

1 **REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM**

2 **For the Special Visit Conducted at**

3 **San Jose State University**

4 **March 1-3, 2006**

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Team Roster

13

Geoffrey Chase (San Diego State University), Chair

14

Patricia Hutchings (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching)

15

Teresa Shaw (Claremont Graduate University)

16 **Description of the Institution and Visit**

17 The team would like to begin by thanking members of the San Jose State
18 University community for their helpfulness, collegiality, and hospitality. The team was
19 impressed with the attention to detail that went into this visit. It made the team's work
20 easier and enjoyable. The team wishes to thank in particular President Kassing, Provost
21 Sigler, Bob Cooper, Kathleen Roe, Beth Von Till, and all of the members of the
22 Accreditation Steering Committee. Their work, their openness, and their support set a
23 positive context for this special visit.

24 San Jose State University, California's first public institution of higher education
25 is located in the heart of Silicon Valley. Currently, it is comprised of seven colleges, 60
26 departments, and offers more than 150 degree programs. In the last fifteen years, San
27 Jose State University has granted 87,000 BAs and MAs combined, and thus the
28 university has a key role to play in San Jose and in neighboring communities. The
29 institution has a strong sense of its history, its core values and, increasingly, a clear vision
30 of its future. The team's sense is that SJSU is taking bold steps into the future while
31 remaining true to its mission, history, and the shared commitments that contribute to its
32 culture.

33 Several key changes in leadership have taken place at San Jose State University
34 since the Capacity and Preparatory Review site visit took place in October 2004.
35 Foremost among these have been the appointments of Carmen Sigler as Provost and Vice
36 President of the Academic Division, of Veril Phillips as Vice President for Student
37 Affairs, of Rose Lee as Vice President for Administration and Finance, and of Fred
38 Najjar as Interim Vice President for Advancement. These appointments have helped

39 reorganize and focus the administration in ways that have led to greater coherence and
40 more fully developed institutional planning. The team also wishes to make note of the
41 Greater Expectations retreat involving 60 faculty, students, staff, and administrators from
42 San Jose State University in January 2006. This retreat clearly had a significant impact on
43 the campus and laid the groundwork for a greater sense of direction, commitment, and
44 focus on integrated learning. Events such as this retreat, fully supported by the campus
45 leadership, can be instrumental in helping faculty develop consensus and define more
46 clearly their focus.

47 This report follows the WASC special visit conducted in March 2006 by Geoffrey
48 Chase (chair), Teresa Shaw, and Pat Hutchings with assistance from Barbara Wright, the
49 WASC staff liaison for San Jose State University. The visit took place on March 1 – 3
50 and involved meetings with administrators, staff, and faculty. Additionally, a secure
51 email account was established so that any member of the campus community could
52 provide the team with additional feedback. The focus of this report is on the issues and
53 concerns raised in the WASC Commission action letter in 2005.

54

55 **Quality of the Special Visit Report and Supporting Evidence**

56 The Team found the Special Visit Report to be well-prepared and responsive to
57 the specific concerns raised in the April 2005 Commission letter. In addressing such
58 concerns or issues, the report made use of appropriate evidence and data. The report was
59 clearly written and focused, and the links to data and exhibits highlighted in the text of
60 the report facilitated the identification of additional evidence. The links in the on-line
61 version of the report were active and useful.

62 As the steering committee and campus leadership prepares for the educational
63 effectiveness review and visit, the team strongly encourages a shift to an “inquiry based”
64 approach to the process and to the writing. That is, a shift from capacity to effectiveness
65 should be reflected in a shift from “what we can do” to “what are our questions?” “how
66 do we know if we are effective?” and “how do we respond to what we learn?”

67

68 **Description of the Team Review Process**

69 The visiting team’s process began with a reading and review of the written self-
70 study and linked materials on the Web. Using the framework supplied by WASC, each
71 team member prepared an initial analysis of issues, which were then consolidated and
72 discussed during a conference call the week before the visit. During that call, a number
73 of needed adjustments in the schedule for the visit were identified, and the team is
74 especially grateful to Robert Cooper and his colleagues for accommodating the team’s
75 request for changes.

