

San Francisco State University

Framework for an Academic Master Plan

Background and Context

Under the direction of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Jennifer Summit and Academic Senate Chair Nancy Gerber, and with the full support of outgoing President Les Wong, San Francisco State University began drafting an Academic Master Plan in the fall of 2018 (Appendix 1).

The Academic Master Plan (AMP)'s intent is to set the academic direction for San Francisco State in line with the University's mission. The AMP will anchor the core of future planning efforts, to the extent that its organizing questions address the University's central purpose: **What kind of future does San Francisco State University imagine for its academic core? How will it shape the education of our students, the development and support of our faculty and, the role of the University in the local, national and global community.**

Academic Senate Resolution #RS18-268 emphasized the important role of shared governance in the plan and in the process leading to a final AMP. Thus, the first task was to engage in a participatory process in order to establish a conceptual framework for the AMP that would reflect SF State values and commitments and then, to propose related broad objectives that could translate into concrete objectives that will guide a forward-looking, transparent and accountable Academic Master Plan.

The following framework:

- 1) articulates the defining commitments that make San Francisco State's education distinctive and valuable;
- 2) provides a summary of the responses to the central questions driving the AMP process provided by the 140 campus members of the AMP working groups, in consultation with the AMP steering and leadership committees, the Academic Affairs Council and the Senate Executive Committee;
- 3) proposes relevant objectives that could translate into to concrete action steps;
- 4) identifies opportunities for further strategic planning.

After broad consultation with campus communities, including students, faculty, staff, and administrators the framework will be used to draft the Academic Master Plan itself. This will involve vetting the recommendations for those already in progress or not possible within the next several years (or at all), assigning responsible parties for each recommendation, determining a timeline and cost for each recommendation.

Question 1: What makes an SF State education distinctive and valuable to our students? To others?

Thanks to the collective input provided by the 140 campus members of the 12 AMP working groups, in consultation with the AMP steering and leadership committees, the Academic Affairs Council and the Senate Executive Committee as well as the campus community (Appendix 3), the conceptual framework for the final AMP identified the following commitments as the essential underpinnings of the AMP as it will shape our academic core and continues to make a San Francisco State education valuable and distinctive:

1. A commitment to a social justice -focused education that empowers faculty, staff, and students to transform the institutional and systemic inequities that affect their lives and communities;
2. A commitment to the success and well-being of all students, many of whom are first generation, low-income, and historically marginalized, through broad access to higher education and equitable and engaged teaching;
3. A commitment to student engagement in research, scholarship and creativity in and outside of the classroom, in keeping with our motto, *experientia docet*;
4. A commitment to civic engagement and to fulfilling our responsibility as a partner and leader in the Bay Area and beyond.

Question 2: How do we ensure high levels of engagement and growth for students at every step of their academic journey?

Students learn more effectively when they feel invested in their education, when they engage in active learning, and when they see a clear connection between their education and the larger world, whether in terms of their career, their community, or their life as critically-conscious and socially-engaged members of our global community. -Grant Ave.

*“High levels of engagement and growth for students begins with dedicated faculty.” –
California Street*

The richness, thoughtfulness and depth of working groups’ answer to this question demonstrate our individual and collective belief in public higher education as a force for social change. We see academic excellence and educational equity as inseparable imperatives. San Francisco State maintains a highly accomplished, professionally active faculty who are drawn here because of the diversity, determination and grit that our students bring to the classroom. “Relevant education” has been our hallmark since 1968, and our curriculum fosters civic and community engagement, hands-on learning, rigorous critical thinking, and ethical intelligence across the disciplines and through multiple modalities. While all groups identify many challenges affecting student engagement and growth, they also provide extensive recommendations, both to improve existing models and, to create new structures and practices that could significantly advance student engagement.

The Bay Area housing crisis has created long commutes, destabilized campus community and presents challenges for students, faculty and staff. Many students face multiple and compounded hardships around basic needs, transportation and mental health that undermine their engagement

with their studies (**Grant Ave, 19th Ave, California St, Portola Dr**). While the oversight of these areas extends beyond the Academic Master Plan, they require a coordinated campus effort. The growing inequities of wealth and well-being affecting San Francisco and the Bay Area pose new challenges to a campus with a social justice mission as foundational as our own, and we must grapple with them directly and make finding solutions a priority.

Even in this seemingly intractable context, the working groups perceive important opportunities to strengthen or build new structures for student engagement—and to acknowledge its linkage with faculty engagement-- around several core areas: pedagogy, technology, curriculum, advising, and last but not least, connections and community.

First, engaging students necessitates high-impact teaching practices. A number of working groups emphasize that we must ensure that a strong culture of teaching is supported and recognized to be critical to academic excellence. Several groups recognize that we need to expand or develop new ways to assist faculty in developing high-impact practices, such as social justice pedagogy. **19th Ave** lauds the role of CEETL in advancing faculty engagement and **Portola Dr** further proposes, *“expanding CEETL to offer a certificate program to support formal faculty training [as] one method of enhancing professional development. The College of Health and Social Sciences Teaching Taskforce also supports faculty development in teaching; methods such as these should continue to be expanded across campus.”*

Second, several working groups note that technology is also a key component for advancing student engagement, provided that technology is up-to-date, and faculty are trained to use it confidently and effectively in their classrooms.

Third, **Grant Ave** posits that high-impact practices must include active and relevant learning that allow *“students [to] see a clear connection between their education and the larger world-issues of social justice”* or as **19th Ave** states, *“what they care about.”* **19th Ave** recommends that we follow proven models of relevant curriculum such as the Metro College Success Program. **Portola Dr** states, *“We can engage our students’ intellectual growth better if we better engage our faculty, staff and administrators’ growth as well.”*

Working groups would like to see an “intentional” curriculum. As **Grant Ave** stipulates, *“This means not only that the structure of the curriculum must be designed intentionally, but that it needs to be accompanied by strong advising to make the roadmap clear to students.”* Most groups would like to see the curriculum integrate more of an experiential or “relevant” component. Recognizing the value of engaging students by (in the words of two working groups) *“build[ing] learning in the context of their own lives and interests,”* and activating the *“give-back mentality”* that motivates them, many groups recommend scaling and deepening students’ hands-on learning through internships, fieldwork, research, civic engagement, and study abroad. **Fulton St** suggests that, *“the campus could function as a living lab where faculty and students could, for example, partner with facilities on sustainability improvements.”* **Grant Ave** observes that *“COSE has a long-standing dedication to undergraduate research, including an outstandingly successful research showcase, and LCA is working to follow suit with its CURE (College Undergraduate Research Experience) initiative”*. **Grant Ave** further recommends that programs

and initiatives like these need to be supported and expanded to promote student engagement and growth.

Fourth, effective student supports, including tutoring, advising and course availability—and an adequate roster of courses with enough seats at days and times that meet student needs through a variety of modalities—are fundamental to the student experience. **19th Avenue** and other working groups emphasize the need to better assist students with the transition to employment.

