

# Table of Contents

---

Foreword January 1999 .....	iii
Executive Committee .....	iv
Senate Chairs 1963-1998 .....	v
Foreword [As originally published in Volume I, 1988] .....	vi
Section I .....	1
Section II .....	19
Section III .....	59
Section IV .....	187
Section V .....	245



# Foreword

## January 1999

---

Ten years ago the First Edition of *Principles and Policies* appeared under the able editorship of David C. Cohen of CSU Bakersfield. That volume, familiarly known as the Blue Book, has been a valuable guide to generations of members of the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) and of campus senates on a variety of issues, including collegiality, the roles and responsibilities of academic senates and on other important positions taken by the ASCSU on academic policy matters.

While the original edition of the Blue Book has served its purpose for these ten years, it was always the intent of the Senate to update it; consequently, the present editor undertook the responsibility, in consultation with the members of the Executive Committee of the ASCSU, of making the Blue Book more current. In this volume, all the text from the First Edition has been included and has been augmented with policies judged significant by the editor and the Executive Committee ASCSU (1998-99). These policies were adopted by the Academic Senate CSU through spring 1996. There will also be an even more current version of *Principles and Policies* available through the Senate's Web site: <http://www.calstate.edu/acsenate>, and this version will be updated annually.

The preparation of this volume has only been possible through collaboration, over time, of previous Executive Committees ASCSU.



Harold Goldwhite  
Editor

# Executive Committees

---

## 1998-1999

Gene Dinielli, Chair  
Vincent Buck, Vice Chair  
Hal Charnofsky, Secretary  
Cristy Jensen, Member-at-Large  
Dick Williams, Member-at-Large  
James Highsmith, Immediate Past Chair

## 1997-98

James Highsmith, Chair  
Marshelle Thobaben, Vice Chair  
Walter Oliver, Secretary  
Gene Dinielli, Member-at-Large  
Judy Stanley, Member-at-Large  
Harold Goldwhite, Past Chair

## 1996-97

James Highsmith, Chair  
Marshelle Thobaben, Vice Chair  
Hal Charnofsky, Secretary  
Gene Dinielli, Member-at-Large  
Gary Hammerstrom, Member-at-Large  
Harold Goldwhite, Past Chair

## 1995-96

James Highsmith, Chair  
Marshelle Thobaben, Vice Chair  
Hal Charnofsky, Secretary  
Allison Heisch, Member-at-Large  
Rosemarie Marshall, Member-at-Large  
Harold Goldwhite, Immediate Past Chair

# Senate Chairs 1963-1999

---

Leonard Mathy	CSC Los Angeles	1963-64
Samuel Wiley	CSC Long Beach	1964-65
John Livingston	Sacramento State	1965-66
Jesse Allen	CSC Los Angeles	1966-67
Sol Buchalter	San Fernando Valley State	1967-68
John Stafford	San Fernando Valley State	1968-69
Jerome Richfield	San Fernando Valley State	1969-70
Levern Graves	CSC Fullerton	1970-71
David Provost	Fresno State	1971-72
Charles Adams	CSU Chico	1972-75
Gerald Marley	CSU Fullerton	1975-77
David Elliott	San Jose State	1977-79
Robert Kully	CSU Los Angeles	1979-82
John Bedell	CSU Fullerton	1982-84
Bernard Goldstein	San Francisco State	1984-87
Ray Geigle	CSU Bakersfield	1987-90
Sandra Wilcox	CSU Dominguez Hills	1990-93
Harold Goldwhite	CSU Los Angeles	1993-95
James Highsmith	CSU Fresno	1995-98
Gene Dinielli	CSU Long Beach	1998-

# Foreword [As originally published in Volume I, 1988]

---

As the Academic Senate of the California State University completes its 25th year of representing the faculty, its Executive Committee believes that important documents reflecting on Senate history and representing recent achievements of the Senate should be provided in a format accessible to those who wish to understand the role of the Senate in CSU academic governance. With minor editing for consistency in style and to reduce redundancy, the papers which follow provide personal perspectives on the Senate's history and reprint several of its most significant recent actions.

The Executive Committee of the statewide Academic Senate, led by the Senate Chair, organizes the activities of the Senate and is principally responsible for representing the Senate in its dealings with many groups, including the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and her staff, the California State Student Association, the CSU Alumni Council, statewide policymakers, and the public. With offices at the CSU Headquarters in Long Beach, the Senate operates throughout the year as an agency of CSU faculty governance. Information about the documents reprinted here or about any other activities of the Senate may be obtained from that office.

The Senate will compile additional volumes in this series from time to time and welcomes a wider audience for its work. Permission to reproduce and quote from these documents is hereby granted. While the thoughtful contributions of many persons are reflected in these documents, editorial responsibility for this publication resides in the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the California State University.

## Executive Committee, 1987-88

Ray Geigle, Chair  
Frieda A. Stahl, Vice Chair  
Peter H. Shattuck, Secretary  
Paul S. Spear, Member-at-Large  
Becky W. Loewy, Member-at-Large  
Bernard Goldstein, Immediate Past Chair

# Section I

---

From the History of the Academic Senate of the California State University.....	3
Remarks to New Senators.....	3
Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University.....	11





# Section I

---

## From the History of the Academic Senate of the California State University

This section of the *Papers* consists of presentations which selectively provide a perspective on the history of the statewide Academic Senate. The first paper is a brief social history of its early development. An orientation luncheon for new members of the Senate on September 11, 1987, provided Professor Peter H. Shattuck an opportunity to help prepare those Senators for their new roles. Shattuck approached this occasion as an historian (at CSU Sacramento since 1965), as a former Chair of the Faculty Senate at that campus, and as a member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU.

Following Professor Shattuck's speech are the remarks of seven former Chairs of the statewide Academic Senate at a January 9, 1986, Senate symposium commemorating the 25th anniversary of the California State University. Their presentations, addressing the challenges they see facing the CSU and the Senate, are based on experiences spanning nearly 20 years. Their remarks demonstrate that many initial concerns of the faculty have persisted virtually unchanged to the current era, while the CSU has grown to be an institution of enormous complexity, with great challenges for those who would participate in its governance. The wisdom and wit of these faculty leaders are evident in their statements.

### Remarks to New Senators

**Peter H. Shattuck**  
**September 11, 1987**

This is not a chronicle of the Senate; I will not go into the begats (Mathy begat Wiley who begat Livingston), nor will I trace the Senate's wanderings in the desert (from Wilshire Boulevard to the Hollywood Roosevelt to the Pacifica to the Long Beach mud flats, with occasional excursions to Sacramento). Instead, I'll try to explain a few of the mysteries about the Senate, and give you some sense of where we come from.

On May 14, 1988, the Academic Senate of the CSU will celebrate its 25th birthday. Born of the altogether unlikely couple of Glenn Dumke and Al Rodda, the Senate has survived a difficult childhood and a frustrating adolescence to emerge as a mature institution, still not entirely sure of its role in an academic world which refuses to remain static. Historians tend to search for ways to chop the seamless web of time into manageable chunks: the history of the Academic Senate may appropriately be divided into the period of origins, the pre-HEERA years, and the post-HEERA epoch, otherwise known as the present.

### Prehistory of the Academic Senate

The California state colleges can trace their origins to 1857, the year of the establishment of Minns' Evening Normal School in San Francisco. After a century, the normal schools had become

teachers colleges, which in turn had metamorphosed into state colleges. Administered by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the state colleges were in fact run by their presidents. The president hired faculty, supervised the curriculum, made personnel decisions, and arranged for parking. To quote from *A History of the California State University and Colleges*, written by Don Gerth and Judson Grenier, "The faculties of the state colleges, reflecting their history as teachers colleges, were not assigned by law or custom any real role in making of policy." (p. 17) What changed that situation was the study which produced the first Master Plan for Higher Education in California. Embodied in the Donahoe Act of 1960, the Master Plan created the state college system and held out a variety of promises for the future.

Among the promises was real faculty participation in the governance of the institutions. It took a change in leadership to fulfill that promise. The first Chancellor, Buell Gallagher, stung by Red-baiting, resigned after eight months; he was replaced by Vice Chancellor Glenn Dumke, former president of San Francisco State.

Dumke became Chancellor in April 1962. By then the 16 campuses each had formed some kind of faculty council or senate to advise, recommend, cajole, or plead with the local president. Dumke quickly met with the chairs of these bodies to begin planning "...of a statewide faculty organization which could be used for consultation on statewide matters." (The quote is from Judson Grenier and Kenneth Simms, *Creation of the Academic Senate, CSUC*, published in 1978, p. 2. The word *used* is delightfully ambiguous.) As planning went forward, it found encouragement from the Legislature. Senator Albert Rodda of Sacramento introduced SR 20 (1962), calling for the creation of an Academic Senate of the state colleges. To the Chair of the Board of Trustees, Rodda wrote, "Many individuals in the Legislature and in the field of higher education are watching carefully the steps that are being taken...in the evolution of arrangements for faculty involvement in the state college system operation." (Grenier and Simms, p. 5)

### The Academic Senate Emerges

Thus, the fortunate product of a sort of blatant legislative intrusion which it has resisted ever since, the Senate held its first session in May 1963, chaired by Leonard Mathy of LA State. It is not altogether wrong to say that, for the next 18 years, Chancellor Dumke used the Senate as an alternative to, and as an instrument against, his *bête noire*, collective bargaining. That is not to say that the Senate made no difference. In fact, Senate chairs and senators worked hard to recommend policy in a wide spectrum of academic issues. To quote again from Grenier and Simms, "Issues referred to Senate committees and discussed in plenary sessions in 1963-64 have a familiar sound. They included grievance procedures, promotions policies, summer session salaries, teacher training guidelines, elimination of remedial courses from the curriculum, enrollment limitations on impacted campuses, joint doctoral programs, and released time for Senate officers." (p. 5) The Senate, they point out, "...wrestled with any controversial problems: student protest movements, sit-ins, strikes, violations of academic freedom, presidential authority, access to the Board of Trustees, threats to tenure, grievance and disciplinary action procedures, diminution of faculty role in selection of administrators, collective bargaining." (p. 6) Early Senate leaders like Len Mathy, Jack Livingston, and Jerry Richfield fought heroically to represent faculty interests. Still, as Mathy noted in 1978, "...the Senate's role in the CSUC system has changed little since its establishment. It was assumed by those of us who helped draft the Constitution and to launch the Senate on its course that it would soon have a powerful role in policy development and acquire fundamental authority in many areas. These cherished hopes have never been fulfilled...." (Grenier and Simms, p. 8)

### The Collective Bargaining Era

Four months after Mathy made this discouraged—and discouraging—assessment, Governor Brown signed AB 1091, and governance in the CSU began to enter a new phase, one in which the Academic Senate would have at once more and less authority, more and less significance, than in the early years. AB 1091, of course, was HEERA—The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act—which gave faculty members the opportunity to be represented by an exclusive bargaining agent with regard to "...wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment." Four and a half years later, the Public Employment Relations Board announced the California Faculty Association (CFA) had won the election and would now be the

official bargaining agent for the faculty. That might well have meant the demise of the Academic Senate, as the arrival of collective bargaining had meant elsewhere. But, thanks to earlier Senate success in shaping the bargaining act, the Senate remained very much in business.

As you are no doubt aware, HEERA contains language which explicitly, if not entirely clearly, recognizes the Senate. "The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational mission of such institutions and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process." Two important documents have spelled out that process: the first, *Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context*, made its way through the Senate between 1978 and 1981, when it was unanimously adopted. In 1982, Chancellor Dumke wrote that the document conveys the message "...that the onset of collective bargaining need not portend the end of a collegial approach to decision-making..." (*The Academic Senator*, Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 5)

Senators with long memories found a good deal of irony in this remark, since one of the major incentives behind collective bargaining had been the Chancellor's intransigent resistance to collegiality. Nevertheless, the Senate had a continuing role, one further recognized in 1983 when Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds wrote, "I have adopted this document." (*The Academic Senator*, Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 6)

She would also adopt a second document prepared by the Senate, the 1985 *Statement on Collegiality*. Meanwhile, the bargaining process went forward. The Congress of Faculty Associations became the California Faculty Association, and we are now into our second contract. Instead of two players in the drama of governance, there are now three. As Past Chair Bernie Goldstein can testify, these last years have been marked by a slow and often painful effort to find the boundaries separating, or sometimes the issues uniting, the players. People have taken extreme positions: "The Senate can't talk about collective bargaining." — "Everything is within scope." — "Collegiality is all." — "Can we talk?" — and perhaps — "Maybe we can talk." The struggle for definition continues, and so does the Senate. The uneasy marriage between the Senate and the CSU, now a *ménage à trois*, has almost reached its silver anniversary. I look forward to joining you in the celebration.

## Remarks by Former Chairs of the Academic Senate

January 9, 1986

Dr. Leonard Mathy

Chair, 1963-1964

I don't plan to bring any world-shaking issues to you. I thought I might talk a little bit about the early Senate, at risk of boring some of my friends who've heard these stories many times. Looking at the minutes of the first meeting, September 26-28 in 1963, I find that among those present, the names are Adams and Allen, and most of the rest you probably wouldn't know. Most of these people subsequently defected to administration. I regret that Perk Hardeman is not here. I had hoped to see him because I think that that completes the list of those whom you know who were present at that first meeting.

Prior to the establishment of the Senate, and my memory is perhaps hazy here and I can be corrected, there was a great deal of pressure to get a Senate. The now ACSUP was then active, trying to get a Statewide Senate through the Legislature and get powers for it and for faculty councils and senates on the several campuses. Chancellor Dumke claims that he was the prime initiator of the Senate and that it was his initiative that carried it forward. I must say that he should be given a good deal of credit, because under his administration, at that time, committees or task forces were established to develop a constitution.

When that constitution, that draft constitution, was prepared, it was acted on in a rather curious way. There was a forerunner to the Senate, a body of council presidents and senate chairs that the Chancellor established. That group met and discussed some issues in the year before the Senate came into existence. I served on that body, having been the chair of our local Senate at the time, and was elected chair of that body. From that body, when the final draft constitution was prepared, two persons met with trustees to work on a final draft. Laverne Graves from Fullerton and myself met in San Francisco with Trustees Halbrin and Coblins in the executive offices of a bank. Starting

at about 8:00 a.m., we worked till about 11:00 a.m., I think, and Laverne and I tried to get what you would like to see in a Senate constitution: powers delegated to the faculty. We got nothing. We got the constitution you have now. These two trustees were very nice men, perhaps some of the best trustees we've ever had, but they were lawyers and were very smart and they gave no ground whatsoever. They did eliminate some offensive language, but otherwise, we gained no powers.

Subsequent to that, that constitution was discussed by a very curious body. With the Chancellor and some of the staff in the background, that academic assembly of local campus council presidents and senate chairs and the president of each campus met to review the constitution. The Chancellor asked me to serve as chair, and we worked through the constitution piece by piece, changing things here and there and acting on various elements of it. One thing that I've told my friends many times, and they probably wish I wouldn't tell you this, but there was one issue that I remember well, and that is that the Chancellor wished to chair the Senate. That issue came up before the body, and you get the scene. I'm sitting next to the Chancellor and he's "leaning" on me and each senate chair. There were only men then, of course (as it properly should be!). Each senate chair was sitting next to his president and, of course, there were no females there either, and so, here was this buddy group and they were going to vote on the issue, "Shall the Chancellor be chair?" It came to a vote, and the tally was 14 to 14! In checking signals later, we found that two presidents had crossed over and two senate chairs had crossed over and so it was a tie. Of course, that represented a failure. I voted no, knowing that it had failed anyway; but I needed to be counted, and so I voted no on it, and that was that.

The next day, a president, who hadn't been at the meeting, came and said, "I understand the vital issue occurred yesterday and if I had been here, would have been different." So that's what happened with respect to the issue of the Chancellor chairing the Senate. I've often wondered what kind of body it would have been (and it would be today) if the vote had been different at that time. In any event, we were launched, and we soon got into the business of Senate actions.

I noticed in looking at these minutes that one of the first things that we took up was the issue of release time, and when I came in here today and saw the Senate was still struggling with release time a few years later (you see, that was September 1963), I really thought it was quite funny that we could never get off that issue. There were many other issues. Of course, I would say that, in some ways, nothing has changed. I imagine that my fellow chairs would agree with me that, over the years, we've always fought for authority and delegated authority and fought for effective and timely consultation. Those fights were frequently lost. I recall writing to the Chancellor a very bitter letter about failure to consult on some issue long since forgotten by me. Subsequent to that, the Chancellor in the hallways or some place said, "You know, Len, we drafted several replies to your letter, but we decided to cool it and never sent any of them." But even that was appropriate with respect to consultation; they "didn't bother" to answer. Those were some of the things that I recall about the early Senate days; I believe I should conclude at this point.

### **Dr. Jesse Allen Chair, 1966-1967**

First I want to commend the Academic Senate for its patience and its efforts. Much progress has been made. Much work remains.

One major issue affecting public higher education in California is the need for the University of California, the California State University, and the Community Colleges to merge under a single head.

The Master Plan attempted to establish three separate systems. The university was to provide professional schools above the master's level and to hold a near monopoly on research funds; the state universities were pretty well fenced in; and the community colleges were restricted to the first two years, occupational programs, and a number of sub-professional areas. The state universities and the community colleges were admonished to seek excellence in their own spheres.

It is unfair for the intellectual and economic elite to study in comparative *Taj Mahals* at the University of California while other students must attend the underfinanced state universities and the even less privileged community colleges.

The Academic Senate should seek a unified university system which permits equal treatment at all levels of education and which permits research wherever it can be justified by the merits of the project and the capability of the professor. It should have one governing board and should divide the system into regions for administration and service. Competition for bodies and for budgets should be discouraged.

Delineation on the basis of function should be maintained only when it contributes to economy and/or excellence in California public higher education. The challenge to the faculties is to give leadership in the establishment of an organization which emphasizes both equality and excellence.

### **Dr. Charles C. Adams Chair, 1972-1975**

It seems to me that the most pressing issue before the Academic Senate in the next few months is the identification of, and insistence on, its proper role in the context of collective bargaining. The foundation for this activity must be the unusual language in the enabling legislation which specifically provides for shared governance and a role for academic senates.

Your mission, as I see it, is to define *criteria and standards* as carefully and broadly as possible and then to insist that you occupy the territory defined. The Academic Senate in this matter is, as usual, operating from a position of relative weakness in conflict with forces of relatively greater strength.

One of my favorite poems is Richard Eberhart's "The Matador." Though I know that it is almost sacrilegious to paraphrase the meaning of a poem in prose, you must know that the poem is essentially about a mismatch in terms of brute strength made less disparate by the grace and skill of the weaker adversary. The matador will leave the arena on the shoulders of his colleagues—either sitting and waving proudly in victory or lying defeated in a coffin.

You are the matador. But you face not one but two bulls—one is the union and the other is management. Facing two bulls is enormously more than twice as difficult as facing only one.

The union, in spite of its probably sincere overtures and blandishments, very naturally wants to be the exclusive representative of faculty, but the law mandates a sharing of representation. You represent the faculty too—as respects academic standards and criteria. The union will naturally and unconsciously (if not deliberately) encroach upon that territory. It may, as a matter of fact, have already done so in the first contract.

Management will naturally seek to reserve that territory for you, not because it necessarily cares about your role, but because it thinks, perhaps not without reason, that it can have its way with you *collegially* more easily than it can with the union at the table.

If the union succeeds in usurping your territory, you really have no reason to continue to exist. If management protects your territory and then prevents you from effectively representing faculty in your *reservation*, you will be liable to ridicule and abandonment.

You must convince the union that you intend to protect your area of representation and that you can represent faculty well. You must insist that management allow you to represent faculty effectively with respect to academic criteria and standards.

At a minimum, management must give public assurance, perhaps in the form of a trustee-adopted charter, that the recommendations of the Senate in matters of academic criteria and standards will be given primacy. That does not mean necessarily that your recommendations will be inviolable. But it should mean that the rare conditions under which they are modified or annulled will be prescribed and require heavy justification.

In some respects, facing two bulls in the arena is very frightening. In some respects, it is very challenging and exciting. You may be killed or you may by grace and skill successfully accost the brutal adversaries. The difficulties make the achievement the more creditable:

Matador of the spirit, be you also proud and defiant  
By grace and skill, accost hot sunlight without fear,  
Try nearer to the fetish tossing of the horns  
Relaxed power best defies the brutal adversary  
And hold that skill most dear that most dares  
The dance almost motionless, as the beast passes...

**Dr. Gerald C. Marley**  
**Chair, 1975-1977**

In May 1977 Vice Chancellor Sherriffs and Dean Moye told the trustees that remediation represented a *temporary* need. If we would show a little compassion and spend a little extra money, then within five years the problem would just disappear. Well, the problem did not disappear. Further, this problem will continue to get worse until we decide that we are going to get out of the remediation business immediately and permanently! We must commit that any regularly admitted recent high school graduate who comes to us unprepared to do college level work will flunk. Until, and unless, we do that, the problem will continue to grow and to subvert our mission.

On my campus we regularly turn away students who are prepared to do college level work and who only ask to be given that opportunity. We have more upper division students than we can accommodate. Meanwhile, we are diverting resources away from these prepared students so that we can offer noncredit high school level courses to people who took these same courses while in high school and who either did not learn the material or are unwilling to take the responsibility to review this material so that they can benefit from the programs we offer.

We frequently hear it asserted that we have a *moral obligation* to remediate any student we admit, regardless of the pervasiveness of the deficiencies. I submit that we have even more of an obligation to meet the educational needs of the prepared students we admit. As long as there is one student who is turned away from a legitimate college level course, it is immoral to spend resources to offer a noncredit high school level course to an unprepared student.

**Dr. David H. Elliott**  
**Chair, 1977-1979**

Thank you, Bernie. I would like to take you up on your invitation to speak briefly about some of the major challenges facing the CSU.

Collective bargaining was the dominant concern of the Senate during my years as chair. We participated directly and extensively in drafting the bill (AB 1091, Berman) that was enacted into law in 1978. We participated because it was evident that the faculty of the system favored collective bargaining, and we were concerned about the survival of collegial governance mechanisms in a collective bargaining context. We sought specific protective language in the bill for academic senates and devised *fail-safe* provisions that would (1) exclude academic and professional matters from bargaining and (2) provide appropriate recourse for the faculty in the event that management failed to engage in good-faith consultation with the Academic Senate on such matters.

As everyone knows, we did secure the provisions that we sought in the law; however, the task of making them work still stands as a major challenge to the CSU. Roy Brophy, who was and is chair of the Board of Trustees, reassured us in the most recent issue of *Stateline* that collegiality is alive and well in the CSU. That is not the feeling, however, that I get from my campus colleagues or from the remarks of the other past chairs who have already spoken. During my terms as chair, we dreamed of a grand symbiosis in which “wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment” could be relegated to the bargaining process, with all of the good stuff left to senates. I still believe such a symbiosis is possible, but in my judgment we don’t have it now, nor will it be achieved easily. Lest you become discouraged about making collective bargaining work and start thinking we might be better off without it, let me remind you of the revealing questions that were posed in the last issue of *Stateline* by Jim Highsmith and the other members of the task force he is chairing on resource allocation and budgeting. Candid answers to these questions make it impossible to escape the conclusion that our current resources are inadequate. The question to all of us is whether, through collegial processes alone, we can ever expect to secure the necessary resources for a great university.

In thinking about the second challenge that I want to touch on briefly, I was tempted to come armed today with multiple copies of Ralph Waldo Emerson’s famous address on “The American Scholar.” In this address, which Oliver Wendell Holmes dubbed the “Intellectual Declaration of Independence” of this country, Emerson urged his colleagues to turn their full energies to the development of an intellectual tradition that was uniquely American. Although there are those among us who might be willing to view the Master Plan (Donahoe Act) as our declaration of independence as a system, I doubt

that there is any real consensus among us as to its meaning or its validity for the CSU. In spite of the recent efforts to develop a role and mission statement for the system, in my judgment much remains to be done in this area. Trustee Claudia Hampton observed several years ago that we were still playing Avis to U.C.'s Hertz; that we were still inclined to define ourselves and measure our achievements in terms that are more appropriate to that segment of higher education. Although we have made some progress in the intervening years, I believe Trustee Hampton's observation still holds. I think Emerson's challenge to 19th century America is still our challenge; we still need to agree on who we are and what, in particular, we wish to contribute to this state and its people.

Thank you again for this opportunity to be with you on this enjoyable occasion.

**Dr. John W. Bedell**  
**Chair, 1982-1984**

I have been blessed by having four excellent vice chairs, Lyman Heine, Perk Hardeman, Judy Rymer, and Bernie Goldstein.

The faculty, in my mind, in this system is an excellent one. We have quality teaching going on with quality baccalaureate and master's experiences because you are really a community of scholars. I think that's a true statement. I am very concerned that the faculty is able to respond to the changing students; they are older, they have different learning styles, and I think they are going to be very problematic, if you will, to many of our faculty and the administration. We have a changing demography with international issues.

We have more and more of our campuses looking at specialized accreditations for their programs. I am concerned that accreditation can become a tail wagging the dog. Yet I am concerned that perhaps maybe the accreditation agencies are right and we should try to do what they are suggesting. Maybe we should rise, if you will, rather than just try to fight it as a system, which has been suggested. I do not understand why a given major at some of the most prestigious liberal arts universities and colleges in this country can be 24 units or 27 units, but we have to take ours to 56 or 58 or 45. I think that as baccalaureate and master's institutions we need to diversify and to be sure that the curriculum is in fact responsive to the students' needs in their life-long learning.

It has been a pleasure for me to be affiliated with this body. The Academic Senate is a credit to the educational experiences that we have in California. You are to be honored as a group for all that you are doing for the faculty, the students and the campuses. Thank you.

**Dr. Robert D. Kully**  
**Chair, 1979-1982**

As I think about what was taking place at the time that I was Chair of this Academic Senate, I conclude that the problems we faced are not really much different from the kinds of issues with which you are concerned. There was one term that was used in regard to the role of the Senate that probably says more about the attitude of the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees toward the Senate than any other term that I can think of. That term was *presidential accountability*. The term was and still is very important, because every time the Senate talked about granting responsibility or authority to the Senate, we were always met with the assertion that if you give responsibility to the Senate you will not have an identifiable authority. That's why the presidents should have the authority, so the argument went, because they can be held accountable. That was the one phrase that we kept hearing in our attempt to strengthen the Senate and the excuse we received whenever we discussed the matter.

During the time that I served on the Academic Senate when Charles Adams was Chair and on the Executive Committee when Gerald Marley and David Elliott were Chairs, our goal was to assure that the Senate survive as a strong, viable, and influential body. I have spoken often of that continuing concern both before this group and on the campuses. The concern is that the Senate must have and must maintain areas of responsibility, particularly in those areas that are separate from the agent's areas of responsibility under the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act. Those areas are, for the Senate, the educational, academic, and professional matters. Although these areas were recognized in HEERA as outside the scope of bargaining, we were not sure how the Senate would function under the law. You are aware, of course, that the Chancellor, the Chancellor's Office, the presidents, and by far the vast majority of the members of the Board of Trustees opposed the bill.

Once the bill was approved as law, we were concerned because, frankly, there was a great deal of animosity toward the Senate because the Senate had supported the bill. There was concern that once collective bargaining was really implemented the perception would be that the Senate would merge with the union and that there would be no way of telling the Senate from the agent. Obviously, if there were no distinctions between the two, there would be no need to deal with the Senate, and for all practical purposes the Senate would probably die. On the other hand, we were concerned that if the Senate appeared to be a tool of management or the system, not only would the Senate lose the confidence of the faculty, but it would lose the confidence of the agent. Without the confidence of the agent, there was no doubt that the union would set out to destroy the Senate's effectiveness, and for good reasons.

Our concerns led to the development of a document that many of you are familiar with, "Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context." The document was approved by the Senate and by most of the campus senates and was accepted by the Chancellor. When it was developed, I thought it was a very good document. About two years ago, I pointed out in some speeches that I was having some doubts about it because I thought it was a bit naive. It seemed to draw very clean distinctions between what ought to be union business and what ought to be Senate business and, once collective bargaining was implemented, it became obvious that these clean lines simply could not be drawn. Now, however, when I reread and study the document, I again think it is a good statement, primarily because it does lay out some specific areas of responsibility for the Academic Senate. Maybe the Senate ought to take another look at the document, bring it up-to-date where needed, encourage those campuses which have not accepted it to accept it, and even consider the possibility of taking it to the Board for endorsement. The document has a lot of merit because, as I said before, it assigns to the Senate some very specific responsibilities.

There is another and very fascinating issue, at least for me. You know that in the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act one section refers to the standards and criteria for the appointment, tenure, promotion, and evaluation of the faculty as the joint responsibility of the Board and the Senate. The fail-safe mechanism of the section requires that if the Board withdraws any part of that section from the jurisdiction of the Senate, those items would become bargainable and placed on the table.

Now the CSU has withdrawn some items from the table because it believes that these items are standards and criteria, although they have been bargained before. At first glance, some of us greeted this action with a certain amount of joy because that act could provide additional authority for the Senate. But I urge you to temper joy with caution. The attempt to remove these items from the table may not only be just an interpretation of the law and they may not be just confidence in the Academic Senate, but they could be an attempt to limit the scope of bargaining. I am not questioning anyone's motives, but I think the Senate must be very careful before it supports this opportunity without qualification. The key issue for me is in the meaning of joint responsibility. I know what the author of the bill intended and I am quite sure I know what the Legislature intended. I shared that definition with some trustees and members of the Chancellor's staff, and I can tell you not everyone agrees with my interpretation of that section and my definition that joint responsibility means consensus or arriving at mutually agreeable solutions.

The faculty could lose a lot if these items are taken from the table, where there is real negotiation, and assigned to the Senate if the Senate's role ended up being advisory. What I am suggesting is that the fail-safe mechanism is in its way operating, but at the same time I think the Senate needs to be very careful and make absolutely sure that the entire statement of that section is in operation, not just that part about standards and criteria. The one other concern that I have is that the Senate must never let itself be put into a position in which it ends up in a combative situation with the agent. The faculty of the system cannot stand a public battle between the Senate and the union. If the faculty is split, the faculty will lose whatever it has gained from having a strong Academic Senate and by having a strong collective bargaining agent. At this point, we just simply have to have confidence that the individuals involved all are people of good sense and good will and have the best interests of the California State University system as their goal.

And I want to extend my best wishes to this Academic Senate and wish you well in your important work on behalf of the CSU faculty.

*(At the time of these remarks, Professor Kully was a member of the California State University Board of Trustees.)*



# ***The Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University***

## Preamble

The faculty of the California State University adopts this constitution in order to exercise its rights and fulfill its responsibilities in the shared governance of the University. As the official voice of the faculty in matters of systemwide concern, the Academic Senate of the California State University provides the means for the faculty to participate in the collegial form of governance which is based on historic academic traditions as recognized by California law.

## Article I

### Section 1. Purposes

- (a) It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of The California State University to promote academic excellence in The California State University; to serve as the official voice of the faculties of The California State University in matters of systemwide concern; to be the formal policy-recommending body on systemwide academic, professional and academic personnel matters; to ensure the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the Trustees in criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees; to be the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions; and to assume such other authority and other responsibilities and to perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the Chancellor or the Trustees of The California State University.
- (b) The Academic Senate shall be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically related fiscal matters, including the charge and composition of such bodies. The Academic Senate shall be responsible for the selection of representatives of the faculty to serve on or participate in such bodies.

### Section 2. Relation to Campus Senates

- (a) The term campus senate shall mean the elected representative body established at each campus by its faculty.
- (b) The Academic Senate of the California State University shall have no authority over those matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or the Trustees; and nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to impair the right of campus senates to communicate with the Chancellor and the Trustees.
- (c) The campus senates may suggest items for consideration by the Academic Senate and may make recommendations on matters before the Academic Senate, either through the campus representatives or directly to the Academic Senate.
- (d) To provide adequate communications with the faculties of the several campuses, the Academic Senate shall circulate to the senate and the president of each campus such materials as agendas for and minutes of its meetings, committee reports, and information on pending matters.

## Article II

### Section 1. Membership

The Academic Senate shall consist of 51 elected campus representatives as follows:

- (a) one senator from each campus with an FTEF of 100 or less  
two from each campus with an FTEF of over 100  
one extra senator for as many campuses as possible apportioned on the basis of the highest FTEF;
- (b) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member;
- (c) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.

The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member shall not be counted as a campus representative.

## Section 2. Representation of New Campuses

The faculty of each new campus shall elect its first voting representatives in the spring of the first year of instruction. At any time after the establishment of the campus and prior to the time voting representatives take office, the faculty of the campus may send a non-voting representative.

## Section 3. Eligibility to Serve as a Campus Representative

Only those persons eligible to vote for campus representatives shall be able to serve as campus representatives, provided that the faculty of the campus may, at its discretion, establish additional requirements for service as a campus representative.

## Section 4. Eligibility to Vote for Campus Representatives

All members of the faculty at each campus shall be eligible to vote for campus representatives to serve in the Academic Senate. Each campus shall determine which members of the campus community are considered to be faculty.

## Section 5. Elections of Campus Representatives

Campus representatives represent the entire faculty of a campus, and not the campus academic senate and shall be elected at each campus in a campus-wide election. In any year in which such an election is held, the election results shall be certified to a designated officer of the Academic Senate by the principal elected officer of the faculty of that campus on or before May 1; representatives so elected shall take office on or before June 15.

## Section 6. Terms of Office

Campus representatives shall serve a term of three years. The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate shall serve for one year.

## Section 7. Substitute Members

In the event that an elected member will be absent for one or more semesters or quarters, the faculty of the affected campus shall replace this member in such manner as may be determined by the faculty of that campus. In the event that an elected representative is unable to attend a meeting of the Academic Senate, the senate of that campus may name a substitute who shall have the right to attend and vote at that meeting.

## Section 8. Recall of Representatives

A representative may be recalled by majority vote of those voting within the constituency which elected this representative under procedures established by the constituency.

# Article III

## Names and Duties of Officers

There shall be a chair of the Academic Senate, and such other officers as shall be specified in the Bylaws; and the time and manner of election, the length of terms and the duties and responsibilities of officers shall be specified in the Bylaws.

# Article IV

## Section 1. Meetings

The Academic Senate shall meet at least twice during each academic year. Additional meetings as needed shall be convened by procedures specified in the Bylaws.

## Section 2. Voting

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership. Voting by proxy shall not be permitted.

# Article V

## Referendum

Any recommendation adopted by the Academic Senate shall be referred to the faculties of The California State University when resolutions requesting such a referendum are adopted by the senates of at least one-third of the campuses. Approval of recommendations so referred shall require a majority of the votes cast at a balloting held for the purpose.

## Article VI

### Section 1. Bylaws

The Academic Senate may adopt Bylaws not inconsistent with this Constitution, provide for committees, and establish its own rules of procedure.

### Section 2. Rules of Order

In the absence of any provision to the contrary in this Constitution, all meetings of the Academic Senate, its standing committees and their subcommittees, and other subsidiary bodies shall be governed by the parliamentary rules and usages contained in the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised)*.

## Article VII

### Section 1. Amendments

Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by a resolution adopted by majority vote of one-third of the campus senates or by a majority of those present and voting at a meeting of the Academic Senate.

### Section 2. Ratification of Amendment

Ratification shall require a majority of the total vote cast in a systemwide referendum and a majority of the votes cast at each of a majority of the campuses.

### Section 3. Adoption of Amendments

Amendments shall become effective upon ratification by the faculties of the campuses and approval of the Trustees.

# Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws

## Bylaw 1

### Definitions and Amendment Procedures

#### a. Definitions

The rules and regulations of the Academic Senate, beyond those already specified in the Constitution and its amendments, shall be designated by *Bylaws*, *Rules of Order* and *Standing Rules*.

- (1) **Bylaws** are those rules and regulations pertaining to organization (including officers, major committees, and other agencies authorized to conduct business in and for the Senate), duties of said officers or agencies, and other such matters as may be specifically required by the Constitution and its amendments.
- (2) **Rules of Order** are such rules and regulations concerning parliamentary procedures not covered in *Robert's Rules of Order (Revised)* or direct amendments thereof.
- (3) **Standing Rules** are those rules and regulations which cover all other matters pertaining to the conduct of the business of the Senate. (*Robert's Rules of Order* provides for such temporary changes of procedure.)

#### b. Amendment Procedures

- (1) **Bylaws** shall be amended by presentation of the text of the proposed amendment at one meeting and approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present at the next regularly called meeting.
- (2) **Rules of Order** shall be amended by presentation of the text of the proposed amendment at one meeting and approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present at the next regularly called meeting.
- (3) **Bylaws and Rules of Order** may also be amended by prior written notice and by a two-thirds affirmative vote of those present at a regularly called meeting.
- (4) **Standing Rules** shall be amended by affirmative vote of a majority of those present at a regularly called meeting.

## Bylaw 2

### Officers, Duties and Procedures for Nomination and Election

#### a. Officers

The Senate annually shall elect a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary; and two Members-at-Large. These officers of the Senate shall serve until regularly succeeded.

#### b. Duties of the Officers

- (1) The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Senate and the Executive Committee. He or she shall be responsible for communications with the faculties of the campuses. He or she shall have the authority to convene regular and special meetings of the Senate. Requests for expenditures of State Funds in connection with the Senate activities shall be subject to the approval of the Chair or his or her designee.
- (2) The Vice Chair shall assume the duties of the Chair when the Chair is unable to serve. He or she shall be responsible for carrying out such other duties as may be delegated to him or her by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the Chair.
- (3) The Secretary shall keep the minutes and the records of the Senate and shall carry out such other duties as may be delegated to him or her by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the Chair.
- (4) The Members-at-Large shall carry out such duties as may be delegated to them by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or its chair.
- (5) An individual designated by the Executive Committee shall be responsible for the regular production and distribution of a newsletter for all the faculties of The California State University. (See Bylaw 7)

#### c. Time of Election

The election of officers shall be held annually at the first meeting of the new Senate. The duly elected officers of the Senate shall assume their duties on June 1 following their election, except that the new Executive Committee may meet earlier than June 1 in order to begin the organization of Senate assignments and responsibilities for the coming year.

#### d. Election Procedures

- (1) Offices shall be filled, starting with the office of Chair and continuing with Vice Chair, Secretary, and two Members-at-Large, in successive order with nominations and election by secret ballot.
- (2) Every senator shall have the opportunity to make nominations.
- (3) All nominees shall be listed on the first and subsequent ballots alphabetically. Those having the highest number of votes, and whose votes, when added together, constitute a majority of the votes cast, shall appear on the next ballot. Voting shall continue in this manner until one candidate receives a majority of votes cast.
- (4) In the event that a new representative has not been elected in time to participate in the election of Senate officers at the first meeting of the new Senate, the outgoing representative shall be entitled to vote in such elections.

#### e. Vacancies in Elected Positions

- (1) When the Chair's position is vacated due to resignation or other reasons, the Vice Chair shall assume the title and responsibilities of the Chair.
- (2) When the position of Vice Chair, Secretary, or Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee is vacated, the position shall be filled by election at the next regular Senate meeting after the vacancy occurs, according to the election procedures stated in Bylaw 2d.
- (3) When the position of Immediate Past Chair is vacated on the Executive Committee, the position shall remain vacant.

## Bylaw 3

### The Executive Committee

#### a. Membership

The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers and the Immediate Past Chair.

#### b. Duties and Authority

- (1) The Executive Committee shall be responsible for preparing the agenda, for advising the Chair regarding the conduct of the Senate business, and for such additional duties as the Senate may assign.
- (2) The Executive Committee shall have the authority to act for the Academic Senate of The California State University between meetings on items requiring action before the next meeting of the entire body.

- (3) The Executive Committee shall appoint the members of the standing and special committees of the Senate, and consultants to the Senate, including specialists.
- (4) A majority of the Executive Committee may direct the Chair to call a meeting of the Senate.
- (5) The standing and special committees shall appoint their own subcommittees, subject to the approval of the Chair of the Senate, who shall consult with the Executive Committee.

#### Bylaw 4

#### Committees and Specialists

**a. Standing Committees**

The Senate shall have, but not be limited to, the following standing committees:

- (1) The Academic Affairs Committee,
- (2) The Faculty Affairs Committee,
- (3) The Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee, and
- (4) The Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations

**b. Special Committees**

The Senate may establish special committees as needed.

**c. Specialists**

The Senate may have specialists, with designated duties, as shall be determined by the Executive Committee each year.

**d. Appointment of Chairs**

The Chairs of the standing and special committees, and the specialists, will be appointed annually by the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee.

**e. Membership**

Members of the standing committees shall be appointed annually from the current membership of the Senate. At least two-thirds of the members of each special committee of the Academic Senate shall be appointed from the members of the Senate. Chairs of the committees shall be members of the Senate. No member of the Senate shall be appointed to more than one standing committee.

**f. Responsibilities of the Committees**

- (1) *The Academic Affairs Committee:* \*

The Committees shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) systemwide aspects of academic planning;
- (b) general or liberal arts education;
- (c) criteria for state approval of specific curricula, programs or degrees;
- (d) accreditation;
- (e) statewide requirements for admission, retention, and graduation of students;
- (f) credit by evaluation;
- (g) minimum standards and conditions for the award of certificates to students;
- (h) academic standards;
- (i) grading standards and symbols;
- (j) systemwide aspects of program review;
- (k) new program allocation;
- (l) joint doctoral programs;
- (m) systemwide aspects of the basic directions of academic support programs;
- (n) library development;
- (o) research related to educational programs;
- (p) academically related fiscal matters;
- (q) systemwide aspects of student services;
- (r) policies governing the awarding of honorary degrees;
- (s) matters relevant to statewide and international programs;

---

\* It shall not be the function of this committee to intervene in any questions as to which courses within an approved program on any campus are proper, improper, adequate, or inadequate.

- (t) research, planning, formation, allocation, and delivery of programs outside traditional campus service areas;
- (u) extended education, campus-based study abroad, faculty participation in international programs, faculty exchange, student exchange, and activities between and among campuses;
- (v) statewide and international programs and the resources to serve non-traditional as well as international students; and
- (w) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate CSU.

The committee shall maintain liaison with CSU, committees and commissions as designated.

(2) ***The Faculty Affairs Committee:***

The committee shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, promotion, evaluation and tenure of academic employees as well as preservation of the principle of peer review and evaluation through the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
- (b) professional development, including minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence such as the awarding of sabbaticals and other academic leaves;
- (c) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators;
- (d) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators;
- (e) academic freedom and responsibility;
- (f) professional matters not collectively bargained;
- (g) other professional matters which may overlap items being collectively bargained where such matters have substantial academic or educational effects;
- (h) the role of faculty in institutional governance; and
- (i) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate.

(3) ***Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee:***

The committee shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) system budgets including strategic and academic initiatives;
- (b) adequate funding for the cost of instruction;
- (c) assessment of faculty productivity and its relationship to the budget planning process;
- (d) current and evolving measures of accountability as they relate to the budget planning and evaluation process
- (e) support for Academic Senate positions and policies before the Legislature and other governmental bodies;
- (f) the proposal of legislation and policies for consideration by the Legislature and other governmental bodies consistent with Academic Senate policy; and
- (g) support for Academic Senate positions and policies before the Legislature and other governmental bodies. Further, at the direction of the Chair, the committee shall:
- (h) represent the Academic Senate before governmental bodies;
- (i) assist the Chair in determining the timeliness and accuracy of Academic Senate resolutions directed to the Legislature;
- (j) work with standing committees of the Academic Senate in researching resolutions directed to the Legislature;
- (k) develop a cooperative working relationship with the Office of the Chancellor and the Trustees so that the CSU can, whenever possible, present a unified approach to the Legislature; and

- (l) inform the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate of relevant matters pending before the state government.

(4) ***The Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations: \****

The committee shall evaluate and make recommendations on matters regarding the CSU's relationship with K-12 and shall maintain liaison with appropriate K-12 representatives on matters of teacher education. The committee shall also make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including, but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) CSU policies and statewide activities affecting campus teacher education and other credential programs;
- (b) state legislation and regulations concerning the requirements for credentials under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing;
- (c) state legislation having potential impact on the CSU responsibility to educate school personnel;
- (d) intersegmental efforts to improve teaching at all levels; and
- (e) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate CSU.

**g. Reporting Procedures**

All standing and special committees, unless otherwise specifically directed by the Senate, shall report to the Senate. Their recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate.

**Bylaw 5**

**Establishment of the Official Roster of the Senate**

The alternates from the several campuses shall at each meeting at which they are official delegates present to the Secretary of the Senate their names and the names of the senators whose places they are taking.

**Bylaw 6**

**Voting on Substantive Motions**

- (1) Voting on substantive motions may take place at any meeting of the Academic Senate CSU when the reports giving rise to the motions have been distributed to all senators at least two weeks in advance. Such reports shall be referred to as "Action" items on the agenda.
- (2) Substantive motions based on reports which have not been distributed to all senators at least two weeks in advance shall take place only after a second reading of the motion at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate CSU, by three-fourths vote of those present, may waive this requirement. The motion to suspend the rules to waive this requirement shall be debatable.

**Bylaw 7**

**Establishment of Faculty Newsletter**

- (1) There shall be established a faculty newsletter coming from the Academic Senate CSU and sent to all CSU faculty at appropriate times.
- (2) Funds shall be provided for this newsletter from the Senate budget.

**Bylaw 8**

**Session of the Academic Senate**

The session of the Academic Senate CSU shall be from June 1 through May 31.

---

\* It shall not be the function of this committee to intervene in any questions as to which courses within an approved program on any campus are proper, improper, adequate, or inadequate.





## Section II

---

Definitions of Role and Responsibilities of Academic Senates .....	21
Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA): A Memorandum to Senate Members and Others .....	22
Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context .....	25
Correspondence Between Chancellors and Senate Chairs Regarding “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context” .....	28
Collegiality in The California State University System .....	31
Report of the Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University .....	41
Recommendations Regarding Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation of the Faculty .....	42
Criteria and Procedures for the Nomination of the Faculty Trustee .....	44
Campus Responsibilities In Collegial Governance .....	46
Faculty Role in the Establishment of a New Campus at Fort Ord .....	48
The Senate Enterprise in an Age of Reinvention and Change .....	49
The Senate Enterprise in an Age of Reinvention and Change: The Report of the Task Force on Governance .....	49
Prologue	
Part I: Historical Perspective on the Academic Senate	
Part II: Changes that Affect the CSU and the Senate	
Part III: The Academic Senate in a Time of Change	
Part IV: Summary and Conclusion	



# Section II

---

## Definitions of Role and Responsibilities of Academic Senates

The statutory cornerstone of the Statewide Senate's current role in CSU academic governance is the explicit inclusion of specified responsibilities for academic senates in the Legislature's landmark collective bargaining legislation, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act, signed by the Governor in 1978. The memorandum concerning HEERA expresses the Statewide Senate's views on vital relationships among the Senate, the exclusive (bargaining) representative, and the Board of Trustees. It also identifies areas where existing definitions may be inadequate, thereby setting an agenda for additional discussions and agreements. The Senate's evolving understanding of this Act and of its implications for academic governance are the major focus of three additional key documents in this section of the *Papers*.

"Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context" was approved by the Senate on May 8, 1981, and is accompanied here by subsequent correspondence between Senate Chairs and CSU Chancellors. As a framework delineating the responsibilities of *the senates* (both on the campuses and statewide) in a new era of collective bargaining, it has served the CSU well and provided a foundation for the development of relationships among constituencies which continue to evolve and strengthen. Although accepted by the Chancellor, this document has not yet been endorsed by the Board of Trustees.

A significant additional event was the Senate's adoption (in March 1985) of a statement on "Collegiality in the California State University System." This document traces the history of university governance and argues forcefully for a collegial system of shared decision-making uniting the responsibilities of those who oversee, administer, instruct at, study at, or have graduated from the CSU. The statement by the CSU Board of Trustees in response to the Senate's document indicates the extent to which the collegiality principle has been accepted by those entrusted to manage the California State University.

The document on page 42 is a rearranged version of an agenda item and related resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1987. Vice Chancellor Naples and Senate Chair Goldstein presented to the Board a jointly developed approach to defining the role that student evaluation of instruction would play in reviews of faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions and in the evaluation of instructional performance of tenured faculty. Through this *collegial* process the Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate successfully employed *joint responsibility* as envisioned in the provisions of HEERA.

# Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA): A Memorandum to Senate Members and Others

Because there has been so much discussion recently about the Academic Senate CSU's responsibilities as they relate to the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), we thought it would be worthwhile to provide to the Senate some background and explanatory material regarding HEERA.

## What Is HEERA?

HEERA was signed into law in the fall of 1978. It exempted the CSU, the UC, and the Hastings College of Law from the state labor laws then existing to govern relations between the State of California and its employees. At the same time, it enacted provisions to govern employer-employee relations of the CSU through meeting and conferring (i.e., collective bargaining) on matters within the scope of representation. As some provisions differ among the institutions covered, we will discuss the law as it applies to the CSU.

HEERA grants employees many of the normal rights associated with provisions of the federal labor laws, such as the rights to form, join, and participate in unions and to refuse to join or participate in unions. It also prohibits unfair labor practices, often defined similarly to the federal labor laws. The law is administered by the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) which has to date, among other things, determined appropriate bargaining units, conducted representation elections, and determined charges of unfair labor practices in the CSU.

## Purposes of HEERA

In HEERA, the Legislature declared that the people of California (1) "...have a fundamental interest in the development of harmonious and cooperative labor relations between the public institutions of higher education and their employees" [Section 3560(a)] and (2) "...have established a system of higher education under the Constitution of the State of California with the intention of providing an academic community with full freedom of inquiry and insulation from political influence in the administration thereof." [Section 3560(c)]

The stated purpose of HEERA is "...to provide the means by which relations between each higher education employer and its employees may assure that the responsibilities and authorities granted to the separate institutions under the Constitution and by statute are carried out in an atmosphere which permits the fullest participation by employees in the determination of conditions of employment which affect them." [Section 3560(e)] "The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this [law] shall be construed to restrict, limit, or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices, including...the Academic Senates of the California State University and Colleges, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting the California State University and Colleges.... The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved." [Section 3561(b)] Finally, the Legislature stated: "It is the policy of the State of California to encourage the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and learning through the free exchange of ideas among the faculty, students, and staff of...the California State University and Colleges. All parties subject to this [law] shall respect and endeavor to preserve academic freedom in...the California State University and Colleges." [Section 3561(c)]

## Scope of Representation Under HEERA

The scope of representation allowed to an exclusive representative (i.e., union) determines the matters about which it may collectively bargain or otherwise represent employees, e.g., grievances. The *scope* provision for the CSU reads:

- (f) For purposes of the California State University and Colleges only, "scope of representation" means, and is limited to, wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment. The scope of representation shall not include:
- (1) Consideration of the merits, necessity, or organization of any service, activity, or program established by statute or regulations adopted by the trustees, except for the terms and conditions of employment of employees who may be affected thereby.
  - (2) The amount of any student fees which are not a term or condition of employment.
  - (3) Admission requirements for students, conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the content and conduct of courses, curricula, and research programs.
  - (4) Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees, which shall be joint responsibility of the academic senate and the trustees. The exclusive representative shall have the right to consult and be consulted on matters excluded from the scope of representation pursuant to this paragraph. If the trustees withdraw any matter in this paragraph from the responsibility of the academic senate, the matter shall be within the scope of representation.

All matters not within the scope of representation are reserved to the employer and may not be subject to meeting and conferring, provided that nothing herein may be construed to limit the right of the employer to consult with any employees or employee organization on any matter outside the scope of representation. [Section 3562(r)]

Additionally, an often overlooked provision of the law defining unfair labor practices states: "It shall be unlawful for the higher education employer to: ... (f) Consult with any academic, professional, or staff advisory group on any matter within the scope of representation for employees who are represented by an exclusive representative.... For the purposes of this, the term *academic* shall not be deemed to include the academic senates." [Section 3571]

## Our View of HEERA

A reading of these provisions of HEERA indicates that the Legislature went to considerable lengths to preserve not only joint decision-making and consultation between faculty and administration for institutional governance but also the principle of peer review for academic employee personnel decisions. Further, the Legislature did not attempt to impede or limit discussion and consultation on any matters by anyone. It did limit "meeting and conferring" (i.e., collective bargaining negotiation) between the employer and the exclusive representative to matters within "scope of representation" (hereafter referred to as *scope*), while prohibiting "meeting and conferring" on matters outside scope.

To more fully understand HEERA, assume that there are three parties one must be concerned with: the Senate (including all academic senates of the system), the CFA (or other elected representative), and the CSU Trustees (often acting through the administration). Here is how HEERA carefully preserves the rights of these three parties to talk to one another.

First, as to matters *within* the scope of representation:

- (a) The CSU, as employer, must meet and confer with CFA as to matters within the scope of representation.
- (b) It may not consult with any other academic, professional, or staff advisory group on any matter within scope, except academic senates.
- (c) While the CSU may consult with academic senates on matters within scope without fear of committing an unfair labor practice, it is not required to do so. Communications from academic senates to the CSU, or to CSU and CFA, expressing opinions or seeking consultation on matters within scope are not prohibited. To the contrary, they are clearly permitted.

Second, as to matters *outside* the scope of representation:

- (a) The CSU, as an institution of higher learning, is encouraged by HEERA in its practices of joint decision-making, consultation, and shared governance with the faculty and academic senates, practices which would encompass most issues outside the scope of bargaining.
- (b) The academic senates and the trustees have joint responsibility specifically for criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure, but, although these matters are excluded from scope, CFA has "...the right to consult and be consulted on matters excluded from the scope of representation pursuant to this paragraph." [Section 3562(r)(4)] It appears that CFA has the right to consult with both the Senate and the CSU on these matters and on "criteria and standards" issues, but it is not required to do so.
- (c) The CSU, as employer, may consult with any employees (including members of academic senates) or employee organization (including CFA) on any matter outside the scope of representation, but the CSU may not meet and confer (in the sense of collective bargaining) with CFA on these matters.

Thus, our view of HEERA suggests a conclusion that common sense might have dictated: the CFA and the CSU have responsibility for matters within scope; the CSU and the Senate, including campus academic senates, have responsibility for matters outside scope; and all parties are permitted to consult with one another on all topics. Because there are areas where the conditions of employment are not easily distinguished or separated from academic or professional matters—where there are gray areas—this approach seems eminently sensible, even though it may be difficult to implement.

Our view of HEERA does not solve all problems. For example, while a close reading of HEERA tells us much, it does not define the meaning of "criteria and standards" or "joint responsibility." Definitions of these terms will have to be agreed upon very soon.

### **Policy Implications of This View for the Senate**

The Senate may communicate or consult on matters within scope provided it clearly enunciates an academic, educational, or professional concern which it believes falls within Senate responsibility.

The Senate should be willing to talk formally with CFA, in addition to the CSU, about criteria and standards for which it has joint responsibility with the Trustees because HEERA gives CFA the right to consult and be consulted on these matters. Within this framework agreements may be reached on which topics are or are not criteria and standards.

The Senate should attempt to educate all parties as to its view of HEERA and what HEERA permits and should also attempt to achieve concurrence so all parties are operating under the same interpretation of HEERA.

(This memorandum was endorsed by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1986.)

# Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context

## Collegiality and Collective Bargaining

On September 13, 1978, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., signed into law AB 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). (Education Code Section 3560 et seq.) This legislation provides faculty members of the CSU an opportunity to determine whether they wish to be represented by an exclusive agent in negotiations on "...wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment." [Section 3561(r)] This section of the Government Code also specifies the intent of the Legislature to preserve, under collective bargaining, traditional shared governance mechanisms, including consultation, and the principle of peer review in faculty personnel decisions. These intentions are expressed as follows:

The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices including the Academic Senate of the University of California and the divisions thereof, the Academic Senates of The California State University and Colleges, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting The California State University and Colleges, the University of California, or Hastings College of the Law. The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, and retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved. [Section 3561(b)]

This document has been prepared to describe the respective responsibilities of the Academic Senate of the CSU and of the local Senates or Councils in this collective bargaining context. The relationships, functions, and responsibilities proposed in this document reflect consideration of HEERA, the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University, and the tradition and practice in the CSU.

## The Traditional Role of the Academic Senate in the CSU

The Trustees of The California State Colleges approved the Constitution of the Academic Senate on March 8, 1963. Prior to this a majority of the voting faculty at each of a majority of the college campuses had approved the document. Encouragement for the establishment of the systemwide Academic Senate, as well as for the creation of an Academic Senate on each campus, came from the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees and the California Legislature. The 1961 Legislature adopted Senate Resolution No. 98 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78 requesting the Trustees to establish an Academic Senate at each college "...wherein the faculty members shall be freely elected by their colleagues for the purpose of representing them in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters." Senate Resolution No. 20, which resolved that the Trustees consider establishing an Academic Senate for the CSC system, was under discussion in the Senate Rules Committee when the Senate was created in 1963.

An examination of the initial Constitution of the Academic Senate CSC, as approved by the Board of Trustees, reveals the official purposes of the Senate:

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of The California State Colleges to serve as the official voice of the faculties of The California State Colleges in matters of systemwide concern; to consider matters concerning systemwide policies and to make recommendations thereon; to endeavor to strengthen the Senates and Councils of the several colleges; and to assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the Chancellor or the Trustees of The California State Colleges.

Senate participation in academic, professional, and administrative matters during the 18 years of its existence evidences a tradition of shared governance in the CSU and suggests appropriate

responsibilities for the Senate under HEERA. The collective bargaining act makes explicit provision for the preservation of this tradition and mandates continuing senate involvement in academic and professional matters.

### **Academic Senate Participation in Systemwide Governance**

The Academic Senate shall continue to serve as the official voice of the faculties in systemwide academic and professional matters as specified in the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSU, Article 1, Section 1a.

The Academic Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on such matters and shall also be the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions. Normally, recommendations of the Academic Senate shall be addressed to or through the Chancellor.

In respect to systemwide governance, the Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees shall be the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges. [HEERA, Section 3562(r)] Criteria and standards determined jointly by the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees shall be considered minimal; campus senates/councils may recommend additional criteria and standards.
- B. The Academic Senate shall be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically related fiscal matters, including the charge and composition of such bodies. The Academic Senate shall be responsible for the selection of faculty representatives to serve on or participate in such bodies.
- C. The Academic Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on general, systemwide policy decisions related to the following matters:
  - (1) minimum admission requirements for students;
  - (2) minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students;
  - (3) curricula and research programs;
  - (4) minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves; and
  - (5) systemwide aspects of academic planning.
- D. The Academic Senate shall be consulted on the following:
  - (1) systemwide aspects of program review;
  - (2) systemwide aspects of the basic direction of academic support programs;
  - (3) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators; and
  - (4) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators.

The Academic Senate shall not participate in the process of collective bargaining. Normally, matters affecting wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be considered by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.

### **Campus Senate/Council Participation in Campus Governance**

The Academic Senate shall have no authority over those matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of the CSU. Furthermore, nothing in this document shall be construed to impair the right of academic senates/councils of the several campuses to communicate through appropriate channels with the Chancellor and the Board of



Trustees, nor to diminish the authority of the campuses and their senates/councils in campus matters of academic or professional criteria and standards.

Because joint decision-making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational missions of the California State University, the academic senates/councils of the campuses shall be the primary consultative bodies regarding educational and professional matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees and shall be consulted on fiscal matters which affect the instructional program.

In respect to campus governance, the Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for:
  - (1) approval of degree candidates; and
  - (2) development of policies governing the awarding of grades.
- B. Through the campus academic senates/councils responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for developing policies and making recommendations to the campus presidents on the following matters:
  - (1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees, including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
  - (2) determination of membership in the General Faculty;
  - (3) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
  - (4) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations; and
  - (5) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.
- C. The academic senates/councils shall be the primary source of policy recommendations to the campus president on decisions related to the following matters:
  - (1) establishment of campuswide committees on academic or professional matters;
  - (2) the academic role of the library;
  - (3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
  - (4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions; and
  - (5) development of institutional missions and goals.
- D. The academic senates/councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning:
  - (1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes; and
  - (2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.
- E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of such functions and responsibilities.

(This document was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1981.)

# Correspondence Between Chancellors and Senate Chairs Regarding “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context”

Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke to Senate Chair Robert D. Kully  
September 29, 1981

I have carefully studied the Senate’s resolution AS-1217-81/EX and its companion document “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context” which you forwarded to me on May 15. I compliment you, the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate on your efforts, so critical at this time in our history, to identify those matters of true academic concern as opposed to those affecting “wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment.” Beyond this, the document reflects important efforts to clarify the differences in roles and responsibilities of the Statewide Academic Senate and those of campus senates and councils.

Having said that, I wish to make clear that my positive feelings toward the document depend on understandings that we have reached with you during its development.

First, as used throughout the document, “consultation” as we understand it refers to providing a means for the faculty (as a whole or through representatives) to present its judgment in the form of recommendation or analysis to systemwide or campus administration. The opportunity for the faculty to formulate and present such judgment makes clear the need for timely communication. Clearly, as we know, circumstances can arise when none of us is allowed sufficient time. However, these circumstances should not be of our (administration or Senate) own doing. Obviously there is no implication of “mutual veto” which would preclude an administrative or Board action or decision following consideration of the Senate’s recommendation.

Second, I understand that you and Vice Chancellor Sherriffs discussed our concern with that part of [the document] which deals with selection of faculty representatives to committees or task forces. Vice Chancellor Sherriffs has informed me that your intent is that if the presence of faculty on a committee or task force is a representative presence—i.e., the members will be representing the Senate or the faculty as a whole—then the Academic Senate shall be responsible for their selection. If, however, the administration desires particular faculty members for any of a variety of reasons, such as their experience, expertise, or acknowledged interest in a subject, the administration on its own volition clearly may appoint such persons as individuals. Regardless of which situation pertains, continuing good communication is anticipated. If my understanding is correct, then I have no problem with [that section] as written. I assume this interpretation holds also for campuses, as under [a later section].

Third, in the introductory paragraphs to [the third part], the document states, “Normally, recommendations of the Academic Senate shall be addressed to or through the Chancellor. “The Senate’s constitution, as you know, does not include the word “normally.” This was intentional because orderly processes require that the chief executive officer of a large organization be aware of potentially significant issues and activities and have a chance to discuss the pros and cons with those who initiate them. I recognize that the Senate, like the students, has been going directly to the Legislature for a number of years. Also, members of the Senate have gone around the administration to the governing board. These exceptions do not contribute to the orderly administration of the institution. I am not pleased with your use of the word “normally.” To enable this agreement to go forward, I will accept its presence only with the stated reservation added to the document, that it is understood that exceptions to the provision of the main clause in that sentence are improper procedure and will not take place except under emergency or crisis conditions.

One final observation. [One paragraph] states:

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall not participate in the process of collective bargaining. Normally, matters affecting wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be considered by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of those who advise me, the inclusion of the word “normally” in the second sentence raises a question about the intent of the first sentence, since to get into matters of wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment can be to get into collective bargaining issues. Further, to the extent that the Senate confuses the line between the scope of bargaining and academic governance, then union-free academic governance is placed that much more in jeopardy. If, on the other hand, you are saying that you will be vigilant in protecting academic matters from union encroachment and would be active in keeping academic matters from the bargaining table, then I withdraw my objection.

If I am correct regarding the first two points, and having put myself on record on the third and fourth, then I am willing within this context to indicate to the Board of Trustees that I find the statement “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context,” together with this letter, a helpful step forward. The statement, with this letter, will provide guidance as we work together to deal with uncertainties of the years immediately ahead.

**Senate Chair Robert D. Kully to Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke  
January 15, 1982**

The Executive Committee has asked me to respond to your September 29 letter in which you observed that your positive feelings toward the document, “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context,” depend upon understandings reached during the document’s development. The Executive Committee also asked me to convey to you its satisfaction that we are so close to reaching closure on this matter.

With respect to your first point, we concur with your understanding of the term “consultation” as “providing a means for the faculty (as a whole or through representatives) to present its judgment in the form of recommendation or analysis to systemwide or campus administration.” We also agree that “the opportunity for the faculty to formulate and present such judgment makes clear the need for timely communication,” which we interpret to mean time for full faculty review. However, we recognize that circumstances may arise where there is not sufficient time for consultation. It is our understanding that even in the event of such regrettable circumstances, every attempt will be made by systemwide or campus administrators to confer with and seek advice from faculty representatives. We agree with you that these circumstances must not be of the administration’s or Senate’s own doing, and we trust that only rarely will it prove impossible to complete the normal consultative process.

We note your concern about ruling out the possibility of a mutual veto. Our concept of consultation does not imply a mutual veto. Nevertheless, we understand the process of consultation to mean that Senate recommendations are to be afforded serious and thorough consideration.

Regarding your second point, we are in concurrence with Dr. Sherriffs’ interpretation of [that section]. We agree that if the presence of faculty on a committee or task force is a representative presence—i.e., the members represent the Senate or the faculty as a whole—then the Academic Senate shall select such nominees. It also should be understood that faculty nominations made by the Academic Senate are based on many factors, including concern for appropriate expertise and experience. If Chancellor’s staff desires to appoint faculty members for any reason, it should be clearly understood that such appointments do not constitute either Senate or faculty representation.

Third, we understand your concern about the use of the word “normally” in the introductory paragraphs to [the third part]. We do not think it advisable to reopen the process by bringing the document back to the Senate which would be necessary if any changes were to be made. Consequently, we trust that you will accept this letter as the expression of our intention that Academic Senate recommendations will be addressed to the Chancellor “except under emergency or crisis conditions,” as stated in your letter.

Finally, regarding the sentence [you cite], the intent of the Senate is to endeavor actively to keep academic and professional matters out of the process of collective bargaining. In other words, the interpretation you propose as unobjectionable in the last sentence of your penultimate paragraph that the Academic Senate “will be vigilant in protecting academic matters from union encroachment and would be active in keeping academic matters from the bargaining table...” is correct.

The section of the document to which you refer serves as a reminder that it is possible for the Chancellor to consult with the Academic Senate on any issue. Just as matters outside of scope may be discussed with the exclusive representative, it is our understanding that it also is possible within the law for the Chancellor to engage in consultation with the Senate on matters that may be within scope. Of course, it is not the Senate's intention to encroach upon items that are clearly within scope. However, if a matter on the bargaining table has implications for the educational program or for other academic or professional matters, then the Academic Senate would expect to be consulted.

