

WASC Interim Report 2010

November 8, 2010

San José State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192

Prepared by

Dr. Dennis Jaehne

*Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies
WASC Accreditation Liaison Officer*

Office of Undergraduate Studies
ADM 159 – 0030

Office: 408-924-2447
Direct: 408-924-5373
Cell: 408-644-6423
djaehne@sjsu.edu

List of Topics or Concerns

This Interim Report responds to the Commission's request of July 6, 2007, following their consideration of the EER visiting team report (March 2007). The Commission requested that this Interim Report should focus on

1. results and sustainability of assessment at all levels;
2. development of the three EER essay themes, particularly "Inclusive Excellence," into core campus values and the improvement of retention and graduation rates;
3. provisions for leadership transitions;
4. identify whether targets have been set and progress made in relation to them on retention and graduation rates.

These four elements will structure the "Response to Issues" section below.

Institutional Context

San Jose State University is the oldest public institution of higher education on the West Coast and the founding campus of California State University. Established as an evening school for teachers in 1857, it became a California State School in 1862. First accredited in 1949, SJSU's seven colleges and six schools offer 81 undergraduate and 71 graduate degrees (or over 240 degrees with all emphases and concentrations). The most popular undergraduate majors are Art, Business Administration and Psychology; the largest graduate degrees are in Library and Information Science, Engineering, Education and Social Work. SJSU grants about one third of all CSU Masters Degrees. Over 25 departments offer degrees accredited by regional and national agencies. With close to 30,000 students, SJSU is the fifth largest campus in the CSU system.

Located one block from City Hall in downtown San Jose, the tenth largest U.S. city, we enjoy a unique location at the heart of the culturally and ethnically diverse Silicon Valley. Since the 1980 census, San Jose has had no ethnic majority. Hispanics make up 30 percent of the population and we are home to the largest Vietnamese community in America, nearly 9 percent of our population. Our student population reflects this diversity. A quick demographic profile of our student population may be viewed at:

<http://www.oir.sjsu.edu/Students/QuickFacts/20094QuickFacts.cfm>.

We are also a university of choice for many international students who make up about six percent of our student population (see Appendix A: Enrollment Trends). In 2009, *U.S. News & World Report* ranked San José State seventh in the nation in terms of ethnic diversity. Among non-research universities, SJSU had the largest foreign enrollment total among master's institutions; it was ranked in the top 15 master's-level public universities in the West in the annual survey of "America's Best Colleges".

Regionally, SJSU is within 50 miles of three major research universities, three CSU campuses and a broad network of community colleges that serve as primary feeder schools for our transfer population.

In 2007 the university celebrated its sesquicentennial anniversary; a banner year for fundraising, SJSU renamed two colleges -- the Charles W. Davidson College of Engineering and the Connie Lurie College of Education -- in honor of generous gifts.

In the last few years, under President Don Kassing's leadership, the university was in a growth mode: our FTES climbed from 23,210 in 2005-06 to a peak of 26,745 in 2008-09 before we were hit with a 12.6 percent cutback in 2009-10. Following Kassing's retirement, President Jon Whitmore started his term in 2008 at the peak of our growth, but the recession had already begun and Whitmore presided over enrollment decrease, the impact of 17 programs, and campus wide layoffs and furloughs in his second year. In Spring 2010, President Whitmore

announced he was leaving to take another position and Chancellor Reed called Kassing back from retirement to serve once again as Interim President, starting in Fall 2010. A Presidential search is currently underway.

In the Provost's Office (Vice President for Academic Affairs), Dr. Carmen Sigler served during Kassing's tenure and retired in Spring 2009. Whitmore appointed Dr. Gerald Selter Interim Provost in Fall 2009; after a failed search that semester, Selter was named Provost. We are also fortunate to have a new VP for Student Affairs, Dr. Jason Laker, who started in Fall 2010.

Provost Selter has used the opportunity presented by several retirements and reassignments to make some beneficial organizational changes in Academic Affairs. Most significant is his creation of a new unit of Student Academic Success Services (described below). This was part of a larger move to bring the Academic Advising and Retention Services unit under Academic Affairs as part of our Graduation and Retention Initiative. Dr. Maureen Scharberg was named as Senior Director of the new unit; a search for a permanent AVP is underway. In fall 2009, following completion of our Inclusive Excellence/Diversity Master Plan (see below), President Whitmore shifted focus to a new campus sustainability initiative, naming Dr. Katherine Cushing as Director of Sustainability. Overall, the leadership team currently in place under Kassing has deep SJSU experience and is committed to the success of SJSU.

On October 21, 2010 Interim President Kassing launched "Acceleration: The Campaign for San Jose State University" and opened the public phase of SJSU's first-ever comprehensive campaign with a goal to raise \$200 million by 2014. SJSU raised over \$129 million during the campaign's silent phase, beginning in 2006. "Acceleration" marks the first time in SJSU's 153-year history that the university will launch a highly organized, resourced and targeted effort to raise millions of dollars. The campaign encompasses all seven colleges, the University Library, Student Affairs and Intercollegiate Athletics. SJSU will seek gifts from private individuals, corporations and foundations in support of four areas: Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Scholarship, An Investment in Students, The Gateway to Silicon Valley and Beyond, and Support for Existing Programs.

No stranger to change, SJSU will promote internal talent and will invite new faces and ideas to lead and shape the university in the future. Despite the uncertain economic situation and the inevitable changes in leadership, SJSU is committed to offering access to higher education to all persons who meet the criteria for admission, yielding a stimulating mix of age groups, cultures, and economic backgrounds for teaching, learning, and research. SJSU takes pride in and is firmly committed to teaching and learning, with a faculty that is active in scholarship, research, technological innovation, community service, and the arts. In collaboration with nearby industries and communities, SJSU faculty and staff are dedicated to achieving the university's mission as a responsive institution of the State of California: To enrich the lives of its students, to transmit knowledge along with the necessary skills for applying it in the service of our society, and to expand the base of knowledge through research and scholarship.