Finally, all groups assert the need to engage students through the building of community in and outside of the classroom. Working groups identify a deep hunger for connection that affects students and faculty across multiple levels: for connection of students with faculty, of students with other students, and of faculty with other faculty; connection of both students and faculty with the campus and SF State community and with the city and region we serve. For **Market St**, “*Much of student engagement practice needs to be thought of as community building and should occur inside and outside of the classroom.*” Curriculum can also strengthen a sense of belonging; **Park Presidio** notes that “*SF State stands alone in the range of general education courses that can be met with courses in Ethnic Studies, Women & Gender Studies, Sexuality Studies, and other courses that students can have an identity-based connection with.*” Further, by inviting students to experience the world through others’ perspectives, curriculum can cultivate empathy. As **Van Ness Ave** observes, “*We believe that we become more just, more ethical the more we confront and grapple with the lives of others, whether that is by reading Anna Karenina or Words Fall Apart or by studying micro-lending in Bangladesh or the role of women in politics in southeast Asia.*”

Question 3: In light of our institutional mission and goals, what is the distinct character and contribution of our graduate programs?

“Our graduate programs bring a wealth of skills and life experiences of a diverse student body to the classroom, campus efforts, faculty research, and community interactions.” – Lincoln Way Working Group

A review of all working groups’ answers to question 3 on graduate education shows unanimous and enthusiastic support for graduate education. All working groups highlight the contribution of graduate education at SFSU in fulfilling its mission of social justice (1), its value to undergraduate students’ success, to the faculty and to the community, local and at large (2). However, while they describe its strengths (3), they acknowledge its challenges or weaknesses (4) and make recommendations to improve it (5).

Social Justice - Working groups all agree that graduate education enhances our mission of social justice. It is clear from the reports that our graduate programs serve a diverse population of students who are underserved at other institutions. **Park Presidio** discusses the fact that our population of graduate students includes greater racial and socioeconomic diversity than is typical in graduate programs. **19th Ave** supports their assertion and cites the Simpson Scarborough report that the “*majority of the current graduate students ... believe that SF State has a supportive faculty and a diverse campus that is focused on the community*” (Simpson-Scarborough report, p. 173 & 175). **Lombard St, California St and Fulton St** argue that an SFSU graduate education provides the skills and the degrees needed for socio-economic mobility or as a bridge to PhDs.

Value of an SF State Graduate Education - The value of grad education SFSU for our internal and external stakeholders was equally emphasized. All groups mention the benefits of having grad students on campus as near- peer mentors and often first-year experience instructors (**Lombard St, Portola Dr**). Groups also converge in their observations that grad students enhance faculty research and creativity as well as create incentive for hiring and retention. **19th Ave** summarizes this point as follows, “*Graduate programs are great recruitment resource and strategy for recruiting high quality faculty. Many potential faculty seek a blend of research and teaching, and SFSU’s graduate programs help support the hybrid approach.*” **Lombard St** concurs, “*In addition, having graduate students contributes to the culture and morale of faculty—it is invigorating and enriches the intellectual and academic culture for faculty. For those reasons, having strong graduate programs help recruit and retain faculty.*”

Graduate education also serves the city, the state and, the global work force and citizenry greatly as our students diversify and invigorate the professions and disciplines (**19th Ave, Van Ness Ave**). **Fell St** remarks: “[*the*] role [*of graduate students as knowledge creators make them keenly situated to expand and redefine the disciplines because of their presence and contributions informed by their identities or situations.*” **Grant Ave** adds, “*another important mission of SF State is to prepare students to become active citizens with a global perspective,*” while **Lincoln Way** states that “*our graduate programs provide a resource to local organizations to partner and provide creative, engaged, trainees and learners.*”

Strengths of Graduate Education - Working groups summarize the strengths of graduate education into compelling themes.

First is national reputation (**19th Ave, California St, Fulton St**). **Portola Dr**. specifically identify the local and national reputation of many MA and MS programs, including those whose impact shapes the artistic communities of the greater Bay Area and nationally through publications, work in publishing, film, TV, theater, arts groups and varied artistic activities. Our graduates in the creative arts promote social justice through increased visibility of historically underrepresented and marginalized groups, including POC, LGBTQ+community, immigrants, and socio-economically disadvantaged groups and have won national recognition, including Pulitzer Prizes, Emmy Awards, and other important accolades.

Second, is the affordability of our tuition compared to other institutions (**19th Ave**) and the opportunity for close connections with faculty (**California St, Fulton St, Park Presidio**).

Finally, our location is described as a crucial advantage (**19th Ave, Grant Ave**). “*San Francisco State University is in the heart of San Francisco and its professional workforce and is in fact a gateway to better lives for many of our students*” (**Lincoln Way**). **Park Presidio** examines how the City of San Francisco and graduate education draw mutual benefit. The group names as a strength the “*ways in which graduate programs engage in the local community, building on our San Francisco location to connect students to mentors and potential employers and to engage in community-embedded research.*” Working group participants also mention professional research and creative opportunities for grad students (**19th Ave, California Street**). **Fulton Street** adds that an education at SFSU provides students with access to an exciting urban experience of arts, museums, music, and valuable cultural and local icons.

Challenges in Graduate Education – On the negative side, all groups lament the decrease in enrollment (while greater in some colleges and in some programs, overall enrollment has

fallen significantly across the board), which undermines quality and strains resources and they all converge in their explanations. Most blame the drop on rising cost of living and housing, which drives students to debt (**Fell St**). Many groups (**California Street, Park Presidio, Geary Blvd, Van Ness Ave, and Portola Dr**) observe that *“the value of graduate education on campus fluctuates depending on the priorities of university leadership.”* **Fulton St** regrets the lack of graduate culture and community and the lack of assigned space for graduate students.

Recommendations - Working groups participants all provide recommendations to address recruitment shortfalls and to strengthen graduate education, recognizing the need for rapid, significant steps to revitalize and allow sustainability of graduate programs. There is unanimity on the recommendation of better financial packages for students, mainly through tuition waivers or remission at least for GTAs. Also, all groups want to see greater and easier pathways from undergrad to grad programs. Finally, innovative curriculum is offered as a way to revitalize our model of graduate education and its delivery. While graduate enrollments and the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students on campus has changed a great deal, many programs have changed very little (**Lombard St**). **Lincoln Way** argues that, *“New ideas and innovative programs, flexibility and adaptability in program delivery must start from the level of faculty and be implemented in concert with the Division of Graduate Studies and the Office of the International Programs.”* All groups mention a need for greater interdisciplinarity and even cross- disciplinarity (**Market St**). Interdisciplinary graduate programs, such as an environmental justice program, might harness the collaboration of multiple graduate programs as might development of new deliveries like stackable certificates and online programs where appropriate. **Grant Ave** highlights the need to internationalize the curriculum and facilitate international exchanges

Question 4: In light of our institutional mission and goals, what is the ideal role of research, scholarship, and creative activity for faculty and students?