Now that these points have been clarified, we urge that, as you propose to do in your letter of September 29, you indicate to the Board of Trustees that you find the statement a helpful step forward and a basis for working together in the years ahead. We would see such action on your part as an acknowledgment of commitment by the Chancellor's Office to the preservation of collegiality and shared governance within a collective bargaining context.

### **Excerpt from Dr. Dumke's Report to the Board of Trustees March 1982**

#### **Academic Senate in Collective Bargaining Context**

For several months I have been exchanging views with the Chair of the statewide Academic Senate concerning a redefinition of that body's role in the context of collective bargaining. These exchanges have been carried out in the context of a position paper adopted by the Senate last May. A copy of the paper and two letters which Dr. Kully and I have exchanged in seeking clarification of intent are included in your folders.

The Senate, and especially its Executive Committee, is to be commended for its efforts to identify matters of academic concern which ought to be dealt with in the tried and tested fashion of academic governance. I would be remiss if I did not also thank Vice Chancellor Sherriffs and Presidents Cleary, Frankel and Gerth who assisted in this activity. The Executive Council also has been most helpful in its input.

As you will see when you review the materials contained in your folders, the Senate document is consistent with long-established Board policy and practice. *Perhaps its most important message is that the onset of collective bargaining need not portend the end of a collegial approach to decision-making associated with the basic purpose of our system and its campuses.*

I am pleased that we have been able to reaffirm principles which have guided this system almost from its inception, even though the context in which these principles operate will be different and realization of the traditional objectives of collegiality will be more difficult to achieve.

### **Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds to Dr. John W. Bedell February 9, 1983**

At meetings of the Academic Senate I have been asked whether I support the Senate's document "Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context." I have indicated that this document (as clarified by the exchange of correspondence between Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke and Senate Chair Robert D. Kully, dated September 29, 1981, and January 15, 1982, respectively) is an excellent statement of CSU collegial relationships between faculty senates and administrations.

Please be assured that it is my position that these documents constitute a constructive framework for our working together in our common concern for the advancement of the California State University.

I have adopted this document. I congratulate you on having initiated progress and worked so diligently on this so important and complex matter.

# Collegiality in The California State University System

## Introduction

The smooth and effective operation of a complex multipurpose university system requires a spirit of collegiality that both reflects and fosters mutual respect among all groups within the system. Collegiality consists of a shared decision-making process and a set of attitudes which cause individuals to regard the members of the various constituencies of the university as responsible for the success of the academic enterprise.

Fundamental to this concept is the understanding that a university is a community of scholars who, out of mutual respect for the expertise and contributions of their colleagues, agree that shared decision-making in areas of recognized primary responsibility constitutes the means whereby a university best preserves its academic integrity and most effectively attains its educational mission.

During the past two-and-one-half decades, the California State University evolved from what had been a collection of teachers colleges operated by the State Department of Education into one of the largest university systems in the world. This development brought profound changes in the organization, size, and mission of the 19 institutions. The California State University has emerged as a complex institution with multiple, and sometimes conflicting, goals. These goals include providing an outstanding education for its students, assuring equal access for all qualified students, maintaining maximum opportunities for faculty professional development, protecting freedom of inquiry, advancing the cause of equal opportunity and affirmative action, and planning effectively for changing social, economic, and demographic realities. Achieving and reconciling these goals constitute a considerable challenge.

In the California State University, governance must combine two often conflicting types of authority. The faculty, by virtue of its expertise, has a responsibility for resolving a wide range of academic issues, including curriculum planning, peer evaluation, and academic policy. The Board of Trustees and administrators acting on its behalf have a responsibility to oversee the university in accord with the law and administrative code. The exercise of these legitimate responsibilities sometimes has led to conflict in university governance.

The state of mind of participants in collegial decision-making is an important determinant of the success of the process. Participants should consider one another as colleagues and should respect each other's individual expertise and contributions. The adversarial implications of collective bargaining terminology must be left at the bargaining table and the grievance hearing and must not enter into the collegial decision-making process. Academic administrators should consider themselves "management" only in the context of collective bargaining.

Critics sometimes compare the functioning of a university to that of private enterprise, but such analogies are misleading. The basic objectives of a business are to maximize profits, to produce a measurable commodity at a minimal cost, and to increase market share; a university strives for alternative and often conflicting achievements. Because of these differences, and because of the special role of faculty and students, decision-making in a university is a more diverse process than that of private industry. A collegial approach to decision-making is the means whereby the fundamental values of the university can be preserved, its conflicting objectives balanced, and its legal obligations to the state met.

Collegiality in the modern public university recognizes that the faculty, the Board of Trustees, and the administration are not the only entities which should participate in decision-making. Student views are particularly important on questions of extracurricular activities, recreational events, and student facilities planning. Obviously, students should participate when decisions are being made regarding curriculum development, program initiation or discontinuance, grading standards and practices, academic disciplinary policies, and student conduct codes.

Alumni, whose interest in and closeness to the university are recognized, also must have the opportunity to communicate their concerns and ideas to the university. The university community recognizes the vital help alumni give to it by fundraising, political action, suggestions for educational improvement, and support for community activities sponsored by the university.

Collegial decision-making encourages all constituencies within the university to participate in ways appropriate to their knowledge and responsibility. As the process proceeds, the parties should be sensitive to the concerns of others and should avoid acting unilaterally.

This document is part of the continuing efforts by the Academic Senate to develop appropriate governance procedures. Its formulation was precipitated by: (1) the concern of faculty, administrators, and students about how best to meet the primary function of the California State University—excellence in classroom instruction—within the context of providing increased access to all segments of society in the state; (2) the widely held belief by the faculty that some of its prerogatives and professional responsibilities have been abrogated; (3) the emergence of collective bargaining as an operational reality in the California State University; (4) significant changes in the administration's view of its function as illustrated in the adoption of the Management Personnel Plan in 1985; and (5) a continued sense of frustration among faculty, and perhaps among administrators and students, over the inability of the California State University to develop a coherent, shared view of the university and its governance.

## **Historical Development of Collegial Patterns of Decision-Making**

Shared decision-making in universities is unique among the administrative systems of large, modern organizations. Universities are complex, pluralistic institutions. Their structures, including their power structures, are loose, ambiguous, and constantly changing. In the evolution of modern universities, greater authority and responsibility have been granted to faculty than most employees in private industry or government service enjoy. The historical origins of faculty authority and responsibility can be found in the universities of the late medieval period.

### **European University Governance Patterns**

The often cited ideal of the university as a free, independent community of scholars has seldom existed in reality. From their inception in medieval Europe, universities have contained four competing authorities: faculty, internal administration, students, and external lay governing bodies. There is no consistent historical precedent from the medieval period favoring the exclusive authority of one over the others.

The universities of northern Italy and Paris, dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, created the pattern for subsequent universities. In the case of Paris, the masters or faculty of these institutions generally came to control the curriculum. By the fourteenth century, however, ultimate authority resided with external bodies created to protect the interests of those—whether papal, monarchical, or municipal—who authorized the existence of the university and who, in many cases, paid the faculty. Protestant universities created after the Reformation did not significantly depart from this pattern. The Calvinist founders of universities such as Geneva, Leyden, and Edinburgh subscribed to the Calvinist belief that all social institutions, including universities, should be overseen by laymen. They therefore created governing boards with final responsibility. However, they also made specific provision for initial faculty authority in academic matters.

The English universities of Oxford and Cambridge followed the continental pattern. While their charters provided for external boards (“visitors”), they also dramatically extended the authority of the faculty, who elected the heads of the colleges and were constituted as a formal governing body exercising internal legislative powers. For some two hundred years beginning about 1650, the faculty ran the colleges of these universities almost entirely free of external interference. In 1850, however, the English government stepped in and began to change the organization of Oxford and Cambridge; by 1870 the faculty had lost much of its power to rectors and lay boards.

The charters for every other English university founded in the preceding two centuries already had permitted strong external control through governing boards, although most included provision for faculty responsibility in educational matters.

The German universities of the nineteenth century broke from the tradition of external governing boards. Prior to that time, German universities had been subject to strong control by civil authorities. The University of Berlin, founded in 1810, set a new standard for the governance of

German universities; its founders deliberately granted complete authority for academic matters to the faculty, hoping thereby to create a true community of scholars, free to study and teach without external control. The University of Berlin and subsequent German universities were governed by faculty boards composed of full professors who elected the rectors and deans. Civil authorities retained powers of faculty appointment and salaries, but the faculty had complete control over internal matters. Greatly admired by academics in other countries, these German universities provided a model for the transformation of American universities in the late nineteenth century. They also form the historical basis for the modern view that a university is a community of scholars and that the faculty should properly have primary responsibility for academic matters.

## University Governance Patterns in the United States

Prior to the Civil War, university governance in the United States drew upon European and English patterns. The charter of Harvard College (founded in 1636) provided for a “Board of Overseers,” and the charters of all subsequent American universities contained similar provisions. Those who founded universities retained control over them and exercised that authority through rectors. At the same time, the Calvinist pattern of faculty control of academic matters and the model of Oxford and Cambridge resulted in significant delegation of responsibility to the faculty. Both Harvard and the College of William and Mary (founded in 1693) originally had dual boards, faculty and trustee, an arrangement that ensured significant faculty involvement in governance. Over time, however, the growth of the power of the external boards resulted in a decline in faculty authority.

The tradition of strong trustee authority continued into the nineteenth century. There were some exceptions: Yale University (founded in 1701) provided for extensive faculty control, and Thomas Jefferson made specific provisions for faculty control of the curriculum when he founded the University of Virginia (1819). Throughout the nineteenth century, patterns of governance varied from university to university depending upon individual traditions and the style of trustee boards, rectors or presidents. Universities were simple organizations, faculties were small, and the curriculum was standard. The faculty constituted nearly the entire university staff and was generally conceded to have some responsibility for curriculum. Trustee authority, however, was supreme. No American university resembled the Oxford-Cambridge model of a corporation of research and teaching fellows; none emulated the German model of near-complete control by faculty.

These conditions changed dramatically after 1860. Over the next four decades, a revolution in American higher education accompanied the emergence of industrial, urban, multi-ethnic America, so that the universities of 1900 bore little resemblance to those of 1860. Universities grew larger and structurally more complex, reflecting changes in the curriculum, especially the emergence of majors and electives.

The increasing size of universities and the need of university presidents and trustees to make informed decisions regarding increasingly diverse and specialized activities prompted the creation of middle-level administrative units and officers in a fashion analogous to the *middle management* in the concurrently emerging industrial corporations. At the same time the appearance of academic departments, each organized around an increasingly specialized discipline, brought a decentralization of authority over academic matters; the downward shift of such authority increased the power of the faculty, particularly in the older, elite, liberal arts institutions. Simultaneously, there came an even greater increase in the power of university presidents, who began to exercise many responsibilities formerly wielded by external boards. Trustees retained legal authority but, due to the growing size and complexity of universities, found themselves increasingly dependent upon the university president to summarize information and to present policy proposals, and the trustees thereby became more and more remote from the details of administration.

By the end of the century, it was generally recognized that the faculty had primary responsibility for academic matters. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago from 1891 to 1906, stated that it was the “...firmly established policy of the Trustees that the responsibility for

the settlement of educational questions rests with the Faculties.” This authority found organizational expression in the creation of academic senates during the 1890s. Cornell University established the first senate, composed of the president and full professors, in 1889.

By 1900, American universities were organized much as they are today. Changes since then have been largely the result of an increase in size, structure, and complexity. The rapid growth of universities served to reinforce the patterns of the second half of the nineteenth century. Faculty tended to lose responsibility in *administrative* areas to presidents and to a rapidly increasing number of middle-level administrators. At the same time, the growing size and complexity of universities necessitated greater delegation of authority over *educational* matters to faculty and academic departments where expertise would facilitate decision-making and maximize the academic integrity of the university.

While the tradition of faculty authority over educational policy has been characteristic of elite, private institutions since the late nineteenth century, the past half century also has seen a significant movement toward collegial governance in publicly supported colleges and universities. In 1980, the Association of California State University Professors published a list of 100 colleges and universities in the United States in which the faculty had been granted authority in academic, educational, and professional matters. Among the many state-supported institutions on the list are University of California, University of Illinois, University of Michigan, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Texas, and University of Washington.

The growth of faculty influence in university governance accelerated after World War II. Faculty increasingly have come to regard themselves as *professionals* with expertise which, along with tradition, justified a major role in educational policy, research, personnel decisions, athletics, libraries, and auxiliary organizations. They see their authority as *functional*, i.e., based upon competence, and, as professionals, they believe their standards, integrity, and dedication are sufficient to justify their primary control of academic policy.

By the 1960s, this professionalism, combined with the tradition of faculty governance, produced a general acceptance of the ideal of a *collegial* university administrative structure based upon meaningful consultation within a formal governance structure on *all* matters of educational policy. The extent of demonstrated collegiality, however, varied among universities. If the influence of the faculty had generally grown, so also had the size of university administrations. Thus, there developed two bureaucracies within most large universities: the administration (president, vice presidents, provosts, and deans) and the faculty governance structure (senates, councils, and committees). The potential for conflict is inherent in such a bifurcated organization, but the *spirit* and *reality* of collegiality between administrative professionals and academic professionals, despite their correspondingly different values based on varied responsibilities, can lead to satisfactory resolution of these conflicts.

## Governance Patterns in the California State University

Preserving collegiality (shared governance) in the California State University is possible despite a bifurcated decision-making structure established in law and administrative code. The subchapter of title 5 which considers “Educational Programs” defines “Appropriate Campus Authority” as “...the president of the campus acting upon the recommendation of the faculty of the campus.” Similarly, state legislators noted in the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act that:

The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions [Section 3561(b)]

Most recently the concept of joint decision-making was expressed in the statement by the Academic Senate of the California State University on “Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context,” which received the endorsement of the Chancellor and some campus senates and presidents.



## Recent Changes in Governance Patterns

In 1960 the Donahoe Higher Education Act transformed what had started as a few small-sized and medium-sized teachers colleges into the multi-purpose California State University system, now one of the largest systems of higher education in the nation. Its institutions began receiving closer legislative scrutiny of both budget and program, and increased centralization of administration brought a greater need for information and a greater emphasis on reporting responsibilities.

Ironically, some university officials have adopted a hierarchical managerial approach to the administration of universities at the very time when such management increasingly is seen as outmoded in private industry. This managerial approach is prone to regard collegiality as inefficient and imprecise. Administrators who see themselves as *managers* of the university emphasize *resource management* and *efficiency* and feel frustrated by collegiality because it does not allow them to do their job unfettered by the faculty. In many cases such administrators lose touch, or are perceived by the faculty as having lost touch, with the unique character of university governance and with the very purpose of the university.

Faculty are frustrated and ultimately alienated by demonstrations of hierarchical management. Like all professionals, faculty do not comfortably accept managerial control. The hallmark of a professional is self-direction; such an individual is not susceptible to being *managed*. Nor are faculty inclined to regard managers as colleagues, thus further reducing the level of mutual respect necessary for collegiality.

When hierarchical management occurs, a line is drawn between the faculty, who see themselves as defending the traditional values of higher education and the academic integrity of the institution, and the administrative managers, who see themselves as fostering the welfare of a large, complex *business*. This split has occurred on many campuses in the United States, and examples can be found in the California State University system.

This erosion of the spirit of collegiality has helped introduce, and on occasion has been exacerbated by, collective bargaining in higher education. Collective bargaining in higher education is the direct product of (1) the remarkable increase in the size of universities in the United States and the appearance of *multiversities*, (2) the shift to professional management techniques, and (3) fiscal retrenchments made necessary by reduced budgets. Because of these developments, some faculty across the nation, including those in the California State University, embraced unionization as a means to supplement—and occasionally supplant—patterns of academic governance and collegiality. As a result, the traditional division between faculty and administrators recently has grown wider on some campuses. Presidents, instead of being first among their academic peers, too frequently appear to be managers and chief executive officers. Faculty who once took pride in the professorial ideal of unselfish and underpaid dedication to the university and to teaching and research are now increasingly inclined to regard the same issues as *working conditions*. The institutions and the students of the California State University are the losers.

## Maintaining and Improving Shared Decision-Making in the California State University

The Academic Senate of the California State University does not believe that the shared decision-making of the collegial model and the shared decision-making of the collective bargaining mode are inherently incompatible. They represent *different* approaches to *different* types of decisions. By outlining the types of decisions appropriate to the collegial process and the usual steps involved in the collegial process for these decisions, the Academic Senate hopes that this statement will help to keep separate the two approaches to decision-making and simultaneously will help to maintain and improve the collegial process of shared decision-making. The three major types of decisions to be discussed below are those involving the curriculum, other aspects of academic policy, and the faculty itself.

## Collegiality in Curricular Decisions

The university's curriculum is central to the operation of the institution and is the principal concern of the faculty. The curriculum is determined within the framework of established educational goals. Although there is great diversity in the California State University system, all campuses must conform to general policies established by law and by the California State

University Board of Trustees. But within those limits, each campus develops its own mission statement, which is the product of faculty and administrators engaging in a collegial process.

The faculty have a professional responsibility to define and offer a curriculum of the highest academic quality. In some fields, this professional responsibility is exercised within accrediting guidelines developed and enforced by professional associations. This professional responsibility cannot, by its very nature, be delegated. The faculty, therefore, have primary responsibility for making curricular recommendations to the president. Normally, the president will accept the advice and recommendations of the faculty on curriculum matters. Faculty appropriately have this responsibility because they possess the expertise to judge best whether courses, majors, and programs adhere to scholarly standards.

Among curricular decisions for which faculty should have primary responsibility are:

- (1) The initiation of new academic courses and programs, and the discontinuance of academic courses and programs;
- (2) Course content, including choice of texts, syllabus design, assignments, course organization, and methods of evaluating students;
- (3) The designation of courses as degree or nondegree applicable, lower or upper division, or graduate level;
- (4) The content of the general education program within systemwide guidelines. Faculty should designate appropriate courses and establish the requirements for completion of the program. Faculty should be responsible for review and revision of the program;
- (5) The adoption, deletion, or modification of requirements for degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs;
- (6) The establishment of minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the approval of degree candidates; and
- (7) Recruitment decisions affecting curriculum.

Generally, since any curricular decision affects the primary mission of the university—the education of students—collegiality also demands student involvement in developing the curriculum.

Although practices on the various campuses will differ, decisions affecting curriculum will generally proceed through a process of (1) initiation by a faculty member or academic administrator, (2) approval by a department committee, (3) approval by curriculum committees at one or more levels, (4) approval by other relevant committees (general education, graduate programs, interdisciplinary), and (5) approval or review by the campus senates. The recommendation is then forwarded to the president.

The major limitations on faculty autonomy in curricular decision-making include constraints related to the general policies of the California State University system, the campus mission, budgets, and staffing limitations. Consultation among faculty and administrators should ensure that faculty are well aware of both the constraints on, and the possibilities for, program development and innovation. Faculty can be expected to make responsible judgments if they are in close consultation with administrators and thus kept knowledgeable of developments affecting curricular matters.

### **Collegiality in Academic Policy Decisions**

Because the university's curriculum is of central concern to the faculty and because faculty have the primary responsibility in curricular decisions, it follows that faculty should have the major voice in academic policy decisions which closely affect the curriculum, access to the curriculum, or the quality of the curriculum. All of the following are examples of academic policy:

- (1) Criteria, standards, and procedures for adoption, deletion, or modification of degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs;

- (2) Grading practices and standards;
- (3) Criteria, standards, and procedures for earning credit or satisfying requirements outside the classroom, including competency examinations for English composition and in U.S. history and government, credit by examination, and credit for experiential learning;
- (4) Both short-run and long-range planning, including definition or modification of the campus mission statement, determination of the general scope and relative size or priority of campus programs, modifications of the campus academic master plan, annual campus allocation of faculty positions to schools or other units, and annual campus budget allocations;
- (5) Criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluating programs, the quality of instruction, faculty currency, and all other evaluations of the quality of the curriculum or of instruction;
- (6) Campus policies which govern resources which support or supplement the curriculum, especially the library and research facilities;
- (7) Campus policies which govern auxiliary institutions which support or supplement the curriculum, especially the campus foundation and the campus bookstore;
- (8) Student affairs policies, especially those governing financial aid, advisement, learning services, Equal Opportunity Programs, and related services which determine the extent to which students can avail themselves of the curriculum;
- (9) Campus and system policies governing withdrawal, probation, reinstatement, and disqualification which affect access to the curriculum and which can affect program quality;
- (10) Co-curricular activities, especially those which increase the likelihood that students will benefit fully from the curriculum or those which distract students from the curriculum, including intercollegiate athletic programs, and the relationship of those programs to the academic program and mission of the campus; and
- (11) The academic calendar, including the first and last days of instruction and the scheduling of final examinations.

Faculty and administrators recognize that such policy decisions dramatically affect the quality of education afforded to students and agree that these decisions will involve students.

The process of academic policy-making will vary from one campus to another and may vary from one type of decision to another on the same campus. Collegial patterns of decision-making, however, should be followed in all instances. On every California State University campus, the full faculty and the faculty's representative body, the campus senate/council, are the agencies for collegial decision-making. Some types of decisions may be made directly by the campus senate/council. In other instances, the faculty or campus senate/council may create a special body to develop academic policy in some area; if so, that body should include at least a majority of faculty representatives, chosen either by direct election or by the campus senate/council.

In the case of curricular decisions, the faculty should usually be the initiator of policy, within the constraints of budget, law, and system policy. By contrast, in the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators. The Chancellor or Board of Trustees may designate campus administrators as responsible for implementation of systemwide policies. In every instance, collegiality requires that the academic administrator work closely with the appropriate faculty representatives. When a change in policy or a new policy is needed, the faculty should be invited to participate fully in framing the policy. When an academic administrator presents a policy question to the faculty, the faculty should give it full consideration, and the academic administrator should participate as a colleague in order to arrive at agreement. Where there are differences of opinion, compromise should be sought. All academic administrators should be constantly alert to the policy implications of their decisions. If a decision may have policy dimensions or implications, the academic administrator should bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate faculty representatives.

## Collegiality in Faculty Affairs

The faculty's professional competencies (derived from academic training, teaching experience, and continuing professional development) must play a significant and often decisive role in decisions regarding curriculum and academic policy. It is also the faculty who implement academic plans, programs, and curricula. Policies and procedures used in building, maintaining, and renewing the university faculty are vital determinants of the quality of the education the university provides to its students and to society.

The professional competencies that are central to curricular and academic policy decisions should be comparably decisive and significant in the genesis and implementation of faculty personnel policies, procedures, and criteria. Recommendations regarding hiring, retention or nonretention, awarding of tenure, promotion, and disciplinary actions are best left to faculty who are technically competent in their disciplines and in pedagogy and who are in the best position to observe and make judgments on such matters as faculty performance and the specific staffing needs of academic programs.

Academic administrators may propose changes in faculty affairs policies. Proposals from administrators should be forwarded to the appropriate faculty committee for review and action in accordance with normal policy development procedures. The administrator should be invited to meet with the committee to discuss the proposal.

"Faculty affairs," in this context, refers to those decisions regarding personnel policies, procedures, and criteria which have a potential impact on the quality of the curriculum. The following are examples of such faculty affairs decisions:

- (1) The establishment of criteria and standards for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion;
- (2) The hiring of new faculty members, including the establishment of qualifications, development of procedures for implementing university policies such as affirmative action, evaluation of candidates, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator;
- (3) The granting of tenure to faculty members, including the establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for tenure, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator;
- (4) The development of appropriate criteria and standards for layoff and retrenchment;
- (5) The promotion of faculty members, including establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for promotion, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator;
- (6) The selection of department chairs, including establishment of the election process and of criteria and standards, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator;
- (7) The selection, evaluation, and retention of all academic administrators (i.e., those administrators who also hold an academic appointment and who have the potential for exercising retreat rights to a faculty position), including establishment of qualifications, composition of the search committee (which should always include a majority of faculty representatives), evaluation of candidates for appointment, and recommendation to the appropriate administrator; and
- (8) Recommendations regarding the selection, evaluation, and retention of nonacademic administrators whose duties involve substantial influence on the curriculum.

Obviously, while evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure, committees must take into account student perceptions.

The process of collegial decision-making in faculty affairs areas will vary somewhat, depending on the type of decision. In decisions involving hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, the criteria and standards shall normally be determined through the campus senate/council and implemented through departmental committees and other appropriate faculty committees at levels above the department. Faculty committees must abide by all California State University and campus policies, such as affirmative action requirements. Administrators should assume that faculty committees are best qualified to judge the teaching effectiveness and other merits of the candidates.

Administrators should decide contrary to faculty recommendations only if there is clear indication of violation of system or campus policies or clear indication that the faculty committee failed to consider relevant information, in which instance the administrator should provide the faculty committee with written reasons for the decision and should refer the matter back to the faculty committee for reconsideration.

Department chairs have a substantial impact on the quality of the curriculum as well as on the quality of professional life. Because of their key role in implementing a range of decisions, department chairs should be acceptable to both the faculty of the department and to the university's administration. The campus senate/council should develop policy defining the minimum guidelines to follow in the selection of department chairs. When faculty act within those guidelines to recommend a candidate for appointment, administrators should assume that the faculty are best able to judge the effectiveness and merits of the candidates; administrators should deny a faculty choice only for cause and should explain fully any such decision to the faculty in question. Administrators should not impose a chair upon a faculty against its wishes except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be clearly stated in writing.

Because most academic administrators hold both academic and administrative positions, they have the option of exercising "retreat rights" and thereby becoming members of the instructional faculty. Academic administrators also have an impact on the curriculum. To maintain the quality of the instruction, faculty members should be closely involved in the evaluation and recommendation of candidates for academic administrative positions, both to evaluate the qualifications of the candidates, who might exercise retreat rights, and to evaluate the fitness of the candidates to make crucial decisions affecting the curriculum.

## Conclusion

Authority in the modern public university derives from two quite different sources: (a) from the knowledge of subject matter and the pedagogic expertise of the faculty and (b) from the power vested by law and administrative code in governing boards and administrators. The collegial decision-making process evolved nearly a century ago as a means of reconciling these two types of authority. Collegial governance must resolve conflict within the university, while preserving respect and understanding among the faculty, trustees, administrators, students, and alumni.

Central to collegiality and shared decision-making is tolerance, which might be defined as a civil regard for differing opinions and points of view. Tolerance welcomes diversity and actively sponsors its opinions. The collegium must be the last public bastion of respect for individuals, whether they are members of the faculty, student body, staff, alumni, administration, or Board of Trustees.

The faculty must exercise its authority responsibly and recognize the legitimacy of administrative authority. If faculty members fail to act responsibly, academic administrators have an obligation to intervene. If an academic administrator fails to act responsibly, the faculty is professionally obligated to seek rectification of the problem. At all times, the various entities should try to reach an accommodation which is sensitive to the concerns of the university's constituencies.

Academic administrators and the faculty may not always be able to achieve consensus, even when they approach a problem in a properly collegial state of mind and when they exert their best efforts to achieving consensus through rational dialogue. In such circumstances, the appropriate administrator should meet with faculty representatives to discuss their differences. The more closely a decision affects the curriculum, the more the administrator should defer to the views of the faculty. Administrators should reject faculty proposals if the proposals are contrary to system policy or law or if they cannot be implemented due to budgetary constraints, but administrators should not reject faculty proposals merely out of differences of opinion. When there is disagreement on an issue, all parties should undertake a serious reconsideration of their positions.

The California State University's system administration is also important in encouraging collegial decision-making. California State University directives requiring campus implementation should always include sufficient time to allow for full consideration through the collegial decision-making process. Shared decision-making is time consuming, especially when the issue is complex. When California State University administrators direct campus administrators to develop campus policy

and specify short timelines, they place the campus administrator in an untenable position. Time constraints are an unacceptable reason for bypassing full and collegial consideration.

The California State University administration should encourage collegial patterns of thought and behavior in other ways as well. It should itself be a model of collegiality, limiting its managerial mode to the bargaining table and to the working conditions specified in the contracts. It should specifically encourage all campus presidents to do the same and should incorporate appropriate references to the key role of the faculty and to the process of collegial decision-making into all memoranda and directives which address curricular, academic, or faculty matters. Ability to sustain good collegial relations through shared decision-making should be one of the most important criteria in evaluating campus presidents and candidates for appointment as campus presidents.

In fostering collegial, shared governance, all members of the university community must realize that conflict within the university is inevitable. The challenge is to resolve conflict or at least bring it to closure, while maintaining due regard for the prerogatives, expertise, and responsibilities of those involved. Disagreements must be vigorously and openly debated, then resolved through procedures of shared decision-making. Differing perspectives must be tolerated and respected. The university suffers seriously when faculty-administrative relations erode to "us versus them." All members of the university community must treat one another with respect and honesty.

Mechanisms for shared decision-making exist systemwide and on each campus. What is needed now is the commitment of students, faculty, administrators, and the Board of Trustees to use these institutions in accordance with the principles discussed in this document. By so doing, they will accomplish the sensitive, thoughtful resolution of the inevitable conflicts that arise in the university, and they will thereby create a better university.

(This document was approved by the Academic Senate in March 1985.)

# **Report of the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University**

Academic governance is a complex web of decision-making and responsibility that translates academic goals and values into university policy or action. Authority in the modern public university derives from two quite different sources: (a) from the power vested by law and administrative code in governing boards and administrators and (b) from the knowledge of the subject matter and from the pedagogic expertise of the faculty.

Collegiality consists of a shared decision-making process and a set of values which regard the members of the various university constituencies as essential for the success of the academic enterprise. It incorporates mutual respect for similarities and for differences—in background, expertise, judgments and assigned responsibilities—and involves mutual trust based on experience.

Collegial governance allows the academic community to work together to find the best answers to issues facing the university. Collegial governance assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees. This includes admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities. Collegiality rests on a network of interlinked procedures jointly devised, whose aim is to assure the opportunity for timely advice pertinent to decisions about curricular and academic personnel matters.

The governing board, through its administrative officers, makes sure that there is continual consultation with appropriate faculty representatives on these matters. Faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons. The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility.

Central to collegiality and shared decision-making is respect for differing opinions and points of view, which welcomes diversity and actively sponsors its opinions. The collegium must be the last public bastion of respect for individuals, whether they are members of the faculty, students, staff, alumni, administration or Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees wishes to maintain the statewide Academic Senate and campus senates/ councils separate and apart from collective bargaining. It is the intention of the Board to maintain its efforts to promote collegiality and to support the continuing efforts of the Academic Senate to preserve collegiality in the CSU.

(Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, September 1985.)

# Recommendations Regarding Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation of the Faculty

Presentation by: Caesar J. Naples, Vice Chancellor  
Faculty and Staff Relations

Bernard Goldstein, Chair  
Academic Senate CSU

The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) contains provisions to govern employer-employee relations of the CSU through collective bargaining on matters within the scope of representation. For the purposes of the CSU, scope of representation is limited to wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment. The CSU, as an institution of higher learning, is also encouraged by HEERA to maintain and enhance its practices which would encompass most issues outside the scope of bargaining. The intention of the Board of Trustees to act accordingly is reflected in its adoption of the "CSU Statement of Collegiality."

While a comprehensive definition of "criteria and standards" under HEERA may not be possible, criteria and standards may functionally be viewed as being those factors against which the performance of faculty are measured in considering appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure. Criteria and standards are necessarily the substantive requirements the faculty member, or prospective faculty member, must satisfy, and do not include the procedural framework for such actions or decisions.

The Academic Senate and the Trustees have joint responsibility for criteria and standards for appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of the faculty. The process of exercising joint responsibility is a collegial one, leading the participants toward a consensus. As consensus is reached on an increasing number of criteria and standards, the exercise of joint responsibility will have been established as a successful aspect of collegiality in the CSU.

At its May 21, 1986, meeting, the Trustees of the CSU adopted a resolution appointing a special committee of Trustees to meet with representatives selected by the Academic Senate to determine the process of exercising joint responsibility within the meaning of HEERA. Several presidents and vice chancellors were also appointed as staff advisors to the Trustees. Prior to its fall meeting, preliminary and informal discussions have led to a consensus on an initial item of criteria and standards. This agenda item was discussed at the November meeting of the special committee and is recommended by both the committee and the Senate representatives.

The Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate CSU concur that normally the indicators of teaching performance such as peer and student evaluations constitute a matter of criteria and standards subject to joint responsibility between the Senate and the Board of Trustees. Both the Board and the Senate have in the past preserved the principle of peer evaluation of faculty, while including a role for the results of student evaluation of teaching performance. Recently, the Academic Senate CSU reiterated this position in a resolution adopting a developmental paper on "Student Evaluation of Instruction," following review and acceptance by the majority of campus academic senates. The Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate CSU have reached consensus on the use of student evaluations in personnel matters, agreeing that student evaluations shall not be the sole indicator of teaching performance when used in retention, promotion, and tenure decisions and in evaluations of tenured faculty.

Student perception of aspects of instructional performance, when properly interpreted, provides useful evidence of the quality of an individual's teaching. Other aspects of quality instruction, such as accuracy, currency, completeness of course content, and the degree to which it fits the goals of the program, require the professional judgment of peers in the discipline. Both are required for a proper assessment.

Teaching effectiveness is neither easily defined nor measurable in standard quantifiable terms. Criteria and standards legitimately may vary widely, particularly from one discipline to another and from one program to another. While the format used for student evaluations quantifies subjective opinion of students, it does not thereby make those opinions objective nor does it validate them. Because of the complexity of the teaching performance, student evaluations must



be considered along with other important, necessary information about faculty and their courses in the overall evaluation of teaching.

Ideally, student evaluations can provide evidence of those portions of the individual's teaching performance which students legitimately can judge. This information, when judiciously interpreted and combined with judgments made by peers in the discipline of all aspects of an individual's teaching, enriches the process of teaching evaluation and should lead to better instruction.

**WHEREAS,** The CSU Board of Trustees and the Academic Senate CSU, in exercising joint responsibility for criteria and standards as indicated in HEERA, concur as follows regarding the role of student evaluations of teaching performance; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the retention, tenure, promotion, and evaluation policies of the CSU include the provision that in tenure, retention and promotion reviews and in evaluation of instructional performance of tenured faculty, the results of student evaluation of instruction shall be used as one important element in the evaluation of instruction but not as the sole indicator of instructional quality.

(This resolution was accepted by the CSU Board of Trustees in January 1987. The order of the paragraphs has been rearranged for the sake of clarity.)

# Criteria and Procedures for the Nomination of the Faculty Trustee

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of the California State University modify the "Criteria and Procedures for the Nomination of the Faculty Trustee" as proposed in the attached document.

(This resolution, 1773, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1988.)

## Criteria for Nominees for Faculty Trustee

1. Candidates must be faculty members who are tenured at the California State University at which they teach and currently shall not hold any administrative positions other than department chair or equivalent.
2. Candidates shall have demonstrated records of excellence in teaching, professional achievement and university service.
3. Candidates shall possess experience in academic governance in the California State University.
4. The appointed faculty trustee shall not be a member of the Academic Senate of the California State University. Should the faculty trustee be a member of the Academic Senate CSU at the time of appointment, that person shall resign from the Senate.
5. Questions as to definitions and eligibility shall be resolved by the Academic Senate CSU.

## Procedures for Selecting Trustee Nominees

1. These procedures shall be initiated at least one full academic term in advance of the time that Faculty Trustee nominations are to be made.
2. Each campus senate shall develop procedures for selecting eligible nominees. As at least one option, the procedures shall allow for nominations by petition. Each such nomination shall require the signed concurrence of at least 10% of the full time teaching faculty or 50 such faculty members, whichever is less. The campus senate or council shall forward the names of all eligible nominees to the Academic Senate of the California State University by a date to be determined by the Academic Senate CSU.
3. The local senate chair shall forward for each nominee the completed Faculty Trustee nomination form and a current vita structured to the eligibility criteria, a one-page statement from the nominee expressing his or her views of the position, and a statement of commitment to serve. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of five references shall be provided by the nominee.
4. The Academic Senate CSU Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee shall be composed of seven non-candidate faculty members. Five members shall be elected by and from the Academic Senate CSU in the manner of election to the at-large Executive Committee positions. No campus shall have more than one representative. Two additional members shall be selected by their local senates from two campuses chosen by lot from those not represented by the first five. The qualifications for these two faculty members shall be the same as eligibility for election to the Academic Senate according to its constitution and bylaws.

The Academic Senate of the California State University shall elect these five members of the nominating committee at the September meeting of the Academic Senate CSU in the academic year in which the term of the present faculty trustee is to expire. The two additional members shall be selected in time to permit the committee to have its full composition by the succeeding (November) meeting of the Academic Senate CSU. The first member elected shall serve as chair of the committee.

The committee shall determine its own procedures for selecting candidates for nomination.

5. The Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee shall screen the original list of nominees and develop recommendations with supporting information.

The committee shall present four candidates for nomination to the Senate. The nominee recommendations of the committee shall be made available to the Academic Senate CSU at the January plenary session. The confidential files of these candidates shall be made available for review in the Senate office to members of the Academic Senate CSU at that time and at the plenary session in which the determination of the nominees is made. Unless otherwise determined by vote of the Academic Senate CSU, selection of nominees for the post of faculty trustee shall be made at the March meeting of the Academic Senate CSU immediately preceding the end of the tenure of the incumbent faculty trustee.

6. All academic senators of the Academic Senate CSU are eligible to vote.
7. The Academic Senate CSU, acting in executive session, chaired by the Chair, Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee, shall designate the final (2 or more) nominees by secret ballot in the following manner, conducting as many votes as necessary:

The Senate shall be provided with ballots containing the names of all the forwarded candidates in alphabetical order.

Each senator may vote for as many candidates as he or she wishes in each voting round. Candidates become nominees in the voting round in which he or she obtains approval of at least two-thirds of the ballots of eligible voters. At the close of each voting round the names of nominated candidates shall be eliminated from further voting consideration.

Voting shall be continued by the procedures indicated above until at least a sufficient number of candidates (two) has been nominated to meet the legal requirements.

When that condition obtains, the Senate shall determine by majority vote whether it wishes to continue balloting. If the Senate chooses to continue, one further round of voting, one time, shall take place. Any candidate not nominated by these regular procedures is again eligible for nomination at this time. Any candidate receiving two-thirds of the votes of eligible voters in this round of voting is declared a nominee.

8. The Chair of the Academic Senate CSU shall forward the names of the designated nominees to the Governor.

(Approved unanimously March 4, 1988, as part of AS-1773-87/EX)

---

***Please note***

The following persons have served as CSU faculty trustees:

**Robert Kully, 1983–1987**

**Lyman Heine, 1987–1991**

**Bernard Goldstein, 1991–1998**

**Harold Goldwhite, 1998–**

# Campus Responsibilities in Collegial Governance

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of The California State University endorse the developmental paper entitled "Campus Responsibilities in Collegial Governance"; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates and administrators to adopt and work to implement the principles suggested in the paper entitled "Campus Responsibilities."

(This resolution, 1796, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1988.)

## Campus Responsibilities in Collegial Governance

In May of 1981 the CSU Academic Senate approved a document entitled "Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context" (AS-1217-81/EX). Evolving circumstances make it timely for the Academic Senate to speak to the issue again, with special reference to campus responsibilities in collegial governance.

When the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) was passed in 1978 it was made explicit that the onset of collective bargaining in the CSU was not designed to eliminate the role of the academic senates in governance in the system. Rather, the distinction between the roles of the bargaining agent and the senates were indicated. Since that time all parties concerned (administration, bargaining agent, and the Academic Senate) have been endeavoring to clarify the roles each would play in making governance decisions in the CSU system.

The AAUP has proposed a statement on "Academic Government for Institutions Engaged in Collective Bargaining."\* The statement says in part that "Collective bargaining should not replace, but rather should assure, effective traditional forms of shared governance... From a faculty perspective collective bargaining can strengthen shared governance by specifying and assuring the faculty role in institutional decision making... From an administration perspective, contractual clarification and arbitral review of shared governance can reduce the conflicts occasioned by ill-defined or contested allocation of responsibility and thereby enhance consensus and cooperation in academic governance... When legislatures, judicial authorities, boards, administrations, or faculty, act on the mistaken assumption that collective bargaining is incompatible with collegial governance, they do a grave disservice to the very institutions they seek to serve." In an effort to avoid this "disservice," the parties involved in governance in the CSU have all worked toward consensus as the way to solve the problems that have confronted the university system.

The Academic Senate CSU has issued a series of papers attempting to help clarify the role the senates should play in the governance of the university. They range from a position paper on the perception of what HEERA is and means to the role of senates, to the statement on "Collegiality in the CSU System" developed to present the Senate's interpretation of what collegial governance means.

The CSU administration has also gone on record supporting the need for shared governance. The Board of Trustees has adopted a "Statement on Collegiality" that indicates the approach to solving problems and making decisions in the system, and on the campuses, is intended to be a cooperative one. In addition, one of the criteria to be used in evaluation of presidents will be that of collegiality.

The bargaining agent has also worked to establish the need for collegial governance in a collective bargaining context, and has insisted upon recognition in the Memorandum of Understanding of the senates' responsibilities in shared governance.

All three parties that are involved in the governance of the CSU system are now attempting to broach the issues of common concern through a tripartite decision-making process. This cooperative approach bodes well for the university and helps establish our collegial atmosphere in the California State University.

As a system, the CSU is now fully committed to collegiality. Within this atmosphere it is important that local senates and administrations endeavor to ensure a collegial approach to campus matters

---

\**Academe* (Nov-Dec 1987)

and decisions. Joint decision-making and consultation between administrators and faculty are essential to the performance of the educational mission of the various campuses. The academic senates and administrations on each campus should ensure that the senates are the usual mechanisms by which faculty exercise their primary responsibility for curricular policies, academic standards and policies, review of academic administrators, approval of degree candidates, the awarding of grades, criteria and standards for appointment-retention-tenure-promotion decisions, the preservation of peer review in academic decisions, and other matters which are delegated to the faculty. The senates and administrations should also ensure that the senates are the usual mechanisms by which the faculty are consulted regarding other professional and education matters such as faculty representation on committees and councils, academic calendars, and fiscal matters which affect instructional programs. The senates, bargaining agent, and administrations should also consult collegially regarding implementation of provisions of the MOU by means of campus policies. It is only through the collegial shared governance approach that the individual campuses, and the CSU as a whole, can continue to meet their academic responsibilities.

(Approved May 1988, as part of AS-1796-88/FA)

# Faculty Role in the Establishment of a New Campus at Fort Ord

**WHEREAS,** The California State University Board of Trustees intend to establish a new campus at Fort Ord that is also planned to be a charter campus; and

**WHEREAS,** There was no faculty consultation in the development of the proposal to establish a campus at Fort Ord; and

**WHEREAS,** The Academic Senate of the California State University, in AS-1829-88/FA, adopted a position statement on "Faculty Role in the Establishment of New Campuses" urging the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees "to involve appropriate faculty representatives in the development of new campuses"; and

**WHEREAS,** If a new campus is to be established, significant faculty participation will be required for the new campus at Fort Ord in such matters as formulation of mission statement, academic master plan, and the design of physical facilities, especially teaching and laboratory space; therefore be it

**RESOLVED,** That, if plans for a new campus at Fort Ord are to go forward, the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to establish, in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU, a Steering Committee of faculty to perform the following tasks:

1. to advise the Interim Provost for CSU Monterey Bay (Fort Ord) and the leadership team on all relevant issues in lieu of a CSUMB faculty;
2. to consult on budget and resource challenges, plans, allocations, etc.;
3. to assist in designing and implementing staffing, including creation of administrative and faculty teams and recruitment and hiring of faculty;
4. to provide guidance on academic planning related to the development of a draft mission and goal statement; curricular framework and programmatic specialties; core curriculum; feasibility report; self-study; and accreditation documents;
5. to serve as a catalyst for innovative ideas, projects and proposals for the new campus;
6. other tasks as mutually agreed to and as needed.

(This resolution, 2166, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

# The Senate Enterprise in an Age of Reinvention and Change

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the report of the Task Force on Governance, "The Senate Enterprise in an Age of Reinvention and Change."

(This resolution, 2272, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1995.)

[The following report was an]

Attachment to  
AS-2269-95/GA  
AS-2270-95/GA  
AS-2271-95/GA  
AS-2272-95/G

## Academic Senate of The California State University The Senate Enterprise in an Age of Reinvention and Change: The Report of the Task Force on Governance

March 9, 1995

Respectfully Submitted By:  
Keith Boyum, Chair • CSU Fullerton  
Timothy Hegstrom • San Jose State University  
Timothy Kersten • CPSU San Luis Obispo  
Richard Levering • CSU Stanislaus  
Rosemarie Marshall • CSU Los Angeles  
Rosemary Papalewis • CSU Fresno

### Prologue

In *The Effective Executive*, management expert Peter Drucker poses for any organization a powerful question: "If we did not already do this, would we go into it now?" The Academic Senate of The California State University (ASCSU) has just that question on its agenda. In a nutshell:

If we did not already have a statewide Senate, would we invent one now?

This report of the ASCSU Task Force on Governance means to forge an answer.

In Part I immediately below we offer a historical overview, seeking an answer to what the Senate's key functions and roles have been.

In Part II we mean to identify realities at hand, or evident trends, that we think are consequential for the function and role of the ASCSU.

In Part III we consider current and potential future Senate structures, not in constitutional and specific terms, but generally. Our pursuit in Part III is a response to consequential change, in light of function and role.

We conclude in Part IV with our answer to Drucker's question, recast for the ASCSU. To pull no punches: we think that if we did not have an Academic Senate of The California State University, we would, indeed, seek to invent one now.

### Part I

#### Historical Perspective on the Academic Senate

The California State University (the CSU) is a system of many campuses. Significant campus autonomy is featured alongside a centralized administration, with ultimate authority vested in a Board of Trustees. In turn, Trustees are obliged and constrained by state law.

Campus educational policy must draw vitality from rich faculty involvement in its making and in its practice — or risk being deemed irrelevant, and justly ignored. Campus senates have been a response to that reality, with senates the chief mechanism for giving voice to the uniquely expert views of faculty on educational and professional issues.

Things are not fundamentally different in system context. To the extent that an engaged central administration and an active Board of Trustees seek to promulgate educational policy that meaningfully informs practice in classrooms, laboratories and studios, a rich faculty involvement is required for its

making. For three decades the Academic Senate of The California State University (the ASCSU) has been a response to that reality, the primary mechanism for bringing faculty voice to meaningful educational policy.

The ASCSU has sought to embody and stand for academic values, as distinct from the also-legitimate but different concerns that focus on the terms and conditions of work and the workplace. Such academic values have been especially sought in determining what the faculty shall be—in the standards for hiring, retaining, tenuring, and promoting faculty. Such academic values have been not less featured in determining what the faculty shall teach—in making curricula. And such academic values have been sought as guides for issues that frankly touch on the faculty as workers, such as class sizes, faculty-student ratios, and the extent to which fiscal realities will or will not drive means and modes of instruction.

If function is what we do, then role is how we do it, including the responsibilities to which we attend as a Senate. This list of tasks is derived from previous reflective work on the nature of the ASCSU, and specifically from *Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a Collective Bargaining Context*.\*

The key role responsibilities of the Academic Senate are as follows:

1. Make recommendations “as the official voice of the faculties of the CSU in matters of systemwide concern.”
2. “Endeavor to strengthen” the Senates of the several universities.
3. “Assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as delegated by the Chancellor or the Trustees.”
4. Act as “the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions.”
5. Take joint responsibility with the Trustees for setting “criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees” in respect to systemwide governance.
6. “Be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically related fiscal matters.... Be responsible for the selection of faculty representatives to participate in such bodies.”
7. Recommend policy on systemwide decisions regarding “minimum admission requirements for students.”
8. Recommend policy on systemwide decisions regarding “minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students.”
9. Recommend policy on systemwide decisions regarding “curricula and research programs.”
10. Recommend systemwide policy on “minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves.”
11. Recommend policy on “systemwide aspects of academic planning.”
12. Be consulted on “systemwide aspects of program review.”
13. Be consulted on “systemwide aspects of the basic direction of academic support programs.”
14. Be consulted on “systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators.”
15. “Endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.”

But admirable, vital and current as these role responsibilities still may be, they now arise in fresh context that will surely condition their discharge. We turn to some review of at-hand and reasonably-foreseeable conditions that we think are consequential for the fulfillment of ASCSU function and role.

## Part II

### Changes that Affect the CSU and the Senate

#### 1. Demographic Changes

The nature of the student body has changed significantly in the last ten years. The CSU student population is now composed of a diverse group of men and women who view a college degree as essential to social and economic advancement. Partly because students are ever more frequently from families that have no history of college attendance, their success requires abundant nurturing, welcoming, mentoring, and advising. Such students do best in small classes taught by skilled and motivated faculty. Partly because they are as a group older than the traditional 18–22 year-old

---

\* This document was published in its entirety in the May 1983 issue of *The Academic Senator* (Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 2-3). Quotation marks are used to indicate when we have quoted directly from the document; we have reworded some of the 15 points slightly to update and to make the construction parallel.



college-going population, our students frequently seek nontraditional class schedules that permit their full-time employment. Such students are commonly in a hurry to graduate, but paradoxically take five or more years to achieve a bachelor's degree.

The CSU struggles with these demands, and with demands from public policy makers that are meant to give voice to the interests of non-student citizens. Thus even when budgets are severely constrained the CSU is pushed hard to serve more students per dollar, to achieve gains in persistence to the degree, to facilitate brisk progress toward the baccalaureate, and certainly to insure outreach and welcome to traditionally underrepresented populations. Raised up in the name of the people of California, all are worthy goals. All are nearly impossible to simply mandate, though at least some public policy makers are not shy about trying with statutes, budget language, and just "jaw-boning."

We note finally that demographic change is sure to continue, and not least in the number of students who are expected to seek admission to higher education in the years immediately ahead. The "baby boom echo" is on its way by every account, and this system of campuses that together comprise the people's university must prepare.

## **2. Mood of Harsh Public Policy**

Harsh moods are abroad in the state. California voters have recently endorsed severe treatment for persons convicted of crimes and for persons who immigrate unlawfully, alongside ungenerous treatment for persons who may seek welfare, or a subsidized higher education. Alongside thoughtful inquiries on the topics stand mindless barrages aimed at programs designed to recruit underrepresented minorities to the academy—affirmative action—and at programs designed to support underprepared but regularly admitted university students—remediation. This harshness in mood and in public policy surely affects a public agency such as The California State University—but in our judgment the university must seek thoughtful response rather than uncritical embrace of the current mood.

The California State University is and must remain a place of reflection, learning, empowerment. The implication must be, while recognizing harsh moods where they exist, where possible a coherent and leading voice of the faculty ought to seek to temper those moods, and assist in efforts to reach constructive outcomes.

## **3. Pressure to Lead the Reform of Elementary and Secondary Education, and to Participate in Constructing Solutions for Other Pressing Social Problems**

Given the leading role of the CSU in teacher preparation, many within the institution will seek to respond constructively to calls for K-12 reform. This cannot help but be consequential for the operations of senate function and role. Yet the CSU is certain to feel some of the pressure to "fix" K-12 education as ordinary Californians express their (warranted or unwarranted) dissatisfaction with public schools.

Social issues ranging well beyond K-12 education are also certain to affect CSU mission, and perforce ASCSU function and role. The list is long, and familiar: crime; injustice; poverty; environmental degradation. While CSU faculty may not be expected to "fix" these problems in as immediate a way as some Californians will expect for the schools, surely the ASCSU must remain sensitive and alert to changing social issues and expectations for our own performance. Concerns for equality of opportunity and social mobility are sure bets for ASCSU agendas. The challenge will certainly include balancing the legitimate interests of the citizens for the highest quality education, temperate university environment, and sensitive treatment of all persons.

## **4. Decline of Public Support**

The strange method of making policy by initiative together with other mandates for public spending adopted by the legislature has produced a budget reality in which only about 15% of state funds are discretionary. The components of state activity which must be supported by that slim percentage are implicitly rivals, as apparent needs for prisons and roads must be weighed against higher education and the state parks. User fees for roads and parks, and surely for higher education, backfill meager budgets, but leave users unhappy. The recipe for public dissatisfaction is enhanced further where even in the face of higher prices the Master Plan's promise of access is unmet. At least some among ordinary Californians—perhaps many—think of higher education as the culprit. The senate finds itself part of an institution that appears to be trusted less, and loved much less, than may have been true thirty years ago.

## **5. Public Policy Now Initiated in Sacramento**

Things change. In the making of California public policy, the locus of activity has changed. Surely the governor, the legislature, and major state agencies were important three decades ago, when The California State Colleges constituted a new system. But especially the post-Proposition 13 movement of fiscal authority to Sacramento has resulted in a real focus on the state capital as the place where education policy is importantly determined. Decisions that once were principally local, especially for primary and secondary education, are increasingly made in the context of building the state budget.

The consequences for The California State University in 1995 and beyond are enormous. Relationships with Sacramento policy-makers, always a priority for a state agency like ours, are complicated by the higher profile of other competing interests, by policy leaders in the state capital now grown accustomed to calling the tune as indeed they pay the piper, and by legislators who inhabit a term-limited and remarkably unpopular institution. This becomes a pressure toward centralization. If faculty would be influential in policy made in Sacramento, retreat to local campuses cannot be an appropriate strategy.

#### **6. Impoverished State Finance**

The State of California is not broke. But state public finance has been rocked by changed conditions, beginning with the massive property tax cut that was Proposition 13 in 1978, and which has led to many new draws on the state general fund budget in the years since then. Add to Prop 13 the constraints of other propositions, among them Prop 98 which guaranteed a percentage of the general fund to education from kindergarten through the community colleges. Move beyond propositions to the fundamental restructuring of the state's economy that has taken place in the early 1990s, add in military base closures and military procurement cutbacks, and top it all with a business cycle downturn. Small wonder that the state's budget had not been in balance for three years as of Fiscal Year 1995.

The still-greater problem is that there are few scenarios in which The California State University will be generously funded in the future. As the new legislative year began in January 1995, the state had accumulated deficits to deal with, had a serious proposal to cut taxes on the table, and had new and large demands for the housing and care of prisoners looming in years ahead, a consequence of policy choices such as "Three Strikes" whereby the state has chosen to imprison ever-larger numbers and percentages of criminal wrongdoers. The squeezes on the general fund budget from quarters other than higher education were many, and strong.

An environment such as that cannot help but be consequential for The California State University. Some forecast "nightmare" budgets for the CSU if fundamental policy patterns went unchanged.

#### **7. State Governmental Constitutional Strait Jacket**

A complex system of Constitutional provisions and statute-driven mandates severely constrains California's fiscal policy choices. In common with only one other state, California requires the assent of 2/3 of each house of the legislature to adopt a state budget, to approve any appropriation, and to approve any tax increase. One-third plus one state Senator—fourteen members—can prevent fiscal action. Beyond that, the amount of money spent by government at all levels is capped by formulas in the state constitution. Beyond that still, formulas both constitutional and statutory give prior call upon state resources to programs and agencies other than the CSU. Severe policy choices in criminal penalties—the so-called "Three Strikes" laws—put felons ahead of college students in the queue of those seeking state budget support.

Of this we feel sure. Meeting the objectives of the State Master Plan For Higher Education will continue to be a very hard job without transforming constitutional change.

#### **8. Need for Citizenship Education**

Structural problems now inherent in California government have commonly been adopted by the initiative process, where dollars and the media they buy prey upon well-meaning but only partially-informed voters. Meanwhile proposed new statutes are debated in a deliberative process featuring inexperience, as term-limited legislators seek to cope. Few expect short-run amelioration of these conditions, and The California State University seems disadvantaged.

Perhaps the only hope for some long-range corrections to these difficulties is comprehensive citizen education. A society in which citizens understood the issues and the intricacies of government, in which more residents participated in voting and other manifestations of citizenship, and in which more were capable of participating effectively in a public forum, might be able to provide correctives.

This obligation is partly within the province of the California State University. It has always been a goal of the university to provide education in citizenship. There is some danger, however, of losing sight of the goal, emphasizing instead career preparation, especially during hard times. At this point in California's history, citizen education qualifies in our view as urgent.

#### **9. Pricing, Other Rationing Schemes**

If not all can enter The California State University, then who should be given access? The CSU has always rationed access, but with evident justification in previous eras has limited the rationing criteria to apparent academic qualifications. But now, in times of severe fiscal constraint, the whole issue is reopened and in plain view as senior policy makers encourage a move toward an environment in which students themselves pay much more of the total cost of their instruction. Painful cries are audible. Students from economically less-advantaged family circumstances are

especially worried. Many observers find alarm in the observation that tuition (or high fees) tend especially to deter students from historically underrepresented racial and/or nationality groups. This all arises at a time when California is shortly to become a state in which no racial or ethnic heritage comprises 50% or more of the total population.

In times of fiscal constraint, the California State University must depend on the faculty to ensure academic quality and must look to the faculty for guidance in relation to accountability, admissions policies, and the direction the downsized system should take in order to serve the largest number of students possible at a high level of quality. The CSU must not give in to those (among them, some public policy makers) whose vision of a University system includes a majority of faculty who are inexpensive because they lack the earned doctorate or equivalent, and where the only criterion of quality is the number of years it takes for students to earn the baccalaureate degree.

#### **10. Competition from Proprietary Institutions**

Students enroll at The California State University for many reasons, and faculty are commonly proud of the high quality teaching that transpires at CSU campuses. That high quality combined with traditionally low student fees and easy geographic access has in fact made The California State University a remarkable bargain.

As the size or extent of our bargain fades under annual fee increases, however, and as access is limited and unable to meet the state's needs, thoughtful potential students will surely consider other options, and among these are proprietary institutions. We note that most private/independent institutions are not for-profit, but we also note that a remarkable and seemingly increasing number are. If part of the package at some of these institutions is lowered academic standards, at least some in the community will wonder aloud whether CSU standards ought to be revisited, and lowered. Although we trust in the strength of commitment among the faculty to maintain appropriately high academic standards, we note nonetheless this condition in which the ASCSU will operate in the years ahead.

Teacher preparation programs appear especially vulnerable to such threats. We worry that California's current trend seems to be toward commercial enterprises offering programs to prepare teachers even as some in the state's political leadership call for radical deregulation of teacher licensure.

#### **11. Technology and the Academy**

A variety of new and emerging technologies are affecting the CSU. These include distance learning capabilities, multimedia lecture presentation potential, computer laboratory instruction, and the information highway. These seem certain to demolish many boundaries that now mark individual campuses, while also changing the culture of the individual academy.

The implications for administration and faculty at both campus and system levels are substantial: individual campus, department competitiveness based on the traditions of the academy will be tested; informed policy practices will require senate debate and discussion; and pedagogy of expertness will challenge the pedagogy of facilitation, to the rapidly increasing quantities of information.

#### **12. Decentralization Within the CSU**

Consequential for the whole university is the thrust toward decentralization. Practically, we understand that decentralization has been named a priority by Chancellor Munitz, endorsed by the Trustees, and embraced by campus Presidents. Philosophically, we understand that decentralization has the great potential to honor decision-makers closest to "the action" as not only capable and fair, but possessed of excellent firsthand information about conditions at hand. Politically, we understand that decentralization has been made all but mandatory by budget pressures, and has resulted in a reduced complement of systemwide administrators.

Decentralization is an apparent basis on which to argue for abandoning or radically transforming the ASCSU. Yet as discussed below, we discern continuing, even freshly-building, pressures for centralization. Moreover, even in a decentralized environment, we see new potential for statewide faculty leadership.

#### **13. Evolving Relationship, CSU and Local Senates**

Ebbs and flows of decision-making authority over education policy inevitably affect relationships between structures designed to give voice to faculty. Regarding some issues, at some time periods, an outside observer might think that local processes and structures are ascendant; at other times and with respect to other issues, centralized processes and structures seem especially influential. Elsewhere in this report we talk about pressures to centralize, and efforts to decentralize. Here we may be content with noting that relationships between a statewide senate and local campus senates will surely be affected by these trends.

We see no signs, however, that campuses are likely to end the now-universal practice of sending to the statewide senate some of their most seasoned representatives from local collegial governance processes. We think that the talent represented in the statewide body can and should be made helpful to local campus processes.

#### **14. Applied Research Set by System**

We note, and many of us welcome, fresh positioning of The California State University as able and willing to undertake applied research. We further note that as fewer general fund budget dollars are available to our institutions, the attractiveness of entrepreneurial activities that may attract private dollars grows. At both campus and system levels, this has inevitably led to the fashioning of research agendas that are collective, unlike the traditional scholarship of individual faculty. We note, and some of us welcome, such things as using faculty as consultants representing the university, campus centers that provide services for a fee, campus laboratories providing services similarly for a fee, and efforts to commercialize faculty intellectual property.

Collective agendas for the future require collaborative ventures of applied research for the academy. Called for is a collective faculty voice providing ethical standards, offering guidance as to how these activities link to academic missions. A value base for the system administration, and veteran statewide perspective for campus senates, seem urgent for negotiating this new and promising role.

#### **15. Unionization of Faculty Now a Normal Condition**

CSU faculty have explicitly chosen to bargain collectively over wages and working conditions, selecting their agent for the first time in 1983. Since then, the California Faculty Association and the Academic Senate CSU have worked hard and with remarkable success to delineate their respective roles. For all of this, inevitably the senate's role and that of the union overlap as issues dealing with wages and working conditions impact, to varying extents, issues dealing with academic and professional matters.

The meaning of this for the ASCSU is straightforward. Though now built on strong foundations of prior work, matters of jurisdiction and domain as between the union and the senate will not go away in years ahead. We share a sentiment that cordial and productive relations ought to continue, but we share also a belief that such relations must be intentionally wrought.

### Part III

#### The Academic Senate in a Time of Change

##### **A. Senate May Need a Structure for Monitoring Revenues, Expenditures**

The CSU faces the most difficult period of fiscal constraint since its founding in 1961. The administration and Board of Trustees are required to propose expenditure and revenue plans to the state on behalf of the CSU. The state has been unable for many years to meet its commitment to support the CSU according to budget formulas. More recently, the abandonment of formula-based budgeting has led to continued erosion of the budgetary support base of the CSU and its ability to meet its obligation to accept any graduating high school student who is in the top one-third of the class. The administration and Board of Trustees have considered the appropriate mix of public, private and tuition-based funding for the CSU. While some general agreement about these issues seems to exist among the Board members, it is difficult to know how stable this agreement is or whether the public and state government are willing to accept the current position that the cost of education should increasingly be borne by the state, private donors, and families of students. It seems very likely, then, that aggregate budget policy (both on the revenue and expenditure sides) will continue to be an important issue within the CSU. There has also been a review of policies for the disbursement of funds among campuses. The principles governing these decisions have been the subject of discussion and debate. As new campuses come into being and older ones change, it seems probable that policies governing the internal distribution of moneys within the CSU will be a continuing topic of concern. It is axiomatic that the rules controlling the receipt and distribution of scarce resources are powerful incentives and significantly affect the behavior of decision makers. In the past, decisions concerning the mode and level of instruction were partly the product of resource maximizing behavior.

The Academic Senate CSU has a responsibility to provide faculty oversight to policies which affect the CSU's educational mission. Budgetary policy certainly affects the CSU's ability to fulfill its educational mission. There seems no adequate vehicle for such oversight. In the past, ad hoc consultation about budget formula revision was provided on occasion by the Executive Committee during the summer when "program change proposals" were developed by the administration. There has been little advance discussion with faculty concerning the current policy on tuition or the target breakdown of revenue sources proposed by the Board. Nor has there been consultation with faculty concerning systemwide program initiatives or their budgetary impact. There are likely to be a wide range of emerging and evolving questions the answers to which will be largely determined by budget policy.

The Academic Senate CSU did not need an organ for budgetary policy during the period when the CSU's budget was primarily controlled by formulas which changed little and infrequently. That time is past. With the current flux in these processes and the profound implications which they portend our University, the faculty need to provide timely and carefully considered advice. Accordingly, the Academic Senate CSU should establish a permanent vehicle for these purposes. This vehicle should be organized to complement and coordinate with the administration and Board of Trustee policy-making processes. It should be composed of faculty representatives who have a wide range of experience and are able to intellectually integrate budget policy with the entire mission of the CSU. These representatives must have the ability to anticipate the future effects of budget policy and should not be particularly concerned with the auditing aspects of budget processes. This group will need to be prepared to meet at what for faculty seem unusual times of the year since budget policy development often occurs during the summer. It should work closely with the Executive Committee to assure proper liaison with the Academic Senate in policy review and development. A standing committee on budget policy could be one way to achieve these objectives. Since budget policy often becomes a political issue, some connection with the Governmental Affairs Committee may also be desirable.

It is expected that during the next several years budget policy will continue to absorb considerable time and effort by the administration and Board of Trustees. Finding an equilibrium level of support from the state, agreeing on accountability standards and processes, revising and implementing our tuition policy and getting the state to agree to it, determining just what minimum level of fiscal support is necessary to achieve our mission, and balancing competing systemwide objectives with inadequate resources are some of the issues which the faculty need to engage. The Academic Senate CSU has a responsibility to provide leadership in the arena.

**B. Senate May Need a Vehicle to Support and Assist Local Senates**

The Academic Senate CSU is composed of veterans of local campus consultative governance processes, and both for that reason and because of the broader scope of the statewide body's concerns, may be a resource for local senates.

We have especially in mind the earlier stages of policy-making processes, where agendas for policy-making are set, and where policies are initially formulated. Veterans of local campus processes whose present jobs (as statewide senators) encourage them to broadly sweep the policy horizons, and whose present jobs place them in some information streams that can help to identify emerging issues, may also find themselves armed with policy responses initially formulated in the statewide setting. What could be more natural than to "bring home" to local campuses both the sightings of fresh issues and the still-plastic formulations designed to respond?

To further empower local senates, we think that the Academic Senate CSU ought to consider a specific vehicle to support and assist local Senates in issue-identification and possible responses. A simple idea would be to include at least one statewide senator per campus in the meetings now held twice yearly with local Senate chairs. We also note with approval the current Chair's efforts to send e-mail and other messages to local Senate chairs, which often very nicely identify issues and begin the formulation of responses. We note the obvious, but not-yet fully realized, potential that e-mail and other forms of communication via computer network offer for bringing local input to statewide discourse, as campus Senates communicate with the statewide senate as to the feelings, ideas, and questions of local faculty.

