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Student Success and Academic Achievement Task Force
Report and Recommendations

Overview and Background

The Student Success and Academic Achievement Task Force believes student success is at the heart of what we do at San Diego State University, and with that in mind, we recognize that everything in which we are engaged—research, teaching, internationalization, faculty, campus life, facilities, and outreach activities—plays a key role in helping students achieve at the highest levels. The task force also notes that SDSU has had remarkable success related to achievement of our students over the past decade. We lead the nation in the improvement of graduation and retention rates; we are more diverse now than we were ten years ago; and we have erased the achievement gap. Because we believe it is important to build on our success, we will list some of the programs and initiatives that have contributed to our achievements (See Appendix A).

Recommendations:

- Establish an Office of Commuter Life and Engagement;
- Establish a University Honors College to serve high-achieving students;
- Create a Learning Center to promote critical thinking and writing excellence;
- Build institutional capacity to use learning analytics tools;
- Increase institutional commitment to a campus-wide approach to high quality design, development, evaluation, and support of hybrid/online courses, programs and degrees; and
- Provide additional support for the campus community to address issues related to alcohol and other drugs.

Our discussions in response to the charge we received were wide ranging but focused on core commitments related to student success and academic achievement. These core commitments include:

- Increasing overall graduation rates with a special emphasis on increasing our four-year graduation rate;
- Increasing emphasis on attracting and supporting high achieving students, through the development of a University Honors College;
- Continuing focus on the integrity of the degree, which includes a focus on campus life and student engagement; and
- Continuing efforts to establish policies, processes, support mechanisms, and educational opportunities to address challenges and problems related to the use of alcohol and other drugs.

Practically, these core commitments are interrelated; success and achievement in one area will inevitably contribute to success overall. Goals related to these core commitments and specific recommendations as to concrete steps we can take now and in the future follow.
Goal 1 – Increase graduation and retention rates with a particular focus on increasing our four-year graduation rate while also supporting the level of student learning particularly in regards to writing and quantitative reasoning:

Recommendation I – Establish an Office of Commuter Life and Engagement. ($200k/year for a director, support staff, programing, graduate interns, and faculty “in residence.”) (See Appendix B)

Rationale and context: We know from background research already completed that the students living off campus are less likely to continue and to graduate than their peers who do live on campus. This is true for both ‘college-ready’ and not ‘college-ready’ cohorts. A Director of Commuter Life and Engagement will oversee programs, coordinate activities for commuter students, identify barriers, and help provide both academic and engagement support structures.

We recommend appointing a Director of Commuter Life and Engagement; and providing staff support and funds to support one or two graduate interns. This office would be responsible for:

- Providing services and space to meet the basic needs of commuter and off-campus students as determined by campus research and assessment;
- Ensuring that commuter and off-campus students benefit equitably from San Diego State University’s educational programs - both curricular and co-curricular programs and services offered;
- Coordinating with key campus partners to provide engagement opportunities to assist commuter and off-campus students learning and development;
- Working with key campus partners to identify and meet the academic support needs of commuter and off-campus students;
- Outreach and partner with relevant individuals, groups, communities and organizations external to the campus in support of commuter and off-campus student transition, integration and success;
- Develop and implement a clearly articulated assessment plan to document achievement of stated goals and learning outcomes, demonstrate accountability, provide evidence of improvement, and describe resulting changes in program and services.
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**Recommendation II** - Create a Learning Center to promote critical thinking, quantitative and information literacy, presentation and communication skills, and writing excellence ($470,651/initial cost; See Appendix C). This Center will:

- Foster student success and degree completion;
- assist in closing the educational achievement gap by offering all students—including the less prepared—equal opportunities to receive one-to-one instruction in multiple academic subjects;
- build academic community among students by providing learning spaces and individualized tutoring;
- make Love Library the academic center of the campus by connecting research and learning.

**Rationale and context:** Currently, students living on campus have an excellent suite of services to support their academic achievement and co-curricular leadership opportunities. As we seek to improve our retention and four-year graduation rates, we need to ensure that all students, commuter as well as those who have moved out of the residence halls, also receive the academic support critical to their success. A Learning Center is an important step toward achieving that goal. In 2011 the Provost invested $150,000 to create a tutoring center in the Love Library. The SDSU Learning Center will substantially expand these tutoring services by not only including tutoring in writing but also in quantitative and information literacy, as well as in presentation and communication skills. It will provide the administrative and support staff that is necessary for the future success of the Center.

**Recommendation III** – Build the institutional capacity of Instructional Technology Services to use learning analytics tools and data to improve retention and graduation rates, and decrease the number of students on academic probation. (See Appendix D)

**Rationale and context:** One of the ways we have been successful in improving graduation and retention rates has been through using data to identify populations of students with varying levels of readiness and need for assistance, and through using data to make strategic decisions regarding our programs and the support we provide with limited resources. Building on this capacity and commitment is important as we address increasing four-year graduation rates. The Center for Learning Analytics will allow SDSU to:

- Provide information related to high-impact educational practices such as undergraduate research, study abroad, writing intensive courses, and residential learning communities;
- Align data mined from the Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS) with other sources of student data to create robust, predictive models of student academic behavior and success;
- Utilize LMS student data to provide students, faculty, staff, and administrators with critical and timely feedback, interventions, and assistance:
  - Identify students who are not making progress toward graduation, and determine how best to support those students with actionable data on their performance and areas for improvement, with targeted interventions based on pre-set criteria:
    - Assign students to an “at-risk group” determined by a predictive student achievement algorithm (e.g., students receiving 60% or less on an exam);
    - Provide system alerts to students when they have poor attendance and/or are under-performing in a course;
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- Recommend interventions such as advising or supplemental instruction.
  - Personalize learning via adaptive systems that change dynamically in response to student activities, tailoring recommendations based on performance criteria;
  - Provide information related to student engagement that enables students to see in real time how their levels of engagement compare with that of their peers.

