

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM CAPACITY AND
PREPARATORY REVIEW

To: San Jose State University

December 6, 2004

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

William B. DeLauder, Team Chair
President Emeritus
Delaware State University

Larry L. Loeher
Associate Vice Provost &
Director for the Office of Instructional Development
University of California, Los Angeles

Teresa M. Shaw, Assistant Chair/Team Writer
Vice Provost
Claremont Graduate University

Christina Maslach
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
University of California, Berkeley

Geoffrey W. Chase
Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies
San Diego State University

Michael P. Groener
Vice President, Business & Finance & Treasurer (ret.)
Claremont Graduate University

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the Institution according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

1
2
3 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
4 CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW TEAM REPORT
5
6 December 6, 2004

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

General Description

San Jose State University (SJSU) will celebrate its 150th anniversary in 2007. It is the oldest public institution of higher education in California, and a member of the California State University system. SJSU enrolls 29,055 students (Fall 2004, 72% undergraduate and 28% graduate), and employs approximately 806 regular faculty, 969 full-time and part-time lecturers, and 1317 staff. SJSU's most recent reaffirmation of accreditation dates to March 1995. Since then the University has submitted an interim report (1999) and several substantive change proposals (for off-site, distance education, and joint doctoral programs).

The site visit for the current Capacity and Preparatory Review took place on October 13-15, 2004. The members of the visit team were:

- William B. DeLauder, President Emeritus, Delaware State University (Team Chair)
- Teresa M. Shaw, Vice Provost, Claremont Graduate University (Team Writer)
- Geoffrey W. Chase, Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies, San Diego State University
- Michael P. Groener, Vice President, Business and Finance (ret.), Claremont Graduate University
- Larry L. Loehner, Associate Vice Provost, Director of the Office of Instructional Development, University of California, Los Angeles
- Christina Maslach, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, University of California, Berkeley

The team would like to thank the faculty, staff, and students with whom we met during our visit for their time, and for the thoughtfulness and seriousness they have brought to the self-study and review process. In particular we would like to thank Interim President Don Kassing, Robert Cooper, Bethany Shifflet, and the members of the Accreditation Steering Committee for their careful organization of the visit and for their warmth and hospitality.

Quality of the Capacity and Preparatory Report and Alignment with the Proposal

The team found the preparatory report to be comprehensive and thorough. It included much information necessary for evaluating the capacity of the institution in relation to the four standards as well as its preparation for the Educational Effectiveness review process. The team in particular would like to note that the web resources and exhibits were excellent, well organized, and well presented. We recognize the amount of work that goes into a web-based set of exhibits; and were impressed by the result. While it was sometimes difficult to tell from the paper copy of the preparatory report what data or exhibits were available on the website for each section or paragraph, overall the website was very useful.

Regarding the institutional presentation itself, team members all felt that the essays were not as reflective and focused as they could have been, and the report as a whole did not "tell the story" in a clear narrative thread. More importantly, we noticed a "disconnect" between the SJSU proposal for review (written in July 2002) and the preparatory report (completed two years later). The proposal identifies (p. 9) institutional issues and questions, including alignment of budget and academic program planning,

51 assessing the feasibility of new long-range objectives, assessment of academic programs,
52 student support services, and enrollment management planning. Goals for the University (p. 1) include
53 enrollment growth, new academic partnerships, increasing the visibility of SJSU in the region and as a
54 "destination campus," increasing collaborative programs including joint degrees and international
55 programs, increasing the number of courses and degrees offered through distributed learning, and
56 improving facilities. However, the preparatory institutional presentation claimed a specific focus on
57 enrollment management and support for student success, and there seemed to be no focus on or
58 consensus around the institutional goals stated in the proposal.

59
60 Moreover, neither enrollment management nor support for student learning received thorough attention
61 in the preparatory report, which had a broader purpose. While on campus we heard that campus leaders
62 were advised by WASC staff to narrow the focus of the preparatory review from the broad picture of the
63 proposal, but there was no acknowledgement of this issue or discussion of the development of the SJSU
64 community's thinking through this process. Finally, we noted that the two stated themes of the
65 preparatory review, enrollment management and support for student success, seem to have been treated
66 as two separate issues, with enrollment management as a capacity issue and student development,
67 learning, and success as an educational effectiveness issue. The team felt that the two themes are in fact
68 deeply connected, especially at SJSU, and we hope that they will remain integrated as SJSU moves into
69 its Educational Effectiveness Review.