**C. Senate Must Maintain Vigilance for Its Separate Role Vis-à-vis the Faculty Union**

The Academic Senate CSU is charged under the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) with distinct responsibilities in a collective bargaining atmosphere. There can be no doubt that the importance and necessity of the ASCSU, confirmed in law, is essential to the continuation of the CSU system and the integrity of its academic programs.

As economic pressures on the system mount, it may be tempting to seek to reduce faculty prerogatives in the areas of retention, tenure, and promotion, and in matters of the curriculum and instructional policy, in the name of some variety of efficiency. The Senate, and not the union, must lead the fight for the faculty's professional prerogatives.

Again as economic pressures mount, an unfortunate de-professionalization of the faculty is implicitly encouraged: it can be cheaper to replace retiring veterans with part-time faculty than with new tenure-track hires. In turn, HEERA charges the faculty bargaining agent (the California Faculty Association) with protecting the wage and working condition interests of the part-time professors. We note that the interests of part-time people (some of whom teach at more than one campus) especially in some form of job protection or seniority can easily put that voice of the faculty which sets and maintains professional standards in conflict with that voice of the faculty which may stand for certain rights to employment for long-time part-time classroom instructors

Ultimately our point is not necessarily to create new Academic Senate structure, but rather to encourage continued attentiveness. The Academic Senate must maintain productive liaison with the California Faculty Association while maintaining suitable vigilance for its role. As wages and working conditions should not be made matters for Senate action, so also professional standards and educational policy must remain exclusively within the Senate's purview.

**D. Continue, Strengthen Sacramento Presence**

As noted, the locus of California public policy-making has shifted away from localities and toward the state capital in the years at least since the adoption of Proposition 13 in 1978. At the same time the interests of The California State University appear jeopardized as state government wrestles with its strait jacket-like constraints on spending. On one hand, no state constitutional provision grants The California State University either budget preference (similar to K-14 education), while on the other hand the CSU is granted no budget independence similar to that enjoyed by the University of California. A prisoner, therefore, of what happens to be left unclaimed in the state general fund, The CSU must compete with welfare recipients and prison guards for its annual allocation.

No less than any other CSU entity or constituency, the Academic Senate of The California State University (the ASCSU) must therefore make a priority of building and tending relationships in Sacramento. The Senate ought to continue, and ought to strengthen, its presence in Sacramento and its activities in the broad realm of governmental affairs. Senators have gifts to bring to policy-makers within agencies as well as to legislators and their staffs. Broadly, these gifts are mature contributions to wise public policy, and urgently, the championing of the values of the academy. Faculty can speak with unique authority of the conditions and the needs of learning. Academic Senators can stand for the maintenance of high quality when, under budget and other pressures to "enhance productivity" quality may be threatened. We note that in this vigorous relationship-building with state policy-makers, the ASCSU can also reach out to local senates. As appropriate, the governmental relations leadership in the ASCSU can bring news, and encourage faculty to insure that local legislators know well the story of "their" CSU campus.

**E. ASCSU Should Be an Advocate for the Values of the Academy**

Advocacy for the values of the academy amounts to advocacy for the institution, in crucial ways. Such advocacy takes place in ways and means that extend beyond the state capital, and some of it may appropriately fall to the ASCSU to undertake.

A first element of such advocacy is monitoring the external environment, and noting well which external entities have ascended in importance for education policy. Thus when a Higher Education Policy Institute—to name one such new entity—emerges, the Senate ought to thoughtfully consider how best to forge good relationships. From time to time the job may fall most suitably to the Senate Chair, or to the Executive Committee. At other times it may be best seem right to assign the task to another committee or work group.

A second element of such advocacy is plainly the establishment of suitable relationships with governmental, nongovernmental, and quasi-governmental entities, engaging them and assuring the presence of the academy's perspective in deliberations. We note that we do not think the ASCSU should take a leading role in building relationships with opinion leaders in communities served by CSU campuses. Members of the Senate, after all, lead their professional lives on local campuses, and define their CSU citizenship and role in local campus terms. Even more sharply, alumni and friends in the communities in our judgment identify less with a statewide multi-campus entity than they identify with the institution that immediately serves them. While the ASCSU ought to be sympathetic and encouraging to local efforts to encourage public appreciation of the professoriate and its values, we think the Senate should leave the leadership in that to others.

A third element is the articulation of the senate's—the faculty's—voice on issues which connect our professional lives to broader public policy debates. The ASCSU ought to lead the faculty by leading local senates in taking positions on the proper relationship of the academy to undocumented immigrants, to historically underrepresented racial and ethnic communities, and most broadly to the place of the academy within a society that seeks reasonable fairness and opportunity for its people. The expectation for Senate leadership ought to be roughly proportional to the nexus of such issues to our professional purposes. When issues such as fairness in university admissions or the proper treatment of underprepared students are debated, the Senate's voice should be loud and clear.

**F. Information Highway: A Remarkable Stimulus to an Evolving Faculty Role**

In the view from 1995, technology appeared to bring with it remarkable possibilities for centralizing and reducing the number of instruction-providers, while at the same time opening up to the individual learner sources and voices bearing information in rich detail and at an astonishingly low cost.

Thus on one hand technology is removing the barriers of physical separateness. An implication is that packaged coursework can be distributed quickly and cheaply: as a CSPU Pomona program in hotel management can be distributed in Mexico and Taiwan as well as in the United States, so also

may a course in 17th century metaphysics be delivered systemwide in the University of California, via videoconferencing. The question, made more urgent by budget constraints, will be how many instruction-providers are needed, when good materials are available on tape or via internet.

On the other hand particular classes can be wonderfully enriched where faculty savvy in how to access storehouses of information reach out to find an illustration, make a point, or set out pathways for student exploration and individualized learning. The question made obvious by this has to do with securing a savvy faculty, and securing appropriate access to the world of digital information for both faculty and students. Both seem costly.

Yet blizzards of information do not amount to an education. We think there is a role for the ASCSU in making certain that seemingly obvious point is not lost on policy-makers. Equally, there is a role for the faculty and for the Senate in monitoring what is near-certain to be a genuinely remarkable period of evolution in what it means to be a member of a university faculty. Undoubtedly the ASCSU will be both a voice for past traditions of academic progressives and for visionaries boldly pushing on this new frontier. Our view of that is wholly positive.

#### **G. ASCSU Should Monitor RFP Processes for Faculty Scholarly and Public Service Activity**

We believe that the scholarly and professional work of the faculty is increasingly frequently made the object of concern by system and campus administrators and others through Request for Proposals (RFP) processes. We acknowledge that these RFP processes commonly take up topics of considerable public interest and importance, and that many faculty find the RFP processes helpful as they look for ways to build records of scholarship and public service for promotion and other purposes.

We are concerned, however, about appropriate balance and about the traditional freedom of scholars to set their own agendas. We note that relatively unconstrained support for scholarly and public service activity may best nurture classroom instruction, for the topics of the work would be defined by the service (instruction)-delivering professional. We note that where it is thought suitable nevertheless to generate scholarly work on a specific topic of keen current interest, the whole RFP enterprise should be made a matter for consultation with the faculty. Note that this is more than merely requiring that a committee be set up to determine which among competing proposals may be the most promising.

We think there is a role for the ASCSU in all of this. On some occasions the Senate may propose policy; on other occasions the ASCSU may engage local senates on the issue; in nearly all circumstances, suitable monitoring of the RFP processes mounted by administrators is a job for the Senate.

#### **H. Engaging Outside Agencies That May Want to Set CSU Policy**

As war is too important to be left to the generals, so education policy may be better where its making is ventilated rather than closed. Surely there lies the essential justification for a lay Board of Trustees.

Yet the Senate stands for the occasionally competing proposition, also valid, that the views and judgments of those professionals whose services define the institution deserve great weight. Faculty know best both the process and the products of higher education. It falls therefore to the Senate to deal with episodic intrusion from outside the CSU, however well-meaning that policymaking generalists on one hand, and specialized interests on the other, may be. At times the Senate may have to stand ready to engage and persuade outside agencies and groups. At other times the Senate may have to resist them, either alone, or where possible and convenient, in coalition with friends and partners.

Especially in an era of unprecedented demand for higher education coupled with resource constraints, the entreaties of outside groups seem likely to grow more numerous, and louder. In that difficult environment the Senate must be able to voice effectively the professional concerns of the faculty.

#### **I. Support for Faculty Entrepreneurship**

Knowing, monitoring, maintaining, and where appropriate, modifying, the boundary between allowable commercially- or entrepreneurially-oriented professional activity on one hand, and the misuse either of faculty intellectual property or of faculty time that properly belongs to pedagogy on the other hand, is never simple. That is why such boundary-maintenance is properly the first-order business of professionals. And senates give voice to faculty professional concerns.

We note the close connection between many entrepreneurial activities undertaken by faculty and the necessary professional renewal required for effective classroom performance. As applied research overlaps consulting and other money-making activities, especially in budget-pressured context, the ASCSU in proper coordination with campus senates must take a leading role in defining what is to be permitted, what is to be forbidden, what is to be encouraged, and what is to "count" and in what ways in faculty professional performance evaluations for retention, tenure and promotion.

Revenue-generating enterprises housed with the university require faculty engagement and oversight to insure that academic values and standards are upheld. The systemwide senate is the faculty voice where such enterprises are housed centrally.

#### J. Retention, Tenure and Promotion Standards

The senate must be vigilant about standards for retention, tenure and promotion. As local senates must insure suitable harmony between local mission and local RPT standards, so the statewide senate must seek suitable harmony between system mission and trustee policy. In this, we speak for the academy.

As we have noted, new technology, pressure to attack urgent social problems in education and in other realms, and other fresh items of context bring this back to a statewide as well as to a local agenda. In a word: retention, tenure and promotion standards must be reviewed to accommodate change.

### Part IV

#### Summary and Conclusion

The materials and recommendations above point to an obvious conclusion that we can usefully make explicit. We asked earlier whether we would invent a systemwide senate now, if we did not already have one. Our answer is an easy "yes." As long as there is a systemwide CSU, there is a need to articulate a systemwide faculty voice that takes up academic and professional themes and topics. While there may be little surprise in such a conclusion emerging from a Senate Task Force, we think that our analysis would lead most fair-minded observers to the same conclusion.

But two further points may be fairly thought to emerge. In the first place, we believe that the ASCSU ought to be an advocate for its own function, for itself, in effect. The Senate may be best-positioned for pointing to the strengths of collegial governance as a way of thinking, a way of doing business. We note that in an era when gathering the insights of workers, and implicitly their consent, is regarded as a remarkable discernment of modern management, universities have used the model successfully for six or seven centuries. We note further the obvious urgency of gathering the consent of any institution's defining professionals. Who would argue that the administration of judiciaries should not richly take judges' views into account, or the administration of hospitals, the doctors'?

Nor is there any escape from the point by saying that the argument is limited to campus academic senates: for as long as a Chancellor and staff interact with a Board of Trustees in ways meant to be consequential for the learning activities of students and their faculty, they will need a coherent faculty organ for consultative purposes. To argue otherwise is to argue the educational irrelevance of systemwide administrative and Board leadership, and that simply is not how we view them.

A second point is derivable, then, from this argument about the need for a statewide senate. It is that in times of budget stress, especially then, a senate is especially needed. In just those eras, when well-meaning cost-cutters would welcome targets for spending cuts, the values for which senates stand must be heard, and the experience which senators bring must be made to speak to policy proposals. Shall we cut program X, or activity Y? Senates can define the views of the professionals at the point of service delivery concerning that. Senates can help to define what such cuts might do to crucial values such as the maintenance of high quality learning.

We are not comfortable in saying that a systemwide senate should be held exempt from budget reductions, especially where it may be shown that essential functions are achievable at lower cost. We are entirely comfortable, however, in saying that the senate probably has a size below which it should not shrink, implying a budget floor for the ASCSU.

There ought to be a systemwide senate. It ought to be supported. There is work to be done.

(Approved May 1995, as part of AS-2272-95/GA)



## Section III

---

<b>Positions on Academic and Professional Matters</b> .....	63
<b>Academic Senate Self-Study of Undergraduate Education</b> .....	65
<b>Considerations Involved in Determining What Constitutes a Baccalaureate Level Course</b> .....	68
<b>Accelerated Implementation of the California Articulation Number System (CAN) on CSU Campuses</b> ...	70
<b>Support for the California Articulation Number System</b> .....	71
<b>Recommended Guidelines for General Education Programs in High-Prerequisite Majors</b> .....	72
Recommended Guidelines for General Education Programs in High-Prerequisite Majors.....	72
G.E. Program Design for High-Unit Majors.....	72
<b>Endorsement of the Draft Statement of Principles</b>	
<b>Regarding Teacher Education Legislation</b> .....	75
Attachment to AS-1801-88/TE.....	75
Responsibility for Teacher Education	
Governance	
Maintenance of Professional Standards	
Student Assessment	
Fiscal Support and Responsibility	
Relationship to the State's Education Community	
<b>All-University Responsibility for Competency in Writing</b> .....	78
<b>Full and Subject Area Certification of the General Education Transfer Curriculum</b> .....	79
<b>Support of the General Education Transfer Curriculum</b> .....	80
General Education Transfer Curriculum and The California State University.....	80
Subject Area: English Communication	
Subject Area: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning	
Subject Area: Arts and Humanities	
Subject Area: Social and Behavioral Sciences	
Subject Area: Physical and Biological Sciences	
<b>Baccalaureate Credit for Elementary Foreign Language Study</b> .....	84
<b>Student Outcomes Assessment in the California State University</b> .....	85
Student Outcomes Assessment in the California State University: Report to the Chancellor.....	85
Chapter One: CSU Involvement with Student Outcomes Assessments	
Chapter Two: Factors Contributing to Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment	
Chapter Three: Guiding Principles for Assessing Student Outcomes in the CSU	
Chapter Four: Recommendations for a California State University Assessment Policy	
Appendix A: Current Assessment Practices in the California State University.....	99
Report of the Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment	
Current Assessment Practices in the CSU	
Appendix B: CSU Campus Views Regarding State Incentive Funding Programs.....	102
Recommendations for Incentive Funding by Level	
Recommendations Regarding Principles	
Caveats	
State Incentive Funding Approaches.....	107
Appendix C: Bibliography.....	108

<b>Support for “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University”</b> .....	<b>111</b>
Recommendations on Graduate Education in The California State University–December 1989.....	111
I. A California State University Policy on Quality in Graduate Education	
II. Campus Policies and Practices to Improve Graduate Program Quality and Graduate Student Access	
III. Trustee and System Level Policies and Activities to Improve Graduate Program Quality and Graduate Student Access	
IV. Building the Infrastructure: Policy and Resources	
Members of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU (Appendix A)	
<b>Multicultural Education for Prospective Teachers</b>	
<b>and for all Baccalaureate Degree Recipients in the California State University</b> .....	<b>119</b>
Meeting the Challenge of the New Diversity: Multicultural Infusion	
in the California State University for Prospective Teachers and for All Undergraduates.....	119
Underrepresentation in Teacher Preparation	
<b>CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) Programs</b> .....	<b>127</b>
<b>Modification of General Education Certification Policy: Full- and Subject-Area Certification</b> .....	<b>129</b>
Attachment to: AS-1979-91/AA	
Proposed Modification of General Education Certification Procedures.....	129
Memorandum	
Draft	
Full and Subject-Area Certification of Courses to Meet CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements .....	131
Routes for Meeting CSU General Education Requirements.....	132
<b>CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and ROTC Programs</b> .....	<b>133</b>
<b>Support for Admissions Advisory Council Recommendations</b> .....	<b>134</b>
Implementation of the 15-unit College Preparatory Course Requirement.....	134
Percentages of CSU Fall Applicants Who Completed the Full 15-Unit College Preparatory Pattern	
Percentages of CSU Fall Applicants Completing 15-Units with One Unit Flexibility	
<b>Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education</b> .....	<b>137</b>
Attachment to: AS-1987-91/AA • Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education.....	137
Attachment 1: Summary of Campus Responses to Graduate Study	
Implementation Plan for Recommendations on Graduate Education.....	138
<b>C Grades in Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum</b> .....	<b>144</b>
<b>The Student-Athlete in the CSU</b> .....	<b>145</b>
Principles and Guidelines for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU.....	145
<b>Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program</b> .....	<b>147</b>
Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program.....	147
<b>The Importance of International Students Being Educated Within The California State University</b> .....	<b>149</b>
<b>Support of the Statement of Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected</b>	
<b>of Entering Freshmen, Phase II—Chinese, Japanese, Russian</b> .....	<b>150</b>
<b>Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression</b> .....	<b>151</b>
Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression.....	151
<b>Library Planning in the CSU</b> .....	<b>153</b>
<b>The Necessity of Lower-Division Education in the CSU</b> .....	<b>154</b>
The Necessity of Lower Division Education in the CSU.....	154
The Vision of the Master Plan	
General Education and Continuity with Majors	
Educational and Social Aspects of a Coherent Education	
Staffing and Other Costs of Splitting Lower and Upper Division	
Impact on Student Populations	
Conclusions	
<b>Reaffirmation of AS-2062-92/AA/FA “The Student Athlete in the CSU”</b> .....	<b>159</b>
<b>Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR): Certification of Transferability</b> .....	<b>160</b>
Proposed Amendment to Executive Order 514.....	161
<b>Emerging Technologies and Pedagogy in the California State University</b> .....	<b>163</b>

<b>Support for 24-Hour Student Access to Computing Resources and the Internet .....</b>	<b>164</b>
Attachment to AS-2261-95/AA: Letter to Chancellor Munitz.....	164
Attachment to AS-2261-95/AA: CLRIT Task Force on Student Access Implementation Plan Related to the Resolution for 24-Hour Access to Computing Resources and to the Network.....	165
Attachment #2 to Implementation Plan: Draft Guidelines, January 25, 1995 Guidelines Relating to Adoption of a Requirement for Students to Have 24-Hour Access to a Personal Computer and the Network.....	166
<b>Commendation for the CSU Workgroup on Underprepared Students .....</b>	<b>168</b>
Workgroup on Underprepared Students Final Report June 1995.....	168
Introduction	
Remediation Principles and Task Group Recommendations	
<b>Proposed Revision of Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees .....</b>	<b>170</b>
Information Item • Committee On Educational Policy • Agenda Item I • November 7-8, 1995	
Revision of Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees.....	170
Brief .....	170
Summary	
Item.....	170
Background	
Proposed Revisions	
Attachment A • Ed. Pol. • Agenda Item 1 • November 7-8, 1995	
Revised Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees—The California State University.....	171
<b>Board of Trustees Action on Precollegiate Skills Instruction .....</b>	<b>173</b>
Action Item • Committee on Educational Policy • Agenda Item 2 • January 23-24, 1996	
Precollegiate Skills Instruction.....	173
Brief.....	173
Summary	
Recommendation	
Item.....	174
The Issue: Too Many Entering Freshmen (with the Right Courses and Grades to Qualify for Admission) Need Remedial Study	
Why Is This a Problem?	
What Kind of Problem Is It and Who Should Be Responsible for Solving It?	
The Deliberative Process	
The Context of the Issue: CSU's Mission, Purposes, and Commitments	
Resolution	
<b>Report of the Subcommittee on K-16 Curricular Issues of the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee of the California Educational Round Table .....</b>	<b>177</b>
Notable K-12 Reforms.....	177
Effects of K-12 Reforms on the CSU.....	178
<b>Fair Use of Copyrighted Material .....</b>	<b>179</b>
The Statement of Principle from Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America.....	179
Sec. 107 Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Fair Use.....	180
<b>Recommendations and Reports from the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) Work Groups on Academic Issues and Administrative and Fiscal Issues, Removing Obstacles to the Use of Instructional Technology .....</b>	<b>181</b>
Joint Findings and Recommendations of the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT)	
Work Groups on Academic Issues and Administrative and Fiscal Issues.....	181
<b>Endorsement of <i>Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU</i> .....</b>	<b>183</b>
<i>Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU</i> .....	183
<b>Recommendations Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU .....</b>	<b>184</b>
<b>Response to <i>The Teachers Who Teach Our Teachers</i> Teacher Preparation Programs at the California State University Report of the Institute for Education Reform .....</b>	<b>185</b>



# Section III

---

## Positions on Academic and Professional Matters

The documents in this section are representative of the significant broad policy actions taken by the Senate in recent years. They strike to the heart of what an Academic Senate is about: preserving and extending the quality of the curriculum; providing the means to improve faculty members' skills in their areas of expertise; and working diligently to assure adherence to the highest standards of professional responsibility.

The first paper is a summary statement of the findings from a major self-study project initiated by the Academic Senate to examine the state of undergraduate education in the CSU in the light of three national reports which were quite critical of higher education in the United States. While finding that the CSU was relatively free from many of the major problems identified in these reports, the self-study process resulted by May 1986 in several recommendations for change. Some of those recommendations contributed to the development of an official statement of mission for the CSU, while others have become part of the Academic Senate's subsequent action agenda.

In the second paper general considerations are proposed to guide faculty in determining what constitutes baccalaureate level coursework. The document was developed jointly by faculty from the California Community Colleges, the University of California, and the California State University. This form of intersegmental cooperation, one of many such activities, improves the quality of public postsecondary education and adds to the benefits all Californians receive from their investment in higher education.

Development of two papers included in Section IV was stimulated by questions arising from the work of the Commission to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education, which examined the roles and needs of this state's postsecondary educational systems. However, faculty professional development has long been a Senate concern, and the position paper documents the losses to students when faculty lack opportunities for renewal and growth. The second paper, on the central importance of faculty scholarship to teaching, indicates the broad impact this area of faculty activity has on the mission of the university. Both of these issues have received increasing attention within and outside the CSU, and both require conscientious efforts at improvement.

"...[W]hat we, as faculty, believe constitutes educational quality..." is addressed more broadly in a paper included in Section V, which was inspired in part by the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978. The relationship between adequate budgetary support and the conditions conducive to a quality education has been a persistent theme in statewide Academic Senate deliberations for as long as there has been a Senate in the CSU. While the "taxpayer revolt" of 1978 did less harm to higher education than was feared at the time, current public policy debate related to retaining or modifying spending limits mandated by Article XIII B of the state's Constitution reminds us that concern about essential budgetary support and the consequences of inadequate funding must still be a high priority for the CSU.

Two resolutions, which are included in Section IV, refer to issues of academic and professional matters and were approved by the Academic Senate. Resolutions are one means by which the Senate addresses specific concerns, expresses positions, and makes recommendations. One of the

most important professional issues affecting the CSU is the need for a faculty whose composition reflects the diversity of our students and of the citizens of California. Affirmative action in hiring and in all faculty personnel matters is one important response to this situation. In addition, the faculty play a key role in deterring sexual harassment on our campuses, through personal conduct as well as through the standards they enunciate. In these two resolutions, the Senate seeks to influence the policies, attitudes, and actions of faculty, campus senates, and all others who comprise the CSU.

# Academic Senate Self-Study of Undergraduate Education

## Introduction

In fall 1985, the Academic Senate of the California State University conducted an in-depth and critical evaluation of undergraduate education in relation to three recent national reports on the state of United States education which have described a “crisis” in America (i.e., *Integrity in the College Curriculum*, by the Association of American Colleges; *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education*, by the National Institute of Education; and *To Reclaim a Legacy*, by the National Endowment for the Humanities). That evaluation was carried out as a consequence of the ASCSU recommendation in March 1985 for a self-study of undergraduate education. Administrative and trustee support was instantaneous and real; in fact, Provost Vandament and Trustee Brophy both said this was the most important task that we had to face in the near future. It was with that sense of shared agreement on priorities that we set out to conduct our work, establishing seven subcommittees to study: Mission and Goals, Curriculum, Learning, Faculty, Instruction, Campus as a Community, and Governance and Academic Freedom.

What follows is a brief overview of the most significant findings and recommendations in each area:

## Mission and Goals

The recommendations of the subcommittee on Mission and Goals have been incorporated by the Academic Senate, the Trustees, and the administration into the revised *Mission and Goals Statement of the California State University*.

## Curriculum

The most persistent and telling charges against the undergraduate curriculum, as presented in the national reports, are that it fractures, rather than makes coherent, students’ encounters with the world of ideas; it dampens their excitement for learning; and it effectively denies them the opportunity to participate, actively and productively, in honest inquiry. The reports constitute an indictment of a single-minded devotion to the transmission of information and, overwhelmed by its plenitude, an accusation that colleges and universities have capitulated to the impulse to parcel out that information more and more narrowly in academic programs. Faculties and curricula have become so concerned with mastery of smaller and smaller bits of learning that students are rarely able to appreciate the interconnectedness that is necessary for a coherent undergraduate education. The reports charge that such fragmentation and specialization are found throughout the curriculum, in General Education, in study in the major, and in electives.

The CSU Self-Study finds that the General Education-Breadth Policy of the CSU, which preceded the national reports by at least five years, reflects the same underlying objectives for General Education as do the national reports on the status of undergraduate education. These objectives include emphasis on the development of such broad-based abilities and skills as critical thinking; logical analysis and synthesis; communication; and the development of an understanding and appreciation of the principles, methodologies and their limitations, and value systems used in human inquiry. While the existing CSU General Education-Breadth policy advocates an integrated approach to meeting these objectives, campus implementation has not always achieved this goal. In the area of curriculum, therefore, the Self-Study recommends that:

- (1) Policy be developed that requires substantial written communication, critical analysis and, where appropriate, quantitative reasoning in every course accepted for General Education credit;
- (2) Students complete remedial basic skills courses prior to enrolling in baccalaureate level courses which require the use of those skills; and
- (3) Greater efforts be made by campuses to ensure that students graduating from the CSU have been exposed to, and understand, the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by women and by members of a variety of cultural groups (Western and non-Western).

The Academic Senate recommends further study of the recommendation that policy permitting exceptions from the General Education-Breadth Program's requirements for high-unit major programs be eliminated.

## Learning

The report by the Association of American Colleges draws attention to the constraints imposed upon learning by the traditional major. These constraints are particularly evident in the large number of units that academic disciplines either require or expect of their major students and in the increasing overspecialization characterized by what is called "major inflation" and by options and emphases within disciplines, all of which limit opportunities for students to experience breadth in their undergraduate study. Indeed, when we think of the baccalaureate degree, we tend to think of the academic major and not the whole range of undergraduate study; the CSU Self-Study, however, questions the wisdom of this prevailing view.

The Self-Study recommends that:

- (1) EP&R 85-123, "Guidelines for Breadth in the New Bachelor's Degree Majors," be considered the foundation for policy governing not only proposed academic programs but also the program review of existing majors; and
- (2) The CSU undertake a study of the role and purpose of the academic major within the baccalaureate degree.

## Faculty

The Self-Study reaffirms the Academic Senate's and Trustees' long-standing positions emphasizing the primacy of teaching in undergraduate education within the CSU and recommends that:

- (1) Campuses provide means for faculty to evaluate and improve their teaching methods, particularly in response to the needs of changing student demographics, and to keep abreast with the rapidly expanding knowledge occurring in all disciplines;
- (2) The Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees continue to affirm teaching as the heart of the CSU mission, as they reassess and reevaluate standards and criteria for evaluating faculty regarding appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion; and
- (3) Efforts be made to encourage faculty scholarship, research, and creative and artistic activity through the use of flexible scheduling, new difference-in-pay leave policies, increased assigned time, and a greater number of sabbatical leaves.

## Instruction

One of the major recommendations to come from the Self-Study is the creation of a CSU Teacher-Scholar Institute which can make significant contributions to the improvement of teaching and learning in the CSU by:

- (1) Sponsoring research into the processes of teaching and learning in institutions of higher education;
- (2) Emphasizing research into the implications of student diversity on learning and into improved methods for teaching nontraditional students; and
- (3) Publishing a journal devoted to disseminating research findings concerning teaching and learning in higher education.

The CSU has the opportunity through this institute to make significant and substantial advances in our knowledge of the teaching process and of effective teaching, and the Academic Senate strongly urges the creation of this institute.

## Campus as a Community

This subcommittee made a variety of useful recommendations. Academic advising, however, was the area receiving most attention. The Self-Study recommends that a joint Academic Senate-California State Student Association project develop a report on what constitutes good academic



advising. Included among the topics for discussion and development of recommendations are the methods for selecting and training effective advisors, methods of advisement for nontraditional students, and specification of student and faculty responsibilities for effective participation in academic advising. The Academic Senate, with the support of CSSA, has authorized the creation of this joint project.

## **Governance and Academic Freedom**

In recent years the Academic Senate has produced two documents clarifying the role of senates in a collective bargaining context in the context of collegiality within the CSU. While neither document has been adopted in *toto* as a system policy by the Board of Trustees, the Board did act on the matter of collegiality by adopting and issuing a "Statement of Collegiality." Building upon this statement, the Self-Study recommends that:

- (1) The campus presidents and campus senates/councils fully implement the principles of the "Statement on Collegiality" through establishing or continuing campus processes and policies that ensure collegial decision-making;
- (2) The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees adopt policies and practices which will incorporate the faculty, through the statewide Academic Senate, as full participants in the development of the budget and budget priorities, and that each campus be required to have a budget or resource committee with adequate faculty membership and to publish budget information;
- (3) The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees allocate a major portion of lottery funds to the campuses for local determination of the ways in which the funds may best be expended to improve the quality of instruction; and
- (4) The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees work to ensure adequate state and nonstate funding support for faculty development and research activities appropriate to the CSU if development and research are to be important criteria in the evaluation of faculty.

## **Conclusion**

The preceding recommendations reflect the progress to this point in the Self-Study of Undergraduate Education. As the Academic Senate and administration continue to study the reports prepared by the Self-Study groups, we expect to make additional recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

We hope that the Trustees will join with us in adopting the recommendations made in this report and will assist the faculty and administration in their implementation. It is our belief that these recommendations, when translated into practice, will: (1) improve teaching and learning opportunities; (2) increase faculty responsibility, commitment, and morale; (3) create an environment for greater faculty-administration cooperation; and (4) strengthen the collegial system of governance at all levels in the CSU.

# Considerations Involved in Determining What Constitutes a Baccalaureate Level Course

Because baccalaureate level coursework is intended to contribute to the student's attainment of the objectives embodied in the baccalaureate degree, courses which are designated as baccalaureate level will meet, as one of several standards, the criterion of having a *bridging* function, helping to move the student from the skills and knowledge expected at entrance toward the competencies expected at graduation.

In areas of the curriculum for which the three segmental Academic Senates have identified expected entry level competencies (e.g., English, mathematics, natural sciences), baccalaureate courses shall not replicate the skills and knowledge which are entry expectations but will instead require for satisfactory completion the prior attainment of such skills and knowledge. As comparable statements are developed in other areas of the curriculum, reference to entry level expectations will be useful in helping to define baccalaureate level coursework.

Various graduation expectations, such as those expressed in (1) the goals of general education, (2) the objectives of the various majors, (3) the standards for competency, and (4) such generalized expectations as *intellectual growth* also will influence the judgment as to what constitutes baccalaureate level coursework. Courses designed by qualified faculty to help qualified students move toward the attainment of those expectations will generally be of baccalaureate level. In such courses, faculty judged by their peers to be qualified to teach the courses shall have the determining voice in the decisions as to content, instructional methodology, instructional support resources, and methods and standards for assessing performance. Qualified faculty shall construct and teach baccalaureate courses in ways which assure that the level is appropriate for enhancing the knowledge and skills of the adequately prepared student, and appropriate faculty entities shall have primary responsibility for making course level determinations.

## Criteria for Determining Baccalaureate Level Courses

The significant elements involved include institutional issues, the course expectations, and the pedagogy employed. Course content alone will not determine acceptability for baccalaureate credit. The criteria are phrased in terms of expectations from each of the parties. These expectations shall not be construed as, by themselves, defining a baccalaureate level course; rather they are designed as aids to the process of making that determination. Thus, they suggest the kinds of considerations that must underlie a determination of course level but they do not define a rigid and objective standard. The use of this document requires informed judgment as to the extent to which the course in question meets the expectations embodied in each of these criteria. These criteria have been developed primarily to guide community college faculty and administrators in determining appropriate baccalaureate course designations, but they should also be useful in university curriculum review processes.

## Institutional Issues

- (1) The course is to be taught by a qualified instructor, judged by peers to be competent in the subject matter.
- (2) Qualified faculty, as judged by their peers, shall make the decisions as to course content, instructional methodology, instructional support requirements, and methods and standards for assessing student performance.
- (3) The institution shall provide adequate assessment and advising to ensure that students enrolling in baccalaureate courses are adequately prepared.
- (4) Adequate instructional support resources shall be available to all students who enroll in the course, including facilities, library materials, and access to qualified faculty outside of class meeting times.

## Course Expectations

- (1) The course is presented in a manner that requires of students:
  - a. a level of intellect, skill, prior knowledge, and maturity consistent with entry-level collegiate expectations and the stated prerequisite(s), if any, for that course;
  - b. learning skills and a vocabulary necessary to master the subject matter of a baccalaureate level course; and
  - c. the capacity to think critically and to understand and apply concepts.
- (2) The course:
  - a. treats subject matter with an intensity and pace that establishes an expectation for significantly greater learner independence than that required at the secondary level; and
  - b. requires the student to continue development of communication skills appropriate for higher education.
- (3) Coursework that:
  - a. enhances understanding of analytical, intellectual, scientific, or cultural concepts and traditions generally shall be considered baccalaureate level.
  - b. enhances understanding of occupational and professional fields usually requiring experience in higher education as prerequisite to employment in such fields may be considered baccalaureate level if it includes attention to appropriate theories and concepts.
  - c. provides instruction in occupational fields not usually requiring experience in higher education as prerequisite to such fields may be considered baccalaureate level if the primary emphasis is upon understanding the theories and concepts that underlie practice rather than only upon the development of technical skills required for immediate employment.
  - d. is remedial or college preparatory shall not be considered baccalaureate level.

## Pedagogy Employed

- (1) There shall be opportunity for student-faculty interaction of a kind and variety commensurate with achievement of course objectives.
- (2) The method of evaluation of student performance in courses shall discriminate among levels of attainment as appropriate to both entry and exit expectations.

(This document was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1987.)

# Accelerated Implementation of the California Articulation Number System (CAN) on CSU Campuses

**WHEREAS**,The Academic Senate of the California State University is on record (AS-1645-86/AA - March 13-14, 1986) supporting the California Articulation Number System (CAN); and

**WHEREAS**,Minority students in particular are finding the CAN System an aid in educational planning; and

**WHEREAS**,Chancellor Reynolds, in her August 14, 1987 letter to Presidents, has emphasized the importance of CSU collaboration with the CAN project; and

**WHEREAS**,Initial implementation of the CAN System is moving at a slower pace than anticipated, as evidenced by the monthly reports issued by the CAN System office; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the local campus senates, through their curriculum committees or ad hoc task forces, to participate actively in getting courses placed in the CAN System; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus to set a goal of having 25 courses placed in the CAN System by Fall 1988 and an additional 25 courses by Fall 1989; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU assign a standing committee or ad hoc group to offer assistance in seeing that the goal of 50 courses per campus be placed in the CAN System by Fall 1989.

(This resolution, 1775, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1988.)

# Support for the California Articulation Number System

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of The California State University has endorsed efforts to facilitate student transfer between and among public institutions of higher education in the state of California; and

**WHEREAS**The great majority of student transfer is from the California Community Colleges, a lower division institution, to the CSU, a baccalaureate degree granting institution; and

**WHEREAS**The California Articulation Number system, administered by an intersegmental coordinating committee, allows participating CSU and CCC institutions to present their course-by-course lower division curricula in such a way as to make the acceptability and transferability of the courses more evident to students, counselors and academic advisors; and

**WHEREAS**The cooperative approach built into the proposed California Articulation Number system together with the faculty-to-faculty involvement in the actual operation will assure the quality of the courses and programs involved; and

**WHEREAS**The California Articulation Number system structure is flexible and adaptable to individual campus circumstances; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of The California State University endorse California Articulation Number system participation as an element in the total CSU effort to facilitate student transfer; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU encourage campus senates/councils to consider the possible benefits of campus participation in the California Articulation Number system and to take appropriate action.

(Approved January 1988, as part of AS-1775-88/AA.)

# Recommended Guidelines for General Education Programs in High-Prerequisite Majors

**WHEREAS**,The technological nature of some disciplines requires students to complete an unusually high number of prerequisite courses in order to be properly prepared to enter the major; and

**WHEREAS**,The total number of General Education units and necessary prerequisite units for a major may be so great that students cannot meet both sets of requirements within their lower division coursework; and

**WHEREAS**,Special provisions must be made for students in such majors if the goals of General Education are to be met and a high quality of instruction is to be provided in the major; and

**WHEREAS**,Appropriate disciplines should be identified and provisions made that have minimal adverse effect on the liberal education of students in such majors; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the attached statement on High-Prerequisite Majors; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU recommend these guidelines to the Chancellor for adoption and for dissemination to local campus senates.

(This resolution 1783 was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1988.)

## Recommended Guidelines for General Education Programs in High-Prerequisite Majors

In certain majors, the number of units required as prerequisite to the major is so large that students cannot accommodate General Education, major requirements, and a reasonable number of electives within their lower division coursework. The following General Education guidelines are recommended in such high-prerequisite majors:

1. A high-prerequisite major is defined as a degree program which has at least two of the following three characteristics, in order to have students properly instructed in the discipline of the major:
  - a. It requires a substantial number of serially related courses, each prerequisite to the succeeding ones.
  - b. It requires a substantial number of prerequisite courses from at least two additional disciplines.
  - c. It requires considerably more than the number of units specified as the statutory minimum for a major, thereby leaving little or no room for electives outside the major
2. Campus faculty and administrative approval for designation of a program as a high-prerequisite major shall be based in part on the most recently completed program review or accreditation study of the program for which that designation is sought, as an independent evaluation of the stated need. For such programs, the 48 semester units mandated by E.O. 338 as a minimum for General Education-Breadth shall be accepted as the maximum when the department or equivalent unit responsible for that major so requests. The statutory requirements of Title 5, Section 40404, may be included in the general education program for high-prerequisite majors.
3. In disciplines where the initial course required in a major program is beyond the level of complexity characteristic of the regular General Education-Breadth course in that discipline, the initial major course shall be accepted for general education in the corresponding category for all major programs so affected without exception for all students enrolled in those majors.  
Examples: Calculus, Physics, Chemistry, Biology (Area B).
4. If a department with a high-prerequisite major offers upper division general education courses for use by its own students as well as others, such courses shall require no more than a lower division general education course as prerequisite. Such courses shall not be used to meet major requirements in the discipline when they are used for upper division general education.

## G.E. Program Design for High-Unit Majors

### I. The Purpose of General Education-Breadth in the Baccalaureate Degree Program

A student earning a bachelor's degree is expected to have attained entry-level competence in a profession represented by the major. Expected along with that competence is a body of generally enabling knowledge that equips the graduate for independent intellectual understanding and

discourse, formal and informal communication, and active citizenship, both local and national. Thus every degree program must incorporate study distinctly different from the student's major field. "Tailored" courses applied to the major discipline beg the question and distort the concept of *general* education.

## II. The Nature and Level of G.E. Courses in Various Disciplines

There are two disparate categories of g.e. courses in the lower division, depending on the structure of the discipline represented. In many fields, particularly the social sciences, the course that serves as an introduction to the subject is appropriate also for g.e. In many other fields, particularly the sciences, the first course for majors cannot be an overview suitable for g.e. Instead it must be an introduction in technical detail to the principles and methods of the discipline. Conversely, students enrolling in such a major are rarely well-served by the g.e. introductory survey; frequently their high school preparation has carried them past the level of such a course.

It is conceivable that this dichotomy might be significantly lessened when the Intersegmental Expectation Statements, which go beyond the new admissions requirements, are implemented. However, that goal is necessarily projected further into the future than the admissions criteria, and may be even more controversial.

## III. The Nature of High-Unit Majors

The major fields identified for purposes of this subcommittee study are engineering, agriculture, nursing, and business administration with particular emphasis on accounting. Others could have been cited, such as medical technology.

A feature common to all high-unit majors, indeed, the feature that drives their unit requirements, is their complement of indispensable support courses drawn from several disciplines. These fields in fact are not disciplines but professions, and are interdisciplinary. There also are discipline-titled major fields with high-unit programs that entail support from other disciplines, notably physics, chemistry, geology, biology, microbiology, and biochemistry, which draw from one another and from mathematics to a varying extent.

## IV. Other Pressures in High-Unit Major Programs

Programs designed to prepare students for entry to professional employment or advanced study such as postbaccalaureate licensure or graduate degree programs, must meet accreditation standards or graduate admissions requirements, and frequently both. There also is interinstitutional competitiveness to contend with: CSU faculties want to make sure that their students will succeed. Thus there are variations in requirements for a given field among CSU campuses, and between CSU and other universities. The tendency is a larger number of course requirements for CSU students than, for example, UC students.

In addition, CSU students in overwhelming numbers are older than traditional students, enrolled part-time, and employed. They commute to their classes and jobs and spend little unscheduled time on campus. In contrast, the full-time resident students at other types of institutions benefit from spontaneous, informal discussions, in which they learn from one another and develop integrative insights without assignment of academic credit to such experiences.

## V. Recommended Guidelines for General Education Programs in High-Unit Majors

The guidelines proposed here for general education requirements in high-unit majors are based on the foregoing differences. Making such intrinsic differences into account may enable us to set aside terms such as "variances," "waivers," "exceptions," "double-counting," and any other term implying "forgiveness." To support these curricular requirements, therefore, the following g.e.-breadth guidelines are recommended:

1. A high-unit major is defined as a degree program which has at least two of the following three characteristics, in order to have students properly instructed in the discipline of the major:
  - a. It requires a substantial number of serially related courses, each prerequisite to the succeeding ones.
  - b. It requires support courses from two or more related disciplines as additional prerequisites.
  - c. It requires considerably more than the number of units specified as the statutory minimum for a major, thereby leaving little or no room for electives outside the major.
2. Campus faculty and administrative approval for designation of a program as a high-unit major shall be based in part on a program review or accreditation study of the program for which that designation is sought, as an independent evaluation of the stated need. For such programs, the 48 semester units mandated by E.O. 338 as a minimum for general education-

breadth shall be accepted as the maximum when the department or equivalent unit responsible for that major so requests. The statutory requirements of Title 5, Section 40404, may be included in the g.e. program for high-unit majors.

3. In disciplines where the initial course required in a major program is beyond the level of complexity characteristic of the regular g.e.-breadth course in that discipline, the initial major course shall be accepted for g.e. in the corresponding category for all major programs so affected and irreversibly for all students enrolled in those majors.

Examples: Calculus, Physics, Chemistry, Biology (Area B).

4. If a department with a high-unit major offers upper division general education courses for use by its own students as well as others, such courses shall require only a lower division g.e. course as prerequisite and be regularly available to students with no further technical background. Such courses shall not be used to meet major requirements in the discipline when they are used for upper division g.e.

(Approved May 1988, as part of AS-1783-88/AA)



# Endorsement of the Draft Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation

**WHEREAS**The Office of the Chancellor is seeking advice concerning a draft document entitled "The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation"; and

**WHEREAS**A statement of principles developed on the basis of consensus among the constituencies in the California State University would be useful in formulating and revising positions on legislation concerning teacher education and credentialing; and

**WHEREAS**The rationales and principles contained in the draft document accompanying the April 5, 1988 memorandum from Associate Dean Mendelsohn (attached) are fully consistent with the views of the Academic Senate of the California State University; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the draft document "The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation" as attached to the April 5, 1988 memorandum from Associate Dean Mendelsohn.

(This resolution, 1801, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1988.)

## Attachment to AS-1801-88/TE

State of California  
Trustees of The California State University  
Memorandum

Date: April 5, 1988

To: Members

Chancellor's Executive Advisory Group on Teacher Education Legislation

From: Jan Mendelsohn

Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, Plans

Subject: The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation

Thank you for being so patient in regard to the long overdue redraft of "The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation." Attached is the redraft of the principles which has recently been approved by President Cleary who chaired the advisory committee.

We will need to review this product with key groups in the CSU. We are requesting that Al Johnson and Arlene Okerlund lead the consultation with the Presidents for Academic Affairs and Henrietta Schwartz and David Greene conduct the review with the Deans of Education. As well, we will share the document with the Academic Senate. It would be helpful if we could have your comments and those of your colleagues by June. If suggestions necessitate modifications, we will make them prior to sharing the document with the Presidents.

Thank you for your assistance.

JM:km

Attachment

cc: Dr. James W. Cleary  
Dr. Lee R. Kerschner  
Dr. Sally Lloyd Casanova  
Dr. David M. Greene  
Dr. James E. Jensen  
Dr. Albert W. Johnson  
Dr. Arlene N. Okerlund  
Dr. Henrietta Schwartz  
Dr. Ray Geigle  
Dr. David Cohen

# DRAFT

## The California State University Statement of Principles Regarding Teacher Education Legislation

### Responsibility for Teacher Education

#### *Rationale*

Under the provisions of the Master Plan for Higher Education (Donahoe Act of 1960), The California State University has the primary responsibility for ".... the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students, through the master's degree, in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and the professions, including the teaching professions."

This assignment of responsibility has been reaffirmed most recently in the deliberations of the Commission for Review of the Master Plan by its recommendation that the Trustees of The California State University and the governing boards of the University of California and accredited degree-granting independent colleges and universities ensure that the education of teachers is among the highest priorities for institutional and systemwide support.

The California State University through its Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Presidents, administrators, and faculty has moved to discharge its function as primary preparer of teachers in California. It is estimated that the CSU prepares approximately 70% of all teachers educated in California institutions which corresponds to about 10% of teachers educated in the nation. The CSU takes very seriously its responsibility for the educational welfare of the state which is manifest in its role as the major preparer of teachers. Programs to prepare students for preliminary and permanent teaching credentials exist on all CSU campuses. The CSU is committed to excellence in teacher preparation through maintenance of high standards, both for students' performances and for faculty instruction and supervision.

#### *Principle I*

Among organizations of institutions in higher education, and given its legal mandate for and commitment to excellence in teacher education, The California State University should have the primary role in framing and responding to policy affecting teacher education.

### Governance

#### *Rationale*

The CSU is governed by the Board of Trustees through the Chancellor and Presidents in consultation with such key constituent groups as the California State Students Association and the Statewide Academic Senate. General direction from the Board and the Chancellor for all campuses is essential in an area so universally recognized to be a primary mission, as is teacher education. At each campus is encouraged to implement Board policies, experiment with programs, and propose new approaches to teacher preparation based on its determination of needs, resources, and sound research and practice.

#### *Principle II*

The governance of teacher education should provide for the greatest possible latitude for campus programs to flourish consistent both with demands on the CSU as a single entity for accountability to the state and with demands of individual campus missions.

### Maintenance of Professional Standards

#### *Rationale*

The Board of Trustees, working through the Chancellor and the Presidents, has the responsibility for ensuring the quality of all academic programs, including those leading to the preparation of teachers. In 1968, the Board of Trustees resolved to encourage CSU campuses to seek national accreditation for all curricular programs.

Those curricular programs designed to prepare students for particular professions such as teaching are especially enhanced by national accreditation. This process brings to bear the review of persons from throughout the nation; its standards are developed in close consultation with representatives of the profession.

#### *Principle III*

The California State University should encourage national accreditation and resist state interference and prescriptions for academic and professional programs.

## Student Assessment

### *Rationale*

The report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education states, "The education of teachers is a crucial institutionwide responsibility and must be reflected through faculty commitments and priorities and through careful evaluation of prospective teachers prior to their entry into the classroom." Public school involvement in the evaluative process is stressed.

Multiple measures should be used to assess prospective teachers. Faculty who work closely with students and possess the appropriate expertise are best able to conduct evaluations of a student's performance and knowledge. A single test, observation, or interview does not provide a sufficiently reliable or valid basis for diagnosis or selection. Direct performance appraisals are needed to assess higher order skills and are preferred to indirect measures such as paper and pencil tests. Evaluations should be criterion rather than norm-referenced.

Assessment of prospective teachers should be formative as well as summative if they are to strengthen the teaching profession rather than merely eliminate the minimally proficient and provide to the universities information with which programs can be improved. Assessment conducted by faculty should be followed up with advisement and recommendations for addressing deficiencies.

Public school personnel should be involved in the development as well as the implementation of assessment of prospective teachers for credentialing purposes.

If university faculty were eliminated from the assessment process for prospective and new teachers, their responsibility and accountability for teacher preparation excellence would be diminished.

### *Principle IV*

The university should be responsible for assessing the knowledge and abilities of its students prior to their full responsibility for a classroom. Public school representatives are an important resource to the university in development and implementation of assessment. Novice teachers' performances should be supported and assessed by the school district, the profession, and the university - in partnership.

## Fiscal Support and Responsibility

### *Rationale*

The CSU is principally supported by the State of California. Through the budget process, provision is made for both general and specific programs. To ensure the quality of its programs for teacher preparation, sufficient funds must be provided.

### *Principle V*

Given its legal mandate and responsibility for teacher education, funding should be included through the budget process in the form of direct appropriation or commitment to the CSU for participation in programs for prospective, intern and resident teachers.

## Relationship to the State's Education Community

### *Rationale*

The CSU is one voice among many in determining state policy regarding the education of teachers but is one of three higher education organizations responsible for teacher preparation. The teacher and administrator organizations, the school boards association, the State Department of Education, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and others have responsibility for and great influence in determining policy on teacher preparation.

### *Principle VI*

The CSU should work closely with the various persons and organizations as well as with other institutions of higher education to explain CSU principles and influence state policy for teacher education.

### *Principle VII*

The CSU has a responsibility for ongoing involvement with teachers and schools for the purpose of improving teacher education programs and the teaching profession.

(Approved May 1988, as part of AS-1801-88/TE)

# All-University Responsibility for Competency in Writing

**WHEREAS**The English Council has brought to the attention of the Academic Senate of the California State University the need for an all-university effort for the improvement of writing; and

**WHEREAS**Writing is a valuable means of learning and discovery in every discipline; and

**WHEREAS**Success in a wide variety of professions requires skills in writing; and

**WHEREAS**Students will become better writers if they write frequently and receive response to their writing; and

**WHEREAS**Courses which include writing assignments can reinforce what students learn in composition courses while they are learning the modes of inquiry specific to a particular discipline; and

**WHEREAS**The design of writing assignments affects how well students write and how much they learn in the process of completing the writing assignment; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the position that students should write frequently in every discipline and receive appropriate response to that writing in order to become more competent and confident writers; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the CSU campuses to fund adequately faculty development programs that help faculty in all disciplines improve the design of their writing assignments and their evaluation of student papers; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the CSU campuses to fund adequately such other support programs as writing laboratories and tutorial centers; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the CSU campuses to provide all necessary resources for the support of this commendable enterprise in order to insure the successful exercise of the all-university responsibility for competency in writing.

(This resolution, 1830, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in October 1988.)

# Full and Subject Area Certification of the General Education Transfer Curriculum

**WHEREAS**, there is a mandate from the State of California to assure maximum access to higher education for all its citizens; and

**WHEREAS**, California AB 1725 mandates the development and implementation of a transfer curriculum for General Education to provide ready transfer among the three segments of California higher education; and

**WHEREAS**, a uniform and consistent approach in the transfer and certification process is an important tool in providing access to higher education for California's students and would facilitate transfer for students in underrepresented categories; and

**WHEREAS**, the General Education Transfer Curriculum is divided into the following subject areas:

- English Communication
- Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning
- Arts and Humanities
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Physical and Biological Sciences

**WHEREAS**, making full and subject area certification available allows certifying institutions to create a reasonable lower division General Education program by subject areas and provides the potential for better curricular development and complementation of courses; and

**WHEREAS**, the advantage of providing for subject area certification is that it allows certifying institutions to meet the objective of the transfer curriculum within the framework of subject areas by configuring courses to meet the philosophical objectives and intent of each subject area; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend to the Chancellor that full and subject area certification of the General Education Transfer Curriculum be accepted and implemented by the California State University as CSU policy; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Academic Senate CSU urge the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates to adopt full and subject area certification of the General Education Transfer Curriculum as intersegmental policy.

(This resolution, 1841, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1989.)

# Support of the General Education Transfer Curriculum

**WHEREAS** Approximately 65 percent of undergraduates in the California State University are transfer students; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of the California State University agrees that transfer between institutions must be facilitated; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate CSU has endorsed the concept of an intersegmental general education transfer curriculum which includes baccalaureate courses acceptable for transfer among all segments of public postsecondary education; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of the California State University accept a 37-unit general education transfer curriculum of which 31 units are common to all three segments of public postsecondary education and 6 units are specific to the California State University, as described in the document entitled "General Education Transfer Curriculum and the California State University (March 1, 1989)"; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates to meet the access and equity principles espoused by the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education through the adoption of common policies to implement transfer and certification; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates that the General Education Transfer Curriculum as adopted by all three segments be reviewed every five years.

(This resolution, 1842, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1989.)

## General Education Transfer Curriculum and The California State University

Executive Order No. 338 on General Education Breadth Requirements was issued on November 1, 1980, after considerable consultation, vigorous debate, and thorough involvement of the faculty of the California State University. It has been the position of the Academic Senate CSU and the local senates that the General Education requirements now in place are sound, excellent, and exemplary and that no important feature or component of these requirements should be compromised. This position has been successfully maintained throughout intersegmental negotiations toward a common General Education Transfer Curriculum. The 31+6 unit proposal\* fits entirely within the minimum 48-semester units prescribed by E.O. 338.

It is the intention of the General Education Breadth Advisory Committee that E.O. 338 remain in place. Because it requires more than the proposed General Education Transfer Curriculum (GETC), the relationship between the two needs to be clarified. E.O. 338 requires a General Education program of a minimum of 48 semester units. The GETC proposed here does not address or affect either CSU upper division unit requirements or CSU units beyond the 37 proposed. Nine of the minimum 48 units must be taken in upper division courses after the student has reached upper division status. A parallel requirement is that at least nine of the minimum 48 units must be taken at the CSU campus granting the degree. As the 37 unit GETC includes only 31 units common for the CCC, CSU and UC, plus 6 CSU-specific units, a minimum of 11 units (9 of them upper division) remains to satisfy CSU G.E. requirements for graduation.

The history of, rationale for and purposes of the proposed GETC is important in understanding the structure of the proposal. A substantial number of CSU graduates do not take their lower division general education programs in the CSU; most CSU students transfer from Community Colleges. In 1986, 53% of CSU graduates had transferred from Community Colleges. On the other hand, in 1985-86 only 17.3% of California Community College students transferred to the CSU. This low transfer rate places California near the bottom number of states nationally in the proportion of its population completing bachelors degrees.

The Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University, and California Community Colleges responded early and quickly to the concerns about transfer raised by the Legislature and the Commission to Review the Master Plan. California faculty share fundamental convictions about the purposes of General Education. General Education should develop students' abilities to think; general education courses should not merely transmit information, but should require analysis, criticism, and

---

\* Of February 29, 1988, amending the proposal of November 12, 1987

synthesis. One of the most effective tools for achieving these goals is the written essay, evaluated with attention to the quality of its writing as well as the accuracy of its content, and, as appropriate, general education courses should require significant amounts of writing. In addition, speaking, listening, and reading are important skills that general education courses should foster. Participation in the intellectual and cultural life of our society requires ability in verbal communication of all kinds.

Courses in the transfer curriculum should be culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach and have a pronounced historical perspective. They should recognize the contributions to knowledge, civilization, and society that have been made by women and members of minority groups.

Similarly, one of the most useful things that students should get from their general education is an understanding of the modes of inquiry that characterize the different areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted, and the validity and implications of the answers obtained.

General education should be intellectually challenging; indeed, it must be to do a responsible job of preparing students for entry into the upper division of our demanding four-year institutions and for full participation in the life of the state. It is equally clear that participation in such a curriculum itself requires adequate preparation. General education builds upon adequate high school preparation, and poor preparation may require students to take remedial courses prior to entry into the transfer curriculum.

Both the State University and the University have a specific American Institutions requirement that is separate from their general education requirements. Completion of the General Education Transfer Curriculum will not satisfy those requirements. Similarly, general education requirements are separate from lower division requirements for the major. Students pursuing majors that require extensive lower division preparation may not find the General Education Transfer Curriculum option to be advantageous.

All courses offered towards satisfaction of the requirements of the General Education Transfer Curriculum must be baccalaureate in level<sup>2</sup> and must be acceptable for transfer among all segments of public postsecondary education. Advanced Placement credit that is considered equivalent to a course accepted for credit towards the Transfer Curriculum should also be acceptable. The following requirements are listed in terms of the number of courses specified for each designated area and the minimum number of semester and quarter units so represented. Coursework in all areas must add up to a minimum of 37 semester or 56 quarter units.<sup>3</sup>

#### Subject Area: English Communication (3 courses; 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units)

The English Communication requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or nine units of lower division courses in English reading and written composition (1 course), oral communication (1 course), and critical thinking (1 course). Each course shall include a substantial amount of written work appropriate to the course content and the discipline in which the course is taught. Courses in this area shall include close analysis of a variety of representative texts.

Instruction approved for fulfillment of the requirement in communication is to be designed to emphasize the content of communication as well as the form and should provide an understanding of the psychological basis and the social significance of communication, including how communication operates in various situations. Applicable course(s) should view communication as the process of human symbolic interaction focusing on the communicative process from the rhetorical perspective: reasoning and advocacy organization, accuracy; the discovery, critical evaluation and reporting of information; reading and listening effectively as well as speaking and writing. This must include active participation and practice in written communication and oral communication.

Instruction in critical thinking is to be designed to achieve an understanding of the relationship of language to logic, which should lead to the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend. The minimal competence to be expected at the successful conclusion of instruction in critical thinking should be the ability to distinguish fact from judgment, and belief from knowledge, to use elementary inductive and deductive processes, and to recognize common logical errors or fallacies of language and thought.

---

<sup>1</sup> A General Education transfer curriculum for high prerequisite majors is under development.

<sup>2</sup> AS-1719-87/AA, "Guidelines for Determining Baccalaureate Level Coursework."

<sup>3</sup> The CSU requirements for nine units of upper division G.E. coursework and for a total of 48 semester units (72 quarter units) in the General Education program are not changed by the transfer curriculum.

Subject Area: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning  
(1 course; 3 semester, 4-5 quarter units)

The Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-semester three-unit course in mathematics or statistics above the level of intermediate algebra, with a stated course prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra.\* Courses on the application of statistics to a single discipline may not be used to fulfill this requirement. An appropriate course in statistics must emphasize the mathematical bases of statistics, probability theory and estimation, application and interpretation, uses and misuses, and the analysis and criticism of statistical arguments in public discourse.

Because knowledge relevant to public and private decision making is expressed frequently in quantitative terms, we are routinely confronted with information requiring quantitative analysis, calculation, and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning is designed to help prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges.

Subject Area: Arts and Humanities  
(at least 3 courses; 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units)

The Arts and Humanities requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least three courses which encourage students to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to develop a historical understanding of major civilizations and cultures, both Western and non-Western, and an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of women and of ethnic and other minorities. In the Arts, students should also learn to develop an independent and critical aesthetic perspective.

At least one course shall be completed in the Arts and one in the Humanities. Within the arts area, performance and studio classes may be credited toward satisfaction of this subject area if their major emphasis is the integration of history, theory, and criticism.

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Our understanding of the world is fundamentally advanced through the study of Western and non-Western philosophy language, literature, and the fine arts. Inclusion of the contributions and perspectives of women and of ethnic and other minorities as part of such study will provide us a more complete and accurate view of the world and will enrich our lives.

Subject Area: Social and Behavioral Sciences  
(at least 3 courses; 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units)

The Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least three courses dealing with individual behavior and with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior in a minimum of two disciplines or in an interdisciplinary sequence. The pattern of coursework completed shall ensure opportunities for students to develop understanding of the perspectives and methods of the social and behavioral sciences. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary, historical, and geographical settings. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to help them gain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of women and of ethnic and other minorities and a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies. The material should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects. Courses used to satisfy the United States History Constitution and American Ideals requirement (Title 5, Section 40404) may not be counted in this area.

Courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences allow students to gain a basic knowledge of the cultural and social organizations in which they exist as well as the behavior and social organizations of other human societies. Each of us is born into, lives, and must function effectively within an environment that includes other individuals. People have, from earliest times, formed social and cultural groups that constitute the framework for the behavior of the individual as well as the group. Inclusion of the contributions and perspectives of women and of ethnic and other minorities as part of such study will provide us a more complete and accurate view of the world and will enrich our lives.

---

\* See the description of "Algebra 2, Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen - 1988, revised February 1988.



Subject Area: Physical and Biological Sciences  
(at least 2 courses; 7-9 semester, 9-12 quarter units)

The Physical and Biological Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least two courses, one of which is in Physical Science and one in Biological Science, at least one of which incorporates a laboratory. Courses must emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic questioning, rather than only the recall of facts. Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.

The contemporary world is influenced by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the relationship of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

(Approved March 1989, as part of AS-1842-89/AA)

# Baccalaureate Credit for Elementary Foreign Language Study

**WHEREAS**The California State University requires applicants for admission either to complete satisfactorily at least two years of high school course work in a (single) foreign language or to demonstrate equivalent competence; and

**WHEREAS**Although the rate of language acquisition is accelerated at the postsecondary setting, the general content and expected outcomes of high school and basic college-level foreign language study are similar, as evidenced through students' performance on common tests of learning and competency; and

**WHEREAS**The Foreign Language Council of the California State University has expressed support for systemwide adoption of a formula which equates one year of high school foreign language study with one semester at the college level; and

**WHEREAS**The ad hoc Advisory Committee on Implementation of the CSU Foreign Language Admission Requirement has recommended that restrictions be applied to the award of baccalaureate credit for foreign language course work equivalent to that completed in high school; and

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University, in recognition of the need to improve articulation between high school and college foreign language curricula has endorsed the Statement on Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen: Phase 1 - French, German, Spanish, which identifies performance criteria applicable equally to high school and college curricula; and

**WHEREAS**Precedent exists to deny the award of baccalaureate credit for CSU courses offered to assist students who do not meet entry-level expectations in subjects for which they received high school course credit (i.e., English and mathematics); therefore be it

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend a systemwide policy which would prohibit the award of baccalaureate credit for college-level foreign language course work equivalent to that already completed in high school; and be it further

**RESOLVED**,That the Academic Senate CSU recommend systemwide policy which equates a minimum of two successful years of high school foreign language study with one year at the college level.

(This resolution, 1849, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1989.)

# Student Outcomes Assessment in the California State University

**WHEREAS**, In November 1987 the Chancellor established an Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment; and

**WHEREAS**, Extensive local campus consultation has indicated general approval and commendation for the committee's August 1989 final draft report; and

**WHEREAS**, The December 1989 final report has been revised in accordance with several of the suggestions made by local campuses; and

**WHEREAS**, The report emphasizes that effective outcomes assessment programs must be faculty developed, multivariate, campus based, and adequately funded; and

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment for its excellent work; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees to endorse the recommendations expressed in the committee's report, "Student Outcomes Assessment in the California State University," as guidelines for assessment policy in the California State University.

(This resolution, 1911, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1990.)

## Final Report

## Student Outcomes Assessment in the California State University

### A Report to the Chancellor

California State University  
Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment  
Office of the Chancellor  
December 1989

#### *Contents*

- Chapter One: CSU Involvement with Student Outcomes Assessment
- Chapter Two: Factors Contributing to Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment
- Chapter Three: Guiding Principles for Assessing Student Outcomes in the CSU
- Chapter Four: Recommendations for a California State University Assessment Policy

#### *Appendices*

- A: Current Assessment Practices in the CSU
- B: Summary of Campus Responses to Survey on AB 2016
- C: Bibliography

### Chapter One: CSU Involvement with Student Outcomes Assessments

In November 1987 Chancellor Reynolds established an Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment and charged its members with: studying student outcomes assessment and advising the Chancellor on policies related thereto; coordinating responses to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in connection with its study of outcomes assessment; and submitting a report and recommendations for directions the CSU should take with regard to outcomes assessment.

This report seeks to:

1. Identify the external and internal factors that contribute to the interest in outcomes assessment;
2. Interpret the implications of emerging assessment programs for the CSU;
3. Summarize important actions and activities related to outcomes assessment that have occurred within the CSU at the system level; and
4. Recommend specific assessment policies, strategies and practices the Committee believes are appropriate and of significant potential benefit to the CSU.

## Definition of Student Outcomes Assessment

A major difficulty in discussing “student outcomes assessment” is the lack of a common definition. It has become, in the words of Terry W. Hartle, “a catch-all phrase that refers to a wide range of efforts to improve educational quality”\*

For all of its vagueness, however, a rapidly expanding inventory of institutional practices and critical studies clearly distinguishes student outcomes assessment from narrower applications of the term “assessment” used prior to the emergence of national discussion in 1985.

For purposes of this report, the Advisory Committee has adopted the definition of student outcomes assessment formulated by Carol M. Boyer and Peter T. Ewell in their analysis of assessment in undergraduate education undertaken for the Education Commission of the States:

Any process of gathering concrete evidence about the impact and functioning of undergraduate education. The term can apply to processes that provide information about individual students, about curricula or programs, about institutions or about entire systems of institutions. The term encompasses a range of procedures including testing, survey methods, performance measures or feedback to individual students, resulting in both quantitative and qualitative information. (Carol M. Boyer and Peter T. Ewell. “State-Based Approaches to Assessment in Undergraduate Education: A Glossary and Selected References.” Denver: Education Commission of the States, March 1988.)

Student outcomes assessment differs from conventional testing practices, program review and accreditation processes in an important respect. It seeks to employ what can be discovered about actual current/former student learning, skills, attitudes, behaviors and opinions—if possible over time—in illuminating and evaluating the effectiveness of the educational programs in helping students achieve the goals and objectives for those programs. Outcomes assessment attempts to provide, whether at the level of the individual course, program or institution, information to answer the question: What do you expect of your students and how do you know if they are meeting your expectations?

## CSU and the Undergraduate Education Reform Movement

The CSU, in cooperation with the California Postsecondary Education Commission, hosted the western regional dissemination conference of the report *Involvement in Learning*, in May 1985. In response to the call for reform and improvement voiced at this conference and to the stream of studies critical of higher education, the CSU Academic Senate undertook a year-long study of undergraduate education in the CSU. That study concluded that the CSU should accord greater priority to research on teaching and learning and recommended establishment of a systemwide Teacher-Scholar Institute.

