catalog  
Program Learning Goals  
Advising Policy (revised)  
Graduate Admissions  
Library Instructional Services  
Community Engagement Center Web Page: Service Learning  
Distance Education/College of Continuing Education |
| 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 faculty and professional staff are taking increasing responsibility for developing, reviewing and evaluating attainment of University and program objectives through the program-review process.  
University and department publications, presentations and web sites communicate the institution’s expectations for learning.  
Syllabi also make these expectations explicit at the course level. | Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals.  
GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
Student Affairs student learning outcomes and and assessment reports  
Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
Program Review Pilot  
Outreach  
Orientation  
Freshman Year Experience  
Academic Departments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. | Most programs have developed learning expectations and communicate their learning goals on course syllabi. Program reviews and a variety of assessment strategies provide opportunities for reflection on student learning and improvement. | Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
Art Student Achievements  
Annual Assessment Summary 2006-2007  
Annual Assessment Summary 2007-2008  
Center for Teaching and Learning-Faculty Services  
Writing Across the Curriculum  
Academic Departments |
| 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. The program-review process ensures that each program's expectations for learning are embedded in its curriculum. | Grading Policy  
Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
Provost's Advisory Committee on Assessment  
GE Portfolio: Outcomes  
College Portrait  
Program Review |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>CSU Board of Trustees regulations require that every academic unit be reviewed on a regularly scheduled basis. These self studies 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.</td>
<td>Program Review Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Professional Accreditation Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self Study Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento State Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research Date Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research and Sponsored Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Engagement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning Teaching Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE Area Reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.B. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

<p>| 2.8. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character. | Through the ARTP process, faculty development programs, and funding opportunities, the University demonstrates that it values, supports, and promotes scholarship and instructional innovation. | UARTP Policy |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | University Enterprises, Inc. Faculty Grants |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | Outstanding Teaching Awards               |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | International Research Scholars           |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | Research and Sponsored Projects           |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | Center for Teaching and Learning-Faculty Services |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | Faculty Development                        |
|                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                      | Faculty Funding Support                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.9.</strong> The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, and service.</td>
<td>Academic Affairs’ Destination 2010 Goal 3 emphasizes excellence in both teaching and learning. As a learning organization, Sacramento State is committed to the support of an engaged faculty in order to improve student and institutional learning. Academic Affairs’ Destination 2010 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 excellence in instruction, faculty and staff development, technological necessities and library enhancement.</td>
<td>Goal 3: Enhance Excellence in Teaching and Learning&lt;br&gt;Center for Teaching and Learning-Faculty Services&lt;br&gt;Goal 4: Develop Resources to Support Instructional Needs&lt;br&gt;Community Engagement Center&lt;br&gt;Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>2.C. SUPPORT FOR STUDENT LEARNING</strong> | | |
| <strong>2.10.</strong> 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 a learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success. | 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. | Student and Alumni Surveys&lt;br&gt;Honors Program&lt;br&gt;Assessment Surveys&lt;br&gt;Learning Skills&lt;br&gt;National Survey of Student Engagement&lt;br&gt;College Portrait (Voluntary System of Accountability) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The Division of Student Affairs has assessed its progress on the goals it identified in its Destination 2010 Strategic Plan. The University’s co-curricular programs are engaged in a number of significant learning-centered activities.</td>
<td>Student Affairs: Destination 2010 Strategic Plan Student Affairs Assessment Reports Cooper-Woodson College Enhancement Program Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) College Assistance Migrant Program Faculty Student Mentor Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The Sacramento State Catalog is a primary resource for understanding University and program requirements. Departments also provide valuable information to students both online 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.</td>
<td>Sacramento State Catalog: Academic Programs Sacramento State Website Departments and Colleges Student Handbook (Sample) Academic Advising Resources Academic Advising Policy Mandatory Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.13. Student support services</strong> — 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.</td>
<td>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 provides 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 advance the University’s educational goals. The Library Instructional Services unit promotes the use of library resources as teaching/learning tools.</td>
<td>Student Affairs Learning Skills Computing, Communications, and Media Services Veterans Enrollment Services Library Instructional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td>Clear and accurate information is provided to transfer students in the Sacramento State 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.</td>
<td>Sacramento State Catalog: Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations, Transfer Centers Admissions and Records: Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations Transfer Orientation Outreach, Admissions and Records: Transfer Students Office of Institutional Research: Fact Book Strategic Planning Council: CSU Accountability Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