76 The visit began on Wednesday morning, March 1, with a meeting with President
77 Kassing; that meeting set the stage for everything that followed, providing the team with
78 a sense of current themes and issues that recurred throughout many of the team’s
79 interactions with faculty and staff. Sessions were organized around key topics from the
80 self-study, and team members were pleased with the range of participants in those
81 meetings, and impressed by their thoughtfulness and candor.

82 Throughout the visit, the team (which included Barbara Wright from WASC for
83 the first half of the visit) met to compare notes, examine documents, and share drafts of a

84 preliminary report. Key themes and findings were then represented in a final debriefing
85 session at the end of Friday morning.

86

87 **Team Findings, Analysis, and Recommendations**

88 *Strategic Planning and Institutional Research*

89 Under President Kassing’s leadership, San Jose State University
90 has engaged in a strategic planning process that has been broadly
91 inclusive and that has led to a large degree of consensus on campus
92 about where the university is headed. Broadly shared core values—
93 assessment, inclusive excellence, integrated learning, and a focus on the
94 curriculum—inform the both the Vision and the Goals that the university
95 has set for itself. The goals—Enhancing Academic Quality, Enhancing
96 the Student Experience, Improving Campus Work Environment, and
97 Strengthening Community Alliances—are clearly articulated and have
98 been communicated widely across the campus community. These goals
99 reflect the core commitments of the university and the team was
100 impressed with the high degree of understanding and commitment to
101 these goals (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

102 San Jose State University has also developed an elegant and
103 effective strategy that aims to align resources and efforts to reach these
104 goals. Initially developed by the Goals Advisory Committee, the goals
105 have led to Goals 2010 and a Vision for the university. To keep this
106 process working, a second group, the University Planning Council, has

107 been formed to propose strategies to achieve the goals, to solicit input
108 from panels comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, and
109 to forward initiatives to the Resource Planning Board (RPB). Once the
110 RPB has reviewed proposals, it forwards funding proposals to the
111 President.

112 This process is still in the early stages but it shows significant
113 promise and the team was impressed with the support the process has
114 across the campus community. The process is well understood, is open
115 and transparent, invites involvement from diverse stakeholders, has
116 served to build a culture of commitment and innovation, and it creates a
117 means through which planning becomes a dynamic process. The
118 strategic plan is designed as a living document and the team was
119 impressed with the degree to which the plan provides direction while
120 also remaining flexible and open.

121 It is also clear to the team that key administrators have
122 demonstrated their commitment to the shared values of San Jose State
123 University and of the planning process. They have done this through
124 active involvement with the process and, perhaps most importantly, by
125 providing resources to allow campus initiatives focused on student
126 learning to move forward. The result is that faculty have become
127 increasingly engaged and positive about the process. The mood on
128 campus is positive, upbeat, and reflects a phrase the team heard often:
129 “it’s our time.” Increasingly, San Jose State University refers to itself as

130 “a university of choice” and the individuals with whom we met are
131 proud of that designation. There is a great deal of pride and commitment
132 at San Jose State University and a good deal of that is related to the
133 planning process that has been developed and implemented.

134 At the same time, the team wishes to note that this planning
135 process is relatively new and it will be important to realize early
136 successes to keep the momentum going forward. This will be
137 challenging given resource constraints and other pressures, but the
138 university is well poised to move forward. *As it does, faculty need to be*
139 *rewarded for their work and efforts and campus leadership will need to*
140 *provide them with time and resources to keep moving ahead.*

141 One way to do this will be to build on the early gains that have
142 been made in the area of institutional research once the new Associate
143 Vice President for Institutional Research is on board. Creating this
144 position and pulling together key staff for this new office will allow the
145 university to continue to build its culture of evidence and inquiry. The
146 new software system (Cognos) the university has purchased will also
147 provide meaningful, useful data at all levels at the university, from the
148 president right on through department chairs, and will provide a basis for
149 ever more alignment between the Vision, the Goals, and the activities
150 and initiatives in divisions, colleges, and departments (CFRs 4.5, 4.6).

