

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, January 26, 1999
Board Room

William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Martha C. Fallgatter
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Closed Session

Government Code Section 11126 [c][5]—Trustees Expected to Attend: Committee Members

Discussion Items

1. Review and Recommendations of Nominees for Honorary Degrees, *Action*

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
January 26-27, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

Presentation By

William D. Campbell, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor

Summary

Recommendations from the Committee on Educational Policy, Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, will be addressed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c) (5) [closed session “to consider the conferring of honorary degrees”].

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 27, 1999
Auditorium

William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Martha C. Fallgatter
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 11, 1998

Discussion Items

2. Community Service Learning in the CSU, *Information*
3. Cornerstones Implementation, *Information*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

November 11, 1998

Members Present

William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
William Hauck, Chair, ex officio
Eric C. Mitchell
Maridel Moulton
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Alice S. Petrossian
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Members Absent

Martha C. Fallgatter
Bob Foster

Other Trustees Present

Jim Considine
James H. Gray
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Presidential Liaisons

Marvalene Hughes, President, California State University, Stanislaus, present
Bob Suzuki, President, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, present
Blenda J. Wilson, President, California State University, Northridge, present

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 9:28 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 16, 1998, were approved as submitted.

Cornerstones Implementation

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence reported that discussions of Cornerstones implementation have been under way since the summer of 1998. Because the goals and principles of this report are broad, developing an implementation plan that meets the varying universities' needs and also meets common system goals is challenging.

Dr. Spence emphasized that many campuses are already putting specific Cornerstones recommendations into action; however, some recommendations are of such high priority as to warrant action by all universities. He stated that the following will need to occur: (1) reach consensus on those high priority Cornerstones principles and recommendations that should be implemented by all universities; (2) agree on specific actions that should be taken by the universities, the system, or both, to implement these principles; (3) identify what should be decided and done by campus initiatives and what should be done through systemwide coordination; and (4) determine the implementation schedule.

In fall 1998, as a part of the consultation process, a series of possible actions or initiatives was distributed to campus presidents, campus and statewide faculty senates, student associations, and alumni. Dr. Spence praised the Statewide Academic Senate for its contributions to development of an implementation plan. By January 11, 1999, each campus, the Statewide Academic Senate, and the students will submit comments and recommendations on Cornerstones implementation. This information will be used to develop a proposed implementation plan which will be presented at the January Board of Trustees' meeting as an information item and, subject to appropriate modifications resulting from continuing consultation, considered for adoption at the March Board of Trustees' meeting.

President Corrigan reported that San Francisco paralleled the Cornerstones recommendations in developing its campus long-range strategic plan. The campus implements approximately ten recommendations each year in alignment with the Cornerstones principles. President Corrigan said that a majority of faculty is involved in the campus and system planning process.

President Maxson stated the Cornerstones recommendations have been folded into the Long Beach planning process. Assessment and collaboration, providing a seamless education with K-12 education and the university, are high priorities. Long Beach has involved faculty and student groups in developing and implementing the recommendations and assisting with the preparation of the report to be submitted in January.

In closing, Chair Campbell observed that the Cornerstones report creates an umbrella for change.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2
January 26-27,1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Community Service Learning in the CSU

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor

Robert A. Corrigan, President
San Francisco State University

Summary

It is estimated that CSU students provide over 28 million hours of service to California communities annually. Understanding the importance of connecting students' interest in community service with their academic endeavors, the CSU adopted a Community Service-Learning Strategic Plan in September 1997. Community service-learning is a powerful pedagogy by which students learn through structured community service experiences that are directly related to the academic content of a course. Twenty-one CSU campuses support community service-learning pedagogy. A report on these activities will be presented.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2
January 26-27, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Community Service Learning in the CSU

Community service and community service-learning have long standing traditions in the mission and purpose of the California State University. Established to “serve the people of California,” the CSU can more effectively accomplish its mission with the use of community service-learning.

In the most recent Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) conducted in 1994, 49 percent of CSU students reported community service involvement. Based on those data, it was estimated that CSU students provide over 28 million hours of community service each year.

Understanding the importance of connecting students’ interest in community service with their academic endeavors, the CSU adopted a Community Service-Learning Strategic Plan in September 1997 (see Attachment A). The plan provides direction for each campus to maximize the potential of community service and community service-learning within the academic and co-curricular arenas. The two key objectives of the plan over a five-year period (July 1997 – July 2002) are to:

1. Engage students at each CSU campus in at least one community service-learning experience prior to graduation.
2. Offer a continuum of community service opportunities at each CSU campus, including a wide variety of community service-learning experiences, as well as extra-curricular and co-curricular community service experiences (CSU, 1997).

Community service-learning, as defined in the CSU Strategic Plan, is “academic study linked to community service through structured reflection so that each reinforces the other.” The plan outlines the benefits students receive from a service-learning experience: mastery of subject matter; application of academic learning to real-world activities; development of civic engagement and responsibility; and exploration of career opportunities.

Given the distinctiveness of each campus within the CSU, the plan is carried out in a rich variety of ways. Twenty-one CSU campuses have designated a faculty member or administrator to lead community service-learning initiatives. These 21 leaders are supported by the Coordinator of Community Service Learning in the Chancellor’s Office.

The California State University has provided national leadership in developing and implementing its strategic plan for community service-learning. It is committed to preparing students who not only have mastery of subject matter, but also have an understanding of their civic role in applying that knowledge to the challenges that society faces.

**Strategic Plan for
Community Service-Learning
at the
California State University**

September 1997

I. Vision and Objectives

The mission of the California State University is to serve the people of California. Community service-learning is essential to that mission.

Community service-learning is academic study linked to community service through structured reflection so that each reinforces the other. The academic study may be in any discipline or combination of fields. The community service may be direct service to people in need, community outreach and education, or policy analysis.