**Recommendation IV – Increase the institutional commitment to a campus-wide approach to high quality design, development, evaluation, and support of face-to-face as well as hybrid/online courses, programs and degrees ($200k/year for college-based instructional designers and IT support).** (See Appendix E)

**Rationale and context:** Interest in online learning at the course level at SDSU and across the CSU is immense, and institutional program-level interest is expanding. Online education demands just as much, if not more, of the combined academic technology resources of the university. Putting more resources into online and hybrid education, and strengthening partnerships between colleges and the Instructional Technology Services area of Academic Affairs, is important to address increasing four-year graduation rates. This commitment will enable SDSU to:

- Increase online efforts at the program level, as well as the course level
  - Experiment with general fund degree programs;
  - Monitor online education initiatives across the CSU and beyond;
  - Reframe the Course Design Institute as the *Curriculum Design Institute* and evolve from a course-centric to a program-level focus.
- Modify processes and policies to support online and blended learning, e.g., rethink course designations, pilot an on-campus testing center for proctored exams, and build accessibility into the course approval and review process;
- Improve core technologies for delivery, interaction and engagement, both online and virtual learning spaces;
- Extend formal collaborations between colleges and ITS:
  - Expand strategic collaboration between ITS faculty consultants and college-based instructional designers to provide opportunities for faculty development and exchange effective practices between ITS and colleges, and across campus;
  - Recruit discipline-specific faculty champions from each college to work closely with ITS and serve as an example, resource, and mentor, providing their colleagues with information and expertise about instructional technology and pedagogy, and providing ITS staff with further insight into faculty and student needs.

**Goal 2 – Attract and support more high-achieving students across the university**

**Recommendation I – Establish a University Honors College to serve high-achieving students, broadly defined, across the university.** ($180k/year for a director and staff support). (See Appendix F)

**Rationale and context:** While the University Honors Program has gained in stature over the past decade, and while we enroll many high-achieving students, more students could benefit from an Honors College model. Such a program would allow us to establish a more inclusive definition of
what it means to be a high-achieving student at San Diego State, recognize students with diverse backgrounds and talents, and continue to build an identity of achievement and excellence.

To reach this goal, we recommend establishing a University Honors College office that would house an academic leader at the associate dean level and that would have administrative support. This office would:

- Help define the parameters of the Honors College;
- Work collaboratively with existing colleges to identify curricular pathways for diverse students in the Honors College;
- Work collaboratively with Student Affairs with regards to residence hall programming, co-curricular, and leadership activities for Honors College students;
- Work with International Programs to identify study abroad and international service components for students in the Honors College;
- Collaborate as needed with Enrollment Services to assist with recruiting strategies for high-achieving students;
- Work with University Relations and Development, and others, to find ways to increase financial resources for scholarships, instruction, programming, and staff support.

Goal 3 – Address issues related to the use of alcohol and other drugs.

The Student Success and Academic Achievement Task Force received a broad charge that touched on many issues related to student success. Among these charges were questions related to issues dealing with alcohol and other drugs. Given the importance of this particular topic, we have chosen to make a separate set of recommendations related to these challenges. (See Appendix G) Briefly the recommendations from the ad hoc working group and supported by the Student Success Task Force include:

- The development of an Annual AOD Strategic Assessment Report to Faculty Senate. The report will also form the basis for the federally mandated biennial Drug Free Schools and Community Act review, and the CSU mandated biennial reporting. The assessment will require funding for two graduate assistants to be supervised by the Coordinator of AOD Initiatives and $7,500 in data collection costs.
- The Greek community comprises a disproportionate share of the problems associated with AOD use at SDSU. To make inroads in this community, we recommend restructuring the way student organizations are recognized. Each organization should be capable of periodically demonstrating that their recognition fits within the broader SDSU institutional mission.
- Many of the opportunities to engage students in AOD prevention occur in the context of judicial action. Therefore, we recommend contacting students before problems are noticed; and that a screening and brief intervention or referral to treatment (SBIRT) program be implemented within Student Health Services. Costs for this program are noted in the full set of recommendations in Appendix G and would include staff for intern supervision, and counselors for students who meet the referral criteria.
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Ongoing Engagement and Retention Efforts at San Diego State

- Assessment Plans/Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee
- Bounce Back Program
- Center for Teaching and Learning
- Collaboration with Local School Districts – City Heights, Sweetwater
- Common Experience
- Compact Scholars Program
- Course Re-Design Institute
- Early Start Program
- Effective Enrollment Management
- Early Assessment Program (EAP)
- Enrollment Management Task Force
- Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)
- Faculty-Student Mentoring Program
- Graduation and Retention Report Annually
- Impacted Majors – Targeted Advising
- Living/Learning Communities
- MAPS
- Orientation – focus on taking 15 hours
- President’s Enrollment Management Advisory Committee
- Student Research Symposium
- Study Abroad
- Summer Bridge Program
- Thomas B. Day Student Success Program
- Undergraduate Research – FSMP, MBRS, etc.
- University Honors Program/

Current Student Involvement and Campus Life Engagement Opportunities

- Associated Students
- Aztec Nights Events
- Aztec P.R.I.D.E.
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- Career Services/Aztec Career Connection
- Casa Azteca Program for commuter students through SLL
- Center for Regional Sustainability
- Co-Curricular Transcript through SLL
- Commuter Lounge (expected with new Aztec Union)
- Fraternity & Sorority Life membership opportunities
- Leadership Certificate Program through SLL
- Office of Academic Scholarships
- Peer Leadership Consultants through SLL
- Student Organizations (over 300)
- Honors Council
- Veteran Affairs Office

New/Potential Programs for Campus Life Engagement and Student Success

- Co-curricular MAP
- “Student Life Orientation” in addition the academic/university orientation
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Commuter Student Analysis

In order to maximize the extent to which SDSU can improve its graduation rates, it is important to identify which specific target groups are at the greatest risk of not graduating. Thus, the purpose of this report is to: (1) utilize known risk factors such as commuting and non-college readiness in identifying a group of SDSU students that are at high risk of not graduating and (2) examine the degree to which these factors affect the likelihood of graduation for these high risk students. FTF cohorts for Fall 2005, Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 were utilized for this report because four to six year graduation rates are currently available for those cohorts.