“Research, scholarship, and creative work keep teaching current.”
– Park Presidio Boulevard Working Group

“Research should...practice the university values of social justice and inclusion, with faculty and students central to an inclusive and welcoming research process.” – Grant Avenue Working Group

“San Francisco State University provides a balance between theory and practice”
– Fulton Street Working Group

There is unanimous belief across all working groups that research, scholarship, and creative activities are ways to fulfill our mission of social justice as well as our commitment to excellent teaching (1). However, equally present in the working groups’ answers is the perception that numerous institutional obstacles currently prevent faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities from achieving their full potential (2). Finally, working groups provide suggestions and recommendations for improvement (3).

Connection to our mission – California St is clear that “*research and creative activity in the arts allows SFSU to have a social justice impact,*” primarily by enhancing on the student educational experience. **Portola Dr** summarizes this consensus view: “*based on its commitment to social justice, SF State has established and should maintain a reputation for providing students from all parts of society access to first-rate opportunities for student involvement in (community-responsive) research, scholarship, and creative activities, including and encouraging first generation students, students from disadvantaged economic backgrounds, students from underrepresented minority communities, and those who come to SF State for a second chance.*” **Park Presidio** similarly states that “*student involvement in scholarship, research and/or creative work, is clearly in harmony with our social-justice mission: it empowers our students, regardless of their academic, cultural, and socioeconomic background, to build their experience and increase their credentials, in order to become stronger candidates whether applying to masters and/or doctoral programs, or seeking to enter the workforce, optimally in their discipline.*” In the same line, **Van Ness Ave** posits that for students, research is a matter of access and equity. Indeed, engaging our students, especially undergraduates and the underrepresented, is frequently considered a distinctive and valuable component of our RCSA efforts.

More specifically, working groups highlight the relationship between research, scholarly and creative activity to pedagogy as it “*increases student engagement, engages the identity of the student, looks at real issues and real-world*” (**California St**). Several groups laud the teacher-scholar model. More specifically, Boyer’s model of scholarship (e.g. the scholarship of discovery; integration; application; and, teaching/learning) is credited for having informed many departments in executing the campus mission and goals (**Lombard St, 19th Ave**). Undergrad research is seen in several colleges to play a potentially significant role in student success (**Lombard St**).

Several groups also see the pedagogical benefits of community-engaged research. For example, **19th Ave** recognizes that “*Community-based participatory research and other forms of applied scholarship can be used as an active learning tool; informs classroom content; and can serve as a community service-learning opportunity.*” **Grant Ave** concurs and states that “*Research should also collaborate with local communities, through community-based research, collaborations with the private and non-profit sector.*” The plenary helped to surface an especially strong campus commitment to the scholarship of application/engagement. Two groups specifically mentioned engagement through community service learning.

Institutional Obstacles - While all groups value the role of RSCA in promoting social justice and student engagement, they identify numerous obstacles faced by faculty. At SF State, five out of six colleges maintain a 3-course (9 WTU) teaching assignment for full-time faculty; although it may not be equitably implemented both within and across colleges, it is valued as an institutional commitment to faculty research. As **Lincoln Way** states, “*Many faculty come to SF State precisely because they value teaching, research, and service, and do not believe they could do all three at another institution.*” However, **Lincoln Way** also remarks that, “*Increasingly, faculty are concerned about their ability to do all three and are seeking a more realistic balance in their professional lives.*” **Fell St** regrets that “*The struggle for publication and the search for meaningful grants often presents itself in opposition to the teaching mission of the university.*” Faculty highlight obstacles to their RSCA, including a lack of clear guidelines in RTP policies and from successive Provosts and Presidents when leadership changes (**Geary Blvd**), and the

difficulties encountered when applying for grants and administering the money thereafter. For example, **Grant Ave, California** and **Market Sts** highlight a need for streamlined grant management mechanism within a cumbersome ORSP Process. A perceived lack of support for graduate programs is also seen to negatively impact faculty research and creative activity in the arts. **Geary Blvd** notes that, *“Mechanisms are also missing to attract graduate student researchers, in the form of tuition reimbursement and formal graduate research and teaching appointments.”*

Several groups also mention the difficulties for adjunct faculty to engage in meaningful research given their lack of compensation and their workload. Yet without peer-reviewed work, they lose opportunities to apply to TT positions, should they become available (**Lombard St**). Finally, **California St** also mentions crumbling infrastructure as an impediment to research and creative collaboration and activity.

Recommendations - Some working groups offer specific recommendations for improvement. Several participants, based on obstacles described above, recommend more resources be allocated to graduate education, including tuition waivers (**California St**). They also suggest streamlining the grant processes. Several groups would like for the University to reexamine RTP and the weight given to research with students (**Fell St**). Others would like to see a return to more choices for faculty between teaching and research (**Lincoln Ave**). **Market St** advocates for better mentoring of faculty while **Lombard St** asks that funds allocated to support students, for example, travel awards to conferences. **Lombard St** also suggests a better utilization of summer. *“Some research assistants who live in the dorms must vacate at the end of spring semester, so their ability to have continuity with their lab can lose momentum. Having summertime ‘bridge’ awards covering room, board or other living expenses would allow to research assistants a chance to maintain momentum*

Question 5: In light of our institutional mission and goals, how should service be defined, measured, and evaluated?

“The benefits of service are, first and foremost, to create conditions for students to be successful.” – Portola Drive Working Group

“We need to understand service as an attempt to make this big university small.” – Fell Working Group

“Expectations of service should be clear and measurable” – Geary Boulevard

While participants in the Academic Master Planning process were largely comprised of those who believe in the value of service—as reflected in their willingness to step up and volunteer many weeks on the project—the value is not universally shared across campus. There is widespread agreement that service is measured, and thus evaluated, differently across the university and concern about unevenness of the levels and value of service across campus. **Fulton St** asks us to consider if our institution would look more like a UC if service was not a part of the goals of our institution. Service which aligns itself with the mission and goals of the university is most valued by the working groups. The characteristics of service that are most highly valued include service that benefits others (not self) and the functioning and effectiveness of shared governance. Additional valued forms of service include mentorships of any kind, service that is aligned with the social justice mission, and service that enhances the reputation of the university. **California St** posits *“Service by faculty, staff, and students is fundamental to the*

mission of San Francisco State University; enables the democratic processes to function within the university; creates a sense of togetherness within the university; facilitates connections with the university and the broader communities that catalyze scholarly and employment opportunities for students and faculty; and enhances the overall reputation of the university in the eyes of the local communities and broader public of California.”

The perceived drop in service by faculty in recent years was linked, at least in part, to the lack of engagement by the faculty with the campus (**Fulton St**). **Lincoln Way** notes that “*service is required to maintain a community,*” but that is hard when our faculty have such long commutes to manage. The value of service in building bridges across entities and working and building relationships with others on campus is underappreciated. There was consensus in the reports that, although service is valued, its value is not adequately captured through the RTP process nor through observed current participation levels. The sense that the campus has moved towards rewarding research/scholarship/creative works over both teaching and service is prevalent throughout the reports: “*In many departments, service is third in order of importance in retention and tenure.*” (**Grant Ave**) and “*Abundant service is treated the same/given the same consideration in terms of retention, tenure & promotion as doing no service. In light of this, why participate in service?*” (**Van Ness**).

