

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
1.2	The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels.	<p>Course level: The university's course outline policy requires all course outlines to include goals and objectives. In the most recent Annual Assessment Reports (2007-2008) departments were asked to review course outlines to insure that learning objectives were included and to work with faculty in assuring that these outlines conformed with university policy (Annual Assessment Reports available in WASC Team Room). Both the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) and the General Education Subcommittee require that all new course proposals contain learning outcomes that support the learning outcomes of the department or of the appropriate General Education area and subarea (see Guide for GE Course Proposal).</p> <p>Program level: All major programs and General Education have developed student learning outcomes [See SSU Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (2007-2008) in EER Report Appendix]</p> <p>Institutional level: See EER Report Essay: Distinctiveness of an SSU Education and SSU Mission Statement.</p> <p>Major program level learning outcomes, General Education outcomes, and course level outcomes are widely available in varied formats: on department and university websites, in the University Catalog, in department handbooks and handouts, and on course syllabi.</p>
1.2	The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning.	<p>Institutional Research performs systematic analysis of data on retention and graduation rates, including 6-year graduation rates by ethnicity and gender. Each program has developed student learning assessment strategies that are described in yearly Annual Assessment Reports (available in the WASC Team Room for review); departments are also required to describe their assessment strategies and results in the 5-year Program Review Process (see EER Report Essay on Academic Program Review and Program Review documents for each department in WASC Team Room). The General Educational Program has completed its program review (available for review in WASC Team Room) and is developing a systematic approach to assessment of GE learning objectives, which were recently formulated (GE Learning Objectives).</p>
1.2	The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.	<p>Data on student achievement is widely available to the public as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Voluntary System of Accountability, of which SSU is a participant, requires prominent posting of the College Portrait, which includes information on graduation, retention, student characteristics, and student learning outcomes. It includes data on student self report from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and data on student learning outcomes assessed by the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), including analytical reasoning, written communication, and critical thinking. • Institutional Research makes public data on student achievement through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General Information about SSU ➤ Student Demographics

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
1.9	The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution	The University's Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) is a fulltime academic administrator with responsibility for informing the WASC commission of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution. The ALO is a member of the Academic Affairs Council and meets regularly with the Provost and is assigned the duty of completing all reports to WASC in a timely and accurate manner.
2.2b	GUIDELINE: Institutions offering graduate-level programs demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.	SSU's graduate programs (MA, MS, MBA, and MPA) are integrated into the Academic Schools and Departments, include qualified faculty with appropriate work load levels. The University Library works closely with the Academic Schools and Departments to insure that materials and on-line resources support research and scholarship. SSU's joint-doctorate in Educational Leadership with UC Davis is appropriately funded and faculty members receive support for advising of dissertations.
2.3	The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level.	<p>Course level: The university's course outline policy requires all course outlines to include goals and objectives. In the most recent Annual Assessment Reports (2007-2008) departments were asked to review course outlines to insure that learning objectives were included and to work with faculty in assuring that these outlines conformed with university policy (Annual Assessment Reports available in WASC Team Room). Both the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) and the General Education Subcommittee require that all new course proposals contain learning outcomes that support the learning outcomes of the department or of the appropriate General Education area and subarea (see Guide for GE Course Proposal).</p> <p>Program level: All major programs and General Education have developed student learning outcomes [See SSU Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (2007-2008) in EER Report Appendix]</p> <p>Institutional level: See EER Report Essay: Distinctiveness of an SSU Education and SSU Mission Statement.</p> <p>Major program level learning outcomes, General Education outcomes, and course level outcomes are widely available in varied formats: on department and university websites, in the University Catalog, in department handbooks and handouts, and on course syllabi.</p>
2.7	All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review . The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.	All academic programs, as well as programs in Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and in Administration and Finance, are subject to systematic program review. Please see EER Report Essay on Academic Program Review for a full discussion of the University's processes for program review. All academic programs are on a 5-year cycle of program review and includes a self-study, external review, review by the school curriculum committee, Dean, Educational Policies Committee, and Provost. Completed program reviews are maintained at the department and in the Office of the Provost. All reviews include learning objectives and outcomes, evidence of licensing exams and external constituents such as employers and professional organizations, as appropriate.

