

# Appendix 2

## Compliance with Standards

### Appendix 2.1

#### Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet

##### Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet

###### Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

###### The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

###### Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

###### Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four forms that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the cited federal requirements. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

#### Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</p> <p><b>Self-Review Rating</b> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> <p><b>Importance to address at this time</b> A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Institutional Information</b></p> <p>Institution _____</p> <p>Type of Review:  <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive for Reaffirmation  <input type="checkbox"/> Initial Accreditation  <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p>Date of Submission: ____/____/____  <small>Mo Day Year</small></p> <p>Institutional Contact _____</p>
--	--

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives						
<i>The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.</i>						
Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<b>Institutional Purposes</b>						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	1	C	Although the Mission and campus vision seem well-defined, room exists for improvement, such as aspects related to the public good. Look forward to input from new President.	Mission Statement: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/about/mission.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/about/mission.html</a>	

1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2		2	B	Institution level educational objectives (such as the Graduation Initiative) are widely available but the level of knowledge varies by academic department. Student achievement data is available both on the University Reporting & Analytics website, as well as through the Voluntary system of Accountability (College Portrait), the Student Achievement Measure, and IPEDS Data Center websites. More attention is needed on School and Department educational (learning) objectives being made consistent and widely available.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 5: <i>Student Success</i> .  Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.	
--	--	---	---	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<b>Integrity and Transparency</b>						
1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	Although academic freedom is strongly supported, policy does not include staff nor distinguishes freedom of speech from intellectual freedom.	Academic Freedom Policy: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/documents/academicfreedom.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/documents/academicfreedom.html</a> Statement of Professional Responsibility: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/documents/responsibility.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/documents/responsibility.html</a>	
1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.	2	A	Although campus has a commitment to diversity (working towards HIS status), it struggles to attract larger representation of groups from different racial or demographic backgrounds, both in students as well as faculty. We continue improving inclusiveness efforts on campus, but more is needed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10	The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.	2	B	Some concern about donors (e.g., GMC, Wine Institute), State Legislature (and by extension Chancellor's Office) having potential influence on educational goals.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12	The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.	2	B	All academic goals, programs, services and compliance policies are readily available through the University Catalog or on appropriate web pages. Some attention should be directed to increasing student support through reestablishment of strong Student Affairs division.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.  Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
-------------------------	----------------	------------------------	---------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

<p>1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6, 3.7</p>		2	B	<p>The institution has solid business practices and is regularly audited with no issues. However, transparency between business operations and impact on academics can be increased. We see a greater need for input from University Affairs.</p>	<p>Audits submitted with Annual Report.</p>	
<p>1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.</p>		1	C	<p>The institution is timely in communicating on changes in practices or procedures.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction</i>.  Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.</p>	

### Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

1. Transparency at all levels. Part of this concern may be the need for better communication between divisions. Although regular "reports" are presented at governance meetings, the distribution of this information seems to not make it out to the general campus population. More cooperation among the divisions would also aid the flow of information and lend to a better perception of understanding how operations work on the campus.
2. Increase in diversity at all levels. The institution should continue its efforts to attract and retain a diverse faculty, staff, and more critically, student body. Our current practice of attracting a large contingent of students from Southern California could become more focused on those students from a more diverse background.
3. Autonomy from mandates (State and/or Chancellor's Office). The institution feels constrained by meeting demands driven by legislative dictate and budgetary directive than educational need.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

1. The availability and quality of information provided by the Office of Reporting and Analytics (formerly Institutional Research). This is also reflected in System-wide Student Success Dashboard.
2. Accessible institutional policies and procedures.
3. Academic freedom.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

1. Better use of data by institution to improve student retention and graduation rates.
2. Improvement in the use of information to increase diversity at all levels and in support of current population.
3. Better standardization of data gathered from Schools and Departments towards efforts in 1 and 2.

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

*The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1</p>	<p>The content, length, and standards of teaching and institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.</p>	<p>Learning</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>Academic Program Review is regularly undertaken by all academic programs to assess content, performance, and rigor of the degree. A number of programs are subject to external accreditation specific to their disciplines and follow the standards set by those bodies. All programs require external review during the program review to provide independent perspective on each program. The institution recognizes the need for standardization of assessment methods across academic programs with a focus on program learning objectives (including the General Education program). The institution would benefit from a greater tenure track to part-time faculty ratio. Tenure track faculty are more engaged in curriculum development and offerings and assessment of student performance.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist".</p>	
<p>2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4</p>		<p>1</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Degree requirements are explicit in University Catalog. Each student is provided an Academic Requirements Report (ARR) through their MySSU portal which outlines all requirements for the chosen major, including General Education requirements. Along with the ARR, SSU will soon institute a 4-year degree planner in the student MySSU portal which will show a clear pathway to graduation in terms of course requirements as well as sequencing of courses to meet prerequisites and typical course schedules. The institution will work with programs to build guidelines on defining meaning and quality of each degree within a program, as well as developing institutional learning outcomes.</p>	<p>SSU Catalog: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/catalog/">http://www.sonoma.edu/catalog/</a></p>	