70 71 **Response to Previous Commission Issues**

72
73 As summarized in the preparatory report (49-53), the SJSU community has responded well to the issues
74 raised in its last visit and summarized by the commission in 1995: We note in particular the development
75 of a GE curriculum that includes carefully articulated learning outcomes and assessment processes, the
76 appointment of an assessment director, the development of multiple programs and resources that enhance
77 multicultural education and student support, an increase in external support for faculty research, and the
78 new library facilities. In one area the campus has not made as much progress, namely, increasing the
79 percentage of full-time faculty. Clearly the constraints of state funding have impeded efforts to add new
80 full-time lines: We learned, however, that the provost and the academic division are committed to
81 increasing the percentage of fulltime faculty. Evidence of their commitment to making this a top priority
82 is the fact that 90 tenure-track searches are presently underway.

83 84 85 **II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS**

86 87 **Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

88
89 Based on both the Preparatory Review Report and the site visit, the team found that San Jose State
90 University has a clear sense of its educational mission and its core values, which are widely shared by the
91 members of the campus community (CFR 1.1, 1.2). It also has a clear identity as a Metropolitan
92 University, with strong ties to the city of San Jose and the surrounding region. The partnership with the
93 larger community is evident in such things as the shared Library, the service learning programs within the
94 local schools, and the program with NASA/Ames.

95
96 The team believes that SJSU has the capacity to carry out its mission, despite recent budget cuts and
97 interim leadership. However, it will need to consider how its mission may change, as a result of strategic
98 decisions it will need to make with regard to future challenges, particularly the composition of its student
99 body and the implications for programs, services, and enrollment management. Some of these challenges
100 are:

- 101
- 102 • The growing number of residential (vs. commuter) students, as a result of the new housing
- 103 complex that will open in Fall 2005, and the implications for campus climate and operations, and
- 104 for necessary services and programs.
- 105 • The ratio of freshmen to transfer students, and the preparation and retention issues linked to the
- 106 former:
- 107 • The ratio of graduate to undergraduate students.
- 108

109 The team believes that SJSU clearly knows what kind of institution it is currently, but that it does not yet

110 have as clear an understanding of what it will become in the future.

111

112 **Institutional Purposes**

113

114 SJSU has published statements of its mission and of its educational objectives (1.2). However, the latter

115 objectives are framed primarily at the level of student outcomes. Although these are certainly admirable,

116 the team feels that SJSU also needs to articulate the objectives it holds for itself as an institution. SJSU

117 has developed some good indicators of student achievement, particularly in its GE program. It will be

118 important to continue to develop these indicators and extend them to other educational programs

119 throughout the University.

120

121 An important next step for SJSU will be to embark on a strategic planning process, in which a vision for

122 the future is articulated, and is then used to guide decisionmaking and resource allocation. Again, the

123 team believes that SJSU has the necessary capacity to engage in this strategic planning process, and has

124 made a good start.

125

126 Particularly noteworthy is the institutional focus on enrollment management, and the commitment to

127 address the challenges of institutional research, "data gaps" and the more effective use of data for

128 decision-making and program review. A major challenge for SJSU is to identify its priorities (rather than

129 "doing everything"), and to then align its resources appropriately. There was clear evidence that all

130 stakeholders wanted to move forward on this process, rather than wait for a new permanent President to

131 lead the effort. The team concurs with this self-assessment; SJSU is currently well positioned to engage

132 in strategic planning, and the energy being devoted to this effort bodes well for beneficial outcomes for

133 the future of the campus.

134

135 **Integrity**

136

137 SJSU has published policies on academic freedom and grievance procedures (CFR 1.4, 1.7). All the

138 evidence reviewed by the team shows that SJSU acts with integrity in its educational and business

139 operations (CFR 1.8). In addition, SJSU demonstrated a strong commitment to the WASC accreditation

140 review process (CFR 1.9). The depth of faculty leadership and participation was especially noteworthy.

141 A wide range of faculty, staff, students, and administrators are actively involved in doing the work for the

142 reports, and they all expressed the opinion that this work is helping to move the institution forward.

143 Despite the challenges of budget cuts and the unforeseen changes in the presidential leadership, morale

144 was quite high and University leadership is in place and functioning at an appropriate level (CFR 1.3).

145 We noted, however, that several of the administrative positions at the University are currently filled on

146 an interim basis, one possible effect of recent transitions in the presidency.