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
2.8	<p>GUIDELINE: Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.</p>	<p>The University's Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy (RTP) was recently revised after extensive review and comment by the Academic Senate and approved by the President (May 2008). The policy requires that departments explicitly to describe in detail evaluation criteria for RTP and provide this information to the candidate and to the University RTP committee. Scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning can be a part of an individual faculty member's evaluation criteria. All faculty in the RTP process must provide an explanation of how the candidate's scholarly activities contribute to the classroom experience and an indication of methods by which the diverse learning styles of students are addressed. Additionally, the CSU system office, through the Center for Community Engagement, has begun an initiative on Engaged Scholarship in the RTP Process. SSU's Provost is a member of the task force investigating how faculty can use this type of scholarship in all three areas of RTP: teaching, scholarship, and service.</p>
2.10	<p>The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success.</p>	<p>Institutional Research performs systematic analysis of data on retention and graduation rates, including 6-year graduation rates by ethnicity and gender. The IR staff is currently disaggregating data by areas of study (majors) and will have this information available to the WASC Visiting Team at the time of the campus visit. Data on student achievement is tracked as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Voluntary System of Accountability, of which SSU is a participant, requires prominent posting of the College Portrait, which includes information on graduation, retention, student characteristics, and student learning outcomes. It includes data on student self report from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and data on student learning outcomes assessed by the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), including analytical reasoning, written communication, and critical thinking. • Institutional Research makes public data on student achievement through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General Information about SSU ➤ Student Demographics <p>The University's Campus Climate Committee was charged to routinely survey the university. The most recent survey was conducted in Spring 2007 and a summary of the report is available to the WASC Visiting Team on the Institutional Research website (password protected). Visiting team members will be given access to the site before the team visit). The President has created a new committee, the President's Diversity Council, which replaces the Campus Climate Committee, but which will include survey of campus climate as part of its new charge (see EER Report Essay on Diversity for further information).</p>

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
2.11	Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.	The Division of Student Affairs & Enrollment Management (SAEM) is currently engaged in a uniform assessment process utilizing nationally accepted assessment standards. All functional units within the division are undergoing assessments using standards set forth by the Council for Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Functional units are in various stages of completion with targeted completion of self-study for all units by February of 2010. In addition, many functional units also respond to professional accreditation standards adhered to in various externally driven accreditation cycles. Assessment results will be used to inform data-driven practice and bring about structural changes, as well as development of learning objectives, called for in the Strategic Plan.
3.2	GUIDELINE: The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	The University's full-time non-tenure track and part-time non-tenure track faculty fall under contractual arrangements with the university. Because of contractual issues, the University cannot require non-tenure track faculty to engage in program review and faculty development; however, faculty development opportunities, such as workshops or funding under the faculty development fund, are available to non-tenure track faculty. Non-tenure track teaching faculty members are required to assess student learning as part of their teaching and must follow course outline policies. Individual departments involve non-tenure track faculty (particularly full-time or long-term adjuncts) in department activities, including department meetings, retreats, and faculty development activities. However, in most cases, this involvement is voluntary since contractually the University cannot require part-time faculty participation.
3.3	Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation , workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives.	New faculty members receive orientation through the Office of the Provost, Faculty Affairs , and the Professional Development Subcommittee of the Academic Senate. Additionally, the Center for Teaching and Professional Development offers on-going workshops throughout the academic year on a variety of topics for new faculty orientation, development, and on-going training and development of all faculty members. There is also an on-line Faculty Handbook that provides information and resources for new and continuing faculty.
3.4	GUIDELINE: The institution provides training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.	The Center for Teaching and Professional Development offers on-going workshops throughout the academic year on a variety of topics, including accessibility, academic technology, WebCT training, software training, etc. The Academic Technology Advisory Council (ATAC), and advisory body to the Provost, is charged to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an Academic Technology Strategic Plan for Sonoma State University and • Act as a forum for the exchange of ideas around sound applications of academic technology. (See EER Report Essay on Planning Efforts for further discussion of the ATAC Strategic Planning effort.) The Office of Information Technology provides Academic Computing and Instructional Technology in support of teaching and research. The University's Classroom Renovation Program allows for technology upgrades and refurbishing on a scheduled basis.
3.5	The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability.... If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit.	The University reported on CFR 3.5 in its Capacity and Preparatory Review. SSU continues to have a history of financial stability. External and independent audits of Sonoma State University and its auxiliary organizations are completed annually. In each year that these audits have occurred, SSU has received an unqualified opinion with no material findings for improvement. In addition, the University and its auxiliaries have never operated in a deficit position and each has a fund balance necessary to support long term viability.