151

152

153 ***Assessment***

154 The assessment of student learning is an essential component of educational
155 effectiveness, and not one that is easily achieved. To build an authentic “culture of
156 evidence” requires wide engagement by members of the campus community and long-
157 term institutional commitment. The team was pleased to see that SJSU has made
158 significant progress toward this long-term goal since the capacity visit. A number of
159 useful processes are now in place, and though they have not yet “taken” equally in all
160 settings, and though clear links with other processes of decision making must still be
161 forged, the team heard notable success stories that can show the way toward more
162 widespread habits of gathering and using evidence of student learning to improve the
163 institution’s educational effectiveness.

164

165 Assessment at SJSU is quite well established in the general education program,
166 where the course-embedded model that was initiated in the late 90s is now a regular
167 expectation. The community understands that as faculty submit courses for continuing
168 certification, they must address questions about how student learning of key objectives is
169 assessed. Importantly, this process has consequences: courses in which mechanisms for
170 assessment are deemed inadequate are not recertified (4.4).

171 The team was impressed by the assessment *process* in general education, but
172 perhaps even more important is the vision that drives that process. Individuals who have
173 been active on the Board of General Studies (BOGS) are clearly able to articulate the
174 “big ideas” behind assessment: that it begins in clarity about outcomes, entails habits of
175 inquiry and evidence gathering, and values evidence (and analysis and deliberation about

176 evidence) as essential to ongoing improvement. These are simple ideas but powerful
177 ones that are often *not* understood, especially when faculty perceive assessment to be
178 someone else's agenda imposed from outside. In this sense, assessment in general
179 education provides a kind of demystification that can be extremely useful in the more
180 challenging (or at least newer) arena of assessment of the major. Indeed, faculty from
181 several fields reported that their experience with GE assessment enabled them to assist
182 their department colleagues in understanding and embracing assessment. *The team*
183 *believes that more of this kind of cross-program learning could usefully be encouraged*
184 *and organized.*

185 We are aware that the GE program is now attempting to move toward a more
186 integrative model of student learning, and this transition—assuming that the proposed
187 model is approved--will bring new assessment opportunities and challenges. In particular
188 it will raise the need to look *across* courses at what students' learning adds up to over
189 time. This will be an important step forward for the campus because *assessment must*
190 *move beyond the level of the individual course in order to provide the kind of bigger-*
191 *picture data about learning outcomes that are needed for decision making.* We are aware
192 that there is talk about the use of electronic portfolios as one strategy for more integrative
193 assessment, and, *for the EE visit, the campus will certainly want to showcase assessment*
194 *processes and results that move beyond the course level, whether through portfolios or*
195 *other mechanisms.*

196 Assessment in the major is a newer venture, one that has clearly been moved
197 forward by the "fast tracking" of this goal by the University Planning Committee. The
198 team was pleased to see that departments are moving through a step-by-step, iterative

199 process that has the potential to generate real progress in the next several years. We
200 heard about departments in which the call for assessment served as a prompt for useful
201 departmental conversations about outcomes, and about the need to make expectations
202 more public and explicit for students. We were particularly impressed by the exercise of
203 mapping agreed-upon outcomes against courses that a number of departments have
204 undertaken, an exercise that uncovers issues about alignment and also helps faculty see
205 that they are not exclusively responsible for all aspects of students' learning in the major.

206 The team also heard about useful changes and improvements that have resulted
207 from the assessment process in some departments—developments that should be at the
208 heart of the EE report. For example: based on a careful reading of student papers
209 assigned late in the program, one department decided to introduce a key concept earlier in
210 the curriculum. Another realized that a key outcome had been neglected and built it more
211 explicitly into the program. It is hoped that there will soon be further and more extensive
212 examples of improvement driven by the assessment process.

213 The team was struck by the decision to invite a focus on one student learning
214 outcome at a time; most departments have little assessment experience, and a broad
215 mandate to assess “the whole program” can be daunting, even paralyzing. Breaking the
216 task up into smaller increments seems a useful approach, and, as indicated here, the
217 team's conversations with multiple departments and our examination of department
218 reports shows that it has made progress possible.