Community service-learning enhances academic learning by enabling students to apply knowledge and skills gained through academic study to real-world problem solving and to appreciate the connections between their academic work and real-world activities. Community service also contributes to both civic learning—coming to understand how a community functions, what problems it faces, the richness of its diversity, and the importance of individual commitments of time and energy to enhancing community life—and moral learning—strengthening the elements of character that lead to ethical actions, and helping students think about themselves in relation to others.

Finally, community service-learning enhances career learning by strengthening personal traits such as self-esteem and interpersonal skills such as careful listening, empathy for others, and abilities to lead, to compromise, to change one's mind. Additionally, community service-learning provides a unique opportunity for students to explore potential careers and to gain valuable career related experience prior to graduation. These are all important to personal interaction in any setting and vital to success in most careers.

This plan was drafted by faculty and staff members from every CSU campus with an interest in and commitment to community service-learning. They met in March 1997 for a two-day colloquium, and are committed to continuing their collaborative efforts.

The *two key objectives* of this plan over the next five years—from July 1997 to July 2002—are to:

1. **Engage students at each CSU campus in at least one community service-learning experience prior to graduation.**
2. **Offer a continuum of community service opportunities at each CSU campus, including a wide variety of community service-learning experiences as well as extra-curricular and co-curricular community service experiences.**

To meet these dual objectives, the CSU and its campuses must overcome a number of challenges. The two primary hurdles are:

- Inadequate resources to support community service-learning.
- Faculty concerns about integrating community service-learning into their courses.

As a result of many circumstances, the CSU campuses are at different levels of development in community service-learning. No campus has done all that the faculty, staff, and students engaged in community service-learning believe is needed, though some are much closer to having fully developed programs than others. Further, the CSU system as a whole has not had a significant role in enhancing community service-learning. And, there has been no sustained effort, until now to make the system more than the sum of its campus parts in terms of community service-learning.

Six priority goals were set at the colloquium as essential to meet the two objectives of the plan. The first three goals are primarily the responsibilities of each campus. The last three goals are primarily the responsibilities of the CSU Division of Academic Affairs at the Chancellor's Office.

II. Priority Goals

A. GOALS FOR EACH CAMPUS

GOAL ONE: Institutionalization of Community Service-Learning

To develop an infrastructure to support community service-learning.

Steps to success:

- Create and support an office of community service-learning that provides assistance to faculty and students through facilitating meaningful community-service placements and assisting in course development. The office need not be free-standing, but community service-learning must be an explicit responsibility of the office, and a person or persons in the office must have full-time responsibility for supporting community service-learning at the campus.
- Integrate community service-learning into the campus mission statement and strategic plan, with the support of the campus faculty and administrative leadership.
- Develop a campus strategic community service-learning plan, with clear goals and a time line to achieve them.
- Develop and administer an instrument to collect data about university and community needs and resources.
- Create an information management system (computerized and hard copy database) which allows for efficient communication exchange among university/ community partners.

GOAL TWO: Build Faculty Support for Community Service-Learning

To develop a critical number of faculty members willing to engage in community service-learning, aid their colleagues in developing future community service-learning courses, and to promote community service-learning on the campus.

Steps to success:

- Provide faculty training about experiential education in general and along a continuum of integration in community service-learning specifically.
- Provide curriculum-development funds to assist faculty in developing community service-learning courses.
- Recognize faculty involvement in community service-learning in retention, tenure, and promotion policies.
- Create department-based incentives for faculty involvement.
- Provide campus awards for outstanding faculty and student involvement in community service-learning.
- Provide workshops and other support arrangements for faculty interested in community service-learning.
- Organize a community service-learning committee that includes strong faculty representation from all colleges.
- Give regular reports about community service-learning to the Academic Senate and other campus bodies to enhance awareness.
- Provide appropriate workload credit for designing and for offering community service-learning courses.

GOAL THREE: Design Student and Community-Based Programs

To develop programs that meet the needs of both the students and the community, in partnership with students and the community.

Steps to Success:

- Involve students and community partners from the beginning in planning and developing community service-learning programs and policies.
- Establish community advisory panels to gain community insights about community needs.
- Prepare student and community agency/organization handbooks on community service-learning and other materials to engage student and community partners in community service-learning.
- Develop ties with local K-14 schools for the development of community service-learning activities and programs.
- Conduct workshops with community agencies/organizations and neighborhood groups in an effort to develop co-educational partnerships.
- Create community service-learning demonstration projects to encourage faculty, student and community collaboration.
- Develop assessment techniques to evaluate partnership outcomes and disseminate findings among members of the university and general communities.
- Work with campus student organizations to develop ways to increase faculty/student collaboration in addressing community challenges.

B. GOALS FOR THE SYSTEM

GOAL FOUR: Collaboration Across the CSU

To develop a network of CSU faculty, students, and administrators working together in support of community service learning throughout the system.

Steps to Success:

- Create a system office to support community service-learning.
- Create a Commission on Service that brings together faculty and administrators to promote community service-learning particularly and service generally.
- Gather and disseminate baseline data on numbers of students, faculty, and courses in community service-learning.
- Establish technology ties to promote the dissemination of information throughout the system on community service-learning.
- Organize periodic statewide meetings on community service-learning.
- Create a CSU library and clearinghouse of community service-learning resources in collaboration with California Campus Compact.

GOAL FIVE: Broadening the Base of Support

To engage the entire California State University in supporting community service-learning.

Steps to Success:

- Make clear strong support of chancellor.
- Encourage strong support by campus presidents and provosts.
- Help campuses take maximum advantage of existing funding opportunities such as the Lottery, Instructionally Related Activities, and the Foundation.
- Help campuses develop external funding sources.

GOAL SIX: Coordinate State and National Community Service-Learning Initiatives

To bring together the various state and national programs that encourage service generally and community service-learning particularly.