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

**3.A. FACULTY AND STAFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3.1.** The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives. | The University employs 1,402 staff and 179 administrators to support its educational mission. (Fall 2008) | University Fact Book  
Department Fact Book  
Academic Affairs Data Center |
| **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 2008, there were a total of 578 (36.5 percent) tenured and 219 (13.8 percent) probationary faculty (including Faculty Early Retirement Plan). There were also 786 (49.7 percent) non-tenure track, including temporary part-time faculty. A total of 810 (51.2 percent) were male, while 770 (48.6 percent) were female. Three did not report gender. | OIR: Faculty/staff |
| **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. University policy requires that teaching form the basis of any retention, promotion or tenure decisions for all faculty members. | ARTP Policy and Periodic review of tenured faculty  
Goal 3: Enhance Excellence in Teaching and Learning |
| **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 provides a rich program of faculty support. There is evidence that University-level funding opportunities for faculty development such as Research and Creative Activity Awards, Pedagogy Enhancement Awards, and travel assistance have had a positive effect on teaching and learning at Sacramento State. | Sacramento State Learning Outcomes  
Center for Teaching and Learning: Faculty Services  
Funding Opportunities  
Research and Sponsored Projects |
### 3.B. Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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 Administration and 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. They 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. | Destination 2010: Administration and Business Affairs Strategic Planning  
Destination 2010: Administration and Business Affairs Goals and Measures  
University Budget  
Facts and Figures  
General Fund Budget |
| **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.** | In 2005, the University opened the new Academic Information Resource Center (AIRC). The building is home to University Computing and Communications Services and the University Telecommunications Services. This is a natural migration pathway considering the "like and kind" 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, five group study rooms, 10 laptop stations, and one copier. The AIRC 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. | Academic Computing Resources  
University Media Services  
Library Services  
Academic Technology and Creative Services |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. | 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, the Faculty Senate approved a strategic plan for information technology and the committee’s recommendations for classroom information technology. | Faculty Senate: Information Technology Committee  
Computing, Communications and Media Services  
Information Resources and Technology |

### 3.C. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

| 3.8. The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision-making. | Guided by the vision of the Destination 2010 initiative, administrative units within the University have developed strategic planning processes to support effective decision-making. | Academic Strategic Plan  
Administration and Business Affairs Strategic Plan  
Student Affairs Strategic Plan |
| 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. | Sacramento State is one of 23 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, and is responsible for the hiring and evaluation of the chief executive officer. | CSU Trustees |
| 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. | The University administration has demonstrated effective educational leadership through a number of initiatives and activities such as Destination 2010, the University Budget Advisory Committee, and the new Strategic Plan. | President Alexander Gonzalez  
Strategic Plan  
Destination 2010  
University Budget Advisory Committee  
Campus Climate Survey Report |
### WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

| 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. | The Sacramento State faculty exercises academic leadership through the Faculty Senate. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to formulate, review, revise, adopt, and make policy recommendations about any academic matters delegated to the President by law, and by the Trustees and Chancellor of the CSU, including but not limited to academic, personnel, and fiscal policies and to forward them to the President of the University. Some recent examples include recommendations for a new Graduate Advising Council, the New Advising Policy, University Budget Advisory Committee and establishment of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Assessment. | Faculty Senate |

### Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

#### 4.A. STRATEGIC THINKING AND PLANNING

<p>| 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. 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, University Budget Advisory Committee, Strategic Plan |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 has combined 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 is 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. | There is evidence-based decision making linked to data supplied by the Office of Institutional Research, assessment reports from departments and divisions and status updates to the Strategic 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.

Academic Program quality is first of the Destination 2010 goals. Responding to the call for accountability, academic program assessment was a major component of the Cornerstones project of the Chancellor’s Office in the 1990s.