Through their recommendations on assessment, some national studies, including *Involvement in Learning* and *Integrity in the College Curriculum* conferred instant celebrity on a small number of colleges and universities that had developed programs to evaluate the quality of educational programs by looking at output rather than input measures. During the summer of 1985, Chancellor Hatfield and Academic Senate leaders agreed to investigate the assessment models that were attracting national attention.

## The First CSU Assessment Conference

In consultation with campus administrators and the Academic Senate, “Program Development,” with strong emphasis on the evaluation of outcomes, was adopted as a category for Academic Program Improvement grants in 1986-87. To inform the development of the grant proposals, and to stimulate debate on outcomes assessment by affected campus constituencies, a systemwide conference was held in October 1986. Its primary purpose was to identify the essential characteristics of emerging assessment theories and practices and the contexts out of which they grew. Faculty and administrators associated with state assessment models in Tennessee, New Jersey, Missouri, and Florida discussed the reasons and processes leading to the adoption of these programs, the rationales for the program designs, and the costs and effects of their implementation. The conference proceedings were published in the New Directions for Higher Education series by Jossey-Bass under the title *Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain* (edited and introduced by Diane Halpern).

An informal survey of the campus at the end of the academic year indicated that follow-up activities, ranging from formal reports to the establishment of university assessment committees, had occurred on almost every CSU campus.

---

\* Terry W. Hartle. “The Growing Interest in Measuring and Educational Achievement of College Students” in Clifford Adelman, ed. *Assessing American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Fall 1985), p.4.

## Experimental Assessment Projects

To date, eleven outcomes assessment projects on ten CSU campuses have been supported through grants from the Academic Program Improvement Fund. The directors of the 1986-87 projects were selected to make presentations at the Third National Assessment Conference in Chicago in the summer of 1988. Through their appearance, a California presence was established in what had been a movement dominated largely by eastern institutions. CSU faculty and administrators presented a panel discussion on the development of outcomes assessment policy and programs in the CSU at the 1989 Conference of the American Association of Higher Education. Faculty associated with assessment activities on CSU campuses were on the program of the Fourth National Assessment Conference in June 1989.

## Interest in Sacramento

School reform legislation in the wake of the publication of *Nation at Risk* (1983) had focused the attention of California lawmakers on the conditions of education in the state, and on the performance of its public institutions. The establishment, in 1984, of a Blue Ribbon commission to study the community colleges (SB 2064, Stiern) and to review the California Master Plan for Higher Education (SB 1570, Nielsen) signaled the intent to scrutinize postsecondary education with equal thoroughness.

State legislators' keen interest in the implications of the assessment movement for educational improvement in California became evident in the spring of 1986. In March Assemblyman Tom Hayden, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, published *Beyond the Master Plan: A New Vision for Higher Education in California*, a call for California to adopt features of outcomes assessment programs developed in other states. Since 1986 Assemblyman Hayden has authored several bills proposing the establishment of mandatory outcomes assessment programs. In 1987, Senator Marion Bergeson introduced legislation to require standardized testing of candidates for teaching credentials.

## The Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment

By mid-1987, assessment had become a major educational and public policy issue in California. Conferences on assessment were sponsored by the California Assembly and the California Community Colleges. In the CSU, the Academic Senate devoted a session of its fall retreat to the topic and appointed a former Senate Chair as special advisor on assessment issues. The California State Student Association agendized debates on outcomes assessment over the course of academic year 1987-88 and passed a resolution supporting outcomes assessment in January 1988. CSU faculty and administrators served on a CPEC advisory committee to make recommendations regarding outcomes assessment to the California Legislature. In 1987, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges revised its standards for accreditation to require evidence of program effectiveness in institutional self-studies.

In order to monitor and interpret these developments, and to coordinate CSU responses to them, Chancellor Reynolds appointed an Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment. Its members included representatives from the Academic Senate (3), the California State Student Association (2), campus administration (2), the alumni association (1), and Chancellor's Office staff (2). Since its initial meeting in December 1988, the Committee has completed the tasks described below

### 1. Survey of Campus Views on Assessment

Committee members reviewed the literature on outcomes assessment, deliberated the issues and evidence available to them, and sought to clarify their implications for the CSU. Based on this study and on responses to a survey of campus opinion about the recommendations contained in Assembly Bill 2016 (Code Memorandum APPS 87-31), the Committee drafted a set of Guiding Principles. Chapter Three of this report sketches the considerations that led to their formulation. The Principles were circulated widely among faculty and administrators for review and comment. The statement of principles thus evolved served to guide the Committee in responding to requests for advice from the California Postsecondary Education Commission and in shaping recommendations for system policy on outcomes assessment.

### 2. Response to the Legislature

Supplementary language to the Budget Act of 1987 required the CSU to report to the Legislature progress made "toward adoption and implementation of comprehensive outcomes assessment mechanisms for evaluating student learning, program effectiveness and institutional accomplishment of mission." The Committee provided guidance to Chancellor's staff regarding the content and direction of that report. Included in the response to Budget Language was a summary of current assessment practices in the CSU, included in this report as Attachment A [see page 99].

### 3. Advice to the California Postsecondary Education Commission

The Committee prepared a report to CPEC summarizing campus responses to specific provisions of AB 2016 and urging the Commission to adopt for California the principles recommended by the Committee. The summary of campus input on AB 2016 is included as Attachment B [see page 102]. The CSU Advisory Committee was active in reviewing and commenting on CPEC drafts during the entire period of the CPEC study

#### 4. Consultation with CSU Constituencies

Committee members recognized that the sophistication about assessment acquired by faculty and administrators participating in assessment projects and conferences was not widely shared by CSU faculty. This was seen as a major obstacle to the practical usefulness of any positive recommendations the Committee might make. To probe the receptivity toward outcomes assessment with faculty and administrators whose understanding and acceptance would be determinative in implementing recommendations to develop assessment programs, the Committee assisted in planning and conducting the Second CSU Conference on Assessment (November 1988 at Lake Arrowhead).

The conference revealed that the number of CSU faculty and administrators knowledgeable about assessment and supportive of many of its purposes was larger than the Committee had anticipated. It also confirmed strong negative reaction to assessment on the part of some faculty. The principal objections expressed were: demands to develop and implement outcomes assessment programs would impose unreasonable additional burdens on faculty; information produced through assessment programs would be of little value to faculty; and data could be misused in ways detrimental to individuals, programs or campuses.

In keeping with the view that the Committee's recommendations should be grounded in the realities of institutional life on CSU campuses and build upon widely shared values, the Committee sponsored regional meetings to enable anyone in the CSU who felt strongly about assessment or about the Committee's recommendations about assessment to be heard. Members of the Committee met in April 1989, with students, faculty and administrators on the Humboldt, Sacramento and Fullerton campuses to discuss the draft recommendations. These discussions helped to determine the form, content, and recommendations of this report.

### Chapter Two: Factors Contributing to Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment

A variety of factors have contributed to the growth of interest in assessment. The following statements by leaders outside and inside the academy illustrate the major concerns behind the call for alternative means to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs and institutions. The Committee interprets these statements to be a recognition of changing circumstances and evolving priorities, rather than criticisms of the contributions or dedication of individual faculty members.

#### Integrity of the Baccalaureate Degree

*By failing to articulate the shared objectives of a liberal education or to discuss how they are related to individual courses in the curriculum, faculties can easily lose sight of their common purposes. In such an atmosphere, important aims acknowledged by all, such as the ability to communicate precisely or to reason carefully, remain the responsibility of no one.* (Derek Bok, *Higher Learning*, 1986)

*The major in most colleges is little more than a gathering of courses taken in one department, lacking structure and depth... or emphasizing content to the neglect of the essential style of inquiry on which the content is based.... Another victim of this posture of irresponsibility is the general education of the American college undergraduate, the institutional course requirements outside the major.... They lack a rationale and cohesion.... It is as if no one cared, so long as the store stays open.* (Arnold B. Arons, Ernest L. Boyer et al. *Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees: Integrity in the College Curriculum*, 1985)

Many factors have contributed to the tendency of colleges and universities to place less emphasis on explicit, common educational characteristics for the baccalaureate degree. They include the enormous expansion in the number of institutions and students in American higher education in the postwar period, growing diversity of the student population, rapid shifts in federal and state funding policies and priorities, cultural changes that impact the academic readiness of college bound students and the values supporting their commitment to higher education, increasing suspicion of authority, institutional adjustments to declining enrollment in the seventies, and the evolution of disciplinary research.

These influences have exerted competing pressures on the loyalties and priorities of college and university faculty. The institutional processes that worked to assure integrity of the degree—curriculum approval, personnel review, evaluation of student work—are less effective where faculty hold diverse understandings of the goals and values of the institution and its programs and of how to relate them to a diverse student population with differing goals and values.

#### Improved Means to Evaluate Teaching and Learning

*We must overcome the lazy habit of grading and scoring "on the curve" as a cheap way of setting and upholding standards. Such a practice is unrelated to any agreed-upon intellectual standards and can reveal only where students stand in relation to one another.... It tells us nothing about where they ought to be. Moreover, students are left with only a letter or number—with nothing to learn from.* (Grant Wiggins, Senior Associate, National Center on Education and the Economy, "A True Test: Toward More Authentic and Equitable Assessment" in *Phi Kappa Delta*, May 1989)

*[The development and implementation of student outcomes assessment] has made faculty members teaching in the Interdisciplinary General Educational Program more aware of their interdependence.... The exercise of publicly discussing and putting on paper the outcomes expected of specific courses and the pedagogical strategies that will produce them has nurtured cooperation.... [As a result of the assessment activities,] the end of the quarter is no longer perfunctory; it is an important time to complete connections that have been building over the term.... The outcome of autonomous learning has been reinforced through student outcomes assessment. Experience with assessment has empowered students to do this. (Andrew I. Moss, Professor of English, California State Polytechnic University-Pomona. Third National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, June 1988)*

Research in assessment has led to the emergence of promising new approaches and techniques for analyzing and measuring student learning and other developmental changes associated with higher education. As a result, there are better and better ways for faculty to evaluate the effectiveness of learning and teaching and there are better ways for educational institutions and accrediting agencies to analyze the quality and performance of programs. Thoughtfully developed outcomes assessment programs have demonstrated significant potential for improving communication between faculty and students, enhancing learning and helping faculty and staff reach consensus on changes to improve the quality and performance of programs.

### Global Competitiveness

*There has never been a time in American life, when legislators have believed as firmly that higher education is a central vehicle for dealing with a number of problems critical to the future of the region, state, nation. They want equity and excellence. This is an unprecedented challenge. No other country has attempted to do this. (Frank Newman, President, Education Commission of the States. Third National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, June 1988)*

*Ever yone thinks we in America are number one.... The process of falling behind is only discovered after it's happened, not while it's happening and we're resting on our laurels. (Assemblyman Tom Hayden, dialogue with John Ashcroft moderated by Frank Newman. AAHE National Conference, March 1987)*

State governments fear profound erosion in the quality of life as production moves offshore, imports gain larger shares of the domestic market, and foreign capital exerts greater influence over the national economy. They are looking to colleges and universities to equip graduates with the understandings and skills to meet the technological and managerial challenges connected with the transition to a global economy.

### Declining Educational Achievement

*We are being asked to do a better job with more students who are less well prepared and who will be called upon to do more on the job.... We have more students who are more dependent on the performance of the institution. (Bob McCabe, President, Miami-Dade College. Third National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, Chicago, June 1988)*

The perception has become commonplace that diplomas and degrees from American schools and colleges no longer guarantee possession of basic literacy and numeracy. Critical reports from business, industry, and the military echo news of declining scores on a several indices of educational achievement: e.g., college aptitude tests, professional and graduate school admission tests, teacher credential tests, and international comparisons of abilities in math, science and geography. At the elementary and secondary level, this has led to the imposition of mandatory testing programs. In the absence of more appropriate methods, some states have imposed similarly draconian measures on colleges and universities.

### Demographic Changes in American Society

*It is not true that access causes a decline in the quality of higher education. However, access without quality is a cruel deception, while quality without access is a betrayal of the cherished American ideal of equal opportunity.... The nation simply cannot afford to sacrifice the next generation of emerging Americans in the name of quality enhancement. (George Deukmejian, Michael Dukakis, John Ashcroft, et al. Task Force on College Quality. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, 1986)*

States are worried about the emergence of a two-tiered society in which a large underclass, defined along racial or ethnic lines, is unprepared for constructive participation in a technological, information-based economy. Maintenance of a stable economic and political environment requires that all segments of society share in its benefits. Formal education is the principal gateway to such participation.

### Changing Views of Educational Quality

The chief challenge facing higher education is not just the need to improve public understanding of the academy. The academy must want to perform better in substantive matters in order to serve the public.

interest more effectively. This can best be undertaken by building bridges between our colleges and universities and the enormous problems that face American society and the workforce. (Gary H. Quehl, President, Council for Advancement and Support of Education. "Higher Education and the Public Interest" in *Academe*, September-October 1988)

*The capacity for higher education to be a positive change agent in American society will depend upon our ability to transcend our institutional egos, our narcissism, and our self-interest, and to concern ourselves more directly with the impact we are having on our students and communities.* (Alexander Astin, Director, Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA Graduate School of Education. Third National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, June 1988)

As state governments increasingly recognize the close links between the university and the economic and social well being of their states/regions, they look at the performance of public universities in a changing light. Criticism of the "reputational" or "resource" notions of educational excellence, as distinct from the "outcomes" or "talent development" model, has found a positive reception from public policy makers. The call to measure the contributions of an institution by how much and how well its students are learning and how the college experience is affecting their values and attitudes, speaks directly to the concerns of state governments.

### Rising Costs

*We need not just more money for higher education, we need more education for the money.* (John Ashcroft, Governor of Missouri, Chairman, Task Force on College Quality National Governors' Association. *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*, 1986)

In recent years the cost of a college degree has risen at a rate higher than the index of inflation. Nationally, this is occurring at a time of dwindling federal resources. In California, the Gann Limit has capped state spending in the face of increased demand for services. The effects of this policy will be exacerbated by the implementation of Proposition 98. State government must determine what share of fixed resources shall be allocated to meet diverse social needs. Elected officials are forced to make painful choices and they want clear, comprehensible evidence of institutional effectiveness upon which to base their decisions.

### Accountability

*Each campus should assess whether the receipt of a baccalaureate degree signifies the acquisition of a core of knowledge, along with the development of abilities to use that knowledge effectively. . . . A more rigorous undergraduate program will require high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools to do a better job of preparing students to perform college level work.* (George Deukmejian, Michael Dukakis, John Ashcroft, et al., Task Force on College Quality *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*, 1986)

*Without constant attempts to redefine and reassert publicly their nature and purpose, universities become frozen in internal mythology, in a complacent self-perpetuation. . . . When they are not challenged within themselves to justify themselves, to themselves as well as to the society they serve; when they are not. . . constantly urged to examine their presuppositions, their processes and acts, they stiffen up and lose their evolving complementarity to other American institutions.* (A. Bartlett Giamatti, former President of Yale University *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University* as excerpted in the Opinion section of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 9 November 1988.)

*What's relevant is that an institution that has as its primary mission research, scholarship, investigation, and inquiry knows so little about itself. . . . Higher education is a black box. You go in, and come out the other side. You don't know what happened in it. . . . What we're trying to communicate in California is an urgency. We have a breakdown of the K-12 system. We have a crisis in minority enrollment. Just because we're [talking about assessment] doesn't mean that we want to impose something; we want to invite the leadership of academic institutions to help create the future leadership of the country.* (Assemblyman Tom Hayden, dialogue with John Ashcroft moderated by Frank Newman. AAHE National Conference, March 1987)

*We have a responsibility to communicate to the public how well we're doing, regardless of whether we are mandated to do so. . . . It's clear from our behavior that we think we know what students should know. It's not credible to declare that we do not. We cannot face the public schools and say: "We produce 70% of your teachers, but we can't certify their competence." If we are to hold up our end of the commitment to improve public education, we must press forward with student outcomes assessment regardless of how primitive these efforts may be. We cannot take the position that we're so perfect that we can't improve our own teaching.* (Vice Chancellor Lee R. Kerschner 1988 CSU Systemwide Conference on Student Outcomes Assessment, November 1988)

Elected representatives and governing boards have the right and responsibility to receive timely, accurate and useful information about the performance and effectiveness of institutions supported through taxation. Traditional modes of communicating such information do not report the outcomes of student



enrollment at colleges and universities in terms related to the goals and objectives of the respective institutions educational programs. Where this does occur it is usually unsystematic and anecdotal.

## **Actions of Governmental and Professional Agencies**

### ***At the Federal Level***

Government response to these pressures identified above has been a vigorous call for reform of undergraduate education and a much expanded role for evaluation. The following ten states have adopted mandatory outcomes assessment programs at the postsecondary level: Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Missouri, New Jersey, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Other states, including California, have asked coordinating boards to study assessment and advise them about the desirability of imposing similar requirements. At least one state system, the State University of New York, is moving toward implementation of assessment programs for instructional improvement in the absence of a state mandate.

Most states, including California, have instituted mandatory testing for prospective teachers. Efforts to develop a national teachers exam are under way. The National Governors' Association has made strong recommendations regarding state government's need to fix accountability for educational quality. The Education Commission of the States and virtually every national professional organization in higher education have devoted major conferences to assessment.

The U.S. Department of Education has responded to these pressures by revising the "Secretary's Procedures and Criteria for Recognition of Accrediting Agencies"—guidelines affecting the distribution of federal funds to postsecondary institutions—to require student outcomes assessment. Section 602.17 contains the following new guideline for determining whether accrediting agencies are making a satisfactory effort to evaluate the educational effectiveness of postsecondary institutions or programs:

- Determining that institutions or programs document the educational achievements of their students . . . in verifiable and consistent ways, such as evaluation of senior theses, reviews of student portfolios, general educational assessments (e.g., standardized test results, graduate or professional school test results, or graduate or professional school placements), job placement rates, licensing examinations results, employer evaluations, and other recognized measures;
- Determining the extent to which institutions or programs broadly and accurately publicize . . . the [educational objectives consistent with its mission], the assessment measures described above, the information obtained through those measures;
- Determining the extent to which institutions or programs systematically apply the information obtained through the measures described above . . . toward steps to foster enhanced student achievement...

### ***At the Regional Level***

In its January 1988 *Handbook of Accreditation* , the Western Association of Schools and Colleges incorporates revisions requiring the collection and reporting of outcomes assessment information.

- Standard 2.C requires each institution to demonstrate that it has "developed the means for evaluating how well, and in what ways, it is accomplishing its purposes as the basis for broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation." Included among the suggested procedures and measures used to evaluate instructional programs are: changes in students' academic achievement; peer evaluation of educational programs, structured interviews with students and graduates; changes in students' values; pre- and post-testing of students; surveys of students, graduates and employers; student scores on standardized or locally constructed examinations; performance of graduates as indicated by measures appropriate to the field of the major

Standard 4.A requires universities to specify clearly for each field of study the: "subject matter to be covered, the intellectual skills and learning methods to be acquired, and the affective and creative capabilities to be developed." They must also demonstrate that efforts are undertaken to develop and implement ways to measure the educational effectiveness" of academic programs.

### ***At the State Level — The Legislature***

The California Legislature has, to date, enacted four pieces of legislation directly related to student outcomes assessment:

- Assembly Concurrent Resolution 141 (Hayden 1986) required the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to develop, in consultation with representatives of the public postsecondary systems, recommendations regarding "talent development, value-added, and performance-based budgeting approaches to measuring and improving the quality of education in California."

- The Budget Act of 1987 incorporated language of intent requiring The California State University to report progress made toward adoption and implementation of "comprehensive assessment mechanisms for evaluating student learning, program effectiveness and institutional accomplishment of mission."
- Assembly Bill 2016 (Hayden 1987) directed CPEC to develop and present options for measuring and implementing talent development or value added approaches to higher education and for an incentive funding approach designed to develop appropriate methods of assessing the teaching and learning process.
- Senate Bill 148 (Bergeson 1987) directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to adopt new standards and requirements for earning a teaching credential. Central to the new credentialing process is a shift from program approval to comprehensive assessments of individual candidates as the basis for granting credentials.

In its final report, *California Faces... California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy* (March 1989), the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education recommends the funding and initiation of three kinds of assessment programs:

- An intersegmental assessment project, developed under the aegis of CPEC, aimed at increasing: the numbers of currently underrepresented minority students, the retention rates of all postsecondary students, and the number of women and minority faculty in regular appointments.
- A comprehensive "Student Tracking System," under CPEC direction, to collect data from all California postsecondary students.
- Campus-based student outcomes assessment programs, developed by the faculty of each public college and university to understand the "cognitive and substantive development of students."

#### The California Postsecondary Education Commission

The California Postsecondary Education Commission prepared two assessment-related studies in response to Legislative requests. *Funding Excellence in California Higher Education* (March 1987) clarifies terminology outlines several model programs, and formulates six guiding principles which should guide state policy development in assessment. The second study, *Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Changing Student Population* (approved December 1988), describes current assessment practices in California, discusses value added/talent-development assessment methods, and recommends that the Legislature establish a California challenge grant program "to support initiatives for improving teaching and learning in higher education, including the development of institutional assessment plans."

#### Chapter Three: Guiding Principles for Assessing Student Outcomes in the CSU

This chapter describes the reasons for adoption of twelve principles that guided the Committee in responding to external agencies and proposing recommendations for CSU policy on outcomes assessment.

#### Assessment and Diversity: For What Purposes Should Assessment Be Done?

Many of the pressures for assessment arise from a concern that the baccalaureate degree has lost any common meaning. In attempting to address this concern, Universities run the risk of creating a different problem: they may damage that academic diversity that makes individual faculty and institutions unique and causes knowledge to advance. The balance between common standards and beneficial academic diversity is delicate and easily distorted.

There is indeed evidence to support the concern about lack of common meaning in the bachelordegree and in all its components: general education, basic skills, the major. These criticisms, often carefully researched, have been brought to the attention of the academy by respected members of its ranks in responsible and constructive forms. The rigorous self-examination called for in such analyses as *Involvement in Learning and Integrity in the College Curriculum* cannot be ignored. It would be ironic, however, if the California State University were to respond to these legitimate demands by adopting the strategies of other states which have sought to remedy basic skills deficiencies by imposing large scale programs and examinations that standardized the content and sequence of instruction at the cost of that academic diversity that other nations have long envied and sought to emulate. For one thing, The California State University has already implemented reforms in writing, mathematics, and general education. For another, the arguments for academic diversity are valid.

The values and traditions represented in the community of America's 3,000 postsecondary institutions reflect the pluralism of American society. The faculties of these institutions are geographically dispersed, free from the centralizing influence of a national ministry, responsive to the manifold interests and needs

of the communities in which they are located, stimulated by association with colleagues in independent disciplinary societies, and governed by boards representative of a broad range of constituencies. These circumstances, and a widely shared belief in the value of academic freedom, have enabled American faculty to pursue and transmit knowledge as each individual sees fit.

Each faculty member brings to the classroom a unique collection of diverse knowledge, views, and interests. Courses of the same name may resemble each other only in some respects, depending on the instructor. Students completing a major in a specific field will possess some knowledge in common with other students completing that major; there will assuredly be much knowledge they do not have in common, however, owing to their experience with a different faculty. This intellectual and programmatic diversity is the particular strength of American higher education. And it is this diversity that faculty believe is threatened by centrally developed and administered assessment programs.

Measurement of students' performance against specific criteria or norms tends to standardize and homogenize student learning. If institutions are rated, punished or rewarded on the basis of specific indicators of student learning, they will make whatever adjustments are necessary to meet the performance expectations measured by those indicators. This may be all to the good when the goal is to increase student competency in mathematics or writing, but it is enormously destructive of the innovation that occurs in academic disciplines when individual faculty strive to question or expand the frontiers of their disciplines and push their students to do likewise.

Assessment programs can be designed to provide evidence of students' progress toward meeting the educational goals of programs and institutions while preserving and nurturing academic diversity. The growing literature on assessment provides outstanding examples of programs incorporating thoughtful approaches and yielding information which can improve teaching and learning. Such approaches are consistent with the ethos of the academy where the process of collecting evidence and reflecting on its meaning is a habit of mind and a principal strategy of academicians. Because of its concern that inappropriate models be avoided but that the benefits of assessment be available to CSU campuses, the Advisory Committee adopted the following principles:

- The only legitimate purpose of assessing student outcomes is to improve teaching, learning and academic advising at the individual, course, program, and/or institutional level. Data from outcomes assessment programs will not be used for cross-campus rankings or comparisons of individual faculty
- Unique assessment models, tied to a multiplicity of goals represented by the different institutions and incorporating the principles adopted by the Committee, are appropriate to the CSU.

#### **Assessment and Complexity: What Should Be Assessed?**

The most important outcomes of higher education are difficult to assess in reliable and affordable ways. Just as teaching at its most inspired is as much art as science, drawing upon and stimulating the creative as well as analytic resources of the mind, so can the university experience as a whole be infinitely more than the sum of its separate courses and requirements. Among the most compelling arguments for the value of higher education is its potential to inculcate disciplined curiosity, tolerance, ethical commitment and self-esteem qualities that do not lend themselves to affordable assessment.

Valid assessment using standardized instruments is possible in some areas. Basic skills in writing, computation and reasoning can be (and are) evaluated appropriately and economically using standardized tests.

In the major field, tests of students' knowledge fail to identify strengths and weaknesses in such important dimensions as reactivity, enthusiasm, adaptability and perseverance, and are inadequate as indicators of how well institutions are preparing students to continue study or begin their careers. Obtain reasonably complete and valid measures of progress toward the goals of the major. A variety of outcomes have to be assessed through a variety of modes. Measures of student achievement in the absence of contextual information are of little use for improving teaching and learning.

Although concern about students' general intellectual development has motivated several states to require its assessment, there are no generally accepted methods to measure it effectively. Evidence suggests that programs or instruments designed to measure comprehensive knowledge or intellectual growth apart from a particular curriculum in fact produce results more indicative of students' natural abilities or socioeconomic backgrounds.

In view of the complex nature of the most important outcomes of higher education and of the strong influence of the variables that contribute to it, the Advisory Committee adopted the following principles:

- Meaningful outcomes assessment must be multivariate if it is to provide valid information to campuses for their use in improving academic programs and modifying institutional practices and for evaluating their effectiveness. Standardized tests provide specific but limited kinds of information.

- Campuses need to consider as part of an assessment program, student characteristics and academic program variables that affect student learning. Where these variables can be monitored using systemwide databases, applicable data should be provided to the academic departments.
- A full student outcomes assessment program will take into consideration such factors as: academic advising, counseling and career planning, laboratories, libraries, housing, financial aid services, extracurricular activities, health services, campus social life and the quality and quantity of student contact with faculty

### Responsibility for Assessment: Who Should Assess?

Student outcomes assessment programs are based on two major premises: (1) Changes that occur during students' formal education are attributable in some part to the institution(s) they attend, and in particular to the academic and support programs with which they are associated. (2) It is possible to obtain global measures of important outcomes—e.g., cognitive development, skills acquisition, attitudinal changes, values clarification—and to link them to institutional factors. Aggregate measures of what students actually know, believe, and do, provide information for analyzing the effects of programs and planning for changes to improve them.

To be useful, assessment programs require personal and institutional responsiveness to the information generated. If the evidence produced through an assessment program is perceived to be peripheral to the interests and efforts of the faculty, the students or the campus administration, it will not command their respect or attention. In some mandated assessment programs, employment of standardized tests selected and developed by persons outside the institution has led to changes that were unintended and contrary to the broader concerns underlying the programs' adoption. The motives of outside agencies were perceived as anti-intellectual. Stimulation of campus dialogue about institutional excellence and improvement and the means to attain it were not reported as outcomes of this approach.

To contribute significantly to the quality of educational programs in the CSU, outcomes assessment programs must be designed to measure those educational dimensions identified by the faculty, students and the administration as most important. The university is a collection of rich cultures, each of which must be served by an outcomes assessment policy.

Persuaded by examples of both beneficial and injurious assessment plans, and mindful of the need to place any new tools for improving educational programs in the hands of those responsible for them, the Advisory Committee adopted the following principles:

- Programs to assess student outcomes should be campus-based, faculty centered, and student-responsive.
- Faculty of the individual campuses have the primary responsibility for deciding how to assess student learning. This extends to the design or selection and administration of assessment methods, the interpretation of the results, and how the data will be used to improve programs.
- Consistent with the principle of institutional responsibility, the resources appropriated for assessment should support the development and operation of programs at the campus level. System and State efforts should be directed to helping campuses devise assessment programs. For this reason, the CSU opposes creation of a centrally administered State assessment program.
- Data collected through institutional assessment programs should be governed by recognized codes of ethics treating research with human subjects.

### The Priority of Assessment: At What Cost Should Assessment Be Done?

Higher education in America serves a multitude of social and personal purposes. Public universities in particular are seen as the vehicle for accomplishing an enormous range of services critical to the well being of the community, region, state and nation. These expectations translate into competing demands upon postsecondary institutions and upon their primary resource, the faculty.

CSU faculty are expected to perform a variety of tasks. Chief among these is their obligation to teach effectively. The tasks associated with effective teaching are multiplying as discoveries resulting from research on teaching and learning are applied in the classroom. Examples of these necessary but time-consuming activities to improve instruction include: added time for academic advising; one-to-one student contacts in recognition of the benefits of direct interaction in improving the achievement and persistence of students; and the integration of technologies into the discipline as a means of promoting student learning. Because there is evidence of program improvement when faculty spend time in evaluating programs with which they are associated, the CSU now requires faculty to devote time to this end. The use of assessment to promote learning and assist in evaluating program effectiveness is another recent result of research on effective practices.

Each of these important instructional tasks requires time investments on the part of faculty who are conscientious about being effective teachers. It is unrealistic to expect faculty to assume these additional responsibilities—often as pioneers on behalf of their colleagues—without some relief from other obligations. In other words, engagement in outcomes assessment represents a cost in terms of faculty workload. There are also opportunity costs at the institutional level. For example, time and resources spent on assessment might prevent investigation of other variables associated with institutional excellence. Class size represents another dimension of the cost-benefit equation. Some of the most effective approaches to assessment (oral presentations, portfolios, field experiences, written essays) require small class size as a means of improving the quality and quantity of student interaction with faculty. The decision to pursue any of these priorities must be based upon a careful evaluation of the costs and the foregone opportunities to pursue other means of improving institutional effectiveness. To assure consideration of these factors, the Advisory Committee adopted the following principles:

- Student outcomes assessment, when appropriately carried out, is just one of several institutional practices that must exist in order to achieve educational excellence. Student outcomes assessment should be linked with the academic program review process presently mandated by the CSU Board of Trustees.
- While the evaluation of student learning is a regular faculty responsibility, implementation of comprehensive assessment programs will add significantly to faculty workload and will be costly. These costs must not be borne directly by students. Supplemental funding is essential to the development and operation of effective assessment programs. In the absence of adequate support, program implementation must be limited.
- Before substantial resources are requested for or invested in, comprehensive assessment programs, it must be established that they provide effective means to improve the quality of educational programs. Because of their high cost and the need to evaluate their effectiveness, assessment programs should be implemented experimentally and incrementally within the CSU. It should be noted that assessment has the potential of identifying problems in educational programs that require additional resources for solution.

The “assessment movement,” as it came into being in the mid-eighties, is the offspring of parents from very different cultures: one, native to the academy, concerned primarily with being the best possible alma mater; the other from beyond the walls, worried that the baccalaureates the academy sends forth are inadequately prepared to meet the challenges they must surmount for the good of all. In the effort to increase accountability, the latter discovered the former and recognized immediately their common interest in quality.

Given their disparate histories, customs and languages, it is not surprising that the associates of each view the new alliance with suspicion. The relationship is tense. Mutual commitment to quality has kept them together; disputes over how to define and measure it often divide them. To achieve their respective goals, each must understand and respect the other's motives and work diligently to help the other comprehend the complexity and implications of actions taken or contemplated.

There are inherent antagonisms between the notion of simple indices of performance and the goals of higher education. To attain the one, the other must be sacrificed. That is not to say, however, that educational quality cannot or should not be measured, or that its goals must be compromised in order to communicate them. The natural links between assessment and the values of the academy need to be reaffirmed in a more public context and internalized within the academy. The values of diversity and complexity need to be asserted and effectively communicated beyond the academy.

After lengthy study and discussion about the benefits and risks of student outcomes assessment, the Committee concluded that: (1) student outcomes assessment programs, of the kind recommended in this report, have significant potential for improving teaching and learning; (2) the CSU cannot afford to ignore educational practices, and strategies, including student outcomes assessment, that show great promise for the improvement of teaching and learning; and (3) where they have been demonstrated to be effective, it is the responsibility of CSU faculty and administrators to adopt them as appropriate to the classroom, the discipline, and the campus.

#### Chapter Four: Recommendations for a California State University Assessment Policy

The following recommendations seek to balance the need for competent assessment with the need to preserve diversity, complexity and faculty responsibility for the quality of academic programs. The recommendations are organized around four major goals: improving teaching and learning, improving assessment, improving communication with students, and obtaining support for assessment. They recommend integrative assessment practices at the level of the individual student or faculty member, program or department, campus and system.

## Assessment for Improving Teaching and Learning

### *At the Level of the Individual Student or Faculty Member*

1. Faculty should design evaluations of student performance in their courses to include elements that assess students' achievement in terms of the academic goals of departments and programs.

Tests given in classes typically measure how well students have met specific course objectives. They are used, often in combination with evaluations of other dimensions of student performance, for purposes of assigning a final grade in a course. The results of tests and other assignments provide information essential for analyzing the effectiveness of instruction. If evaluations are devised to include them, results can also indicate how well students are acquiring the mastery of content, skills and attitudes expected of prospective graduates in the particular field of study. By carefully embedding measurements of specific programmatic outcomes in appropriate courses, faculty can evaluate students' progress toward attainment of the broader goals of the discipline or program without burdening students themselves with additional assessment requirements.

### *At the Level of the Department or Program*

2. The faculty of each department or program should have ways of evaluating student attainment in the major that go beyond the evidence provided by course grades.

Although the CSU professes knowledge of the discipline to be important, current practices do not generally assess to what extent students acquire it. Students often complain of a bewildering mosaic of demands and of the lack of opportunity to discover the patterns which lend coherence and meaning to them. The relationship of courses to major programs and to general curricular goals and such learned abilities as effective written and oral communication and critical thinking remains unclear and unarticulated. One way of assessing such attainment is to require, in individual majors, a curricular component which calls upon students to integrate general and specialized learning and to demonstrate comprehensive understanding of the field of study appropriate to the degree level. This component could be designed to help students approach their academic experience from a unifying and creative perspective and to permit faculty to observe and monitor the effectiveness of departmental programs.

In assessing comprehensive knowledge of the discipline, faculty may wish to consider: presentations requiring synthesis and integration; senior projects requiring research, scholarship or creative activities appropriate to the discipline; portfolio development; integrative studies and field experiences; simulations and case studies requiring attention to the ethical, historical and philosophical foundations of the disciplines.

### *At the Campus Level*

3. The faculty of each CSU campus should have mechanisms to assess how well students are meeting the goals of the General Education program of the university

The General Education program is central to the quality of all CSU undergraduate degree programs. Responsibility for realizing its educational goals, however, is divided among many different academic constituencies, including the California Community Colleges. For these reasons, there is a need for mechanisms to assess students' progress toward attaining General Education objectives as defined in Executive Order 338 and in the General Education Transfer Curriculum. Information obtained from these assessments should be systematically utilized in periodic reviews of campus General Education programs and in evaluating the preparation of transfer students who have completed CSU General Education requirements in whole or in part at other institutions.

4. Faculty students and academic administrators should work together to develop a campus plan for coordinating and supporting outcomes assessment activities which examine the interaction between academic programs, student services, and the campus environment.

In *California Faces...California's Future*, the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education calls for "campus-based student outcomes assessment intended to understand both the cognitive and substantive development of students, as well as their opinions concerning their educational experience" and suggests that such programs include "a wide range of issues (quality of instruction, campus housing, effectiveness of student services)." Accreditation standards of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges now require each postsecondary institution to "measure the educational effectiveness of programs" as one means of demonstrating that it has developed procedures for "evaluating how well, and in what ways, it is accomplishing its purposes." Student outcomes assessment programs can meet these expectations if they are developed around the goals of each campus and with the participation of the constituencies whose contributions are to be evaluated.

### *At the System Level*

5. The CSU should seek to restrict the proliferation of new standardized tests, encouraging instead the development and use of approaches to assessment that address programmatic needs and curricular goals.

One major consequence of educational reform in California has been the adoption of an increasing number of tests as prerequisites for students to complete and progress beyond specific educational levels. While each new testing requirement was conceived and implemented to address important concerns, the cumulative effect is to burden students with a series of isolated, often duplicative testing requirements, each of which harbors the potential for driving curricular development and instructional practices in divergent directions. The CSU should work toward the adoption of integrative assessment programs which reduce the number of tests demanded of students while making the results of each useful for multiple purposes. Such an approach is particularly desirable in the assessment of entry-level skills for purposes of academic advisement and placement, and in determining the readiness of students to enter postbaccalaureate professional programs.

### **Research for Improving Assessment**

#### *At the Level of the Individual Student or Faculty Member*

6. Each CSU faculty member should review current student evaluation practices for possible improvement in light of evolving research on teaching and learning.

Teaching is the primary mission of The California State University and assessment is integral to the teaching and learning process. Research on cognition, motivation and performance assessment is growing and becoming more sophisticated. This literature is important to the CSU in meeting its primary mission of providing quality instruction for an increasingly diverse student population. CSU faculty would benefit by having access to the findings of assessment research, thereby enhancing their understanding of the uses and limitations of various modes of instruction and evaluation. Better, not necessarily more, assessment should be the goal.

#### *At the Level of the Department or Program*

7. CSU campuses should encourage some faculty in each academic department to engage in assessment research related to teaching and learning.

Most departments do not have, among the faculty, experts in evaluation and assessment. One means for departments to acquire such resident expertise is to encourage faculty to pursue scholarly activities related to instruction. Engagement in student outcomes assessment is consistent with the teaching and the research responsibilities of CSU faculty; it represents the application of the principles of scholarly inquiry to the teaching-learning process and to other environmental factors that directly or indirectly contribute to the effectiveness of educational programs. While the object of such research may represent a new direction for many faculty, the rationale and methodology for pursuing such study are grounded in and supportive of the values and traditions of the disciplines.

#### *At the Campus Level*

8. Academic and research administrators in the departments and schools should actively assist faculty to secure resources to engage in the development of, and research on, assessment related to teaching and learning.

Progress toward the development and adoption of assessment approaches depends in part upon the availability of supplementary resources to fund professional and curricular development activities. Prior to the receipt of specific funding for this purpose, departments should consider utilizing resources that may be temporarily targeted toward the creation of assessment programs. Possible sources of support for assessment activities include lottery and professional development funds, systemwide grant programs, state and federal grant programs, and assigned time.

#### *At the System Level:*

9. The Office of the Chancellor should assist campuses in establishing new outcomes assessment programs and in improving current assessment practices through the dissemination of information about assessment methodology and research.

The process of building consensus on policies and practices for measuring program effectiveness includes providing access to information and expertise in its interpretation. The Office of the Chancellor should support campus efforts to acquire and exchange information about assessment through systemwide programs. The Institute for Teaching and Learning is the logical sponsor for a variety of assessment related activities including: systemwide and/or regional (tele)conferences, workshops, research projects. Other programs that may be appropriate include: Academic Program Improvement, the Lytton Revenue Program, and the Teacher-Scholar Summer Institute.

## Assessment for Improving Communication with and About Students

### *At the Level of the Individual Student or Faculty Member*

10. Students should receive the results of assessments of their performance in a timely fashion, with adequate information to permit accurate interpretation.

Students are entitled to know and understand the results of any measurement of their academic performance. The results of examinations and tests need to be interpreted to students to guide their future efforts. The pertinence of particular tests to the broader goals of courses or programs, and of performance on these measurements as an indicator of progress toward meeting the expectations of the program, must be made clear.

The CSU has a very diverse student population. There is a need for faculty to recognize that the way they convey evaluative information to students can be conducive to learning or it can be very harmful to learning, depending on individual student characteristics. Faculty should discuss test results in class and advise individual students regarding their progress, with awareness of and sensitivity to the complex relationships between testing and personal variables, and the impact of this interaction on individual students.

### *At the Level of the Department or Program*

11. Each academic department should utilize information about how well students are meeting overarching program goals to (a) advise students at key points in the major and (b) analyze and improve the effectiveness of academic programs.

The fragmentary character of students' educational experience is often mirrored by faculty's fragmentary understanding of students' educational development. Departments and programs should ensure that faculty evaluations of students' performance yield information to assess the extent to which students are making acceptable academic progress. The availability of such evidence will enable faculty to discharge, more effectively their individual responsibilities as academic advisors and their collective responsibility for recommending students for degrees. This information will also be useful in understanding the effectiveness of program components and in evaluating changes introduced to improve them.

### *At the Campus Level*

12. The administration of each CSU campus should assist academic departments in (a) collecting, analyzing and reporting information about current and former students' characteristics, development and attainment of degree and program goals, (b) better utilizing data currently collected by the campus, and (c) incorporating these outcome measures in academic program review.

Assessment of student learning in the major and General Education, and of other programs and services to support students' progress toward degree completion, can produce new information for analyzing and improving institutional performance. Its value is limited, however, if not accompanied by an understanding of student characteristics and opinions and how these relate to general institutional patterns, particularly over time. Campuses regularly collect demographic and institutional data that could help provide such a context, but often do not make it available in formats useful for evaluating the impact and quality of specific programs. Campus offices involved in gathering and utilizing relevant data, including alumni associations, should work with academic departments and students to identify and provide important information currently not available for this purpose.

### *At the System Level*

13. The Office of the Chancellor should assist campuses in acquiring data in a format useful to departments in their self-analyses.

Survey information is essential to understanding the impact of educational institutions on the lives of students who attend them. The usefulness of such information is enormously increased when data are scientifically and systematically collected over time and with attention to demographic characteristics. Presently surveys of current and former students are undertaken at various levels for various purposes and with varying degrees of sophistication. At the department level, opinion surveys are typically conducted in connection with self-studies for program review and accreditation.

Campus alumni associations regularly seek information about former students for the specific purposes of the associations. Two systemwide surveys are periodically done to provide aggregate information about CSU students.

In the interest of greater efficiency and of making high quality data available to all campuses and departments, the Office of the Chancellor should work with the campuses to develop and administer surveys to produce data to meet the needs identified in these recommendations. Custody of data so



generated should be the responsibility of the unit of analysis; e.g., data pertaining to departments are returned to the respective departments, campus data to the respective campus. Use of the data by persons or offices external to the unit of analysis should be at the discretion of the unit. Where such use is approved, anonymity of the data should be safe.

#### System Support for Assessment

14. Developing and implementing campus-based student outcomes assessment programs of the integrative nature proposed in these recommendations is costly. The Office of the Chancellor should work with CSU campuses, the Academic Senate, and educational constituencies outside the CSU to acquire adequate resources for this purpose above and beyond the funding for current programs.

The successful acquisition of resources for assessment requires a prior consensus that assessment programs will serve important educational goals. The process of building consensus on policies and practices for measuring program effectiveness demands committed leadership, access to information and expertise in its interpretation, and the ability to release faculty temporarily from regular workload obligations to devote adequate time and effort to this purpose. Implementation of programs will require additional fiscal support for faculty development activities, planning and coordination, instrument design and administration, analysis and publication.

Successful operation of comprehensive institutional assessment programs is ultimately dependent upon reliable, predictable funding of the kind provided through an augmentation of the budget for instruction. A major purpose of the "Challenge Grants," as proposed in the CPEC study *Beyond Assessment: Enhancing the Learning and Development of California's Diverse Students*, is to provide multiple-year funding to campuses for establishing student outcomes assessment programs. The Office of the Chancellor should seek legislative adoption of the recommendations of this CPEC study as one source of fiscal support for developing and implementing assessment programs on CSU campuses.

#### Adoption of Assessment Policy Framework

15. The Board of Trustees of The California State University should: (a) adopt the *Statement of Guiding Principles for CSU Policy on Student Outcomes Assessment* as the framework for developing outcomes assessment programs; (b) adopt the recommendations contained in this report; (c) recognize that the adoption of these recommendations will require additional resources and support the Office of the Chancellor in building a level of consensus regarding the priority of assessment adequate to pursue successfully the acquisition of budgetary resources to implement these recommendations.

## Appendix A: Current Assessment Practices in the California State University

### Excerpt from a Report to the Legislature on California State University Progress in Developing and Implementing Comprehensive Student Outcomes Assessment in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1987-88 Budget Act

#### Report of the Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment

##### Current Assessment Practices in the CSU

The following inventory of established CSU programs is limited to systemwide assessment programs and practices. It does not include a discussion of traditional faculty grading practices, the most basic and important means for evaluating students' educational progress and attainment, or assessment programs and activities existing or being piloted on the nineteen campuses.

##### Evaluation of Student Performance and Development

###### *The English Placement Test (EPT)*

In May 1976, the Board of Trustees, recognizing the need for greater attention to the problem of student writing skills, approved the establishment of a systemwide writing proficiency and diagnostic examination for entering lower-division students. The policy authorized support for developmental writing programs to remediate the writing competency of underprepared students. It also fixed responsibility for oversight and periodic evaluation and reporting.

Since its first administration in September 1977, the English Placement Test has been taken by approximately 350,000 students. Its effectiveness in meeting policy goals was the subject of a major evaluation undertaken with the aid of external consultants during academic year 1985/86. After reviewing considerable amounts of information and data connected with this complex program, the EPT Evaluation Committee found that:

- The EPT is a valid instrument for the measurement of the writing skills of entering students and for placement in appropriate composition courses;
- Study data suggest a positive relationship between success in writing skills and persistence at the University;
- The clearer identification of student needs and abilities made evident through the testing program has, on various campuses, led to curricular revisions, given direction to faculty research interests and prompted the establishment of supplemental assessment programs. (Report of the English Placement Test Evaluation Committee, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, December 1986)

#### ***The Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)***

The Writing Skills policy approved by the Board of Trustees in 1976 included a provision that all students demonstrate writing competency as a requirement for graduation and as a prerequisite to classified standing in graduate programs. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Student Writing Skills, the task group charged with implementing the new policy, recommended against development of a common systemwide examination along the lines of the Placement Test. They were persuaded that the purpose of the requirement would be best served by an approach enabling campuses to tailor programs to suit local situations and particular needs of the disciplines/majors.

An evaluation of the implementation of the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement on each CSU campus through academic year 1986-87 was completed in October 1988. While acknowledging and identifying the need to continue efforts to improve it, the evaluator concluded that "the GWAR substantive, fair, rigorous, and appropriate as an upper-division measure of writing proficiency

#### ***The Entry-Level Mathematics Examination (ELM)***

To implement provisions of the new General Education-Breadth Requirements adopted by the Trustees in 1980, the chairs of the mathematics departments of the CSU campuses, with the support of campus administrations and the Academic Senate, recommended that a systemwide policy on entry-level mathematics skills be adopted and that a uniform examination be developed and given on all campuses to evaluate student entry-level skills.

The ELM must be taken and passed by all CSU students prior to enrollment in a course that satisfies the general education requirement in quantitative reasoning. Data collected since the exam was introduced in 1983 indicate that its use has contributed to improving the level of high school preparation for college math and, as a result of greater readiness and better placement, student performance in CSU math classes as well.

Assessment of students' writing and computational skills, as currently exemplified in the English Placement Test and the Elementary-Level Mathematics Examination, has enabled CSU campuses to do a better job of:

- determining the readiness of entering students to do college level work and communicating information on the effectiveness of preparatory programs to high schools;
- placing students in classes appropriate to their individual level of preparation;
- maintaining the quality of curriculum by establishing minimum criteria for baccalaureate-level courses.

#### ***Comprehensive Examinations for Licensure, Certification, or Advanced Study***

Graduates of many CSU degree programs enter fields requiring completion of comprehensive examinations for licensure, certification or registration. Nursing, architecture, marriage and family counseling, and dietetics are examples of areas of employment to which access is controlled by State boards. CSU academic departments preparing students for entry into careers requiring licensure are keenly interested in the performance of their graduates on state examinations. Where resources and policy permit, this information is collected and reported in program review and accreditation studies.

CSU graduates applying for admission to graduate degree programs at other universities are often selected on the basis of their performance on comprehensive examinations of general knowledge and specialized knowledge in their field. Since graduate school acceptance rates are an important indicator of how well local programs are preparing students, some academic departments attempt to track their graduates' progress and include summaries of the information in self-studies.

### ***Systemwide Surveys of Current and Former Students***

Since 1975 The California State University has conducted a biennial employment survey of all spring graduates from all CSU campuses. The purpose of the survey is to provide faculty counselors, students and prospective students with information on the employment of recent CSU bachelor and masters degree recipients relevant to career and life planning. The data collected in *Survey of Spring Graduates* provide campuses with answers to such questions as:

- What do CSU students do after graduation?
- What are rates of employment for women, minorities and older graduates who seek employment?
- Do CSU graduates get the jobs for which their major programs prepare them?
- What are starting salaries for CSU graduates?
- How do CSU graduates find jobs?

Whereas the biennial spring employment survey attempts to document the status of students that have successfully completed academic programs in the CSU, the *Student Needs and Priorities Survey* (SNAPS) seeks information from currently enrolled students regarding:

- life goals and educational priorities;
- levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their academic and social experiences on campus; and obstacles or problems, whether institutional or personal in nature, which might hinder progress toward their educational goals.

Data collected through SNAPS allow campuses to compare opinions and characteristics of students from their own campus over time and with those of CSU students in general.

### **Evaluation of Program Quality**

#### ***Program Review***

The formal requirement for a qualitative review of existing academic programs has been in place in The California State University since 1971, when the Board of Trustees directed that each campus review each academic degree program on a periodic basis. In 1985, the General Education Advisory Committee, noting that the program review schedules did not incorporate a review of the effectiveness of the General Education program, asked campuses to devise separate, additional procedures to judge the quality of this component of the curriculum.

While the requirement to review all degree and general education programs is a systemwide policy criteria and procedures for conducting the review are unique to the respective campuses. Generally program review begins with a departmental self-study (usually involving surveys of students, faculty and alumni) which is submitted to a school dean or to a school review committee. An external reviewer or team of reviewers including experts in the area of the discipline is typically invited to the campus to analyze the self-study interview students, faculty and administrators, and to offer observations on program strengths and weaknesses.

Unlike outcomes assessment programs, which seek to measure student change and/or performance directly program review examines numerous aspects of the environment that are associated with and necessary to learning, and critical indicators of quality such as departmental grading practices, coherence of discipline coverage in the curriculum, and faculty involvement in scholarly and community affairs.

#### ***Institutional Accreditation***

All campuses of The California State University have been accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Each institution undergoes a full review every tenth year and submits fifth-year reports midway in the cycle. In order to qualify for accreditation, campuses must meet nine standards.

The accreditation standards have been developed by the Commission to understand the unique aspects of an institution and its relative success both in achieving individuality and in meeting regional and national expectations. The nine complex and essential dimensions of an institution of higher education addressed in the standards encompass: institutional integrity, purpose, governance and administration, educational programs, faculty and staff, learning resources, student services and activities, physical resources and financial resources.

#### ***Program Accreditation***

Currently over two hundred CSU degree programs are accredited by some thirty specialized accrediting bodies. Each program accreditation involves site visits and accreditation standards in addition to the institutional accreditation reviews described above.

The specialized accrediting associations, all themselves accredited by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, are supported by many professional organizations or groups of such organizations. Included among these are: the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, the American Medical Association, the National League for Nursing, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

## Appendix B: CSU Campus Views Regarding State Incentive Funding Programs

### A Summary of Campus Responses to a Request for Consultation on Assembly Bill 2016 (Hayden) "Higher Education Talent Development"

State of California  
Trustees of The California State University  
Memorandum

Date: January 22, 1988

To: Members, CPEC Advisory Committee on State Incentive Funding Approaches

cc: Dr. Lee R. Kerschner  
Members, CSU Advisory Committee on Students Outcomes Assessment

From: Frank W. Young, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, Plans

Subject: Policy Issues and Problems Related to State Incentive Funding: Report of Consultation with Academic Leaders in the CSU

As agreed in October CSU members of the Advisory Committee have undertaken to consult broadly with faculty and administrators from the campuses regarding State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education. Efforts to engage affected constituencies in discussions directly connected with the work of the Advisory Committee included the following:

- Chancellor Reynolds established a systemwide advisory committee on student outcomes assessment to examine assessment issues and make policy recommendations. Members of this committee include a campus president and academic vice president, three representatives of the Academic Senate, two representatives of the California State Student Association, and two members of the Chancellors staff.
- The Academic Senate of the CSU discussed outcomes assessment at its annual systemwide conference in November and requested subsequent input from campus senates.
- Vice Chancellor Kerschner requested campus comment on questions posed by the State Incentive Funding study (A copy of Dr Kerschner's memorandum is attached [see page 107].)
- The California State Student Association addressed talent development and outcomes assessment in meetings of the Board of Directors over the last six months. In addition, CSSA has sponsored two student forums focusing on these issues.
- An information presentation on assessment issues was made to the Board of Trustees of The California State University at its January meeting.

The CSU Advisory Committee on Student Outcomes Assessment convened on January 13 to review the responses of campuses to the question posed in Chancellor Kerschner's memorandum and to provide guidance in the preparation of this report.

The campus responses confronted the Committee with an enormous wealth and diversity of perspectives and views regarding educational quality and how it might best be promoted through a State incentive funding plan. The recommendations listed below represent a homogenization of a substantial range of these views. Lost as a result of this process is a sense for the vitality and persuasiveness of the original formulations and with this much of the information value as well. A small number of campuses declined to reply to the request at this time, explaining that consultative processes could not be concluded within the time allowed.

Apart from strong consensus about fundamental purposes and principles, there is little common agreement regarding most of the key questions raised in the Prospectus. The points listed below reflect findings, opinions and recommendations contained in the campus responses as identified and synthesized by the committee in the short amount of available time.

It is clear that campus understanding of the question asked of them was not uniform: some respondents interpreted AB 2016 and the proposed State Incentive Program broadly to include approaches to improving educational quality beyond assessment; others understood the bill and the CPEC focus to be strictly limited to outcomes assessment.

To assure at least minimally representative character the following summary reports recommendations made in one form or another by more than a single campus. For purposes of economy of presentation, similar recommendations differing as to level of implementation (e.g., departmental or university) are presented under only one rubric. The order of listing reflects generally the degree of consensus found in the separate campus replies.

## Recommendations for Incentive Funding by Level

### At the Course Level

#### *Instructional Improvement*

A majority of responding campuses expressed approval of a program that would make additional funds available to improve instruction. The recommendations included: assessment centers aimed at helping faculty assess/improve the effectiveness of their teaching/courses, applied research into factors affecting teaching and learning in specific disciplines, assessment of student learning in relation to course/program objectives, reduction in student-faculty ratio for certain types of instruction or students (to allow individualized attention for students with developmental needs).

#### *Student Involvement in Learning*

Funding to develop instructional materials and strategies aimed at involving students more actively in the learning process was recommended. A variety of approaches were suggested: e.g., student-faculty research, social service projects, faculty development activities aimed at changing modes of instruction and motivating students, interdisciplinary/integrative learning, cooperative learning.

### At the Departmental Level

#### *Curricular Improvement*

Support was recommended for activities designed to: enable faculty to define programmatic goals and develop assessment mechanisms appropriate to them; integrate critical thinking, verbal proficiency and international/multicultural perspectives into curricula; develop capstone/stepping stone courses; define articulation in terms of content mastery.

#### *Diagnostic and Placement Testing*

Substantial interest was expressed in external support to develop and administer either through the department or the campus testing offices, additional diagnostic tests intended to provide information for accurate placement and referral of students and for collection of baseline data for program evaluation.

#### *Academic Advising*

Funding to improve the quality of academic advising was encouraged in some responses. The link between effective advising and efforts to retain and assist students from underrepresented groups was stressed. Advisement training and innovative approaches to improve and expand academic advisement were suggested.

#### *Assessment in the Major*

A few campuses approved the use of incentive funding to allow departments to assess the student learning and program effectiveness in the major provided the responsibility for developing and administering the assessment and for utilizing the data in improving curricula and instruction remains with the faculty of the department.

#### *Partnerships with Business, Industry and Government*

The many educational benefits of integrating practical applications into the curricula of academic majors has long been recognized. Some campuses would like additional resources to support programs featuring student internships/practicums, community service components and programs enabling faculty and experts from outside academe to learn and teach in their counterparts' environments.

## At the Campus Level

### *Educational Equity*

Consensus among respondents was highest regarding the need to make our institutions more effective in meeting the educational requirements of students from underrepresented segments of the State's population. Clearly CSU campuses regard this issue as a priority concern of all segments of California higher education and one which may be usefully addressed through a State incentive funding program.

Specific suggestions as to what kinds of programs might be funded include support to:

- identify and address the factors that contribute to attrition of students who have potential to complete postsecondary education
- track the progress of individual students coming to, dropping out, and graduating from our campuses
- assess the individual/group learning styles of students
- expand peer support programs and increase tutorial services in basic skills and lower division GE programs
- improve/expand orientation and study skills programs develop assessment programs for oral communication, computational and critical thinking at the entry and exit levels

### *Underprepared Students*

The problem of inadequately prepared and poorly motivated students was mentioned in several campus reports. Campuses recognize that these students are often educationally disadvantaged and represent, collectively a significant element in the State's economic and political mainstream. Assistance through a State incentive funding program would provide additional resources with which to address this problem. Possible approaches, in addition to those mentioned under one or more of the preceding headings, include:

- development/implementation of intervention strategies for high-risk students
- improvement of academic advising, personal counseling and other opportunities for individualized attention to students with remedial and adjustment needs
- partnership programs with secondary and middle schools to improve the academic preparation of educationally disadvantaged students

### *General Education*

About half of the responding campuses expressed interest in outcomes assessment approaches to measuring the effectiveness of their General Education programs. The design and evaluation of such programs should be the primary responsibility of each institution's faculty and might involve collaboration with counterparts from community colleges in the respective campus's areas. Locally designed and administered programs might include a component common to all campuses of the system that would reflect the CSU general education-breadth requirements outlined in title 5.

### *International/Multicultural Education*

The need to assure that CSU graduates acquire a useful understanding of the global context of major political and economic problems confronting the United States was evident in the responses of several campuses, as was the obligation to prepare students to live and work in a multiethnic, multicultural society. Supplemental resources would allow campuses to accelerate and intensify efforts towards these ends.

### *Integrating Existing Assessment Programs*

Most of the campus reports allude to the many kinds of assessment currently employed that do, in fact, measure outcomes. Additional funding to integrate and utilize more systematically and publicly the data already collected was suggested as a valuable, cost-effective addition to current practices.

### *Faculty/Staff Development*

Strong support was evidenced for use of incentive funds to support faculty and staff development activities targeted toward institutional priorities. Those mentioned included: use of instructional technologies, crosscultural communication, integrating writing and critical thinking across disciplines, applied research on domain-specific learning, alternative modes of instruction.

### *Expanding Student Surveys*

Measures of student engagement/effort, moral and social development, and changes in behavior were identified as important outcomes, a better understanding of which would help institutions identify programmatic and environmental factors in need of improvement. Financial support for surveying students over time should be included in a State incentive plan to promote higher quality

## **At the System Level**

### *Basic Skills Assessment and Development*

Funding to measure and to enhance the development and retention of skills in oral communication, critical thinking and quantitative reasoning, using something like the English composition model already in place, was recommended by about half of the respondents. Most of them supported system-level assessment, though lesser numbers thought it would be more effective to do such evaluation at the campus level or on a statewide basis. (Rationales and programs to assure student retention of basic skills are mentioned above in the discussion of underprepared students.)

### *Assessment Technology*

Mindful of the limitations of available instruments to measure student learning and development in any comprehensive ways some campuses saw support for research and development of evaluation tools as a major function for a State incentive funding program focussing on outcomes assessment. Resources should also be made available to enable the systems to monitor the cost-effectiveness of assessment programs.

## **At the State Level**

### *Longitudinal Data Collection*

CSU campuses signaled very strong support for the funding of comprehensive longitudinal data collection systems. We know that students attending the CSU come with widely divergent backgrounds, preparations and aspirations. Enrollment, course-taking, degree progress and post-graduation employment patterns vary enormously. Systematic identification of these and other variables, many of which extend beyond the CSU admissions and enrollment databases and the resources of the system, would provide a powerful tool for more effective advising, counseling and for academic and student services planning.

### *Educational Policy*

About a quarter of the responding campuses suggested much in the way of creating conditions for improvement of quality could be accomplished through the funding of system- and/or state-level forums for discussion of educational issues with representatives of industry, government, the media as well as all segments of education. Such exchanges would enable academic leaders to gain broad societal perspectives regarding educational priorities and to inform key constituencies of the priorities and constraints undergirding policy development in higher education. One particular policy issue related to AB 2016 that could be addressed in such a forum would be the cost-benefit question connected with outcomes assessment: To what extent should funds be expended to obtain more exact measures of value added by institutions/programs versus use of these resources to improve the quality of the programs and the conditions for learning directly?

### *Student-Faculty Ratio*

Several campus responses suggested that budget formulas resulting in rather rigid production "quotas" of targeted student-faculty ratios was a principle constraint affecting the ability of CSU campuses to address effectively some of the problems noted above. Supplementing resources to permit lower ratios and/or reduced faculty teaching loads were recommended as an appropriate approach for a State program to promote higher educational quality

### *Financial Aid*

A second major constraint impinging upon campuses' ability to resolve problems cited in the discussion of educational equity and underprepared students is the dependency of many students upon income generated from full- or nearly full-time employment at jobs unconnected with their studies. Resources to allow students to concentrate their energies on learning would, some campuses suggest, go far toward enhancing the educational experience and the value of the time spent on campuses for many of these students.

## Recommendations Regarding Principles

Agreement on basic principles that should govern creation of a State incentive funding mechanism was far more evident than how the funds ought to be used. Most respondents explicitly endorsed the six principles contained in the CPEC report *Funding Excellence in California Higher Education*. Echoes of these principles recur in all of the campus responses.

### Purposes of Outcomes Assessment

Without exception campuses supported the view that assessment of student outcomes should be the purpose of improving teaching and learning at the individual course, program and/or institution level. It should not be used for purposes of comparing the performances of any one of these to others or to norms.

### Institutional Autonomy and Faculty Responsibility

There was near unanimous agreement regarding the need to assign to the faculty of the individual campuses the primary responsibility for designing, administering and interpreting the results of programs to assess student learning, program and institutional performance. The diversity of institutional missions and the rapid shifts in the demographics of the State require flexibility in approaches to measuring the quality and effectiveness of each.

### Multiple Measures

Meaningful outcomes assessment must be multivariate if it is to provide reasonably valid information for use in improving academic programs and modifying institutional practices and for evaluating their performance. Standardized tests provide valuable but very limited kinds of information that do not necessarily relate to career productivity.

### Adequate Supplemental Funding

A good deal of skepticism was expressed about the real source of fiscal support for outcomes assessment programs. All respondents concurred that the dollars for these purposes should be in addition to regular institutional budgets; most, however, thought that the money would be taken "off the top," resulting in a distribution of the costs to all campuses.

Fears were also evident that the real costs of implementing comprehensive assessment programs in terms of money time and political stability have not been recognized or taken into consideration. Several CSU campuses have recent, apparently painful, experience with unfunded efforts to implement subject-matter competency tests for students entering credential programs.

### Cost-Benefit Ratio

A State incentive program of the kind under study should be structured in such a way as to minimize the resources required for its administration; i.e., the dollars should support development and operation of assessment, not the administrative apparatus charged with distributing supplemental funds to do so. (It was suggested that existing system grant programs—e.g., the merit-based instructional improvement funds—might be appropriate vehicles for administering funds targeted for encouraging assessment.)

A strong public commitment to careful analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the outcomes assessment approach should be made if it is adopted as the goal of a State incentive plan.

### Reductive Effects on Academic Programs

The CSU opposes the creation of an incentive funding approach that rewards institutions for producing simplistic, quantitative measures of student performance. Funding should go to institutions proposing to address complex educational problems in commensurate ways. Performance funding, as a concept and as it operates at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is not acceptable.

### Caveats

#### Educational and Institutional Priorities

A major danger of targeting additional resources for assessment is that it reduces support for other programs to address concerns of high priority to the State, the system and the institutions. There was substantial consensus that additional money could be spent more effectively on approaches to improving quality not related to outcomes assessment.

Fears were also evident that the real costs of implementing comprehensive assessment programs in terms of money time and political stability have not been recognized or taken into consideration. Several CSU campuses have recent, apparently painful, experience with unfunded efforts to implement subject-matter competency tests for students entering credential programs.



### Cost-Benefit Ratio

A State incentive program of the kind under study should be structured in such a way as to minimize the resources required for its administration; i.e., the dollars should support development and operation of assessment, not the administrative apparatus charged with distributing supplemental funds to do SO. (It was suggested that existing system grant programs—e.g., the merit-based instructional improvement funds—might be appropriate vehicles for administering funds targeted for encouraging assessment.)

A strong public commitment to careful analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the outcomes assessment approach should be made if it is adopted as the goal of a State incentive plan.

### Erosion of Diversity

Adoption of standardized testing as a prominent index of institutional quality across institutions within/between systems will cause a shift away from complex educational goals toward achieving good ratings as measured by assessment results. “Teaching to the test” and homogenization of curriculum are inevitable consequences of such an approach.

### Distortions of Reality

The existence of comprehensive assessment programs does not guarantee improvement of quality. Quality cannot rely on summative evaluation approaches to achieve formative ends. Indices of quality derived from limited measures may be far more misleading than GAP or other currently available measures.