Statement on Report Preparation

WASC ALO Dennis Jaehne (AVP, Undergraduate Studies) is primarily responsible for preparing this report. Svetla Ilieva, Administrative Analyst in the Office of Undergraduate Studies, provided primary editorial support. Supporting data, analysis, and segments of the narrative were provided by (in alphabetical order):

Dr. Stephen Branz, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies

Cathy Busalacchi, Associate Vice President for Campus Life

Gloria Edwards, Curriculum Analyst, Undergraduate Studies

Dr. Rona Halualani, Professor of Communication Studies (formerly Director of Institutional Planning & Inclusive Excellence)

Steven Hernandez, Associate Director for Analytic Studies, Institutional Research

Pat Lopes Harris, Director of Media Relations

Rose Lee, Vice President for Administration & Finance

Joan Merdinger, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs

Dr. Ronald F. Rogers, Director of Assessment and Professor of Psychology

Dr. Maureen Scharberg, Senior Director of Student Academic Success Services
Dr. Jackie Snell, Director of Assessment and Professor of Marketing
Dr. Shawn Spano, Professor of Communication Studies
Dr. Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Associate Vice President for Institutional Research
Dr. Sharon Willey, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Provost Gerry Selter reviewed the report.

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

I. Results and Sustainability of Assessment at all Levels

Context

The team noted our considerable efforts to improve assessment processes and our progress in “overcoming resistance, defining learning outcomes, developing methods of assessment, and collecting data.” Nonetheless, they encouraged us to shift from a focus on data collection to “a broader and more balanced focus on data collection, data utilization, and results.” The thrust of their recommendation was that we attend more to impact, establishing outcomes, benchmarks, and targets for success. Further, they urged us to use the data we have collected more fully before adding new data collection efforts.

The common refrain we heard was: “close the loop.” When we launch initiatives we should set standards and/or targets of performance, focus on findings/results and develop actions to improve those results. The team encouraged us to shift our focus “from course-level assessment to assessment of the major as a whole,” and “beyond that to assessment of the ways in which different kinds of learning ... are integrated to produce a well-educated graduate.” We are encouraged to share our assessment results broadly across the spectrum of our educational efforts, i.e., the major, GE, co-curricular activity, and service learning. We understand that “WASC’s most urgent interest is in the quality of overall student learning, as demonstrated at graduation.”

An additional element of concern is about the sustainability of our assessment work – the worry that too many initiatives and activities will lead to eventual burnout. The Commission encouraged us to align our activities with our strategic plan, to prune away the redundant and less successful programs and activities, and to ensure there are adequate resources to support and reward faculty and staff for the efforts invested in our initiatives. Finally, the Commission urged us to “institutionalize” our commitments so that would rest on “firm foundations...able to flourish beyond any future leadership transitions.”

Response: Assessment Efforts

We continue to work at improving our assessment practices. We have improved the structure of our efforts campus wide through a streamlined system of reporting and feedback. We have provided resources to support facilitators (0.2 assignment each semester) in each college to work with faculty on increasing attention to “closing the loop” and improving the sustainability of assessment. The facilitators also serve as the coordinating assessment group for the Academic Affairs Division, conducting the awards program and planning the annual campus wide “best practices” meeting. We support a full time faculty assignment as Director of Assessment and we continue to invest in faculty development and recognition for assessment work. The following summarizes these achievements. A more detailed statement will be found in **Appendix B**. Data tables reporting assessment results for specific SLOs across all colleges will also be found in the Appendices.

Improved Web Services for Assessment: we have refined, expanded, and improved our main assessment website on the Undergraduate Studies page (see: <http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/>).

Improved procedures

First, we are asking program faculty to focus annually on closing the loop on ONE SLO. It became apparent through assessment reporting and feedback from Assessment Facilitators that programs were worried more about complying with reporting requirements than using their assessment efforts to improve student learning. The above reporting modification represents our effort to shift the focus from one of “compliance” to that of “inquiry.” Our goal was to have

programs focus on and find success with “closing the loop” on at least one SLO during each reporting cycle.

Second, we are initiating direct feedback on each assessment report. Until the last EE visit, the assessment facilitators’ focus was on getting program SLOs and baseline data, as those are prerequisites to closing the loop. Reports were not evaluated above the department level beyond counting SLOs established and measured. For the past two academic years, the facilitators and Director(s) of assessment read all assessment reports, gave written feedback, and met with most departments to discuss progress and goals. A summary report assessing each program’s progress toward closing the loop is prepared for the Dean of the respective college and the AVP of Undergraduate Studies. Results for each college are reported in **Appendix C**.

Generally the meetings with faculty are far more rewarding than the reports and written feedback process. Departments that are resisting assessment are in the minority. Most meetings our facilitators attend have the tenor of cooperation and willingness to learn. Still, getting meaningful data is not an easy task. Nearly all faculty do informal course assessment and within the constraints of their workload find it difficult to take on new formal assessment techniques. Some programs discuss student progress frequently and feel, with at least some justification, that they are *doing* assessment but that formal database management and reporting are beyond reasonable workload requirements. Given these realities, we believe the progress we’ve made (see below for results) is good, or perhaps admirable.

Much of what we learned at the WASC Level II retreat supported the notion that facilitating faculty dialog around assessment and student learning at the program level positively influences their perceived value of assessment and greatly enhances the sustainability of the process. Having some clear goals helps; therefore, we have distributed the WASC Educational Effectiveness rubrics (especially the SLO and Program Planning rubrics) to help departments (and Deans) assess their programs to see where they stand in relation to the highest level of achievement.

Third, we moved from semester assessment reports to annual assessment reports. Once most programs were submitting reports, the assessment facilitators felt it was time to switch to annual reporting with more focus on the quality of reports. We believe this move improves sustainability in two ways: 1) it will decrease the workload devoted to writing reports; 2) a focus on results should increase the rewards to faculty for their effort on assessment. It remains a large project simply to track the reports and the feedback and keep all of the programs operating on their cycle of assessment and program review and we are working to improve our capability in this area. Our most recent administrative support hire in Undergraduate Studies (Fall 2010) has been tasked to support the Program Planning and Assessment work.

Fourth, we moved to reporting updates only. Previously, programs were required to report for all SLOs every year, and at the time of the last WASC visit, all SLOs every semester. We changed from organizing reports by semester to organizing reports by SLO. Programs submit one report for each SLO on which they worked during the year. Reports are then posted by SLO on the assessment Web site: <http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/programs/>. The website serves as an archive, so that a department measuring student learning on a specific SLO after a change in pedagogy can simply download the most recent report on that SLO and update and resubmit it.