Also responding to the call for accountability, the University has an assessment policy that 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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. | Office of Institutional Research: Web Site  
University Fact Book  
Department Fact Book  
Academic Affairs Data Center |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE EE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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, Administration and Business Affairs, and Student Affairs have developed strategic planning documents that 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. Student Affairs has continued its development, implementation and review of the assessment process that it began in Fall 2005. The results of these activities have enabled the division to 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 levels of teaching excellence. Some notable practices can be found in the Writing Across the Curriculum Program and faculty services of the Center for Teaching and Learning. | Center for Teaching and Learning
Writing Across the Curriculum |
Appendix C

REQUIRED DATA TABLES
## Data Table 1: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>(1) Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>(2) Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>(3) Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</th>
<th>(4) Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?</th>
<th>(5) How are the findings used?</th>
<th>(6) Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the institutional level:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our institution still relies heavily on GPA for major decisions such as conferring of degrees. Grades are also used as indicators to certify writing competence and to advance from Learning Skills Center courses.</td>
<td>GPA data are available to departments in fact books.</td>
<td>Faculty are expected to use the fact books during program review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For general education if an undergraduate institution:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/University%20Learning%20Outcomes.html">http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/University%20Learning%20Outcomes.html</a></td>
<td>Our recent GE assessment report concludes that grades are heavily used as indicators in GE.</td>
<td>Individual course instructors interpret the data.</td>
<td>Instructors are expected to use the data to improve their individual courses.</td>
<td>2006/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List each degree program:</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior exit survey, assignments from courses</td>
<td>Faculty teaching core courses discuss in sub-disciplinary groups.</td>
<td>Improvement of instruction at the course level</td>
<td>2005/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Anthropology, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>University Requirements</td>
<td>Assessment Instrument</td>
<td>Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Continuous Program Improvement, Content Mastery</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Asian Studies, BA</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>Online content assessment instrument, scientific writing, embedded essay questions</td>
<td>Department, assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement, content mastery</td>
<td>1996/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Biological Sciences, BA, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Online content assessment instrument, scientific writing, embedded essay questions</td>
<td>Department, assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement, content mastery</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Business Administration, BS, MBA, MSBA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Portfolios, curriculum-embedded assessments</td>
<td>Faculty subcommittees</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2007/2008 AACSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Chemistry, BA, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Capstone course (laboratory project with a value-added strategy); American Chemical Society exam; senior exit survey; alumni survey</td>
<td>Department retreats, assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Communication Studies, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Senior survey every three years; capstone senior seminars staggered across seven concentrations</td>
<td>Primary report author; circulation of survey results among faculty; department meeting discussions</td>
<td>Fine-tuning curriculum and instruction across the concentrations</td>
<td>2004/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Computer Science, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Survey of industry, industry visits, exam questions, writing samples, oral presentations</td>
<td>Assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2003/2004 C.A.C. of ABET, Inc. 2007/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Criminal Justice, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Capstone, writing samples, pre-test/post-test</td>
<td>Division Assessment and Standards Committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2005/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Economics, BA, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Capstone, (empirical research project), senior exit survey</td>
<td>Assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2004/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required Data Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Education-Teacher Education, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-See Academic Affairs-</td>
<td>Culminating Experience</td>
<td>Program group</td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>2003/2004 CCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Course Surveys</td>
<td>Assessment Meetings</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement Process</td>
<td>Program Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Family and Consumer Sciences, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Shared rubrics applied to course work, exit survey</td>
<td>Department meetings</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2001/2002 ADA 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Film, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>In implementation phase</td>
<td>In implementation phase</td>
<td>In implementation phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Geography, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Capstone, gateway course, baseline knowledge quizzes, senior research project, graduating senior interview, alumni survey</td>
<td>Assessment committee, designated professors annual retreat</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2004/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Geology, BA, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Field camp grades, writing rubric, Geologic Knowledge Inventory, key assignments in geologic problem solving</td>