## State Incentive Funding Approaches

The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
400 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Code: APPS 87-31

Reply Requested by January 11, 1988

Date: October 28, 1987

To: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

From: Lee R. Kerschner  
Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs

Subject: *State Incentive Funding Approaches*

Attached please find a copy of Assembly Bill No. 2016, “Higher Education Talent Development” [not included in this document], that has been signed by the Governor in accordance with the bill, the California Postsecondary Education Commission has established an Advisory Committee on State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education. Six members of that committee are from The California State University:

Dr. Bernie Goldstein, Academic Senate, San Francisco State  
Dr. Diane Halpern, CSU San Bernardino  
Dr. Glenn Irvin, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo  
Dr. Leigh R. Mintz, CSU Hayward  
Ms. Shery Skelly, CSSA  
Dr. Frank Young, Chancellors’ Office

The anticipated outcomes of the CPEC study (for which a proposed prospectus is attached [not included in this document]) are a list of quality improvement options or proposals designed to:

1. Stimulate institutional practices to promote quality in higher education;
2. Provide greater accountability for the quality and content of college instruction;
3. Understand better how the budget process can be used to improve the educational process.

As its title implies, Assembly Bill 2016 specifies that the options CPEC is to develop and present to the Legislature focus on measuring gains in student learning and on assessing the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process.

In fulfilling its charge to develop State funding incentives to achieve these ends, AB 2016 requires CPEC to consult with “students, faculty staff, and administrators at the state and local campus level.” This provision is consistent with the guiding principles developed by the ACR 141a Task Force last year and incorporated into the text of the legislation (Section 66912). These principles recognize that “the definition and assessment of student outcomes and competency standards at the course, program and departmental level is primarily a faculty responsibility

The CPEC advisory committee has ascertained that it will begin its work by requesting that as many faculty and administrators as possible be polled on the following question:

How can incentive funding be used at the course, departmental, university system and state levels to effect improvement in educational quality?

I am asking each campus to consider this complex question and to propose options amenable to incentive funding. In soliciting recommendations, campuses should keep in mind the legislative stipulation that "State funding incentives to promote quality in California higher education should be funds that are supplementary to the institutions' base budget...." Please return your recommendations to Dr Frank Young by January 11, 1988.

To coordinate the CSU responses to the CPEC advisory committee, and to address related issues raised in supplemental budget language, the CSU Assessment Advisory Committee is being established. Dr Young will convey campus responses to this group whose members will be asked to compile the system report.

You may be interested to know that this question will be discussed with the campus Senate chairs when they meet at Asilomar on November 13, and will be a topic of discussion at an Academic Senate Retreat workshop on November 14. However, the Retreat discussions are not intended to produce campus or system responses.

Please call Dr Frank Young at (213) 590-5856 or ATSS 635-5856 if you have any questions.

LRK/na(APPSTWO: 1161n)

Copies to: Presidents

Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs  
Academic Senate CSU  
Chancellor's Office Staff  
Campus Faculty Senate Chairs  
CPEC Committee Representatives  
CSU Assessment Advisory Committee Representatives  
Chair, California State Student Association

## Appendix C: Bibliography

### Selected List of Sources Consulted

Adelman, C. (Ed.). (1988) *Performance and Judgment: Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Students*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Adelman, C. (Ed.). (1986) *Assessing American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Adelman, C. (Ed.). (1986) *From Reports to Response. Proceedings of Regional Conferences on the Quality of American Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

Alexander, J. M. & Stark, J. S. (1986). *Focusing on Student Academic Outcomes. A Working Paper*. Ann Arbor MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Alexander, L., et al. (1986). *Time for Results, The Governors' 1991 Report on Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

Arons, A. B., Ernest I. Boyer et al. (1984, October). "Integrity in the College Curriculum: Report of the Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. pp. 35 - 48.

Ashcroft, J. & Hayden, T. (1987). "The Assessment Debate. What Do Students Learn by Going to College and How Do We Know?" Washington, D.C.: AAHE.

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving Educational Excellence. A Critical Assessment of Priorities and Practices in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W., Blake, J.H., et al. (1984). *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, Final Report of Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Banta, T. W. (1987). *Bibliography of Assessment Instruments*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Assessment Resource Center

- Bergen, S. S. Jr. (1987). *Report to the New Jersey Board of Higher Education. From the Advisory Committee to the College Outcomes Evaluation Project*. New Jersey Board of Higher Education.
- Bok, D. (1986). *Learning to Die*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Boyer, C. M., Ewell, P.T., et al. (1987, March). "Assessment and Outcomes Measurement—A View from the States. Highlights of a New ECS Survey and Individual State Profiles." *AAHE Bulletin*, pp. 8-12.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (1987) *Background Papers of the ACR 141 Task Force on Funding Excellence in Higher Education: Correspondence from Task Force Members Preparatory to the Commission's 1987 Report*. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (1987) *Beyond Assessment: Enhancing Learning and Development of California's Changing Student Population*. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (1986) *Funding Excellence in California Higher Education*. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.
- Cross, K. P. (1988). *Feedback in the Classroom: Making Assessment Matter*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Assessment Forum.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1988, June). "Assessment and Incentives: The Medium Is the Message." *Three Presentations: From the Third National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Assessment Forum.
- El-Khawas, E. (1986). *Campus Trends: Higher Education Panel Report Number 73*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education Higher Education Panel.
- Ewell, P.T. (1985). *Assessing Educational Outcomes*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ewell, P.T. *The Self-Regarding Institution: Information for Excellence*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Farmer, D. W. (1988). *Enhancing Student Learning. Emphasizing Essential Competencies in Academic Programs*. Wilkes-Barre, PA: Kings College.
- Fond, B. (1987). *The External Examiner Approach to Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.
- Giamatti, A. B. (1988, November). "A Free and Ordered Space: The Rebirth of the University." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 35, p. B1f.
- Halpern, D. F. (1987). *Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, J. (1985). "Assessing Outcomes in Higher Education: Practical Suggestions for Getting Started." Columbia, S.C.: Paper presented at the National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education. ERIC ED 260277.
- Hayden, T. (1986). *Beyond the Master Plan: A New Vision for Higher Education in California*. Sacramento, CA: California State Assembly.
- Heffernan, J. M., Hutchings, P. et al. (1988). *Standardized Tests and the Purposes of Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Assessment Forum.
- Kean, T. H., et al. (1986). *Transforming the State Role in Undergraduate Education*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Lamb, M. B. (1986). *Assessing the Outcomes of Higher Education. Proceedings of the 1986 ETS Invitational Conference*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Members of Challenge Grant Evaluation and Implementation Committee. (1989). *Excellence and Equity: The Kean College Challenge Grant Final Report*. Union, NJ: Kean College.
- Mentkowski, M. & Doherty, A. (1984). *Careering After College*. Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College.
- Neill, D. M. & Noe J. M. (1989, May). "Standardized Testing: Harmful to Educational Health." *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 688-696.

- Nichols, J. O. (1989) *Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes Assessment Implementation. A Practitioner's Handbook*. New York, NY: Agathon Press.
- Northeast Missouri State University (1984). *In Pursuit of Degrees with Integrity: A Value-Added Approach to Undergraduate Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Novak, J. D. & Ridley D. R. (1988). *Assessing Student Learning in Light of How Students Learn*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Assessment Forum.
- Paskow, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Assessment Programs and Projects: A Directory*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE Assessment Forum.
- Quehl, G. H. (1988, September). "Higher Education and the Public Interest." *Academe*. pp. 7-11.
- Rossmann, J. E., El-Khawas, E. (1987) *Thinking About Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education/AAHE.
- Vasconcellos, J. (Chair), Allen D., et. al. (1989, March). *California Faces...California's Future: Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Democracy*. Final Report of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Sacramento, CA: Government Printing Office.
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges: Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. (1988). *Handbook of Accreditation*.
- White, E. M. (1985). *Teaching and Assessing Writing, Recent Advances in Understanding. Evaluating and Improving Student Performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiggins, G. (1989, May). A True Test: Toward More Authentic and Equitable Assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*. pp. 703-713.

#### Specialized Sources of Current Information

- "AssessNet:" Comprehensive Research Universities Assessment Network. BITNET Address: ASSESS@COLORADO.
- Banta, T.W. (Ed.). *Assessment Update*. (quarterly newsletter). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weiner, J.R. (periodically updated) *National Directory: Assessment Programs and Projects*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

#### CSU Publications

- Barnes, S.F., Coleman, J. et. al. (1969, May). *Report of the Educational Support Services Master Plan Task Force*. Long Beach, CA: The California State University Office of the Chancellor
- Boxer, M. J. & Richmond, J.E. (1988). *Resource Guide: Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective Elementary School Teachers. Report of CSU Workgroup on Assessment of Prospective Elementary School Teachers*. Long Beach, CA: The California State University Office of the Chancellor
- Harris, O. (Ed.). (1989). From Projects to Policy: Seize the Agenda. *Conference Proceedings: The 1988 California State University Systemwide Conference on Outcomes Assessment*. Long Beach, CA: The California State University Office of the Chancellor
- Holder, C. & Arena, N. (1989). *Academic Program Improvement: The Campus Grants Program 1988-89*. Long Beach, CA: The California State University Office of the Chancellor
- White, J. O. & Denham, C. H. (1987) *Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English Teachers. Report of CSU Workgroup on Assessment of Prospective English Teachers*. Long Beach, CA: The California State University Office of the Chancellor

(Approved March 1990, as part of AS-1911-90/AA)

# Support for “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University”

**WHEREAS**The Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the California State University has prepared a report titled “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University”; and

**WHEREAS**The report stresses the importance of maintaining high quality graduate programs in the CSU; and

**WHEREAS**The report has been widely distributed to, and commented on by, faculty and administrators, including graduate deans and coordinators, and has been amended in response to their comments and recommendations; and

**WHEREAS**Recommendation 1 of the report, Quality in Graduate Programs, speaks to the need for an institutional infrastructure which provides adequate facilities and resources to conduct graduate work and research, and recognizes the need for appropriate teaching loads and opportunities for faculty to maintain currency in their fields; and

**WHEREAS**The report, in Recommendation 23, Workload Credit for Faculty Involved in Graduate Supervision and Graduate Instruction, says that “The recommended instructional workload for those with significant responsibilities for graduate instruction should not exceed nine weighted teaching units per semester.”; and

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate CSU agrees that a downward adjustment of workload is needed for faculty teaching graduate courses and supervising graduate students, but does not believe that adjustment of instructional workload as currently calculated is necessarily the best way to make that adjustment; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU for its report, “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University”; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU support the “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University,” with the reservation that the language in Recommendation 23 be modified to remove the reference to a specific nine weighted teaching unit load and replace it with “a reduced teaching load”; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees to endeavor to obtain the resources needed to implement the “Recommendations on Graduate Education in the California State University.”

(This resolution, 1915, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1990)

## Recommendations on Graduate Education in The California State University–December 1989

*Note: This version is proposed for submission to the Board of Trustees*

No study of graduate education in The California State University can overlook the system's remarkable achievements. It is, in many ways, the “reformed” system that the national reports have called for in recent years: it honors teaching and learning, it is restoring civic consciousness to political life, it promotes international understanding, it prepares students for life in a culturally and ethnically diverse society and it supports professional research. Its 36,000 masters degree students are diverse in age, ethnicity goals, and personal circumstances.

The CSU, however, is not without those problems which run through the major national reports: some faculty, students, and administrators in the CSU believe that the CSU and its individual campuses have somehow allocated their resources in ways that do not serve all priorities equally well; that specialization is rewarded inordinately in a world where technological change is rendering specific skills occupationally obsolete; that too many student decisions are job related; that too little recognition and compensation are given to professors and scholars in a high-tech society more dependent on the university than ever before; and that the quality of the higher education system has declined.

Recent national studies have highlighted additional concerns unique to the masters degree: though it is the postbaccalaureate degree of preference, its purposes and characteristics are neither widely shared

within the university nor widely understood beyond it. Mindful of these concerns, Chancellor Reynolds established an Advisory Committee to consider the nature and extent of graduate education within the CSU; to consider quality, access, and resources within the scope of graduate education; and to point to the directions graduate education should take in the next few decades. Advisory Committee members are listed in Appendix A [see page 117]. Beginning its work in January 1988, the Advisory Committee conducted research, polled students, faculty and administrators, discussed those questions it and interested parties raised about graduate education, rearranged and refined its own priorities, and sought advice from many constituencies, including the CSU Deans of Graduate Studies. Its report, *Master's Degree in The California State University: Meeting Public Needs Consistent with Educational Priorities*, serves as the basis and provides the rationale for the recommendations that follow.

Graduate education in The California State University, once an "extension" of undergraduate education, has now taken on a distinctive mission, focused principally (though not exclusively) on the master's degree, and characterized by unique requirements of quality, access, and resources. In the recommendations that follow, Sections I and II provide a policy framework for describing the quality and characteristics of the master's degree and other graduate programs. Section III recommends changes in policy and practice needed at the system level to implement these quality recommendations, and Section IV contains recommendations for campus and system implementation involving infrastructure and resources.

## I. A California State University Policy on Quality in Graduate Education

The test of any graduate program is its quality. The following statement of quality shall serve as the basis for recommendations on governance, curriculum, access, and resources.

### Recommendation 1: Quality in Graduate Programs

To support the goal of quality in graduate education, the CSU Trustees and each campus should adopt the following criteria for quality in graduate programs and should incorporate them into procedures for reviewing proposals for new as well as existing programs:

Graduate programs of quality in the CSU require:

1. An institutional infrastructure which provides:
  - appropriate standards and processes for admission, continuation, and graduation;
  - adequate facilities and resources (including library and information technologies) to conduct graduate work and research at an appropriate level and in an appropriate and timely fashion;
  - recognition of the need for appropriate teaching loads, resources for research, opportunities to maintain professional and pedagogical currency, and opportunities for renewal for faculty who teach graduate courses;
  - a scholarly environment providing such support programs as visiting lecturer series and faculty seminars.
  - appropriately qualified faculty to teach graduate courses or direct graduate research;
  - the involvement of graduate students in the program evaluation process, and
  - the opportunity for graduate students to participate in the intellectual discourse of departments.
2. A personalized learning format that permits greater student-professor contact (instruction, advising, and guidance) than the undergraduate model.
3. A core curriculum in each program (where it applies) which emphasizes integration of knowledge and preparation for specialization and which is designed to assure mastery of requisite knowledge and skills.
4. A curriculum characterized by advanced disciplinary content and intellectual rigor beyond the baccalaureate level which imparts within its scholarly or professional context an appreciation of the intellectual and/or professional contributions of women and minorities, and prepares scholars and practitioners for a diverse society.
5. A teaching faculty with the Ph.D. (or other appropriate terminal degree) and relevant professional experience where required.
6. A required demonstration of fundamental knowledge of research methods appropriate to the discipline.
7. A required demonstration of oral and written communication skills.
8. An opportunity to integrate and apply sophisticated knowledge in internships or practicums related to the discipline.

9. A required culminating experience (e.g., thesis, project, or comprehensive examination) which demands demonstration of breadth of knowledge in the discipline, depth in specific areas, and the ability to integrate that which has been learned.

## II. Campus Policies and Practices to Improve Graduate Program Quality and Graduate Student Access

The distinctiveness of graduate education can be described by the ways that faculty and students are selected to participate in it, by the level and kind of instruction that supports it, by the level, complexity and necessity of research and creative activity involving faculty and graduate students, and by the competencies expected of master's degree graduates. A graduate degree of quality must be more than a bachelor's degree plus thirty or more units. It must involve periodic assessment of student progress by qualified faculty with frequent individual advising. It must involve course and seminar experiences with other graduate students in courses designed for the graduate level. It must involve exposure to the research methods and practice of the discipline. It must involve an integrative experience under the supervision of one or more qualified faculty. These requirements must be supported through policy practice, and funding.

Because of constraints caused either by resource limitations, small numbers of students, or both, expediency rather than academic rationale has sometimes governed policy practice, and decisions concerning the operation of graduate programs. It is time that the quality considerations ~~was~~ the guiding principle for policy practice, and support, and that expediency not be cloaked as academic respectability. California State University graduate students have made it clear that access to graduate seminars, to other graduate students, and close contact with faculty are indeed minimum expectations for a graduate program of quality.

The attainment of additional resources for graduate education requires a concomitant commitment on the part of The California State University to monitor both quality and efficiency. Resources should not be invested in programs that do not demonstrate a commitment to quality or cannot maintain enrollment levels sufficient to support a range of graduate-level course offerings.

### Curriculum and Faculty

#### **Recommendation 2: Student Advisement and Faculty Committee**

- Campuses should assure that students have an organized program of advisement and that all students' progress be monitored. Each graduate student should have a major professor and a faculty committee. The committee should normally be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member with the Ph.D. or appropriate terminal degree who is also the thesis adviser and/or major professor for the student.

#### **Recommendation 3: Graduate Level Course Availability and Requirements**

- The percent of graduate coursework required in a graduate program is increased from 50 to 70 percent (e.g., from 15 units to 21 units in a 30-unit program). A phase-in period of five years should be permitted for existing programs.
- Each department offering a master's degree program should make available at least four regular graduate courses in addition to supervision and independent study per year and new graduate programs should be initiated only if they have the enrollment potential to achieve this minimal level of course offering.
- The use of graduate independent study courses should be carefully controlled, and no graduate program should utilize independent study courses (excluding thesis or project) to meet more than 20 percent of the unit requirements for graduate level work. In disciplines which are research intensive, 30 percent is allowable.
- The use of "dual-listed" courses (courses offered under both an undergraduate course number and graduate course number and which enroll both undergraduate and graduate students) should be eliminated or limited to a few justifiable instances (e.g., studio or laboratory courses where the instruction is one-on-one). Existing small programs central to each University may use dual listing where it is necessary to assure sufficient offerings and where course requirements are clearly more rigorous for graduate students.

#### **Recommendation 4: Writing Competency at Entrance and Exit**

- The development and assessment of graduate student writing competency demands renewed attention. Procedures for assuring writing proficiency both prior to admission and at advanced levels should be periodically examined by each campus. While all students must meet campus standards, alternative means of meeting those standards for students with special needs should be arranged. Information about successful approaches should be disseminated among the campuses.

#### **Recommendation 5: Research Opportunities for Graduate Students**

- When reviewing proposals for new master's degree programs, each campus should use, as one of the criteria for approval, the department's ability to provide graduate students with appropriate opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity

#### **Recommendation 6: Teaching Opportunities for Graduate Students**

- Teaching opportunities or training should be provided to students as a regular part of graduate programs where appropriate to the discipline. All graduate students employed by the CSU in teaching positions shall be required to participate in a discipline-related seminar, or the equivalent, on teaching. Each campus should provide an orientation or workshop for graduate students who will teach.

#### **Recommendation 7: The Culminating Experience**

- The choice of culminating experience should be that which is educationally most appropriate to the student, and to the discipline. Where a project or exam serves as the culminating experience, it should be equivalent in rigor to the thesis. An oral defense should be part of the culminating experience.

#### **Recommendation 8: Minimum Criteria for Doctoral Programs**

- California State University campuses proposing doctoral programs shall evaluate proposals on the basis of the following minimal criteria:
  1. Faculty with extensive experience in offering graduate programs, including supervision of thesis research; extensive, relevant, and ongoing research experience and interest; demonstrated potential for obtaining funding for research.
  2. Space, facilities, equipment, and support staff required for doing advanced research in the discipline.
  3. Potential for obtaining funding to provide financial support for students and for student research projects.
  4. Library holdings and staff appropriate for advanced study and research in the discipline. Institutes or Centers engaged in relevant work on the campus or in the region are desirable.

#### **Recommendation 9: Faculty Qualifications**

- Policies concerning the qualifications of faculty teaching or serving in other roles in graduate programs should be established at each of the campuses.

#### **Recommendation 10: Program Review**

- Regular program review and evaluation should be used by each campus to assess the quality of its graduate program. The evaluation design should ensure that the graduate program is given specific attention separate from the other offerings of the department. The program review guidelines now used at each campus should be reviewed and revised to incorporate the specific criteria and indicators of quality set forth in Section I, above, and in the following recommendations on campus policies and practices. External reviewers should be used in all evaluations of graduate programs, and graduate program review should be monitored by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

#### **Students**

#### **Recommendation 11: Access to Graduate Degree and Certificate Programs**

- In addition to assessment of discriminatory barriers, each campus should explicitly assess the needs of all present and potential students in its constituency and develop plans to address the special needs of graduate students.
- Graduate certificate programs should be utilized as a means of responding to student needs for occupationally related graduate coursework without unduly interfering with degree programs. The graduate dean should have administrative responsibility for policies and for monitoring of graduate certificate programs.

#### **Recommendation 12: Admission Procedures and Categories**

- The department (or program) should be responsible for recommending admission of students to graduate programs. Students should be admitted either to Graduate-Classified or Graduate-Conditional status from the outset, if the students' objectives are a graduate degree and they are eligible for admission. Students not admitted to the department or program may be admitted as Graduate-Special, with the understanding that Graduate-Special students are not eligible to take



graduate coursework in the department (or program) in which they have been denied admission, without explicit approval of the graduate dean and the department or program graduate coordinator. The following categories of post-baccalaureate student should replace current Title 5 categories and be used by all CSU campuses for admission and student classification and for systemwide reporting: Graduate-Classified, Graduate-Conditional, Graduate-Special, Postbaccalaureate-Credential/Certificate, and Postbaccalaureate (2nd Baccalaureate Degree).

**Recommendation 13: Linkage of Master's and Doctoral Degrees**

- To improve the pipeline which ultimately produces doctorally qualified faculty, each campus should attempt to reach an agreement with doctoral granting institutions for articulation of one or more of its master's degree programs with a doctoral program, emphasizing those fields where the underrepresentation of women and minority faculty is most acute. The CSU in addition should increase the number of doctoral programs it offers.

**III. Trustee and System Level Policies and Activities to Improve Graduate Program Quality and Graduate Student Access**

Some of the changes proposed above will require action by the Board of Trustees in the form of policy change or action by the Chancellor on delegated matters. The following policy and procedural actions will need to be undertaken at the system level to implement some of the recommendations above:

**Recommendation 14: Systemwide Graduate Application Book**

- A separate graduate application form should be designed, taking into account the need to expedite student notification of admission while simultaneously recognizing the primacy of the department in the process of graduate admission.

**Recommendation 15: Approval of New Master's Degrees**

- The Office of the Chancellor should add as criteria for system approval of new master's degree programs evidence of a department's capacity to support the level of research required for a graduate program, the capacity of the proposing department to offer at least four graduate level courses per year, departmental plans for recruiting underrepresented students, and campus/departmental plans for assuring that each student is assigned to a major professor and a faculty committee.

**Recommendation 16: Title 5 Revisions**

- Title 5 should be revised to implement the admission categories proposed in Recommendation 12 above and to implement the required increase in graduate level coursework from 50 to 70 credits as proposed in Recommendation 3 above.

**Recommendation 17: Minimum Standards for Graduate Certificates**

- System guidelines establishing minimum standards for graduate certificate programs should be developed. Authority for approval of graduate certificate programs should remain delegated to the campuses.

**Recommendation 18: Position Classification for Supervised Teaching**

- The Office of the Chancellor should create a position classification that will accommodate graduate students who are teaching under supervision.

**Recommendation 19: Strategic Plan for Generation of Resources for Instrumentation, Technological, and Support Needs**

- The Chancellor should establish a Task Force to develop a comprehensive, strategic plan for addressing the generation of resources for instrumentation, technological, and other support needs of The California State University instructional program. That plan should incorporate recommendations for change in Federal and State policies; steps to increase the competitiveness of CSU in receiving donated equipment; changes in laws on gifts, bequests, and donations; proposals for new methods of financing; and such other strategies as may be developed. The Task Force should include campus representatives with expertise on the special instrumentation and technological needs of graduate and professional programs and expertise on public financing.

#### IV. Building the Infrastructure: Policy and Resources

The infrastructure involves both the resources to support graduate education and the structure for governance policy and support. The necessary infrastructure to support quality graduate education is not fully in place, nor are graduate programs in The California State University adequately supported. Resource scarcity for graduate programs has many causes. First, even where formulas generate resources differentially and adequately for graduate education, campuses may choose not to use them for that purpose. Such decisions are legitimately within the purview of campus decision-making, but suggest that the offering of a variety of master's degree programs should be reconsidered by campuses that do not assign a priority to graduate education. Second, budgeting or cost increase formulas in some areas—libraries and instrumentation, to be specific—are inadequate for the support of quality graduate education, and the failure of the State to provide even those resources generated by formula has exacerbated these problems. Third, policies on faculty workload are not conducive to quality in graduate education. There is no workload recognition for a number of the non-classroom activities associated with graduate education, such as serving as a second reader, chairing or serving on a graduate committee, or participating in the oral defense. Even where workload credit is embodied in policy, budgetary restrictions and some policy constraints have prevented actual teaching load reductions.

The following recommendations on campus infrastructure attempt to protect campus autonomy in matters of administration while recognizing that any campus placing a priority on graduate education will need to support it with appropriate administrative and policy structures. The recommendations on budgeting are grounded in the assumption that budget generation is a matter of system formulas and Trustee action, while budget allocation, if continued as a campus responsibility, will allow for needed local flexibility in the assignment of priorities.

##### Recommendation 20: Campus Administration of Graduate Education

- Each California State University campus should identify an administrator who is the chief spokesperson for graduate education and who has direct administrative responsibility for actions and policies affecting the quality of graduate programs. This individual should be the designee of the president in such areas as admissions and graduation policies involving graduate students; should be centrally involved in graduate program development and evaluation, including decisions regarding the implementation of programmatic or budgetary changes that derive from such evaluations; and should be recognized as the campus official (under the president and in consultation with the faculty) most directly concerned with all matters pertaining to graduate program enhancement.
- The faculty graduate coordinator in a department or program should be recognized as an important element in promoting graduate student diversity and providing leadership necessary to the vitality and quality of the graduate program. Such recognition should be made explicit by adjustment of teaching load.

##### Recommendation 21: Campus Infrastructure Support for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

- A review of campus infrastructures (policies and practices) that support basic and applied research should be initiated by each campus. The review should consider such issues as hours of laboratory, library, and facility availability; computer access policies; equipment conditions and availability; campus policies for the governance of research; and processes for the flow of financial resources that support research.
- To support the kind of research required for graduate education of quality, campus policies on intellectual property rights should be more clearly delineated, and procedures should be established which encourage faculty and students to produce and disseminate original work, with appropriate protection and advice for patents, licenses, and copyrights.

##### Recommendation 22: Graduate Enrollment Efficiency

- Means should be sought to increase graduate course enrollments to economically justifiable levels while increasing the availability of graduate level coursework. Such means might include "pooling" graduate courses between related departments, encouraging cross-registration, or coordinating graduate offerings in a region with other campuses and institutions.

##### Recommendation 23: Workload Credit for Faculty Involved in Graduate Supervision and Graduate Instruction

- Faculty who earn workload credit for supervising graduate theses and projects should receive compensating course load reductions. The Office of the Chancellor should seek necessary formula adjustments, and the campuses should assure that workload policy permits such recognition.

- The recommended instructional workload for those with significant responsibilities for graduate instruction should not exceed nine weighted teaching units per semester. The California State University should seek funding to implement this workload provision. Budgetarily, this could be accomplished by changing the definition of full-time equivalent graduate student to 12 Student Credit Units instead of the current 15, by negotiating an increase in the weighting assigned to graduate course units, or by adjusting the normative ratios by which faculty positions are generated for graduate instruction.

#### **Recommendation 24: Policy and Generation of State Resources for Graduate Education**

- The California State University should continuously seek the number of faculty positions required to provide instruction of quality. A portion of these positions should be dedicated to tasks in support of graduate education beyond those associated with direct instruction.
- The Board of Trustees should continue to seek funding to meet the needs of CSU libraries, including funding to keep pace with inflation or price increases. In addition, the Office of the Chancellor, in consultation with CSU and other cooperating library directors and the Deans of Graduate Studies, should develop a specific plan for providing CSU graduate students and faculty with electronic access to specialized information not available in local campus libraries. Attempts should be made to develop mechanisms for communicating widely and quickly the information available to graduate students and faculty.
- State support for research, scholarship, and creative activity should be increased to a base level of need expressed by faculty in 1988-89. At such time as the funding is increased, the Advisory Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity should revise the program guidelines to permit flexibility in support of faculty time, including released time.
- Joint doctoral programs should be implemented only when supplementary budget support is provided for them.

#### **Recommendation 25: Policy and Generation of Resources for Student Support**

- The Board of Trustees should aggressively support the Student Aid Commission in its attempt to seek full funding for financial aid programs in order to permit all students who are eligible to receive aid.
- The Board of Trustees should seek statutory changes that would permit the California Graduate Fellowship program to include full fees and sufficient funds in its grants for living expenses.
- The CSU Board of Trustees should establish or attempt to have an appropriate funding agency establish a program of financial aid for postbaccalaureate students who are preparing for entry into master's degree programs.
- Until such time as full funding is available to support graduate students who are eligible for financial aid, each campus should review its policies on the relative priority of undergraduate and graduate students for receipt of financial aid and consider the extent to which some percentage of financial aid funding should be reserved for graduate students, particularly for students who have historically been underrepresented in graduate study.
- The Board of Trustees should seek General Fund support of the Doctoral Incentive Forgivable Loan for Minorities and Women and the California Pre-Doctoral Program for Minorities and Women. To further support minority students and women in fields where they are underrepresented, the Board of Trustees should seek funding for the Graduate Equity Fellowship Program to increase significantly the number of fellowships currently awarded. The Chancellor's Office should study the possibility of combining these categorical programs to provide campuses with greater flexibility in meeting the unique needs of local graduate students for support in master's and doctoral degree programs.

#### **Members of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU (Appendix A)**

Gene L. Dinielli (Chair)  
Department of English, CSU Long Beach

Nancy M. Carmichael  
Department of Biology, San Diego State University

Hal Charnofsky  
Department of Sociology, CSU Dominguez Hills

Janice Erskine  
Associate Dean, Academic Affairs, Plans  
Office of the Chancellor  
Wayne Itoga (1987-88)  
Associated Students, CSU Long Beach  
Kenneth C. Jones  
Department of Biology, CSU Northridge  
David McNeil  
Department of History, San Jose State University  
Gerald R. Stairs  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
CSU Chico  
Serena Stanford  
Associate Academic Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research  
San Jose State University  
Don Stelluto (1988-89)  
Associated Students, CSU Fullerton  
Robert E. Winchell  
Department of Geological Sciences, CSU, Long Beach  
Robert Rogers (Consultant)  
Department of Physics & Astronomy, San Francisco State University

(Approved March 1990, as part of AS-1915-90/AA/FA)

[The document in the Senate record is not the full report of the Committee, but a shortened version scheduled to be presented to the Trustees. This is the version endorsed by the Senate, with one reservation.]

# Multicultural Education for Prospective Teachers and for all Baccalaureate Degree Recipients in the California State University

- WHEREAS** California is rapidly becoming a state in which no one ethnic, cultural, or linguistic heritage is in the majority; and
- WHEREAS** All Californians need to acquire new knowledge, skills, and attitudes in order to succeed in and contribute to a society in which respect for and understanding of diversity creates new challenges and opportunities; and
- WHEREAS** Preparation for ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity is especially important for public school teachers, who must provide effective instruction in classrooms where, increasingly, the students speak languages other than English and adhere to cultural expectations which are different from those of their teachers; and
- WHEREAS** Virtually all California citizens are experiencing increased diversity in their workplace, neighborhoods, and other social settings; and
- WHEREAS** Recent events on some CSU campuses suggest a growing intolerance and a lack of appreciation for cultural differences; and
- WHEREAS** The position paper entitled "Meeting the Challenge of the New Diversity: Multicultural Infusion in the California State University for Prospective Teachers and for All Undergraduates" offers perspectives and suggestions which can assist universities to fulfill their special responsibility to prepare graduates for a changing world; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the position paper entitled "Meeting the Challenge of the New Diversity: Multicultural Infusion in the California State University for Prospective Teachers and for All Undergraduates" and recommend that campus senates, all-university teacher education councils, general education committees, and other faculty groups give it serious consideration as they plan for changes which will prepare their graduates to participate more fully and effectively in a multicultural California.

(This resolution, 1930, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1990.)

## Meeting the Challenge of the New Diversity: Multicultural Infusion in the California State University for Prospective Teachers and for All Undergraduates

*This paper was prepared by the Teacher Education Committee of the Statewide Academic Senate of the California State University, with the able assistance of Professor Terrence Wiley of California State University, Long Beach. Dr. Wiley volunteered his expertise to assist the committee in defining the issues, and he contributed to successive drafts. Without his considerable help, this paper could not have been written.*

This paper reaffirms the importance of the California State University commitment to meeting the needs of its diverse student population and argues for infusing multicultural perspectives throughout the curriculum to prepare all students to participate constructively in an increasingly diverse California now and in the future. Only by an increased emphasis on issues and content associated with diversity in the undergraduate program can the CSU ensure that prospective teachers and indeed all CSU students acquire the perspectives, knowledge, and skills necessary to live and work effectively in a multicultural society. In addition, each CSU teacher preparation program will need to ensure that credential candidates who completed undergraduate work in other universities are offered a multicultural education comparable to that received by CSU undergraduates.

The needs of prospective teachers provide an important starting point because the rapidly increasing diversity in the public schools creates new challenges for teachers and has resulted in specific credential requirements concerning preparation for diversity. Classroom teachers have special needs which are directly related to their responsibility to educate children from varied backgrounds. But in the immediate future, if it is not already the case, success in virtually any California employment setting and life in virtually every community will require that any responsible participant understand, appreciate, and have the skills necessary to interact constructively with people from a wide range of linguistic, cultural, and

ethnic backgrounds. Thus this paper emphasizes the needs of prospective teachers and those faculty who contribute to their preparation, but also addresses the educational needs of all undergraduate students in the California State University

## Background

The mission of the CSU places a primary emphasis on the education of students. Liberally-educated students make good citizens, and good citizens keep our country strong and firmly committed to its basic values of democratic participation, equal opportunity and open access. CSU General Education and graduation requirements include such objectives. In a pluralistic society such as ours education must prepare all students to respect diversity and to cooperate with one another. The educated person understands and appreciates the world in which he or she lives, and California in the 21st century will be a world in which diversity is the rule.

The California cultural landscape has long been diverse. Immigration from Southeast Asia, Central and South America, and other countries and relatively high birth rates in many Hispanic and some Asian groups make our communities even more varied. Across all age groups in the state, the non-European origin population is expected to become the majority shortly after the turn of the next century. Among the K-12 population the non-European origin population is already the majority. These trends give credence to the observation that California is becoming more like the world than like the nation.

## Participation in the CSU System

Since the California State University system is entrusted with the role of educating tomorrow's leaders, it must ensure that its enrollment represents an equitable cross-section of all demographic segments in the state. Beyond that it must prepare all CSU students with the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in a multicultural society.

The challenge of providing equitable representation in higher education begins in the public schools. In recent years, high school dropout rates have soared, contributing to underrepresentation of many groups in postsecondary education. Moreover, newly emigrated groups show patterns of eligibility for and participation in higher education comparable to those of groups that have historically been targets of discrimination. While many factors contribute to this reality, public school teachers surely have a critical role in affecting students' successful preparation for and interest in attending postsecondary institutions.

Formal education for many terminates at an early age, with a disproportionate number of African American and Latino students leaving school as early as the fifth or sixth grades. In California 43% of African American and Latino students drop out before graduating from high school, and of those who do complete high school a very small percentage go on to higher education. Those who enter colleges or universities often do not persist and are in need of support programs to improve their chances of success.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (1985) has noted that African American and Latino students are particularly underrepresented in institutions with selective admission requirements and eligibility criteria such as the University of California and, to a lesser extent, the California State University. This trend has not changed substantially during the past few years. Inequity in ethnic representation persists, particularly among Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans.

While participation rates are high for Asian Americans generally and low for Native Americans, African Americans, and Latinos, those broad census labels have a tendency to blur distinctions among subgroups. As Carl Grant of the University of Wisconsin and James Banks of the University of Washington have recently pointed out (at the January, 1990 conference on "Celebrating Diversity: Preparing the Educators of Today for the Schools of Tomorrow"), it is a mistake to cast the problem of equity and the need for multicultural education in terms of a majority/minority or Black/White/Asian formula. Khmer (Cambodians), to cite one example, are labeled "Asians," but are grossly underrepresented (given their numbers in the general population) at both the University of California and the California State University systems (Wiley & Berdan, 1989).

Performance on standardized measures such as the California Assessment Program (CAP) tests or on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) continue to show variance in performance across ethnic groups (Pennock-Roman, 1988). However California's increasing diversity is not limited to ethnicity and language background. Increasingly the gap between rich and poor in our state—as in the nation as a whole—is widening. The positive correlation between family income and performance on standardized measures such as the SAT is well documented.

Given the continuing challenge of promoting equitable participation in higher education by all major groups in the state, the CSU system must continue to exercise leadership in efforts to reduce and ultimately remove discrepancies in full participation related to ethnicity, linguistic background and social class. In addition to improving eligibility rates and facilitating enrollment, campuses must take steps to increase all students' chances for success while enrolled. The incidents and public opinions concerning

the "treatment" of persons who are not "traditional" students which led to passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 126 (Campbell; differential treatment of women and minorities in universities and colleges) suggest that increased diversity can pose problems as well as opportunities. If the curriculum and the faculty embrace multicultural diversity and affirm its value in the university, the educational experiences of all students will be more profound and more enriching.

In all of its programs, the California State University must work toward the vision of California recently stated in the final report of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education:

California must cherish and welcome all of its people, recognizing our multiculturalism as a unique and rare historic opportunity. And we must organize and inspire our educational institutions to respond to our new majority with moral vigor and imagination.... An education for a multicultural democracy means, then, an education for everyone in our multicultural society—to the full extent of his or her capacities and inspirations. But it also means an education to responsible citizenship in a multicultural democracy.... We ask, then, that our universities and colleges share with us a deepening commitment to build the programs and realize the promises of a true multicultural democracy. (1985; pages 4-6)

### The Need for Multicultural Infusion

In the past, approaches to multicultural education emphasized strategies either for the assimilation of ethnic minorities or for tolerance of difference. Now as students of European American background become a new minority in California, it is essential that all students, no matter what their backgrounds learn about the cultures of their peers and develop strategies for communication with individuals from a variety of backgrounds. Equitable representation at the University will help to improve this opportunity for all students. Mutual knowledge, opportunity, understanding, and tolerance for differences must now be the foundation for a multicultural campus and for a multicultural society

If this vision is to occur the CSU campuses must strive to reflect the stated diversity in their students, faculty, and staff. Moreover, they must incorporate the cultures and values of presently underrepresented students if they are to make these students feel welcome. For many people the university remains an alien environment in its institutions and in its curriculum. At the "Celebrating Diversity" conference Grant noted that, if we truly want a multicultural society and want to reflect the achievements of all groups in our curriculum, we are faced with some hard choices in redefining and reconceptualizing the existing curriculum, especially in areas which directly reflect cultural values such as art and literature. At the same conference, Banks added that some will label such efforts as "catering to special interests," while the interests of dominant groups are seen as being "universal." Respect for diversity requires that we move beyond the chauvinistic notion that a Euro-centric curriculum is synonymous with universalism.

Students who are unaware of their own culture are less likely to recognize and appreciate the effects of culture upon themselves and others. Along with acquiring information and experiences which illustrate other cultures, one should understand how one's own culture and accumulated experience affect basic outlooks and behaviors. Study of one's own culture should occur in ways which lead the student to examine the basis for beliefs and to discover through observation and experience the role that cultural orientation plays in one's life. Many disciplines offer opportunity for such self-discovery and some, such as cultural anthropology, social psychology and family sociology are based upon methodologies central to such processes.

Meaningful and comprehensive exposure to culture, language, and related phenomena will be most effective when such issues are presented throughout the curriculum and, indeed, throughout the university experience. Piecemeal "foods and festivals" approaches expose some students to aspects of culture but are not effective in imparting knowledge and changing attitudes. The curriculum must give appropriate attention to significant persons and to ideas which developed independently of European history and culture. Students must experience and learn to understand and appreciate people who are different from themselves in background and outlook.

### Experiential Learning in Community and School Settings

In order for campuses to better represent and meet the needs of their diverse areas, linkages need to be strengthened with surrounding communities through partnerships with schools and through field activities. Partnerships of this kind offer students the chance for meaningful exposure to parts of society which are different from those in which they grew up or presently live. The CSU requirement that prospective teachers engage in an early field experience offers one such opportunity. Human Corps programs are open to all undergraduate students on each CSU campuses, and community internships are available in many disciplines. In UC San Diego's Third College, undergraduate students with an interest in teaching take a three-course field experience track which begins with a focus on a local community followed by study of a school in that community and concluding with a field experience in a classroom in that school. These linkages broaden the notion of learning from mere book knowledge to experiential study based on community participation.

Such an approach allows prospective teachers the opportunity to gain a holistic picture of the relationship between community and school and the chance to determine whether they are truly interested in teaching. On some campuses, those interested in teaching have little exposure to its daily challenges until they fulfill observation and student teaching requirements as part of their professional preparation. Moreover these activities are performed—all too frequently—in schools which are not representative of those in which new teachers are most likely to be hired. The UCSD Third College approach ~~over~~ solves these problems by linking preprofessional with professional training and by linking the university with local communities.

Experiential links with the community should not be limited to teacher education programs. ~~in~~ In the past fifteen years, California communities have provided a remarkable laboratory for field study in social and demographic change. The current effort to expand Human Corps participation on CSU campuses offers timely opportunity for meaningful student involvement in and learning from the varied communities which surround most CSU campuses. Immigrant communities have revitalized decaying inner cities and stagnant suburban economies across the state. The recent emergence of these communities recalls the role which immigrant towns have played throughout our history and reinforces the notion that immigrants contribute to the larger economy by helping themselves. Students in social sciences, the arts, and the humanities need to be trained in rudimentary data collection techniques to chronicle the contributions and impact of the new Americans within our communities. While learning to ~~obs~~ and collect information, students also learn to be sensitive to the subtle phenomena which often reflect culture.

### Underrepresentation in Teacher Preparation

While minority students are heavily recruited into professional programs such as business and engineering, success in recruiting and retaining minority students in teacher preparation programs remains a major challenge. In 1988-89, of the 12,305 applicants to credential programs within the CSU system 10,872 were coded by ethnicity. Of these 329 (3.0%) were Asian American, 353 (3.2%) were African American, 883 (8.1%) were Hispanic, 9,022 (83.0%) were European American, and 285 (2.6%) were from other groups. In 1988-89, of those 12,305 applicants 8,573 were admitted. Non-European Americans comprised 17.4% of all admissions. Of 5,179 admitted to the multiple subject credential program 249 (3.2%) were Asian, 250 (3.3%) were African American and 640 (8.4%) were Hispanic.

The CSU will expand its Teacher Diversity Grant program in 1990-91 so that each campus is funded to engage in activities designed to interest eligible minority persons in becoming teachers. However the magnitude of the problem requires a sustained effort with additional predictable funding and the active participation of many faculty including those who are not now directly involved in teacher preparation.

Considering the make-up of the student population in the public schools, it is clear that we are not attracting sufficient numbers of minorities to the university or to the teaching profession. As a result the majority of those entering credential programs, and ultimately teaching, are European American, middle class, female, monocultural and monolingual. Many of them have had ~~yd~~ little meaningful contact with people who differ from them culturally and linguistically. Many have only recently realized that, when they are ready to teach, they are going to teach "minority" children. Given the rich cultural diversity among the community of K-12 students, teachers need some knowledge of the major cultural groups as well as strategies for learning about students who come from smaller and less familiar groups.

Because of the past deemphasis on foreign language learning (which is now being reversed), students often have no personal experience with the process of language acquisition. Meanwhile, linguistic diversity within the public schools is at its highest point since the early years of this century. For example, within the Los Angeles school district nearly one-third of the students are of limited English proficiency. While the district provides bilingual education (which it has done since 1906) and while it has a large cadre of English as a Second Language teachers, the rapid increase in the non-English speaking population now necessitates that all teachers have some knowledge of second language acquisition and of techniques in teaching English as a second language, especially within content areas.

Although most other professions do not share the intense demands for knowledge of language acquisition placed upon teachers, the majority of Californians encounter cultural and linguistic diversity in the normal course of their work and in the conduct of their daily lives. Persons in human ~~vis~~ occupations, in sales, and in service or manufacturing businesses will be at a serious disadvantage if they are not familiar with and capable of effective interaction with people from diverse backgrounds. No one is at an advantage by being ignorant of culture and diversity.

### New Expectations for Teacher Preparation

In recognition of the challenge of meeting the needs of all students, the Commission ~~ach~~ter Credentialing (1989) has recently mandated new ~~st~~ standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for single and multiple subjects credentials. Among the 32 standards are requirements that credential candidates



engage in cross-cultural study and experience, including the study of language acquisition and of methods which are successful in the instruction of linguistically different students. The new standards also call for the infusion of information on, and consideration of, cultural diversity and discussion of the historical and cultural traditions of the major cultural groups in California society, and an examination of effective ways to include cultural traditions and community values in the instructional program of a classroom. As an illustration, Standards 15 and 30 are included as an Appendix [not included in this document].

A recent report from the Curriculum and Assessment Cluster Committee (1989) of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council proposes an intersegmental English as a Second Language Agenda which includes increased attention to the needs of nonnative English speaking students. Implications of their recommendations extend to both university faculty and K-12 teachers; the report asks that coordinated efforts take place to assess the need for improvements in teacher preparation programs.

### **Areas of Greatest Need for Supporting the K-12 System**

Although specific expectations for teacher preparation programs are communicated via ~~Standards~~ , the limited number of units devoted to professional preparation is not sufficient to enable prospective teachers to acquire the sensitivity, knowledge, and skills needed to function effectively in a multicultural world. As with all other undergraduate students, they need frequent exposure to those concepts and experiences throughout their baccalaureate curriculum. Many students do not decide to prepare for a teaching career until most or all of their undergraduate work has been completed. Multicultural perspectives must be instilled across the undergraduate curriculum, particularly in general education, which plays a significant role in the liberal studies curriculum and contributes significantly to ~~every~~ baccalaureate degree. Each program and major has an important role to play in assuring that CSU graduates have the benefit of learning about and experiencing diversity as they acquire knowledge and proficiency in various disciplines.

To provide a public school teaching ~~for~~ which can educate pupils to their full potential and to enable all new teachers to fulfill these new expectations, fundamental changes are needed which involve:

- (a) increasing recruitment and retention of minority teacher candidates who have the opportunity to serve as role models for presently ~~under~~ served pupils;
- (b) providing exposure to English as a Second Language, sheltered English, and other related methodologies and techniques for teaching students with limited English proficiency;
- (c) including information in undergraduate curricula and in ~~pre~~service education courses regarding the major cultures in California, perhaps emphasizing those most represented within each university' immediate service area;
- (d) teaching ethnographic strategies (i.e., techniques for ~~obs~~erving and learning about naturally occurring human processes) to help prospective teachers learn about students from other cultures as they experience them in the classroom;
- (e) promoting ~~pre~~service opportunities for participation in communities and in classroom environments which are representative of those where teacher candidates are likely to be employed;
- (f) developing teacher candidates' sensitivity to and appreciation of multicultural diversity;
- (g) modeling by university professors of various instructional strategies appropriate to multicultural and multilingual education; and
- (h) forming partnerships between institutions of higher education and the public schools in which their graduates will often be employed.

### **What Can Campuses Do to Prepare Students for Diversity?**

From one perspective, nothing less than a paradigm shift in which the entire University is reconceptualized as a multicultural community will allow higher education to prepare students for the California they will face. In the short term, however, there are a number of actions and areas for further study which would be good beginnings. As a start, each campus could do the following, if it has not already done so:

#### ***Recommendations for the University at Large***

1. Provide faculty development across the curriculum to heighten the awareness and improve the preparation of faculty for multicultural diversity

***Discussion:*** Some faculty may need assistance in developing strategies to upgrade and reconceptualize curriculum and teaching techniques to meet the needs of all students. Faculty should be surveyed to determine their needs and should be encouraged to participate in suitable programs of professional development.

2. Identify resources which can be used for curriculum revision and faculty development to influence multicultural education in all programs.

**Discussion:** Assistance needs to be provided to faculty since reconceptualization of curriculum and faculty development must be undertaken over and above regular faculty load. For example, California State University Long Beach has received a Title VII ESL/Multicultural Education Infusion grant to undertake such a review of courses used for the Multiple Subjects Credential programs and for the new ESL Supplemental Credential program. Faculty receive stipends or release time to review courses and attend professional conferences. The grant is funded through 1992 and is designed to bring credential programs into compliance with the new state teacher credentialing standards.

San Francisco State University's Center for Multicultural and Immigrant Education conducted a Symposium on Culture, Literacy/Participatory Research, Immigrant/Multicultural Education, and Student Empowerment in April 1990. Most of the thematic strands in that symposium were directly related to multicultural education at the university and the presenters are potential resources for similar, if more limited, activities on other CSU campuses.

The CSU Academic Program Improvement Competitive Grants Program for 1990-91 included a new category entitled "Curriculum and Faculty Development for a Multicultural University." From the interest and capability reflected in the large number of strong proposals submitted, it is likely that this category will be available again for 1991-92.

In many academic areas, discipline-based teaching materials and faculty development guides are already available. Baskauskas (1986) has edited a volume of contributions presenting several social and behavioral science perspectives on cultural diversity and ways to include it within the respective curricula. Faculty from seven departments at CSU Hayward have included annotated bibliographies, lists of readings, course syllabi, and sample assignments in resource manuals for mainstreaming cross-cultural material in courses in their disciplines, which include anthropology, English, philosophy, political science, sociology, speech communications, and theatre arts (Auletta & Paige-Pointer, 1987).

3. Review frameworks for multicultural education (e.g., Banks, 1989a; Sleeter & Grant, 1987) to determine which models (or adaptations of models) would best meet the goals of each CSU campus and its service area. Banks (1989b) provides insight into the controversy which is often associated with efforts to "change the canon." In another brief paper Banks (1988) schematizes four approaches to bringing multicultural content into the curriculum.

**Discussion:** Approaches to multicultural education are not monolithic. Consequently, a campus should not adopt an approach without analysis of the needs and goals of its service area and the characteristics and needs of its own student population.

4. Include a focus on diversity in the curriculum as part of five year program reviews, with specific expectations for those programs where cultural diversity should be implicitly or explicitly addressed (e.g., General Education and major fields such as history, literature, languages, social sciences, art, music, etc.). All programs should be asked to examine their potential for contributing to multicultural education.

**Discussion:** Campuses should establish preparation for and appreciation of diversity as a goal for all programs where there is significant potential for constructive contributions.

5. Increase opportunities for students to study a second language, to spend a semester or a year or longer studying in a foreign country, and to have direct, community-based experiences with people from backgrounds markedly different from their own.

**Discussion:** Direct exposure complements academic learning in significant ways. Learning a language as an adult sensitizes people to the dislocation often suffered by immigrants who have little or no proficiency in English. Cultural immersion provides students with an opportunity to develop cultural sensitivity. Opportunities for action research or community study in one's own country can both benefit those served and provide a rich learning opportunity.

#### Recommendations Specific to Teacher Preparation Programs

6. Develop demographic descriptions and forecasts of the K-12 clientele of districts in its service area and of its credential candidates, Liberal Studies majors, and students in other majors related to teaching. Compare the ethnic compositions of the school population and the potential teacher pool.

**Discussion:** Rapid demographic change due to immigration (primary and secondary), out-migration, and changing birth rates initially put many school districts and the teacher education programs which serve them in a reactive stance. Universities generally and teacher education programs specifically need to have good information about the current status and anticipated changes in the

student populations within their service areas and should update courses and training experiences of their candidates and to monitor their progress on an ongoing basis in order to assess progress in closing the gap between the ethnic representations among teachers and their students.

7. Review the impact of CSU system policies and campus practices on admission and retention of underrepresented groups in professional preparation programs.

**Discussion:** The CSU median GPA requirement may impact underrepresented groups disproportionately. A study at CSU Long Beach (Berdan, personal communication, January 2, 1990) appears to indicate this, although systemwide data do not provide confirmation. Campus practices as to the use of exceptions in admitting students to teacher preparation programs may not give proper emphasis to diversifying the cohort of prospective teachers. Procedures and criteria for demonstrating subject matter competence vary from campus to campus and across disciplines. There does not seem to have been any systematic study of the impact of these differing approaches or standards on underrepresented groups. If, in fact, there is disproportionate impact across groups, it may be desirable to seek alternate predictors of teacher success.

8. Review Multiple Subjects and Single Subjects professional preparation and waiver program curricula with respect to the infusion of material on cultural diversity

**Discussion:** Education departments cannot reasonably be expected to educate and sensitize candidates properly if the responsibility for teaching about diversity has not also been assumed by faculty responsible for undergraduate education. In the curriculum and through the expressed attitudes of faculty students must be led to discover the importance of the contributions made by members of all cultures and must acquire sensitivity to the way people of differing backgrounds understand and evaluate facts, values, and actions. Given the ethnic and cultural diversity of most CSU campuses, university faculty must be familiar with the needs of their diverse student populations and prepared to serve all students.

For example, CSU Northridge imposes a multicultural education requirement upon all teaching credential candidates. From an established list containing four courses from Chicano Studies and Pan-African Studies Departments, the preliminary credential candidate must complete one course in "The Child." One course each in "The Community" (from a list of five) and in "Linguistics" (from seven) is required for the clear credential. At least one of the three courses must relate to Chicano culture.

9. Find ways to require coursework in language acquisition as a prerequisite to the professional preparation sequence.

**Discussion:** In most classrooms, teachers will need to help students develop language skills and to teach content to students with varying degrees of proficiency in English. Without awareness of the process of language acquisition, the teacher is not fully able to understand problems faced by children with limited English proficiency. The CSU Northridge course in the Linguistics area (see #8 above) may address this need.

10. Survey waiver program and teacher education faculty regarding: (1) their perceptions of preparedness to infuse multicultural perspectives within their own courses; and (2) their sense of the need for assistance regarding strategies for reconceptualization of the curriculum for inclusion of multicultural perspectives. Introduce professional development opportunities which address the perceived level of need and the area(s) where assistance would be most useful.

**Discussion:** Faculty with considerable involvement in teaching prospective teachers should have a similar target level of multicultural competency as their students. Professional development programs may be needed. CSU Northridge has developed a Resource Manual for CSUN Students concerning teaching in ethnically diverse classrooms. It and materials of similar scope may contain information which faculty and students on other campuses would find helpful.

11. During hiring and selection interviews, evaluate future faculty in appropriate disciplines and the prospective teachers they will educate to ensure that they are willing to accept the challenge of diversity

**Discussion:** Since California public schools increasingly reflect diversity, CSU faculty and prospective public school teachers must be committed to meeting the needs of all students.

## References

- Auletta, G. S. & Paige-Pointe, B. (Eds.). (1987). *Toward a cross-cultural curriculum: Introduction to the project and resource manuals*. California State University, Hayward, and Office of the Chancellor, The California State University.
- Banks, J. A. (1988). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Multicultural Leader*, 1, 1-4.
- Banks, J. A. (1988a). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allen & Bacon. (See "Integrating the curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines.")
- Banks, J. A. (1989b). The battle over the canon: Cultural diversity and curricular reform. *Allyn & Bacon Educators' Forum*, 1, 11-13.
- Baskauskas, L. (1986). *Unmasking culture: Cross-cultural perspectives in the social and behavioral sciences*. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp, Publishers.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (1985). Background papers to a prospectus for California postsecondary education, 1985-2000. Report 85-14.
- Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1989). Standards of program quality and effectiveness, factors to consider, and preconditions in the evaluation of professional teacher preparation programs for multiple and single subject credentials. December 2, 1988 (Revised September 8, 1989).
- Curriculum and Assessment Cluster Committee (1989). California's limited English language students: An intersegmental agenda. A report to the Intersegmental Coordinating Council. September 1989.
- Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (1989). California faces California's future: Education for citizenship in a multicultural democracy. California Legislature (Final Report; March 1989).
- Pennock-Roman, M. (1988). The status of research on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and Hispanic students in postsecondary education. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 421-444.
- Wiley, T. G. & Berdan, R. (1989). CSULB/Millikan High School Project ADAPT Grant Proposal. Long Beach, CA: California State University, Long Beach, Center for Educational Research and Services.

## Selective Bibliography

- Corno, L. & Snow, R. E., (1986). Adapting teaching to individual differences among learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook on research on teaching*. 3rd ed. New York: MacMillan.
- Dash, R. (Ed.) (n.d.). The challenge—Preparing teachers for diverse student populations. Roundtable report. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and California State University.
- Davidman, L. & Davidman, P. (1988). Multicultural teacher education in the State of California: The challenge of definition and implementation. *California Council of the Education of Teachers*, 15, 50-67.
- Del Zotto, A. C. (1988). Who is "college material"? A tough San Francisco high school blows the typecast. *California Tomorrow*, 3, 34-35.
- Educational Equity Advisory Council (1986). Educational equity in the California State University—Which way the future? Long Beach, CA: Office of the Chancellor. California State University.
- Fillmore, L. W., with Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on research on teaching*, 3rd ed. New York: MacMillan.
- Florio-Ruane, S. (1989). Social organization of classes and schools. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Gay, G. (1983). Multicultural education: Historical development and future prospects. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64 (8).
- Gomez, A. (1989). A report on teacher supply: Enrollments in professional programs during 1987 and 1988. Sacramento, CA: Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Haycock, K. & Navarro, M. (1988). Unfinished business: Fulfilling our children's promise. Los Angeles, CA: Achievement Council.
- Henniger, M. (1989). Recruiting minority students: Issues and options. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40, 35-39.
- Macias, R. F. (1989). Bilingual teacher supply and demand in the United States. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research, University of Southern California & The Tomas Rivera Center.
- Magner, D. K. (1990). Panel calls for radical changes in schools to improve education for minority groups. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36 (17).
- Policy Analysis for California Education (1989). *Conditions of children in California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Rome, S. (1986). Standardization: Introduction. *Radical Teacher*, 31, 1-4.
- Sadker, D., & Sadker, M. (1987). *The intellectual exchange: Excellence and equity in college teaching*. Kansas City, MO: Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

(Approved May 1990, as part of AS-1930-90/TE)

# CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) Programs

**WHEREAS** Any policy or practice of improper discrimination against California State University students is inimical to the values of the University; and

**WHEREAS** The U.S. Department of Defense's policy and regulations exclude homosexuals from military ranks including commissioning programs involving the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) of various branches of the armed services; and

**WHEREAS** There is no scholarly evidence that the policy of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is beneficial to the national defense; and

**WHEREAS** Department of Defense regulations categorically exclude homosexual students on CSU campuses from the ROTC stipends available to other students; and

**WHEREAS** The CSU is a public institution supported by the tax dollars of its citizens, including its homosexual citizens; and

**WHEREAS** It would be a violation of California law and CSU policy for the CSU system, or any part of it, to discriminate in employment or access on the basis of sexual orientation; and

**WHEREAS** The Department of Defense policy and practice of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is inimical to the values of the university; and

**WHEREAS** The CSU should not assist the Department of Defense so to discriminate or to facilitate such discrimination through the extension of university academic credits or otherwise; and

**WHEREAS** Allowing the extension of CSU academic credits to ROTC courses and the publication in university catalogs and bulletins of information regarding programs from which some students are excluded gives support to Department of Defense's discriminatory practices; and

**WHEREAS** The awarding of faculty status to instructors who teach in ROTC programs lends institutional support and respectability to the Department of Defense's policy of discrimination; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University condemn the discriminatory regulations of the Department of Defense that exclude homosexuals from military service; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Governor, California legislators, the members of the CSU Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the campus Presidents to join with other leaders in government and higher education in using the moral force of their offices to cause the Department of Defense to abandon its discriminatory policy against homosexuals serving in the military; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University call upon the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to end the discriminatory policy based on sexual orientation against United States citizens desiring to serve their country in the military; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus senates to consider the following if the military's policy discriminating against homosexuals is not rescinded by January 1, 1991:

- (a) the elimination of the granting of academic credit for ROTC courses and programs;
- (b) the withdrawal of faculty status accorded to ROTC instructors;
- (c) the exclusion of advertisements, notices, listings, and other references to the ROTC programs in university catalogs, bulletins, and announcements;
- (d) the termination of contracts with the U.S. military regarding the offering of ROTC programs at the University;
- (e) The refusal in the interim to initiate any new ROTC program at the University; and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate CSU review this issue in the 1990/91 academic year.

*“Homosexuality is incompatible with military service. The presence in the military environment of persons who engage in homosexual conduct or who, by their statements, demonstrate a propensity to engage in homosexual conduct, seriously impairs the accomplishment of the military mission. The presence of such members adversely affects the ability of the Military Services to maintain discipline, good order, and morale; to foster mutual trust and confidence among service members; to ensure the integrity of the system of rank and command; to facilitate assignment and worldwide deployment of service members who frequently must live and work under close conditions affording minimal privacy; to recruit and retain members of the Military Services; to maintain the public acceptability of military service; and to prevent breaches of security.” (32 C.F.R., part 41, App. A Part H)*

(This resolution, 1939, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1990.)

# Modification of General Education Certification Policy: Full- and Subject-Area Certification

- WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University has established its commitment to improving transfer rates for the benefit of California students; and
- WHEREAS**As part of that effort, steps need to be taken to revise the way in which students transfer GE credit under the provisions of Executive Order 338; and
- WHEREAS**This calls for a revision of certain provisions of Executive Order 342 which currently governs general education transfer procedures; and
- WHEREAS**Among these provisions are the concepts of "Full" and "Partial" certification of general education requirements not explicitly defined in Executive Order 342; and
- WHEREAS**There have been inconsistent interpretations by certifying institutions of these concepts, and consequent reluctance of receiving CSU campuses to honor "partial" certification; and
- WHEREAS**The Chancellor's General Education-Breadth Advisory Committee has approved the concepts and provisions embodied in the document, "Full and Subject-Area Certification of Courses to Meet CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements"; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the definitions of Full and Subject-Area Certification that appear in the attached document, "Full and Subject-Area Certification of Courses to Meet General Education-Breadth Requirements"; and be it further
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU support the development of an Executive Order to incorporate the definitions in the attached document, "Full and Subject-Area Certification of Courses to Meet CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements," and supersede Executive Order 342.

(This resolution, 1979, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in February 1991.)

## Attachment to: AS-1979-91/AA Proposed Modification of General Education Certification Procedures

State of California  
Trustees of The California State University  
Memorandum

Date: December 21, 1990

To: Dr. Sandra Wilcox, Chair  
Academic Senate  
California State University

From: Lee R. Kerschner  
Vice Chancellor  
Academic Affairs

Subject: Proposed Modification of General Education Certification Procedures

The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee is currently reviewing Executive Order 342 with the purpose of improving procedures governing the certification of course work to meet the CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements of Executive Order 338. This memorandum seeks the advice and comments of the Academic Senate regarding a recommendation by the Advisory Committee to define "full" and "partial" certification. It is the first of several modifications to current certification procedures we plan to propose in our continuing effort to address concerns related to general education transfer. Changes to current policy approved as a result of these consultations will be incorporated into a new executive order to supersede Executive Order 342. (A summary of general education tracks is appended to clarify the relationship of the proposed change to related issues under review [see page 132])

Certification of courses offered to meet the general education requirements of CSU campuses has been carried out under the provisions of Executive Order 342. The purposes served by GE certification, and the assumptions upon which it is based, are explained in Section I of the executive order. Acceptance of the certification policy and of the underlying principle of the partnership role of the Community Colleges in

California's higher education structure, has grown since the CSU implemented Executive Order 342 in 1981. There have, however, been persistent problems in certification practices. These include:

- lack of a definition and of criteria for "partial" certification;
- inconsistent interpretations by certifying institutions of distribution and minimum unit requirements within and among the five subject areas;
- reluctance of receiving CSU campuses to honor certification, particularly partial certification.

Executive Order 342 grants to regionally accredited postsecondary institutions the authority to certify to CSU campuses that course work completed at their institutions meets CSU graduation requirements in General Education-Breadth as they are described in Executive Order 338. Participating institutions are permitted to "certify courses or examinations in terms of the objectives set forth in Executive Order 338 and in such additional statements of objectives as may from time to time be issued by the Chancellor

Consistent with the philosophy of the task force that developed the general education framework of E.O. 338, E.O. 342 sought to preserve to certifying institutions as much latitude as possible in providing instruction to meet these objectives. Rather than prescribing what participating institutions may do, Executive Order 342 defines the limits of what CSU campuses must accept under the policy. Section IV stipulates that CSU campuses need not accept for credit toward satisfaction of their general education requirements: (1) more than a total of 39 semester units; (2) more units in a given subject area than minimum stated in Executive Order 338; (3) more than 30 semester units for Areas B through D. Certified transfer students may be held to no more units in general education-breadth than the difference between the number of units certified and the total number of units in general education required by the campus awarding the degree.

Understandably this approach has led to divergent interpretations of what may legitimately be certified. Institutions have certified completion of CSU General Education-Breadth requirements on a continuum ranging from individual courses to subject areas (both examples of "partial" certification), to the maximum thirty-nine semester units ("full" certification). Completion of subject area requirements has sometimes been certified without regard for distribution or minimum unit requirements contained in Executive Order 338.

CSU campuses have responded differently to "certified" transfer students who have not satisfied all of the specific distribution objectives of the CSU graduation requirements in general education. Some campuses accept the certification and ignore the disparity between the certified program and the specific objectives of E.O. 338; others identify unmet requirements and hold students to their completion, certification notwithstanding. As a consequence, certifying institutions, the vast majority of which are community colleges, often complain that CSU campuses do not honor their certification; CSU campuses often complain that community colleges are certifying students who have not met the requirements of E.O. 338.

Over time, the issues of certification have come to center around the concepts of "full" and "partial" certification. The Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee has concluded that the purpose of the certification policy—ease of transfer for students—would be best served by the establishment of clear criteria for certification. Alignment of certification standards with the requirements of Executive Order 338 will, in turn, eliminate grounds for resistance to the acceptance of certification.

Attached is a draft policy statement which establishes criteria for "full" and "subject-area" certification [see page 131]. If the proposed policy change is adopted, there will be no ambiguity regarding the specific expectations of students transferring under provisions of E.O. 338 with certification of some or all General Education-Breadth Requirements. The obligation of CSU campuses to accept certification based on these criteria will be similarly unambiguous. Adoption of these criteria will not affect current limitation on the number of certified units that must be accepted by CSU campuses.