Fifth, we have initiated an annual best practices meeting: “Improvements in Student Learning” held in early February of each year. The third annual meeting is scheduled for February 2011. The Provost typically kicks off the meeting and strongly encourages attendance by department Chairs and program assessment coordinators. About 80 faculty and administrators attend. We use a format in which the meeting content develops organically from participant discussion groups rather than a set agenda or a presentation from a visiting expert. In 2009 Occupational Therapy presented a practice that is probably the most widely adapted and used on campus now: a common grading rubric to be used by all department faculty members for all written assignments. A student paper is allowed two unique errors; on the third error the instructor stops

grading, returns the paper to the student for rewriting and resubmission, with a recommendation to visit the Writing Center. Success is measured in number of papers returned for rewrites. This represents the best kind of pedagogical change: it improves student writing while requiring little or no extra grading by instructors, making it easier to expand faculty participation. (Our WASC Liaison, Barbara Wright, attended and addressed the 2010 event.) We recognize that expanding (and maintaining) the campus wide conversation about assessment is an essential component of the culture change required to make us an engaged campus.

Sixth, we have initiated a Provost's Assessment Award. In 2007 the Provost began giving an annual assessment award, with a small amount of cash attached (usually \$200) to a program or an individual in each college. Assessment facilitators choose the recipients of the awards. The goal now is to recognize the efforts of those demonstrating closing the loop and/or innovative practices in their assessment efforts. Previous award winners (with brief descriptions of their work) can be viewed at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/awards/>. In spring 2010 we were also able to provide five iPads as a reward to faculty members who had demonstrated significant leadership in assessment. Our strategy here is to focus on rewarding those who are doing good work rather than on flogging the recalcitrant.

Seventh, we have coupled assessment reporting to the each department's program planning) schedule. Program faculty members are free to focus their assessment efforts where they feel they are most needed with the understanding that all of the SLOs will be assessed at least once in a full program planning cycle. The assessment website (<http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/>) shows at a glance the most recent year in which a particular SLO was reported.

Assessment Results: Compliance

Compliance with assessment reporting is generally good, though there are still a few departments that refuse to participate. The following table shows, by college, the percent of programs that have their Student Learning Objectives posted on or linked to the assessment Web site and the percent that have a spring 2010 report posted.

College	SLOs posted	Spring 2010 report posted
Applied Sciences & Arts	100%	97%
Business	100%	100%
Education	100%	100%
Engineering, Undergraduates	100%	75%*
Engineering Graduates	100%	69%
Humanities & Arts	100%	84%
Science	95%	75%
Social Science	97%	85%
UNIVERSITY TOTAL	98.6%	85%

Quality of Reports: Assessing the Assessors

We are reasonably pleased at the percentage of programs that have “closed the loop” or are getting close to closing the loop. We review and assess each program report and provide detailed feedback to the department, the Dean and the AVP of Undergraduate Studies. We use the following scheme:

	Beginning	In Progress	Advanced
Evidence of need provided			
Change implemented			
Impact assessed			

(Programs can also be assessed as “minimally engaged” or as offering “no report.”)

“Advanced” means that the program has provided a report of at least one SLO that needs improvement in student performance, made a change to pedagogy or curriculum, and reported some assessment of change in student performance. A summary of these reports is included in Appendix C. Overall for the university 41% of programs were deemed advanced in “closing the loop” and we are pleased with these results. Just two years ago virtually no assessment reports reflected closing the loop (though some programs surely had). Another 15% were in progress or at least beginning to assess the impact of a change. Overall, 69% of programs have moved beyond just collecting data. See full reports of all programs at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/assessment/programs/>.

Integrating Assessment with Program Planning

Closing the loop on assessment of student learning should ultimately integrate assessment results with ongoing program planning. This is the current frontier of our efforts. We have adjusted our assessment calendars so that assessment of SLOs now conforms to the program planning calendar. Each department is scheduled for program review every 5 years, unless they have at least one accredited program, in which case they follow their accreditation cycle (up to 7 years). Since fall 2007 programs have been asked to post a calendar for assessing each SLO such that all SLOs are assessed at least once in the planning cycle.

We have required assessment of learning outcomes in each Program Plan since at least 2006. In response to our feedback from WASC we started to pay closer attention to evaluating program planning efforts. Now we insert a standard paragraph into the final Program Planning Committee report to the Provost giving a “good”, “improving”, or “not acceptable” evaluation of the department assessment efforts. The Committee offers individualized feedback on progress in assessment, based on both the Program Plan and the assessment reports posted on the assessment Web site. Reports to the Provost are posted at:

http://www.sjsu.edu/ugs/programplanning/PPC_reports_to_Provost/.

The final loop to close will be integration of the program planning reports with strategic planning at the college and university level. The AVP of Undergraduate Studies is working with the Deans on the use of program planning in college decision-making and with the Provost on use of program planning in University decision-making. In Fall 2010, we established satisfactory assessment and program planning as essential components of all requests to recruit tenure track faculty (See Faculty Recruitment Guidelines in Appendix D). We are working with the Curriculum and Research committee to require these elements as part of requests for new degree programs as well. We are redrafting the Program Planning Guidelines this semester to reflect these (and other) improvements. We intend to implement the new guidelines in spring 2011.

As part of our commitment to improving the effectiveness of the Program Planning process, we are sending seven participants to the WASC Program Review Workshop in November.

Assessing Program Outcomes at Graduation

Per the Commission's suggestions, we are making efforts to demonstrate the overall quality of student learning at the time of graduation. In Fall 2009 we used a small amount of federal stimulus funding to support a year long pilot project in which three faculty teams from upper division GE courses are examining student work for one discipline-specific SLO and 3-4 program-level LEAP SLOs using (modified) VALUE Rubrics. We anticipate this program level data will permit "closing the loop" at the program level where need for improvement is identified. The plan was finalized in Fall 2009 with Board of General Studies input and approval. Faculty were recruited at the end of Fall 09 and supported with 0.2 assigned time for Spring 10 to cover the year's work. A full description of the project to date will be found in Appendix E.

We will subsequently use the pilot data to track student performance and seek correlations, e.g., native vs transfer for CORE GE, performance in specific CORE GE Areas, WST performance, etc. This pilot project has been presented within the CSU and is the basis for a presentation to be made at the upcoming AAC&U GE Conference (Chicago, March 2011). This project is also an integral part of a successful proposal to AAC&U for the multi-year program entitled "GE for a Global Century (SJSU was one of 32 institutions selected from 147 applications nationwide).