147

148 A core value for SJSU, which was articulated by faculty, staff, and students, is its commitment to

149 diversity (CFR 1.5). Indeed, the campus is especially proud of the diverse student population, and how

150 that affects the educational experience and the quality of life on the SJSU campus. It has a number of

151 programs and services that enhance and sustain this student diversity, including the orientation program,
152 the integration of diversity themes into all general education courses and many first-year MUSE courses,
153 the MOSAIC program, multicultural student groups, diversity training, excellent services for disabled
154 students, a focus on community involvement, a McNair Scholars Program, and a campus climate
155 committee. The team noted that SJSU would now benefit from a careful assessment of the relationship of
156 demographic diversity and curricular and co-curricular diversity and campus climate efforts on the one
157 hand and student success, retention, graduation rates, and equity issues on the other. This analysis should
158 be one component of regular program review (i.e., data on graduation and attrition rates disaggregated by
159 gender and ethnicity) as well as University-wide enrollment management planning.

160
161 The diversity of the faculty is not as great as it is among the student population, as shown by faculty and
162 student demographic data. Attempts to improve this situation are constrained by state policy (Proposition
163 209), budget cuts (which have reduced faculty hiring), and market pressures, but the campus did
164 articulate its commitment to the goal of a more diverse faculty. Written guidelines for conducting faculty
165 searches offer suggestions on developing a large and diverse pool of candidates, and an Affirmative
166 Action Committee encourages faculty diversity. The team members felt, nevertheless, that SJSU needs to
167 revitalize its efforts to diversify the faculty, to become more proactive even within the legal and
168 budgetary constraints of the CSU system.

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

170
171 San Jose State is an institution committed to students and ample evidence reveals that the University is
172 moving to create a more focused and extended consideration of student learning. Challenges remain,
173 however. In reporting on Standard 2, the team wishes to note areas where significant progress has been
174 made and also point to areas where more work needs to be accomplished.

175 176 **Teaching and Learning**

177
178 The team was impressed with the energy, enthusiasm, and commitment of many of the faculty, students,
179 and student affairs staff with whom they met. This commitment translated into a strong concern for
180 student success both in and outside of the classroom. Additionally, it is clear that faculty and staff, and
181 students, can talk specifically about the kind of education SJSU offers in ways that speak to
182 communication, writing, quantitative skills and civic engagement that students need if they are to move
183 successfully into careers upon graduation (CFR2.3, 2.4, 2.5). The general education program, in
184 particular, focuses on these skills and has a broad set of goals, including a focus on diversity, that it seeks
185 to meet. Every course offered as part of the GE program, for example, must focus on some aspect of
186 diversity.

187
188 At the same time, faculty are well aware of the challenges they face. They acknowledge that more than
189 50% of the incoming freshmen need some remedial coursework, and 51% of the students at SJSU
190 identify a language other than English as their native language. Faculty and staff with whom the team
191 met, however, still spoke of diversity as a strength and commitment, and embraced these challenges with
192 regard to student learning and success.

193
194 Another challenge related to student learning deserves mention as well. While a clear focus on
195 assessment and student learning outcomes has been underway since 1998, and while significant progress
196 has been achieved in, for example, General Education, the institution needs to maintain its focus and
197 extend its efforts in this regard (2.3, 2.4, 2.5). Specifically, faculty must build on assessment in the GE
198 program, most of which is course-based, to develop mechanisms for effective program assessment.
199 Similarly, although some departments have developed clearly articulated student learning outcomes,
200

201 those efforts must be broadened to include departments in all disciplines and at all levels of the
202 curriculum.

203
204 The academic program review plan currently utilized by the University provides a second example of
205 how significant progress has been achieved upon which further refinement and improvement may be
206 based (CFR 2.6, 2.7). The review plan provides important and adequate oversight of the curriculum by
207 the faculty and does help departments set goals and define learning outcomes. The team's impression,
208 however, is that the role of the deans in this process, and the link to hiring lines and resource allocations
209 may need to be more explicitly defined. The team also supports the notion of streamlining program
210 reviews, of making them more concise, and of developing a set of standard data elements for use by
211 faculty and external reviewers in program reviews and planning. This suggests that the University would
212 benefit from reestablishing an institutional research office that will coordinate with the Director of
213 Assessment and the Program Planning Committee.