Commuter Student Research

Students who are integrated academically and socially to their institution (Braxton, Vesper, & Hossler, 1995; Tinto, 1993) and have support networks in their new environment (Christie & Dinham, 1991; Skahil, 2002) are more likely to persist due to the ease of establishing and accessing campus social and academic support (Astin, 1975; Chickering, 1974). Students who commute on the other hand, may be more at risk of withdrawing from the institution because of the need to balance their academics with many off-campus commitments, such as work, family, and multiple life roles (Braxton & Hirschy, 2005; Jacoby & Garland, 2004; Newbold, Mehta, & Forbus, 2011; Tinto, 1993; Torres, Gross, & Dadashova, 2010). Furthermore, social support networks for commuter students tend to be off-campus preventing them from being socially integrated to the campus community (Braxton et al., 1995; Clark, 2006; Jacoby, 2000; Jacoby & Garland, 2004; Newbold et al., 2011).

Methodology and Results

For this report, commuting (living off campus) is presented relative to those who lived on campus, thus the variable Live-Off/Live-On Status is defined as entering FTF who lived off campus during their first year versus those who live on campus (in the campus resident halls). It should be noted that of the FTF who lived off campus a large majority commuted from their parent’s home as opposed to living in apartments near
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campus. The second factor utilized is College Readiness, which is defined as students who require remediation in either math or English (Non-College Ready) versus those who do not require remediation (College Ready).

In order to show the degree to which these factors differentiate the pre-college academic preparation among entering FTF at SDSU, the average high school GPAs and SAT composite scores for three cohorts of FTF (Fall 2005, Fall 2006, and Fall 2007) were broken down by College Readiness and Live-Off/Live-On Status and are summarized in Table 1 (Note: only California residents, which make up 95% of the FTF, were used in the current analysis.) As can be seen in Table 1, there is no significant difference in average entering high school GPA those who are non-college ready and who lived off campus during their first year. In contrast however, the average SAT composite scores were significant lower for those who were non-college ready and who lived off campus during their first year.

Given the results in Tables 1, we developed four subsets of risk groups based on the combination of College Readiness and Live-Off/Live-On Status. The first subset labeled High Risk, is defined as entering SDSU FTF who are non-college ready and lived off campus. On the other end of the continuum are the Low Risk entering SDSU FTF who are defined as college ready and living on campus. In between are two other subsets: Low Medium Risk (non-college ready and living on campus) and High Medium Risk (college ready and living off campus). Although the students in the High Medium Risk group were college ready, they lived off campus, and thus, were assumed to be at a higher risk than the non-college ready students in the Low Medium Risk group given the commuter risk factors cited in previous research.

Together, these four subsets make up our College Risk Factor Matrix, which is shown in Table 2. Once the four subsets of the College Risk Factor Matrix were defined, the FTF were then grouped accordingly. Table 2 shows the distribution of FTF within the four risk factor subsets for each of the three longitudinal cohorts (Fall 2005, Fall 2006, Fall 2007). As can be seen, the Low Risk group had the largest proportion at about 44%, while 16% to 20% of the FTF were High Risk students. The two middle sub-sets each consisted of nearly 20% of the students.

We also computed the average family income for each of the four risk factor subsets; see Table 3. The data shows the average family income for the High Risk students to be around $56,000, while the average family income was much higher for the Low Risk students ranging from $103,000 to as high as $115,000. The data in Table 3 also show the average SAT composite scores across the three cohorts for each of the risk factor subsets. As shown in Table 3, the average SAT composite score for non-college-ready students (left column: High Risk and Low Medium Risk) ranged between 923 and 998. In contrast, the average SAT composite scores for college-ready students (right column: High Medium Risk and Low Risk) was much higher, ranging from as low as 1106 to as high as 1152.

Finally, four, five and six year graduation rates were computed for each of the subsets and are shown in Figures 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The data in Figure 1 shows that about only 14% of students in the High Risk group graduate within four years as compared to the Low Risk students, whose four year graduation rates gradually increased from 36% (Fall 2005) to as high as 43% (Fall 2007). The four year graduation rates for the two middle sub-sets (Low Medium Risk - and High Medium Risk) fell in
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between the rates for the high and low risk groups. Not surprisingly, students in the low medium risk group graduated at a higher rate than those in the high medium risk group, particularly for the Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 cohorts. In other words, the data in figure 2 shows that non-college ready students who live on campus their first year are more likely to graduate than those who are college ready, but live off campus.

The five year graduation rates, which are shown in Figure 2 reflects the same trend as the four year rates. Only 37% to 41% of the High Risk students graduated within five years in contrast to the Low Risk students whose graduation rates ranged from 65% to 69%. Similarly, the rates for the medium risk groups fell in between the low and high risk groups. The data again shows Low Medium Risk students graduating at a higher rate than the High Medium Risk students.