Summary

We believe the actions taken above in response to the WASC team's EE report will improve the assessment process on campus and help to make it sustainable. We are also taking the key steps necessary to "close the loop," especially in our move to link assessment firmly with the revision of the program planning process. Among the evidence of progress are the willingness of Deans to fund representatives of their college to attend the WASC Level I and Level II workshops; the encouraging level of faculty participation in our annual assessment "best practices" meeting; and emerging evidence of "closing the loop" activities spreading across campus.

Our remaining challenges are 1) to fix the program planning process and make it robust by integrating assessment results more fully and meaningfully into planning; and 2) to develop effective measures of program learning outcomes at the time of graduation. Responsibility for leading the necessary efforts rests with the Office of Undergraduate Studies. We have not yet developed a timeline but we anticipate that we will establish more detailed milestones by the end of Spring 2011 and that the plan will take us to a significant level of accomplishment by the time of the next WASC accreditation visit cycle.

II. Development of the Three Themes, particularly "Inclusive Excellence," into Core Campus Values and the Improvement of Retention and Graduation Rates

Context

The thrust of the team's recommendations is that "inclusive excellence" is not just a theme for a year; rather it is an "overriding theme" that must be integrated into strategic planning, assessment, retention and graduation efforts, faculty recruitment, integrative learning, student support programs and campus climate issues.

The team report noted that "success and excellence are not equitably achieved among all students at SJSU." In particular, they pointed to disappointing six-year graduation rates (around 41 percent), with lower and "truly dismaying and unacceptable" rates for African American and Latino males. While the team reported that the data have "galvanized" the campus and that we have responded with multiple initiatives (including increasing the diversity of faculty), they identified "a need to create a conceptual framework, unify efforts, establish priorities and

benchmarks for success, and focus on collecting and using the information” to guide action and improve results.

They also made suggestions about how we might expand our research into practices of successful programs; about how we might treat data more usefully to track specific subpopulations; and they encouraged us to pay special attention to STEM disciplines (given our location in Silicon Valley).

In summary, we should study “the ways in which a diverse campus enhances the learning of all students.”

Response

Note: The Commission’s concerns link inclusive excellence with graduation and retention rates. Inasmuch as graduation and retention are also the separate focus of topic 3 (below), we will focus on those activities and results in that topic. Here we wish to report

- 1) our success with the development of an innovative comprehensive campus wide Inclusive Excellence/Diversity Master Plan, including assessment reports on two action steps from the plan:
 - a. the first year of the Diversity Dialog Project;
 - b. improvements in the faculty recruitment process;
- 2) an update on our work to improve student success in the STEM disciplines through development of Science 2 and Science 90T;
- 3) an update on programming and assessment in Student Affairs (co-curriculum) that contributes to graduation, retention, and achievement of LEAP learning outcomes.

I. Diversity Master Plan

In July 2007, following receipt of the Commission Action Letter of July 6, 2007, President Kassing appointed Dr. Rona T. Halualani Director of Institutional Planning and Inclusive Excellence and charged her with the development, design, and implementation of an Inclusive Excellence/Diversity Master Plan for the campus. We believe the completed plan is the first of its kind in the CSU. Two years in development, the Plan is posted on the university web page at (<http://www.sjsu.edu/diversityplan/history/stages/theplan/>). It is also attached as a pdf file in Appendix F. Campus diversity data are in the Plan, while more recent and comprehensive data can be found on the website of the Office of Institutional Research for students at <http://oir/Students/trends/default.cfm?version=graphic> and for faculty at <http://www.oir.sjsu.edu/Faculty/quickfacts/2009.cfm>. An organizational change model that undergirds the Human Resources components of the Plan along with related action items may be viewed at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/diversityplan/strategy/>.

The purpose of the Diversity Master Plan initiative is to create a coordinated, integrated, campus-wide action plan that outlines ways in which an engaged, inclusive, thriving context of diversity will be deeply embedded in the university’s infrastructure. This plan identifies core values, goals, implementation steps and strategies, and assessment measures.

Chronology of Plan Development

- AY 07-08 – Research, Consultation, Scanning the Campus Environment; Initiating Campus Buy-In and Interest; Initiating Conversations with Implementing Units
- AY 08-09 – Specific goals, designs, and action steps developed and coordinated by a Presidential Design Team (38 faculty, staff, students, and administrators).
- AY 09-10 – Plan completed and implementation of action steps begun.
- AY 10-11 – Start assessment of first year results

When Dr. Halualani completed the Plan in summer 2009, she returned from the President’s staff to her faculty position. By that time, our campus administration had changed (President

Whitmore inherited the project). He assigned project oversight to the Division of Human Resources, and ultimately to Mr. Arthur Dunklin, the campus Director of Equal Opportunity and Workforce Development. Action Steps began in Fall 2009 (some action steps started sooner). Sadly, however, Mr. Dunklin passed away this week, a great loss to our campus. We expect President Kassing will soon reassign responsibility for overseeing implementation and assessment of the Plan.

The bulk of the Master Plan comprises the objectives and the action steps, each with assigned owners, milestones, and timelines and resource needs. They are found on pp. 27 – 10 (<http://www.sjsu.edu/diversityplan/history/stages/theplan/>).

We summarize here, as examples, initial outcomes from two action steps: 1) Diversity Dialogues and 2) efforts to improve the diversity of faculty.

Diversity Dialogs Project

The Diversity Dialogs Project responded to the Plan's *Objective/Action Goal* of Creating a Welcoming, Supportive, and Inclusive Campus Climate. This goal is part of the Thematic Area focusing on Diversity Innovations (Curricular and Co-Curricular Initiatives). Complete details of this action step will be found on pp. 55-58 of the Plan. The full assessment report for this project will be found in Appendix G.

The diversity dialogues training program is designed to achieve three overarching goals:

1. *Capacity-Building*: Develop a core group of students who have the skills, knowledge, sensitivity, and personal commitment to design and facilitate dialogues on diversity-related issues.
2. *Create Opportunities for Dialogue*: Create multiple opportunities for student facilitators to assist the campus community by designing and facilitating diversity dialogues in both academic and co-curricular contexts.
3. *Cultural and Institutional Change*: Create awareness and institutional change at SJSU so that dialogic communication is accepted and encouraged as a legitimate and valuable way to address diversity issues.