<p>2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Individual programs assess the breadth and depth of the curriculum for preparing students for post-graduation success. A major component of this assessment comes from program review and it is typically focused on the courses offered by the major. SSU to date does not have well established guidelines for programs to integrate the effectiveness of the general education program with the major's curriculum with regards to student life-long success, and this is a topic that would benefit from further consideration. However, with respect to our general education (GE) program, the institution has thoughtful learning objectives that address a wide-range of topics that reflect broad training and preparation for all graduates, including core competencies and many social, ethical, and cultural areas of knowledge. Our general education program requires a minimum of three classes in at least two different areas of GE to be taken at the upper-division level.</p>	<p>General Education Learning Goals and Objectives: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/committees/ge/LGOs_new.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/committees/ge/LGOs_new.html</a></p>	
---	--	----------	----------	---	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Admission to graduate-level programs follows CSU standards and individual programs may set higher standards for admission. Similar to baccalaureate programs, individual programs set the standards for performance, curricula, and student learning outcomes, and assess these through program review. At the institution level the Graduate Studies Subcommittee (of the Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate) oversees institution standards for all graduate programs. This subcommittee monitors the quality of graduate programs, develops policy recommendations for graduate studies, and oversees periodic program review of graduate programs. The oversight responsibility of the subcommittee has not left sufficient time to address the development of core competencies/learning outcomes for SSU graduate studies.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	

<p>2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5</p>	<p>The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>B</p>	<p>Academic programs have learning outcomes that are stated at multiple locations. At the institution level, the GE program's learning outcomes are provided in the catalog. When revisions to curricula, or new program are proposed, the Educational Policies Committee (Academic Senate) requires listing of the student learning outcomes and assessment strategies. It is also University policy that course outlines (syllabi) include the goals and objectives of the course. The application of course learning objectives is expected to be uniformly applied to all forms of class delivery. The institution has set minimum grade requirements for baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate degrees and for foundational General Education courses. Programs may set higher minimum grade standards for courses within the major, for the major and the minor. Although the institution has general education, programmatic and course learning outcomes, we have not spent time on developing</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs.</i></p>
<p>2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>A</p>	<p>Student learning outcomes for General Education were developed collectively by the faculty and are provided in the university catalog. The Course Outline policy strongly encourages listing GE course learning objectives in the syllabus. Learning objectives for curriculum development are required by the Educational Policy Committee (EPC). Learning objectives for programs are given in multiple locations – the catalog, in program descriptions, department webpages, course syllabi, student handbooks, and program review documents. The Course Outline policy directs course learning outcomes be included in the syllabus. However, greater consistency in providing easily accessed program and student learning outcomes needs attention. As the institution moves to a new web interface, standard department/program templates are being designed which include a section for each program to explicitly list program learning outcomes. Programs that are</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance.</i></p>

<p>2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4</p>		1&2	B	<p>The institution provides ample opportunities for assessing student prior knowledge through challenge exams and evaluation of prior learning (SSU Catalog, pgs. 16-17). The Learning Center and Writing Center provide excellent aid for helping students reinforce and deepen learning. All programs provide active learning through high impact practices such as field and lab experiences, faculty-student collaboration in research, scholarship and creative activities, as well as opportunity to apply knowledge through service learning, internships, teaching practicums, and capstone experiences.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
---	--	-----	---	--	---	--

<b>Criteria for Review (1)</b>	<b>Guidelines (2)</b>	<b>Self-Review Rating (3)</b>	<b>Importance to Address (4)</b>	<b>Comments (5)</b>	<b>Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)</b>	<b>Team/Staff Verification (7)</b>
<p>2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4</p>	<p>The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.</p>	2	B	<p>The program review process (or outside accreditation) provides the main vehicle for assessing student learning outcomes and standards of performance. Programs with external accreditation maintain standards for performance in degrees and credentials, but greater consistency across programs and at the institution level needs attention. Recently, Academic Affairs provided School Assessment Coordinators as a resource to develop assessment tools and strategies for programs in all schools. The Assessment Coordinators are also developing institution-wide learning outcomes and assessment strategies. At both the institution and program level, the Assessment Coordinators help faculty embed assessments into the tools faculty use to evaluate student performance within classes.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	