Steps to Success:

- Encourage America Reads programs to use community service-learning by providing campuses with descriptions of successful state and national models and supporting ways for them to maintain regular communication among coordinators of system programs.
- Encourage the PreCollegiate Academic Development Program to use community service-learning by supporting campuses that develop well-structured plans to expand their outreach efforts to local and regional schools.
- Implement the Governor's Mentoring Initiative as a community service-learning effort by supporting campus efforts to develop structured partnerships with local agencies/organizations and neighborhood groups who focus on youth issues.
- Maintain links with the California Commission on Improving Life Through Service to gain regular access to national and statewide policy developments and share these findings with system campuses.
- Give active support to California Campus Compact's effort to provide guidance for system campuses to more fully integrate academic study with public service.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
January 26-27, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Cornerstones Implementation

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor

Summary

The most comprehensive and thorough systemwide planning effort the California State University has conducted came to fruition in January 1998 when the Board of Trustees endorsed the Cornerstones report as a planning framework and directed the chancellor to pursue the recommendations included in the report. Discussions of Cornerstones implementation have been under way since the summer of 1998. In fall 1998, as part of the consultation process, a series of possible actions and priorities was distributed to campus presidents, campus and statewide faculty senates, student associations, and alumni.

During his presentation at the November meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence pointed out that many campuses are already implementing some Cornerstones recommendations. However, some recommendations may be of such high priority that they warrant action by all universities. He indicated that we need to: (1) reach consensus on the Cornerstones principles and recommendations that should be addressed by all universities, (2) agree on specific actions that should be taken by the universities, the system, or both, to implement these principles, (3) identify what should be decided and accomplished by campus initiative and what should be addressed through systemwide coordination, and (4) determine an accountability process.

Comments, suggestions, and recommendations have come from many sources and from both systemwide and campus-based discussions about the implementation of Cornerstones. These included discussions of a wide range of related issues at the November 18-20 Academic Conference sponsored by the Statewide Academic Senate, resolutions adopted by campus academic senates that conveyed the results of faculty discussions, debate at systemwide meetings of such groups as the academic vice presidents, vice presidents for advancement, and the Executive Council, and a special December 11 session of the Statewide Academic Senate that was devoted exclusively to Cornerstones implementation. Comments and suggestions on the draft were submitted by January 11, 1999.

All of these responses informed day-long discussions by the academic vice presidents on January 13 and the Executive Council on January 14. The results of these discussions helped shape the draft Cornerstones implementation plan that is being sent under separate cover. This proposed implementation plan is being presented as an information item for discussion at this meeting. Subject to modifications that may result from this discussion and suggestions from other sources, a Cornerstones implementation plan will be presented for trustee action in March.

DRAFT

Cornerstones Implementation Plan Revised version, January 21, 1999

OVERVIEW

The Cornerstones planning process began in 1996 and yielded a set of general principles and supporting recommendations designed to guide CSU into the next century. In adopting the Cornerstones report in January 1998, the Trustees directed the Chancellor to pursue implementation of its recommendations.

Implementing a report as far-reaching as Cornerstones is challenging because, for implementation to occur, general principles and recommendations must be converted to specific, concrete actions. Doing so requires hard choices to be made about priorities, about what is most important to do now as opposed to later and about the procedures for moving from principle to action.

The need for a plan that is more exact about how Cornerstones should be implemented is based on the large scope of Cornerstones, its commitment to giving the campuses significant flexibility in how the recommendations are carried out, and the likelihood that many of the principles are subject to wide ranges of interpretation. To promote both clearer direction and accountability across the system, a plan is needed that is specific about what should be done and that assigns responsibility for action.

This plan includes those actions related to Cornerstones that all universities will be expected to address owing to their priority, importance, strategic value, or factors of timing and sequence. To varying extents, the plan spells out what is meant for an action to be addressed. For a great majority of the initiatives, individual campuses will have substantial flexibility in deciding how to implement an action; this is in keeping with Cornerstones Principle 10. A smaller number of actions call for a more common set of approaches to implementation across all campuses. This is especially applicable to many of initiatives recommended in the access section (Principle 5). In many cases, campuses are already acting on some of the principles and need only to integrate those activities with the larger Cornerstones plan.

The plan indicates for each action where responsibility will reside. Again, in recognition of the Cornerstones commitment to campus autonomy and flexibility, many actions call for responsibility at the campus level, especially for those actions concerning the curriculum, teaching-learning process and faculty activity. Other initiatives recognize a shared responsibility for implementation among the campuses and the system-level offices of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Such system responsibility may include the functions of policy-making, coordinating common approaches to campus implementation, facilitating communication among campuses, and seeking support for various initiatives.

No clearer statements exist for giving meaning and direction to our discussion of how CSU should move into the next century than Cornerstones, adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1998, and the Baccalaureate Study, approved by the Statewide Academic Senate in November 1997. Each, in its own way, invites serious attention to that which all our efforts are directed: teaching and learning. Each, in its own way, asks us to forget about impediments and to recreate and shape the CSU for the demands of the 21st century. Each, in its own way, calls for the full participation of the

DRAFT

whole CSU community, to accomplish the tasks before us. And, each, in its own way, is prelude to the particular work we propose the system and the campuses to undertake. It is daunting, to say the least, but it must be undertaken.

No statement about the hopes and directions embodied in Cornerstones and its implementation can be made without constant attention to the students of CSU; in fact, underlying every principle and recommendation is the given that the end to which all the Cornerstones activities are directed is the development of the educated and productive citizen. To achieve that end, CSU needs the collaboration and support of its current students and CSU alumni/ae to fulfill our vision for CSU in the 21st century.

We have asked the faculty to combine their current efforts in order to generate creative, integrative, and collaborative ways in which the system, under the principle of joint investment but tolerance of variability, can move forward in concrete ways to implement Cornerstones. We have proposed that the faculty and staff, students and alumni/ae, deal with such issues as learning outcomes and their assessment; program requirements; public school outreach; faculty development and support; baccalaureate education; graduate and post-baccalaureate education; accountability; institutional autonomy and system governance.