219 Predictably that progress is quite uneven. In programs where specialized
220 accreditation has adopted an outcomes-based approach, the concept of assessment is not
221 new and progress has been easier. In one such case, it appears that work on assessment is

222 now so extensive the program is being advised to cut back, to streamline. But this is
223 clearly the exception. Departmental documents, and comments by faculty, make it clear
224 that this new work is difficult. In some settings it has met with hostility; in others,
225 perplexity. The language can be off-putting in some fields: while some disciplines may
226 find the idea of “rubrics” appealing, others (the team was told) “glaze over” when the
227 word is mentioned. And in just about all settings there are workload issues: Faculty are
228 already pressed from many directions, and where assessment appears to be “one more
229 thing” (and a thing people do not understand), there is understandable resistance. None
230 of this is unique to San Jose State University.

231 The question, then, is how to move forward—especially in settings where
232 assessment is being undertaken in perfunctory ways, as a bureaucratic requirement that
233 no one really cares about or believes will make a difference (3.8). Indeed, it was not
234 clear to the team how departments in need of further support and assistance are being
235 identified or, for that matter, what kinds of support are planned for the crucial next year
236 of work to move *all* programs (even those that are making good progress) ahead. Perhaps
237 such support can be provided in part by the center that provides support for teaching—
238 since, after all, assessment should be seen as closely linked with teaching effectiveness.
239 In any event, this is a critical time for building on what has been done.

240 One possibility is to find success stories and make them more widely known. The
241 team was struck by the fact that departments do not have many opportunities to learn
242 from one another’s work on assessment. (Bringing departments together for the site visit
243 created useful exchange, as several participants noted.) Hearing examples of successful
244 approaches is key to further progress. *What would be especially powerful is to organize*

245 *occasions where programs (including general education) could share examples of*
246 *cumulative assessment which looks at learning over time rather than only in discrete*
247 *courses.*

248 Drawing on lessons from other institutional settings may be helpful as well.
249 Nothing that the team observed at San Jose is unique; many institutions have faced the
250 same challenges. In fact we heard about a very useful consultation with an expert from
251 the CSU system who offered a workshop and individual departmental consultations;
252 many appeared to have found this useful. *More opportunities to draw on expertise from*
253 *other settings may be a good investment.*

254 But perhaps the most important next step will be to ensure that assessment comes
255 to be seen *as making a difference*. Without a sense of consequence, many faculty will
256 conclude that assessment has simply been a bureaucratic exercise. *What's needed is a*
257 *much firmer, more concretely imagined set of links between assessment processes and*
258 *data and institutional planning, decision making and allocation of resources*. Many of
259 the individuals we talked with were *hoping* such links would be made but unclear about
260 how that would happen, what it would look like. Certainly the program planning process
261 is a crucial link, and the team suggests finding ways to *illustrate how assessment will be*
262 *part of the new program planning process*. That will both lower anxiety and create new
263 visions of what's possible. It is, of course, when assessment is used as a basis for
264 significant institutional decisions that people will fully appreciate its usefulness (4.3). A
265 few high visibility, positive examples of this in the next year would be extremely
266 valuable.

267 Finally, the team believes that assessment must be factored into current
268 discussions about faculty roles and rewards. We are aware that RTP guidelines are
269 currently under discussion but as things now stand most faculty seem persuaded that
270 work on assessment will not count—at least not much. It would be useful, too, to assist
271 faculty to “make the case” for their work on assessment (and related matters of teaching
272 and curriculum) as a form of scholarly work.

273

274 ***Enrollment Management***

275 In the sixteen months since the preparatory review team visit to the
276 SJSU campus, the faculty and staff have made enormous progress in
277 developing an enrollment management plan that is comprehensive,
278 inclusive of student retention and satisfaction, and based in a strategic
279 planning process. The visiting team believes that there are talented and
280 resourceful people in place who can guide the approval and
281 implementation of the enrollment management plan with skill and
282 professional understanding. We found a high level of ability to manage
283 the aspect of enrollment management related to setting targets and
284 forecasts, a well-informed approach to recruiting and communication
285 plans for admitted students, and a deep commitment to enlarging the
286 view of enrollment management from a traditional focus on “bringing in
287 bodies” to a broad focus on student affiliation with SJSU, retention, and
288 satisfaction. In addition, we found that the campus has a solid foundation
289 of information technology resources, availability of data, improved

290 reporting tools, and advising resources based in the PeopleSoft data
291 management system. The technology and data resources, in turn, are
292 clearly linked to the goals of the entire plan.