There is a near-universal sense that service is not equitably distributed across campus. Several groups mentioned the perception that women and faculty of color tend to be overburdened with service, both formal and informal. While several reasons were given, including the need for diverse representation on committees and higher levels of mentoring and advising, it remains a problem to be addressed. Most groups agree that better measures of service must be developed, and some gave specific examples of how this could be done. It was universally recognized that how service to the profession and community are defined and measured will vary enormously between departments and they should be guided in their development of those definitions and measures. **Grant Ave** recommends defining service in a way that aligns the interests and expertise of the individual with the service tasks they take on, a perspective shared by other groups. There is also a desire on the part of many of the groups to carry out more meaningful evaluation of service and use those measures in RTP processes. Many linked meaningful services to that which positively impacts our students and that does not directly benefit the person engaging in the service.

A few groups pointed out concerns about how service is broken down in our campus RTP policy. The **19th Ave** group points out that the CBA requires service to the University, profession **and** to the community, while our RTP policy terms University service as “campus” service, which could occur solely inside a department setting, and groups professional service into service to the community. This allows some faculty to meet community service requirements entirely within their profession, and never engage with the community through service as well as never serve outside their department or college.

Another theme in the reports is the need to recognize that the type and extent of service changes as faculty mature at the university. **California St** asks that a process be developed to “*quantify and equitably distribute service among faculty within departments and across the university but weight more for relatively senior faculty and less for new assistant professors.*”

Many groups grappled with the role of non-tenure track (lecturer) faculty, temporary and adjunct faculty as well as staff in university service. There is a lack of support for these groups’ engagement in service, but a critical need for them to be involved given their numerous touch points with our students. “*Because their service is voluntary (not required in contract, nor*

compensated when service is given) their voices are largely missing from our institutional workings.” (Portola Dr).

Fell St asked that we understand service as an attempt to “make this big university small” and place special emphasis on those service activities that directly impact students. “*We’d like to redefine service as: 1. Anything that contributes to the learning environment of our students 2. A sense that what one is doing is “beyond the call of duty”*” Geary recommends that expectations of service be made clear and measurable.

Lastly, the value of shared governance was stated by many groups. For shared governance to function effectively, there must be participation by all groups on campus: tenure-line faculty, lecturer faculty, and staff, and expectations of service as well as rewards must be built into the fabric of the institutions

Question 6: How should our organizational structure be set up to encourage innovation and collaboration across colleges and disciplines?

“We need to help students see the art and science of merging disciplines.”
–Geary Boulevard Working Group

“A new research culture that promotes collaboration across differences for greater innovation is needed.” – Market Street Working Group

“A key strength within SFSU is the excitement and willingness of faculty to collaborate with colleagues across colleges and disciplines. ... collaboration opportunities should be focused on improving student learning outcomes and developing new research directions that reflect the Bay area of the future.” California Street Working Group

San Francisco State has numerous exemplars of collaboration and innovation, which provide both models for future success and legacies that should be valued and further nurtured. There is widespread support for expanding collaborations across campus. Interdisciplinary programs at San Francisco State University can serve as important sources of faculty expertise, generating innovative, collaborative approaches to address high-level issues and challenges. **Geary Blvd** notes somewhat facetiously that “If the University does not enable student, faculty, and staff collaborations, then it is participating in setting itself up as an evil empire that must be resisted.”

Characteristics of previous successful collaborative efforts in both teaching and research (Metro Academies, Health Equity Institute, Estuary & Ocean Science Center, Center for Research Translation and Public Policy, Center for Iranian Diaspora Studies, Paul K. Longmore Institute on Disability, etc.), direct the university to the following key aspects necessary for success:

- 1) Collaborative leadership by individuals serving who are willing and able to lead from a shared and collective perspective, while simultaneously meeting individuals’ goals.
- 2) Clear and defined (measurable) outcomes.
- 3) Sufficient resources to support the effort.

Many examples of successful collaborative projects on campus had a characteristic of bridging faculty and administration early in the endeavor. Some interdisciplinary projects may emerge within a particular college/department/unit before expanding campus-wide, while other cross-

disciplinary efforts may require initiation and organization at the university level. CEETL was frequently mentioned in the plenary as an exemplar that started as a collaboration between the Academic Senate and the Office of Faculty Affairs and brought in other groups and functions as it grew to become a university-wide center. At a smaller level, team teaching comes up frequently as an effective pedagogical tool, but one that can be difficult to arrange because of structural constraints, real or perceived. *“Collaboration among different functional units provides a huge opportunity to align the whole organization to the core mission of the university, mitigating the ‘us versus them’ mentality” (California St).*

Given that a desire for collaboration is so prevalent across campus, what is stopping it from becoming more widespread? One group observes that *“the campus ‘silo’ framework for distributing financial resources and administering policy limits opportunities for designing and building ‘new ways’ of facilitating pedagogy and professional development” (Park Presidio Blvd)*, while others note the difficulty in allocating WTUs in support of team teaching. The emphasis on individual scholarship in RTP criteria discourages faculty from joint research projects. The inability to identify partners for collaborative projects is another commonly mentioned barrier as is finding the time to coordinate joint projects. The fear that working together will lead to the diminishment of one of the partners. The working groups proposed a variety of solutions, and only some are summarized here. Compared to other questions posed to the working groups, there was less consensus on the answer to this one.

Several groups recommended setting aside a common meeting time in which classes would not be scheduled to facilitate collaborations: *“university life stops to take a breath” (Lincoln Way)*. A need for a meeting space came up frequently, and the formation of a center to promote and support collaboration was proposed by many. **Van Ness Ave** points out the importance of space in facilitating innovation and collaboration by noting, *“Space is a Resource that facilitates Innovation and Collaboration”* and *“Creative uses of digital space, and encouraging a culture of sharing across digital spaces, may enhance innovation and collaboration across campus.”*

A clearing house of faculty interests was proposed to help identify potential partners and collaborators. This type of support could be housed in an often-proposed Center for Innovation and Collaboration, which could help match faculty interested in collaborative projects. Related to this is the development of more faculty learning communities, which connect faculty with shared interests. Revision of RTP criteria to support and reward collaborative teaching and research is encouraged by many of the working groups as is providing support for team teaching, which can often be more expensive than a class taught by a single instructor. Both **California St** and **Lombard St** mention using the new faculty orientation to form learning communities and encourage the development of collaborations between new faculty from different departments and colleges.

California St recommends that collaborative campus events be encouraged. They mentioned Ethics Week, Songfest, and the Rights and Wrongs: Constitution and Citizenship Day Conference as exemplars of this approach. They noted that *“These collaborations are often initiated through one-on-one requests made between faculty or between students and faculty for collaborations across departments”*.

Lastly, several groups mentioned coordinating hiring within or across colleges to support and encourage interdisciplinary, collaborative research.

Question 7: As we look to the future, what should we consider in determining how academic areas should develop, grow, or transform?