Campuses, in short, are asked to reexamine what universities have been dealing with for centuries: in the face of growing numbers of calls for change, what is it about the university that ought to change, and what ought not to change? We know the faculty are up to the tasks we place before them, as we direct new attention to best fulfilling our mission, without any loss of quality and within the contexts of the new demographics and the new economics. Campuses are appropriate sites for these deliberations where the faculty, who are the main repository of institutional values, have been, along with campus administration, wrestling with these issues and proposing changes.

A system like ours honors the various campuses for their multiplicity of functions and differentiation through centers of excellence. It also recognizes that some major concerns are “borderless,” meaning we share common educational goals; we want the best education made available to our students based on shared and relevant goals; we jointly want to demonstrate accountability for achieving these goals; we want to achieve cooperation with all campus partners; and we jointly want to explain our mission in a way that is articulated clearly, well integrated, fair, consistent, and understandable.

By any account this discussion has taken place within a short time line; however, the discussions and debates have been responsive and rich, a sign of a vital university system. The campuses and other stakeholders have responded in most thoughtful, constructive ways; the campus discussions and those of the statewide Academic Senate became timely occasions for focusing time-honored beliefs about the academy in relation to the initiatives embodied in Cornerstones and to the public policy concerns of the 21st Century.

All the responses recognize and note the preponderance of evidence showing ongoing Cornerstones activity already anticipated and taking place on the campuses. The campuses have taken upon themselves to attempt, within the context of competing demands for resources, to implement whatever Cornerstones initiatives that might be amenable to their individual cultures. This climate of activity, these many attempts to make CSU the University of the 21st Century, must be sustained and supported. Support will be given to efforts that foster faculty development; ensure a productive teaching and

DRAFT

learning environment; develop appropriate and meaningful reward structures, and effect changes in workload which accurately reflect different modes of teaching and learning; and ensure accountability by collecting evidence of results of experiments on the use of new modes of teaching and learning.

The implementation discussion has brought a growing clarity of focus on such matters as the changing roles of faculty, the campuses, and central administration. Cornerstones and the beginning of organized implementation have been occasions, as they were designed to be, to rediscover the ends to which we are all directed-to develop the educated and productive citizen in the context of California and the 21st Century.

The benefits of this exercise have been: 1) the remarkably thoughtful and insightful responses which have come from the campuses and their faculty, 2) the unmistakable evidence of the ongoing attempts of campuses to translate Cornerstones into practice, and 3) the admirable commitment to CSU and its mission which has resurfaced as a result of this discussion.

In that spirit, we present, for your information, the Proposed Cornerstones Implementation Plan and the 11 December Academic Senate Resolution.

Cornerstones Draft Implementation Plan

Revised version, January 21, 1999

PRINCIPLE 1

The basis on which campuses award the baccalaureate degree is CSU's most visible window to the public with respect to quality. The following Cornerstones principle asks faculty on each campus to be more explicit in defining and assessing learning outcomes which students will be expected to demonstrate.

The purpose of this principle is to enable each campus to ensure, as the Baccalaureate Study did, appropriate focus across the curriculum on critical elements of the baccalaureate degree, to provide a basis for gauging and improving program effectiveness, and to clarify in public terms those learning characteristics that mark a CSU graduate.

CSU's campuses already award the degree by virtue of learning demonstrated typically through a series of courses as assessed by faculty. Outcomes and their assessment are intended to provide a basis for faculty at each university to be more explicit about the value of its baccalaureate degree; however, it is recognized that the baccalaureate process will continue to be primarily course-based, faculty assessments and requirements, and its quality will involve a wide range of faculty and student experiences which cannot easily be defined and measured.

PRINCIPLE 1: The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning as determined by our faculty. The CSU will state explicitly what a graduate of the California State University is expected to know, and will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills, and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 1a. **Campus Priority** Each university will have a faculty-determined, comprehensive set of general educational "outcomes" that is sufficiently specific to support a public declaration of educational results, and sufficiently general to allow each campus to develop its own mission and each college and department to develop its own educational outcomes.
- 1b. **Campus Priority** Each university faculty will have systems of learning assessment that enable students to demonstrate learning in both courses and programs. These assessment tools need to be developed with a broad consensus as to their proper use, and will vary substantially among the disciplines.
- 1c. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU System and each university will devote sufficient resources to faculty development and the resources and time required to develop appropriate assessment techniques, redesign programs, and to shape definitions of credit, including responding to individual university requests for exceptions, on a pilot-basis, to certain system requirements.

- 1d. **Campus Priority** Each university will have indicators of institutional accountability that demonstrate the university's achievement of the outcomes to which it is publicly committed.
- 1e. **Campus Priority** Each university will have a formal process for using the assessment results to review and improve programs.

PRINCIPLE 2

Quality depends, in part, on the responsiveness of CSU's degree programs and its services to student needs. As the needs and diversity of California's population change, universities must ensure that the kind of programs and their requirements reflect those changes while always maintaining quality. CSU's alumni/ae and California's employees are valuable sources of advice regarding needs and performance.

These changing student needs also will require universities to ensure that support services respond to the needs of a wider range of students. The later recommendations on graduate, post-baccalaureate, and continuing education also speak to the principle of responsiveness to students.

PRINCIPLE 2: Students are the focus of the academic enterprise. Each campus will shape the provision of its academic programs and support services to meet better the diverse needs of its students and society.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 2a. **Campus Priority** In accord with Board of Trustee program review policy, each university shall make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures. These campus criteria and procedures will be designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to, among others, societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities. The views of alumni/ae and employers should regularly be sought concerning what programs are needed and the extent to which existing programs are yielding important student outcomes.
- 2b. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU System and each university will ensure that all students are able to complete baccalaureate degree program requirements within a reasonable length of time. Recognizing that on some campuses there is a large population of students who must support themselves while attending the university, no time-to-degree limit will be imposed. The Board of Trustees will reduce the Title 5 baccalaureate degree unit requirement from 124 to 120 units. Each campus will re-examine the unit requirements for graduation and provide a monitoring system to ensure that acceptable justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the normative minimum of 120 units.
- 2c. **Campus Priority** Each university will ensure adequate services for all students, including those with non-traditional schedules, such as older and working students.