293 The Enrollment Management Panel associated with the strategic planning process
294 has been meeting intensively for most of the past year, and has developed a
295 comprehensive plan that will be considered for approval this spring by both the Faculty
296 Senate and the University Planning Council (UPC). Many specific action steps and
297 milestones are already in place, but several key elements must still be realized (see
298 below). The next year will be critical for approval of the plan, allocation of resources,
299 coordination of those actions steps already underway, and implementation of the
300 complete plan. While the enrollment management plan as an integrated initiative is thus
301 at a fairly early stage, and the plan is ambitious in its linkages with assessment, student
302 support, and progress to degree, the team believes that the institution has the capacity for
303 success. Several factors led to the team's conclusion:

304 1. The enrollment management process and the responsibility for implementation are
305 clearly integrated into the university's strategic planning process, its articulated goals
306 (Goals 2010), and its structure for decision making and resource allocation. The
307 Enrollment Management Panel, like other "Panels" associated with specific goals of the
308 University, is chaired by a member of the UPC and includes both interested members of
309 the SJSU community as well as key faculty and staff who have knowledge, capacity, and
310 responsibility for the plan's different components. In turn, the UPC and the Faculty
311 Senate will approve the plan developed by the Panel. Both the planning process and the

312 approval process are clearly understood, communicated to the community, and consistent
313 with the university's broader strategic planning and goal setting activities (CFR 3.8).

314 2. The enrollment management plan is based on a university-wide process that links
315 decision making about numbers and types of students, and numbers and types of
316 programs (the traditional "supply and demand" approach to enrollment management)
317 with other goals of the university, specifically the enhancement of the student experience
318 (through enhanced connections between the student and university community, enhanced
319 tracking and advising, and enhanced capabilities to understand and respond to different
320 students' needs). The team found that this integrated approach is clearly understood by
321 the faculty and staff.

322 3. The team found that the enrollment management process at SJSU is a clear
323 example of the alignment of people and resources with the strategic objectives of the
324 University (CFR 4.2). We also found that, while the potential for a full and regular
325 "feedback loop" in which evidence of student learning and institutional effectiveness
326 continually informs the process will take some time to realize, the enrollment
327 management plan provides the structure for success in this area (CFR 4.3). Indeed, we
328 found examples of this already happening:

- 329 • Enrollment management issues and questions have been integrated into the five-
330 year cycle of program planning and review for each department on campus.
331 External examiners now consider issues of configuration of degree programs,
332 demand, balance between graduate and undergraduate programs, and optimal
333 enrollment as part of the overall review process. Already the faculty and
334 administrators in programs have made some significant decisions as a result of

335 this process. For example, the Department of Social Science has decided no
336 longer to admit graduate students, and the Department of Psychology eliminated
337 one graduate program and in order to concentrate its resources on others.

338 • The enrollment management plan’s emphasis on advising is informed by evidence
339 in the NSSE study and from an analysis of current practice by an SJSU marketing
340 class that suggests that students need more contact with and mentoring by faculty
341 and more opportunities for connection with the campus community. For example,
342 in response to recommendations from the marketing students, the Student Affairs
343 office has staffed an information kiosk. This is supportive of other goals and
344 themes of the strategic planning process, such as SJSU as a “university of choice”
345 and “learning and belonging.”

346 • Campus advising as well as a greater attention to recruiting and tracking students
347 are supported by the “degree audit” component of the PeopleSoft system that
348 allows students and faculty to access quickly a summary of progress to degree,
349 including a “what if” function that creates a scenario for those considering a
350 change of major. The student affairs staff and faculty also have the capability,
351 through a tracking system, to identify students who may need immediate contact,
352 for example students whose GPA falls below a certain point. Such intervention,
353 not an easy thing with a large student body, is part of the retention efforts built
354 into the overall enrollment management plan. This is a high level of functionality
355 that brings individuals and information together, and it is supported by a strong
356 PeopleSoft training program for faculty, staff, and students.