“We strongly believe that SF State should strike a balance between generalism and vocational training, and between providing a solid education in traditional disciplines and openness to new competencies that fall outside of traditional disciplines.” – 19th Avenue Working Group

“General student outcomes also should include literacy of fields beyond their majors, cultural competency and global awareness, which would provide a basis for collaborative learning and engagement at the community level and beyond.” – Grant Avenue Working Group

Development, growth, and transformation are core components of the San Francisco State experience. In order to provide guidance on how to enhance academic program array, working groups highlighted a few central themes: (1) Enhance the role of a public university; (2) strike a balanced approach between preparation for a career and preparation for engaged citizenship and life-long learning; (3) engage with emerging complexities; and (4) build within a framework of shared governance.

Enhance the public university - Working groups view San Francisco State as unique in its role, mission, and orientation in a rich and diverse global city. As **California** notes, part of the ongoing role of a public university is its “visioning” in creating “the world we want to live in.” **Lincoln** proposes that change begins with considering:

“the role of a public education to teaching students to think critically, adaptively, and inclusively and not solely providing workforce training. In addition to teaching faculty are important mentors and role models to students. Thus, when SF State faculty and staff are passionately engaged in their disciplines, they inspire and invite participation from students. This training in thinking transmits educated thinking to the broader society, allowing the imprint of an SF State education to help individual students combine their own beliefs, ideas, and perspectives with those gained at SF State to impact the lives of those around them.”

Fell notes growth areas can emphasize a sense in which SF State is “a large university, but with a small university feel.” **Market** advocates that SF State’s proactive development include “regular engagement with students, faculty, alumni, and local needs.” **Van Ness Ave** suggests “increasing and disseminating discussion with both local communities and the state, and being alert to national trends, to inform campus deliberation about what programs should be developed, enlarged, or transformed.”

Strike a balanced approach between preparation for a career and preparation to be an engaged citizen and life-long learner. Any growth and transformation will include a balance between, as **Park Presidio** describes, foundational knowledge and life-learning experience. **Van Ness Ave** suggests, “centering the curriculum on students’ academic needs not just in terms of future careers but also in terms of what will be needed by citizens in a rapidly changing society.” Part of that process involves, as **Lombard** notes, asking “lots of questions about what a future would look like for CSU. What will demographics look like? Who is the subject we are serving? How

can we align our academic areas to meet California's future?" Grant reflects on SF State's unique position, suggesting, "While we are not a technical school, we do provide appropriate skills for future careers; what skills and intellectual aptitudes do the students need so that undergraduate degrees are meaningful in multiple ways in the future? Essential skills for professional preparation for the future should include broader applications of critical thinking, problem solving and analytic skills, effective written and oral communication, and quantitative reasoning."

Geary finds that, *"the academic programs need to be able to offer a compelling education and connections for the students by helping develop skills beyond their technical and theoretical skills, but also to support their growth into their current and future jobs."* **Market Street** recommends *"systematic and coordinated surveys of existing students and employers. ... administered in a consistent fashion, to gain a better understanding of their dynamic scholarly interests and needs for employment. Additionally, environmental scans of local business, non-profit, and government leaders' capacities and desires would be completed on a regular and consistent basis to better understand their workforce needs. The results of both evidence-gathering activities would then be transparently communicated to stakeholders to better link student academic activities to local community needs."* **California** also notes a need to assess industry trends across sectors, asking, *"what are the next jobs to be eliminated? Created? Ask employer questions, priorities, skills, characteristics (empirical skills, applied economic skills)"* For **Portola**, a balanced skills focus emphasizes hybridity, application, and critical connections, acknowledging that *"for many students, their end goal in obtaining a degree is securing a job. Thus, monitoring job market trends and adapting academic programs accordingly is paramount.... SF State is a liberal and comprehensive university, and we should also prepare them for their desired careers."* As **Grant** elaborates, *"Essential skills for professional preparation for the future should include broader applications of critical thinking, problem solving and analytic skills, effective written and oral communication, and quantitative reasoning. These general student outcomes also should include literacy of fields beyond their majors, cultural competency and global awareness, which would provide a basis for collaborative learning and engagement at the community level and beyond."*

19th Street, along with many others, provides practical questions to navigate this balance, affirming a series of questions that might include: Does the area address Bay Area skills, social justice disparities, address the needs of the community (local and global), and does it link up with other initiatives at the high school, community college, and CSU levels? They write further,

"Does program growth or development take account of foreseeable changes in enrollment from the next generation of high school and community college graduates? Do the program's planners and coordinators follow these trends and adjust program offerings in light of them? Do Bay Area businesses (profit and nonprofit) have needs for the skills or training that the program provides? Does the educational structure encourage adaptive responses to rapidly changing technologies and environments? Does it encourage both breadth and depth, and a flexible mindset to navigate the ambiguity of an economy with industries and occupations that are expanding and contracting at alarming speed?"

Ultimately **Lombard** suggests *"our goal should be meet our students at their point of greatest need for their level of greatest access, and to help them assess what those needs are."*

Engage with emerging complexities - Part of the process of growth, development, and transformation will continue SF State's role of engaging the complex opportunities and challenges of contemporary and future life. For the **Fell** working group, growth and transformation must grapple with how to "*integrate complex lives in a university setting.*" **Fulton** suggests this would include problem solving at its core. **Geary** offers that "*We ought to be thinking creatively about 21st Century challenges that best lend themselves to cross- disciplinary discussions and training. However, we must respect the expertise and legacy of departments and fields in this process. Centers and more cluster hires or research/teaching collaboratives (with some formal funding and institutional support) would help build community around emergent and relevant topics to students' lives.*" **California** also noted a need to examine institutional procedures to enhance programing that is "*collaborative, innovative and multidisciplinary.*" **Park Presidio** emphasizes experimental courses and asks that departments and colleges create opportunities for "*shared perspectives and ideas.*" **Grant** notes that enhanced interaction with complex technological change would be helpful: "*while significant societal issues are clearly looming in the near future, a larger issue for universities is that students similarly have considerably evolved. The incoming student classes have never known a non-digital world.*" **Lombard** also stresses that "*in light of moving to re-thinking ways of innovation and course updating, we need to partner with technology and AT to work on course design and new models of delivery.*"

Build a framework within shared governance- Finally, programmatic growth can be enhanced by working in the spirit of the AMP process—a shared community working across departments, rank, and cabinet area to deepen the goals of the university. **Park Presidio** refers to "*an ecology of principled collaboration.*" **Lincoln** writes, "*Trust in shared governance. Our existing expertise, strengths, and passions allow faculty members to become experts in their fields. This equips faculty to engage our students deeply within disciplines and train them to be able to make important contributions to their workplaces and communities.*"

Question 8. What types of facilities, infrastructure, and resources are needed to enable us to meet our highest academic goals?

Facilities and infrastructure are an essential element of a university's academic core. As **19th Ave** observe, "*University campuses can be seen as socio-technical systems that evolve due to increasing global competition, changing funding structures and technological development...a university should consider both the structure and function of their buildings and services to serve the student of the 21st century which may lead to better student retention and success.*"

Two areas requiring attention emerge from the working groups and from the plenary discussions: housing (1) and educational spaces (2).