<td>Assessment coordinator, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Gerontology, BS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Common course assignment rubrics, internship portfolio, capstone, culminating community project</td>
<td>Faculty, Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2003/2004 AGHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Government, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Form B (hardcopy in Academic Affairs)</td>
<td>Student writing samples, senior survey, multiple choice test</td>
<td>Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2003/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Assessment Body</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement Note</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Graphic Design, BS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Portfolio, Spring Show, Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2004/2005 NASAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Health Science, BS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Course assignments, clinical assessments Department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2006/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>History, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Capstone, senior survey, moderated group discussions, performance measures in courses Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2006/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Humanities and Religious Studies, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Course-embedded assignments Department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2001/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Interior Design, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Capstone, portfolio, Spring Show Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2004/2005 NASAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>International Affairs, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Student writing samples, multiple choice test Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td>2003/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Journalism, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Senior survey every three years; capstone senior seminars staggered across seven concentrations</td>
<td>Primary report author; circulation of survey results among faculty; department meeting discussions</td>
<td>Fine-tuning curriculum and instruction across the concentrations</td>
<td>2004/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Liberal Arts, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="HTTP://WEBAPPS2.CSUS.EDU/ASSESSMENT/PLANS/DEFAULT.ASPX">HTTP://WEBAPPS2.CSUS.EDU/ASSESSMENT/PLANS/DEFAULT.ASPX</a></td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>In development</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Liberal Studies, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Subject-matter competency tests</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Program improvement, credentialing</td>
<td>2000/2001 CCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Marine Sciences, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Online content assessment instrument, scientific writing, embedded essay questions</td>
<td>Department, assessment committee</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement, content mastery</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Webpage Details</td>
<td>Assessment Method</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Nursing, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Assessment Technologies Institute testing, National Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses, Educational Benchmarking program, focus groups, student course evaluations</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program improvement, licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Photography, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Portfolios, exams, course rubrics</td>
<td>Assessment committee, department</td>
<td>Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Physical Science, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common final exam questions</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Physics, BA, BS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Common final exam questions</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Psychology, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Surveys, pretest-posttest design, writing/research skills study, culminating experience study (for graduate students)</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Curriculum development, accreditation, program improvement</td>
<td>Program improvement, accreditation, state licensure</td>
<td>Department Faculty Program committees Program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Recreation, Parks and Tourism Administration, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Culminating experience (Internship with agency supervisor), exit exam, portfolio</td>
<td>Social Science Advisory Committee, department chair</td>
<td>2006/2007 NRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Social Science, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Portfolio, capstone</td>
<td>Certification of subject matter competence for teacher credentialing, program improvement</td>
<td>2000/2001 CCTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Social Work, BA, MSW</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Course, embedded assessments, performance measures done by field supervisors, alumni survey, focus groups</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2000/2001 CSWE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Speech Pathology and Audiology, BS, MS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Alumni survey, clinical supervisor’s assessments, coursework, checklists</td>
<td>Instructors, department, clinical supervisors, Student Advisory Group</td>
<td>2001/2002 ASHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Theater and Dance, BA, MA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Performances with external reviewers</td>
<td>Department faculty</td>
<td>2003/2004 NAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Vocational Education, BE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>Supervisor observation, field supervision project, Swan portfolio (California Board of Examiners for Vocational Teachers), culminating projects for particular courses, research papers, alumni survey</td>
<td>Faculty/Academic Coordinator, faculty from Teacher Education, Special Education, Educational Leadership, Kinesiology, Foreign Language &amp; Women's Studies</td>
<td>Program improvement, demonstration of profession competence</td>
<td>2005/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Women's Studies, BA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td>In-class quizzes and presentations, short essays, final in-depth essays, self-reflection questionnaires</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program improvement</td>
<td>1999/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx">http://webapps2.csus.edu/assessment/plans/default.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C Required Data Tables