214
215 These efforts, linked to a focus on retention and graduation rates can provide an important cornerstone as
216 San Jose State University looks forward to a strategic planning process that defines its role in higher
217 education and in the region surrounding San Jose.

218
219 As part of that process, the team believes that the SJSU faculty and administration should carefully
220 consider the role and value of graduate education. The University currently offers several dozen master's
221 degree programs in professional fields as well as in the humanities, arts, and sciences. Some programs
222 are offered off campus or through successful on-line programs. In addition, SJSU has one joint doctoral
223 program in education with the University of California at Santa Cruz and has the approval of the WASC
224 substantive change committee for a joint doctoral program in urban education leadership with San
225 Francisco State, CSU Hayward, and UC Berkeley. The team noted that SJSU has submitted other
226 substantive change proposals for joint doctoral programs which were tabled, and that current discussions
227 are underway for possible joint doctoral programs in one or two programs. Overall, the team felt that the
228 role of graduate education within the mission of SJSU is not clear, and that development of graduate
229 programs seems to be based primarily, if not solely, on the interests and entrepreneurship of faculty in
230 departments. We suggest that graduate education be an explicit consideration in the University's strategic
231 and enrollment management planning.

232 233 **Scholarship and Creative Activity**

234
235 The review team found that San Jose State University promotes scholarship and creative activity, and
236 that it recognizes links between service, scholarship, teaching, and student learning (CFR 2.8, 2.9). The
237 work completed by faculty serving on the Board of General Studies (BOGS) highlights this connection at
238 SJSU. Faculty members are rewarded for their work in linking these areas of commitment. Moreover, the
239 team was pleased to hear students describe their involvement with research at early points in their
240 undergraduate careers, as well as the interdisciplinary experiences through programs such as MUSE.

241
242 The team noted, however, that budgetary issues have had an impact in these areas. First, teaching loads
243 are high and class size has increased because of budget cuts the campus has experienced in the past
244 several years. The team understands that the University is subject to fluctuations in budgets over which it
245 has little or no control, but supports wholeheartedly the commitment to increase the number of full-time
246 faculty as soon as it is able to do so. Second, the MUSE program, which the team recognized as a key
247 component of the first year experience at San Jose State University, has been severely cut back due to
248 budgetary limitations, and the team's hope is that as resources do become available, they will be restored
249 to this program. Third, the team believes that if an increased focus on student learning will be successful,
250 faculty will need more support from an office dedicated to these issues. The team understands that

251 because of budget reductions it may be necessary for faculty development to be part of academic
252 technology for the time being. However, the team also believes that resources need to be made available
253 so that the activities of the CFDS can be broadened or so that an additional office can be created. While
254 both pedagogy/teaching strategies support and technology support continue to be provided, the team's
255 impression is that most of the support for faculty currently available through the CFDS is related to the
256 use of technology and while such workshops are essential, they do not replace those that focus
257 specifically on student learning, pedagogy, and teaching strategies based on what is known today about
258 how individuals learn.

259 **Support for Student Learning**

260
261
262 San Jose State University publishes clear guidelines on grading policies, appeals processes, admissions
263 and advising processes, and academic calendars (CFR 2.10, 2.12). The University does an excellent job
264 of identifying the characteristics of its students and has a number of programs in place that support those
265 students (CFR 2.11). The review team noted in particular that the University has adopted a mandatory,
266 overnight freshman orientation program and that it offers programs throughout the year for transfer
267 students (CFR 2.13, 2.14). The University is also working on articulation with community college
268 courses in order to continue to improve the transfer process. The team wishes also to highlight the Martin
269 Luther King, Jr. Library that San Jose State University shares with the City of San Jose. The library
270 clearly provides a remarkable resource for both students and community members.

271
272 The University has also constructed Campus Village, a facility that will open in 2005 and that will
273 eventually house more than 2000 students. At the same time, the team wishes to note that the increased
274 number of students living on campus will inevitably tax a student affairs staff that has been reduced as a
275 result of recent budget reductions (2.13). Thus, while the directors in student affairs are committed to
276 supporting SJSU students and are doing so effectively, they will need additional help and support as the
277 University moves to change its campus character by providing significantly more housing for students
278 who wish to live on campus.