Housing - There was near universal consensus that housing, including basic needs, is a primary challenge for the entire community, but particularly students. **Grant Ave** notes, "*the high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area exacerbates the urgency of basic needs such as food and housing.*" **California St** summarizes the concerns by suggesting that efforts should be made to "*meet the need for affordable and innovative housing solutions for homeless students and low-income faculty as a community builder, not a money maker.*" The plenary confirmed that SF State also needs resources that are unique to the San Francisco and Bay Area communities. Affordable housing for faculty, students, and staff is desperately needed, but similarly meeting

other basic human needs (including food, transportation, and mental health care) is an imperative if the University is to achieve its mission.

As a result, the on-campus physical master plan must address housing availability for all members of the University community.

Educational Spaces - In terms of our need for better conceptualized academic spaces, Geary frames the issue's importance: *"A large mix of facilities, infrastructure, and resources are needed to help the diverse SFSU community to meet the university's highest academic goals. Currently, there is the sense that the university is working with the minimum in terms of facilities, infrastructure, and resources."* **Lombard St** notes that in order for programs to be successful, *"there was a resounding call for more communal, comfortable spaces on campus that are welcoming to all students and faculty, with a high priority placed on improving the cleanliness, deferred maintenance, physical accessibility, inclusivity, community, and functionality of such spaces."* Yet inadequate teaching spaces (including laboratories and performance spaces) were mentioned frequently in the working group papers and in the plenary, identifying a need for increased classroom space and space that better reflects the variety of teaching methods used on campus. The traditional lecture hall is not serving our students or faculty well. We must develop spaces to support hybrid and online learning as well as active learning in the more traditional face-to-face courses. We must have spaces that facilitate collaboration, not just meetings.

Thus, working groups suggested a number of areas to enhance including laboratories, classrooms, student learning services, and human services (**Geary Blvd**); sophisticated technology and its accessibility (**Park Presidio**); transportation (**Fell St**); and faculty office spaces (**Portola Dr**). Collaborative spaces are a key theme for **Fulton St** and **Lincoln Way** with **Fell St** noting the need for *"creative and multiple use spaces for strategic and inspiring engagement."* **Market St** supports a collaborative approach to solving these issues, suggesting that *"decisions about infrastructure and resource allocations should be with wide consultation with faculty, departments, and other stakeholders."* There is also agreement that spaces need to signal shared values and be inclusive of all groups by culturally affirming content. The plenary made clear that the current Campus Physical Master Plan should address and include campus instructional spaces that facilitate and support student engagement with faculty in research and other out-of-classroom activities. The Campus Physical Master Plan should also prioritize the need for common spaces across the campus that allow for interaction of students, faculty, and staff.

How will the Academic Master Plan integrate with cross-campus strategic planning?

What cross-campus collaboration is needed?

1. Leverage the location of San Francisco more effectively in marketing the University to potential students and in establishing the reputation of the University.
2. Take advantage of a new president's presence in the University to assure cross-collaboration between academic affairs, administration and finance, and student affairs.
3. The Provost, working with the Vice President for Administration and Finance, should develop an approach and action plan to address the types of concerns identified by the members of the University community that served on these working groups.

4. Development of mechanisms to better meet student basic needs. Could involve support of students living on or near campus (priority on campus housing, more student jobs on campus paying SF minimum wage), student-friendly financial policies.

Appendix 1: Recommendations from the Academic Master Plan Working Groups

Ensuring high levels of engagement and growth for students at every step of their academic journey

AMP recommendations

21. Align academic core with our institutional values by encouraging programs to identify their contribution to the university mission in the curricular approval process and the program review process.
22. Revise and rationalize the curriculum, in both degree programs and general education; through intentional curriculum design that facilitates student navigation and progress.
23. Strengthen advising; hire more advisors, implement mandatory advising, and encourage additional touch points with students. Include strong career/transition advising
24. Increase high-impact practices in the curriculum by redesigning degree programs to include and engage all students in at least one experiential learning component: internships, fieldwork, civic engagement, research, creative activity and study abroad.
25. Provide additional training for faculty and staff on how to facilitate student engagement effectively.

Opportunities for cross-campus collaboration

- 2.1. Attention to student basic needs;
- 2.2. Expansion of student housing, transportation, and related infrastructure;
- 2.3. Deliberate design and construction of common spaces that facilitate engagement.

A future that offers greater access to graduate education as a transformational experience

AMP recommendations

- 3.1. Provide (budget for) graduate student assistantships and/or tuition waivers.
- 3.2. Examine the campus funding model to ascertain its impact on graduate programs.
- 3.3. Develop steps or responsibilities to recruit undergraduates into the University's graduate programs more effectively.
- 3.4. Innovation in graduate program offerings should become a central focus of faculty, along with the Division of Graduate Studies, self-support units, and/or the Office of International Programs.
- 3.5. Provide increased funding opportunities for graduate students to do research and creative activities and to travel to conferences.

- 3.6. Expand opportunities for graduate degrees that emphasize innovation and collaboration.

Opportunities for cross-campus collaboration

- 3.7. Develop more systematic and centrally supported efforts to recruit graduate students.
- 3.8. Collaborate with the Office of International Programs to recruit and retain international students to our graduate programs.
- 3.9. streamline the grant processes for various kinds of RSCA: long term, short-term and community-engaged projects. This will allow us to engage a wider group of faculty and students.

A future that advances faculty success in the teacher-scholar model

AMP recommendations

- 4.1. Support research that integrates theory and practice and that aligns best with our areas of distinction.
- 4.2. Consider a university requirement for undergraduate research or creative work.
- 4.3. Focus on developing more, and more effective, communication about the quality of faculty research and creative activity.
- 4.4. Create a teacher-scholar culture (e.g., encourage/support Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) collaboration between faculty and students); explicitly incorporate scholarship into the classroom (e.g., research in the classroom, develop learning activities that encourage students to problem solve, develop cogent arguments, and critically process information).
- 4.5. Situate RSCA practice in social justice and equity, especially that which addresses the inclusion of marginalized communities. Institutional support for RSCA should prioritize supporting that which aligns with campus values and priorities, especially when and where external funding agencies do not value or support these endeavors.
- 4.6. Support and reward student participation in faculty research and creative activity at both the undergraduate and graduate level.
- 4.7. Develop a five-year faculty hiring plan to meet program needs and tenure density goals.
- 4.8. Explore and identify steps that can be taken locally to increase support for lecturers, who are key to the delivery of the University's instructional program.

Opportunities for cross-campus collaborations

- 4.1. Support research assistants who live in the dorms by allowing them to remain in the dorms over the summer or provide summer "bridge" awards, which would allow them a chance to maintain momentum and possibly gain more focused attention towards their degree goals

A future that acknowledges the value and impact of service and

encourages and supports faculty and staff in their service activities

AMP recommendations

- 5.1. Distribute service equitably and recognize and reward service that aligns with the distinctive characteristics of SF State.
- 5.2. Develop clear measures of service that facilitate accountability and evaluation.
- 5.3 Facilitate service by tenure-line faculty to the University, profession and community.
- 5.4. Create definitions of service that embrace its value to faculty, staff, and students and distinguishes it from teaching and scholarship.