We developed a new course (combining grads and undergrads) that provided students with the knowledge and skills needed to design and facilitate diversity dialogues on the SJSU campus. Twenty-five students, divided between six graduate students and 19 undergraduate students, enrolled and completed the course in spring 2010. The course was well-designed with activities to support each of the goals. Students engaged in curricular activities such as in-class readings, discussions and skill-building activities that focused on learning dialogue theory and practical methods to design and facilitate dialogues in response to "real" diversity issues and situations. They were required to participate in campus events and other extra-curricular activities that focused on diversity-related issues and topics. And the course contributed to cultural and institutional change by having the students in the course partner with other campus groups, programs and activities.

Students participated in 15 diversity events on campus, ranging from dialogues sponsored through MOSAIC to the *Tunnel of Oppression* to the Dialogue Facilitation and Diversity Training Workshop conducted by the class. In several cases, students took the lead role in designing and facilitating the diversity events, such as the *Spartalooza Wellness Festival* and *Enough is Enough: Words that Hurt* dialogue session. Each student was required to be involved in multiple events, resulting in over 80 participation episodes.

Summative assessment was conducted by having all participating students help design and facilitate a half-day training workshop (4.5 hours) for SJSU faculty, staff, students and employees with the City of San José. Twenty-five participants attended the training. Key findings from the evaluation instrument indicate that participants judged the training to be successful and productive in a variety of ways. Specific results from the quantitative measures and open-ended questions will be found in the report in Appendix G. Some key findings:

- Almost all the students (91%) students reported increased confidence and skill in designing and facilitating diversity dialogues.
- The vast majority of students (81%) reported that they are more comfortable participating in informal conversations with friends, family, co-workers and fellow students about sensitive diversity-related issue and topics.
- Virtually all of the students (96%) said that they will use the knowledge and skills they learned in the course to engage with others about diversity related issues in the future.

We plan to continue these dialogs as well as the training, focusing on topics of high salience. The student engagement and application of learning qualifies this as a “high impact practice.”

Improving the Faculty Recruitment Process

During AY 2009-2010, the Office of Faculty Affairs was charged to plan and implement several initiatives that were outlined in the SJSU Diversity Master Plan, specifically those that focused on diversifying the faculty through recruitment of candidates for tenure-track positions.

1. Faculty-in-Residence for Diversifying the Faculty

The centerpiece of the initiative on diversifying the faculty has been the appointment of a Faculty-in-Residence position, supported with 0.2 assigned time. Following a campus-wide recruitment process, Dr. Wendy Ng, Professor of Sociology, was hired to take on this important responsibility.

2. Travel Booth Fund for Recruiting at Minority Conferences

As a direct result of Dr. Ng’s research on disciplinary conferences that attract a diverse audience, SJSU has had a presence (including advertising and booth staffing) at the following national meetings in Spring 2010: Association for Asian American Studies (AAAS), National Association for Chicana/Chicano Studies (NACCS), American Association for Blacks in Higher Education (AABHE), National Black Graduate Student Association, and The College Board which has three specific programs for which SJSU provided materials: Preparate, Native American Student Advocacy Institute, and A Dream Deferred. Our Faculty-in-Residence attended the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education (NCORE) in June 2010, staffed a booth and provided extensive materials to conference attendees about our University. As a result of the connections made by our Faculty-in-Residence at the June 2010 conference, in AY 2010-2011, SJSU will be taking on the important responsibility of being a co-sponsor of the NCORE annual conference that will take place in San Francisco, CA in June 2011.

3. Travel Funds for Chairs to attend/recruit at Disciplinary Conferences

Following a Request for Proposals that was sent to all Department Chairs and School Directors, applications were received and funded at \$1300 each. Following attendance at national disciplinary conferences (through the month of June 2010), each awardee provided a report to the Faculty-in-Residence about activities undertaken at the conference to attract a diverse candidate pool.

4. University-Wide Ads for Tenure-Track Faculty in Diversity Publications

As part of this initiative the Office of Faculty Affairs received funds to supplement advertising for faculty positions in publications that target a diverse audience of higher education readers. This initiative has provided funding for one University ad yearly in the Chronicle of Higher Education that focuses on San José State University and our efforts, as a campus, to diversify the faculty. We also purchased targeted ads for individual department-specific recruitments in Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, Hispanic Outlook and in SACNAS News (Society for the Advancement of Hispanics/Chicanos & Native Americans in Science).

5. New Procedures for Tenure-Track Faculty Searches

The Recruitment Guide for Probationary Faculty Recruitment has been revised to reflect new procedures that focus on broadening applicant pools and approving searches following good faith efforts to reach larger and more diverse candidate populations.

In additional work that supports (but does not derive from) the Diversity Master Plan, the Office of Faculty Affairs (FA) has been involved with additional partnerships that have furthered the goal of working to diversify our faculty. In partnership with the ACE/Sloan Faculty Career Flexibility Award, FA collaborated with the Faculty Diversity Committee to survey tenure-track faculty to better understand issues related to retention. The ACE/Sloan Faculty-in-Residence planned year-end workshops for early career tenure-track faculty. Finally, the ACE/Sloan project continued the funding of chair attendance at national disciplinary conferences with an RFP to provide support to 15 chairs. Although the campus will conduct only a limited number of recruitments (10 to 12) in AY 2010-2011, chairs are able to attend national disciplinary conferences from June 2010 through February 2011 to provide outreach to diverse candidates that are in attendance with targeted efforts to individual candidates and to diversity caucuses.

College of Science Initiatives that Support Inclusive Excellence and Student Success in STEM Disciplines

The Commission's Action Letter called out STEM disciplines for special attention. The College of Science supports many initiatives for students and faculty. One of the most impressive is the NSF funded project: STEP at SJSU (Improving Retention Through Student Learning Communities). The midway (year 2 of 4) evaluation report (from July 2010) will be found in Appendix H. The evaluation report tracks each grant objective and documents impressive results (including retention of STEM students) through a program of intensive advising through Science 2 and Science 90T (data below).

Science 2 is a three unit success in college course that is useful for freshman students starting a science major, as well as for undeclared students who did not get into their proposed major, and students who are not properly organized to succeed in college. Science 90T ("Success as Transfers") is offered to all new transfer students. During the Spring 2009 and Spring 2010 semesters, when SJSU did not admit new transfers, the course was repurposed to "rescue" STEM students from academic probation.