Data Table 2: Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of accredited or certificated program</th>
<th>Professional, special, state '08, or programmatic accreditation agency for this program</th>
<th>Date of most recent accreditation action by agency</th>
<th>Summary (&quot;bullet points&quot;) of key issues for continuing institutional attention identified in agency action letter or report</th>
<th>One performance indicator accepted by the agency; selected by program</th>
<th>For one indicator, provide 3 years’ trend data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>NASAD</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>• Update facilities</td>
<td>Senior Seminar with portfolio development and review required of all students</td>
<td>Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Portfolio review upon application to credential program</td>
<td>Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Standard 15: Composition &amp; Rhetoric fulfilled by English120A holistic grading of final essays</td>
<td>The bulk of students scored 2 or 3 on a 4-point scale. Weak skills areas were identified. Instructors meet to discuss the rubric &amp; student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Design</td>
<td>NASAD</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>• Increase required lab hours for identified classes</td>
<td>Required senior-level portfolio class with review and reassessment of assignments from previous classes; annual public exhibit of student work</td>
<td>Faculty note any inconsistencies or issues in the curriculum. Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Accreditation Body</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interior Design    | CIDA (formerly FIDER) | 2004 | • Revise course sequencing to lead students through projects of increasing complexity  
  • Address student learning goals to new CIDA standards | Juried portfolio review, annual public exhibit of student work  
  Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards. |
| Music              | NASM               | 2001 | • Develop plan to replace/update equipment  
  • Renovate the music listening lab  
  • Evaluate/revise units required for GE and its impact on Bachelor of Music degree  
  • 4- Renovate Music Recital Hall | Annual juried (normed) student recital/performance is recorded and archived  
  Student performances continue to meet established standards of excellence. |
| Music Education    | CCTC               | 2006 | • Submit syllabi and proof of faculty development | Annual juried (normed) student recital/performance is recorded and archived  
  Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards. |
| Photography        | NASAD              | 2008 | • KDM Hall lab deferred maintenance issues. | Course rubrics, developing a digital portfolio review, annual public exhibit of student work  
  Quality of student work remains consistent with identified program standards. |
| Theatre Arts          | NAST       | 2004 | • Realign the curriculum to merge Theatre and Dance more effectively  
|                      |           |      | • Identify and track assessment  
|                      |           |      | • Renew faculty hires  
|                      |           |      | Senior capstone course, under development  
|                      |           |      | Annual theatre productions videotaped and archived  
| Business Administration | AACSB   | 2008 | • Continuous Improvement Objectives: continuously review and implement the CBA strategic plan and update when necessary.  
|                      |           |      | • Faculty Qualifications: ensure that faculty has, and maintains, intellectual qualifications and current expertise to accomplish the mission of the university and the CBA.  
|                      |           |      | • Assurance of Learning: continued development and implementation of the CBA assurance of learning program including outcomes assessment as the guide for continuing development of the degree programs.  
|                      |           |      | Technology utilization  
|                      |           |      | After a complete cycle of assessment and the analysis of outcomes, the CBA found that some of the incoming graduate students did not have any or sufficient background in information technology. The CBA faculty proposed the addition of a foundation course called MBA 205 Introduction to Managerial Issues in Information Technology to ensure our incoming graduate students are proficient in IT before taking graduate programs. This course was approved through all college and University levels and is currently offered to students.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Scores (Fall 2007)</th>
<th>Scores (Spring 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subjects &amp; Multiple Subjects BCLAD Emphasis, BMED</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final student teaching evaluation</td>
<td>Spring 2008 (only) – mean scores: Preparation (5 items): 3.57/4.0, Instruction (27 items): 3.49/4.0, Assessment (3 items): 3.42/4.0, Professionalism (8 items): 3.86/4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject &amp; Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis, BMED</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final student teaching evaluation</td>
<td>Spring 2008 (only) – mean scores: Preparation (5 items): 3.36/4.0, Instruction (27 items): 3.34/4.0, Assessment (3 items): 3.32/4.0, Professionalism (8 items): 3.32/4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services, School Counseling</td>
<td>CCTC (program also has conditional CACREP accreditation)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination, mean scores compared to national mean</td>
<td>Fall 2007: 92/87.1, Spring 2008: 86.7/87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Credential, Level I, EDLP</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final fieldwork evaluation (based on six professional standards)</td>
<td>Fall 2007: 92.5 percent meeting standards, Spring 2008: 97.5 percent meeting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Credential, Intern, EDLP</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final fieldwork evaluation (based on six professional standards)</td>