PRINCIPLE 3

Teaching and learning are central to the CSU mission. Building on this critical strength and orientation, the quality of teaching and learning can be taken to an even higher level by enriching the interaction among faculty and students. Commitment to this principle will help to secure CSU's unique reputation for high-quality teaching and learning.

The system should create and support an environment within which faculty can develop and test new ways to augment their current strong commitment to teaching and learning. Because they carry out this most central process of the university, faculty should determine what methods are used and ensure that quality is always maintained or increased.

PRINCIPLE 3: Students will be expected to be active partners with faculty in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 3a. **Campus Priority** Each university will require that all students work with faculty and staff in planning their academic careers to include taking a more active role in their own learning, including self-paced and self-directed study.
- 3b. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU System and each campus will facilitate such practices of active learning as collaborative learning, community service learning, internships, problem solving, and the use of interactive technology.
- 3c. **Campus Priority** Each campus will encourage student involvement in scholarship, research and creative activity under faculty guidance, because these activities are central to the teaching and learning mission of a comprehensive university

PRINCIPLE 4

Faculty are central to carrying out CSU's teaching and learning-centered mission. For CSU to strengthen already strong performance of this mission, it will look to its faculty.

Cornerstones asks faculty to take additional steps to bring the effectiveness of teaching and learning to a new level, a level which few other systems will approach. In doing so, we should recognize that CSU faculty are, and are expected to be, teachers, but also scholars, meaning that CSU faculty work with knowledge at its highest levels. Such scholarship, including research and creative activity, is essential to conveying knowledge at the highest levels of effectiveness. To do so, faculty continuously must be able to develop not only new knowledge, but also better ways to transmit it. So, as we ask faculty to take CSU's mission to an even higher level, we must recognize the critical role of scholarship in doing so and find ways to lend greater support to scholarship.

PRINCIPLE 4: The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university. Faculty scholarship, research and creative activity are essential components of that mission.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 4a. ***System Priority*** The CSU System will provide faculty with a fair and reasonable incentive and reward system, including closing the faculty salary gap.
- 4b. ***Campus Priority*** Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity will be broadly defined and recognized as appropriate to each campus.
- 4c. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will support research, scholarly and creative activities for the faculty as a central element of a rich learning environment for our students.
- 4d. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will provide a more coordinated and substantive faculty development effort. These efforts will be supported by seeking new resources and by recognition of faculty time needed for these purposes.
- 4e. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU and each university will seek resources for instructionally-related technology support.

PRINCIPLE 5

Providing access to the baccalaureate degree of high quality is the most important role of CSU. The vast majority of students seeking the social and economic benefits of a baccalaureate education look to CSU. In light of the size and diversity of California's population, no other system of public higher education faces such a challenge, particularly given CSU's commitment to providing access while adhering to high standards. These access challenges only will increase as CSU seeks to raise standards and at the same time assist a wider range of people to complete successfully a high quality degree.

Strengthening access to the degree will require CSU to address many current barriers to successful access including making CSU programs more available to students who have time, schedule, place or financial barriers to current programs. Given that a great majority of community college students seek to complete the baccalaureate degree at CSU, it is critical the transfer process be as effective as possible. And perhaps most important, access to a CSU degree depends on students coming to CSU prepared to begin a high-level of study, which for too many students is not now the case. Addressing this problem will require a comprehensive, systemwide series of joint CSU-public school efforts to reach students while still in school to convey CSU standards for beginning college-level study and to help them to meet these standards.

PRINCIPLE 5: The California State University will meet the need for undergraduate education in California through increasing outreach efforts and transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and providing students a variety of pathways that may reduce the time needed to complete degrees.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 5a. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will continue the current Trustee policy to strengthen the connection between the CSU and K-12, and our collaborative relationship with the California Community Colleges.

- 5b. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will devote greater attention to the articulation of required lower division major courses and/or competencies, both within the CSU and between the CSU and community colleges. Both systems will help define the nature of any problems and, if warranted, ask faculty disciplinary groups across the CSU to seek common requirements.
- 5c. ***Campus Priority*** Each university will continue and expand programs to reach traditionally underserved communities through increased efforts at outreach and retention.
- 5d. ***System Priority*** The CSU System will revisit the competencies needed to begin college-level work and how best to assess them. This review will be linked to the re-examination of General Education through a learning outcomes-based approach.
- 5e. ***System Priority*** The CSU System will intensify its support for early diagnostic testing of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade high school students in English and math to determine progress being made in meeting CSU expectations. These efforts will focus on the Math Diagnostic Placement Test (MDPT) and the CSU-UC on-line writing assessment project.
- 5f. ***System Priority*** The CSU System will make placement tests available to K-12 students in English and mathematics during their junior year. Students who pass would be granted appropriate CSU placement.
- 5g. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will strengthen alliances with the public schools. These alliances will focus on developing a clear understanding of what the CSU math and English placement standards are and how best to achieve them. Special funding will support these efforts.
- 5h. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU and each university will expand the number of well-trained CSU students helping K-12 students achieve stronger English and math skills.
- 5i. ***System Priority*** The CSU will seek more effective methods and structures by which remedial education will be provided, including extended learning and expansion of partnerships with community colleges, public schools, and other institutions.
- 5j. ***Campus Priority*** Each university will design its academic calendars and class schedules to maximize the availability of courses in a significantly wider range of times and modes, both with regard to the weekly schedule of courses and the concept of the traditional academic year.
- 5k. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will redesign current standards and processes for facilities utilization, so that the universities can offer courses when appropriate throughout the year and throughout the hours of every day of every week, to enhance student-faculty contact, advising, and instruction.