As can be seen in Figure 3, High Risk students continue to graduate at a lower rate (51%) within six years as compared to their Low Risk counter-parts (72%). In addition, for the medium risk groups, the Low Medium Risk students who were non-college ready and lived on campus continued to graduate at a higher six year rate (68%) than the High Medium Risk students who were college-ready, but lived off campus (59%).

Given that 59% of the High Medium Risk students graduated within six years, the 41% who did not graduate (and left the university) were tracked to see what their academic standing was before leaving. The results are presented in Figure 4, which shows that almost half (48%) left in good standing and only a third (31%) were academically disqualified. Moreover, 16% were still on probation and 5% had their probation removed or were reinstated, yet, still chose to leave. Finally, we looked at when these students left SDSU and found that almost two thirds (63%) did not return after their first year.

Summary

The data suggests that FTF who enter SDSU who are not college-ready and live off campus during their first year are at a higher risk of not graduating than those who are college-ready and live on campus. However, for the medium risk students, the data also showed that those who were college-ready and lived off campus were at a higher risk than those who were non-college ready, but lived on campus. Given these results, one conclusion that can be made from the data is that FTF who choose to commute during their first year, will decrease their likelihood of graduating regardless of their college-readiness status. In addition, as shown in Table 1, about 40% of the FTF (20% - High Risk, 20% - High Medium Risk) choose to live off campus. Therefore, further investigation of the push-pull factors that affect the academic success of commuter students is warranted. Finally, although the data also suggests that students who choose to live on campus will increase their likelihood of graduating regardless of whether they enter as non-college-ready students, further analyses as to why living on campus increases a student’s likelihood of academic success is also warranted.

Proposal

The above data suggests that non-college ready FTF who commute during their first year are the least likely to graduate. However, the results also showed college ready FTF commuters graduating at a lower rate than non-college ready FTF who lived on
campus, which would suggest a lack of connection to the campus community. Thus, in order to enhance our capacity to better involve commuter students, we propose the following recommendation with key strategic focuses:

**Recommendation: Establish an Office of Commuter Life and Engagement charged with the following strategic objectives:**

**Strategic Objective 1:** Strategic use of learning communities for commuter students such as:

- Use of individual courses to build community
- Supplemental instruction
- Block scheduling
- Active and collaborative learning

**Strategic Objective 2:** Creative use of space (e.g., new student union and library) in order to provide commuter students access to:

- Tutoring
- Writing support
- Community service and leadership programs
- Leadership opportunities for commuter students
- Freshmen year seminars and experiences geared toward commuters

**Strategic Objective 3:** Strategic use of faculty, staff and administrators such as:

- Faculty / staff mentoring
- Student assistant / work study opportunities

**Strategic Objective 4:** Identify strategies and relevant student programs and services with a focus on access, transition, community and connection to the university such as:

- Orientation and welcome week
- Commuter Summer Bridge
- Commuter University Seminar

**Proposed Budget for the Office of Commuter Life and Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grad Interns</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty In-Res Stipends</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating &amp; Programming</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


Table 1
Pre-College Academic Preparation of SDSU First-Time Freshmen (FTF) Cohorts (EI > 3399)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fall 2005 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-College Ready</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ready</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-Off/Live-On Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived Off Campus</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived On Campus</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fall 2005 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-College Ready</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Ready</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-Off/Live-On Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived Off Campus</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived On Campus</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>3,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
College Risk Factor Matrix (EI > 3399)
SDSU First-time Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-COLLEGE READY</th>
<th>COLLEGE READY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>High Medium Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005 (N = 568 or 16.2%)</td>
<td>Fall 2005 (N = 762 or 21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006 (N = 828 or 19.8%)</td>
<td>Fall 2006 (N = 982 or 23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007 (N = 770 or 17.6%)</td>
<td>Fall 2007 (N = 977 or 26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Medium Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005 (N = 597 or 17.0%)</td>
<td>Fall 2005 (N = 1,579 or 45.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006 (N = 641 or 15.3%)</td>
<td>Fall 2006 (N = 1,726 or 41.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007 (N = 775 or 17.7%)</td>
<td>Fall 2007 (N = 1,931 or 44.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Financial Profile of SDSU First-Time Freshmen (FTF) Cohorts *(EI > 3399)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON-COLLEGE READY</th>
<th>COLLEGE READY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFF CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>56,633</td>
<td>56,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC = 0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC &lt; $3,500</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Comp</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ON CAMPUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Medium Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>74,087</td>
<td>89,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC = 0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC &lt; $3,500</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Comp</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2005: 1,579</td>
<td>2006: 1,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>103,377</td>
<td>113,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC = 0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EFC &lt; $3,500</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Comp</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

SDSU First-Time Freshmen (FTF) Cohorts
Percent Who Applied for Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)
*(EI > 3399)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Fall 2005 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td># FAFSA</td>
<td>% FAFSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium Risk</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium Risk</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,506</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1
4 Year Graduation
(Percent Graduated in 4 Years)
EI > 3399

Figure 2
5 Year Graduation
(Percent Graduated in 5 Years)
EI > 3399
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Figure 3
6 Year Graduation
(Percent Graduated in 6 Years)
EI > 3399

Figure 4
FTF Fall 2005 Cohort

The 41% of High Medium Risk Students who Did Not Graduate in 6 Years and Did Not Return
San Diego State University Learning Center Proposal

Recommendation

The SDSU Learning Center will promote critical thinking, quantitative and information literacy, presentation and communication skills, and writing excellence. Fostering critical thinking and excellence in writing and communication will be a significant focus of the SDSU Learning Center. It will assist students at all levels and in all disciplines to strengthen their academic writing and communication abilities. The Center will also support the efforts of faculty to incorporate writing into their classrooms and to conduct research related to writing and the writing process. In addition, the Center will provide assistance in quantitative and information literacy so that students will succeed both in their academic careers and once they leave the university.