<td>Fall 2007: 100 percent meeting standards, Spring 2008: 100 percent meeting standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services Credential, Level II, EDLP</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final fieldwork evaluation (based on six professional standards)</td>
<td>Fall 2007 only: 100 percent meeting standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate, EDS | CCTC | 2007 | Under new CCTC accreditation review process | Final special education student teaching evaluation (43 item rubric) | Fall 2007  
100 percent passing  
Spring 2008  
100 percent passing |
| Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate w/Multiple Subjects, EDS (candidates are evaluated by both special education and multiple subjects assessments) | CCTC | 2007 | Under new CCTC accreditation review process | Final multiple subjects student teaching evaluation (43 item rubric) | Fall 2007  
100 percent passing  
Spring 2008  
100 percent passing |
| Education Specialist, Moderate/Severe and Moderate/Severe with Multiple Subjects, EDS | CCTC | 2007 | Under new CCTC accreditation review process | Final student teaching evaluation (11 content areas) | Fall 2007 | Range and Mean score out of 4: Areas 1-5: 4-4; 4  
Area 6: N.O. – 4; 4  
Area 7: 3-4; 3.8  
Area 8: N.O. – 4; 4  
Area 9: 4-4; 4  
Area 10: 4-4; 3.6  
Area 11: 4-4; 3.83 Spring 2008 | Range and Mean score out of 4: Areas 1: 3-4; 3.94  
Area 2: N.O. – 4; 3.78  
Area 3: N.O. – 4; 3.83  
Area 4: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 5: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 6: 3-4; 3.68  
Area 7: 3-4; 3.69  
Area 8: 3-4; 3.39  
Area 9: 3-4; 3.81  
Area 10: 3-4; 3.78  
Area 11: 3-4; 3.7 N.O. = not observed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Specialist, Early Childhood Special Education</th>
<th>CCTC</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</th>
<th>Final student teaching evaluation, Preschool (54 items)</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Mean score: 2.0 out of 2.0  Spring 2008 Mean score: 2.0 out of 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist, Level II, EDS</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Standards-based portfolio</td>
<td>Fall 2007  Mean score: 3.8/4.0  Spring 2008  Mean score: 3.6/4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentialed Program</td>
<td>CCTC (this program also has NASP accreditation)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Praxis Exam</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services Credential, School Psychologist, EDS</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subjects, EDTE</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process</td>
<td>Final Student Teaching Evaluation (43 item rubric)</td>
<td>Fall 2007 Mean score: 3.94/4.0 Spring 2008 Mean score: 3.84/4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Accreditation Body</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject, EDTE CCTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process Final student teaching evaluation (43 item rubric)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist Certificate &amp; Credential, EDTE</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation review process Standards-based Culminating Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final student teaching evaluation Mean score: 3.74/4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final student teaching evaluation Mean score: 3.6/4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering ABET</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering ABET</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Succession plan for program director Financial resources in times of lower enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science ABET</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Time for faculty scholarly activity and professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management ACCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Outcome assessment is a work in progress Continue emphasis to students the importance of academic excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Electronic Engineering ABET</td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Variation or inconsistencies in coverage of some learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering ABET</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Licensure Exam Pass Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering Technology</td>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>• Document that assessment results in program improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>CCNE/AACN/CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>None None Under new CCTC accreditation process</td>
<td>2005-2006: 91.6 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2007: 94.95 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008: 92.59 percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>CAPTE</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Licensure Exam Pass Rate</td>
<td>3-year average pass rate on national licensure examination [2004-2006 per Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy (FSBPT.org) website—national licensing agency]: 100 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Parks &amp; Tourism Administration</td>
<td>NRPA</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>CSWE/CCTC</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Field Instructor Rating Table</td>
<td>2007-2008: 24 learning objectives scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td>ASHA/CCTC</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>None Under new CCTC accreditation process</td>
<td>SLP National Praxis Exam Pass Rate</td>
<td>2005-2006: 82 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2007: 90 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008: 100 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic Program in Dietetics</td>
<td>CADE</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>CCTC</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Under new CCTC accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IPEDS Data: Fall 2007