Science 90T is a "fast start" course for students needing guidance and assistance with navigating the university successfully and increasing their academic performance. The course covers such topics as: academic success strategies, policy navigation (e.g., probation and disqualification policies, use of various forms and petitions), study skills and time management, SJSU faculty expectations, educational planning and use of SJSU online resources, and includes an introduction to the various colleges and campus resources. Students' code of conduct and academic integrity issues, information & library literacy, coping with change and a host of other topics are explored as well. An experienced advisor who works with students to develop an

academic plan teaches each component of the course. Students meet weekly with a peer advisor for time management and study skills checks.

SCI 90T Early Outcomes Assessment

In Spring 2009, the College of Science focused on biology students who went onto probation after Fall 2008 grades were posted. (Biology majors represent the largest cohort of College of Science majors, with over 1000 majors.) During Spring 2009, 89% of biology majors on probation who participated in SCI 90T as well as participated in activities through the College of Science Advising Center improved their GPA and 75% returned to good academic standing. For students who did not participate in these activities, 82% did *not* improve their GPA, 50% continued on probation and 47% were disqualified from SJSU.

In Spring 2010, 84% of the students enrolled in SCI 90T were on probation. For this semester, the course was open to students from other colleges in addition to students in the College of Science. 92% improved their GPA from the previous semester with 64% returning to good academic standing. 28% of the students continued on probation, but improved their GPA. 8% of the students were disqualified.

Because of this success we are looking into expanding and institutionalizing a similar course more widely across the curriculum through the new Student Academic Success Services unit.

The College of Science contributes in other ways to the success of STEM students:

Academic Excellence Workshops (Science 1) funded by the NIH MARC and RISE Grants and by the NSF LSAMP Program. This provides supplemental instruction (not remedial instruction) to students in gatekeeper science courses. On the average, students in these workshops show a one-half to one letter grade improvement compared to students not in these workshops.

Pre-calculus, calculus and physics workshops to improve the pass rate in these courses. Results are reported in the NSF STEP Grant evaluation in Appendix H.

NIH Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC) Grants, NIH RISE Grants, a Howard Hughes Grant, major equipment grants in the biomedical sciences, and grants to help with K-14 education have helped modernize the curriculum, as well as to support research students, including underrepresented minority students. The MARC Program alone (the only one with a long track record) is starting to double or triple the numbers of SJSU minority undergraduates who go on to get Ph.D. degrees. We expect 5-6 minority Ph.D.'s over the next 15 months compared to the 1-2 biomedical Ph.D.'s normally produced each year (from NSF data and MARC tracking).

IV. Integrative and Inclusive Excellence Programming and Assessment In the Division of Student Affairs

The Division of Student Affairs engages students in a variety of learning experiences and programs intentionally designed to foster student development and academic success. A complete overview of their learning goals, mission statements and assessment results will be found as links on their "about us" webpage: <http://www.sjsu.edu/studentaffairs/aboutus/>.

Several departments have developed specific initiatives and programs related to inclusive excellence and social justice on campus. Residential Life staff members have coordinated 371 programs related to multicultural competence since 2007, and residents consistently rate learning from diverse interactions as their highest learning outcome on the EBI study. Highlights of programs include "Hate does not have a home here", annually attended by 100 students, and "Breaking the silence," a weeklong series of programs exploring what it means to be LGBTQQA in coordination with the MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center and the LGBT Center. The Tunnel of Oppression, coordinated by MOSAIC, is an interactive experience that has reached over 6000

participants since 2004. Of the 1022 participants in 2009, 956 indicated they learned something new related to social justice from their participation. Leadership Today, a social justice and leadership immersion retreat, provides an opportunity for students to reflect on their multiple identities. Students consistently indicate a greater individual and social responsibility around civic engagement and social justice resulting from their participation.

The Career Center provides workshops for students to learn how to develop a one-minute presentation in order to effectively and succinctly share their experience and assets with employers. After participating in the workshops, 64% of students rate their skills as very high compared with 7% of students who gave the same rating prior to the workshop. The annual Student Organization Leadership Conference is attended by 500 student leaders and offers sessions on improving communication skills, motivating their peers, and achieving organizational goals. 88.9% of attendees indicated they gained relevant communication skills from their experience at the conference. The Disability Resource Center counselors ensure that students can effectively describe their disability and any needed accommodations or support for their daily academic success. This capability is directly assessed through one-on-one interactions.

Students are encouraged to expand their leadership and interpersonal skills through participation in student government, student organizations, peer mentor roles and intramural activities. The Office of Student Involvement coordinates multiple leadership programs for students including the Student Organization Leadership Conference, the Nuts & Bolts Leadership Series, and the Leadership Retreat. 97.3% of Nuts & Bolts participants indicated they gained leadership skills from the workshops, and similar responses are reported from the other events. Diversity Advocate Interns in the MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center have rated their leadership skills as improving after training, and Resident Advisors indicated growth in their ability to collaborate within staff teams.

The Division of Student Affairs strives to assist students in their development of a healthy lifestyle pertaining to making informed decisions to enhance personal and community health. Students attending workshops on HIV/STI education through the Student Health Center participated in a pre- and post-test which indicated an increase in their understanding of these topics. Over 400 students participated in Spartalooza, a one-day resource fair designed to promote wellness, and 88% agreed or strongly agreed that they intended to take action to enhance their personal health/wellness.

The Division of Student Affairs has developed intentional experiences to deepen students' critical thinking skills pertaining to problem solving and reasoning. Students meeting with the University Ombudsperson are consistently able to identify their next steps for resolving their grievance as assessed by a rubric. Approximately 90% of students participating in the Student Organization Leadership Conference indicate they gained reasoning skills from their participation while approximately 70% of Nuts & Bolts participants rated an increase. Residential students rated their problem solving skills at a 4.90 on a 1 to 6 scale after participating in Residential Life programs.

To help students develop practical competence or life skills the Financial Aid staff members provide workshops for students to better understand financial management, and the Career Center coordinates numerous workshops about interview preparation and resume writing where approximately 70% of respondents indicate their skills at the high or very high rating. The Office of Student Conduct & Ethical Development assesses students' understanding of their responsibilities as members of the SJSU community through reflective papers and discussions. Several departments have utilized Strengths Quest as an avenue to assist students in gaining a better understanding of their five core strengths and how to leverage them for success.