279 **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure** 280 **Sustainability**

281 **Financial Resources in Support of Operations**

282
283
284
285 A little over half of the total annual operating revenues of SJSU comes from a combination of State of
286 California General Fund appropriations received through the California State University system (CSU)
287 and from student fees for education. The balance comes from various self-supporting operations such as
288 housing, parking; student union, continuing education programs, student health center and bookstore,
289 from the Federal government for student financial aid and from the SJSU Foundation. The Foundation
290 administers the institution's grants and contracts and receives gifts from the private sector on behalf of
291 the institution. Funding for facilities, both construction and renewal and replacement over time, is
292 primarily from the State either in the form of direct allocations or from general obligation or revenue
293 bonds issued through CSU. Funding for new facilities or major renovations is also solicited from the
294 private sector.

295 **Faculty and Staff**

296
297
298 In general, SJSU employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its
299 operations and to support its academic programs (CFR 3.1). Budget cuts in recent years have resulted in
300 hiring freezes for many open positions. Although staff members remain committed to serving the needs

301 of the campus community, many are experiencing the pressures of overwork (CFR 3.3). A particular
302 concern of the team is the fact that already overworked personnel in the Student Services area will be
303 called upon next year to accommodate a material increase in the number of on-campus students as the
304 new Campus Village opens in fall 2005. About 1,800 students currently live on campus and the new
305 Village will accommodate over 2,000 additional students. Similar demand will increase for other support
306 areas on the academic side, such as the library, IT consultation, lab access, counseling, etc.

307
308 The student/faculty ratio at SJSU is on the rise as a result of budget cuts, and it is not likely that it will
309 decrease in the near future. A corresponding rise in the number of larger classes is also apparent. This
310 change is not merely a change in numbers, but also represents a different demand pattern for classrooms,
311 increased need for teaching support, and possibly even changes in the classroom methods employed by
312 the faculty. Attention must be given to maintaining sufficient faculty numbers to accommodate the
313 student population without decreasing the quality of student learning. If faculty relief is being obtained
314 now through the adoption of larger course sizes, it does not seem likely that there is much room for
315 further gains, sufficient to support the faculty time needed for research, if indeed more research is being
316 expected. The number of faculty, the ratio of temporary to tenure track faculty, and the distribution of
317 FTE among the colleges and departments must remain subjects of continued attention, especially within
318 the context of strategic planning.

319 **Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources**

321
322 Increasing competition among various publicly supported organizations and agencies has affected the
323 State of California's ability to continue past levels of support for higher education. The CSU, the
324 University of California and Community Colleges are actively seeking alternative sources of revenues to
325 offset shrinking state support. SJSU is currently financially stable. For the future, the institution is
326 reorganizing its Office of Institutional Advancement and its foundation structure to position it for more
327 effective fundraising efforts. While the effort and success of SJSU faculty in securing contract and grant
328 activity is good, there is considerable room for growth, and the reorganization of the University
329 Foundation is a laudable and constructive move in that direction. The formation of partnerships for more
330 cost effective mutual benefit also is being actively pursued. The new MLK Library, opened in 2003 as a
331 joint SJSU and City of San Jose project, is an example of partnering for mutual benefit. Finally,
332 generation of additional revenues through continuing education programs (what SJSU refers to as
333 International & Extended Studies - IES - Education) is encouraged. (CFR 3.5)

334 **Information Resources**

335
336
337 Information Technology has become central to almost every aspect of the academic enterprise, and SJSU
338 is engaged in re-examining its investment in IT and creating a framework for further growth (CFR 3.6,
339 3.7). The current deployment of resources suggests that SJSU has an uneven allocation of information
340 technology, with growth needed in multiple disciplinary areas. The campus is making a much-needed
341 expansion of its networking capability, and is investing wisely in basic infrastructure. There is some
342 evidence that administrative uses of computing are further advanced than academic computing. It might
343 seem paradoxical to suggest that even further investment is needed, especially in the face of budget
344 constraints, and especially when return on investment in IT is difficult to calculate. There are indications,
345 however, (from student surveys, for example) that student services could benefit enormously from further
346 computerized operations, that instruction is uneven in its use of available resources and in its utilization
347 of them, and that research and communication both have significant gains to make. With the recent
348 successful implementation of the PeopleSoft student database at SJSU, a significant and positive
349 development in itself, some of these issues should be addressed through training and assessment of
350 processes. The creation of a coherent IT coordination and development planning group, within the larger

351 context of strategic planning, would be of great advantage.
352

353 We should also note that we heard from faculty and administrators that the University provides strong
354 support staff, leadership, and information technology resources for on-line and distance education
355 programs (CFR 3.6).
356