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment by Category</th>
<th>Total FTE of Students*</th>
<th>Total Headcount of Students</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien Headcount</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native Headcount</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander Headcount</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino Headcount</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown Headcount</th>
<th>Total Male Headcount</th>
<th>Total Female Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>19538.63</td>
<td>23724</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>10156</td>
<td>13568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td>19538.63</td>
<td>23724</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>10156</td>
<td>13568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19538.63</td>
<td>23724</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>9,480</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>10156</td>
<td>13568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If institution has used a formula other than FTE = FT + (PT/3), please indicate how calculated FTE: Full-Time Equivalent Students is the sum of Student Credit Units (SCU) divided by 12 for Classified Graduate students and 15 for Undergraduate students.

Institution: California State University, Sacramento
IPEDS Data for 6-Year Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

Please indicate if the data provided in tables below is for:

- freshmen only (use Table 2)
- freshmen and transfer students combined (use Tables 2 and 3)

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Cohort Year (Entering Fall)</th>
<th>Overall Graduation Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien %</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native %</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific Islander %</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino %</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Averages:</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If institution tracks freshman and transfer graduation rates separately please provide last 3 years data for 6-Year cohort transfer graduation rate by ethnicity and gender:

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Cohort Year (Entering Fall)</th>
<th>Overall Graduation Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien %</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native %</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific Islander %</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino %</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Averages:</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution: California State University, Sacramento
FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

Last Reported IPEDS Data for Enrollment in each program level by Ethnicity and Gender. Use IPEDS definitions for students.

IPEDS data reported as of (date) __Fall 2007______________

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment by Category</th>
<th>Total FTE of Students*</th>
<th>Total Headcount of Students</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien Headcount</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native Headcount</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander Headcount</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino Headcount</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic Headcount</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown Headcount</th>
<th>Total Male Headcount</th>
<th>Total Female Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2,513.42</td>
<td>3632</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>2398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Master's &amp; Doctorate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,513.42</td>
<td>3632</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>2398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IPEDS Data for Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Graduation Percentage (all programs)</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien %</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Am Indian/Alaska Native %</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific Islander %</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino %</th>
<th>White/Non-Hispanic %</th>
<th>Ethnicity Unknown %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Year Averages:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Graduate level graduation rates were calculated using a 7-year cohort since all work towards a master's degree, including transferred credits, course work, and thesis, must be completed within seven years.

**Current Faculty:** 1551  
**Total FTE** of faculty 1126.9 as of 08/11/08

**Full-time** faculty headcount: 787  
Non-Caucasian: 28%  
Male: 52%  
Female: 48%

**Part-time** faculty headcount: 764  
Non-Caucasian 24%  
Male 46%  
Female 54%

**FTE Student-to-FTE Faculty Ratio:** 20.0 to 1
Institution: California State University, Sacramento

**Finances:**

A. **Annual Tuition Rate:**
   - Undergraduate Resident Tuition: $3558
   - Undergraduate Non-Resident Tuition: $13,728
   - Graduate Resident Tuition: $4,200
   - Graduate Non-Resident Tuition: $14,370

B. **Total Annual Operating Budget:**
   - $246,613,878 (FY2007/08)

C. **Percentage from tuition and fees:**
   - 32%

D. **Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years:**
   - 0 (FY2004/05); $1,997,170 * (FY2005/06); $4,322,965 (FY2006/07)

E. **Current Accumulated Deficit:**
   - $4,405,393 (FY2007/08)

F. **Endowment:**
   - $22,287,688

**Governing Board:**

A. Size: 25
B. Meetings a year: 7

**Off-Campus Locations:**

A. Number: 25
B. Total Enrollment: to be determined

**Distance Education Programs:** (50% or more of program/degree requirements are offered via any technology-mediated delivery system):

A. Number: 6
B. Total Enrollment: to be determined

* In 2005/06, the University had an operating deficit of $1,997,170 but used a one-time reduction to resolve it for that year.
Acronyms Guide
&
End Notes
Sacramento State Acronyms Guide

- **APC**: Academic Policies Committee/Faculty Senate
- **ASI**: Associated Students, Inc.
- **CTL**: Center for Teaching and Learning
- **CPC**: Curriculum Policies Committee/Faculty Senate
- **EPT**: English Placement Test
- **GE/GRPC**: General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee/Faculty Senate
- **GECRC**: General Education Course Review Committee/subcommittee of GE/GRPC
- **OIR**: Office of Institutional Research
- **PACA**: Provost Advisory Committee on Assessment
- **PROC**: Program Review Oversight Committee/subcommittee of CPC
- **SASEEP**: Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Programs
- **SPC**: Strategic Planning Committee
- **UBAC**: University Budget Advisory Committee
- **UPC**: University Planning Committee
- **WAC**: Writing Across the Curriculum Program
- **WPE**: Writing Proficiency Examination
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