The departments within the Division of Student Affairs work collaboratively with students, faculty, and staff in other divisions to contribute to SJSU's academic mission and foster a sense of belonging for SJSU students. Our educators utilize a holistic approach to programming in order to meet the diverse needs of our students and assist them in reaching their goals. We strive to

create a supportive environment and innovative learning opportunities for our students. This is especially, and literally, true for one of the largest components of Student Affairs: Housing and Residential Life.

Approximately 1100 students are housed in the legacy halls while the new Campus Village buildings provide approximately 560 first-year students with an option of "suite-style" living. In addition, the Campus Village Apartments B building, housing approximately 1450 residents, provides an opportunity for us to retain more of our upper class students. Finally, Campus Village Building A apartment-style housing is home to approximately 150 seniors, faculty and staff. A full report on Housing and Residential Life is found in Appendix I.

III. Leadership and Stability

The team's concern is that our assessment and inclusive excellence work, as well as other programming and initiatives, should be sustainable in terms of faculty workload and resource support. Further, we should institutionalize our programs so that they continue to thrive even during leadership transitions.

Perhaps the most significant evidence of our response is the continued budget support for assessment (as described above). We have carried on, and grown, our assessment program through three Presidents and two Provosts because the strategic planning process identified it as a priority and because that priority was built into our base budgeting. As we prepare for the next WASC accreditation cycle, we have actually increased our annual budget support for assessment and accreditation to allow for increased training and development of faculty as part of the capacity building we believe will be necessary. In the most recent budget plan, we built in a four-year projection for such support. We are now beginning to send younger faculty members to the WASC workshops so that we build a broad base of understanding, support, and expertise for assessment.

Another development that will support both stability and sustainability of our efforts is the development and increasing robustness of our Office of Institutional Research which provides accessible data, dashboards, and custom reporting. An overview of OIR will be found in Appendix J. The website can be viewed at: <http://www.oir.sjsu.edu>. OIR's work also provides integral support to the Retention and Graduation Initiative, described below.

IV. Retention and Graduation Initiatives

In Fall, 2009 the CSU mandated that all 23 campuses develop systematic plans to improve overall retention and graduation success, with special attention to underrepresented minority students. The plan requires quarterly public updates of our progress, which can be viewed, along with all action steps, timetables, and metrics, at http://www.sjsu.edu/provost/Retention_Graduation/.

Goals: By Fall 2015, our 6-year graduation rate will increase by 9% (from 41.9% to 50.9%) for all first-time freshmen. Graduation rate of Under-Represented Minorities (URM) is expected to improve by 12% (from 35.5% to 47.5%). For upper division transfers, the 6-year graduation rate will increase by 6% (from 66.1% to 72.1%). Graduation rate of URM transfers will improve by 10% (58.8% to 68.8%). With these changes, our achievement gap between URM and non-URM students will decrease by approximately 3.4% for first-time freshmen and 4.5% for upper division transfers. Following are brief descriptions of some of the major action steps of the plan.

Student Academic Success Services (SASS): On our campus, the academic advising unit has moved back and forth between divisions. In part this reflected changes in management philosophy that came with leadership transitions; in part it reflected various dissatisfactions with

ability to control various aspects of the overall process. In response to the Initiative, Provost Selter collaborated with the VP Student Affairs to arrange a transition of Academic Advising and Retention Service (AARS) back to Academic Affairs. We completed the transition in Fall 2010.

Other student success programs currently housed in Student Affairs will also be integrated under a new supervisory unit in Academic Affairs: Student Academic Success Services (SASS). The following units will come under its supervision during Fall 2010:

- Student Athletic Success Services
- Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC),
- Writing Center
- EOP
- Trio's ASPIRE Program,
- Trio's McNair Scholar Program
- Connect, Motivate, Educate Society (foster youth).

Academic Advising: We are creating a centrally located advising satellite center in Clark Hall that will serve as a hub for transfer students. (The current AARS unit operates out of the Student Services Center located off the edge of campus.) Currently, there are three college-based advising centers (Business, Engineering and Science) and the College of Applied Sciences and Arts will open their new advising center in Fall 2010. The remaining colleges are exploring this option.

Project Transition: Graduate High Unit Seniors: The first major targeted effort to improve our graduation rates started in spring 2009 when the magnitude of our budget cuts for 2009-10 became fully apparent. We determined that, at the end of the spring 2009 term we had 5038 students with over 120 units (1047 with 150 units or more) and that 1737 of them had NOT applied to graduate. We began a yearlong effort of advising outreach, intensive messaging, and selective application of registration holds to get these students on track to graduation. In spring 2010 we had reduced the overall number of students with 120 or more units by 31 percent, and the number with over 150 units by 33 percent. Even more impressive was our reduction of the numbers of those who had not yet applied to graduate by nearly 70 percent (and of those with over 150 units, by over 75 percent).

Remedial Education and Closing the Achievement Gap: For incoming frosh who are remedial in math and/or English, we are planning to offer (starting summer 2012) an "early start" summer program that begins remediation studies before students begin their coursework at SJSU, as mandated by CSU Executive Order No. 1048. For incoming frosh who require remediation in English, we plan to offer a 6-unit "stretch course" (starting Fall 2012) that combines development work with the ENGL 1A curriculum, based on a successful San Francisco State model (with retention and remediation completion success rates above 90 percent). We have also just been invited by the Carnegie Foundation to participate in a pilot project for mathematics remediation – STATWAY – that will offer a similar one-year "stretch" course via an innovative statistics pathway through to completion of the GE B4 mathematics requirement.

Writing Skills Test (WST) Remediation: Poor writing skills among our students leads many to fail the CSU Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement that, at SJSU, begins with the high stakes WST (required to complete final 12 units of upper division General Education requirements). After multiple failures, many students become stranded, even though they successfully complete all major courses.

We will implement a policy change to encourage students to take the WST as soon as they complete ENGL 1B and require that they take WST prior to reaching 75 units. In Spring 2009 we developed and offered (in Special Session) a new 3.0 unit baccalaureate credit writing proficiency course that could provide an alternative demonstration of writing competency to the WST. We offered approximately 25 sections of this course in pilot mode during spring and summer 2010 and during Fall 2010 our Writing Requirements Committee reviewed the evidence of completion

rates, course practices, and writing samples and recommended adjustments that will be implemented in Spring 2011. Fortunately, recent budget augmentations to CSU mean that we will be able to offer this course in regular state-supported session. OIR is tracking the success of students who pass the 96S course, and comparing results with other student cohorts. Finally, we are working with majors to require passing WST prior to select gateway courses so that students don't complete their entire major without passing the WST.