Opportunities for cross-campus collaboration

- 5.1. Organize the Academic Senate as a University Senate to better include the voices of staff or develop a Staff Council as a mechanism of shared governance for staff.

A future that supports innovation and collaboration across the University's academic programs

AMP recommendations

- 6.1 .Identify clear goals for collaborative efforts that can be assessed by measurable outcomes.
- 6.2 Address both real and perceived institutional barriers to collaboration (e.g., by reexamining funding models and how WTU's are assigned).
- 6.3. Identify collaboration and innovation as goals for future program developments and revisions.
- 6.4. Identify and work with existing course overlaps to create more meaningful and purposefully curricular collaborations.
- 6.5. Revise RTP standards to reflect and allow shared faculty research, teaching, and pedagogical efforts.
- 6.6. Establish purposeful collaborative initiatives:
- 6.7. Create centers on emerging topics that require cross-disciplinary analysis (e.g. climate change, artificial intelligence, rapid urbanization, etc.). These topics require critical thinking across the humanities, social and physical sciences, business, ethnic studies, and arts.
- 6.8. Develop a multi-college strategy to address a local or state issue (such as gentrification, etc.), possibly through a partnership with city-wide arts and culture organizations and/or Silicon Valley or area businesses.
- 6.9. Encourage departments to work in cross-college collaborations to create theme or topic-based educational experiences for students in emerging fields (e.g., game design, big data, wicked problems and public policy, sustainable structures, etc.) in order to create a culture of intellectual and creative excitement on campus, and offer a satisfying "real-world" project for students.

A future that constantly develops, grows, and transforms academic programs

AMP recommendations

- 7.1 Support and develop academic programs that:
 - 7.1.1 balance liberal education and professional development in order to prepare students for careers, personal growth, and engaged citizenship in their chosen communities;
 - 7.1.2 sustain and advance the commitment of the University to its social justice mission;
 - 7.1.3 ensure that the necessary fiscal, personnel, and space resources are secure for the program and/or its changes;
 - 7.1.4 address City of San Francisco (and Bay Area) needs for an educated workforce and a creative community; and
 - 7.1.5 address international and global concerns.
- 7.2 Regularly survey existing students, employers, and alums to align course and program offerings with emerging workforce and academic developments.
- 7.3 Recruit faculty who have greater adaptability in terms of the curriculum.
- 7.4 Build out more lower-division coursework in which students are able to explore future professions and their role in society.
- 7.5 Establish more online courses and programs and ensure their consistently high quality.

What infrastructure, facilities, and transportation resources are needed?

AMP recommendations and opportunities for cross-campus collaboration

- 8.1. Develop a comprehensive plan for addressing deferred maintenance for the campus. This plan should be developed within shared governance venues as well as administratively. The plan should be widely communicated and assiduously implemented.
- 8.2. Expand existing plans for affordable and accessible housing options for faculty, staff, and students.
- 8.3. Expand plans to enhance classroom and environmental conditions.
- 8.4. Enhance campus organizational support.
- 8.5. Invest in technological infrastructure.
- 8.6. Continue to consider conceptual innovative campus design.
- 8.7. Expand commuter-campus identity by enhancing transportation options.

- 8.8. Allow no cost access during Winter break for students (who likely have yearlong leases and also work).
- 8.9. Develop a rideshare drop-off and pick-up station.
- 8.10. Negotiate discounts/institutional rates with the major rideshare companies.
- 8.11. Continue to work with BART/MUNI to enhance price assistance.
- 8.12. Expand the SF State fleet to help offset the commute from BART to SF State.

Appendix 2: Description of the Steps in the Process Leading to the Development of the Academic Master Plan

The development of an Academic Master Plan depends on widespread university engagement and discussion about the relevance of the University's current mission and vision to current and future academic programs. The consultation process for this AMP focused on creating opportunities for widespread participation and meaningful input about the critical questions that must be answered to achieve common understandings about the future of the University's academic programs. Another hallmark of the process used to develop SF State's Academic Master Plan is the overt availability of ideas and inputs from all interested community members; transparency of inputs and decisions was valued highly in this process.

A facilitator for the development of the plan was identified (Dr. Jolene Koester), and she began her work in the summer of 2018 by studying relevant materials and data about the University. Through conversations with the Provost, she began to refine the consultative process for the AMP development. At the end of August, the facilitator came to campus and met with faculty and administrative groups to describe a proposed consultative process that would facilitate the development of a framework for the AMP. Adjustments to the proposed process were made based on input about the needs and circumstances of SF State.

A steering committee to guide the development of the plan was established (Appendix 1), 12 working groups were created, and a leadership team comprised of the co-chairs of the twelve working groups was formed (Appendix 2). Key to the consultation process was the development of questions critical to potential elements of an SF State AMP that needed to be considered and answered through widespread consultation across the university community. The twelve working groups were each comprised of about 12 campus faculty, administrators, and staff members. Each group was charged with deliberating on the nine critical questions and then preparing written responses to those questions. In early October, the facilitator met with members of the working groups to describe the upcoming process. All working groups had access to a large set of relevant data. The Academic Master Plan co-chairs (Academic Senate Chair Gerber and Provost Summit) met monthly with the leadership team and consulted bi-weekly with Dr. Koester to monitor progress and troubleshoot where needed. In addition, surveys of students (n=542) were conducted to capture student perspectives on several relevant questions, which the Provost and Senate Chair discussed further with the Associated Students Board of Directors. Survey results were analyzed by Institutional Research and shared with the Leadership Team in advance of the plenary.

On March 15, the 12 working groups submitted papers responding to the critical questions. The papers represented the passions, richness of ideas, and experience-based perspectives of the many members of the university community involved in this project. All working group papers are available on the AMP web site.

The facilitator then analyzed the twelve working group papers and prepared a document that summarized the agreements, disagreements, and range of stakeholders' perspectives on the critical questions, along with suggestions for action steps. The facilitator's analysis of the working group papers is also available on the AMP web site, along with a shorter document that presents some important caveats to her work.

On the basis of the facilitator's analysis of the working group papers, an agenda was prepared for a plenary session to which all working group members and steering committee members were invited. The general purpose of the plenary was to (1) build on the shared agreements present in the Working Group Papers; (2) explore issues and ideas in depth to achieve greater understanding of the points-of-view related to key elements of an AMP that were not widely shared within the working groups; 3) get a better sense of the priorities for actions related to the AMP among plenary participants; and 4) provide plenary outcomes to the Steering Committee and the Leadership Team so they could begin to build the elements of the AMP (which would then be publicly available for additional consultation and refinement).