We would appreciate receiving the Senate comments and suggestions regarding the proposed change by March. The proposal will then be circulated to the campuses for review and comment. Please direct your response and any questions you may have to Dr. Sally L. Casanova.

Attachments

cc: Dr. John M. Smart  
Dr. Ronald S. Lemos  
Dr. Charles W. Lindahl  
Dr. Sally L. Casanova



## **Draft**

# **Full and Subject-Area Certification of Courses to Meet CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements\***

CSU campuses shall accept full or partial certification of courses to meet CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements, as defined in Executive Order 338, provided such certification: (1) meets the criteria for “full” or “subject-area” certification described below; and (2) is provided by an institution accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations which offers the BA or BS or the first two years of such degree programs. Any eligible institution may report completion of courses or examinations taken at other eligible institutions provided that all such courses and examinations would be certified by the institution offering them. Such courses and examinations shall be deemed to have been certified.

### **1. Full Certification**

To qualify for “full certification,” students must satisfactorily complete no fewer than ~~thirty-nine~~ *nine* lower-division semester (59 quarter) units of instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of Executive Order 338 distributed as follows: Area A: no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units including instruction in oral and written communication and critical thinking; Area B: no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units including instruction in physical science and life science— at least one of which must include a laboratory component and mathematics/ quantitative reasoning; Area C: no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities; Area D: no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units with courses taken in at least two disciplines; Area E: no fewer than three semester (4-5 quarter) units.

Students admitted to CSU campuses with full certification may not be held to any additional lower division general education requirements. Full certification does not exempt students from unmet lower division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.

### **2. Subject Area Certification**

To qualify for “subject area” certification, students must satisfactorily complete instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of one (or more) subject area(s), as defined in Executive Order 338, distributed as follows:

- 2.1 **Area A (Communication in the English Language and Critical Thinking):** no fewer than *nine* semester (12-15 quarter) units including instruction in oral communication, written communication and critical thinking. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student, except for programs in which instruction to meet the three objectives is integrated into a series of linked courses or into interdisciplinary courses offered at a correspondingly greater number of student credit units.
- 2.2 **Area B (Physical Universe and Its Life Forms and Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning):** no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units including instruction in physical and life science at least one of which must include a laboratory component, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student, except for laboratory components incorporated into a physical or life science course.
- 2.3 **Area C (Arts, Literature, Philosophy and Foreign Language):** no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities.
- 2.4 **Area D (Social, Political and Economic Institutions):** no fewer than nine semester (12-15 quarter) units taken in at least two disciplines within the social and behavioral sciences.
- 2.5 **Area E (Life Understanding and Self-Development):** no fewer than three semester (4-5 quarter) units.

Students admitted to CSU campuses with certification of one or more subject areas may not be held to any additional lower division course work in the subject areas certified. Subject area certification does not exempt students from unmet lower division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.

---

\* If adopted, the proposed policy will be incorporated into a new executive order that will supersede Executive Order 342.

# Routes for Meeting CSU General Education Requirements

	A CSU General Education Title 5 Section 40405.2, 40405.3, 40405.4	B <i>Intersegmental Gen. Ed.* Transfer Curriculum Title 5 Section 40405.x</i>	C <i>UC Reciprocity* Title 5 Section 40405.x</i>
1 Implementing Policy	Executive Order 338 Executive Order 342	<i>Executive Order to be prepared</i>	<i>Executive Order to be prepared</i>
2 Students Affected	CSU native students; Students transferring within CSU; Students transferring into CSU from other accredited institutions, including Community Colleges	Limited to Community College students transferring to CSU	Limited to UC students transferring to CSU
3 Procedures for Transfer from Community Colleges	Community Colleges provide list of G.E. courses to CSU. Students completing listed courses are certified partially or fully.	<i>Students completing approved IGETC program are certified by Community Colleges and meet all CSU lower division G.E. requirements.</i>	NA
4 Procedures for Transfer from Community College Without Lower Division G.E. Completed	Partial or subject area certification possible; CSU campus establishes requirements in areas not certified. <i>Clarification of partial certification to be developed.</i>	Only full package is recognized. Partial completion of IGETC places student under provisions of Title 5 Sec. 40405.2 and all procedures shown at left.	NA
5 Procedures for Transfer from CSU & UC	E.O. 342 now governs. CSU campuses may certify partial or full completion for transfer to other CSU campuses. <i>Lower division reciprocity policy for transfer among CSU campuses to be developed.</i>	NA	Agreement that satisfaction of lower division G.E. is honored without course or program evaluation. <i>Procedures to be developed.</i>
6 Procedures for Review/Challenge of Courses	Course review subcommittee (CSU and CC faculty) challenge after the fact. Challenge panels are convened as prescribed in E.O. 342 .	Draft master lists are proposed by CC faculty and reviewed and approved by UC and CSU. Courses not acceptable to both segments are ineligible for master list.	No course challenge or program challenge procedures
7 Determination of Upper Division G.E.requirement for Community College Transfer Students	Units to complete E.O. 338 48 semester unit G.E. package must be required.	<i>Determined by CSU campus awarding degree.</i>	<i>Determined by CSU campus awarding degree.</i>

*\*Note: Items in Italics are proposed parts of policy that are either under review or will be proposed for review.*  
Academic Affairs, Plans 12/19/90

(Approved February 1991, as part of AS-1979-91/AA)

# CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and ROTC Programs

- WHEREAS** Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a violation of basic human rights; and
- WHEREAS** California State University campuses maintain relations and contracts with the United States Department of Defense whereby Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs are taught on various campuses; and
- WHEREAS** The United States Department of Defense's policy and regulations exclude homosexuals from military ranks; and
- WHEREAS** There is scholarly evidence that the policy of discrimination by the military on the basis of sexual orientation is a policy based on prejudice and is not beneficial to the national defense; and
- WHEREAS** It is a violation of CSU policy for the CSU system, or any part of it, to discriminate in employment or access on the basis of sexual orientation; and
- WHEREAS** The CSU makes vigorous efforts to create campus climates free of bigotry and prejudice; and
- WHEREAS** The Department of Defense policy and practice of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is inimical to the values of the university; and
- WHEREAS** Allowing academic credit for ROTC courses and awarding faculty status to instructors who teach in these programs facilitates such discrimination by lending institutional support and respectability to the Department of Defense's policy of discrimination; and
- WHEREAS** In May 1990 the Academic Senate CSU called upon the Department of Defense to end its discriminatory policy based on sexual orientation (AS-1939-90/AA); and
- WHEREAS** In May 1990 the Academic Senate CSU urged the campus senates to consider action if the military's policy discrimination against homosexuals was not rescinded by January 1, 1991; and
- WHEREAS** In June 1990 the Chair of the Academic Senate CSU received a reply from a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense, which stated: "Accordingly, we [the Department of Defense] do not plan to reassess the Department's policy on homosexuality"; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the campus senates and campus presidents to enact the following policies:
- (a) ROTC programs shall not be allowed to enroll any additional students;
  - (b) students already enrolled in ROTC programs shall be allowed to complete the program;
  - (c) all contracts with the United States military regarding the offering of ROTC programs at the University shall be terminated, not be renewed, or be allowed to expire; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to enact statewide procedures to ensure that its non-discrimination policy for all students, in all campus programs throughout the system, be observed; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the campus presidents to use the moral force of their offices to cause the Congress to abandon the Department of Defense's discriminatory policy against homosexuals; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That should the Department of Defense end its discriminatory policy regarding homosexuals, the Academic Senate CSU urge that campus policies regarding ROTC be modified accordingly.

(This resolution, 1980, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1991.)

# Support for Admissions Advisory Council Recommendations

**WHEREAS**, Implementation of the California State University 15-unit college preparatory admission course requirement is scheduled for fall 1992; and

**WHEREAS**, The Admissions Advisory Council has recommended to the Chancellor that the 15-unit college preparatory admission requirement be implemented fall 1992 as planned with an exception that would for an unspecified period allow students to be short one unit of any course requirement as long as they have earned a total of 15 college preparatory units; and

**WHEREAS**, Allowing any exception to extend for an “unspecified period” provides an unclear message about the importance of completing all of the requirements; and

**WHEREAS**, The Admissions Advisory Council will continue its annual monitoring of admission eligibility and plans a thorough review of admission requirements in 1994; and

**WHEREAS**, The Academic Senate of the California State University has been assured that the CSU will emphasize in its communication to high school counselors, and prospective students, and their families, the importance of completing all course requirements in English and mathematics; and

**WHEREAS**, The Chancellor plans to present an information item to the CSU Board of Trustees advising the Board of his plans to proceed with the scheduled implementation of the 15-unit requirements subject to the flexibility described above; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the Chancellor’s plans to proceed with implementation of the 15-unit college preparatory admission course requirements in fall 1992 with a one unit variance allowed within the 15 units of prescribed course requirements, but with the additional recommendation that the “unspecified period” for the one unit variance terminate no later than fall 1995.

(This resolution, 1984, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1991.)

## Implementation of the 15-unit College Preparatory Course Requirement

The California State University’ 15-unit college preparatory admission requirement requires completion of the following courses:

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Units</i>
English	4
Mathematics	3
U.S. History/Government	1
Laboratory Science	1
Foreign Language	2
Visual and Performing Arts	1
Electives	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15 Units</b>

The college preparatory requirement scheduled for final implementation in 1992 has been phased in since 1988 according to the following schedule:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Requirement*</i>
1988	10 of the 15 units*
1989	12 of the 15 units*
1990	12 of the 15 units*
1991	13 of the 15 units*
1992	all 15 units

*\*Through 1991 requires a minimum of 3 of the units required in English and 2 of the units required in mathematics.*

At the time the comprehensive college preparatory pattern was adopted, the Board of Trustees directed staff "...to implement the new requirement in ways sensitive to underrepresented students and to continue to monitor the admission and performance of first-time freshmen with particular reference to the effect of the subject requirements on eligibility and participation rates of ethnic minorities." That directive led to the inclusion of the following statement in Section 40753 of the Code of Regulations: "The Chancellor shall implement the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements and in so implementing shall make every effort to avoid undue hardship during the phasing in of these requirements..."

To comply with the Board's directive, CSU has monitored annually (1) the capacity of high schools to offer college preparatory courses, (2) the courses completed by California public high school students, and (3) the courses completed by CSU first-time freshman applicants in the upper one-third of California public high school graduates. The information derived from this monitoring has enabled CSU to determine how fast the course requirements can be implemented without impeding the access of students from underrepresented groups.

During its most recent examination of the phase-in schedule based on data for fall 1990 CSU applicants, the Admission Advisory Council concluded that implementation of the 15-unit college preparatory pattern in fall 1992 without some form of flexibility would jeopardize CSU's educational equity objectives by denying admission to disproportionate numbers of ethnic minority students. The Admission Advisory Council considered five implementation options but quickly agreed on the 15-unit requirement with a one unit variance as the preferred approach.

The Council's decision was influenced by data showing that (1) although about 90 percent of all applicants had completed all English and mathematics requirements, those who had not were more likely to be students from underrepresented groups and (2) only 70 percent of the applicants had completed the visual and performing arts course requirement. Therefore, the Council recommended to the Chancellor that the 15-unit college preparatory admission requirement be implemented in fall 1992 as planned with one adjustment: that for an unspecified period of time, students can establish admission eligibility if they are short one unit in any subject as long as they have earned a total of 15 college preparatory units.

The data in the following tables contrast percentages of 1988, 1989, and 1990 applicants who met the current eligibility index and completed the full 15-unit college preparatory pattern with applicants who completed 15 units of college preparatory subjects with the one unit of flexibility proposed by the Council.

#### Percentages of CSU Fall Applicants Who Completed the Full 15-Unit College Preparatory Pattern

<b>Year</b>	<b>American Indian</b>	<b>Asian/ Filipino</b>	<b>Black Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Total</b>
1988	36.4	42.8	36.1	37.5	46.8	44.4
1989	47.0	49.8	41.5	39.6	54.1	50.9
1990	45.7	51.6	41.2	42.8	56.2	52.2

Over half of the 1990 applicants had completed all 15-unit college preparatory units, representing an increase of 7.8 percentage points over 1988 and of 2.7 percentage points over the previous year. There were substantial percentage increases from 1988 to 1990 by all ethnic groups. While American Indians made a noteworthy 11.4 percentage point increase between 1988 and 1989, the reversal between 1989 and 1990 was not statistically significant.

#### Percentages of CSU Fall Applicants Completing 15-Units with One Unit Flexibility

<b>Year</b>	<b>American Indian</b>	<b>Asian/ Filipino</b>	<b>Black Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White Non-Hispanic</b>	<b>Total</b>
1988	65.0	73.2	64.2	64.5	75.8	73.5
1989	74.0	77.1	67.9	69.1	81.1	78.1
1990	70.8	78.7	68.6	70.4	82.2	78.7

Allowing one unit of flexibility increases the eligibility percentages of all ethnic groups and raises the overall compliance percentage to 78.7 percent. All but one ethnic group satisfied the 15-unit requirement with one unit variance at a rate of 70 percent or better. The percentage drop from 1989 to 1990 for American Indians is consistent with the drop in percentage completing the specified 15-unit requirement.

Other available data show that over 88 percent of eligible first-time freshman applicants in fall 1990 had completed 14 or more units, a full two years before the 15-unit requirement becomes effective. Completion rates for individual subject areas range from a high of 99 percent for science and social science to 70 percent for visual and performing arts. Completion rates for English and mathematics are almost 90 percent, though this value varies significantly by ethnic group. As noted earlier, applicants missing a unit of English or mathematics are more likely to be from underrepresented groups.

Since almost 80 percent of CSU fall 1990 applicants already meet the 15-unit requirement with one unit variance and since students have historically responded to increased course requirements, the Admission Advisory Council is confident that students will be able to meet the 15-unit course requirement in 1992 provided the one unit variance is permitted.

**(Approved March 1991, as part of AS-1984-91/AA)**

# Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University is on record as supporting with only minor reservations the Report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU; and

**WHEREAS**The Board of Trustees received a modified report with its recommendations, and requested the Chancellor to review the recommendations, and to prepare a plan for accomplishing the goals of the report and its recommendations; and

**WHEREAS**The Chancellor's staff have prepared (Draft Implementation Plan for Recommendations on Graduate Education 5/1/91) such an implementation plan; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University express support for the Draft Implementation Plan for Recommendations on Graduate Education; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Board of Trustees to endorse the definition of quality in graduate education as the standard for graduate programs in the CSU as recommended in the Report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU and set out in the Draft Implementation Plan for Recommendations on Graduate Education, Section Ia.

(This resolution, 1987, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1991)

## Attachment to: AS-1987-91/AA Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education

The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
400 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Code: AAP 91-04

Reply Requested March 15, 1991

Date: January 16, 1991

To: Presidents

From: Lee R. Kerschner Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs (w/attachment)  
Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs (w/attachment)  
Deans of Graduate Studies (w/attachment)  
Chairs, Academic Senates (w/attachment)  
Chancellors' Office Staff

Subject: Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education

At its meeting, of November 27-28, 1990, the Board of Trustees adopted the following resolution pertaining to proposed recommendations on graduate education:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University that the Board receives the report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the California State University with the recommendations as shown in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the November 27-28, 1990, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees requests the chancellor to review the recommendations contained in the report to determine:

1. those that can be effected immediately without additional resources;
2. those that can be effected only if additional resources are obtained;
3. those that would require changes in Board of Trustees policies or regulations;
4. those that would require action by campus senates and presidents; and
5. those that have implications for collective bargaining agreements;

and further requests that the chancellor prepare, with appropriate consultation, a plan for accomplishing the goals of the report and its recommendations; and be it further

- RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees directs the chancellor to encourage the campus presidents and faculty to pursue actively the goals of the recommendations of the report, subject to available resources and to file periodic reports to the chancellor on campus progress towards the goals, and be it further
- RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees acknowledges the need to meet and confer with the appropriate bargaining agents as required by law; and be it further
- RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees expresses its appreciation for the work of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the California State University

I am pleased to forward to you, attached, the full report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the California State University [not included in this document]. As you can see from the above resolution of the Board, a sorting of recommendations and an implementation plan have been requested. I am enclosing the proposed plan (labeled D 1/14/91 [not included in this document]), which will be submitted as an information item to the Board in March and as an action item in May and I am seeking your comments and suggestions on the placement of particular recommendations into categories and on the implementation plan proposed within each category. The draft will be discussed at the Executive Council meeting, of February 13, but a formal campus response is being requested after that date.

This is not a request for comments on the recommendations themselves. The campus responses to the recommendations were sought from you in an earlier draft version distributed in September 1989 (AAP 89-35), and were subsequently used by the Advisory Committee to modify its recommendations. In preparing its final recommendations, the committee was able to incorporate most of the suggestions and accommodate most of the concerns made by campuses in their formal responses. Because the recommendations were renumbered after the campus responses were received, I am attaching a table that cross-references the numbers in the attached trustee document; shows which recommendations were subject to comment by campuses; and shows whether the recommendations were revised as a result of campus comments [not included in this document].

While the proposed plan will be presented as an information item to the Trustees in March as it is shown in the attachment, we plan to address campus recommendations in the action item scheduled for the May Trustees meeting. To meet the agenda deadline, we will need formal campus responses by March 15, 1991. Please address questions to Dr Sally Casanova (213-590-5952 or ATSS 635 5952) or Dr Janice Erskine (213-590-5953).

## Attachment 1: Summary of Campus Responses to Graduate Study Implementation Plan for Recommendations on Graduate Education

DRAFT 5/1/91\*

1. Recommendations that can be effected immediately, without additional resources.
  - (a) The Board of Trustees endorses the following definition of quality in graduate education as the standard to which graduate programs in the California State University should aspire. Graduate programs of quality in the CSU require:
    1. An institutional infrastructure which provides:
      - appropriate standards and processes for admission, continuation, and graduation;
      - adequate facilities and resources (including library and information technologies) to conduct graduate work and research at an appropriate level and in an appropriate and timely fashion;
      - recognition of the need for appropriate teaching loads, resources for research opportunities to maintain professional and pedagogical currency and opportunities for renewal for faculty who teach graduate courses;
      - a scholarly environment providing such support programs as visiting lecturer series and faculty seminars.
      - appropriately qualified faculty to teach graduate courses or direct graduate research;
      - the involvement of graduate students in the program evaluation process, and
      - the opportunity for graduate students to participate in the intellectual discourse of departments.

---

\*Note: This draft contains recommendations submitted to the Board of Trustees in November 1990. In recommendations 8 and 13, references to doctoral programs have been revised to indicate that these are "joint doctoral" programs. All other recommendations are identical to those previously submitted.



2. A personalized learning format that permits greater student-professor contact (instruction, advising, and guidance) than the undergraduate model.
  3. A core curriculum in each program (where it applies) which emphasizes integration of knowledge and preparation for specialization and which is designed to assure master requisite knowledge and skills.
  4. A curriculum characterized by advanced disciplinary content and intellectual rigor beyond the baccalaureate level which imparts within its scholarly or professional context an appreciation of the intellectual and/or professional contributions of women and minorities, and prepares scholars and practitioners for a diverse society
  5. A teaching faculty with the Ph.D. (or other appropriate terminal degree) and relevant professional experience where required.
  6. A required demonstration of fundamental knowledge of research methods appropriate to the discipline.
  7. A required demonstration of oral and written communication skills.
  8. An opportunity to integrate and apply sophisticated knowledge in internships or practice related to the discipline.
  9. A required culminating experience (e.g., thesis, project, or comprehensive examination) which demands demonstration of breadth of knowledge in the discipline, depth in specific areas, and the ability to integrate that which has been learned (Recommendation 1)
- (b) The Board of Trustees directs the Chancellor to take the necessary steps to implement the following policies and/or practices, effective immediately:
- New graduate programs should be initiated only if they have the enrollment potential to achieve this [four courses annually] minimal level of course offering (Portion of Recommendation 3b)
  - Information about successful approaches [to ensuring graduate student writing competency] should be disseminated among the campuses. (Portion of Recommendation 4)
  - California State University campuses proposing joint doctoral programs shall evaluate proposals on the basis of the following minimal criteria:
    1. Faculty with extensive experience in offering graduate programs, including supervision of thesis research; extensive, relevant, and ongoing research experience and interest; demonstrated potential for obtaining funding for research
    2. Space, facilities, equipment, and support staff required for doing advanced research in the discipline.
    3. Potential for obtaining funding to provide financial support for students and for student research projects.
    4. Library holdings and staff appropriate for advanced study and research in the discipline. Institutes or Centers engaged in relevant work on the campus or in the region are desirable. (Recommendation 8)
  - The Office of the Chancellor should add as criteria for system approval of new master's degree programs evidence of a department's capacity to support the level of research required for a graduate program, the capacity of the proposing department to offer at least four graduate level courses per year, departmental plans for recruiting underrepresented students, and campus/departmental plans for assuring that each student is assigned to a major professor and a faculty committee. (Recommendation 15)
  - System guidelines establishing minimum standards for graduate certificate programs should be developed. Authority for approval of graduate certificate programs should remain delegated to the campuses. (Recommendation 17)
  - A separate graduate application form should be designed, taking into account the need to expedite student notification of admission while simultaneously recognizing the primary role of the department in the process of graduate admission. (Recommendation 14)
  - The Chancellor should establish a task force to develop a comprehensive, strategic plan for addressing the generation of resources for instrumentation, technological, and other support needs of The California State University instructional program. That plan should incorporate recommendations for change in Federal and State policies; steps to increase the competitiveness of CSU in receiving donated equipment; changes in laws on gifts,

bequests, and donations; proposals for new methods of financing; and such other strategies as may be developed. The Task Force should include campus representatives with expertise on the special instrumentation and technological needs of graduate and professional programs and expertise on public financing. (Recommendation 19)

(c) The Board requests that staff return with an action plan to implement the following recommendations:

- The Board of Trustees should aggressively support the Student Aid Commission in its attempt to seek full funding for financial aid programs in order to permit all students who are eligible to receive aid. (Recommendation 25a)
- The Board of Trustees should seek statutory changes that would permit the California Graduate Fellowship program to include full fees and sufficient funds in its grants for living expenses. (Recommendation 25b)
- The CSU Board of Trustees should establish or attempt to have an appropriate funding agency establish a program of financial aid for postbaccalaureate students who are preparing for entry into masters degree programs. (Recommendation 25c)

## 2. Recommendations that can be effected only if additional resources are obtained.

The study of graduate education had several recommendations for the generation of additional resources for graduate education. While several of these budget items were in fact requested in 1991-92 Program Change Proposals, it is clear that funding possibilities are slim until the State revenue situation improves. As soon as feasible, the Board requests that proposals be prepared to ensure that explicit State support is generated for the following activities, all of which are required to meet fully the definition of quality in graduate education.

- Faculty who earn workload credit for supervising graduate theses and projects should receive compensating courseload reductions. The Office of the Chancellor should seek necessary formula adjustments, and the campuses should assure that workload policy permits such recognition. (Recommendation 23a)
- The recommended instructional workload for those with significant responsibilities for graduate instruction should be reduced. The California State University should seek funding to implement this workload provision. Budgetarily, this could be accomplished by changing the definition of a full-time equivalent graduate student to 12 Student Credit Units instead of the current 15, by negotiating an increase in the weighting assigned to graduate course units, or by adjusting the normative ratios by which faculty positions are generated for graduate instruction. (Recommendation 23b)
- The California State University should continuously seek the number of faculty positions required to provide instruction of quality. A portion of these positions should be dedicated to tasks in support of graduate education beyond those associated with direct instruction. (Recommendation 24a)
- The Board of Trustees should continue to seek funding to meet the needs of CSU libraries, including funding to keep pace with inflationary price increases. In addition, The Office of the Chancellor in consultation with CSU and other cooperating library directors and the Deans of Graduate Studies, should develop a specific plan for providing CSU graduate students and faculty with electronic access to specialized information not available in local campus libraries. Attempts should be made to develop mechanisms for communicating widely and quickly the information available to graduate students and faculty. (Recommendation 24b)
- State support for research, scholarship, and creative activity should be increased to a base level of need expressed by faculty in 1988-89. At such time as the funding is increased, the Advisory Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity should revise the program guidelines to permit flexibility in support of faculty time, including released time. (Recommendation 24c)
- The Board of Trustees should seek General Fund support of the Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan for Minorities and Women and the California Pre-Doctoral Program for Minorities and Women. To further support minority students and women in significantly the number of fellowships currently awarded. The Chancellor's Office should study the possibility of combining these categorical programs to provide campuses with greater flexibility in meeting the unique needs of local graduate students for support in masters and doctoral degree programs. (Recommendation 25e)

### 3. Recommendations that would require changes in Board of Trustees policies or regulations.

The Board of Trustees requests that the Chancellor initiate consultation to effect the following changes:

- Title 5 should be revised to implement the admission categories proposed in Recommendation 12 [below] and to implement the required increase in graduate level coursework from 50 to 70 percent as proposed in Recommendation 3 [below]. (Recommendation 16)
- The percent of graduate coursework required in a graduate program should be increased from 50 to 70 percent (e.g., from 15 units to 21 units in a 30-unit program). A phase-in period of five years should be permitted for existing programs. (Recommendation 3a)
- The following categories of postbaccalaureate student should replace current T5 categories and be used by all CSU campuses for admission and student classification and for systemwide reporting: Graduate Classified, Graduate-Conditional, Graduate-Special, Postbaccalaureate-Credential Certificate, and Postbaccalaureate (2nd Baccalaureate Degree). (Portion of Recommendation 12)
- The Office of the Chancellor should create a position classification that will accommodate graduate students who are teaching under supervision. (Recommendation 18)

### 4. Recommendations that require action by campus senates and presidents.

The Board of Trustees encourages campuses to adopt policies and practices that support quality in graduate education. As the study of graduate education says, those recommendations on campus infrastructure attempt to protect campus autonomy in matters of administration while recognizing that any campus placing a priority on graduate education will need to support it with appropriate administrative and policy structures. The recommendations on budgeting are grounded in the assumption that budget generation is a matter of system formulas and trustee action, while budget allocation, which is a campus responsibility, will allow for needed local flexibility in the assignment of priorities. In accord with the advice of the committee the following recommendations are supported by the Board as defining sound practice at the graduate level, but they are advisory rather than mandatory to the campuses.

- Campuses should assure that students have an organized program of advisement and that all students' progress be monitored. Each graduate student should have a major professor and a faculty committee. The committee should normally be chaired by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member with the Ph.D. or appropriate terminal degree who is also the thesis adviser and/or major professor for the student. (Recommendation 2)
- Each department offering a master's degree program should make available at least four regular graduate courses in addition to supervision and independent study per year. (Portion of Recommendation 3b)
- The use of graduate independent study courses should be carefully controlled, and no graduate program should utilize independent study courses (excluding thesis or project) to meet more than 20 percent of the unit requirements for graduate level work. In disciplines which are research-intensive, 30 percent is allowable. (Recommendation 3c)
- The use of "dual-listed" courses (courses offered under both an undergraduate course number and a graduate course number and which enroll both undergraduate and graduate students) should be eliminated or limited to a few justifiable instances (e.g., studio or laboratory courses where the instruction is one-on-one). Existing small programs central to each University's mission may use, dual listing where it is necessary to assure sufficient offerings and where course requirements are clearly more rigorous for graduate students. (Recommendation 3d)
- The development and assessment of graduate student writing competency demands renewed attention. Procedures for assuring writing proficiency both prior to admission and at advanced levels should be periodically examined by each campus. While all students must meet campus standards, alternative means of meeting those standards for students with special needs should be arranged. (Portion of Recommendation 4)
- When reviewing proposals for new master's degree programs, each campus should use, as one of the criteria for approval, the department's ability to provide graduate students with appropriate opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity. (Recommendation 5)
- Teaching opportunities or training should be provided to students as a regular part of graduate programs where appropriate to the discipline. All graduate students employed by the CSU in teaching positions shall be required to participate in a discipline-related seminar or the equivalent, on teaching. Each campus should provide an orientation or workshop for graduate students who will teach. (Recommendation 6)

- The choice of culminating experience should be that which is educationally most appropriate to the student, and to the discipline. Where a project or exam ~~was~~ as the culminating experience, it should be equivalent in rigor to the thesis. An oral defense should be part of the culminating experience.(Recommendation 7)
- Policies concerning the qualifications of faculty teaching or ~~acting~~ in other roles in graduate programs should be established at each of the campuses.(Recommendation 9)
- Regular program review and evaluation should be used by each campus to assess the quality of its graduate program. The evaluation design should ensure that the graduate program is given specific attention separate from the other offerings of the department. The program review guidelines now used at each campus should be reviewed and revised to incorporate the specific criteria and indicators of quality set forth in Section I, above, and in the following recommendations on campus policies and practices. External reviewers should be used in all evaluations of graduate programs, and graduate program review should be monitored by the Dean of Graduate Studies.(Recommendation 10)
- In addition to assessment of discriminatory barriers, each campus should explicitly assess the needs of all present and potential students in its constituency and develop plans to address the special needs of graduate students.(Recommendation 11)
- Graduate certificate programs should be utilized as a means of responding to student needs for occupationally related graduate coursework without unduly ~~interfering~~ interfering with degree programs. The graduate dean should have administrative responsibility for policies and for monitoring of graduate certificate programs.(Recommendation 11)
- The department (or program) should be responsible for recommending admission of students to graduate programs. Students should be admitted either to Graduate-Classified or Graduate-Conditional status from the outset, if the students' objectives are a graduate degree and they are eligible for admission. Students not admitted to the department or program may be admitted as Graduate-Special, with the understanding that Graduate-Special students are not eligible to take graduate coursework in the department (or program) in which they have been denied admission, without explicit approval of the graduate dean and the department or program graduate coordinator(Portion of Recommendation 12)
- To improve the pipeline which ultimately produces doctorally qualified faculty ~~each~~ each campus should attempt to reach an agreement with doctoral granting institutions for articulation of one or more of its master's degree programs with a doctoral program, emphasizing those fields where the underrepresentation of women and minority faculty is most acute. The CSU in addition should increase the number of joint doctoral programs it offers.(Recommendation 13)
- Each California State University campus should identify an administrator who is the chief spokesperson for graduate education and who has direct administrative responsibility for actions and policies affecting the quality of graduate programs. This individual should be the designee of the president in such areas as admissions and graduation policies involving graduate students; should be centrally involved in graduate program development and evaluation, including decisions regarding the implementation of programmatic or budgetary changes that derive from such evaluations; and should be recognized as the campus official (under the president and in consultation with the faculty) most directly concerned with all matters pertaining to graduate program enhancement.(Recommendation 20a)
- The faculty graduate coordinator in a department or program should be recognized as an important element in promoting graduate student diversity and providing leadership necessary to the vitality and quality of the graduate program. Such recognition should be made explicit by adjustment of teaching load(Recommendation 20b)
- A review of campus infrastructures (policies and practices) that support basic and applied research should be initiated by each campus. The review should consider such issues as hours of laboratory, library, and facility availability; computer access policies; equipment conditions and availability; campus policies for the governance of research; and processes for the flow of financial resources that support research.
- To support the kind of research required for graduate education of quality, campus policies on intellectual property rights should be more clearly delineated, and procedures should be established which encourage faculty and students to produce and disseminate original work, with appropriate protection and advice for patents, licenses, and copyrights. (Recommendation 21)
- Means should be sought to increase graduate course enrollments to economically justifiable levels while increasing the availability of graduate level coursework. Such means might include "pooling" graduate courses between related departments, encouraging cross-registration, or coordinating graduate offerings in a between related departments, encouraging

cross-registration, or coordinating graduate offerings in a region with other campuses and institutions. (Recommendation 22)

- Until such time as full funding is available to support graduate students who are eligible for financial aid, each campus should review its policies on the relative priority of undergraduate and graduate students for receipt of financial aid and consider the extent to which some percentage of financial aid funding should be reserved for graduate students, particularly for students who have historically been underrepresented in graduate study. (Recommendation 25d)
- Joint doctoral programs should be implemented only when supplemental budget support is provided for them. (Recommendation 24d)

**5. Recommendations that have implication for collective bargaining agreements.**

The following recommendations have been included in the categories above. They will need to be negotiated with the bargaining agent prior to implementation.

- Faculty who earn workload credit for supervising graduate theses and projects should receive compensating course load reductions. The Office of the Chancellor should seek necessary formula adjustments, and the campuses should assure that workload policy permits such recognition. (Recommendation 23a)
- The recommended instructional workload for those with significant responsibilities for graduate instruction should be reduced. The California State University should seek funding to implement this workload provision. Budgetarily, this could be accomplished by changing the definition of a full-time equivalent graduate student to 12 Student Credit Units instead of the current 15, by negotiating an increase in the weighting assigned to graduate course units, or by adjusting the normative ratios by which faculty positions are generated for graduate instruction. (Recommendation 23b)
- The faculty graduate coordinator in a department or program should be recognized as an important element in promoting graduate student diversity and providing leadership necessary to the vitality and quality of the graduate program. Such recognition should be made explicit by adjustment of teaching load. (Recommendation 20b)

(Approved May 1991, as part of AS-1987-91/AA)

# C Grades in Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University has endorsed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) as an important mechanism for making it easier for students to transfer between the segments of higher education in the state; and

**WHEREAS**Students should be expected to perform at an acceptable level in all general education courses because they provide the broad foundation of learning and skills to an educated person; and

**WHEREAS**Performance level expectations should be uniform across the segments with respect to acceptable grade levels in the courses of the IGETC; and

**WHEREAS**The University of California will require a minimum grade of C [a grade of C- (C minus) will not satisfy this requirement] in each course submitted by a student to satisfy the requirements of the IGETC for transfer to the University of California; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend that the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees require a minimum grade of C [a grade of C- (C minus) will not satisfy this requirement] in each course submitted by a student to satisfy the requirements of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum for transfer to the CSU.

(This resolution, 1990, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1991.)

# The Student-Athlete in the CSU

- WHEREAS** Intercollegiate athletics is an important activity in the California State University; and
- WHEREAS** There is heuristic and social value in competitive sport for our students; and
- WHEREAS** Athletic programs in the CSU have made a dynamic contribution to nearly all of our campuses, helping to build a sense of community as well as to promote community support; but
- WHEREAS** Recent studies, such as the March 1991 report of the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (KFCIA) and the February 1990 report of the American Association of University Professors Special Committee on Athletics (AAUP), document widespread concern regarding the relationship of some programs in intercollegiate athletics to the primary mission of colleges and universities; and
- WHEREAS** The KFCIA has issued a call for the reform of intercollegiate athletics, asserting that “[i]t is time to get back to first principles. Intercollegiate athletics exist first and foremost for the student-athletes who participate, whether male or female, majority or minority, whether they play football in front of 50,000 or field hockey in front of their friends” (KFCIA p.8); and
- WHEREAS** The KFCIA has published (March 1991) and the AAUP has adopted (June 1991) guidelines for intercollegiate athletics; and
- WHEREAS** The obligation of the California State University is to educate, as well as to graduate, our students; and
- WHEREAS** CSU programs in intercollegiate athletics should reflect the highest academic values, which should be expressed in a statement of principles common to all campuses of the California State University; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the “Principles and Guidelines for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU” appended to this resolution and urge each campus senate to do likewise; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to endorse and the presidents to implement the “Principles and Guidelines for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU” to provide necessary guidance for faculty, students, and administrators in the appropriate operation of CSU intercollegiate athletics programs; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and Chancellor to hold campus presidents accountable for all aspects of their athletic programs.

(This resolution, 2062, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1992.)

## Principles and Guidelines for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU

*PREAMBLE: The following set of principles and guidelines is intended to be minimal and generic, rather than exhaustive. We are aware that all CSU campuses have their own athletics policies, whether or not they are codified, and that for some campuses the principles listed below may merely reflect ordinary policy and practice, while other campuses may wish to enact policies more stringent and detailed than those suggested by this list. We are also aware that many of these principles are presently included in NCAA regulations. While we welcome the strengthening of NCAA rules for participation and hope that they will be maintained, we believe that the primary responsibility for the integrity of athletics program rests with our institutions.*

### Institutional Principles

1. The faculty is responsible for the curriculum and for protection of academic standards.
2. Academic and Athletics administrators should ground all regulatory procedures in the primacy of academic values.
3. CSU campus athletics committees should be primarily composed of faculty representatives and they should be appointed by the campus academic senates.
4. Faculty representatives appointed by campus presidents to athletic governance organizations, such as the NCAA and regional athletics consortia, should be endorsed by their academic senates.
5. Presidents should be fully committed to the principle of gender equity

6. Graduation rates of student-athletes should be comparable to those of other students.
7. Each campus should develop the means by which to make certain that student-athletes understand that their primary obligation to themselves and to the University is to be students. Students should understand that representing their campus by participation in intercollegiate athletic competition is a privilege, one contingent upon satisfactory academic performance, upon steady progress toward a baccalaureate degree, and upon social conduct which reflects the values of the University
8. All prospective student-athletes should have a reasonable prospect of graduating and should normally meet regular admissions standards. Such judgments should be made by admissions officers.
9. Student-athletes should be admitted as "special admits" on the same basis as all other applicants for special admission and be constrained by the same requirements for satisfactory progress.
10. California Community College and junior college transfer students should meet the standards for transfer required of all other students.
11. Freshman students whose high school course of study renders them academically ineligible or partially ineligible for competition under NCAA rules specifying units, course patterns, and GP should (1) sit out a year and (2) meet the normal requirements for eligibility before competing.
12. Students who are invited for campus visits should be informed that all scholarship offers are contingent upon their meeting academic standards appropriate for admission.

**Guidelines**

13. Using procedures modeled after those of academic governance, presidents should commit themselves to an annual review of their athletics programs in areas pertaining to policy (including admissions, academic progress, graduation rates, ICA budgets, and such gender equity issues as distribution of resources, schedules, facilities, travel arrangements, coaching, and participation). These reviews should be published in a substantive annual report to the campus senate and subsequently made available to the entire campus community
14. Student-athletes should not be counseled or permitted to enroll in courses simply to maintain eligibility but should be counseled into courses of study which lead to a major and a degree.
15. In order to enjoy the privilege of participation, student-athletes should demonstrate satisfactory progress toward a degree.
16. Satisfactory progress should be determined at least on an annual basis.

(Approved May 1992, as part of AS-2062-92/AA/FA)



# Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program

**WHEREAS** The faculty have primary authority over, and responsibility for, the academic program and the education of students; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of the California State University and the campus senate chairs have organized a series of regional campus meetings to discuss faculty priorities for dealing with unprecedented fiscal constraints brought about by the state's continued budget deficit and structural problems in the state budget; and

**WHEREAS** These discussions have served to reaffirm the Senate's position that access without quality has no meaning and have identified areas of faculty consensus; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the statement "Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program."

(This resolution, 2067, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1992.)

## Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program

The faculty's paramount concern is access to an education of quality allowing us to discharge our mission according to the Master Plan for Higher Education. Preserving the quality of the educational experience for students requires:

- Ensuring the quality of instructional programs;
- Ensuring appropriate instructional support;
- Ensuring that sufficient faculty of high quality are available to serve student needs for instruction, taking into account the nature and mix of programs and the composition of the student body as determined by the faculty

In the event that the state does not provide the resources adequate to serve projected enrollment, the CSU should not enroll more students than those for whom it can provide classes and support services. It is preferable to limit student numbers through both control of admissions and management of course enrollments, rather than admit students who cannot find classes in which to enroll.

- Involving the faculty is essential to educationally sound enrollment decisions.
- The faculty of each campus must participate in determining secondary criteria when the university must limit admissions.
- Secondary criteria should support the mission of the campus. Considerations include attracting and retaining a diverse student population and maintaining an appropriate mix of programs.

Each campus should examine its own policies to maximize student access to needed courses and programs. Taking into account the campus mission, student body and mix of programs, the faculty should consider such strategies as the following:

- Enforcing prerequisite checking;
- Tightening or enforcing disqualification policies, add/drop policies, and repeat-and-cancel policies;
- Limiting the number of units in which a student can enroll each term;
- Setting priorities for enrollment in major courses;
- Limiting access to courses other than those in English and mathematics for students who have not yet satisfied ELM and EPT requirements;
- At the system level the CSU should facilitate campus purchase and sharing of software that allows campuses to implement such strategies.

While systemwide guidelines may be appropriate, decisions about such areas as the following are best made on the campus, with full faculty consultation:

- The mix of programs, including the balance among lower division, upper division, and graduate education;
- Organization of courses and faculty assignments in delivering the campus educational program;

- Teaching strategies, including the development of more cost-effective teaching innovations;
- Optimal use of facilities.

While we consider support services vital to each campus' mission, the mix of programs and level of support for each should be determined at the campus level with full participation of the faculty in making the decisions.

The faculty of the CSU are the primary resource upon which educational quality depends. The recruitment and retention of a faculty of high quality is essential in maintaining the quality of the education the CSU provides. Even in a time of budget crisis, faced with the need to replace fifty per cent of its faculty in the next ten years, the CSU must provide (not in order of importance):

- Expanded opportunities for faculty professional development;
- Increasing support for faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities;
- Competitive salaries and a salary policy (MSAs, etc.) which allow the CSU to attract and retain the highest quality faculty and staff in a difficult hiring situation;
- Greater recognition of the special needs of probationary faculty for support in working towards tenure.

Maintenance of the educational program of the University under such difficult economic and political circumstances requires that the faculty remain unified, informed, and involved. The CSU must be able to communicate a compelling message to California citizens, legislators, and other policy makers as well as to students and faculty about the impact of severe underfunding on educational quality and access to educational programs.

{Approved March 1992, as part of AS-2067-92/Ex}

# The Importance of International Students Being Educated Within The California State University

- WHEREAS**The Mission Statement of the California State University adopted by the Board of Trustees, November 1985, asserts that it is the mission of the CSU “to prepare students for an international multicultural society”; and
- WHEREAS**The Board of Trustees noted in the Mission Statement that in order to accomplish its mission the California State University should: “Promote an understanding and appreciation of the peoples, natural environment, cultures, economies, and diversity of the world”; and
- WHEREAS**The Board of Trustees in the November 1985 Mission Statement recognized that diversity is an important component of quality education; and
- WHEREAS**The diversity of the California State University population creates an ambiance in which international students can flourish; and
- WHEREAS**A high percentage of CSU students lack the financial means for foreign travel; and
- WHEREAS**California State University students who were born in the United States receive great benefits from the presence of international students on their campus; and
- WHEREAS**On January 10, 1992, the Academic Senate of the California State University, in AS-2065-92/CSIP, recognized that international students’ tuition and fees at the CSU now ranks sixth highest among public universities in the United States; and
- WHEREAS**Some public concern has been expressed as to the potential financial drain of international students on the CSU (“CPEC Analyses of Options and Alternatives for California Higher Education,” draft 30 March 1992, p. 25); the tuition and fees collected from an international student exceed the full average cost of instruction in the CSU; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the campuses to continue their recognition that the presence of international students promotes diversity in the CSU and enhances the education of students attending the California State University without incurring additional costs to the system.

(This resolution, 2073, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1992)

# Support of the Statement of Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen, Phase II—Chinese, Japanese, Russian

- WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University supports improved articulation between secondary and postsecondary education; and
- WHEREAS**Reports and analyses for over a decade have remarked on the comparative failure of the United States adequately to prepare its citizens in cultural knowledge and in language proficiency; and
- WHEREAS**The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates has received from its drafting committee the *Statement of Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen, Phase II — Chinese, Japanese, Russian*; and
- WHEREAS**The Statement is designed to inform instructors, students, and the public of the progressive nature of acquiring language competencies and cultural knowledge; and
- WHEREAS**The Statement will help students in preparing for college, parents and counselors in advising, and teachers and administrators in planning the curriculum; and
- WHEREAS**The Statement adapts descriptions of communicative language competencies from the national American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines (1986 et seq.); and
- WHEREAS**The Statement is based on the same fundamental principles as the California State Department of Education's *Model Curriculum Standards, Grades Nine Through Twelve, For Foreign Language*; and
- WHEREAS**The Academic Senate CSU endorsed the *Statement on Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen, Phase I — French, German, Spanish* in May, 1986 (AS-1655-86/AA); therefore be it
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the *Statement of Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen, Phase II — Chinese, Japanese, Russian* as presented by the drafting committee of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates; and be it further
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU commend the members of the drafting committee for their skill, energy, and thoughtfulness in preparing the *Statement of Competencies in Languages Other Than English Expected of Entering Freshmen, Phase II — Chinese, Japanese, Russian*.

(This resolution, 2081, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1992.)

# Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression

- WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of the California State University recognize that freedom of artistic expression is an indispensable part of academic freedom; and
- WHEREAS**There are frequent attempts to limit artistic presentations at academic institutions because these presentations are perceived to be offensive; and
- WHEREAS**In 1990 the American Association of University Professors adopted a policy on fundamental preservation of artistic freedom at academic institutions; and
- WHEREAS**Without a CSU policy protecting artistic expression, campuses are vulnerable to attempts to repress artistic expression; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the American Association of University Professors' policy, "Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression," and urge the CSU Board of Trustees to incorporate this statement into the policies of the CSU.

(This resolution, 2111, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1992.)

## Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression

*The following is a concluding statement by the participants in the 1990 World Trade Conference on Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression, sponsored by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the World Trade Foundation. The statement was endorsed by AAUP's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Trade Unions and by its Council at their meetings in June 1990.*

*Attempts to curtail artistic presentations at academic institutions on grounds that the works are offensive to some members of the campus community and general public occur with disturbing frequency. Those who support restrictions argue that works presented to the public rather than in the classroom or other entirely intramural settings should conform to their view of the prevailing community standard rather than to standards of academic freedom. We believe that "essential as freedom is for the relation and judgment of facts, it is even more indispensable to the imagination." In our judgment academic freedom in the creation and presentation of works in the visual and performing arts by ensuring greater opportunity for imaginative exploration and expression, best serves the public and the academy.*

*The following proposed policies are designed to assist institutions to respond to the issues that may arise from the presentation of artistic works to the public in a manner which preserves academic freedom:*

### (1) Academic Freedom in Artistic Expression.

Faculty and students engaged in the creation and presentation of works of the visual and the performing arts are engaged in pursuing the mission of the university as much as are those who write, teach, and study in other academic disciplines. Works of the visual and performing arts are important both in their own right and because they can enhance our experience and understanding of social institutions and the human condition. Artistic expression in the classroom, studio, and workshop therefore merits the same assurance of academic freedom that is accorded to other scholarly and teaching activities. Since faculty and student artistic presentations to the public are integral to their teaching, learning, and scholarship, these presentations no less merit protection. Educational and artistic criteria should be used by all who participate in the selection and presentation of artistic works. Reasonable content-neutral regulation of time, place, and manner of presentations should be developed and maintained. Academic institutions are obliged to ensure that regulations and procedures do not impair freedom of expression or discourage creativity by subjecting work to tests of propriety or ideology.

### (2) Accountability.

Academic institutions provide artistic performances and exhibits to encourage artistic creativity, expression, learning, and appreciation. The institutions do not thereby endorse the specific artistic presentations nor do the presentations necessarily represent the institution. This principle of institutional neutrality does not relieve institutions of general responsibility for maintaining professional and educational standards, but it does mean that institutions are not responsible for

---

<sup>1</sup> Helen C. White, "Our Most Urgent Professional Task," *AAUP Bulletin* 45 (March 1959), 282

the views or attitudes expressed in specific artistic works any more than they would be for the content of other instruction, publication, or invited speeches. Correspondingly, those who present artistic work should not represent themselves or their work as speaking for the institution and should otherwise fulfill their educational and professional responsibilities.

**(3) The Audience.**

When academic institutions offer exhibitions or performances to the public, they should ensure that the rights of the presenters and the audience are not impaired by a "heckler's veto" from those who may be offended by the presentation. Academic institutions should ensure that those who choose to view or attend may do so without interference. Mere presentation in a public place does not create a "captive audience." Institutions may reasonably designate specific places as generally available or unavailable for exhibitions or performances.

**(4) Public Funding.**

Public funding for artistic presentations and for academic institutions does not diminish (and indeed may heighten) the responsibility of the university community to ensure academic freedom and of the public to respect the integrity of academic institutions. Government imposition on artistic expression of a test of propriety, ideology or religion is an act of censorship which impermissibly denies the academic freedom to explore, teach, and learn.

(Approved May 1988, as part of AS-2111-92/FA)

# Library Planning in the CSU

- WHEREAS** Recent analysis provided in *Background Documents for January Library Report for the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology* reflects a precipitous erosion of funding for California State University libraries, indicating that for the three budgeted years, the actual allocation was \$61,000,000 (20%) less than the General Fund Appropriation; and
- WHEREAS** The General Fund appropriation was considered to be nearly \$100,000,000 lower than the official CSU budget request during this three-year period; and
- WHEREAS** Over a seven-year period book purchases have plummeted from a high of 382,760 books acquired in 1985-86 to a low of approximately 201,000 in 1991-92, a drop of 47% and the number of journals subscribed to has dropped during 1985-86 to 1991-92 from approximately 60,000 to 58,400; and
- WHEREAS** *Background Documents for January Library Report for the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology*, September 1992, provides an elaboration of the components that will characterize a successful academic library of the 1990s and beyond, and outlines the current status of "information technology" in CSU libraries as well as what is still being accomplished and planned; and
- WHEREAS** The possible configurations of electronic libraries are highly speculative, visions of electronic libraries are uncertain, and thus enthusiasm for electronic solutions or a desire to avoid the high cost of continuing present operation should not be the sole justifications for technological advancement in libraries; and
- WHEREAS** As operations and services become more complex and more capital-intensive, ad hoc unsystematic decision making can lead library services down unproductive paths, and correcting mistakes becomes expensive and disruptive; and
- WHEREAS** To proceed with further movement toward the development of electronic libraries without librarian and other faculty consultation could lead to over-enthusiastic solutions, considering the cost of such ventures, and could lead to the adoption of impractical or unsuitable strategies, particularly when one considers the CSU's constrained financial situation; and
- WHEREAS** There is vital concern among many members of the library and scholarly community regarding product availability and copyright law with respect to electronic access and document delivery; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University applaud the efforts of the CSU libraries toward shared access to collections and for their demonstrated efforts at cooperation among libraries, computer centers, and telecommunications areas; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to ensure that the inclusion of electronic library services takes place within traditional library services in a careful and systematic way, allowing full participation of librarians and other faculty; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to encourage appropriate units in his office to investigate and keep current with copyright developments and to work with vendors in the development of products requested and currently needed by CSU libraries; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to ensure that plans for library development in the CSU be based primarily on campus determinations of the appropriate balance of traditional and electronic library services in their campus libraries; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge local senates to work with library faculty and staff to determine the appropriate balance of traditional and electronic library services in their campus libraries; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge the Chancellor to ensure campus presidents make every effort to provide adequate funding for necessary traditional library services as the campus plans for appropriate integration of electronic services proceed.

(This resolution, 2115, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1993.)

## The Necessity of Lower-Division Education in the CSU

- WHEREAS** There is a proposal before the Assembly Committee on Higher Education to shift all or substantially more responsibility for lower-division education to the community colleges; and
- WHEREAS** The development of upper-division major courses and creation of a coherent major relies on faculty involvement in development, teaching, and evaluation of lower division courses; and
- WHEREAS** Further reducing lower-division education in the California State University would substantially disrupt continuity between lower- and upper-division courses and coherence of the major, thereby reducing the quality of undergraduate education in the California State University; and
- WHEREAS** Lack of coherence in the undergraduate major resulting from disjunction between lower- and upper-division courses would seriously disadvantage CSU graduates in the workforce and in seeking advanced professional and other higher education; and
- WHEREAS** Concentrating lower division in the community colleges would undermine efforts on CSU campuses to provide integrated and innovatively designed general education and major course programs, and
- WHEREAS** Professional or high-unit majors must integrate non-major and general education lower-division courses throughout their entire curricula, and
- WHEREAS** Increased enrollment of UC- and CSU-qualified students into the community colleges would disadvantage the less academically prepared high school graduates who now benefit from the transition into several sectors of higher education offered by the Master Plan, and
- WHEREAS** Shifting more lower-division course work to the community colleges would demand increased professional preparation of community college faculty, increased staffing and increased space, thus leading **not** to savings for the state of California but to substantially additional costs; and
- WHEREAS** Without substantial lower-division instruction, it would be economically prohibitive to maintain in the CSU the critical mass of faculty with appropriate sub-discipline specialization's to provide diversity of upper-division courses required for degree programs; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the position statement "The Necessity of Lower-Division Education in the CSU" prepared by the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees to oppose strongly any action which would substantially or completely reduce the lower-division offerings of the CSU; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge the Assembly Committee on Higher Education to refrain from taking any action affecting the offering of lower-division instruction in the CSU.

(This resolution, 2134, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

## The Necessity of Lower Division Education in the CSU

In documents prepared for a discussion of the Master Plan in Higher Education the following has been proposed: "to substantially reduce lower division education as a primary mission of UC and CSU, and provide funding for the Community Colleges sufficient to absorb the shifted students." (Discussion Paper 1: Mission and Function.) It has also been suggested that lower division growth be concentrated in community colleges. AB 1174 (Bornstein). However such actions would severely undermine the quality of the baccalaureate degree program in the CSU and thus impair the ability of CSU graduates to compete for



postgraduate education and employment and also reduce their competence and effectiveness in the workplace. While the proposal to substantially reduce lower division education in the CSU and UC is preferred as a cost savings measure to respond to short-term budget pressures, its adoption would represent a fundamental educational policy change with long-term educational, social, and economic consequences in California. Further it is our judgment that such an action would not save money and instead may have increased long-term economic costs.

## The Vision of the Master Plan

The provisions of a low-cost quality undergraduate education accessible to all eligible California citizens has been a long-term commitment of the state of California. A key assumption of the Master Plan for Higher Education has been that such a goal is crucially important and that the provision of a high quality undergraduate education is central to the mission of the CSU. Indeed, the CSU is the public institution in the state which has taken very seriously the goal of providing an excellent undergraduate education. The CSU has, in fact, been providing full baccalaureate education successfully to students of widely diverse backgrounds. The Master Plan has effectively guided higher education in California for more than three decades. Its provision of three systems with three distinct but overlapping and integrated missions has been the envy of the country and the world. The Master Plan envisioned a continuous flow of educational experiences and opportunities from the preparatory and vocational education offered by the community colleges, through the full four-year undergraduate and master's experiences provided by the CSU, to the highest reaches of professional and graduate education in the UC. To enact policies in a time of fiscal crisis that eliminate components of an integrated educational plan for perceived cost effectiveness will disrupt and dismantle an educational system which, while not perfect, contains long-term educational wisdom and a sound action plan for the future.

A fragmented undergraduate curriculum, i.e., one in which upper division courses are not interrelated and supplemented by foundations in the lower division courses is not a quality undergraduate education. A major is an integrated whole in which upper division courses build on a array of lower division courses that provide background on key concepts, histories, and methodologies of the discipline.

In order to ensure continuity and overall integration of the major a significant number of faculty teaching upper division courses in a major must also be involved in teaching and monitoring lower division courses. Fortunately many of the best teacher/scholars in the CSU choose to teach introductory subject matter courses, providing not only for the maintenance of curriculum vitality but serving as "recruiters" for the major. Many students who go into the liberal and technical professions so needed by our state arrive at their degree objectives because they are recruited and mentored by faculty/scholars while in the lower division program. This is an added benefit for first-time freshmen who enter CSU and, furthermore because CSU is a comprehensive university with many departments and disciplines not represented in the community colleges, students have a broader exposure to discipline and career choices.

Whether specializing in biological science, philosophy or the fine arts, students need the foundation material of the first years of coursework to have the proper building blocks of the discipline. This is particularly true in technological and preprofessional majors. A key sequence of courses, for example, in economics, accounting, MIS and mathematics is essential for all business majors. These must be taken in the first two years of the undergraduate experience, and continuity in content and methodologies is assumed in the upper division major courses.

A basic assumption of the Master Plan is that students who complete lower division coursework in a California Community College will be fully prepared for upper division coursework in the CSU or UC. This goal has been realized by a well-developed and effective system of articulation with community colleges that assures continuity and building to upper division majors. Articulation only makes sense in a context in which there is a substantial lower division component present in the segments to which transfer is being made.

## General Education and Continuity with Majors

Another component of a quality undergraduate education is the assumption of a close connection between lower division general education courses and majors and professional courses. Lower division general education must provide the key skills of critical, creative and quantitative thinking as well as those of effective oral and written communication. These skills are essential for all fields of study and are assumed as a base on which development of other related skills in the disciplines occurs. Further, these skills are not taught in a vacuum and are most effectively taught in the context of the upper division subject areas. The lower division skills courses must connect and flow into the more refined skills of the discipline as well as receive reinforcement in the context of the major subject area. Also, the breadth of view and the liberalizing effect of general education informs and enriches discipline study and enables the culminating and interdisciplinary synthesis that should occur in culminating experiences of a senior seminar in a major. The state of California and its educational institutions recognized the important

connections of general education with upper division discipline and professional programs when it worked to achieve the General Education Transfer Curriculum.

Because of the close connection between majors and the General Education curriculum, it is imperative that discipline faculty bring the depth of their training and understanding to General Education development and instruction. Further involvement of discipline specialists in General Education development and instruction insures the necessary crossover and cross-fertilization between general education content and discipline content and skills which informs and enriches the total educational experience.

### Educational and Social Aspects of a Coherent Education

Continuity and coherence, then, are necessary components of a quality undergraduate education. This is true educationally, socially, and pragmatically. Educational research shows, for example, that continuity and coherence of educational experience produces better educated and more satisfied students. Continuity and coherence of the undergraduate experience establishes a sense of purpose and direction for students regardless of their subject area pursuits and provides persons of disparate backgrounds a sense of community and shared values as well as an appreciation of differences. A sense of community and common interests is crucial in today's diverse, international and ever-changing world. A residential four-year undergraduate experience, of course, contributes even more to this bridge building, but for nonresidential students the sense of community provided by curricular coherence is invaluable.

In addition to the educational imperatives for a coherent undergraduate experience, there are also economic and social imperatives having to do with the needs of the workforce for today and the future. There can be little doubt that the workforce of the future, immediate or long term, will need to be broadly educated, flexible and creative. Californians must be able to function effectively in many environments. This requires strong communication skills and the application of sophisticated conceptual understanding to complex real-world problems as well as an ability to work with many kinds of people and a capacity for conflict resolution and the building of community. A coherent, strong, quality undergraduate education can provide these skills. Indeed, the kind of education and educational setting that CSU provides is especially suited to ensuring a first-class workforce. This is true because the CSU is dedicated both to high quality undergraduate education and to providing such an education to a diverse student body representative of the California population. Students in the CSU learn, in a broadly diverse environment, to hone the skills that are applicable to a changing and diverse worksituation. California owes its citizens the chance to compete effectively in the global business climate of today and tomorrow.

Further, diversity of the educational environment of the CSU is enhanced by a proper mix of students of varying class levels and educational experience. Lower division students contribute to the educational breadth and experience of upper division students by providing a fresh, not yet specialized, perspective, while upper division students benefit the experience of lower division students with their more specialized discipline views.

### Staffing and Other Costs of Splitting Lower and Upper Division

Turning to the even more specific aspect of the proposal to shift the lower division education to the community colleges, it needs to be recognized that this will be both a difficult and costly task. Community colleges would have to be augmented both in staffing and curricular offerings in a considerable way. This is true because they do not now offer the spectrum of lower division courses required for the diverse set of upper division majors and specializations students would need to pursue. To be able to handle this complete spectrum of courses, community college faculty would require additional training to provide the kind of breadth and depth of understanding of necessary disciplines. Essentially they would need advanced degree preparation at the Ph.D. level. Finally, in order to deal with the increased student demand, each community college would need a sizable augmentation of its faculty. Community colleges also could not offer the residential four-year educational experiences offered by the CSU and the UC which studies have shown help promote retention and success. Involvement in campus life, mentoring of students by peers and faculty, access to role models of upper division and graduate students and doctorally qualified teacher/scholars, ethnic studies programs, and cultural activities are all important factors in student retention and are parts of a full four-year baccalaureate program provided by the CSU.

Another costly aspect of staffing that needs to be addressed is the requirement that major and professional programs have for a variety of expertise. A major in physics or in accounting requires a variety of discipline specialists in order to adequately cover that discipline for students. For example, accounting students need training in various aspects such as income tax accounting, managerial accounting, and auditing, and specialized faculty are required for each field. Upper division enrollments do not, however, provide for a full teaching load for these faculty who must then teach lower division courses to level out teaching assignments. An added benefit of such arrangements is that faculty with special areas of expertise expose lower division students to subdiscipline areas of the discipline.

All of this indicates that moving lower division education to the community colleges would be harmful for students, faculty and curriculum. It certainly would not save the state money. An understanding of the staffing needs of major programs also helps correct the misconception that undergraduate education is more expensive in the CSU. These costs, which are actually lower than UC and not that much higher than the community college costs actually provide high quality upper division major and professional education along with quality lower division education.

### Impact on Student Populations

Another issue involved in the proposal to move lower division education to the community college concerns the impact on the California student population. Moving all or most eligible California students to the community colleges for their lower division work would not only far overtax the resources of the community colleges, but also would displace a large number of students who now find the community colleges their only access to higher education. This would have a disproportionate impact on underrepresented students and thus a disastrous effect on California's commitment to access to higher education for its citizens. Less-prepared students, many of whom come from first generation and underrepresented groups, would be replaced by students in the higher percentiles of eligible high school graduates.

The concentration of lower division students in the community colleges will result in increasing numbers of students from disadvantaged socioeconomic levels and most students of color coming from urban-based schools attending community colleges, while students from higher income levels and school districts with greater resources will attend the CSU and the UC. Such tendencies toward segregation will prove particularly harmful to those students who are the first in their families to attend colleges and who would especially benefit from the CSU's extensive academic support programs, including counseling services, peer mentoring, ethnic studies programs, and discipline-based minority student associations.

Further, giving the community colleges the charge to handle the bulk or all of the lower division education might well result in inattention or loss of the ability of these institutions to provide vocational training for California's citizens. This would, of course, seriously impact on California's ability to have a skilled and competitive workforce. Finally mixing the upper one-third of the graduating class with less well-prepared students might lead either to a pulling down of academic expectations and quality or an acceleration of expectations which will push out the more vulnerable students.

Proposals to concentrate responsibility for basic skills and remediation courses in the community colleges raise the following objection. While large numbers of adults whose first language is not English are well-served in basic literacy classes in the community colleges, most of these students are preparing for entering the California workforce directly and are not likely to transfer into baccalaureate programs. On the other hand, many students whose objective is the baccalaureate degree and who are regularly admitted require precollege level coursework in math or English. These students should not be required to attend the community colleges for such coursework, especially when their academic skills are appropriate for other coursework in the CSU. "Remedial" instruction in the CSU is more likely to be in smaller classes than in the community colleges, which enhances student learning. English as a Second Language (ESL) students in the CSU benefit the universities, their communities, and other students by increasing the representation of ethnic and socioeconomic minorities in the student population. Finally, instruction in the CSU is supported in ways not appropriate to the community colleges. Comprehensive universities in the CSU support ESL instruction with curricula and professionals in schools of education, departments of linguistics and anthropology, English and foreign language departments, and the like. CSU campuses also train teachers of ESL, and ESL students and courses are required in this training. In short, while there is a good case to be made for certain "remedial" courses to be concentrated in the community colleges, there should not be a shifting of the responsibility for all such curricula to them.

In considering the impact of a proposal to shift substantial proportions of lower division education to the community colleges, it is well to point out serious problems that such a move would make for both placebound students and for transfers from private institutions and from out of state. Most of the latter students transfer to the CSU lacking a few lower division preparatory courses or some General Education coursework which they need to make up before they enter into full-time upper division work. Lack of an adequate lower division curriculum will force these students to seek out work elsewhere, delaying their progress toward a degree and thus causing both academic and maybe financial hardship. Placebound students, i.e., those who are limited to a geographical location because of employment or other restraints, will also be forced to delay their progress toward a degree or even to forego education altogether.

Finally, it should be noted that in high unit majors, particularly in science and engineering disciplines, a mix of major and G.E. courses over the full degree program is preferred. The sequential nature of the coursework in the sciences (including upper division courses), substantial corequisite requirements in science and engineering majors, and the scheduling peculiarities in these disciplines limit the number of major courses that can be taken in a semester or quarter. Therefore, taking a mix of courses throughout the degree program hastens time to the degree.

## Conclusions

In sum, we urge that the proposal to move lower division education to community colleges, separating it from the upper division component, not be pursued as a serious option for education and for dealing with the financial crisis in California. To pursue such a course would adversely affect the competence of the teaching at the upper division levels, for faculty would no longer have incentive to tie their specialization to the overall knowledge in their field or to review new knowledge in their field outside their own area of focus. The desire and need to teach introduction courses is now an important incentive to integration of knowledge. To pursue such a course would require extraordinary expenditures to adequately staff the lower division schools and to equip them properly. Given such costs, inadequate resources are likely all that would be available. To pursue such a course would severely diminish the quality of education now provided students in California. In the long run it would damage opportunities for upward social and economic mobility for citizens and damage our state's capacity to attract and hold rich providers of employment opportunities.

Finally, to pursue such a course of action will seriously diminish the quality of higher education in California while also threatening long-term commitments to the citizens of California to provide adequate educational opportunities and social mobility. It also is a course which will add to rather than relieve the financial problems of the state.

(Approved May 1993, as part of AS-2134-93/AA)

# Reaffirmation of AS-2062-92/AA/FA

## “The Student Athlete in the CSU”

- WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of the California State University unanimously passed AS-2062-92/AA & FA, “The Student Athlete in the CSU,” in May 1992; and
- WHEREAS** The resolution endorsed a set of “Principles and Guidelines” drawn after extensive consultation with the CSU campus senates and with campus athletics representatives; and
- WHEREAS** These “Principles and Guidelines” reflect a consensus judgment of what constitutes equitable treatment of students and good practice in intercollegiate athletics; and
- WHEREAS** The CSU has routinely framed, endorsed, and required systemwide compliance with guidelines (such as the General Education curricular guidelines); and
- WHEREAS** “Campus autonomy” is not compromised by endorsement of these “Principles and Guidelines;” and
- WHEREAS** The “Principles and Guidelines” reflect current NCAA regulations and state and federal law; and
- WHEREAS** The CSU has, in a recent legal settlement with National Organization of Women plaintiffs, formally agreed to move toward gender equity in intercollegiate athletics participation and funding, which is an important goal set forth in NCAA regulations, and the “principles and guidelines” indicating that systemwide policy on athletics is sometimes necessary in the long run; and
- WHEREAS** The Chancellor has not yet provided a formal response to the recommendations contained within AS-2062-92; therefore be it
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its support for AS-2062-92/AA & FA, “The Student Athlete in the CSU,” and express its strong commitment to sound, ethical, equitable and accountable intercollegiate athletic policies and procedures; and be it further
- RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU convey to the Chancellor that in the tradition of collegiality and shared governance, and absent compelling and stated reasons, the Academic Senate CSU expect that the provisions of AS-2062-92/AA & FA will become policy and practice on each CSU campus.