357 • The enrollment management plan is also clearly linked to broader campus
358 initiatives on student success, helping students develop “roadmaps” to the
359 undergraduate and graduate degree or credential, and retention. One example of
360 the type of academic program that both informs and is informed by these efforts is
361 the “Success in Science” course (SCI 002) for first year science students. Science
362 faculty and Academic Services staff worked together to design a course that has
363 already had a measurable positive impact on retention, GPA, and general
364 academic standing for students who complete the course. The development of this
365 course represents, it seems to the team, an ideal coordination of disciplinary
366 knowledge, understanding of best practice in student retention and success, and
367 use of institutional data for program development and refinement (CFR 4.4).

368

369 4. The advising emphasis mentioned above is particularly impressive. The team
370 observed a strong understanding of advising as key to retention and thus enrollment
371 management. Some new systems for enhancing advising and communication have
372 already been implemented in response to needs identified through the planning process
373 and focus groups. For example, a Communication Plan that establishes and tracks
374 consistent, frequent, and action-oriented contacts with prospects and admitted students
375 has been implemented. The plan reflects an overarching strategy of integrating students
376 into the University community as early as possible. Regarding advising of enrolled
377 students, ten general staff advisors in Academic Services are deployed as liaisons to
378 colleges for the purpose of improving linkages between general education advising and
379 advising in the major. A coherent and consistent schedule of required advising points for

380 all undergraduate students is being implemented. This will allow for contact with
381 students at critical points in their progress toward their degrees. A full proposal has been
382 developed for an enhancement of advising that will include a central “hub” for electronic
383 information on university requirements, a system of “peer advising” that will train to
384 students to advise other students on basic issues and requirements while freeing faculty to
385 advise students on more individual issues of career planning, focus, and research, and the
386 establishment of an “advising guru” who will coordinate these activities with information
387 resources and processes. The plan demonstrates both a clear integration with campus
388 decision-making, an alignment of resources, a clear commitment to student progress and
389 success, and a clear understanding of the use of information and data to enhance student
390 success (CFR 3.8, 4.2, and 4.3). When fully realized, the advising component will be part
391 of an informed quality assurance process (CFR 4.4).

392

393 Overall, then, the team is convinced that in relation to enrollment management the
394 university has developed a strong team, the right information resources, an integrated set
395 of goals and strategic priorities, and a clearly-understood process for aligning resources
396 with processes that further those priorities and goals. Several key needs are apparent as
397 the process moves forward and in order for the process to succeed:

- 398 • The enrollment management plan will be considered for approval by the Faculty
399 Senate and the UPC, and the Resource Planning Board will consider the Plan’s
400 resource and funding requests, this spring. The advising proposal will also be
401 considered this spring, and also has funding requests associated with it. *Along*
402 *with the obvious need for approval, the team also wonders how the resource*

403 *allocation process will “play out” over the next year, that is, how these plans will*
404 *be implemented if total funding requests are not granted.*

405 • The team was impressed that the enrollment management and advising planning
406 processes have included an awareness of faculty workload concerns, which are
407 significant on this campus. For example, *the advising committee is concerned that*
408 *enhanced advising should also be an enhancement of faculty work, and that*
409 *faculty advising should be a rewarded activity (e.g., included in the RPT process).*
410 *The team agrees and encourages further attention to these issues. This would*
411 *represent a further alignment of workload and activities with University identity,*
412 *mission, and goals.*

413 • *Some additional information and technology resources are necessary, including a*
414 *common e-mail address system for the University that will vastly improve*
415 *communication with faculty and students.*

416 • Overall, the team was impressed by the number of items outlined in the
417 enrollment management plan that have already been implemented and integrated
418 into university processes and academic advising. For example, dashboard reports
419 have been developed for use in planning at the level of the provost and the
420 president, the program planning (review) process has been revised to include
421 enrollment management considerations, first-year experience courses have been
422 expanded and revised to include emphasis on persistence, graduation, and
423 roadmaps to success, and the “My SJSU” student portal provides students easy
424 access to advising resources such as the degree audit. Nevertheless some items in
425 the plan are in development or have not been fully implemented, such as the new