357 **Library**

358 SJSU is justifiably proud of its new and unique Library facility, but the initial excitement should not
359 mask the longer-term serious challenges that the Library must confront. Collection development,
360 particularly the breadth and the quality of the collection are, as for almost every library, at the forefront
361 of their needs. While the inspired building partnership with the City of San Jose gives room for growth,
362 the nature of the growth must be carefully considered. The preliminary circulation statistics, all positive,
363 also suggest that at some point the public need will far outstrip the campus need within the facility, and
364 what might now seem like abundant shelving space, study areas, and online resources, will be subjects
365 for contention in the future. Program reviews give mixed pictures of the quality of the Library
366 collections, and clearly some areas are in great need of reinforcement. It is hard to reconcile the desire for
367 increased faculty research without seeing a similar growth in the investment in library resources. The
368 team would hope that the momentum obtained from opening such a fine new building would also
369 continue into finding additional means of expanding investment into Library staff and holdings (CFR
370 3.6).
371

372 **Faculty Development**

373 There are many definitions for the term faculty development, but in this report, it is understood as the
374 provision of resources for faculty to improve their teaching methods, and expand their understanding of
375 cognition, student-learning, and pedagogical approaches (CFR 3.4). While it is understandable that
376 budget constraints may have led to a cutback in the size of the SJSU Faculty Development program, the
377 merger with technology resources seems an unusual decision. This is not intended as a negative
378 reflection on the staff of the technology area, but more a recognition that the two functions are related but
379 not the same. In fact, the expansion of technology resources in the classroom, and the use of appropriate
380 technology for instruction are critical needs. Faculty development must address a broader charge and
381 include the successful incorporation of technology into teaching and learning. Student surveys suggest
382 that teaching skills and practices vary among the programs, and that students experience less
383 satisfaction with their instructors than they anticipate. Instructors, on the other hand, feel too pressed for
384 time by their teaching loads and service commitments to take advantage of faculty development efforts.
385 SJSU might wish to reconsider its definition of faculty development, and the appropriate level and types
386 of support it should provide.
387
388
389

390 **Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFR 3.8-3.11)**

391 SJSU operates through a clear organizational structure and distribution of responsibilities through the
392 faculty, staff, and administration (CFR 3.8). We noted that the dedicated individuals in these groups have
393 continued to get the work of the University done in spite of budgetary challenges and recent transitions in
394 the president's office. Interim President Don Kassing, who is very familiar with and committed to SJSU's
395 success, will provide stability over the next two years. Yet the team also observed that recent
396 reorganizations and transitions in the presidency have resulted in the fact that several high-level
397 administrative positions are now filled on an interim basis. The administration should work to achieve a
398 sense of stability throughout the organizational structure of the University (CFR 3.8, 3.10).
399
400

401 More effective utilization of scarce resources over time necessitates greater emphasis on strategic
402 planning and the establishment of goals and objectives. The campus has created a clear appreciation of
403 the value of assessment activity and process, and has benefited from the use of multiple sources of data.
404 Incorporating this data into a larger planning initiative is a critical next step. The long transition in
405 presidential succession at SJSU has resulted in delays in getting such planning moving forward. Under
406 the leadership of Interim President Kassing, a strategic planning process has begun which, when better
407 defined and fully functioning, will inform more effective resource allocation (3.8).
408

409 The budget for the current fiscal year was developed through the efforts of a new Resource Planning
410 Board (RPB), a committee with broad institutional representation established to "advise the President on
411 budget cuts and other matters pertaining to resource allocations across the University". The RPB is
412 co-chaired by the Provost and the VP of Administration and Finance. The Board has opened up the
413 budget process to key constituents allowing them to better understand operations and budget needs of the
414 various divisions. In its deliberations this past year, the Board primarily addressed the budget cuts handed
415 down by the CSU Chancellor's Office. Ideally, such a body will consider resource allocation in a longer
416 timeframe than one year's budget, and be informed by institutionally accepted goals and objectives that
417 emerge through comprehensive strategic planning.
418

419 During the past year, the institution has begun developing an improved enrollment management function.
420 Such a function can both contribute to and benefit from strategic planning. The elements of enrollment
421 management are in place; however, metrics (the numbers) are missing. The team encourages the
422 University to integrate a full enrollment planning process with strategic planning, assessment related to
423 diversity, and community reflection on the mission and objectives of SJSU. This is an especially critical
424 activity as the University enters the Educational Effectiveness phase of this review (CFR 3.8, 3.11).
425