(This resolution, 2178, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1993.)

# Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR): Certification of Transferability

**WHEREAS** A Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) was established by Executive Order 514; and

**WHEREAS** Under the provisions of EO 514, GWAR is defined as the demonstration of competence in writing skills at the upper division level; and

**WHEREAS** EO 514 provides that certification of writing proficiency may rely on a variety of types of evidence (e.g., written course work, essay examinations or other measures of student writing); and

**WHEREAS** EO 514 further provides that "Measures (for certification of writing proficiency) may be developed which best fit individual campus needs"; and

**WHEREAS** It is important to establish conditions for reciprocity for GWAR certification among California State University campuses because students who have satisfied GWAR at one CSU campus may transfer to another CSU campus; and

**WHEREAS** Since GWAR is an integral part of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree in the CSU, students should not receive GWAR certification unless they are matriculated at the certifying campus; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate of the California State University expects all campuses of the CSU to maintain comparable academic standards in GWAR; and

**WHEREAS** Provision for periodic systemwide review of campus GWAR programs would provide guidance to CSU campuses for maintaining comparable academic standards; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate CSU recognizes that each campus has faculty qualified to assess the level of competence necessary for GWAR certification; and

**WHEREAS** Under the provisions of EO 514, the GWAR is a prerequisite to classified standing in the graduate program; and

**WHEREAS** The Academic Senate CSU values demonstration of writing proficiency at the graduate level but recognizes that campuses should determine whether the writing proficiency is an entrance or exit requirement or both and whether the writing proficiency should be the same as established by GWAR for undergraduates or should be at an advanced level; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the proposed amendments (Attachment 1) to Executive Order 514, "Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements (GWAR)," that (a) guarantees transferability of GWAR certification among California State University campuses, (b) provides for campus autonomy in determining the appropriate placement and level of writing proficiency required of graduate students, (c) requires students to be matriculated at the campus they receive GWAR certification, and (d) provides for periodic systemwide review and evaluation of campus GWAR programs; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to the Chancellor that a new executive order be issued to replace Executive Order 514, "Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement," as proposed in Attachment 1 [see page 161], (a) to guarantee transferability of GWAR certification among CSU campuses, (b) to provide for campus autonomy in determining the appropriate placement and level of writing proficiency required of graduate students, (c) to require students to be matriculated at the campus they receive GWAR certification, and (d) to provide for periodic systemwide review and evaluation of campus GWAR programs.

(This resolution, 2180, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1993.)

# Proposed Amendment to Executive Order 514

The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
400 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Executive Order No.:

Title: Competency in Student Writing Skills

Effective Date:

Supersedes: Executive Order 514

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Title 5, California Administrative Code, Sections 40405.1 and 40405.4, Board of Trustees Resolution Number REP 5-76-4, and Sections 1 and 2 of Chapter III of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of the California State University

This Executive Order adopts specific, systemwide procedures for assessment of competency in writing skills and placement in writing skills and placement in writing skills programs.

## I. Policy Development

The Advisory Committee on Student Writing Skills, appointed by the Chancellor from among the CSU faculty and administration, shall have primary responsibility for policy development and recommendation regarding student writing skills testing and instruction.

## II. Entry Level Competence

- A. Each entering CSU undergraduate student shall be required to take the CSU English Placement Test (EPT) for placement in appropriate English course work, except those who qualify for the following exemptions:
  - Entering undergraduates can qualify for an exemption on the basis of satisfactory performance on examinations determined to be appropriate by the CSU English Placement and/or the English Equivalency Examination Evaluation Committee. These examinations and the required minimum scores are described in Addendum A [not included in this document].
  - Transfer students can qualify for an exemption either on the basis of satisfactory performance on an examination listed in Addendum A or by having completed an acceptable baccalaureate level course in English composition of four quarter or three semester units with a grade of "C" or better
  - Transfer students not otherwise exempt who enroll with 56 or more transferable semester units must complete the test only if they are subject to the 1986-87 or later campus catalog or bulletin.
- B. The CSU English Placement Test Development Committee shall review the EPT at least annually and revise it as necessary. The Committee shall be appointed by the Chancellor
- C. Appointed periodically by the Chancellor from among the CSU faculty and administration, an EPT Evaluation Committee shall conduct evaluation studies of test validity, reliability, utility and other program issues as assigned and recommend appropriate action. The Committee shall determine the satisfactory competency score on the EPT which shall be applied throughout the system.
- D. Satisfaction of the EPT requirement shall be defined as taking the EPT as required and enrolling in specified course work, or receiving exemption from the test. Each student subject to the EPT requirement shall be encouraged to take the test as soon as possible after being admitted. Campuses, however, shall require the student to do so before the end of the first semester or the first two quarters of enrollment.

The test is to be taken only once and may not be repeated. A student who does not take the test as required shall be subject to the provisions of Executive Order No. 393 which authorizes campuses to apply sanctions to students not complying with academic policies. Campuses may grant one-term extensions of the deadline for taking the EPT when students can demonstrate that circumstances beyond their control prevented their taking the EPT. Campuses shall monitor compliance with the EPT requirement and provide annual compliance reports as required by the Chancellor
- E. Satisfaction of the EPT requirement shall be prerequisite to enrollment in a baccalaureate English course. Campuses shall ensure that students who do not demonstrate the requisite

competence are required to enroll in a CSU Writing Skills program to correct deficiencies before undertaking baccalaureate English courses. Campuses should require that students begin such course work during the first year of enrollment at the CSU campus.

- F. Campuses shall conduct periodic evaluations of their writing skills programs to ensure that deficiencies in student writing skills are corrected as efficiently and expeditiously as possible.

### III. Undergraduate Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)

- A. All students subject to the degree requirements of the 1977-78 or subsequent general catalogs must demonstrate competence in writing skills at the upper division level as a requirement for graduation and as a prerequisite to classified standing in graduate programs the baccalaureate degree and, if not previously met in the CSU, for a second bachelor's degree.
- B. Students shall be officially matriculated at the CSU campus where they satisfy the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).
- B.C. As soon as possible after admission, campuses inform students of writing skills proficiency requirements for graduation, as distinct from lower division curricula and tests. Certification of writing competency shall be made available to students as they enter the junior year. ~~Students should complete the requirement before the senior year. Graduate students shall complete the requirement before advancement to classified standing.~~
- E. D. Certification of graduation writing proficiency is an all-campus responsibility. Certification may rely on evidence of writing ability as demonstrated in written course work, essay examinations, or other measures of student writing competence. Measures may be developed which best fit individual campus needs. ~~However, certification by examination shall be at the campus level and shall include a common essay examination written and evaluated under controlled conditions and graded scored by at least two faculty readers.~~
- E. Certification of graduation writing ability shall be transferable from one CSU campus to another.
- D. E. Campuses shall submit annually to the Chancellor's Office as requested a description of any changes in campus provisions for implementation of the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR). Campus GWAR programs systemwide shall be subject to periodic review and evaluation at least every five years by under the supervision of the Advisory Committee on Student Writing Skills.

### IV. Graduate Degree Writing Requirements

- A. Campuses may require demonstration of writing proficiency as a condition for successful entrance to a graduate program.
- B. Campuses shall require demonstration of writing proficiency prior to the award of a graduate degree. The level of proficiency shall be no less than the level required for GWAR certification.
- C. Campuses may require additional demonstration of advanced-level writing proficiency as a condition for successful entrance to and/or exit from the graduate program and award of the graduate degree.

(Approved November 1993, as part of AS-2180-93/AA)



# Emerging Technologies and Pedagogy in the California State University

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University recognize and affirm the importance of faculty *using* and, where possible, *teaching* their students with and about *proven as well as emerging technologies that may satisfy both the students' need for a thorough, contemporary education and their need for lifelong learning strategies*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm the principle articulated in the *Principles and Policies: Papers of the ASCSU* (pp. 51-57, Volume I), that the choice of teaching methodologies, including instructional technologies is the *responsibility* of the faculty.

**RATIONALE:** *This resolution recognizes that currently there is little consensus regarding the role technology can or should play in teaching, irrespective of the field. This is particularly the case when technologies that dramatically alter the traditional teacher/student relationship are at issue. It also recognizes that ideological positions at the extremes--traditional teaching/learning methods are always essential and superior ("television will ruin education") versus technological teaching/learning methods foster greater access, are less expensive, and are more effective ("computers will revolutionize instruction")--pose an unproductive dichotomy. Proven and emerging technologies must be seen as potentially useful tools and our debate should center not on mandating or prohibiting their use, but rather on using the best teaching/learning strategies and media.*

*Further using technology is the responsibility of appropriate academic committees and individual faculty members.*

(This resolution, 2248, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1995.)

# Support for 24-Hour Student Access to Computing Resources and the Internet

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the recommendation of the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology and the Academic Information Resource Council that students be provided with 24-hour access to computing resources including the internet; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU endorse the "Implementation Plan Related to the Resolution for 24-Hour Access to Computing Resources and to the Network" developed by the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU Endorse the "Guidelines Relating to Adoption of a Requirement for Students to have 24-Hour Access to a Personal Computer and the Network" developed by the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology.

**RATIONALE:** It is vital that students have access to computing resources and the network on a 24-hour basis given the accelerating expansion of electronically accessible information, the necessity of access to information wherever it is stored to maintain the quality of education, the increased diversity of the students' lifestyles, and the inadequacy of current access to electronically stored information to meet the needs of students.

(This resolution, 2261, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1995.)

## Attachment to AS-2261-95/AA: Letter to Chancellor Munitz

The California State University  
Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology  
c/o P. O. Box 3842, Seal Beach, CA 90740-7842  
Information: (310) 985-9136  
President Warren J. Baker, Chair  
President Blenda J. Wilson, Vice Chair  
[Letter to Chancellor Munitz]

Date: January 31, 1995

To: Barry Munitz  
Chancellor  
California State University  
400 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

cc: Executive Council  
Academic Vice Presidents  
Members, CLRIT

Dear Chancellor Munitz:

On behalf of the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology I am conveying to you our recommendation that CSU adopt a policy that moves all of our campuses towards providing all students 24 hour access to a personal computer and networked information resources which will enhance their learning experience. Attached is a copy of the document prepared by the CLIR Task Force on Student Access [see page 165], which puts forth the specific recommendations and guidelines unanimously adopted at the CLRIT meeting last Friday, January 27, 1995.

Hopefully this recommendation provides you with the policy framework and set of implementation planning guidelines that can be used to advance the CSU effective use of information technology resources. An initial test of the viability of this framework is expected from the pilot programs being proposed by Sonoma, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and Humboldt, programs that you have encouraged them to pursue. You will note our endorsement of the pilot programs as one of our recommendations. In fact, there was discussion suggesting that you consider inviting another campus to join in this pilot. The feeling was expressed that an urban commuter campus was needed to test the policy and guidelines in a setting that represented the majority of our campuses.

I would like to put this issue on the next Executive Council agenda for information. I believe it would be informative for my colleagues to hear about the issues debated by the CLRIT task force and the full commission before sending you this recommendation.

Sincerely

(signed)

Warren J. Baker, Chair

WJB:bfd

*Enclosure*

## **Attachment to AS-2261-95/AA: CLRIT Task Force on Student Access Implementation Plan Related to the Resolution for 24-Hour Access to Computing Resources and to the Network**

The Task Force on Student Access strongly agrees with the intent of the Academic Information Resource Councils resolution as adopted by CLRIT (regarding the need for students to have 24-hour access to a personal computer and to the network). Such a CSU policy is clearly in the best interests of students, both in terms of their education while in college and in terms of their lifelong potential for employment and learning after they have graduated. Toward this end, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- I. That the Academic Information Resource Councils resolution providing all students with 24-hour access to a personal computer and network access be adopted and embraced as a Systemwide policy by the CSU.
- II. That each CSU institution develop a campus-specific plan within the next 18 months that will achieve full implementation with the CSU policy by the Fall of 2000.
- III. That the decision regarding how best to accomplish and provide for student access to personal computers and networks be made by individual CSU campuses based upon their unique educational programs and particular circumstances, as determined by the campus' normal consultative and governing processes.
- IV. That each institution apply the recommended set of guidelines (Attachment #2 [see page 162]), which includes topics and criteria that should be considered to ensure that the student access policy is defensible, prudent, and consistent across the CSU.
- V. That the concern about financial implications for the impact upon the student as well as the campus be given special attention as an integral part of the policy discussions about State funding, student fee structures, financial aid and other revenue sources.
- VI. That the Chancellor's Office pursues an accurate interpretation of the financial aid regulations that might apply
- VII. That the Office of Information Resources and Technology coordinate and facilitate efforts to seek special low cost financing arrangements with personal computer vendors leveraging the size of the CSU.
- VIII. That California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma State University, and Humboldt State University (Attachment #3 [not included in this document]) become pilot projects to serve as a test to establish reasonable and reliable benchmarks for evaluating the educational and financial impacts of the student access policy

The Task Force realizes there is substantial diversity among the CSU campuses and that some are further along than others with the process of incorporating the use of a personal computer and network access to information resources into the curriculum. Based upon their particular stage of evolution in the application of information technologies within the environment, each campus can best determine how best to implement and provide for student access to personal computers and networks. It is hoped that the guidelines will provide a systemwide perspective so that there is some consistent, uniform policy that leaves no question as to the significance of information technologies within the educational mission of the CSU.

Because of the serious financial consequences of such a policy upon the well being of the students as well as the operational integrity of the campus, each campus must possess the flexibility to pursue student fees and creative opportunities for new revenues. Given the CSU goal to be accessible and affordable, the

direct cost to the student must be addressed. The Task Force believes that—once this policy is adopted and there is a consistent practice across the system—there will be additional opportunities to leverage the size of the CSU to negotiate more aggressive pricing structures.

The Task Force recognizes that California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and Sonoma State University have made substantial advances toward integrating the information technologies into the educational environment. The Task Force also recognizes that Humboldt State University wishes to remain part of the pilot program but has chosen to extend the implementation timetable and is currently engaged in a campuswide consultation process involving faculty, students, and staff. Furthermore, pursuant to the pilot campuses developing an implementation plan consistent with the attached guidelines, the Chancellor is urged to approve the request of the three campuses so that gathering information essential to finalizing a CSU student access policy can proceed without further delay.

## **Attachment #2 to Implementation Plan: Draft Guidelines, January 25, 1995**

### **Guidelines Relating to Adoption of a Requirement for Students to Have 24-Hour Access to a Personal Computer and the Network**

Before the implementation of a campus/school/department policy that requires all students to have 24-hour access to a personal computer and the network, consideration should be given to the following criteria:

#### **1. Dependence of the Curriculum upon Personal Computing and Network Applications/Information Resources**

- (a) The curriculum within the unit\* should have a significant emphasis on the use of personal computing and network applications.
- (b) Personal computing applications should be integral components of a majority of the courses within the unit.
- (c) Personal computing skills in appropriate applications, e.g., word processing for writing intensive courses, spreadsheets for selected business courses, computational software for engineering and science courses, E-mail and other network applications across the disciplines, etc., will make a significant difference in the performance and learning outcomes for the student and will have an important effect upon the student's employment prospects following graduation.

#### **2. Faculty Commitment to the Use of Personal Computing and Network Applications**

Faculty within the unit demonstrate a strong commitment to the use of personal computing within the curriculum by any or all of the following:

- (a) Their own use of personal computing;
- (b) Making regular and frequent course assignments that require the use of personal computing including network applications;
- (c) The regular use of E-mail for communications with colleagues and students, and other network applications within their discipline; and
- (d) Acceptance of a policy that embraces general student use of personal computers, i.e., endorsement/support through the campus' regular consultative/governance processes.

#### **3. Student Involvement/Consultation**

The unit should solicit input from its students regarding the proposed student access requirement. Such input should consist of consultation with student body organizations, opinion/interest surveys, student ownership statistics, and other attitudinal responses.

Students should be fully informed of the requirements for a personal computer prior to their enrollment in the program(s), and courses sponsored by the unit. If the student has been adequately informed of the computer requirement well in advance of matriculation in the program, enrollment in the courses should be considered to represent informed consent by the student.

#### **4. Institutional Support**

Demonstrate that the campus/college/school administration fully supports the personal computer requirement by:

---

\* As used here, the word unit refers to the entire campus, a school or college, a department or program, depending upon the context in which the requirement is presented.

- (a) Giving priority for funding to provide the necessary infrastructure (see item 5 below);
- b) Establishing or participating in special programs to assist student access to personal computers (see item 6 below);
- (c) Providing opportunities to mobilize and assist the faculty through workshops, training sessions, and personal consulting services all related to the use of personal computing and network applications.
- (d) Developing and administering, in conjunction with departments and faculty, surveys to aid in the specification of the applications software that will be used in the program(s) and related courses, the specification of one or more personal computer configurations that will be required, and the specification of the necessary network and communications equipment; and
- (e) The consideration of a technology fee and/or other creative financing initiatives to support equipment in open computer laboratories, software licenses, equipment maintenance, consulting assistance for students, and supplies.

**5. Infrastructure Support**

Confirm:

- (a) That the communications network which provides access for student users (both on- and off-campus) has the capacity to support the anticipated demand for connectivity, e.g., number of modems, number of ports, transmission speeds, etc., and
- (b) That, in the event a student's personal computer cannot meet the requirements of a particular course, the unit will ensure access through an alternative convenient resource.

**6. Affordability**

The campus/unit should develop and adopt policies and procedures to ensure that all students subject to the computing access requirement can reasonably be expected to have such access without regard to their income or financial aid status. A partial list of alternatives for providing access includes:

- (a) general access personal computer laboratories open 24 hours a day;
- (b) special financial aid programs;
- (c) volume discount personal computer and software purchase programs;
- (d) installment or lease purchase programs; and  
(both (c) and (d) should include provisions for maintenance, buy-back, and trade-ins)
- (e) personal computer equipment loan programs (e.g., through the Library or the Computer Center).

(Approved May 1995, as part of AS-2261-95/AA)

# Commendation for the CSU Workgroup on Underprepared Students

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the CSU Workgroup on Underprepared Students chaired by Alex Gonzalez, Provost, CSU Fresno, for its excellent Final Report of June 1995 containing a set of nine guiding principles for remediation which stress “both the need to maintain fidelity to the CSU’s commitment to access and to serving a culturally and ethnically diverse California population, and to provide campuses with the necessary flexibility to address the remediation issue locally as dictated by local campus conditions.”

**RATIONALE:** *The set of nine guiding principles for remediation provided by the CSU Workgroup on Underprepared Students serve as a firm foundation for the CSU in examining issues and evolving policy regarding remedial/developmental education. They demonstrate a thoughtful approach to this topic developed by a joint committee of CSU faculty and administrators with broad experience in undergraduate education.*

(This resolution, 2300, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1995.)

## The California State University Workgroup on Underprepared Students

### Final Report June 1995

#### Introduction

During Academic Year 1993-94, Dr. Peter S. Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, appointed a faculty and administrative workgroup to explore the issue of student underpreparation in basic skills in the California State University. The issue had been identified by the CSU Executive Council as one of six critical areas for study through the office of Academic Program Improvement. The workgroup was asked to recommend ways in which student basic skills deficiencies and the resulting remedial programs could be improved and reduced.

Meeting during the spring of 1994, the workgroup developed a series of recommendations outlining actions and policies that the members believed could reduce the incidence of underpreparation among CSU students and the concomitant need for remediation. The group’s final report was transmitted in late June 1994 to Vice Chancellor Hoff by workgroup chair Alexander Gonzalez, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at California State University-Fresno.

In response to interest by the Board of Trustees in the amount of remedial activity taking place on CSU campuses, the workgroup report was forwarded to the Board at their November 1994 meeting. At that meeting a commitment was made to provide Trustees with current data on the kinds and amounts of remedial activities conducted on the campuses. This report and accompanying data were presented to the Board at their January 1995 meeting. At that meeting, a reconstituted workgroup was charged with drafting action plans to reduce remediation. A Board of Trustees’ Subcommittee was also formed, chaired by Trustee Ralph Pesqueira and including Trustees Marian Bagdasarian, Bernard Goldstein and Christopher Lowe. Later a student representative, Oscar De La Torre of CSU Chico, and President Marlene Hughes of the Stanislaus campus were asked to participate with the subcommittee.

The individual task groups, chaired by faculty and administrators, met during Spring 1995 and developed recommendations for action which will have the effect of reducing both the incidence of and need for remediation in the CSU now and in the future.

#### Remediation Principles and Task Group Recommendations

Under the guidance of the workgroup steering committee, the workgroup adopted a set of guiding principles for remediation to recommend to the Chancellor and the Trustee Subcommittee. The principles stressed both the need to maintain fidelity to the CSU’s commitment to access and to serving a culturally

and ethnically diverse California population, and to provide campuses with the necessary flexibility to address the remediation issue locally as dictated by local campus conditions. The principles adopted by the workgroup at their May 19, 1995, final meeting are as follows:

1. The CSU should continue to provide access to its academic programs for California High School graduates consistent with its historical mission as outlined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education.
2. CSU campuses should provide and enforce for entering students an appropriate and timely sequence (preferably within the first term of enrollment) of assessment, advising and placement in prebaccalaureate and baccalaureate coursework.
3. CSU campuses should work closely with K-12 education, the University of California, and the California Community Colleges to ensure that students preparing for the CSU are assessed as early as practicable and that they are prepared adequately in basic skills to undertake baccalaureate coursework on entry to the university.
4. Once assessment has taken place, CSU campuses should have sufficient flexibility to structure programs of advising, placement, and instruction in ways which best meet the needs of a diverse student population and curricular programs at each campus.
5. CSU campuses should be encouraged to establish and enforce limits on remedial/developmental activity and to advise students who are not making adequate progress in developing their foundational skills to enroll in other educational institutions as appropriate.
6. CSU campuses should share with each other information concerning the most effective practices for imparting foundational skills to students with skill deficiencies.
7. The CSU should set forth clearly its entry requirements and consult with all interested constituencies in assuring that such requirements are known and disseminated to all levels of education.
8. CSU campuses should identify prior to placement in CSU English courses those students whose first language is not English and whose major skill needs are developmental in nature.
9. In order to ensure that programs to provide and reduce remedial and developmental activity are successful, the CSU should ensure that all efforts outlined under these principles receive adequate fiscal and administrative support, including adequate resources for faculty development activities.

**(Approved November 1995, as part of AS-2300 & 2302-95/AA/TEKR)**

# Proposed Revision of Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the proposed revision of the Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees in the CSU included in Attachment A to Agenda Item 1 of the November 7-8, 1995, meeting of the Board of Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy which would allow for the conferring of honorary degrees in the names of the CSU and an individual campus, and urge the Board of Trustees to approve the proposed revision (see attached).

**RATIONALE:** *The current Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees in the CSU provide (Section 1.B) that "All honorary degrees shall be conferred by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and only in the name of The California State University." The proposed revision will expand this section to provide that "All honorary degrees shall be conferred by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and only in the name of The California State University or in the names of The California State University and a campus."*

*This policy change, and the other procedural changes proposed to implement this policy change, will allow for greater recognition of the individual CSU campus participating in the award of an honorary degree.*

(This resolution, 2303, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1995.)

## Information Item • Committee on Educational Policy • Agenda Item I • November 7-8, 1995 Revision of Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees

Presentation by: Peter S. Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs

### BRIEF

#### Summary

This item introduces proposed changes to the current guidelines for awarding honorary degrees. The changes, suggested by a campus president and shared informally with the 1994-95 Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, would leave untouched the existing criteria and the consultation and decision-making procedures but would give a campus the option of taking a more visible role in the granting of an honorary degree. Campus presidents and the Academic Senate are being consulted about the proposed guidelines.

### ITEM

#### Background

In July 1983, the Board of Trustees, having consulted with the campus presidents and the faculty approved a set of guidelines for the awarding of honorary degrees by the California State University. The guidelines have since been amended three times, in July 1990, January 1992, and November 1993. Between 1960 and 1982, the CSU conferred 18 honorary degrees; since the approval of the guidelines, the total number of honorary degrees awarded has risen to 80. CSU campuses have differed sharply however, in the number of nominations submitted.

#### Proposed Revisions

Attachment A [see page 171] shows revisions to the current guidelines that were proposed by a campus president and shared informally with the 1994-95 Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees. The existing criteria and the consultation and decision-making procedures would be retained (approval of the trustees, after appropriate consultation, would still be required for every honorary degree awarded). A campus submitting a nomination that wins trustee approval would, however, have the option of taking a more visible role in the granting of the honorary degree. The degree could be conferred in the name of a campus as well as the California State University (guidelines I-B and I-C), and the conferral ceremony would normally include participation by the chair of the Board of Trustees or designee and conferral of the degree by the campus president (guideline VI-C).

Campus presidents and the Academic Senate are being consulted about the proposed guidelines.



**Attachment A • Ed. Pol. • Agenda Item 1 • November 7-8, 1995**  
**Revised Guidelines\* for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees—**  
**The California State University**

\* Deleted material is shown by strike-through typing. Added material is *italics*.

**I. Policy**

- A. Honorary Degrees shall be awarded by The California State University, but only at the doctoral level.
- B. All honorary degrees shall be conferred by the Board of Trustees of The California State University ~~and only~~ in the name of The California State University *in the names of The California State University and a campus.*
- C. The Board of Trustees shall determine the number of honorary degrees to be awarded in any academic year. Normally the Board will consider no more than two recommendations from each campus in an academic year plus additional recommendations which may be submitted by or through Board members and the Chancellor during the same period.
- D. The following categories of honorary degrees shall be recognized for conferral by the Board of Trustees:
  - 1. Doctor of Fine Arts (D.F.A.)
  - 2. Doctor of Humane Letters (L.H.D.)
  - 3. Doctor of Laws (LL.D.)
  - 4. Doctor of Letters (Litt.D.)
  - 5. Doctor of Science (Sc.D.)Other categories may be proposed to the Board for consideration; however the Board will not authorize degree designations which normally are identified as earned doctorates.

**II. Purposes for Which Honorary Degrees May Be Conferred**

- A. To recognize excellence and extraordinary achievement in significant areas of human endeavor within which are embodied the objectives and ideals of The California State University
- B. To honor meritorious and outstanding service to The California State University, collectively, or to its campuses, individually; to the State of California; to the United States; or to humanity at large.
- C. To recognize men and women whose lives and significant achievements should ~~be~~ *serve* as examples of The California State University's aspirations for its diverse student body

**III. Criteria for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees**

- A. Honorary degrees may be awarded to recognize achievements in all parts of the world. Honorary degrees awarded should represent an appropriate balance between local and non-local, and academic and non-academic recipients, and should represent a wide diversity of fields of endeavor.
- B. Nominees for honorary degrees must be distinguished in their respective fields, and the eminence of persons nominated must be widely recognized. Nominees must have demonstrated intellectual and humane values that are consistent with the aims of higher education, and with the highest ideals of the person's chosen fields.
- C. Service or benefaction to the University do not in themselves justify the awarding of honorary degrees. However nothing in these criteria shall preclude nominees who are benefactors of The California State University

**IV. Limitations on Eligibility**

Honorary degrees shall not be awarded to:

- A. Incumbent members of the Board of Trustees of The California State University
- B. The incumbent Chancellor of The California State University
- C. Incumbent campus Presidents of The California State University
- D. A person who already has been awarded an honorary degree by The California State University
- E. All incumbent elected officials.

**V. Procedures for Selecting Honorary Degree Recipients**

In all steps of these procedures, utmost care is to be taken to ensure confidentiality. A breach of confidentiality could seriously embarrass The California State University and those individuals under consideration for the receipt of an honorary degree.

- A. Recommendations of persons to receive honorary degrees are encouraged from any member of The California State University community including Trustees, the Chancellor, Presidents,

faculty, students, administrative staff, alumni, campus Advisory Board members and other friends of The California State University. Such recommendations may include the category of honorary degrees believed appropriate (para. I.D.).

- B. Recommendations originating in any of the campus communities shall be submitted through the campus President. The submission shall note whether the degree is to be conferred only in the name of The California State University or in the names of The California State University and the campus. Recommendations originating elsewhere within The California State University community at large shall be submitted through the Chancellor
- C. Each campus president, after consultation with the Executive Committee of the campus Senate, shall establish a committee, including faculty representation, to review recommendations and to assist in the development and compilation of materials in support of nominations to be forwarded. Following appropriate consultation with this committee, the President shall select no more than two nominations to be forwarded to the Chancellor in any given academic year
- D. The Chancellor in turn, shall forward all nominations, with appropriate comments, as desired, to a separately constituted Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees of the Committee on Educational Policy according to a schedule to be established by the Board.
- E. The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees shall be chaired by a member of the Committee on Educational Policy who shall be named by the Chair of that Committee. The Subcommittee shall be comprised of:
  1. One additional Trustee (other than the Chair of the Subcommittee) to be named by the Chair of the Board
  2. The Chancellor or designee
  3. Two Presidents, to be named by the Chancellor
  4. The following representatives, to be appointed by the Chancellor following consultation with the respective agencies shown in parentheses:
    - a. Two faculty (the Academic Senate, CSU)
    - b. One alumnus (California State University Alumni Council)
    - c. One student (California State Student Association)
- F. The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, meeting in executive session, shall review all nominations received, and shall forward to the full Committee on Educational Policy each nomination with the Subcommittee's notation of "recommended" or "not recommended," using the policies and criteria set forth in these Guidelines as the bases for the Subcommittee's determinations.
- G. The full Committee on Educational Policy, following similar procedures, shall forward to the full Board for final consideration no more than two nominations per campus and those nominations originating with the Board and/or the Chancellor, indicating in each case the full Committee's determination of "recommended" or "not recommended."
- H. The Board of Trustees, meeting in executive session, shall make the final determination in each case, and will, by virtue of its exclusive authority in this matter, award the degree in the category it considers most appropriate.

## VI. Conferral of Degrees

- A. Honorary degrees may be conferred during any California State University function which the Board of Trustees considers appropriate.
- B. Normally if the degree is to be conferred only in the name of The California State University, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and the campus President, where appropriate, will participate in the conferral ceremony as follows:
  1. When a campus is involved:
    - a. The Chair of the Board of Trustees (or designee) will read the Citation
    - b. The Chancellor if present, or the campus President will confer the degree
    - c. The campus President (or designee) will hood the degree recipient
  2. When a campus is not involved:
    - a. The Chair of the Board of Trustees (or designee) will read the Citation
    - b. The Chancellor (or designee) will confer the degree
    - c. The Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees (or designee) will hood the degree recipient
- C. If the degree is to be conferred in the names of The California State University and the campus, the Chair of the Board of Trustees (or designee) will participate in the conferral ceremony. The campus President (or designee) will normally confer the degree.

(Approved November 1995, as part of AS-2303-95/AA)

# Board of Trustees Action on Precollegiate Skills Instruction

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the Resolution on Precollegiate Skills Instruction recommended for adoption by the CSU Board of Trustees at its meeting of January 23-24, 1996; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU endorse the *Report and Recommendations of the Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education* to be presented to the Board of Trustees at its meeting of January 23-24, 1996; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU commend the Board of Trustees for the collegial consultative process it followed in developing its Resolution on Precollegiate Skills Instruction and *Report and Recommendations of the Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education*.

**RATIONALE:** *After issuing its initial draft report, the Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education sponsored a series of public hearings on the recommendations contained therein. The Subcommittee heard the views of faculty, students, administrators, legislators, and the general public regarding their proposals. The messages they received were simple, articulate, and uniform: (1) remediation works, (2) it is the CSU's Master Plan obligation to admit and educate the upper one-third of the high school graduating class, (3) the CSU must work cooperatively with K-12 and the community colleges to develop a comprehensive plan to upgrade the levels of preparation of entering students based upon mutually acceptable competency standards.*

*The Academic Senate echoed these sentiments in its resolution passed in early November 1995, in which it further urged that a comprehensive plan to improve the writing and quantitative reasoning competencies of CSU students be based upon the nine principles for remediation/developmental education adopted by the Work Group on Underprepared Students chaired by Alex Gonzalez, Provost, CSU Fresno.*

*In response to the desires and recommendations of the major stakeholders in the CSU, the Trustees' subcommittee engaged in a major revision of the draft. In so doing, they consulted extensively with the leadership of the Academic Senate and other groups to insure that the new version reflected a broad consensus. This consultative process has yielded the report and recommendations referred to in this resolution. The Senate notes with appreciation the respect paid to shared governance by the CSU Board of Trustees in its handling of this matter.*

(This resolution, 2307, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1996.)

## Action Item • Committee on Educational Policy • Agenda Item 2 • January 23-24, 1996 Precollegiate Skills Instruction

Presentation by:

Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair Committee on Educational Policy

Peter S. Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs

### BRIEF

#### Summary

During the months since the Board of Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education presented its proposed policy changes at the July 1995 trustees' meeting, the subcommittee has held a series of public hearings throughout the state. There also have been meetings with a wide range of student, faculty, administrative representatives, and special sessions with legislators, legislative staff, and representatives from such agencies as CPEC, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and the Department of Finance. Issues raised by the proposal also have been given careful attention by the California Education Roundtable and the agenda of the historic first joint meeting of the members of the California State Board of Education, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors, and the CSU Board of Trustees was devoted almost exclusively to standards, assessment, and improved teaching of English and mathematics.

The public comment, research, and deliberation process has confirmed the Trustees' commitment to resolving this serious problem: too many students are coming to the California State University directly from high school requiring developmental or remedial courses in English and mathematics. The process of public consultation convinced the subcommittee to re-examine its proposal to institute additional entrance requirements by 2001. In place of that single deadline is a series of targets and a sophisticated approach to standards development, early intervention, and a strengthening of the educational process.

This approach will define more clearly the skills and knowledge the students must bring from high school to college. It will strengthen the skills development students get from the earliest grades. It will provide early assessment of college-bound high school students and the opportunity to make up deficiencies before they enter college. The near term result will be a significant decline in the number of students who need remediation, a halving of those numbers by 2004, and ultimately a university that will need to provide remediation for no more than 10 percent of its entering freshmen.

Members of the subcommittee are especially indebted to representatives of the CSU Academic Senate, other members of the CSU faculty, representatives of the California State Student Association (CSSA), the Workgroup on Underprepared Students, the presidents, the vice presidents for academic affairs, and Chancellors Office staff, all of whom provided valuable contributions to this process. These efforts also have been informed and reinforced by Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin's comprehensive plan for reforming public schools stressing the improvement of teaching and learning of reading and mathematics in the early grades.

The proposed policy is intended to help ensure that students come from high school well prepared to make the most of their college opportunity. It is intended to maximize access to a university education guaranteed by the Master Plan and to promote excellence with diversity within the student body of the CSU. It is intended to reinforce the opportunity for all students to develop their academic abilities. As a public university committed to providing educational access to all citizens, especially those for whom other forms of higher education are financially and logistically out of reach, the CSU is sensitive to keeping the doors of access and opportunity open to qualified students.

#### Recommendation

Approval of the resolution.

#### ITEM

##### The Issue: Too Many Entering Freshmen (with the Right Courses and Grades to Qualify for Admission) Need Remedial Study

As directed by the state's Master Plan for Higher Education, the California State University admits students from the top one-third of the state's high school graduating class. This means that students who have taken a prescribed set of fifteen college preparatory courses and whose combined grades and SAT scores are high enough to place in the top one-third of the graduating class qualify for CSU admission. When the Master Plan was established, no one dreamed that students with such high qualifications would arrive in college in need of developmental or remedial work. But for several decades such students have entered the CSU in increasing numbers. They have taken all of the prescribed high school courses, they have earned good enough grades, and they have even posted good enough scores on the SAT ACT. But many of them, when asked to take our placement tests in English and mathematics, score so low that they are referred to remedial courses that do not count for college credit toward graduation. As of 1994, 47 percent of new CSU freshmen arriving directly from high school placed into remedial mathematics, and 41 percent placed into remedial English.

##### Why Is This a Problem?

Mathematics and communication skills are not only fundamental to success in all other studies, they also help make it possible to function as an adult in today's society. Whether or not high school students are headed for college, their abilities to read, to communicate well, to perform calculations, and to reason clearly are fundamental to their eventual success as adult contributors to our society and its economy. In college, math and English skills make it possible to get through the rest of the curriculum, earn a degree, and enter one's chosen profession.

As used in this context, the term "precollegiate skills" means attainment of the understanding and knowledge that enables students to handle the demands of beginning university study. College students who do not possess requisite verbal and mathematical skills are at a significant disadvantage. They face the expense (in time and money) of acquiring skills they should have learned in high school. This can add as much as an additional year to a college education, with all the expense and opportunity cost that attends such a delay. To the extent that they attempt other college courses while they are catching up on these skills, their ability to succeed in those courses is impaired.

While this cost to the individual student is serious, it also has a deleterious effect on the institution. When a significant portion of the student body is underprepared in fundamental skill areas such as English and mathematics, it threatens the university's ability to offer undergraduate instruction at a level that will prepare a competitive workforce and an enlightened citizenry. CSU professors have increasingly expressed their concern that they could no longer conduct many undergraduate courses at a level that fully reflects collegiate expectations.

## What Kind of Problem Is It and Who Should Be Responsible for Solving It?

When about half of the state's best high school graduates need remedial English and mathematics, it seems natural to conclude that schools, parents, and students are failing to do their jobs. But it is not that simple. We need to recognize a number of complicating factors and acknowledge the university's role in helping to create the situation as well as its role in seeking a solution. California schools, strapped for resources, and faced with an increasingly complex multicultural, multilingual setting, have struggled to educate students in an increasingly difficult environment. Teachers, many of them educated by the California State University, have applied techniques they have learned from us. Some of these approaches have worked in the new environment, and some have not. Also, there has not always been effective articulation between the State Department of Education's Curricular Frameworks and the state university's expected competencies. Schools, students, and parents have not always been able to discern just what it was the CSU expected.

What is needed, then, is closer cooperation between the CSU and K-12 education. We need to align our respective curricula and make very clear our expectations of college-bound students. We need to cooperate in the preparation and professional education of teachers, so that new teachers arrive in the schools well prepared to develop English and mathematics skills, and so that they continue to develop as teachers throughout their careers. And we all need to encourage the state to provide adequate levels of fiscal support that will allow K-12 and postsecondary education to meet society's expectations.

In October 1995, the California Education Roundtable announced a joint effort to address these issues. Through cooperative ventures among the education segments, the curricula will become more closely aligned, college expectations will be more clearly articulated, and teachers will be prepared cooperatively. It is through these and similar ventures that we need to work to strengthen education so that the need for college remedial study will abate.

## The Deliberative Process

Aware that increasing numbers of professors, students, and citizens were expressing concerns about the declining skill levels of students entering the university and about the effects of that phenomenon, the CSU began addressing these concerns in 1993, when Senior Chancellor Peter Hoff convened groups of faculty and administrative experts to examine student preparedness. Their findings helped document the seriousness of the problem; and in June 1995, the workgroup on Underprepared Students issued a report containing nine principles to guide policy on student preparedness. In 1995, a trustee subcommittee headed by Ralph Pesqueira took up where the workgroups had finished and advanced a draft policy statement at the July 1995 board meeting.

This action was followed by public comment and debate. A series of six public hearings statewide, related campus meetings, and numerous other public meetings considered and evaluated the subcommittee draft. The trustees collected and discussed testimony from these meetings. The testimony demonstrated that a consensus exists for CSU's twin goals of better preparation at all levels of education and of reduced need for remediation; that the time given to reach our goals must be sufficient for the task; that the CSU is considered a primary gateway for social mobility and economic advancement; and that CSU doors must remain open to the increasingly diverse population of California. During the period of these public hearings, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin announced her comprehensive plan for reforming public schools stressing the improvement of teaching and learning of reading and mathematics in the early grades. In addition, a California Education Roundtable report was released, expressing the segments' commitment to working together to improve educational achievement, and a joint meeting of the governing boards of the State Department of Education, the California Community Colleges, and the California State University was held to focus on basic skills and the quality of education. Using the accumulated testimony, reports, and resolutions, the subcommittee has prepared and adopted recommendations for the Board of Trustees' consideration. The report of the Subcommittee on Remedial Education, including specific recommendations, is attached to this item.

Due to the process of research, deliberation, and public comment, the proposal advanced herein is markedly different from the subcommittee recommendations presented in July 1995. It takes into account what has been learned through the entire deliberative process, and its recommendations reflect what has been learned.

These recommendations represent the California State University's effort to address the needs of California's next generation of citizens and employees, who will need to contribute meaningfully to society's cohesiveness and harmony and to its competitiveness in a global economy. They represent the university's contribution to California's effort to regain its historic position as a leader in public education at all levels. They represent a commitment to working with our partners in elementary and secondary education and with the California Community Colleges and other segments of higher education, in an all-out effort to strengthen education by creating an interconnected framework of common and well-understood goals, expectations, and standards. The recommendations also commit the CSU to a cooperative approach to educating and developing the teachers and other professionals who are so crucial to the success of elementary and secondary education.

## The Context of the Issue: CSU's Mission, Purposes, and Commitments

This is a document of hope, not despair. While the CSU is deeply concerned about promoting learning and developing the skills of its students, it recognizes that academic policy does not exist in isolation. It must mesh with the entire range of the university's purposes. As a public university committed to providing educational access to all citizens, especially those for whom other forms of higher education are financially and logistically out of reach, the CSU is sensitive to keeping the doors of access and opportunity open to qualified students. The proposed policy is intended to help ensure that a maximum number of students come from high school well prepared to make the most of their college opportunity intended to deliver more completely on the promise already inherent in the CSU mission. It is intended to maximize access to a university education guaranteed by the California Master Plan, and to promote the diversity of the university's student body a source of great pride. And it is intended to reinforce the opportunity for all students to develop their academic abilities.

Working diligently and energetically cooperatively CSU hopes and expects that the next generation of college students will come to us with significantly enhanced skills and the ability to enter directly into their studies and achieve unprecedented successes.

## Resolution

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**WHEREAS,** The Board of Trustees of The California State University finds that the current extent of need for remediation among entering freshmen is unacceptable; and, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that a series of goals be established for steadily reducing the need for remediation in the CSU:

- Prior to fall 2001 key implementation components (e.g., standards, assessment, early intervention) will be in place leading to the expectation that by fall 2001 there will be a 10 percentage point decline in the number of regularly admitted new freshmen needing remediation.
- By fall 2004 the number of regularly admitted new CSU freshmen needing remediation will have been reduced to one-half of present levels.
- By fall 2007 the number of regularly admitted new CSU freshmen needing remediation will have been reduced to 10 percent of that group; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the board endorses the nine principles of the Dink group on Underprepared Students included as Attachment A in Agenda Item 2 of the January 23-24, 1996, meeting of the Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the board adopts the report of the Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education included as Attachment B in Agenda Item 2 of the January 23-24, 1996, meeting of the Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy and endorses its recommendations; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the board calls upon the chancellor to appoint an Implementation Advisor Committee:

- to become familiar with the above-mentioned reports and recommendations;
- to determine the best strategies for implementing those recommendations;
- to work with the CSU Systemwide Academic Senate and other elements of the academic governance structure in arriving at recommendations and implementation strategies;
- to report to the chancellor and the Board of Trustees within twelve months; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the chancellor shall submit annual reports to the Board of Trustees until the goals and intent of this policy are achieved.

The following related materials were bound in a separate publication distributed with the agenda book.

1. Membership of the CSU Implementation Advisor Committee
2. Congruence between this policy proposal and CPEC position
3. California Education Round Table Announcement
4. Joint Boards Resolution

(Approved January 1996, as part of AS-2307-96/AA)

# Report of the Subcommittee on K-16 Curricular Issues of the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee of the California Educational Round Table

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the report entitled *K through 12 Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education*, which contains information vital to all segments of the California State University; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Admissions Advisory Council to address the implications of these curriculum reforms on admissions policies of the California State University referenced in the report entitled, *K through 12 Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to inform local faculty of these reforms referenced in the report entitled, *K through 12 Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to facilitate an ongoing dialogue with K-12 colleagues on the benefits of the new pedagogies and the means of implementing them; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to provide support for faculty development on those pedagogies and instructional technologies referenced in the report entitled *K through 12 Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the California Faculty Association to work with us to examine the implications of these reforms for workload policies as well as for appointment retention, promotion and tenure decisions.

**RATIONALE:** *We believe that these reforms will have a major impact on education. In our two-year study of the baccalaureate degree, we must be aware of the reforms outlined in the report: K through 12 Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education and develop strategies that respond to them. The most immediate impact of these reforms on the California State University will be on the admissions process. Questions that need to be addressed are the following:*

- *How are portfolios to be evaluated?*
- *How are multi-disciplinary courses to be reconciled with the traditional admissions requirements for course patterns?*
- *How are nontraditional assessments to be evaluated in place of traditional GPA admissions requirements?*

*This will have a significant impact in our classrooms. Students who have experience with electronic conferencing and information and a range of instructional technologies may have adopted unique and different learning styles.*

(This resolution, 2309, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1996.)

## Notable K-12 Reforms

### 1.1 Pedagogy and Delivery

*Cooperative/collaborative learning and team projects*

Learning as a team activity

Learning about team work and its importance

*Use of the network*

Data base and library access

On line courses or discussion

*The technological classroom*

Automated record of classroom activities

Access to text processing and math software

Simulations

Computer driven media

Groupware discussions

## 1.2 Assessment and Reporting

### *Portfolios*

- Self selected/edited content
- Teacher moderated/edited content
- Teacher selected content

### *Electronic transcript*

- On the network
- On CDs

## 1.3 Curriculum and Content

### *Computers*

- Modeling and simulation
- Text processing and hypertext
- Use of mathematical software (Mathematica, Maple, etc.)

### *The Internet as a reference tool*

- Library access
- Data bases

### *Interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary courses*

## 1.4 School Organization

- Changing roles of the teacher/student/administrator/parent*
- Charter schools (modified reporting & accountability process)*

# Effects of K-12 Reforms on the CSU

## 2.1 Admissions

- Interpretation of portfolios*
- Electronic transcripts*
- Assessment of multidisciplinary courses*
- Remediation*

## 2.2 The classroom

- Distance learning via the Internet*
  - On line courses
  - Data bases
  - Search engines
- Electronic*
  - Media
  - Computers
  - LAN
- Assessment and Pedagogy*
  - These have an effect on learning styles!
- Baccalaureate curriculum and general studies content*

## 2.3 Concurrent enrollment vs. early admissions

- Relationship to remediation*
  - Some college courses should be accessible to K-12

## 2.4 Modifications in teacher preparation and credentialing

- Are changes needed in CSU methods courses?*
- Professional development courses for in-service teachers*
- Changes in methods of supervision of practice teachers*
- Integration of teacher preparation with other parts of the CSU curriculum*

## 2.5 Faculty productivity and assessment

- Investment in faculty work tools*
- Scholarship*
- Assessment of faculty activities*
- Intellectual property rights*
- On line courses for enhanced productivity (same course @ multiple campuses)*

(Approved March 1996, as part of AS-2309-96/TEKR )



# Fair Use of Copyrighted Material

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt *The Statement of Principle* contained on pages 8-10 of the pamphlet *Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America*<sup>1</sup> developed by the CSU-SUNY-CUNY Joint Committee; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to adopt *The Statement of Principle* contained on pages 8-10 of the pamphlet, *Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America*, to guide fair use in the CSU and encourage a liberal interpretation of fair use as set forth in §107 of the Copyright Act of 1976<sup>2</sup>; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to work with the Senate in promoting a liberal interpretation of fair use and in the context of protecting copyright in our mutual educational enterprise; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus Senates to adopt *The Statement of Principle* contained on pages 8-10 of the pamphlet, *Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America*, to guide fair use in the CSU and encourage a liberal interpretation of fair use as set forth in §107 of the Copyright Act of 1976.

**RATIONALE:** *CSU faculty develop and use copyrighted material. Although fair use for educational purposes, including teaching, scholarship, or research, is specifically identified as "...not an infringement of copyright," legal precedent defining the nature and extent of such fair use is lacking. Given the size and importance of the CSU on the educational landscape and the intellectual activity in teaching, scholarship, and research generated by CSU faculty, it is essential that CSU play a major role in shaping the debate about this important and timely topic.*

<sup>1</sup> *Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America*, 1995. Trustees of California State University.

<sup>2</sup> Copyright Act of 1976, §107, Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Fair Use.

(This resolution, 2312, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1996.)

## The Statement of Principle from Fair Use of Copyrighted Works: A Crucial Element in Educating America

*The mission of higher education is realized through the use of various information formats, learning environments, and modes of delivery without unreasonable copyright restrictions.*

The law's flexibility is an opportunity and a challenge. It is an opportunity to expand and apply the fair-use doctrine to diverse and changing requirements in an effort to be fair to all parties. It is also a challenge to apply fair use amidst relative uncertainty and new interpretations often do not favor educational needs. The four principles stated below seek to focus attention on these needs.

*Higher education's legitimate right to use copyrighted works must be protected.*

The fundamental mission of higher education is to advance and disseminate knowledge. This mission is realized through the use of various information formats, learning environments, and modes of delivery without unreasonable copyright restrictions. The goals and objectives that we set in order to accomplish our mission require the ability to explore, analyze, and exchange information. The effectiveness of our work depends on our right to make creative and balanced fair use of copyrighted works.

To succeed, all members of the college and university community must have reliable access to a wide variety of materials for teaching, learning, scholarship, and personal study. The materials also need to be stored and retrieved across the full range of the ever-richer diversity of useful electronic and traditional formats.

Fair use in the electronic era must allow those processes when and where they are needed, without burden of myriad negotiated transactions, and consistent with the constitutional objective that copyright "promote the progress of science."

*Fair use allows all members of the university community to build new works upon the old.*

*Freedom of access to information, regardless of its format, is essential for the creative and learning processes.*

Higher education must make use of the full range of means for accessing and utilizing various works which are protected by copyright law in both electronic environments. Fair use is a historically important

doctrine which is essential to fulfilling our higher education objectives. Fair use allows the academy to respond to the dynamic nature of the educational process and to the evolving formats of information resources. Fair use allows an otherwise rigid copyright system to respond to the changing demands for its use. Fair use allows all members of the university community to sample the broadest possible range of ideas, to build new works upon the old, and to facilitate equal access to copyrighted works within the reasonable limits of the law

*Higher education's right of fair use in the electronic era must continue unencumbered by terms of licenses or transaction fees.* Fair use is the crucial legal provision that allows our educational system to be assured of enriching the student experience and of realizing its research objectives with the widest array of knowledge and insights. It provides the necessary educational opportunity that enables our institutions of higher education to prepare students for success in the world economy

*Higher education must support an expansive and flexible view of fair use.*

Colleges and universities have supported, and will continue to support, the economic and creative incentives of copyright owners. But higher education also must support an expansive and flexible view of fair use in order to assure the fullest possible sharing of knowledge and to meet the unpredictable demands of teaching, learning, and scholarship, regardless of information format, learning environment, or mode of delivery.

*Higher education has an obligation to educate its constituencies about intellectual properties and about the lawful uses of copyrighted material.*

The remainder of this pamphlet is presented as a first step in the discharge of this educational obligation among the constituencies of higher education. In this regard, it is important for higher education to take the initiative in an effort to achieve the appropriate balance in matters related to the evolving interpretation of the fair-use doctrine.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright 1995, The Trustees of California State University

*Permission is hereby granted to reproduce and distribute copies of this publication for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost, that the source is credited, and that this copyright notice is included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act.*

*This publication is a project of the CSU-SUNY-CUNY joint Committee. Electronic versions of this publication, and of other joint Committee projects, may be available on the home page of the Consortium for Educational Technology for University Systems: <http://www.cetus.org>*

*This home page will also include links to fair-use guidelines and other resources which are intended to promote a fuller understanding and appreciation of copyright laws.*

*To simplify management of this project, the copyright to this work is held by the Trustees of CSU for the benefit of CSU, SUNY and CUNY. Permission to make use of this work beyond the rights of use described here may be obtained by contacting:*

Ms. Bonnie F Dunn  
CSU Chancellors Office  
P.O. Box 3842  
Seal Beach, CA 90740-3842

## Sec. 107. Limitations on Exclusive Rights: Fair Use

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 106 and 106A, the fair use of a copy-righted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, testing (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include--

- (1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;
- (2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- (4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work. (As amended December 1, 1990, R.L. 101-650, 104 Stat. 5089.)

(Approved March 1996, as part of AS-2312-96/FA)

## Recommendations and Reports from the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) Work Groups on Academic Issues and Administrative and Fiscal Issues, Removing Obstacles to the Use of Instructional Technology

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse in principle the Joint Findings and Recommendations (attached) of the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) Work Groups on Academic Issues and Administrative and Fiscal Issues with the following qualifications;

- (1) the Academic Senate CSU assume the word “sharing” as used in the phrase “course and degree program sharing” in Joint Findings and Recommendations numbers 5 and 6 refers to formal memoranda of understanding or other agreements concerning courses or degree programs jointly agreed upon by two or more CSU campuses, and
- (2) the contents of a memorandum of understanding specified in Joint Finding and Recommendation number 6 are not an exhaustive list.

(This resolution, 2314, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1996.)

## Joint Findings and Recommendations of the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) Work Groups on Academic Issues and Administrative and Fiscal Issues

1. “Instructional technology” refers to a large variety of applications in higher education. It includes, for example, multimedia instruction provided on-line by computers and computer networks and various forms of instructional television (one-way and two-way live and prerecorded).
2. The principal use of instructional technology that will be examined in this report is the situation where instruction is delivered to sites remote from the classroom (both on- and off-campus).
3. Both work groups find the term “technology mediated instruction” or “mediated instruction” provides a better and more general description of these instructional activities whether conducted at on- or off-campus sites and recommend that this terminology be used in place of “distance education.”
4. The work groups find that technology mediated instruction has great potential to enhance and augment classroom instruction on-campus and to expand access for students who would otherwise be denied the opportunity to earn a degree because they are remote from or for other reasons, cannot attend the campus.
5. The work groups find that course and degree program sharing, which is facilitated by mediated instruction, has potential to increase educational opportunities for students by providing a broader range of courses or degree programs from which to select.
6. The work groups recommend that course and degree program sharing be encouraged and facilitated with the CSU through consortial arrangements between campuses. Because there are many ways in which course or degree program sharing can be structured, it is further recommended that specific agreements be incorporated in a memorandum of understanding (MOU).

As appropriate, these MOUs should:

- assign the responsibility for general student advising,
- include articulation agreements that specify which courses satisfy what course requirements (GE and major) at the other campus,
- specify how residency requirements are to be met and which campus will award the degree,
- specify how access to library and other information resources will be provided,
- specify how network access will be provided,
- specify how enrollment and FTE are to be counted, credited, and reported,
- specify how student record keeping will be accomplished,
- specify how differences in academic calendars between the campuses may affect scheduling needs at the receiving campus,

- specify the add-drop schedule and census date for shared courses,
- specify which campus has responsibility regarding financial aid,
- specify how student fees are to be collected and how they may be shared,
- specify how access will be provided to other student support services (counseling, job placement, services for students with disabilities, student body activities, health services, etc.),
- specify whether there may be the need for one campus to reimburse the other for particular expenses incurred in relation to the sharing arrangement. (Course sharing could involve a reciprocal arrangement with two campuses sending courses to each other the cost of sending a course is offset by the benefit of receiving one. If one campus is primarily a receiver of course and depending upon how the FTE is accounted for financial reimbursement could be appropriate.), and
- specify how faculty workload will be distributed, and
- specify the term of the MOU and how it can be reviewed, amended, or extended.

(Approved March 1996, as part of AS-2314-96/AA)

## Endorsement of Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction\* in the CSU

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse and adopt the attached *Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU commend the members of its Technology Task Force, 1994-95, for their thoughtful development of the position paper entitled *Statement of Academic Issues and Recommendations for the Use of Technology Mediated Teaching and Learning in the CSU* which contributed substantially to the development of the attached *Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to endorse the attached *Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU* and to work with the Academic Senate CSU in developing systemwide policies and procedures related to technology mediated instruction in the CSU consistent with these principles; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus Academic Senates to endorse the attached *Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU* and to develop campus policies and procedures regarding technology mediated instruction consistent with these principles.

\* Technology Mediated Instruction refers to all forms of instruction that are enhanced by or utilize electronic and/or computer-based technology. It specifically includes distance education, instructional modules delivered via mass media, and computer-assisted instruction.

(This resolution, 2321, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1996.)

## Principles Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction\* in the CSU

1. Because a university education involves a balance between content, skills, and interactive processes that varies within and among disciplines, faculty have the responsibility for determining the pedagogies and instructional methods most appropriate for the instructional modules, courses, and academic programs which the university offers.
2. The quality of instructional modules, courses, and academic programs delivered by or using technology mediated instruction must be at least equivalent to the quality in existing academic offerings.
3. Academic and student services in support of technology mediated instruction at a distance should be comparable to the academic and student services supporting on-campus instruction.
4. Campus and systemwide efforts to promote the use of technology mediated instruction should be supported fully by professional development programs that focus on pedagogies and student learning styles appropriate to the technology as well as training in the use of the technology.
5. Campus and systemwide efforts to promote the use of technology mediated instruction must provide appropriate instructional design support and technical support to assist faculty in the development and presentation of technology mediated instruction.
6. If technology mediated instruction results in increased class sizes or student-faculty ratios beyond traditional classroom and curricular standards, additional resources or workload adjustments necessary to maintain the quality of instruction must be provided.
7. Faculty personnel processes (hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and review of tenured faculty) must value and reward all course and curriculum development and professional development activities that result in improved instruction. Instructional improvement may be accomplished through technology mediated instruction, but technology mediated instruction ought not be the value per se.
8. Where appropriate, other campus and systemwide policies should be reviewed to establish collegial mechanisms to address issues related to the expanding role of technology mediated instruction in the CSU. Areas where adjustments may be necessary include the assessment of curricular quality, the ownership of intellectual property, the determination of the fair use of copyrighted material, and long-range academic planning and capital budgeting.

\* Technology Mediated Instruction refers to all forms of instruction that are enhanced by or utilize electronic and/or computer-based technology. It specifically includes distance education, instructional modules delivered via mass media, and computer-assisted instruction.

(Approved May 1996, as part of AS-2321-96/AA/FA)

# Recommendations Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction\* in the CSU

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse and adopt the following recommendations regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU:

1. Campus senates should develop policy guidelines and procedures regarding the implementation of technology mediated instruction. The guidelines should address such areas as course selection, instructional design, access to learning resources (e.g., library holdings), instructional methodology, student-faculty interaction, and assessment and accreditation.
2. Campuses should consider the use of technology mediated instruction to facilitate the sharing of instructional modules, courses, and academic programs where appropriate. Given the number of unresolved issues in this area, the Chancellor should work with the Academic Senate CSU to develop policies requiring specific agreements for sharing instructional modules, courses, and academic programs in formal memoranda of understanding.
3. Campus senates should engage in and support local and systemwide efforts to improve student and academic support services such as outreach, admission, financial aid administration, course registration, advisement, and course articulation, to facilitate inter-campus sharing of instructional modules, courses, and academic programs.
4. When developing instructional modules, courses, and academic programs to be offered at a distance (synchronously and/or asynchronously), academic departments/programs should assess
  - (a) the need to provide access to student populations not served by existing programs,
  - (b) the curricular suitability of learning at a distance,
  - (c) the projected program costs including the costs of equipment, faculty workload in developing materials, academic support, and student services,
  - (d) the availability of appropriate campus support for instructional design, technical assistance, technical support, and faculty professional development,
  - (e) the nature of the interaction appropriate to the accomplishment of learning objectives.
5. The Chancellor should ensure that each campus develops a strategic plan for student access to computing that includes provisions for off-campus access, networked environments appropriate to disciplines, suitably equipped learning environments (classrooms, libraries, and laboratories), and appropriate technical training.
6. The Chancellor should continue his support for faculty professional development, through the Institute for Teaching and Learning, in the implementation and use of technology mediated instruction, and for securing the necessary equipment and facilities for faculty access to technology. Such faculty professional development should include training in pedagogies and student learning styles appropriate to technology, as well as the use of technology.
7. The Academic Senate CSU, in cooperation with the Chancellor and the California Faculty Association and those faculty groups in other universities or systems of higher education who may wish to participate, should inform the faculty of the CSU in a systematic and continuous fashion of their rights and responsibilities regarding the ownership of intellectual property, including those developed for technology mediated instruction; and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate CSU forward this resolution to the campus academic senates for consideration and endorsement.

\* Technology Mediated Instruction refers to all forms of instruction that are enhanced by or utilize electronic and/or computer-based technology. It specifically includes distance education, Instructional modules delivered via mass media, and computer-assisted instruction.

(This resolution, 2322, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1996.)

# Response to The Teachers Who Teach Our Teachers Teacher Preparation Programs at the California State University Report of the Institute for Education Reform

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University agree with the broad goals identified in *The Teachers Who Teach Our Teachers* report, and we particularly support the following recommendations:

- That effective partnerships with K-12 schools be established, with systematic review and recognition;
- That links between Schools of Education and Liberal Studies majors should be strengthened;
- That the Chancellor, presidents and leadership on campuses publicly promote the active involvement of faculty in the improvement of K-12 schools;
- That the relevant academic evaluation committees should review criteria and procedures for retention, tenure and promotion so appropriate value is given to the active involvement of faculty in K-12 schools;
- That the Teacher Diversity Program be evaluated with the goal of making it more consistent in bringing more minority [sic] teachers into the teaching profession;
- That the Commission on Teacher Credentialing evaluate the application of current law and regulations to ensure the flexibility campuses need to provide early education-related experiences in the undergraduate program;
- That the Commission on Teacher Credentialing repeal add-on courses, such as technology, special education and health, as a condition for receiving a teaching credential in favor of broader outcome standards for teacher preparation;
- That the Commission on Teacher Credentialing should work toward reducing the use of emergency credentials, limiting their duration and requiring recipients to enroll immediately in a credential program; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU oppose those recommendations in the Report that suggest that teacher education graduates be surveyed by a uniform instrument developed at the Chancellor's Office. It is the responsibility of the faculty who develop each CTC-approved teacher education program to evaluate its effectiveness; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its commitment to the principle that responsibility for teacher education should not be limited to faculty in Schools of Education and urge the Chancellor to ensure that partnerships with K-12 include faculty from all disciplines; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU recognize the value of faculty work with K-12 schools and support the notion that it be considered in retention, tenure and promotion decisions. However, the development of standards and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are a faculty responsibility exercised through the campus Academic Senates and approved by the Presidents; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to include the Academic Senate CSU in any discussions of proposals to CTC pertaining to reintroduction of an undergraduate major in education or other proposals pertaining to teacher credential programs that emerge from the Institute for Education Reform.

*RATIONALE: That the California State University has recognized the importance of the connection between itself and K-12 was evident in the establishment of the Institute for Education Reform. As its first effort, the Institute has reviewed teacher preparation programs in the CSU and issued the report The Teachers Who Teach Our Teachers. One of the great values of the report is that it can be used to stimulate more discussion of the university-wide responsibility for the preparation of teachers, and promote faculty involvement with K-12.*

(This resolution, 2324, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1996.)





## Section IV

---

Faculty Professional Development: Expensive Frill or Indispensable Investment? .....	189
The Role of Faculty Scholarship in the Comprehensive University .....	193
Improving Affirmative Action in CSU Academic and Academic/Administrative Personnel Matters .....	197
Professional Responsibility and Sexual Harassment .....	198
“Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors (1987) .....	199
Statement on Professional Ethics .....	199
Planning for the Recruitment and Retention of High Quality Faculty .....	200
Handout • Committee on Faculty and Staff Relations • Agenda Item 1 • May 17-18, 1988	
Recommendations of the Task Force on Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty .....	200
Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty .....	202
Introduction	
The Challenge	
Educational Equity	
Procedures for Recruitment and Outreach	
Incentives for Recruitment and Retention	
Supply	
Appendix	
The California Pre-Doctoral Program: Ideal Program .....	210
Budget	
Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program: The Ideal Program .....	212
Extending the Current Program	
The Next Program, Early Identification	
CSU Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty .....	214
The Educational Implications of the Use of Temporary Faculty in Faculty Positions in the California State University in 1990 and Beyond .....	215
Recruitment and Retention Incentives for Maintaining a High Quality and Diverse Faculty .....	216
Faculty Professional Responsibilities .....	217
Statement on Professional Ethics .....	217
Introduction	
The Statement	
A Statement of the Association’s Council: <i>Freedom and Responsibility</i> .....	218
Endorsement of the Statement in Attachment B of the January 1993 Board of Trustees’ Agenda Item “Procedures for the Selection of Presidents” .....	221
Attachment B • U&FP • Item I • January 26-27, 1993	
To Those Engaged in the Presidential Selection Process .....	221
Faculty Issues Related to Technology-Assisted Teaching .....	222
Length of Appointments of Interim Presidents .....	223
Policy Regarding Interim Presidential Appointments .....	224

<b>Recognition of Domestic Partnership and Extension of Employee Benefits in the California State University to Domestic Partners and Their Dependents .....</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>Endorsement of Position Paper on Peer Review of Instruction .....</b>	<b>226</b>
Peer Review of Instruction in the California State University	
A Position Paper of the Academic Senate, California State University .....	226
Introduction	
Background	
What Is Peer Evaluation: Ideologies and Methodologies	
Reasons for Peer Evaluation	
Issues in Implementation	
Peer Evaluation in the CSU	
Recommendations	
References	
<b>Policy on E-mail Privacy .....</b>	<b>231</b>
<b>Rewards for Faculty in the California State University .....</b>	<b>232</b>
<i>Rewards for Faculty in the California State University.....</i>	<i>232</i>
Principles for CSU Faculty Rewards Categories and Criteria .....	235
References	
<b>Statement of Principle on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning .....</b>	<b>237</b>
Statement of Principle on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning .....	237
Introduction	
Impact upon Curriculum and Pedagogy	
Implications for Faculty Professional Development	
Recommendations	
<b>Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence .....</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Encouraging the Establishment of Faculty Leadership Awards .....</b>	<b>240</b>
<b>Recommendations Regarding New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in the CSU .....</b>	<b>241</b>
New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in The California State University Faculty Affairs Committee	
CSU Academic Senate • March 1996 .....	241
New Faculty Orientation	
Mentoring Programs	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	

# Section IV

---

## Faculty Professional Development: Expensive Frill or Indispensable Investment?

On the first day of November 1986, at the annual CSU Retreat held in Asilomar, sponsored by the Academic Senate of the California State University, two different groups of distinguished and experienced educators, including faculty, administrators, trustees, presidents, business people, and students, met for four hours to discuss the crisis that exists in the CSU over the lack of adequate support for faculty professional development. After considerable debate, they concluded that in the CSU's billion dollar budget, practically nothing is being done to renew our most valuable resource, the faculty. In stark contrast, they noted, corporate firms spend 10-15% of their budgets on developing the talents and skills of their valued personnel.