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
3.6	The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.	The Academic Technology Strategic Plan for the University is aligned with the strategic plans for the university and academic affairs. (See CFR 3.6 analysis done for CPR report).
3.8	GUIDELINE: The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority, which are reflected in an organization chart.	SSU's "traditional" administrative structure includes a president and five vice-presidents: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Vice President and Chief Financial Officer; Vice President for University Affairs; Vice President for Development; and Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. This structure is sufficient to support effective decision making at an institution of SSU's size. Clearly defined Organization Flow Charts , which outline the decision making process, are available on the Employee Services website for each of the five divisions and the University: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Academic Affairs · Administration & Finance · Development · Student Affairs and Enrollment Management · University Affairs
3.9	GUIDELINE: The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	The University's governing body is the system wide CSU Board of Trustees . It the CSU Office of the Chancellor's responsibility to engage the board in self-review and to provide training to enhance the effectiveness of the Board of Trustees.

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
3.10	The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management	<p>The University has a full time President, who is the chief executive officer of Sonoma State University. The President is evaluated every three years by the CSU Board of Trustees. The President's most recent three-year evaluation was conducted in the Spring of 2009. Additionally, all Vice Presidents, including the chief financial officer, are full time administrators. All full time administrators are highly qualified for the positions in which they serve. All administrators are subject to yearly MPP Performance Evaluations. Additionally, senior level administrators (listed below) are reviewed under the Periodic Review of University Administrators Policy:</p> <p>Reviewed by the President (or designee)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Vice Provost for Academic Affairs b. Vice President for Administration and Finance c. Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services d. Vice President for University Affairs e. Vice President of Development <p>Reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Deans of Schools, Library and Extended Education b. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs c. Associate Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs d. Associate Vice President for Academic Programs e. Associate Vice President for Analytical Studies and Planning f. Associate Vice President for Academic Resources
3.11	GUIDELINE: The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.	<p>The University defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty in a number of documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitution of the Faculty of Sonoma State University Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters <p>The faculty, through these documents, is invested with authority over academic programs, policies, and curriculum. The faculty is represented on all budget committees, including the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC), the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee (AABAC), and the Campus Reengineering Committee (CRC). Additionally, faculty serve on the University Planning Steering Committee (UPSC) and the Joint Council on Academic Planning (JCAP).</p>

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

CFR	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR (Changes are highlighted in red.)	Evidence for this Finding
4.4	<p>The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</p>	<p>All academic programs, as well as programs in Student Affairs and Enrollment Management and in Administration and Finance, are subject to systematic program review. Please see EER Report Essay on Academic Program Review for a full discussion of the University's processes for program review. All academic programs are on a 5-year cycle of program review which includes a self-study, external review, review by the school curriculum committee, Dean, Educational Policies Committee, and Provost. Completed program reviews are maintained at the department and in the Office of the Provost. All reviews include learning objectives and outcomes, evidence of licensing exams and external constituents such as employers and professional organizations, as appropriate.</p> <p>The Division of Student Affairs & Enrollment Management (SAEM) is currently engaged in a uniform assessment process utilizing nationally accepted assessment standards. All functional units within the division are undergoing assessments using standards set forth by the Council for Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Functional units are in various stages of completion with targeted completion of self-study for all units by February of 2010. In addition, many functional units also respond to professional accreditation standards adhered to in various externally driven accreditation cycles. Assessment results will be used to inform data-driven practice and bring about structural changes, as well as development of learning objectives, called for in the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Both the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) and the General Education Subcommittee require that all new course proposals contain learning outcomes that support the learning outcomes of the department or of the appropriate General Education area and subarea (see Guide for GE Course Proposal).</p> <p>New curriculum and program approval processes require that student learning outcomes and assessment strategies be identified as part of the approval process (see Curriculum Guide).</p> <p>The University uses benchmarks in decision making from the Delaware Study and from comparable institution data (COPLAC, of which SSU is a member, and Comprehensive Universities).</p>

Appendix 5

Table A: SSU Supplemental Report on 2008 Changes to the CFRs

4.5	<p>The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.</p>	<p>Institutional Research (IR) has sufficient capacity to conduct institutional research. During the CPR Review, an analysis of CFR 4.5 was presented in the SSU Portfolio. IR continues to operate in a similar manner at the time of this EER Review. Assessment of student learning is done at the department and school level and not by the University's IR office. As a member of the Academic Affairs Council, the AVP for Institutional Research is frequently asked to provide data and analysis as needed, particularly regarding enrollment, retention and graduation. Additionally, IR has involvement in assessing student learning via the CLA. Also, IR performs work in student, faculty, and staff surveys such as the NSSE, CIRP, YFCY, COACHE and CADS. The University utilizes benchmark data from the Delaware Study as a basis for cost analysis and virtual SFRs based on comparable departments within the CSU. The Academic Affairs Council (AAC) and the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee (AABAC) regularly review and utilize data in decision-making processes.</p>
-----	---	---