PRINCIPLE 6

Graduate education and continuing education are not only critical elements in CSU's mission but should be expanded and strengthened. Increasingly, economic success will hinge on more education beyond the baccalaureate, both at the Master's degree level and in other forms of continuing and certificated learning.

Additionally, CSU faculty-scholars need the interaction with students in graduate programs in which higher level teaching, learning, scholarship, and research combine to produce new knowledge and its effective transmission; moreover, CSU should seek to widen avenues for its faculty to lend its considerable talents to meeting needs for doctoral-level programs and research.

The particular strengths and roles of continuing education programs in CSU should be recognized. These self-support programs for many years have been effective examples of how to make both credit and non-credit education more accessible to thousands of people and of how to combine private and public support of higher education.

PRINCIPLE 6: Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 6a. **Campus Priority** The CSU System will provide increased access to graduate education and continuing education, especially in those programs central to the lifelong opportunity of our students, and to the continued health of California's communities and economy. These programs include such traditional fields as teaching and nursing, certain liberal arts, and newer fields such as biotechnology. This recommendation suggests a significant expansion of professional and other programs in areas of high need, financed at least partly through program reductions in other areas. New systems of financing these programs will be explored.
- 6b. **System and Campus Priority** The expansion of opportunities in these areas will require a significant integration of programs in both the state-supported and fee-supported modes; the specifics of a more integrated program need to be developed, including the proper institutional and financial relationships.
- 6c. **System Priority** The expansion of opportunity in these areas requires significant increases in financial aid for graduate, credential, and continuing education students. This initiative will require both institutional aid and a commitment to amend state and federal aid policies.
- 6d. **Campus Priority** The expansion of opportunity in these areas will require new partnerships with community and business institutions to make education available beyond the campus, and to increase the immediacy of education that is applied and professional.
- 6e. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU and its universities will increase investment in their graduate and post-graduate educational programs while maintaining the CSU's

commitment to undergraduate education. Consideration will be given to the following possibilities for increased support.

- a. Seek State recognition of the higher cost of graduate (relative to undergraduate) education and the alignment of funding accordingly (without reducing support of undergraduate education).
 - b. Establishment of differential fees for undergraduate and graduate students to reflect the higher costs associated with graduate education, in parallel with increased financial aid for graduate students.
 - c. Allowing campuses and programs to charge differential fees in accordance with costs, competition in the marketplace, and demand, subject to adequate financial aid to assure access.
- 6f. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU's role in doctoral and professional education will be increased through relationships with the University of California and other public and private higher education institutions.

PRINCIPLES 7 AND 8

Securing the resources needed to support CSU's agenda for achieving even higher levels of quality and access is a responsibility to be shared by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campuses, faculty, students, alumni/ae, private enterprise, and the State of California.

As the Board and Chancellor seek these resources for the whole system, the campus administrations and faculty are asked to continue their effective past and current efforts, which have resulted in CSU's high quality and access. These efforts include substantial progress campuses have made in acting on many elements of the Cornerstones agenda. One purpose of this implementation plan is to establish for all campuses across the system a set of action priorities, one purpose of which is to guide the allocation of time, effort, and resources. That many campuses have already institutionalized many of the Cornerstones initiatives speaks well of a shared sense of priorities.

Described below is a series of funding-related initiatives which CSU will seek. It is important to note that securing such support will in part depend upon the commitment of the campuses and Chancellor to a specific agenda and to a process that will provide evidence to funders that progress is being made on critical priorities. In short, seeking and securing more resources must go forward with commitment, action and accountability.

PRINCIPLE 7: The State of California must develop a new policy framework for higher education finance to assure that the goals of the Master Plan are met. This framework should be the basis for the subsequent development of periodic "compacts" between the State and the institutions of higher education.

and

PRINCIPLE 8: The responsibility for enhancing educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty and staff, alumni/ae and students.

CSU will pursue the following financing initiatives:

8a. *Development of future budget compacts with the State.*

The California State University is supported primarily by the State's general fund. The University is subject to the variability of the State's overall revenue and the uncertainty of the legislative budget process. Since 1995, the University has had a "compact" with the state that gives multi-year stability to the revenue expectations for the University. This multi-year expectation allows the University to plan for strategic investments in instructional support, such as technology, that requires implementation over several years. Other areas of need, such as compensation increases and maintenance of plant, can be balanced over several years, allowing the University to make better judgments about the amount to spend on competing high priorities within limited resources.

8b. *Continued commitment to closing the faculty salary gap.*

Competitive salaries for all employees of the university are essential. CSU recruits and retains its faculty in competition with all universities. As enrollment increases and as faculty retire, a significant number of faculty will need to be hired. CSU determines the appropriate salary range by using a CPEC-approved comparison salary methodology. In each budget year a majority portion of CSU's budget increase is allocated for keeping salaries competitive, as measured by the comparison faculty salary survey. CSU is committed to closing faculty salary gap.

8c. *Study of faculty workload issues.*

The system should respond to faculty concerns about heavy teaching responsibilities with a nationally-based comparative study. To the extent that faculty utilize instructional technology and develop new ways of providing instruction without traditional fixed time classroom sessions, current methods may be no longer sufficient as ways of measuring both faculty and student workload.

8d. *Seeking funding to support the integrated technology plan initiatives.*

The CSU has determined that substantial investment in information technology is required to provide students with an educational experience that is appropriate for today's society. The investment in campus networks is a new demand on University resources. There is no doubt that this investment is essential. Today's networks provide access to the data and information of the world. They are an essential part of an educational experience in the 21st century. Also, the University needs to replace and update its current administrative systems for improved fiscal controls and improved student service.

8e. ***Seeking special state funding for faculty development and direct instructional support.***

Instructional support, particularly for information technology equipment and instructional equipment replacement, are among the budget priorities considered by the Board of Trustees each year. A specific budget request will be developed that addresses faculty development required to meet the increased expectations of outcomes assessment and new methods of instruction as outlined in this Cornerstones Implementation Plan.