Staffing

The Learning Center will be staffed by a tenure-track director (with faculty status in the Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies) who has a background in Rhetoric and Composition with an emphasis in learning/writing center administration. Given the year-round needs and the demands of starting and running a new center, we recommend that the director receive a twelve-month contract and be hired at the associate or professor rank. The Center will also be staffed by a tenure-track librarian who will coordinate and provide information literacy instruction and outreach. In addition, the Center's staff will include an assistant director at the lecturer level and fifty graduate and undergraduate peer tutors selected from writing, communication, mathematics, and other relevant disciplines. Baseline staffing of the Center will include the director, the assistant director, and approximately eight tutors working at the same time. The Center will also include computer stations equipped for Skype that will be available for online tutoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Related Costs</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand the current tutoring center space by an additional 25-30 seats; provide tutoring stations, improved lighting, and technology to support practice presentation space and office space for an Assistant Director.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track director to hire, train, and oversee the tutors; develop and implement workshops; and cultivate partnerships with departments (.80 assigned time). Will teach one course per year for Rhetoric and Writing Studies.</td>
<td>$97,712 (11/12-month contract at the associate or professor rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director or Office Manager to be in the Center supervising staff 40 hrs./week, scheduling staff, creating assessment reports, and doing office manager duties.</td>
<td>$53,124 (12 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Related Costs</th>
<th>Annual Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 hrs./week of a tenure-track librarian to coordinate and provide information literacy instruction and outreach.</td>
<td>$48,845 (12 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hrs./week of coverage by tutors per academic year ($10.50 to $12.50 per hour) with between one and ten tutors working each hour. (Averaged at eight tutors working 40 hrs./week for nine months.) Pay tutors to attend/participate in professional development and training/staff meetings: 8 hours per tutor per semester for training/meetings/workshops).</td>
<td>$141,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hrs./week of tutors for summer term. (Averaged at four tutors working 30 hrs./week for eight weeks.)</td>
<td>$11,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Advertising; student and faculty/workshops/training/team building.</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds, books/reference material, web-based documentation, misc. expenditures.</td>
<td>$15,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs, Year I</td>
<td>$470,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Costs</td>
<td>$370,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SDSU Learning Analytics Project
Goals & Vision
A Center for Learning Analytics could extend SDSU's use of data for decision-making in three ways:

1. **Integration and analysis of previously unexplored data aggregated at the course, program, and campus-wide levels.**
   This project would access data previously not considered in most institutional data analysis efforts, such as use of learning management system technologies, participation in high impact practices, cohort membership, and other information about student learning processes and performance. By using information from the immediate student learning context, SDSU is positioned to identify successful practices and to help at-risk students where it has the most impact - while they are in the middle of a course.

2. **Disseminate timely data to new audiences.**
   Rather than waiting for a report to be generated, alerts can be sent when a defined criteria is triggered (e.g. when a student has not logged into the LMS for one week). These reports can be provided to people that are the most appropriate to take action - students themselves.

3. **Providing tools and capabilities for "self-help" data analysis by administrators, faculty, staff, and students.**
   A Learning Analytics project could enable the appropriate audiences to interact with reports by drilling-down on findings, refining queries, and making comparisons between courses, departments, or colleges.

Implementation
The Task Force recommends that a *Learning Analytics Working Group* be convened to explore opportunities to maximize the contributions of learning analytics to the overall SDSU goal of improving graduation rates with a special emphasis on reducing the time-to-degree by increasing four-year graduation rates.

The Learning Analytics Working Group would focus on achieving the following tasks over three time periods:

*Short-term:* Utilize Learning Management System (LMS) student data to provide students, faculty, staff, and administrators with critical and timely feedback, interventions, and assistance.

*Medium-term:* Align data mined from the LMS with other sources of student data to create robust, predictive models of student academic behavior and success.

*Long-term:* Provide information related to high-impact educational practices such as undergraduate research, study abroad, writing intensive courses, and residential learning communities. Track post graduation student outcomes. Examine whether or not there are any disparities in student achievement in online courses between students from underrepresented groups and students from other groups.

The Learning Analytics Working Group will include representation from key stakeholders across the university.
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The Learning Analytics Working Group will establish coordination processes for requesting and sharing data across divisions and ensuring that a common language is agreed upon in order to define terms such as “full time” and “commuter” student.
### SDSU Learning Analytics Project - Draft budget 12/10/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>Total (with 34% Benefits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Analytics Director</td>
<td>Project leadership, strategy, direction. Admin II</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyst</td>
<td>Data filtering, merging, editing, etc.</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$73,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Warehouse Staff</td>
<td>Integration of new data sources and elements. Maintenance of data tables and schema.</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$43,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$251,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th></th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bb Analytics for Learn</td>
<td>Analytics for Learn module only; advanced queries would require additional modules</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb Analytics (installation)</td>
<td>Installation and services for year 1</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$55,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Staff and Application** $307,050  
**Ongoing Cost** $289,050
Three Top Priorities for Developing and Altering Current Initiatives in Supporting Educational Technologies

Recommendation I: Put resources into online education
Interest in online learning at the course level at SDSU and across the CSU is immense; and institutional program-level interest is expanding. For instance, from 2008 to 2011, SDSU student enrollment in Academic Affairs-supported fully online summer courses grew over 700%. This is in line with a trend highlighted in a 2011 report from the CSU Chancellor's Office which stated, “in every student survey of the past decade, [students] consistently rated ‘access to online courses’ as their second most important priority for a college education (just behind workforce preparation).” Institutional interest at SDSU in developing online courses and programs seems to be growing at a similar rate. For example, the College of Business Administration, the School of Nursing, the School of Public Affairs and the School of Hospitality & Tourism Management are all actively considering, creating or implementing their own online degree programs at the graduate level. Looking forward, online education demands just as much, if not more, of the combined academic technology resources of the university.