426 Gathering and analyzing various kinds of data about the many components of the institution is a critical
427 function. At present, information is gathered in many places across the institution and is not readily
428 available for decision makers. A well defined and appropriately staffed centralized institutional research
429 function can enhance enrollment management, aid strategic planning and provide a good deal of data for
430 ongoing assessment of institutional effectiveness.
431

432 **Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

433

434 SJSU has many examples of strategic thinking and planning on a short-term basis and/or for a particular
435 project (CFR 4.1, 4.2). Under former President Robert Caret, SJSU engaged in several strategic
436 initiatives. This included the campus discussion around the concept of a Metropolitan University and the
437 formation and operation of the Budget Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate. The concept of the
438 Metropolitan University was SJSU's way of becoming more engaged with its community. The Budget
439 Advisory Committee provided a process to involve the faculty more fully in campus spending. The
440 Academic Senate and the president approved this committee in December 1996.
441

442 A Resource Planning Board (RPB) was instituted under Interim President Joseph Crowley in February
443 2004. The RPB was formed to involve more campus constituents into the annual budget development and
444 allocation process. It makes the budget process more understandable and more transparent to all campus
445 constituents. The Provost and the Vice President for Administration and Finance serve as non-voting
446 co-chairs. The Board includes representatives from all divisions within the University.
447

448 The University describes several strategic initiatives that demonstrate the University's capability in
449 planning. The most notable example was the establishment of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, a
450 joint project of the City of San Jose and SJSU. The Library opened in summer 2003. The team

451 commends SJSU for this outstanding project and resource that supports teaching, learning, and research.

452
453 Despite the examples of strategic thinking and planning, the University recognizes that a more
454 comprehensive strategic planning process is needed and is committed to establishing one (CFR 4.3). The
455 original plan was to develop a strategic planning process with the new president, who has particular skills
456 and success in strategic planning. Unfortunately, due to health reasons, the new president resigned
457 shortly after taking office in mid-July. An interim president was appointed in September and will serve
458 for two years. The University is committed to proceed with establishing a strategic planning process and
459 preliminary meetings have already been held. The team applauds this effort and commitment and
460 **recommends that SJSU move quickly to establish a strategic planning process and a strategic plan.**
461 This, **along with comprehensive enrollment management planning**, will be essential for the
462 Educational Effectiveness Review.

463
464 The University has implemented PeopleSoft, the enterprise resource planning software that was adopted
465 by the CSU system. This provides the capability to access essential data needed in order to answer
466 critical questions, to analyze data and to improve effectiveness. This will be more difficult if the
467 University does not re-establish its Institutional Research staff position. The team strongly suggests that
468 the University consider this a priority (CFR 4.3, 4.5).

469
470 The University has a program review process that requires all academic programs to be reviewed every
471 five years. The process appears to be working reasonably well. The University, however, indicates that
472 delays are sometimes involved in completing the process and getting feedback to a particular department.

473
474 We recommend that the program review process be streamlined and strengthened by the development of
475 a common set of data elements; this will support the review process and enhance the quality of
476 assessment associated with it.

477
478 The assessment of General Education is quite good. The process is in place and is working well. The
479 General Education Board is active and effective. The team commends SJSU for this outstanding
480 program. Learning outcomes have not been identified for all majors. The team **recommends that the**
481 **University move beyond general education and extend the student-learning model throughout all**
482 **undergraduate and graduate majors.** Certain programs at SJSU survey appropriate stakeholders,
483 including alumni and employers, but this is not done in all areas. The team - suggests that this be
484 expanded to include all programs.

485 486 487 III. MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

488
489 As a result of our review of materials prior to and during the visit, our conversations with various groups
490 on campus, and our understanding of the WASC standards for accreditation, we offer several general
491 observations and commendations, as well as specific recommendations and issues for institutional
492 consideration.

493 494 **Commendations**

495
496 First, the team was impressed with many aspects of SJSU's academic program, community life, and
497 institutional processes. We would like in particular to commend the SJSU community on the following:

- 498
499 • The general education program is well-developed, well-supervised, and demonstrates the broad

500 commitment of faculty and administration to meeting the specific needs of SJSU students. It
501 features a strong assessment and evaluation program and an emphasis on diversity.