<p>2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6</p>		1	B&C	<p>The institution has a robust program review policy and process. Programs that are subject to independent accreditation use those documents in lieu of a campus program review. All program reviews include a minimum of one outside, independent review, and an action plan to address needs or concerns. The institution does recognize the policy is in need of revision and this is underway. The main driving force behind the revision is to provide a clearer template for program review and a better closing of the loop from the program review findings. This past year, the Academic Senate reconstituted a Senate committee (Academic Planning Committee) that had been on hiatus, into one that combines assessment, program review, planning and resources (Academic Planning, Assessment and Resources Committee).</p>	<p>Program Review website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/pra/">http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/pra/</a></p>	
<b>Scholarship and Creative Activity</b>						
<p>2.8 The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2</p>	<p>Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.</p>	2	A	<p>The institution has clear expectations for faculty involvement in research, scholarship and creative activity and strongly encourages and supports faculty and student participation. Recognition exists that the institution needs to continue strengthening the commitment in these areas with help from the Faculty Center (professional development in teaching, assessment, and scholarship); the SSU Office of Undergraduate Research and Creative Experiences (SOURCE) (grants for undergraduate research and aiding underrepresented students in research and preparation for graduate school), and; the Center for Community Engagement (service learning and community engagement).</p>	<p>SSU RTP Website: <a href="https://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/tt/rtp.html">https://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/tt/rtp.html</a> Faculty and Student policies related to research and scholarship: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/grants_and_contracts.htm">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/grants_and_contracts.htm</a> Office of Faculty Research &amp; Sponsored Programs: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/ofrsp/">http://www.sonoma.edu/ofrsp/</a> SSU Office of Undergraduate Research and Creative Experiences <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/source/GraduatesStudiesShowcase">http://www.sonoma.edu/source/GraduatesStudiesShowcase</a>: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/gs/showcase.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/gs/showcase.html</a></p>	
<p>2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. X 3.2</p>		2	B	<p>Institution RTP policy is clear on linkages, although we continue to explore ways to integrate all within standard workload. Individual department RTP criteria allow discipline-specific expectations. Assessment of faculty provided by peer and student evaluations, but broad desire to improve these methods.</p>	<p>SSU RTP Website: <a href="https://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/tt/rtp.html">https://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/tt/rtp.html</a> Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness: <a href="https://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/studentevalofteaching.htm">https://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/studentevalofteaching.htm</a></p>	



Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<b>Student Learning and Success</b>						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	2	A&B	Disaggregated data for the institution is available on the Reporting and Analytics website. Additional information is made available by request. Graduation rates are benchmarked and goals set through the Chancellor's Office graduation initiative. Rates of peer institutions are reviewed through IPEDS Data Center and through Chancellor's Office websites.	Included in Annual Report.  Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		2	B	The institution has a number of avenues that support co-curricular activities - Residential Life, Associated Students, and the Center for Student Leadership, Involvement, and Service. The institution continues to seek greater integration of co-curricular programs within Academic Affairs.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6	Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.	1	B&C	Advising, including information on admissions, degree requirements, course offering, and costs are readily available in a variety of sources, including the SSU catalog, Admissions website, Financial Aid website, and department/schools websites.	Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.	
2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1		1	B	Good services are provided for all populations of students and improvements continually made as necessary.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6	Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.	2	B	The institution has transfer rules for 170 colleges and Universities throughout California and for some out of state schools. In addition, SSU has 108 Test Credit rules built, including AP, CLEP, and IB. We have around 7000 articulated courses in the Assist.org data base, which are also built into our transfer rules in our Student Information System. Improvements are possible in some areas, such as a transfer course policy, and improved technology to process transfer work in a more timely fashion to aid students being placed in courses in their first semester at SSU.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: <i>Student Success</i> . Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist."	

**Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two**

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

1. Greater support and campus cultural change to build a truly robust program of institutional and program assessment.
2. Greater support in the area of faculty/student research, scholarship, and creative activities.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

1. Faculty assessment and evaluation policies and procedures are robust and equitable.
2. Collaboration among programs, schools, and community partners are growing for faculty and students.
3. Information for students related to institution and program requirements, and disseminating this information (with technology).