Description of the themes indicating agreements and disagreements from the working group papers were shared with plenary attendees, along with action steps for some of the critical questions. In the plenary, participants had the opportunity to respond to proposed elements of an Academic Master Plan and recommend additional directions about the specifics of the Academic Master Plan.

Based on the findings in the prior phases and the previous work by the University, and in consultation with the Provost and Senate Chair, the facilitator drafted a framework for the University's Academic Master Plan. That draft was then presented to both the Leadership Team and the Academic Master Plan Steering Committee for additional consultation and refinement.

Appendix 3: Additional considerations for future strategic planning efforts (from Jolene Koester, AMP facilitator)

Directives for Enrollment Management

*“A degree from SF State is a door opener, an opportunity for students to move their lives and their families forward.”
- Van Ness Avenue Working Group*

Facilitator Recommendation:

The Academic Master Plan offers several implicit directives, and one explicit directive, for enrollment management at San Francisco State University. The explicit directive is to examine, retool, and innovate in the recruitment of students for the University’s graduate programs. Implicitly, for both graduate and undergraduate students, student recruitment efforts should more directly engage the San Francisco Bay Area by celebrating the social justice mission of the University, the teaching-centered student engagement values that are the aspiration for SF State faculty, and the relevance of undergraduate and graduate educations to alumni who will work, live, and contribute to San Francisco, the Bay Area, and beyond.

Directives for Philanthropic Endeavors

“SF State is uniquely positioned, and values strong community connections through internships, community engagement, and partnerships.” - 19th Avenue

Facilitator recommendation:

While philanthropy is directed by the fundamental goals of a donor, which is then matched to University goals and needs, this Academic Master Plan provides direction to the core descriptions of needs at San Francisco State for University officials to present to potential donors. Interdisciplinary and collaborative efforts would be of particular interest to donors who share the enthusiasm for the specific goals of the collaborative efforts. Donors interested in supporting social justice could find multiple ways to accelerate the impact of the many ways in which San Francisco State’s academic programs advance the tenets of social justice. Public-public or public-private partnerships to respond to housing challenges might also become necessary and feasible. Finally, scholarships for students’ cost of attendance may be compelling for donors and consequential to the University.

Miscellaneous Other Issues

Facilitator recommendation:

An Academic Master Plan, by definition, specifies and directs the bulk of the work that is done within the Academic Affairs Division of the University. However, the consultative process for this AMP also suggests critically important actions by other divisions of the University, in collaboration with the Provost and Academic Affairs Division. Specifically, at the all-university level there is a perceived need for greater budget transparency and communication, and for a greater service orientation and responsiveness from the University's academic support divisions. There is also a need for greater collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in addressing key student needs and working toward greater student engagement. Finally, the transition to a new University President provides an opportunity to assure a renewed focus on collaboration across the Divisions to support the academic programs and to implement the Academic Master Plan's action steps.

Directives for Telling the University's Story

"SF State should market our value more intentionally to the SF Bay Area community and the State." - California Street Working Group

Facilitator recommendations:

Woven throughout the proposed framework for an Academic Master Plan are the key elements of this University's story – social justice, aspirations to be inclusive, a diverse university community, academic programs taught by passionate faculty with a commitment to the mission and to a pedagogy that engages students in learning, and a university located in and committed to the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area more broadly.

SF State is a university that makes higher education possible for broad sectors of our economic sphere; it is a university that makes higher education possible as a means to achieve the middle class economically, and it is a university that provides an intellectual frame for living.

This is a university where faculty are engaged in a wide range of scholarly activities that are pursued with student involvement as a priority and often with conscious and intentional focus on the social justice mission of the University. This is a university where students are empowered to be agents of change in their society. This is a university where staff and administrators support these overall goals.

These messages should form the central ideas and themes that University officials use to communicate about and advocate for SF State.

Rationale:

The above paragraphs describe the SF State that I learned about during this Academic Master Plan consultation process. While these messages may not be compelling to some in the geographic area that SF State serves, they are nevertheless who and what the University is. Thus,

while embracing these characteristics and key words, and using the sophisticated skills of modern communication experts, use them to tell the story of the University more effectively. Collaboration by the University's communications professionals with those in leadership positions in Academic Affairs will be both functional and critical for the University's story to be told effectively.

Appendix 4: Resolution in Support of a Campus Academic Master Planning Process RS18-368 April 17, 2018

RATIONALE:

An Academic Master Planning process guides a campus through a thorough discussion about the alignment of its academic vision and mission with the vision, mission and values of the University. The process is not unlike that undertaken during the Foundations of Excellence self-study of the first year of college, and results in a plan that guides the University's decision making and improvement processes around the academic mission of the University. The types of questions asked in preparing an Academic Master Plan could include "Where are we now, in terms of an academic mission & current practices, where will we be in 5 or 10 years with no changes and where do we want to be in 5 to 10 years?" and "How can we get to where we want to be?" The result of this year-long process is an Academic Master Plan that provides a blueprint for future decisions around program development, faculty hiring, fundraising priorities and enrollment management. This plan can and should provide the foundation for future strategic and physical master plans.

- WHEREAS an Academic Master Planning process will guide the campus through a thorough discussion about the alignment of its academic mission with the unique mission of San Francisco State University, which is used to drive the future of the University; and
- WHEREAS an Academic Master Plan delineates the strategies needed to accomplish the academic mission of the university and informs other university planning processes; and
- WHEREAS To be effective, the Academic Master Plan must drive improvement processes for the university; and
- WHEREAS an Academic Master Plan informs program development, faculty hiring, fundraising priorities and enrollment management; and
- WHEREAS an Academic Master Plan will link and specify the relationship between current and future academic programs (undergraduate and graduate) and the creation and utilization of space on the main campus and in other properties (downtown center, Romberg-Tiburon etc.); and
- WHEREAS identification and agreement on parameters for the development of new academic programs, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as support for current academic programs (at both the graduate and undergraduate levels) that will fulfill the University's mission; and therefore, be it
- RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of SF State asks that the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Academic Senate compose and charge an Academic Master Plan steering committee during the Spring 2018 semester; and be it further

- RESOLVED that the steering committee should develop a plan for an Academic Master planning process to take place during the 2018-19 academic year; and be it further
- RESOLVED the Academic Master Plan must be data-driven and developed and congruent with the strategic plan for the University, the student success plan and the Foundations of Excellence recommendations; and be it further
- RESOLVED that the development of an Academic Master Plan at SF State must include widespread campus engagement in the conversations leading to the plan and must include the role of student support services in the academic mission of SF State; and be it further
- RESOLVED that the campus undertake a guided and thorough discussion about the nature of pedagogy, including assessment of student learning, for current and future programs, and how pedagogy shapes the needs of faculty development and physical space construction and development; and be it further
- RESOLVED that the Academic Master Plan at SF State not be a program prioritization process nor a disguised process to eliminate academic programs; and be it further
- RESOLVED that the Academic Master Plan at SF State will provide the foundation for future strategic and physical master plans; and be it further
- RESOLVED that a draft of the Academic Master Plan for San Francisco State University be completed by June 2019 and that the final plan be reviewed every five years.