- 502 • The campus has made great efforts to improve the first year experience, by developing a
503 mandatory overnight orientation and a set of first-year MUSE courses that emphasize integration
504 into college life and the metropolitan setting of SJSU. We were concerned to hear that due to
505 budgetary limitations the MUSE program has been scaled back this year.
- 506 • The faculty we met demonstrated a high level of commitment and sensitivity to the core values of
507 SJSU and to student needs. Faculty members seem to know their students and what SJSU students
508 need to be successful.
- 509 • Faculty and staff members have responded to state budgets cuts in a strong and resourceful way,
510 but this has led to some workload issues and cannot be sustained in the long term.
- 511 • SJSU has a strong and clear sense of itself as a metropolitan University and has engaged with the
512 community through the shared library, building town and gown relations, service learning
513 programs, and continuing education programs.
- 514 • The effort to create more transparency and greater involvement in budget and planning, for
515 example with the implementation of the resources planning board, is very positive.
- 516 • SJSU's quick and coordinated implementation of the PeopleSoft database in the areas of human
517 resources, finance, and student administration, is also laudable. The system should be a great asset
518 in advancing the institutional research, assessment, and planning activities of the University.
- 519 • The diversity of the SJSU student body is impressive, not simply by the numbers, but by the
520 extent to which the faculty and especially the students we met seem to have embraced diversity.
521 We noticed also the many efforts to weave diversity and campus climate into the student
522 experience (e.g., at orientation).

523 524 **Recommendations**

525
526 The following specific recommendations are supported by the discussions above.

- 527
528 1: Strategic Planning: SJSU needs to engage in comprehensive strategic planning that will build on
529 and pull together some of the planning efforts already underway at the University. The team felt
530 that although there is a strong sense of "who we are" on the campus, there is not a strong or shared
531 vision of "who we want to be." And while goals for student learning and student success are
532 carefully articulated, the institutional goals and the vision for the University have yet to be
533 affirmed and developed through a careful and shared process. We noted that this process should
534 begin immediately, and not wait for a permanent appointment to the presidency.
535
- 536 2. Enrollment Management: The University has begun the process of developing an enrollment
537 management plan, but the hard decisions about size of and balance between undergraduate and
538 graduate programs, the process of program planning, the relationship of enrollment management
539 to retention, and the educational priorities of the University need to be established. We would
540 encourage the faculty and the administration to proceed boldly with a comprehensive enrollment
541 management plan, especially in the context of strategic planning, and we would like to see this
542 addressed substantially in the educational effectiveness review.
543
- 544 3. Assessment: We commented above on the success of assessment efforts within the general
545 education program. We recommend that these efforts need now to be extended throughout the
546 undergraduate and graduate majors and degree programs. This should include a re-evaluation of
547 the program review process (its purpose, its effectiveness, and its structure).
548
549

550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586

Other Issues for Consideration

In addition, the team raises the following issues and suggestion for consideration:

1. It is not clear that the level of investment in information technology resources and infrastructure is sufficient to meet the needs of the campus.
2. It was unclear to us whether the faculty and administration has prepared for the impact of the expected increase in the residential student population with the opening of the campus village this fall. Residential students make different demands on campus services than commuting students. This will be particularly important within the student services area and among the student affairs staff.
3. While the student diversity at SJSU is notable, the faculty composition is not particularly diverse. While the team understands the legal constraints of California public education after proposition 209 and the constraints of the marketplace, these factors should not stop the faculty and administration in their commitments and their initiatives to move forward on this issue.
4. The team felt strongly that SJSU should re-establish and fill the institutional research staff position quickly. This person, and indeed a functioning institutional research office, will be essential to the processes on enrollment management and strategic planning, and to the long-term assessment and planning activities of the University.

IV. PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW

The institution has begun work on the design for the forthcoming educational effectiveness review. According to the SJSU Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, the comprehensive model of review is to be used and focused on two broad areas: enrollment management and student development and success. It appears, however, that the draft structure for the educational effectiveness review is only focused on student development and success. The team believes that the two issues are interrelated and that both should be a part of the effectiveness review. As indicated earlier in this report, the team recommended that the institution complete the metrics on enrollment management and include the assessment of the enrollment management plan as a part of the effectiveness review.

The other critical item needed for a meaningful educational effectiveness review is a campus-wide strategic plan, complete with institutional goals and objectives.