1. **Increase online efforts at the program level, as well as the course level.** Experiment with general fund degree programs; monitor CSU-wide online education initiatives; provide essential student support services online such as advising, financial aid, and tutoring. Reframe the Course Design Institute as the *Curriculum Design Institute* and evolve this popular faculty development initiative from a course-centric to a program-level focus.

2. **Modify processes and policies to support online and blended learning.** There are many logistical and process considerations that can support online learning at SDSU, such as rethinking course designations, considering an on-campus testing center for students to take proctored course exams, and building accessibility into the course approval and review process.

3. **Improve core technologies for delivery, interaction and engagement.** Leading practice suggests that universities update core technologies approximately every three years. For SDSU, that means meeting the demand for technology-rich physical learning spaces, as well as online / virtual learning spaces via web-conferencing, lecture recording / archiving, and streaming media.

4. **Embrace learning analytics.** As students arrive at SDSU with extreme differences in readiness, goals and needs, learning analytics can help faculty spot trends, and help faculty and students make informed choices. Learning analytics provides accountability and alerts about performance problems that can then trigger timely interventions and assistance. This data helps personalize learning via adaptive systems that change dynamically in response to student activities, tailoring recommendations based on performance criteria. We suggest conducting a pilot study to examine the impact of learning analytics on student success vis-à-vis student activity within the Learning Management System (LMS).

---
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Recommendation II. Strengthen college partnerships with ITS
Extend formal collaborations between colleges and ITS to further a campus-wide approach to high-quality design, development, support, and delivery of face-to-face as well as hybrid/online courses, certificates, programs, and degrees.

1. **Expand local instructional designer concept.** Strategic collaboration between ITS faculty consultants and college-based instructional designers (IDers) provide opportunities for faculty development that might not otherwise be available to individual faculty. The relationships between IDers and ITS are critical to disseminating instructional technology strategies to the colleges and then sharing best practices with ITS for wider dissemination across campus.

2. **Recruit faculty champions.** Faculty development is most effective when it is faculty-driven and discipline-specific. ITS hopes to recruit an instructor from each college to work closely with ITS and serve for one academic year as an example, resource, and mentor for their colleagues. Through this two-way channel, faculty can provide their college with information and expertise about instructional technology and pedagogy, and provide ITS staff with further insight into faculty and student needs.

Recommendation III. Elevate the strategic role of ITS
Three demands continue to stretch the university: a push for more student and faculty research, the rising interest online learning, and the need for more state-of-the-art technology-rich physical learning spaces. As these activities increase, Instructional Technology Services plays an even more central, strategic role.
Now more than ever, SDSU needs academic technology leadership with specialized skills and competencies to provide integrated planning and delivery of a suite of academic technology products, services, and support to the campus as well as to set policy and standards, and to champion new approaches across the university. Therefore, we recommend expanding the institutional role of the ITS Director – the university’s senior instructional technology leader. In a more strategic role, the ITS Director would be better able to do the following:

- Create stronger ties and integrated planning with other areas of Academic Affairs, such as the colleges, Division of Undergraduate Studies, Enrollment Services and the Library;
- Extend partnerships with the Faculty Senate, Enterprise Technology Services, Center for Teaching & Learning, College of Extended Studies, and other campus areas as appropriate to work collaboratively toward institutional strategic goals that can be addressed by instructional technology and learning analytics;
- Provide leadership in operational and strategic planning and policy related to curriculum development, online education, and instructional technology initiatives that facilitate achievement of the university’s strategic goals; ensure that academic technology issues and requirements are incorporated into the university’s overall technology plan;
- Provide high-level leadership and direction for instructional technology support staff, ensuring efficient and effective utilization of human resources with an emphasis on high quality service.
The Honors College at San Diego State University

“Putting honors at the heart of university life encourages students to aspire to become better citizens, not just competitive job applicants.”

-Megan Burks, Journalism Major ‘08

Increasingly, SDSU is attracting some of the most academically qualified students it has ever enrolled. These students, like Megan Burks, believe that their experience is about becoming better citizens, not just better job applicants. They know that their experiences at SDSU play an important part in helping them make connections across disciplines, to understand their role in society, to engage in community activity, to study abroad, and to effect change in a global age. Throughout their lives, these students will need to address problems associated with global warming, political instability, adequate health care, and economic prosperity for all people. Given these challenges, our task is to ensure that they have the background they need to benefit us all.

A Distinctive Experience

A college of the University

The Honors College at San Diego State University will provide a distinctive learning community for selected students, one in which students work closely with faculty, advisors and staff to develop the skills to excel regardless of their major or career path. The Honors College will seek students who are well qualified, but also those who will bring different perspectives, who have the desire to make a difference in their own lives as well as in the lives of others, and those who appreciate the importance of diversity in a global age.

Additionally, the Honors College will provide multiple pathways for high-achieving students from across the university to pursue their academic and career interests while also benefitting from a community of diverse students.

Our commitment to these students is to build an Honors College at San Diego State University, a college where students in small classes can engage challenging ideas, work side-by-side with research professors, pursue interdisciplinary challenges, and apply their understanding to real world problems. Students in this College will have the best of all worlds: engagement in a small college environment while drawing on the opportunities provided by a large research university. They will study abroad, work in the local community, take on leadership roles, ask questions, listen, and learn how to make a positive difference.

A College of the University

Such a college also benefits other students by existing as a resource through which they can seek out additional opportunities and compete for Marshall, Udall, Goldwater, and Truman scholarships, for example. Students outside the college may also draw on staff support to identify undergraduate research opportunities, internships, and unique study
abroad programs. Thus, while a college is a distinct entity within any university, it contributes to higher degrees of excellence and more opportunities for all students.