426 advising plan. While the Enrollment Management Panel is working across the
427 university, with each college, in order to develop a campus-wide vision for SJSU,
428 this process is still underway, and a shared understanding of the right “mix” of
429 enrollments (by college and department, graduate and undergraduate, transfer
430 students, distance education, off-campus programs, etc.) will be critical in the
431 near future. *The team encourages the faculty and staff to continue to work for full*
432 *implementation, and full integration of the various aspects of the enrollment*
433 *management plan.*

434 • As the enrollment management plan is more fully implemented, a key challenge
435 will be *to continue to ensure that information gathered from assessment activities*
436 *within schools and across the university are integrated into the more “nuts and*
437 *bolts” matters of FTE targets.* This is critical for effective advising, tracking of
438 degree progress, and responding with appropriate changes in program offerings
439 and design. And this is the type of institutional learning that should become more
440 apparent as SJSU prepares for the education effectiveness review (CFR 4.2, 4.3,
441 4.4, and 4.5).

442

443 ***Other Issues***

444 San Jose State University has made impressive progress in the past year and a half
445 and the team was struck with the positive mood on campus, the commitment to core
446 values—“learning and belonging,” “social justice,” “great cities have great
447 universities”—and to a shared sense of purpose: “it’s our time;” “university of choice.”
448 At the same time, the team noted that many faculty were, by their own admission, tired.

449 The commitment to the university among those the team met was extraordinary. Faculty
450 and staff care about San Jose State University, and they are justifiably proud of what they
451 have achieved together.

452 The team was also aware, however, that much of the work that has been achieved
453 is still in its early stages and that much work remains to be done. *As the university moves*
454 *ahead with this work, it will be critical to attend to faculty work load issues, to provide*
455 *appropriate rewards, and to broaden campus involvement to help meet the challenges*
456 *that remain.*

457

458 ***Meeting the Expectations of the 2001 Handbook***

459 The team is confident that San Jose State University meets the expectations of the
460 2001 Handbook in regards to capacity and that it is well positioned to move ahead with
461 the educational effectiveness stage of the reaccreditation process.

462

463

464 ***Major Recommendations and Summary of Findings***

465 1. Strategic Planning and Institutional Research: As noted earlier in this report,
466 San Jose State University has made considerable progress in the areas of strategic
467 planning and institutional research. The team recommends that this work continue, and
468 that as the university moves into the future, it tracks and illustrates how planning
469 contributes to increased educational effectiveness. Specifically, the university needs to
470 continue to extend and develop the alignment that shows such promise in guiding the
471 work of faculty and student learning.

472 2. Assessment: San Jose State University has made significant progress with
473 regards to student learning outcome assessment. As the university prepares for the
474 Educational Effectiveness Report and site visit, it needs to (1) pay particular attention to
475 approaches that move from course-based to more integrative/cumulative student learning
476 outcomes. The university needs to extend work already underway and be prepared to
477 demonstrate the use of student learning outcomes at the program level. Additionally, the
478 university needs to (2) work with departments and units that are in the early stages of
479 understanding assessment so that there is less disparity across campus. The team believes
480 the university can achieve in this, in part, through the identification of more assessment
481 “success stories” in which findings have been used to make important changes in
482 teaching, curriculum, faculty development, planning and resource allocation. Finally, in
483 preparing for the educational effectiveness visit, the university needs to (3) move beyond
484 a description of assessment processes to an evaluative analysis of how those processes
485 lead to improvement.

486 3. Enrollment Management and Planning: The team recommends that the
487 university continue toward full approval and implementation of the enrollment
488 management plan and the advising plan. As it does so, the university should focus
489 especially on the integration of enrollment management with strategies for retention and
490 student success, and on using data and institutional research capabilities to inform
491 initiatives and decisions. The team feels that the elements for success are in place
492 (informed and capable professional staff, information resources, alignment with strategic
493 goals of the University, and a clear process for securing funding for components of the
494 plan) and will make such integration possible.

495 4. Preparing the Educational Effectiveness Report: San Jose State University has
496 developed a strong vision and direction. Based on the significant progress the university
497 has achieved since the site visit in 2004, the team recommends that the Educational
498 Effectiveness Report focus on inquiry, evaluation, and analysis rather than on description.
499 The team believes it is important for the university to focus its efforts around key issues
500 related to educational effectiveness rather than to attempt broad coverage of all facets of
501 the university community.

502

503