Identifying and Removing Barriers to Student Success: Among other efforts, we now track scheduling of bottleneck courses on the OIR website:
<http://www.oir.sjsu.edu/Reports/EP/default.cfm?version=graphic>.

Predictive Modeling for Retention: The purpose of predictive modeling for retention is to help us identify student risk elements after admittance, but prior to enrollment, so that we can identify students most likely to drop out (or likely to persist); identify specific characteristics that contribute to non-persistence; and plan and implement targeted, pro-active interventions to prevent student attrition.

Identification of Other Changes and Issues

Changes in key personnel have been highlighted in the Institutional Context section of this report. We have a Presidential search underway and a new President is expected to start the 2011-12 academic year. Since Provost Selter is nearing retirement, we might reasonably expect a new Provost in the year following. In addition, we are searching for a new VP/Chief Information Officer and our VP Administration and Finance has announced her retirement effective in spring 2011. Current organizational charts reflecting these changes will be found in the Appendix.

Our most pressing issues of concern surround California state budget allocations and our rapidly changing enrollment environment. For example, in this academic year (2010-11) we have already received five (progressively higher) enrollment and funding targets from the CSU system, ranging from 20,027 to 22,222 FTES. Each of the targets is linked to separate funding assumptions. Impaction affects the access dimension of our Mission. Because we have been so long in growth mode, the changing landscape has presented us with a steep learning curve for enrollment management. In 2009-10 we impacted 17 programs (most for the first time) and we have been approved for campus wide impaction of all programs for 2011-12. Also for 2011-12 we have set a requirement that all entering frosh who come from more than a 30 mile radius from campus will be required to live in campus housing.

We have recently completed a substantive change permitting us to offer a fully online BA in Global Studies, now in its first semester. Our earlier substantive change proposal for an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership was withdrawn from WASC consideration in Fall 2009 because of the poor economic climate. We anticipate that we will reactivate that proposal after the economy improves. We do not anticipate any new programs that would rise to the level of accreditation issues. In other aspects (governance structure, financial results) the institution is sound and we have no significant issues to report.

Concluding Statement

It is always valuable to have outside evaluation to focus reflection on our institutional practices and performance. Clearly the three major thrusts of the Commission's focus for this Interim Report have engaged the campus with sensitive, timely, and significant issues: assessment of student learning outcomes, the integration of Inclusive Excellence with the full array of campus programs, and the improvement of retention and graduation rates -- with particular care for the success of underrepresented minority students. Not surprisingly, these issues are also paramount in higher education across the U.S.

We believe our responses have had a major impact on helping us to target our energies toward productive planning and meaningful outcomes. We are proud of the comprehensive and detailed nature of our Diversity Master Plan and the fact that it integrates all aspects of a student's educational experience. It may well be the single best operational plan the campus has produced. Though we are at an early stage, the results reported here give us optimism that we are making progress and that we will have significant achievements to report in our next full accreditation cycle. Similarly, the Retention and Graduation initiative is leading us to undertake careful planning to produce measurable outcomes. With a new leadership team in place, dedicated resources, action step ownership and accountability, and quarterly public progress reports we believe we are on the right road. Our ability in 2009-10 to manage enrollment down by 12% to within 1% of our target -- and to reduce significantly our numbers of "swirling" high unit seniors -- give us additional confidence that we are improving.

Our most problematic area continues to be achieving the complete culture change required to be an institution driven by a commitment to assessment of learning outcomes and evidence-driven program improvement. We have not yet resolved faculty resistance to what is still perceived as "bureaucratically imposed workload of dubious value," though we have made significant progress. Institutional inertia requires multifaceted solutions, not least of which is adapting the faculty tenure policy and reward system to recognize the value of meaningful assessment for program improvement. We seem to be at a generational turning point; it is proving difficult to find many senior faculty who are willing to change their "tried and true" approaches to accommodate the new paradigm. We plan to target our most recently hired tenure track faculty to engage them in these efforts early in their career. For the time being, we are continuing to follow WASC's advice to cultivate, support, and reward the early adopters and those who are engaging the problems -- on the assumption that others will follow. We are encouraged by administrative support for the GE program outcomes assessment pilot, which provided faculty release time for 9 faculty members last semester (described above).

Finally, our responses to the Commission (and our reflection on where we stand) have brought to the surface the inadequacy of our strategic planning process. Through the turbulence of leadership changes over the past five years we seem to have lost our hold on Vision 2010. We had established a comprehensive planning structure, including a Goals Advisory Committee, a University Planning Council, and a Resource Review Board. For several years these groups set goals, identified resource priorities and followed up on outcomes. But with the changes in leadership, the groups were dissolved. Under President Whitmore's two-year tenure the Diversity Master Plan was finalized and turned over for implementation and Sustainability was announced as a new strategic goal; he appointed a new Director of Sustainability and we are now developing a campus sustainability plan, including new curricular possibilities. Our former embrace of a third goal -- internationalizing our campus -- also slipped out of sight. We have a strong campus constituency that supports this goal, however. Most recently, the SJSU Salzburg Program has been named one of the nation's top ten citizen diplomacy programs in the field of higher education by the U.S. Center for Citizen Diplomacy, in partnership with the U.S. State Department and the NAFSA Associate of International Educators (see: <http://salzburg.sjsu.edu>). Our selection last month by AAC&U as one of 32 universities to lead the "GE in a Global Century" initiative buttresses our commitment to move forward in this area (see: http://www.aacu.org/SharedFutures/global_century).

Provost Selter, following the dictates of a new university policy (see: www.sjsu.edu/senate/S09-6.htm) is currently reviving the strategic planning process on campus. We are optimistic that once the new planning process takes hold we'll be able to integrate our academic program planning, our faculty recruitment, and our curriculum development more productively to support our efforts to become a leading engaged university for the global century.

Required Documentation (Appendices)

- Current Catalog (<http://info.sjsu.edu/home/catalog.html>)

- Summary Data Form
- Required Data Exhibits
- Most Recent Audited Financial Statements
- Organization Charts or Table