Creating the Honors College

The key components of an Honors College cannot be created overnight but must be developed over time. However, this process has been initiated and has been underway for the last decade. Here are some highlights:

**Time line:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Honors Program Director Position converted from half time to full time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Phi Eta Sigma (Freshman Honor Society) moved under auspices of the Honors Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Required study abroad instituted for all Honors Program students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>International Coordinator hired to complement Honors Program Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Office of Academic Scholarships created and director appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Coordinator converted to full time position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Research created and director appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi Beta Delta (International Honor Society) moved under auspices of the Honors program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,560 students apply for University Honors Program, up from 230 in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholars Without Borders established at San Diego State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Institute Henry Janssen Faculty Fellows Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortar Board moved to Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Maya Residence Hall is designated as the Honors Program residence hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and all first-year Honors Program students are required to live on campus in their Freshman year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Minor in Honors approved and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Shannon Clark, an Honors Program student, becomes the first student from San Diego State University to receive a Udall Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Honors Program initiates a call for interdisciplinary international seminars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, over these years, 6 students from the Program have taken part in the Panetta Institute, and 75% of all Honors Program students have taken part in volunteer and community activity.

While the Honors Program will remain a core component of the Honors College, our aim is to create more opportunities for high-achieving students across campus. At its core, the College will be established with a commitment to:
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Academic Achievement (Curriculum)
International Experience (Study Abroad)
Residential Education (Living Learning Community)
Leadership (Service and Commitment)

The College will also be overseen by a director, as noted in the proposal from the Student Success Task Force, and an Honors College Advisory Committee with representatives from across the campus community.

The Future for Honors at San Diego State

We ask honors students at San Diego State University today three questions:
(1) What kind of world do you want?
(2) What kind of difference will you make?
(3) What kind of future will you map?

Creating an Honors College allows us to help more students ask and answer these questions.
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Report from the AOD subcommittee to the Student Success and Academic Excellence Task Force.

Members of the Subcommittee:
Jim Lange, Ph.D., Coordinator of AOD Initiatives
Lee Mintz, Ed.D., Director of Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities
Christy Samarkos, Director of Residential Education
Captain Lamine Secka, SDSU Police Department
Randy Timm, Director of Student Life and Leadership

Background
SDSU recognizes that student alcohol and other drug use can pose a significant impediment to academic success, may lead to life threatening and other serious consequences, and negatively impacts our community. The issue is not unique to SDSU; indeed it is a campus, community and national issue. It has been estimated that over 1,800 college students die each year in alcohol-related incidents. Further, there are hundreds of thousands of alcohol-related injuries, assaults, and rapes (Hingson, Zha, & Weitzman, 2009). SDSU students and our broader community have not been immune from these tragic consequences. Therefore, we have a comprehensive strategy of prevention that seeks to reduce the abuse of AODs and their harms. The strategy follows the model proposed by the Student Health Services AOD Initiatives office.

The model for comprehensive AOD strategies includes elements from five interacting domains (see Figure 1). This model puts into place a system whereby (1) student attitudes and motivations to use or abuse AODs are changed through Individual Focus programs; (2) Behavioral Alternative opportunities for students to act responsibly while fulfilling developmental and social; and (3) access to AODs or risky ancillary behaviors are reduced to limit excessive consumption or harm through Enforcement and Access Limiting programs. These domains act both within the campus and at the broader community level thereby often requiring Community Action and involvement. Finally, all programmatic activity should be developed and evaluated within an environment of rigorous Research using scientific methods that enable measurement of improvements in individual and public health outcomes, cost-efficiencies, program sustainability, and program improvement.
Leadership

SDSU has established a leadership role within the CSU and the nation with this model. The model was adopted by the CSU system to organize its AOD meetings for many years; and other campuses and national organizations have used variants of this model. Within the model are programmatic activities that have also established our leadership credentials. Below are a few examples.

Individual Focus

Within the Individual Focused domain, the e-Check-Up-To-Go, which is an online alcohol assessment and intervention, is required of all students. It was developed at SDSU’s CPS office and is now licensed for use on about 500 campuses across the nation. Independent peer-reviewed studies have demonstrated that this intervention can reduce student alcohol consumption. (see “eCHECKUP TO GO :: San Diego State University Research Foundation,” 2012)

Behavioral Alternatives

The Aztec Nights program is jointly supported by Associated Students, Student Affairs and Business Affairs. Concentrated in the first 5 weeks of the fall semester, this program offers high-profile late-night alcohol and drug free events for SDSU students. The program is credited for setting a healthy tone for students as they enter the Aztec Community (Higher Education Center for AOD Abuse and Violence Prevention,” 2010).

Access and Enforcement

Since many of the unhealthy behaviors associated with alcohol and other drugs also conflict with the law, enforcement is an important component to prevention. The SDSU Police Department has been a leader in creating a cooperative enforcement response with other agencies in San Diego. Indeed, we have been able to show that by combining enforcement with student awareness, reductions in vexing problems like drunk driving can be made (Clapp et al., 2005). The enforcement and judicial sanctions also represent an important contact point for at-risk students, allowing for interventions that are tailored to their needs. This means that Counseling and Psychological Services (CPS), Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities (CSRR), and other departments are included in the team that addresses student AOD risky behavior. Sanctions, such as CSRR-imposed probation or suspensions, and counseling programs, such as the CPS ASPIRE program, are examples of this important element of SDSU’s response to AOD problems.