8f. ***Seeking sharper focus of instructionally-related technology support.***

Over several years, there have grown many different initiatives and consultative structures that encourage new uses of technology, particularly information technology, in instructional support. These consultative structures will be examined to coordinate and focus the University's efforts in using technology to assist instruction.

8g. ***Seeking special funding for specific systemwide public school outreach efforts.***

California has a diverse population. Students eligible for the CSU have come from schools with varying levels of preparation for CSU level work. CSU takes the responsibility to help students in high schools understand the preparation required to perform successfully at the collegiate level. The outreach efforts outlined in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan will be fully developed and the legislature and the Governor will be asked to provide special funds to implement new and coordinated outreach programs to help students prepare for and succeed in university study.

8h. ***Campus reinvestment of productivity.***

The CSU has a program of making continuous productivity improvements. These improvements may result in savings or may result in improved services at the same cost. It is critical that these productivity savings be reinvested at the campuses where they are generated and not be used by the state to diminish the state's obligation to support CSU's instructional program.

8i. ***Seeking categorical funding for applied research.***

Applied research is a critical part of the CSU's mission to the people of California. In the last decade, the state has not provided any new support for this part of the University's activities. Investment by the state in applied research, often matched by industry, helps invigorate the state's economy, and assists in preparing students to address problems facing California's society.

8j. ***Seeking funding for joint doctoral programs based on need.***

There are doctoral programs that CSU is in the best position to provide. Current policy and budget practices work against forming programs that could meet these needs. Fee and funding strategies for high demand doctoral programs should be explored with the state.

8k. *Advancement and fundraising*

The Cornerstones priorities once imbedded in campus academic plans, will provide development directors and other advancement professionals an opportunity to assist with a number of academic and program priorities. The university advancement officer functions best when the university has an academic plan to assist advancement to order its fund-raising, marketing, alumni/ae and community relations efforts. External fund-raising is becoming extremely important in maintaining CSU's margin of excellence.

PRINCIPLE 9

The Cornerstones process is about charting directions for CSU to carry out its mission for quality and access in ways that will meet the demands of the next decade. Cornerstones is also about a commitment to accountability, to assuring the public that, in exchange for its support, it can expect certain results. We trust that making a case based on clear evidence of CSU's value and commitment to continuous improvement will lead to even greater public support.

The nature, formats, and kind of information included need to be defined carefully with full participation by all parties—individual campuses, Trustees, Chancellor, faculty, students, alumni/ae and the general public. Great sensitivity must be given to differences in institutional missions, identities, and cultures and to the appropriate level and detail of reports, particularly respecting the nature and process for sharing information about student achievement.

This accountability process is critical and should address at least two reporting relationships: that of each individual campus to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor and that of the overall CSU system to the general public and its governing bodies. The focus of campus accountability to the Board should reside at the highest institutional levels; the Chancellor and Board of Trustees should report for the system as a whole.

PRINCIPLE 9: The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society, through regular assessment of student achievement, and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.

The recommendations in support of this principle provide:

- 9a. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU will expand and/or develop mechanisms for evaluating institutional performance, and develop annual reports appropriately formatted to reach different audiences, describing institutional performance in the areas of student achievement, student satisfaction, the quality of teaching and support services, administrative effectiveness, the provision of service to the community and to the state's economy and society, alumni/ae satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and faculty and staff satisfaction.

PRINCIPLE 10

Cornerstones will be successfully implemented to the extent that its initiatives are institutionalized by the campuses, particularly through their strategic planning and consequent actions. Virtually all actions that affect quality and access reside with the campuses, where CSU's mission is carried out. While all of the recommendations in this implementation plan are expected to be addressed by each university, it is expected that for a vast majority of them, campuses will have substantial flexibility in how they are implemented. This is especially true for initiatives concerning the teaching and learning process, such as learning outcomes and assessment, faculty-student interaction, and academic programs.

Some initiatives suggest consideration of new methods, such as the use of technology-enhanced instruction for augmenting the classroom experience or for extending instruction to place- or time-bound students. Determinations as to their use on an experimental or permanent basis should reside with the faculty, who are in the best position to determine if the primary criterion of quality will be at least maintained, if not increased, by the use of such new methods.

It also is important in calling for faculty to consider other approaches that the system support the necessary experimentation. Support includes not only providing readily accessible information technology resources and infrastructure, but also creating an environment that recognizes the faculty time needed to develop and test new procedures and the fact that some experiments conclude with negative findings, which also have value.

Finally, as individual campuses continue to address the recommendations, the system commits to remove barriers to their effective implementation, including relaxation on a pilot basis of such policies as those in Title 5.

PRINCIPLE 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.

The recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 10a. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will streamline the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. All of this will balance against greater campus and system accountability for outcomes.
- 10b. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU System and each university will work cooperatively with external agencies (WASC, California Postsecondary Education Commission, etc.), to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs, and to develop appropriate accountability frameworks.
- 10c. ***System Priority*** The CSU System will review current Title 5 and university code requirements to eliminate regulatory constraints where possible.

Response to the Draft “Cornerstones Implementation Plan”

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following response to Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence’s draft “Cornerstones Implementation Plan” (October 16, 1998). The Board of Trustees adopted the Cornerstones Report on January 28, 1998. The Academic Senate CSU adopted the Cornerstones Report’s ten principles on January 23, 1998. Implementing Cornerstones requires an active partnership among the Board of Trustees, the CSU administration, and the CSU faculty, students, staff, and administration on each campus. In general, the various partners have the following responsibility in providing the high-quality education envisioned in Cornerstones:

- The CSU Board of Trustees has primary responsibility to secure adequate funding from the State of California, to advocate for the broad meaning of higher education in a pluralistic society, and to adopt the regulations and policies that will provide an atmosphere of adaptability and improvement;
- The CSU administration has primary responsibility to propose—in consultation with faculty, students, and staff—the structure and administrative flexibility to carry out Board of Trustees regulations and policies;
- The faculty, administration, students, and staff on each campus have the primary responsibility to translate the principles of Cornerstones into action in a way that maintains and improves upon past levels of quality and meets the challenge envisioned for the future; and
- Faculty on each CSU campus have primary responsibility to study the efficacy of the changes proposed by Cornerstones as a means of maintaining the high level of excellence in baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate education. It remains the faculty’s responsibility on each campus to determine the appropriate number of units required for awarding degrees for our diverse baccalaureate programs, for example, applying, a priori, 120 units as a benchmark for our diverse programs is ill advised.