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

1. Greater efforts on standardizing assessment across academic programs with a focus on developing programmatic and institutional learning outcomes.
2. Development of specific standards of student performance at the institution and program level.

**Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability** *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<b>Faculty and Staff</b>						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	2	A	Past President commitment for new tenure track hires led to ~15 hires per year for the past 3 years. New Administration continues support of growth of tenure track hires. Still need to increase tenure-track to part-time faculty ratio (see CFR 2.1). Along with hires need to increase faculty and staff compensation to retain high quality employees.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4		1	B	Adequate systems in place for recruitment and hiring of personnel. Evaluative processes in place for staff and faculty and follow System-wide bargaining agreements.	Human Resources website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/hr/erc/">http://www.sonoma.edu/hr/erc/</a> Faculty Affairs website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/">http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/fa/</a> Tenure Track Faculty Hiring policy: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/TenureTrackFacultyHiring.htm">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/TenureTrackFacultyHiring.htm</a>	

3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4	The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	2	A	Professional development opportunities are available for all personnel. Institution sees need to continue working on increasing resources for expanding professional development opportunities.	Staff Training and Professional Development website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/hr/training/">http://www.sonoma.edu/hr/training/</a> Faculty Center website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/facultycenter/">http://www.sonoma.edu/facultycenter/</a> Academic Senate, Professional Development Subcommittee: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/committees/fsac.html#PDS">http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/committees/fsac.html#PDS</a> Sabbatical Policy: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/sabbaticalpolicy.html">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/sabbaticalpolicy.html</a>
--	---	---	---	---	---

**Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources**

3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7	The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.	3	A	The institution continues to seek and direct resources towards improving its operations.	Audits submitted with Annual Report.  Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .
---	--	---	---	--	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.	3	A	Information technology continues to be improved, with repairing the base initiative in IT, upgrading IT resources in all classrooms, and enhancement to the Common Management System. However, demands in services and rapid changes in IT are challenges the institution continues to address.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

**Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes**

3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	B&C	Personnel recruitment, hiring, and evaluation incorporate assessment of these qualities and seek individuals of the highest caliber.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	1	B	The institution has reorganized its structure (and subsequent decision trees) since the last visit. Two in particular are direct benefit to students: reorganization of Student Affairs and integration of campus life with residence life.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	0	The institution has undergone new leadership and organizational changes reflective of a strong student-success orientation.	University Administration webpage: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/about/cabinet/">http://www.sonoma.edu/about/cabinet/</a>	

<p>3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7</p>	<p>The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Overseen system-wide by the 25-member Board of Trustees.</p>	<p>CSU Board of Trustees website: <a href="https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/Meet-the-Board-of-Trustees">https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/Meet-the-Board-of-Trustees</a></p>
<p>3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4</p>	<p>The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The Academic Senate provides strong academic leadership and shared governance in SSU's character.</p>	<p>Academic Senate website: <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/Faculty%20Consultation%20Policies">http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/Faculty Consultation Policies:</a> <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyconsultbudget.htm">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyconsultbudget.htm</a> <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyconsultationindex.htm">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyconsultationindex.htm</a> <a href="http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyrepresentation_2016.htm">http://www.sonoma.edu/uaffairs/policies/facultyrepresentation_2016.htm</a></p>

**Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three**

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?
  1. The institutional commitment towards increasing tenure-track faculty lines over the past three years and continued commitment to increase in TT faculty density (tenure-track relative to part-time faculty).
  2. Continued improvement of faculty (both tenure-track and part-time) review.
  
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?
  1. Strong commitment to use of technology tools for data access, especially with respect to student tracking.
  2. Renewed commitment to support of faculty through new hires and strengthening of Faculty Center.
  
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?
  1. Increase staff support through better compensation and improved training.
  2. Completing transition with new President and upper-level administration.

**Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement**

*The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<b>Quality Assurance Processes</b>						
<p>4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10</p>		2	A	<p>The institution has a robust curriculum and program approval process. New or revised curricula are reviewed and approved by the relevant School Curriculum Committee and Dean. Graduate curricula are reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Subcommittee of the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) of the Academic Senate. General Education curricula are reviewed and approved by the General Education Subcommittee of the EPC. The EPC reviews all undergraduate curricula. During the review process, the AVP for Academic Programs reviews curricula for consistency with state regulations and CSU policies. Final approval occurs at the Academic Senate followed by review and approval by the Provost and President.</p> <p>Program reviews follow a similar process and often provides the impetus for new or revised curricula. The Program Review Subcommittee of APARC is the final level of review. With the formation of APARC, the institution now has a committee</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

<p>4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10</p>		2	A&B	<p>The institution has good data collection capacity and is making good progress on expanding its tools for sharing data. Increases in staffing has given Research &amp; Analytics greater ability to develop tools for accessing institutional data on student success. In conjunction, an initiative by the System-Wide office has made student success data readily available and useful for comparison among campuses. Data from campus has been used in guiding discussions and making informed decisions on student success. The institution can still work on developing common sets of required data for reoccurring activities, such as program review, assessment, student recruitment and admissions, and student success.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	
<b>Institutional Learning and Improvement</b>						
<p>4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.</p>	2	A	<p>The institution has uneven performance on collection, analyzing, and using data from all areas. The Academic Coordinating Team, consisting of members of administration and faculty, serve to make informed decisions based on evidence from Academic Affairs and the Schools. The new Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resource (APARC) committee of the Academic Senate will be another component of the institution reviewing evidence from assessments and program reviews to guide decisions on where resources should be directed.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>, and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.</p>	2	A	<p>Institution standards for courses and curricula are overseen by the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) of the Academic Senate and their maintenance by the University Standards Subcommittee of the EPC. Peer and student review of the faculty is conducted by student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (SETE) for each course and by the RTP process. Further review by peer and external reviews for courses and curricula occurs through the program review process and often provides feedback for course or curricula revision. The Faculty Center provides additional resources for aiding programs and faculty in design improvements to curricula, pedagogy and assessments.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7</p>		2	B	<p>Programs or schools with professional degrees typically employ community advisory boards, often required by external accreditation bodies. Other programs utilize social media as mechanism to reach out to alumni and the wider community, but this provides limited feedback in many cases. Student feedback is often provided as representatives on department, Senate, and University committees.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3</p>		2	B	<p>The institution utilizes multiple levels of reflection, including retreats (departments, chairs, deans, faculty, administration). On-going reflection occurs in particular committees such as the Academic Coordinating Team and the Graduation Initiative Group. Periodic opportunities arise from informal brown bag sessions with faculty, staff, students and administration, as well as campus-wide input to the recent President search.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.</p>		2	B	<p>Often the institution responds to priorities determined by the Chancellor's Office. Planning and implementation for these priorities often lies in Academic Affairs, University Affairs and Administration &amp; Finance. Each of these divisions seeks input and guidance from campus stakeholders through appropriate councils and committees.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

### Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

1. Develop culture of continuous improvement & implementing changes, along with closing the loop between assessment feedback and deployment of resources, teaching approaches/pedagogy.
2. Clearer leadership vision for maintaining and improving academic quality in a climate of limited resources.
3. Better use of data to establish priorities.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

1. Strong process of reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP), through promotion.
2. Excellent data gathering by Reporting and Analytics.
3. Strong pockets of excellence and creativity in assessment, but in programs with external accreditation bodies.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

1. Making better use of available information/data for planning and resource allocation.
2. Greater consistency and connection of assessment to planning and implementation.

### Summative Questions

1. Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?

Summative Question 1.

Multiple stakeholders of the institution provided feedback, scoring and ratings (alphabetic order):

Academic Coordinating Team (Academic Affairs/Faculty Governance)

Academic Programs

Academic Senate Executive Committee

Administration and Finance

Faculty Affairs

Faculty Center

Graduation Initiative Group

Learning Center

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

Office of the Registrar

Reporting & Analytics

Schools (Chairs, Deans, Faculty)

SSU Office of Undergraduate Research & Creative Experiences

Writing Center

2. What areas emerged as institutional strengths that could be highlighted in the institutional report?

1. The growing collaborative efforts across programs, schools, divisions, and community partners to provide high impact practices for students in strengthening learning and retention (FYE, FLCs, SYE).
2. Information gathering and information quality as provided in robust program reviews and in Reporting & Analytics.
3. Tools developed for providing information for students related to institution and program requirements, including e-advising tools.



3. What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?

1. Consistent leadership and setting of priorities for the institution, including better communication among divisions, to provide shared pathways and vision.
2. Closing the loop from assessment/review (at all levels) and directing priorities and resources to identified needs. This information would aid efforts in working towards increasing diversity at the institution and in student retention and graduation.
3. Greater uniformity and consistency of assessment, including development of measurable learning objectives and setting uniform standards of performance for all programs and the institution.

4. What are the next steps in preparing for the review?