Community Action

SDSU was recognized by the U.S. Department of Education for its C-CAPP program in 2004. That program created a coalition that spurred stepped-up enforcement around the campus. More recently, SDSU’s Coordinator of AOD Initiatives was instrumental in the development of the RADD California Coalition that seeks to reduce college student drunk driving. To date thirteen campuses have joined the coalition and this number is ever expanding. SDSU also is represented in two county taskforces: (1) prescription misuse, and (2) underage and binge drinking.
Research

SDSU has hosted some of the seminal research studies on the topic of college alcohol and other abuse. Faculty here have been awarded millions of federal research dollars to advance the field and have published on measurement (e.g., Clapp et al., 2006; Clapp, Johnson, Shillington, Lange, & Voas, 2008; Lange, Lauer, & Voas, 1999; Lange & Voas, 2000; Lange, Devos-Comby, Moore, Daniel, & Homer, 2011), prevalence (e.g., Lange, Reed, Croff, & Clapp, 2008; Lange et al., 2002; Shillington, Reed, Lange, Clapp, & Henry, 2006), prevention (e.g., Clapp & Lange, 2006; Clapp et al., 2005; McCabe et al., 2007), and etiology of abuse (e.g., Clapp, Segars, & Voas, 2002; Clapp & Shillington, 2001; Reed, Clapp, Lange, & McCabe, 2011).

Looking Forward – Recommendations to the Strategic Task Force

That we have been innovative, effective and a model for others does not imply that for SDSU (a) the problem of AOD abuse has gone away, or (b) that there are not more steps we can take to improve the situation. This is partially due to the persistent nature of the problem, but also partly due to the ever-changing nature of AOD abuse, and the steady influx of new young students exploring the developmentally expected aspects of independence and social bonding.

Therefore, it is our expectation that SDSU should seek to maintain its leadership, focus and actions to further enhance the prevention goals.

Leadership

To be a leader, SDSU must foster, support and value expertise in the field. To date, this has meant allowing for faculty-initiated projects and research to flourish. The C-CAPP project (J.D. Clapp & Stanger, 2003), the Alcohol Research Collaborative project (Lange, PI), and e-CHUG initiatives (VanSickle, PI) are all examples of this. Faculty departments and Student Affairs should be encouraged to continue to recruit and support faculty whose research interest and expertise can help benefit the campus on this important issue.

One way to support this is through a structure of research resources that facilitate the study of college-student AOD issues. A system of regular surveys, alcohol and drug indicators (such as arrests and medical transports) and graduate students are the basic infrastructure for this type of research. This research would also feed into a proposed Annual Report (see below) that would guide continued strategic planning. Costs of this effort could include funding for two graduate assistants to be supervised by the Coordinator of AOD Initiatives and $7,500 in data collection costs.

Leadership also relies on communication. Our work to date has been recognized across the country as cutting-edge and valuable. However, on campus, and to some extent within our local community, it is not always recognized. Use of open forums, topic teach-ins, the proposed Annual Report (see below) to the Faculty Senate and other venues may help assure that the SDSU community is better engaged in the topic and those in a position to help can be tapped. It is critical that we engage faculty support for our programming, allowing those who have direct contact with students every day to see the value of AOD prevention.
programs and encourage curriculum and research infusion of AOD topics into faculty expertise domains.

Leadership also means bringing together various interest groups to accomplish large changes in campus and community norms. For instance, it has been suggested that the physical structure of our Fraternity Row buildings and their management under various jurisdictions helps to foster an environment that allows and possibly even encourages excessive consumption of AODs. To make changes to the physical environment that such an observation suggests will require leadership at the highest levels of SDSU, the SDSU Research Foundation, Associated Students and the fraternities themselves.

Focus

SDSU has always acknowledged the importance of managing the problems of student AOD use and abuse. However, the degree to which new initiatives are generated and embraced waxes and wanes. This can sometimes lead to reactive instead of strategic actions. Creating a system whereby student AOD use is regularly measured and reviewed at the highest levels can serve to maintain the focus and continued leadership. A taskforce that is comprised of high-level cabinet officers as well as relevant department heads should review the data and programmatic progress on a quarterly basis. This taskforce will also serve to inform the creation of an Annual Report discussed below.

Specific Actions

Several programs and areas are currently understood to need attention now. These are:

1. Annual AOD Strategic Assessment Report to Faculty Senate. On an annual basis the Coordinator of AOD Initiatives, with the help of a committee of relevant campus representatives, will submit a report on the state of AOD use, prevention programming and policies to the Faculty Senate. This document will serve as a basis for disseminating program activities, explicating challenging areas and engaging the broader campus community in efforts to reduce identified problems. The report will also form the basis for the federally mandated biennial Drug Free Schools and Community Act review, and the CSU mandated biennial reporting. The assessment will require some annual expenditure to support graduate assistants and data collection efforts.

2. Fraternity supervision. Those within the Greek community are recognized to comprise a disproportionate share of the problems associated with AOD use. To make inroads in this community, a restructuring of the way student organizations are recognized is recommended. Each organization should be capable of periodically demonstrating that their recognition fits within the broader SDSU institutional mission. Holding all organizations accountable to fulfilling this obligation for continued recognition should be a priority.

3. Emerging drugs. Prescription drugs are proving to be a substantial threat to the well-being of our students. However, as of this date, there are no evidence-based approaches to preventing prescription drug abuse. New initiatives should be developed and evaluated to make progress toward reducing this problem.
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4. Proactive Contact. Many of the opportunities to engage students in AOD prevention occur in the context of judicial action. To contact students before problems are noticed, a screening and brief intervention or referral to treatment (SBIRT) program should be implemented within the Student Health Services. Such a program would reach a much more broadly representative group of students than our current residence hall and fraternity oriented programs. Costs for this program would include staff for intern supervision, and counselors for students who meet the referral screen criteria.
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