The ASCSU recommends that Executive Vice Chancellor Spence, in preparing an implementation report for the Board of Trustees, address the need to remove barriers to experimentation and creative problem solving, and specify as priorities the following Cornerstones objectives:

1. Recognize campus autonomy and uniqueness as important factors in meeting clearly defined system policy goals (Principle 10).
2. Support and encourage faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity as essential components to the CSU’s teaching mission (Principle 4).
3. Provide faculty with a fair and reasonable reward system that allows the CSU to attract and retain the highest quality faculty (Principle 4, recommendation 4a).
4. Facilitate and provide funding to achieve the conditions that will allow faculty to carry out their professorial responsibilities, by funding efforts to

“[r]einvest significantly in faculty, through a faculty development and reinvestment program that protects the core resources and ensures additional resources for faculty development and learning” (Cornerstones, p. 21) through such things as:

- increased support for faculty to work at the cutting edge of their disciplines;
- adjusted course load levels to be consonant with those in current CPEC comparison institutions;
- increased sabbatical leave opportunities;
- increased funds for travel and participation in professional conferences;
- increased assigned time, technical and clerical staff support, and other resources to assist faculty in their professional growth;
- increased assigned time to develop student learning outcomes and assessment methods;
- increased assigned time and technical staff support, as well as acquisition of appropriate technology, to study the possible conversion of courses to new modes of instruction and, where appropriate, carry out the conversion;
- expanded assigned time for training programs in the use of technology-mediated instruction;
- expanded summer and off-term stipends to support faculty development of educational initiatives;
- increased investment in library resources;
- increased investment in physical facilities and instructional equipment;
- expanded instructional development and support operations and expanded support for campus faculty development centers;
- greater support to new faculty during their earlier years as they acclimate to the academic profession, including regular and predictable salary step increases;
- increased funding for faculty to study the efficacy and advisability of gradually shifting attention in the CSU from a course and unit-based curriculum to one that places greater emphasis on student learning outcomes;
- increased assigned time to review and strengthen articulation for General Education among CSU universities and community colleges; and
- increased assigned time and other funding to enable faculty from CSU campuses, community colleges, and the University of California to convene in disciplinary groups to improve articulation of courses and competencies within degree programs. Until faculty within disciplines have reached consensus on specific transferability of major requirements, the CSU should not encourage any perception that there is a seamless system in this regard.

5. Acknowledge that faculty retain primary responsibility to develop learning outcomes and assessment (Principle 1). Where Step A in the draft Implementation Plan refers to the university, it should specifically assign those responsibilities to the faculty.

6. Recognize that not all desirable outcomes of a baccalaureate education can be easily measured. Such outcomes include a desire for life-long learning; development of social skills through interaction with peers and colleagues; ethical, moral, and social responsibility including effective participation in a democratic society; and appreciation and tolerance for diversity in all of its manifestations (Principle 1 and the CSU Academic Senate Report *Baccalaureate Education in the California State University*).
7. Increase outreach efforts between CSU and K-12 in an effort to ensure a greater preparation of high school students who are prepared for college level study upon entry to CSU (Principle 5, recommendation 5a).
8. Support innovative ways to involve students as active partners with faculty in the learning process, including student involvement in scholarship, research, and creative activity under faculty guidance (Principle 3).
9. Ensure stable state funding for higher education to meet the goals of the California Master Plan (Principle 7).
10. Develop specific means to measure overall effectiveness and efficiency of administrative units at all levels. Such accountability addresses institutional achievements of educational outcomes, campus climate, institutional governance style, resource allocations, personnel transactions, fiscal accounting, and compliance with the law. (Principle 7 and the “Conclusion: Shared Responsibility”).
11. Foster a collegial and collaborative partnership between faculty and administration (Principle 4, recommendation 4a).

Many of the proposed Cornerstones initiatives will require significant financial support. These new proposals must not be implemented at the expense of our existing tradition of educational excellence. For instance, it shall be noted that throughout their history CSU campuses have sought excellence and have produced the current high level of quality evident in the CSU. Thus, many of the prescriptions for excellence found in Cornerstones are already found on CSU campuses. For example, faculty have:

- awarded degrees on the basis of demonstrated learning;
- stated clearly through catalogs, advising, and syllabi what students are expected to know;
- assured breadth and depth of knowledge through General Education and disciplinary majors;
- articulated course requirements effectively with the community colleges, the University of California, and among universities in the CSU system;
- focused on students and worked diligently to meet the needs of a diverse and changing student population;
- encouraged students to actively participate in their learning through involvement in scholarship, research, and creative activities;
- supported—within the limited resources available—faculty development, both professional and pedagogical;
- provided a quality educational experience in a reasonable time;
- striven to carry out the goals of the California Master Plan while maintaining access for all qualified students who desire an education;

- served effectively the communities and citizens of their region;
- made significant and meaningful contributions to the California economy and society;
- assessed on a continuing basis student learning—at the course, program, and graduation levels;
- worked within the context of clearly stated mission statements that identify specific educational goals; and
- created, through a two-year study by the Academic Senate CSU, a statement on the baccalaureate that recognizes that undergraduate education in the CSU is an ongoing cumulative process and not primarily a series of measurable, discrete learning outcomes.

All of these existing activities deserve our continued support. We must remember that our tradition of excellence forms the educational foundation upon which we will place the Cornerstones of the next century.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY — December 11, 1998