Each year, over 50 of the CSU's most experienced and committed faculty who serve on the Academic Senate work together diligently and in good faith to prepare a Program Change Proposal (PCP) seeking augmented funding for professional development, and each year, despite the backing of the administration and the Board of Trustees (at least nominally, since it is their budget), either the Governor or the Legislature or both manage to delete most if not all of the request from the budget. The message is clear: the PCP process for faculty development does not work. We, the faculty, have failed to convince those who control the assignment of tax dollars to higher education that faculty professional development is as important as we know it to be. There are many reasons for this failure, not the least of which is the government's view that faculty professional development is a frill. For example, legislators often mistakenly see travel to professional meetings as *junkets for fun*.

In desperation and because our very futures depend upon it, we are seeking a new approach in this position paper in order to clarify the meaning of professional development. We are not alone. The California Postsecondary Education Commission, under a mandate contained in the 1986-87 Budget Act, is currently conducting a study of faculty and staff development in the CSU. According to a directive issued by Vice Chancellor Caesar J. Naples on January 30, 1987, the purpose of the study is "...to provide CPEC, the Legislature and the Governor's Office with information concerning staff...development activities and needs in order that those governmental entities will have a basis for making decisions concerning Program Change Proposals for faculty and staff development."

Our strategy in this paper is to attempt to explain as clearly as possible what we believe professional development is, why it is important, and how it can best be achieved. To add relevance to our narrative, we have collected a number of anecdotes offered by colleagues throughout the system which illustrate the need for professional development, the current lack of support for it, and the sad consequences that often accrue without it.

Professional development is the enrichment and renewal of the faculty through a time-honored and proven process which includes the broadening of vision, knowledge, and perspective afforded by experiences such as sabbatical leaves *every seventh year*, frequent travel to professional meetings where teachers and scholars can exchange information about current research findings and

teaching innovations in their fields, and a wide variety of other programs and opportunities designed to enhance the value of faculty to their students and to the university. The absence of such opportunities for faculty to stay abreast of the most current knowledge in their fields places the teaching mission of the CSU in jeopardy. The entire process of professional development is indispensable for the maintenance and advancement of faculty in any university.

Other professions have recognized that personnel development is a vital and integral part of long-range planning for progress. Too often we see in national reports the observation that the corporate world is way ahead of higher education in its forward vision. Industry will pay their professionals' expenses to take courses, travel, and attend training workshops. Often it will buy books, pay for the typing of monographs and papers, and cover the costs of publication. Some university systems in this country do support such professional growth for their faculty. The CSU does not.

The essential ingredients of a program for faculty professional development include ways to improve teaching by providing faculty with exposure to new models of instructional technology. This means training in the use of computers, which have become fundamental to many fields of study, along with audiovisual and videotaping techniques. In addition, faculty must be given the opportunity for retraining so they can move out of fields that have become obsolete and enter those that are newly emerging and are more relevant to our students and society. Faculty travel to professional workshops, to other universities, etc., is one important way to gain exposure to new ideas and knowledge. But travel costs have soared in recent years, while CSU budgets for this important part of professional development have shrunk dramatically. Current travel appropriations call for approximately \$140 per position annually or \$175 per professional position, excluding support staff, and this is woefully inadequate. Support for the publication of scholarly work, including typing, editing, drafting, photography, and even simple guidance with respect to grant proposal writing (an emerging criterion for faculty promotion on many of our campuses) is inadequate when it is even available.

The CSU also faces a faculty recruitment crisis. According to predictions from the National Center for Educational Statistics as well as from other reliable research agencies, large numbers of faculty throughout the country will be retiring in the next 15 years. Colleges and universities are scrambling to find qualified faculty in fields where shortages of professors are already being felt. Competition is becoming more intense. Although faculty salaries have increased over the past two years in the CSU, without a dynamic and creative program of faculty professional development to attract and retain talented new academicians, we will find ourselves at a decided disadvantage compared to other institutions of higher learning.

The Academic Senate CSU, in some modest ways, has begun to take initiative in promoting the kind of professional development we so desperately need. In cooperation with the Chancellor and her staff, a new Center for Teaching and Learning is being planned. Faculty assigned to this center would have exposure to recent research on teaching and learning, would conduct their own research, and would be able to apply the knowledge and skills they acquire to the classroom. But this center is only one small part of what is needed in the area of professional development. Another example of the Academic Senate's efforts is a recent analysis of policies indicating the need for and value of sabbaticals.

The following experiences related by CSU faculty illustrate the dramatic consequences when faculty professional development is neglected. The examples range from applied fields such as business or counseling to the sciences and the arts. It is tempting to make editorial comments (e.g., the creative and performing arts have been shamefully ignored so that faculty literally have to foot the bills themselves for showings, exhibits, productions, etc., because not enough money is available in departmental budgets); but on the whole, these statements speak for themselves.

Four promising probationary faculty in the business school on a medium-sized urban campus, all in the process of finishing their Ph.D.s, have decided to leave the university as soon as their dissertations are completed. They all reported that their dissertation advisors (at UCLA, USC, and Claremont) urged them to "get out of the CSU" because their chances for advancement in their field would be impaired due to lack of support for research along with an oppressive teaching load.

A chemist at one of our large urban campuses lamented that he has been unable to attend the national meetings of the American Chemical Society because of lack of travel funds. Attendance at these meetings would enable him to meet other chemists in his specialty and to discuss recent developments in the field. He emphasized the importance of such meetings because they allowed him to maintain currency in his discipline; he could learn of developments without having to wait for them to appear in print, which could take years. He observed that his students are the real losers.

A department chair in a science field on a large inner-city campus reports that at least nine members of his department in recent years have written papers for which there were no technical services available for needed pre-publication processing. He had to engage in “creative scrounging around” to find even minimal assistance. There was no way that the department’s small regular office staff could provide the help needed. Without his extraordinary efforts, his colleagues’ papers would not have been published and their career development would have been slowed.

A promising young assistant professor in the counseling field resigned after three probationary years on the faculty at a small urban campus. Her department chair tried to determine why she would take such a drastic move. She decried the lack of opportunity for professional growth and intellectual stimulation: “The university fails to nurture its new faculty. I had idealistic hopes that I would find a community of scholars and teachers on the campus. I discovered instead that few colleagues had time to devote to a discussion of either teaching or research. We were all scurrying around trying to cope with an overwhelming teaching load. To top it off, we are expected to get involved in service. Well, I ended up having to chair my school curriculum committee because all of the tenured faculty on the committee claimed they had either done it before or were over-worked and couldn’t spare the time. I always had known that I could make more money in private practice as a therapist, but I wanted to teach and do research, and combine my practical experience with the classroom to enrich and motivate my students. What a disillusionment to discover that I had to work 12 hours a day and some weekends just to meet my minimum obligations.”

A faculty member in music has long sought support for performing arts faculty to serve as Artists-in-Residence on their own campuses, to enable each such artist to prepare and present major lectures/performances or exhibits. There have never been funds available, and such performances are a drain on faculty members’ energies when they must teach full loads. As a result, comparatively few faculty performances are given on our campuses, in contrast with places like USC. With proper support, such presentations would enhance both the instructional program and the cultural events program of each campus and the surrounding community.

An English professor on a medium-sized urban campus complained bitterly that he is forced to teach three to four sections of composition each semester instead of courses in the field of literature for which he was trained. “What a waste of faculty resources,” he commented. “How many years can I be expected to worry about the incorrect use of possessive apostrophes? Why isn’t there money available to hire T.A.s to make such notations so I can be freed to continue my writing and research? Why isn’t there travel money for me to attend conferences and mingle with professional colleagues so I can be stimulated to teach students those ideas and insights that I spent so many years acquiring while earning a Ph.D.?” Regrettably, this professor, a winner of the campus distinguished teaching award, has decided to apply for early retirement even though he is only 55 because, as he puts it, “I can’t face the prospect of another 10 to 15 years of this kind of boredom, and no relief in sight.”

A biology professor on a very large suburban campus reported frustration because he is unable to keep abreast of developments in recombinant DNA technology. Several years ago, he was able to obtain partial funding to provide a series of workshops on this subject. Since then, insufficient monies have been available. The field of genetic engineering has grown so rapidly that he has been unable to keep up. A few hundred dollars a year would make the difference. He wonders why the CSU system doesn’t sponsor local workshops and also why his teaching load is so heavy that he has no time for the intensive study his field demands. He noted, “I feel as though I am working in a vacuum. The newspapers publish new data that their science writers get at professional conferences, and I am unaware of it until my students ask me about it. I have to tell them that since I couldn’t attend that particular conference, I don’t know about the research mentioned in the press.”

These experiences represent only a small sample of the kinds of frustrations CSU faculty have endured because of a lack of adequate support for professional development. Of course, there also are successes when faculty have been fortunate enough to procure a grant for professional travel or to support their research.

What needs to be done? The negative examples related above demonstrate clear need for positive action. The state of California must provide the CSU with the support it needs to reverse the pattern of wasteful neglect of faculty. Since most of the CSU budget goes toward faculty salaries, it would seem a wise investment to insure that such monies are well spent by enhancing the opportunities faculty have to develop their knowledge and talents. This means commitment to professionalism. It means providing workshops for faculty in their fields; offering training in how to write and obtain grants; making more funds available for travel to professional meetings; making sabbaticals a reality once again so that faculty can, indeed, renew themselves every seven years to the benefit of their students and the university as a whole; supplying both the funds and the staff to assist faculty in the preparation of prospective publications; and providing release time for faculty research and other forms of scholarship.

Most of all, what is needed is a reversal of the obvious continued erosion of faculty morale, a nationwide phenomenon. Evidence continues to accumulate that the rewards for being a college professor are diminishing. The recent Carnegie Foundation survey of over 5,000 faculty clearly shows declining morale and a serious loss of enthusiasm among the faculty for their work. Over half of those surveyed would consider leaving academia if suitable alternative employment were available. And it isn't only the middle-aged professor who is disillusioned; beginning assistant professors in increasing numbers are souring on the academy because of inadequate opportunity for career advancement.

The people and the leaders of the state of California need to recognize the crisis in faculty professional development that exists in the CSU. The CSU needs to be supported in making a more active commitment to faculty professional development. The faculty should have the primary role in defining and implementing that development, through their established academic governance processes.

(This document was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1987.)

# The Role of Faculty Scholarship in the Comprehensive University

## Introduction

Scholarly activities by the faculty in a university are essential to every function required of them. The separation of scholarship from other faculty functions is an unrealistic and false approach to the university's obligations with respect to its constituencies, including students, the surrounding community, and the public at large as well as faculty.

The concept of scholarly activity encompasses investigative and creative work in varied settings. The interactive relationship between these activities and other major faculty functions is delineated here for undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching, faculty professional development, and public service. In addition, questions of publications, external grants, and faculty workload are considered.

## Undergraduate Teaching

Undergraduate education encompasses a broad spectrum of intellectual development, including literacy in its many aspects, analytical and critical thinking, civic responsibility, cultural appreciation, effective communication, and comprehension of events and relationships in society. In addition, students invest time, effort, and money in higher education in order to attain competencies requisite to their earning capacities through work that offers greater fulfillment than any available without the baccalaureate degree. Thus a major function of undergraduate education is to provide entry level professionals in the many fields for which a university is authorized to confer a baccalaureate degree. Indeed, the ceremony for that conferral is a Commencement, literally the beginning of the graduates' professional careers. This beginning implies a readiness for the independent work and learning expected in employment or graduate study. An ability to learn independently is evidenced in the analysis of problems to which solutions are not yet known. Accordingly, the process generally requires formulation of pertinent questions, design of tests, search for useful prior knowledge, search for new knowledge, and adaptation of the results of these steps to fit conditions posed in a given problem in order to produce a valid or an optimal solution. These basic competencies apply whether the baccalaureate graduate is pursuing study for an advanced degree or is employed in a commercial, technical, public service, or academic organization.

Development of these competencies in the course of baccalaureate degree study requires more than absorption of facts and deductive reasoning. There must be heuristic teaching, which goes beyond Socratic questions in the classroom and requires more than 50 minutes three times a week for fifteen weeks. Concomitantly, there must be heuristic learning, which requires more than a term paper. Even the much-touted *capstone experience* frequently turns out to be a pebble on a pile of rubble when students pick classes for the moment's convenience rather than planning programs for continuity and synthesis.

Heuristic teaching requires the faculty's commitment to, and practice of, scholarship in modes appropriate to their respective fields. Scholarly activity by faculty therefore takes many forms, depending on discipline and individual interests. Scholarship is inherently long term and can therefore provide a means for heuristic teaching. Scholarship encompasses research, whether in the laboratory, observatory, library, field, or population; creativity, whether composition or performance in visual arts, theatre, music, dance, or literature; and analysis or synthesis, whether in social, behavioral, or natural sciences, arts and humanities, or the professional fields. Doubtless there are other forms and variants. The common element is problem-solving in which new learning occurs, and the process may be more significant than the product to the faculty member as well as to students.

Self-directed learning is the most important *skill* that the faculty can transmit to students. It is therefore most important that the faculty engage in scholarly activity to maintain that skill in themselves and to devise ways for their students to participate. Such practice thus becomes a mode of teaching in which the faculty member exemplifies the work of the discipline and may be observed to make, discover, and correct false choices in the course of a project. Students thus learn methods and the interrelationships of facts rather than a disjointed and static compilation of "information."

Disciplines vary in their opportunities for student participation, but over a wide spectrum, some degree of active involvement is possible. These possibilities may be illustrated by research groups in the natural sciences, engineering, and social sciences; performance ensembles in the arts; and community service groups in applied social sciences, education, and business. Nonetheless, the creative work that must remain an individual endeavor and achievement, such as artistic, literary, or musical composition, is equally vital for teaching the processes of such creativity to students with appropriate interests and aspirations.

The concept of research *per se* is sometimes contrasted with a more amorphous view of scholarship, and the contrast is intended to show that, while *scholarship* may inform teaching, *research* must inevitably conflict with teaching. This distinction is fundamentally false, and, if carried into faculty evaluation criteria, it would set the faculty in some disciplines into untenable conflicts with the faculty in others.

There are subject areas where the reading of source materials is appropriate scholarship, particularly if the scholar produces new syntheses. Literature, philosophy, and the various subfields of history are illustrative examples. Other subject areas necessarily require different types of research, based on development of new knowledge, where the methodology of discovery and verification is the instructional means for students, the basis for currency in the field on the part of the faculty and, indeed, the heart of the subject. Discovered knowledge is not as narrow as the data from which that knowledge is derived because fundamental principles carry through an entire discipline and extend to cognate disciplines as well. A major example is materials science, which unites many subfields of physics, chemistry, crystallography, and electronic and computer engineering.

Another distinguishable category of subject areas consist of creative and performing arts, in which the creative aspects constitute the requisite methodology. Few if any would argue that a teacher of painting need not paint, a teacher of dance need not dance, and a teacher of music need not play, sing, conduct, or compose. A further category encompasses the social and behavioral sciences where, again, the practice of defining a problem to which the answer is not known, designing an approach to a solution, constructing an instrument for obtaining requisite information, analyzing the data, and drawing a conclusion are indispensable to the instructional skill of the faculty and the education of students in those fields.

Thus, all forms of scholarly activity, as diverse as the disciplines in the curriculum, must be conducted as an inseparable part of the faculty's work in order to maintain instructional quality. Writing in *Change*, Michael S. Bassis and Alan E. Guskin have presented a cogent and comprehensive rationale for research at comprehensive universities, which they described as "regional state colleges and universities." They state:

We maintain that, while aspiring to become a major research institution is inappropriate for a regional state college or university, research and scholarly activities *consistent with the norms of the faculty members' disciplines are critical* to the development and maintenance of institutional quality at such schools. [emphasis added]\*

The most important precept is that teaching and scholarship are neither a dichotomy nor a conflict of interest for faculty, but rather interactive and symbiotic aspects of the whole process of university instruction. Indeed, aside from the comparative complexity of subject matter, it is the scholarly practice that most distinguishes the university professor from the pre-college and even the community college teacher. Similarly, the introduction to scholarly practice should be integral to the distinction between the baccalaureate candidate and the pre-college student.

## Graduate Teaching

Teaching at the doctoral level obviously requires the faculty member to prepare both doctoral candidates and postdoctoral associates for independent, original work in the discipline. In teaching candidates for master's degrees, less extensive research is required for a thesis or a project report,

---

\* M.S. Bassis and A.E. Guskin, "Building Quality: Research and the Regional Institutions," *Change*, July/August 1986 pp. 57 et seq.



but that research is no less independent nor necessarily less original. M.S. and M.A. graduates can choose from a variety of careers within a given discipline and other closely related fields. These include pre-baccalaureate teaching and industrial or government positions in which they are expected to direct the work of employees in lower ranks. All the activities and obligations of faculty described above for undergraduate teaching are amplified and focused within the framework of instruction for the master's degree.

It must also be borne in mind that in many fields the material taught to master's degree students in one decade must be distilled for undergraduate teaching in the next decade. There is a continuum through which the faculty must carry itself forward in order to remain competent to teach throughout an evolving curriculum.

## Faculty Professional Development

*Professor* is derived from the same root as *profession*. What is the professor's profession, teaching the subject or practicing it? Again, these aspects are inseparable and do not intrinsically constitute the conflict often imputed to this distinction. The university faculty member must *keep up* by learning self-directedly at a level well beyond the immediate instructional level of baccalaureate education and must, therefore, practice in a way appropriate to the subject to be taught.

Non-doers cannot teach effectively for very long because they lose contemporaneity and spontaneity. All subject areas evolve, including the interpretational aspects of *old* knowledge. Thus the practice of one's subject must include some elements of discovery or synthesis, not necessarily at the *cutting edge* but new enough to contribute to knowledge or insight as part of the generic change.

Such participation in the life of their subject fields enables university faculty to maintain professional vitality sufficient to keep the curriculum abreast of change and themselves competent for a career spanning several generations of students. The alternative is *deadwood* if, as a faculty ages, their knowledge remains static and their teaching iterative. While newly hired faculty with doctoral (or other terminal) degrees do bring fresh knowledge, up-to-date techniques, and new comprehension to an institution, there is no justification or value in a climate of stagnation—the new faculty would soon suffer as did the old before them.

## Public Service

In many fields the problem areas of timely concern are those that bear on individual or societal human need, governmental agency operations, the environment, or cultural preservation, to make but four broad categories to which research or creative endeavor might be applied. The application of faculty leadership, community consultation, and student participation to discovery and problem-solving in the university's service area is effective for many of the purposes detailed above. Applied research can be as productive as basic research in fulfilling the goals of student and faculty development, depending as always on the nature of the various disciplines involved in such activities. A public service application is frequently multidisciplinary and offers much potential for contributions to knowledge as well as assistance to the community.

## Communication of Scholarly Work

Publication, performance, or exhibition is as critical for the faculty of a comprehensive university as for the faculty in a research-driven university. The process in all cases involves peer review. Research and other scholarly papers are refereed by the author's professional peers in the same discipline but from other institutions. Public performances and exhibits are attended by many visitors; even if not juried, they may be reviewed by professional critics. In fields where student participation is expected, co-authorship is an attainment significant to students' professional development.

Publication of findings communicates them to the discipline and establishes the results in the body of common knowledge. In all instances, the university's reputation benefits as much as the faculty member's.

## External Support

The ability to draw government and foundation grants for scholarly activities in a competitive funding environment depends in large measure on the reputation of the proposer as established by prior work. While peer review for grants is intended to select the best proposal of a given set, decisions frequently go to the safest proposer, one whose work was acceptable in the past, or one whose institution has an established reputation. New faculty whose doctoral or postdoctoral research was supported by a grant to a senior investigator and whose contribution was established in publication have promise in competition for grants in their own names.

However, in some cases the current emphasis on the pursuit of grants in effect denigrates the work that many faculty members accomplish without external funding but with equal value to students, to the discipline in question, and to the university. With some notable exceptions, such as the Undergraduate Research Participation (URP) program of the National Science Foundation and the Cottrell grants of Research Corporation, the purpose of a foundation or a public service agency in funding a research project is the outcome of the research. Such research is integral to the foundation's mission or the agency's operation, and contributions to the instructional program of the university are incidental. Many disciplines are not served by such organizations, so that scholarly activities in those fields are conducted by faculty at personal sacrifice when not supported by the state. To the extent that grantsmanship is urged, praised, and rewarded by colleagues or by administrators, the morale of equally productive faculty members in unsupported fields suffers. Because faculty scholarship is integral to instructional quality throughout the curriculum, the state must provide an equitable level of support; in areas where external grant funds are awarded, state support can be redistributed to other scholars.

## The Faculty Workload

The necessity for scholarship on the part of university faculty requires recognition and allocation in the official workload. While this claim is arguably a matter for collective bargaining as a term or condition of employment, the intrinsic issue of scholarship constitutes a standard and criterion for faculty evaluation, one of three in general use.

Faculties at substantially all accredited degree-granting institutions characteristically engage in peer evaluation for retention, tenure, and promotion on the basis of three areas of achievement: teaching and closely related instructional contributions; professional scholarship and appropriate forms of disseminated results; and service to the university community. The CSU faculty follow this national norm in evaluating their peers, despite all the sacrifice entailed in meeting these standards and criteria. To do otherwise would diminish the quality of instruction and the reputations of the faculty and the university, which are inextricably intertwined. Thus, appropriate workload credit for faculty scholarly activities is critical for the fulfillment of the mission of the CSU as a premier teaching institution among the nation's comprehensive universities.

## Summary

The commitment to excellence in instruction established for the CSU requires a parallel commitment to opportunity for scholarly activities by faculty members appropriate to their respective disciplines, including, and not limited to, modes of research, design, or performance. Maintenance of instructional quality for students cannot be accomplished without maintenance of intellectual quality in the faculty. The terminal degrees faculty members bring to their positions are but the beginning of their academic careers, their "commencement"; faculty must be enabled to build upon their initial attainments in order to teach over the span of a lifetime. They must be able to evolve with their subject fields in order to continue teaching effectively.

# Improving Affirmative Action in CSU Academic and Academic/Administrative Personnel Matters

**WHEREAS** Recent academic and academic/administrative hiring in the California State University has shown improvement in affirmative action categories, but a study covering the years 1975 through 1981 has nonetheless indicated only slight change in the ethnic and sex characteristics of the faculty as a whole despite a long-standing commitment to the concept of affirmative action by both the CSU and the Academic Senate CSU; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its commitment to affirmative action in academic and academic/administrative personnel matters and urge each campus senate/council to review procedures for fulfillment of affirmative action goals and objectives; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to campus senates/councils the following means of improving affirmative action in academic and academic/administrative personnel matters:

1. Designation of a campus affirmative action officer, preferably a person for whom affirmative action would be the primary responsibility, and establishment of an affirmative action advisory committee, to work with the affirmative action officer to recommend policies and procedures to the campus senate/council and to report annually in person to the campus senate/council and the council of deans on the impact of affirmative action on the campus;
2. Inclusion of an affirmative action statement in the procedures for selection of campuswide administrators and school deans, a special affirmative action briefing for newly appointed school deans and for newly appointed campuswide administrators having personnel functions, affirmative action briefings for all selection committees early in the search for campuswide administrators and school deans and for department hiring committees as soon as the department is authorized to seek a person to fill a tenure-track position;
3. Regular reporting by the affirmative action officer to each department regarding that department's utilization of members in protected classes, including indications of underutilization and general recommendations regarding hiring (both temporary and probationary) and promotion;
4. Establishing a mechanism for insuring members of protected classes advice and assistance in preparing for advancement, tenure, or retention;
5. Making special efforts to ensure that candidates from protected classes are equally attracted to the position, the campus, and the community as all other candidates;
6. Developing policy and procedures which recognize, in any year when the pool of candidates does not meet the needs and standards, including affirmative action goals of the department, school, or campus, that it would be reasonable to extend the search; and
7. Inclusion of an evaluation of the effectiveness of affirmative action implementation in the review of all campus administrators responsible for the implementation; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its commitment to the Administrative Fellows Program and to the Affirmative Action Faculty Development Grant Program; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to the Chancellor the following means for improving affirmative action in academic and academic/administrative personnel matters:

1. An annual briefing by the system affirmative action officer and the Chancellor to the campus presidents, including a reminder of affirmative action obligation and distribution of data regarding utilization and underutilization of persons in protected classes at each campus (such briefing to come early in the academic year, before the beginning of the personnel cycles);
2. Inclusion of the efficacy of campus affirmative action programs in any review of campus presidents; and
3. Development of programs designed to increase the number of persons in protected classes eligible in candidate pools.

(This resolution was approved by the Academic Senate CSU, May 1983.)

# Professional Responsibility and Sexual Harassment

**WHEREAS** it is the policy of the California State University that each campus and the Office of the Chancellor maintain a working and learning environment free from sexual harassment of its students, employees, and those who apply for student or employee status; and

**WHEREAS** sexual harassment includes such behavior as sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature directed towards an employee, student, or applicant when one or more of the following circumstances are present:

Submission to or toleration of the conduct is an explicit or implicit term or condition of employment, admission, or academic evaluation;

Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with an employee's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse working environment;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with a student's academic performance, creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse learning environment, or adversely affecting any student; and

**WHEREAS** the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has recently reaffirmed the ethical responsibility of faculty members to avoid "...any exploitation of students for...private advantage," and explicitly applied this standard to "...a faculty member's use of institutional position to seek unwanted sexual relations with students (or anyone else vulnerable to the faculty member's authority)"; and

**WHEREAS** the AAUP has recently reaffirmed that "intimidation and harassment" are inconsistent with the maintenance of academic freedom on campus and has specified sexual discrimination and sexual harassment as such unprofessional treatment of students and colleagues; and

**WHEREAS** sexual harassment of students by faculty may compromise standards of evaluation and academic professional standards; may create a condition of mutual suspicion between students and faculty members; and may block students from specific educational and professional opportunities; and

**WHEREAS** it is necessary to investigate all complaints dealing with sexual harassment carefully, to protect fully the rights of both the individual lodging the complaint and the person against whom the complaint is being lodged; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University affirm and publicly support the policy of the California State University prohibiting sexual harassment; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU believe it to be the responsibility of each faculty member in the CSU not only to refrain from acts of sexual harassment and discrimination but also to make it clear through conduct that he or she does not tolerate such behavior from anyone in the university community; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge any campus senates/councils which have not already done so to adopt a policy statement recognizing the faculty's responsibility in maintaining an environment free of sexual harassment and to publicize that statement throughout the campus; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates/councils to work together with their local administrations in the implementation of their campus' sexual harassment policy and procedures, making every effort to ensure that individuals who are perceived as credible and approachable by all campus constituencies be designated to receive complaints of sexual harassment and that the complaint process be developed in such a manner that it is perceived as unbiased by all campus constituencies; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus to make available to faculty, staff and students ongoing education, and/or information on recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment, on the rights of all individuals concerned, and on the policies and procedures for protecting those rights; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus to identify and develop support services necessary for implementing the policy in a continuing and consistent manner.

(This resolution was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1986.)

# “Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors (1987)

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse and adopt the 1987 “Statement on Professional Ethics” of the American Association of University Professors.

(This resolution, 1779, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1988.)

## Statement on Professional Ethics

- I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests, must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
- II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
- III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
- IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
- V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

1961 *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*

1964 *Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances* (Clarification of sec. 1.c. of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*)

1965 *On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government-Sponsored Research at Universities*

1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*

1967 *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students*

1970 *Council Statement on Freedom and Responsibility*

1976 *On Discrimination*

1984 *Sexual Harassment: Suggested Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints*

[from *ACADEME* July-August 1987]

(Approved May 1988, as part of AS-1779-88/FA)

# Planning for the Recruitment and Retention of High Quality Faculty

**WHEREAS** A California State University task force was established to investigate issues regarding the recruitment and retention of a high quality faculty in the CSU; and

**WHEREAS** The Task Force Report on the Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty, including a number of recommendations, has been submitted to and approved by the CSU Board of Trustees; and

**WHEREAS** Some of the recommendations made by the task force relate specifically to planning for the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty (Recommendations 2 and 3); and

**WHEREAS** Meeting the challenge of hiring large numbers of high quality faculty will require a careful identification of the problems to be solved, recognition of the recruitment crisis as an opportunity for renewal, development of strategies combined with creative approaches, and a well-organized response to effect change; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge that the CSU Board of Trustees annually review a report from each campus describing (1) the hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion of faculty compared to the previous year and (2) the appointment and career progress of ethnic minorities, the disabled, and women in fields in which they are underrepresented; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus presidents and academic senates to begin forthwith studying and planning for the personnel turnover, meeting the supply problem, and answering the need for a more diverse and representative faculty, new recruitment strategies, hiring from a wide range of sources, establishment of joint appointments, and possible adaptations and additions to criteria for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge all parties to continue to be involved in viewing planning as a consciousness-raising tool, as an opportunity for campuses to consider the development of incentives for faculty to cooperate in the development of new and appropriate educational skills.

(This resolution, 1899, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1990.)

Attachment to: AS-1899-90/FA, AS-1900-90/FA, AS-1901-90/FA, AS-1902-90/FA, AS-1903-90/FA

Handout • Committee on Faculty and Staff Relations • Agenda Item 1 • May 17-18, 1988

## Recommendations of the Task Force

### on Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty

1. Recommend: that it is the policy of the Board of Trustees to employ a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly represents and reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State.
2. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees' Committee on Faculty and Staff Relations shall annually review a report, from each campus, which describes the hiring, retention, tenure and promotion of faculty, compares with the previous year the appointment and career progress of ethnic minorities, the disabled and women in fields in which they are underrepresented and highlights, in its summary conclusions, such achievements or lack thereof.
3. Recommend: that Presidents charge their faculty and academic administrations with a collaborative effort in studying and planning for personnel turnover, the supply problem, the need for a more diverse and representative faculty, new recruitment strategies, the possibility of hiring from a wider range of sources, and possible adaptations and additions to criteria for hiring, retention, tenure and promotion.
4. Recommend: that the Presidents, with the assistance of the Chancellor, undertake the responsibility to provide assistance, information, training and coordination of support mechanisms to departments as they seek to hire new faculty.

5. Recommend: that in order to broaden the pool of potential faculty applicants, the Chancellor, together with the Presidents, develop (1) incentives for attracting professionals from outside academe to commit themselves to an academic career; and (2) ways to assist them in acquiring academic skills and appropriate academic credentials.
6. Recommend: that the Presidents allocate positions and encourage departments to search for faculty who are at various stages of their professional lives, and the Board of Trustees seek a salary schedule to accommodate this.
7. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek the funding of new faculty positions at a more realistic level than the current Step 8 and seek further means of making competitive appointments.
8. Recommend: that the Chancellor and Presidents encourage and assist cooperation among campuses in recruiting faculty.
9. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek both full funding for relocation expenses and additional funding for travel and associated costs of outreach and recruitment.
10. Recommend: that the Chancellor review and appropriately revise travel regulations to allow more flexibility in the use of general fund money.
11. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees (1) recognize the need for additional positions to enable the campuses to provide for greater emphasis on personal involvement of campus personnel in outreach and recruitment of new faculty and (2) request budget support for such new positions as appropriate.
12. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees affirm its support of a competitive salary schedule for faculty and, while maintaining a competitive base for entry level salaries, seek the support necessary to increase the maximum salaries that can be paid for all academic ranks.
13. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees (1) support in principle provision for individually variable benefit plans as well as retirement plans which would allow transferability of retirement funds from other states both by liberalizing current plans and by providing alternate retirement systems, and (2) direct the Chancellor to review the feasibility of and seek to implement such benefits as appropriate.
14. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor explore more carefully the relationship between the salary structure, the level of salaries and issues raised by housing and the cost-of-living.
15. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees in its policies and legislative and budgetary programs see that CSU policies and practices in faculty workload ensure the CSU's competitive position in recruitment and retention.
16. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek additional support for faculty professional activities, including increased support for research, scholarship and creative activity, for faculty professional development and for sabbatical leaves.
17. Recommend: that the Presidents encourage the continuation and expansion of programs to orient new faculty and programs to help new faculty form social and professional networks.
18. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees establish a concerted statewide campaign to educate and involve the private sector in the needs of the university.
19. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek a pilot pre-doctoral program to identify and assist minority and women students in entering academic careers in fields in which they are underrepresented.
20. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek to expand loan programs and grants for graduate students, such as the Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program, so that they may complete terminal degrees.
21. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees, working with the Regents of the University of California, urge their respective faculties to develop articulation of Masters programs in the CSU to Doctoral programs in UC.
22. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees call upon the University of California and the State of California to increase graduate programs in fields in which there are potential shortages.
23. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees call upon the University of California and other universities granting doctoral degrees to permit, and where possible, to encourage part-time attendance in doctoral programs.
24. Recommend: that the Presidents and Chancellor examine hiring practices and seek reasonable accommodations to the needs of the disabled.

# Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty

## Introduction

Successful recruitment of high quality faculty is fast becoming a challenge of crisis proportions. Universities across the nation are facing increased competition for new faculty. The California State University tenure-track faculty grew rapidly in the 1960s, like faculties in other universities, and that faculty cohort will be retiring in record numbers. The CSU will hire between 8,500–11,000 new tenure-track faculty over the next 15 years, almost as many as the 11,188 tenured and probationary faculty of Fall 1987. The number of faculty hired annually is already increasing and will more than double by the latter half of the 1990s. These predictions are based on retirements, turnover, expected student increases, the relative mix of tenure-track and temporary positions and hiring probabilities of the past decade. The greatest immediate need will be in humanities, education and engineering and computer science, followed by mathematics and natural sciences, social sciences and the arts.

During the period of faculty growth in the 1960s, the number of doctorates awarded annually in the United States also increased. The production of doctorates has stabilized since the early 1970s, but the mix of disciplines varied and declines have been sharp in humanities, education and mathematics. Overall, the number of U.S. citizens earning doctorates has declined 7.4 percent since 1974.

Among minorities, the numbers of doctorates awarded are small and concentrated in a few disciplines. Over half the doctorates earned by Blacks are in education, and many of those by educators already committed to careers in K-12; there were 14 Black Ph.D.s in engineering in 1986. Over half the doctorates awarded to Hispanics are in education and social sciences and over half the doctorates awarded to Asians are in the sciences and engineering. American Indians earned a total of 100 doctorates in all fields in 1986. Altogether, ethnic minorities received under 11 percent of the 23,000 doctorates awarded to U.S. citizens in 1986.

Women earn one-third of all doctorates. Over half are awarded in education and social science, almost a third in life sciences and humanities, and 13 percent in technical and professional fields.

The CSU student body is increasingly a minority and female group. The California adult population of Hispanic and non-white minorities is expected to grow from the present one-third to forty-five percent of the population in 2000. In addition to reasons of equity and representation, there is a further reason for increasing efforts at hiring a diverse faculty. To provide role models for students, indeed to stimulate minorities, women and the disabled to enter graduate school in fields in which they are underrepresented, is essential for the future health of the academic profession and of society. In the desperation to hire someone, as hiring anyone competent becomes increasingly difficult, it will be all too easy to retreat from the modest affirmative action gains achieved so far.

While the CSU needs to hire more faculty from a declining supply, so does the rest of the nation. By 1995, approximately 40 percent of U.S. tenured faculty will retire; by 2009 approximately two-thirds of the tenured faculty will need to be replaced.

The competition for hiring new faculty will be intense, and salary, workload and other conditions of employment will play major roles in the struggle. The CSU currently has minimal funding for research and professional renewal and a teaching load that is at least as heavy as that of other comprehensive universities. Successfully hiring a high quality, diverse faculty will be very difficult; it is indeed a recruitment crisis.

## The Challenge

The recruitment and hiring of new faculty is a joint effort; the Board of Trustees establishes overall policy, the campus administration authorizes positions to be filled and department faculty search for and recommend a final candidate. The President makes the appointment. It is the goal of all to hire and retain the highest quality faculty available. Essential to meeting the goal of a high quality faculty for the CSU are several personal and institutional characteristics.

1. Teaching is the primary responsibility of every faculty member. Good teaching is a hallmark of a high quality faculty.
2. Strong academic backgrounds and competencies in their disciplines are prerequisites for faculty to be able to teach undergraduate and graduate students.
3. Research, scholarship and creative activity are essential to the intellectual vitality necessary for good teaching.
4. A faculty broadly representative of the racial and cultural variety in the nation, and more particularly, in California; representative of the disabled; and able to teach an increasingly diverse student body is necessary to maintain high quality.



5. Faculty diverse in experience provide intellectual breadth and vigor to the University. Hiring faculty at various stages in their professional lives and hiring from across the nation can prevent the development of another "retirement cohort" and of regional parochialism.
6. Commitment, the devotion of faculty to the institution, is another hallmark of a high quality faculty. Many aspects of faculty work such as student advising, curriculum and program development, faculty governance, are carried out primarily by full-time regular members of the faculty. Quality is impinged by overreliance on part-time faculty.

The challenge of recruiting and retaining a high quality faculty is clear and ongoing. This paper consists of proposed policies and possible strategies, several of which will require continuing analysis prior to implementation. The issues, recommendations and strategies to meet the challenge divide naturally into three groups: (1) procedures for recruitment and outreach, (2) incentives for recruitment and retention, (3) supply. Equity issues prevail in all three categories. Policy recommendations form the body of the report. The Appendix contains existing and possible new strategies to meet the challenge.

## Educational Equity

A faculty representative of the rich diversity of the citizenry, able to offer a multi-cultural curriculum to a student body which will be increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse, will be an essential asset of the university.

1. **Recommend:** that it is the policy of the Board of Trustees to employ a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly represents and reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State.

The goal and the commitment of the CSU are not new, but additional strategies and effort are needed as affirmative action hiring becomes more difficult. *The Master Plan Renewed* recommends that:

Educational equity must have the commitment of the Governor, Legislature, the segmental governing boards, and the California Education Round Table and be a principal element in every aspect of institutional operations: The governing boards must exercise continuing oversight of their institutions' effectiveness in achieving educational equity. They must hold faculty and administrators accountable for the success of each institution in achieving equity, and themselves accept accountability to the people of the state. They must regularly assess and evaluate institutional progress toward equity, requesting reports by campus that rate... (3) faculty diversification, and (4) outreach efforts. They shall regularly report to the Governor and Legislature on progress made toward achieving educational equity.

In light of the charge from the Master Plan Commission and the predicted increased difficulties in hiring,

2. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees' Committee on Faculty and Staff Relations shall annually review a report, from each campus, which describes the hiring, retention, tenure and promotion of faculty, compares with the previous year the appointment and career progress of ethnic minorities, the disabled and women in fields in which they are underrepresented and highlights, in its summary conclusions, such achievements or lack thereof.

## Procedures for Recruitment and Outreach

- I. Meeting the challenge of hiring large numbers of high quality faculty will require (a) anticipation of the problems involved, (b) recognition of the recruitment crisis as an opportunity for renewal, (c) new strategies combined with existing successful approaches, and (d) a well-organized response to effect change. Hiring is primarily the responsibility of the faculty and a successful response to the recruitment crisis particularly requires faculty involvement from the beginning.
  3. **Recommend:** that Presidents charge their faculty and academic administrations with a collaborative effort in studying and planning for personnel turnover, the supply problem, the need for a more diverse and representative faculty, new recruitment strategies, the possibility of hiring from a wider range of sources, and possible adaptations and additions to criteria for hiring, retention, tenure and promotion.
- II. Hiring of faculty is initiated at the department level on each campus. The allocation of a tenure-track position is made at the School or University level, advertising is usually approved at the School or University level and the actual appointment is made by the President or the President's designee. While affirmative action officers, deans and committees may help departmental hiring committees in their searches, the search is usually begun, directed and carried out at the departmental level. While the initiative and primary responsibility for hiring must remain with the department faculty, many departments have not hired tenure-track faculty for years; the campus and the Office of the Chancellor can provide information, support services and coordination to aid in hiring high quality faculty.

4. **Recommend:** that the Presidents, with the assistance of the Chancellor, undertake the responsibility to provide assistance, information, training and coordination of support mechanisms to departments as they seek to hire new faculty.

Fewer students electing academic careers in the 1980s and extensive hiring of faculty in the 1960s both contribute to the recruitment crisis. Hiring faculty at various stages in their professional lives and hiring professionals from non-academic positions can increase sources of supply and prevent the development of another "retirement cohort." New faculty from outside academe may need assistance in developing academic skills and credentials.

5. **Recommend:** that in order to broaden the pool of potential faculty applicants, the Chancellor, together with the Presidents, develop (1) incentives for attracting professionals from outside academe to commit themselves to an academic career; and (2) ways to assist them in acquiring academic skills and appropriate academic credentials.
6. **Recommend:** that the Presidents allocate positions and encourage departments to search for faculty who are at various stages of their professional lives, and the Board of Trustees seek a salary schedule to accommodate this.

Currently, new faculty positions are funded at Assistant Professor Step 8, and replacement positions are funded at the level of the previous incumbents only if they are immediately filled. Replacement positions revert to Step 8 if they are vacant on July 1. Tenure-track appointments now average \$37,090 or 22% above Assistant Professor Step 8. The higher costs associated with hiring above Step 8 are compensated for by savings from replacement positions and by hiring part-time faculty. As fewer faculty fresh out of graduate school will be available, faculty with some experience are sought and projected student enrollment increases in the mid 1990s, it will be necessary to hire a larger proportion of new tenure-track faculty at higher steps, thus increasing the average cost of new faculty hires. In order to avoid increasing the proportion of part-time faculty, it will be necessary to seek a higher level of funding for new faculty positions, including replacement positions which revert.

7. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees seek the funding of new faculty positions at a more realistic level than the current Step 8 and seek further means of making competitive appointments.

III. Although the CSU campuses are part of one system and cooperate at several levels, in hiring they are each other's competitors. Advantages and economies of scale are possible, however, which would make cooperation in recruitment worthwhile and with which the Office of the Chancellor can assist.

8. **Recommend:** that the Chancellor and Presidents encourage and assist cooperation among campuses in recruiting faculty.

IV. Successful recruitment requires personal intervention by faculty and administrators such as visiting other universities to talk with graduate students, attending conferences, bringing candidates to campus. It requires a substantial investment of faculty and administrative time and travel. The CSU is prepared to undertake whatever can be done within the system, but that will not be enough without additional funding and increased flexibility in the use of funds.

9. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees seek both full funding for relocation expenses and additional funding for travel and associated costs of outreach and recruitment.
10. **Recommend:** that the Chancellor review and appropriately revise travel regulations to allow more flexibility in the use of general fund money.
11. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees (1) recognize the need for additional positions to enable the campuses to provide for greater emphasis on personal involvement of campus personnel in outreach and recruitment of new faculty and (2) request budget support for such new positions as appropriate.

### Incentives for Recruitment and Retention

As competition for high quality faculty becomes more intense, universities will increasingly be compared by prospective candidates on factors which will affect the candidates' professional lives, salary, benefits and workload, of course, but also less tangible concerns such as what support will be available to enhance professional life, will there be help in curriculum development, what are the students like, and how will the candidate get along with fellow faculty members?

Anecdotal reports indicate that such questions are being raised with increasing frequency by prospective faculty members. These issues, tangible and intangible, affect both the recruitment of new faculty and the retention of present faculty.

- I. Maintenance of competitive salaries is current CSU policy. Average faculty salaries by academic rank are competitive; however, the maximum salaries are higher at comparison institutions. Competition among

institutions will become more intense in order to maintain the quality of the faculty and will be particularly intense for the small, and continuously dwindling, pool of minority and women candidates in fields in which they are underrepresented.

12. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees affirm its support of a competitive salary schedule for faculty and, while maintaining a competitive base for entry level salaries, seek the support necessary to increase the maximum salaries that can be paid for all academic ranks.
- II. Traditionally, improvements in benefits have involved increased coverage or higher employer contributions. It may be possible, however, to provide a wider array of benefits, at little cost increase, which would increase the competitiveness of the CSU, particularly in hiring new faculty who have had several years of experience as faculty elsewhere or in other professional fields.
  13. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees (1) support in principle provision for individually variable benefit plans as well as retirement plans which would allow transferability of retirement funds from other states both by liberalizing current plans and by providing alternate retirement systems, and (2) direct the Chancellor to review the feasibility of and seek to implement such benefits as appropriate.
- III. Housing is expensive in California and on several of the campuses may be a significant obstruction to enticing new faculty, according to a recent survey commissioned by the Trustees. Housing assistance centers have been established on the campuses and an agreement has been reached with a mortgage broker service. Housing costs are a part of the cost-of-living, however, and reducing these costs is beyond the control of the CSU. The usual way to attract employees to areas with high costs of living is to provide salary adjustments. Although economic comparability is considered in the selection of institutions chosen for salary comparisons, housing costs in particular are not reflected in the way CSU faculty salaries are set, nor are regional differences within California recognized.
  14. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor explore more carefully the relationship between the salary structure, the level of salaries and issues raised by housing and the cost-of-living.
- IV. A recurrent concern of students, faculty and the administration of the CSU is the size of the teaching load, particularly for faculty fresh out of graduate school who must develop courses while seeking to establish themselves professionally. A separate working group has been appointed to address workload and flexible staffing. In addition to encouraging the use of flexibility inherent in the present workload formula, the working group will investigate the extent to which CSU policy and practices on faculty workload are competitive with comparison institutions.
  15. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees in its policies and legislative and budgetary programs see that CSU policies and practices in faculty workload ensure the CSU's competitive position in recruitment and retention.
- V. Opportunities are necessary for faculty to meet the needs of a changing student body, contribute professionally, maintain currency in their fields in order to teach well and to develop the intellectual vitality that makes for good teaching and an attractive environment for prospective faculty. *The Master Plan Renewed* endorses support for research, scholarship and creative activity and professional development for better teaching, and in their 1988-89 budget request, the Board of Trustees included three proposals to provide support for faculty development, for research, scholarship and creative activity and for additional sabbatical leaves. Full funding of these three proposals would provide an excellent start of support for faculty.
  16. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees seek additional support for faculty professional activities, including increased support for research, scholarship and creative activity, for faculty professional development and for sabbatical leaves.Programs which assist new faculty in understanding how a campus works and introduce new faculty to each other and to colleagues with similar interests can provide an advantage to the CSU over other institutions, especially for highly sought after faculty such as ethnic minorities and women in fields in which they are underrepresented.
  17. **Recommend:** that the Presidents encourage the continuation and expansion of programs to orient new faculty and programs to help new faculty form social and professional networks.
- VI. The CSU is a major supplier of employees to the businesses and industries of California, but is nevertheless in competition with them. Unable to offer salaries which compete with entering salaries in many businesses, industries, the law, and medicine, academe sees undergraduates and graduate students electing not to train for academic careers and sees new Ph.D.s choosing industry over the universities. Yet, it is in the long term interest of business and industry to encourage high quality people to enter academic careers and in competing, without also helping the universities, they are eating their own seed corn.

A statewide campaign could be undertaken, much as a development campaign might be, to involve the private sector in the needs of the university and to enlist cooperation and support in meeting the demands of students and for employees in the next decade or two.

18. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees establish a concerted statewide campaign to educate and involve the private sector in the needs of the university.

## Supply

Not only will more positions open up as current faculty retire, but fewer graduate students are preparing themselves for faculty positions and fewer are entering academic careers. As a major employer of academic professionals, the CSU has a responsibility to the nation and the state, as well as to the system itself, to seek to alleviate the "supply problem." *The Master Plan Renewed* recommends that:

The Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall establish and the Governor and Legislature fund a statewide program for the early identification, recruitment, and training of minority and women undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate students for faculty and academic administrative positions. Additionally, the Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University shall establish and maintain a program for articulation between CSU undergraduate and master's programs and UC doctoral and professional programs for the purpose of recruiting underrepresented minorities and women to advanced study.

A model pre-doctoral program and a model Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program are included in the Appendix.

19. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees seek a pilot pre-doctoral program to identify and assist minority and women students in entering academic careers in fields in which they are underrepresented.
20. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees seek to expand loan programs and grants for graduate students, such as the Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program, so that they may complete terminal degrees.
21. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees, working with the Regents of the University of California, urge their respective faculties to develop articulation of Master's programs in the CSU to Doctoral programs in UC.
22. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees call upon the University of California and the State of California to increase graduate programs in fields in which there are potential shortages.

One barrier to enrollment in a doctoral program by students who graduate from the CSU is that the majority of these students must work and can attend the university only on a part-time basis. However, doctoral programs at the University of California rarely permit part-time attendance.

23. **Recommend:** that the Board of Trustees call upon the University California and other universities granting doctoral degrees to permit, and where possible, to encourage part-time attendance in doctoral programs.

Expanding the supply of available high quality faculty also requires seeking additional sources of supply. One source is among the disabled, but hiring increased numbers of disabled candidates may require revisions in hiring practices and accommodations on the campuses.

24. **Recommend:** that the Presidents and Chancellor examine hiring practices and seek reasonable accommodations to the needs of the disabled.

## Appendix

### EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

Existing strategies are too numerous to list.

New strategies:

1. Develop networks of disabled, women and minority faculty and staff to assist in contacting candidates.
2. Develop early recruitment strategies using a vita bank, and identify and contact promising women, disabled and minority doctoral students, or invite them to conferences, solicit their applications.
3. Develop incentives for departments to make "affirmative action hires" such as an additional position if the first applicant recommended is a minority candidate, extra faculty development/travel money for the entire department, or preferred space.

4. Set aside "Target of Opportunity" positions at the university or school level which can be allocated if a particularly high quality candidate becomes available.
5. Hire a junior faculty member on the tenure-track a few years before a position becomes free through retirement or enrollment justifies it, combined with released time to finish graduate work.
6. Include as a criterion in program reviews that a department has paid attention to future hiring needs, with emphasis on affirmative action.

## PROCEDURES FOR RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH

### *University Assistance*

Existing strategies: \*

1. Training of hiring committees by campus administrators.
2. Campus and departmental brochures.
3. Campuswide advertising of available positions.
4. Interviews of candidates at conventions and of finalists on-campus.

New strategies:

1. Hiring committees participate in orientation workshops given by faculty who have recently engaged in successful recruiting on topics such as sensitivity to affirmative action issues, techniques for contacts and follow-ups, interview/visit strategies.
2. Prepare recruiting material such as brochures and videotapes describing the CSU system, the campus, the department, the diverse student body, opportunities for professional development, and the pleasures of living in California. Aim material at target contact groups such as ethnic minorities, women, recent Ph.D.s, current employees of industry.
3. The Chancellor's Office investigate developing a vita bank of recent doctorates, graduate students, and professionals seeking to enter academe, particularly minorities and women in all or selected disciplines. Prospective applicants as well as campuses could submit entries and the vita bank could be accessed from each campus.
4. Make personal contact with prospects:
  - a. faculty teams visit graduate schools to meet with faculty and students,
  - b. extend personal invitations to good prospects to apply for a position,
  - c. introduce candidates to department faculty, administrators, other faculty such as an ethnic or women's group.

### *Hiring Faculty at Various Stages in Their Professional Lives*

Existing and new strategies:

Hiring faculty from other institutions at advanced ranks is not new. Hiring professionals from business, industry, government or the arts is less common. Such professionals may have the appropriate degrees, but no teaching experience, or may lack the appropriate terminal degrees. Campuses can experiment with strategies such as three-year contracts for visiting professors coupled with released time to gain academic credentials. Some strategies may be bargainable.

### *Cooperation*

Existing cooperative strategies are limited to systemwide data gathering, discussion of recruitment strategies at meetings and some sharing of travel costs.

New strategies:

1. In addition to individual campus recruiting, develop a clearing house in the Chancellor's Office to which academic positions announcements can be sent and a newsletter publicizing the positions. An application could be sent to the clearing house requesting that it be directed to one or more targeted campuses. The network could be in the form of a computerized network, such as ATI Net (Agricultural Technology Institute network), which is easy to use, accessible to anyone with a modem and could include a variety of campus information.
2. Publish a systemwide full page advertisement for CSU faculty positions in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Advertise the existence of the vacancy network.

---

\*Note: The lists of existing strategies are not exhaustive, but represent the major strategies in general use in the CSU. The lists of new strategies include several approaches which are in use on a few of the campuses, but not in general use.

3. Pool recruiting such that faculty from one or more campuses who attend a national convention or visit an out-of-state campus, agree to provide information about other CSU campuses to prospective applicants.
4. Pool recruiting expenses for candidates coming for interviews.
5. Sponsor a CSU reception at national meetings supported by campuses contributing non-state funds.

## **INCENTIVES FOR RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH**

### ***Salaries***

Existing strategies:

CSU policy to maintain competitive salaries has led to annual average salary increases. Designated market condition salary supplements have improved hiring in hard-to-hire disciplines. A new salary schedule, with overlapping salary steps, allows more flexibility in hiring.

New strategy:

This strategy may require bargaining.

Campuses seek private sources of funding to supplement regular salaries, such as endowed chairs.

### ***Benefits***

Existing strategies include a competitive benefits package.

New strategies:

These strategies may require bargaining.

1. Investigate the provision of a limited individualized approach to benefits, including child care, in order to address the individual needs of single and married faculty, with and without children, with and without a working spouse.
2. Investigate alternative retirement programs to include plans which are moveable from state to state and from private to public employment and which allow California to buy into plans from other states.
3. Campuses can create an environment for emeritus faculty that would serve to help in the retention of high quality faculty.

### ***Housing***

Existing strategies:

The California State University 1985 Housing Survey of Recent Faculty Appointees, by Ira Fink and Associates, discusses the extent and variety of housing problems in detail. As an initial step in a program to address the faculty housing problem, the Trustees directed that housing assistance centers be established on urban campuses in 1986 and within a year or two on all campuses. Chancellor's Office staff has tried unsuccessfully to interest private developers in building and operating (or leasing to the university) on campus rental housing. Staff has just negotiated an agreement with a mortgage broker, Imco, which will provide, via a dedicated 800 number, loan information from all financial sources, qualify an applicant's loan over the telephone, and provide a 1/2 point discount on the loan fee.

New strategies:

1. Seek cost-of-living salary adjustments.
2. Work with businesses and industries, local and statewide, to provide underwriting to lower interest rates for faculty mortgages.
3. Seek private funding for accounts to be administered according to local needs such as to underwrite some mortgage interest, to provide grants to cover closing costs, or to contract with nearby apartments or condominiums for new faculty housing.
4. Seek donations of housing to be leased to new faculty.
5. Allow campuses with faculty housing problems and available land to contract with local developers to build rental housing.

### ***Flexible Staffing and Workload***

Existing strategies:

1. Reduce workloads to allow new faculty to complete a terminal degree.
2. Reduce the number of preparations for each faculty member per term or provide workload credit for additional preparations.

3. Provide support for teaching large class sections either in the form of workload credit, or readers and assistants.
4. Expand class sizes selectively to provide additional workload flexibility.

New strategies:

Additional possibilities involve policy issues to be addressed by the current working group on workload and flexible staffing and require bargaining. The following are suggestions for that group to consider.

1. Increase the length of time for which a full or partial leave counts for seniority, the probationary period, sabbatical eligibility, and so forth.
2. As part of a review of CSU's competitive position on workload, consider average teaching load, faculty-student ratios, workload credit for professional activities.
3. Further issues have been proposed which this task force wishes to refer to the working group without indicating support from the task force. It is suggested that the working group explore the issues surrounding:
  - a. shared tenure-track and tenured appointments,
  - b. tenured part-time appointments,
  - c. reduced time appointments for working parents.

### ***Faculty Development and Support Systems***

Existing strategies:

1. The Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program is a success in providing released time and mini-grant support for ethnic minorities and women in activities which will help them become better candidates for tenure and promotion.
2. The CSU has three proposals in the budget for 88-89 to provide support for faculty development, for research, scholarship and creative activity, and for enhanced sabbatical leave funding.
3. The Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute offers one week of workshops for faculty on a variety of topics and is regularly oversubscribed.
4. Teaching and Learning Institute. The Academic Senate and the Office of the Chancellor are developing the concept for a Teaching and Learning Institute wherein faculty systemwide can pursue research topics related to instruction.

New strategies:

The majority of new strategies require additional funding and may require bargaining.

1. The Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program is funded at \$1 million for 1987-88, the CSU should seek to expand the program. It will need a higher level of funding just to maintain present levels of support as hiring rates increase.
2. Expand the Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute to two weeks, one north and one south. Add workshops and disciplinary seminars throughout the year.
3. Provide summer grants or summer assignments for instructional development or research on a competitive basis. To be effective, such a program would have to provide some support during June, July and August when faculty are able to devote full time to a project. A funding mechanism which crosses fiscal years would have to be developed.
4. Provide individualized opportunities such as:
  - individual journal subscription allowances,
  - individual memberships in professional organizations,
  - individual library allowances,
  - individual travel allowances to attend professional meetings or carry out research,
  - individual faculty development funds to be used as the individual chooses, e.g., to enroll in courses to keep current in the discipline, or to travel, or to purchase equipment.
5. Allow equipment, computers and software to be justified as research related rather than solely as instructionally related.
6. Wherever possible, continue to encourage the assignment of private offices in established buildings as well as in new construction.
7. Provide support for post-doctoral fellows.
8. Provide additional clerical support for faculty members engaged in research or instructional development.

9. Provide discretionary money to departments or schools for use in meeting individual professional development needs.
10. Seek additional support from local businesses and industry for research equipment, research grants, technical workshops, and so forth.
11. Provide centralized administrative support for professional development on each campus to improve the organization of programs and dissemination of information, and to reduce the duplication of efforts which occurs when several part-time people administer different programs.
12. Campuses develop faculty mentors programs. Pair new faculty with a senior faculty member who can provide information about institutional culture as well as "nuts and bolts" information on expectations for retention, interaction with various administrative areas, how to apply for research grants, etc.
13. Campuses facilitate new faculty networks. Introductions to new colleagues across campus and activities which encourage networking can be friendly, useful ways of providing support for new faculty.

## SUPPLY

Existing strategies:

1. The CSU and the University of California are preparing a proposal to submit to private foundations which will establish a joint pre-doctoral program to encourage minorities and women to enter academic careers. See attached description of a fully funded program.
2. The Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program, supported by lottery funds, supports minority and women graduate students in fields in which they are underrepresented, to complete terminal degrees and teach for the CSU. See attached description of a fully funded program, and a possible second stage for early identification.

New strategies:

1. Sponsor disciplinary and research conferences in the CSU for graduate students from across the nation to familiarize them with the CSU as a potential employer.
2. Identify undergraduates in the CSU with high potential for academic careers who might be encouraged to go into the teaching profession; provide mentors, financial support, student clubs, research experiences, and guidance. At the campus level, coordinate existing services under the aegis of a pre-doctoral or pre-Ph.D. program. The Doctoral Incentive Early Identification Program described in the following pages is one approach.
3. Working with local high schools, make similar identification of students, especially ethnic minorities and women, with promise for academic careers, provide mentoring, guidance, peer groups; seek financial support.
4. Expand loan programs and grants for graduate students so that they can complete terminal degrees; The Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program is an excellent beginning. As much flexibility as possible is desirable in establishing starting dates, duration, means of payback where appropriate, and so forth.
5. Develop a coordinated program for applying to graduate schools in which members of minority groups may make one application for graduate school and financial aid which will be accepted for consideration by participating graduate institutions, based on the model of Project 1000 for Hispanic students, funded by the Carnegie Corporation.

## The California Pre-Doctoral Program: Ideal Program

The University of California and the California State University propose a statewide collaboration to identify, assist, matriculate, support and graduate minority students and place in academic careers minority and women candidates in fields in which they are underrepresented. The primary objective of this proposal, the first statewide effort of its kind, is to increase the participation of minority students, and of women in the mathematics-based sciences, in doctoral programs leading to careers in postsecondary teaching and research. A related objective is the fostering of conceptual, attitudinal, and pragmatic bases for increased interaction between the faculties of the two major California systems of higher education.

Both UC and CSU share the prospective shortage of faculty predicted for the mid-1990s and into the new century. Moreover, the future faculty pool will be severely limited by expected demographic changes if current educational patterns of ethnic groups do not change. It is critical that academic careers be pursued by young men and women of all ethnic groups if California is to maintain its competitive edge in education, research and economic development. The California State University educates the largest



proportion of minority undergraduates in the state on its nineteen campuses, but relatively few of them enter academic graduate programs and their progression to doctoral programs on the nine campuses of the University of California is not common.

A number of programs have been developed by UC and CSU to increase the flow of talented minority students and women into academic graduate programs. These include outreach and summer bridge programs, graduate research mentorships, dissertation year and post-doctoral fellowships at the University of California, and the graduate equity awards and the Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program at the California State University. The California Pre-Doctoral Program proposes to build on these individual programs and to produce a carefully articulated cooperative effort.

The components of the California Pre-Doctoral Program will include the following:

#### **1. Identification**

Academically talented minority undergraduates in all disciplines, and female undergraduates in the physical sciences, engineering and other selected mathematics-based disciplines, are nominated by a faculty or staff member familiar with the students academic work. Program participants are selected from among those nominated by campus-based joint CSU-UC faculty committees. The determination is made that the student has potential for doctoral study at the University of California that can be developed with appropriate intervention. The focus of recruitment will be on undergraduates—lower division wherever possible—although in the first few years, recent graduates and students already enrolled in CSU masters degree programs will be eligible. Approximately 100-150 students will be selected in the first two years of the project and 100 new students, plus replacements, each year thereafter. The profile of the first group will be approximately as follows:

- 70 CSU undergraduates
- 30 UC undergraduates
- 30 CSU masters students
- 20 recent graduates from both UC and CSU

#### **2. Program Format**

The program will include: participation in one or more summer resident research programs at a UC campus and undergraduate experiences cooperatively planned by faculty to enhance retention and continuation of students in the program. These experiences will consist of student involvement in faculty research projects, CSU faculty and student attendance at colloquia on UC campuses, peer support groups (home campus and regional), attendance at conferences, a relationship with a faculty mentor, and financial and other support as required.

#### **3. Admission to Graduate Programs**

The ideal interim outcome of this program is matriculation of participants as UC doctoral students. Various strategies for reaching that objective will be available, depending upon the needs of the student and the recommendation of faculty committees and mentors. Successful completion of a CSU master's degree program may be recommended as an admission requirement for some students. Other interim steps that might be recommended include one-year post-baccalaureate limited status or provisional admission to the doctoral program of choice. For those students whom faculty deem more fully prepared, provisional admission may be granted at the beginning of the senior year, with unqualified admission upon graduation. In all instances, participation in and support from the Pre-Doctoral Program will continue. Upon full admission to a UC doctoral program, inclusion in the UC's Academic Career Development Program for Minority and Women Graduate Students will be automatic.

#### **4. Faculty Commitment**

Interaction of faculty in the two systems and with the students is essential. To promote genuine faculty cooperation and strengthened personal and professional ties between the systems, a geographically determined campus-based organizational structure will be emphasized. Thus, UC Berkeley might form cooperative units with CSU Hayward and with San Francisco State University or UC San Diego and San Diego State. Regional committees will be formed to minimize the restrictiveness of that structure, and an intersegmental umbrella organization will serve as the administrative arm. Since faculty in both systems will need to be involved strongly in the process of student identification and referral, as well as in the mentoring and guiding of individual students, the proposal includes plans for faculty and graduate student exchanges, guest lectureships, travel, leaves to teach or participate in research on a campus of the other system, and other cooperative arrangements.

#### **5. Placement**

The primary objective of this program is to increase the supply of minority and women doctoral holders qualified for appointment to faculty positions in California and the nation. Therefore, the

placement of participants as faculty at the end of doctoral or post-doctoral work is a critical aspect of the program. That aspect will not begin formally for at least four years, although publicity and preparation for placement can begin earlier. Faculty mentors are expected to commit themselves to helping place their students through the usual networks. The program will develop additional placement mechanisms and encourage campuses to expand their administrative mechanisms for recruiting and hiring minority and women faculty. Several mechanisms already in place on some campuses are (1) Targets of Opportunity for Diversity programs, (2) guaranteed "acting" assistant professorships, and (3) funds for start-up costs or research for departments who hire recipients into tenure-track positions.

## Budget

Funding is being sought as seed money for the first four years of a program that is projected to continue for a minimum of ten years. The first year is planned to serve as a pilot, with only 50 students enrolled in the program. The second year will increase the number of students served to 100, and years three and four will operate on a replacement basis with a steady state rate of 100 participating students. It is expected that establishment of the program and its early operation will involve program administration full time in the first two years. In the second two years, a major effort will be undertaken to establish a national consortium that will extend the program nationwide, and will secure permanent funding sources from federal, state, and private sources.

### *Estimated Budget: Years One and Two*

	Year One	Year Two
1. Recruitment: literature, brochures, postage	\$ 6,000	\$ 4,000
2. Students*:		
\$6,500 ea. undergraduate stipends x 50 y1, 100 y2	325,000	650,000
\$10,000 ea. graduate stipends x 25 y1, 50 y2	250,000	500,000
travel \$500 ea. x 75 y1, 150 y2	37,500	75,000
undergraduate research stipends \$500 x 50 y1, 100 y2	25,000	50,000
summer stipends \$2500 ea. x 75 y1, 150 y2	187,500	375,000
summer research support \$500 ea. x 75 y1, 150 y2	37,500	75,000
3 Faculty:		
10 faculty/y1, 20/y2. 0.5 FTEF (released for 1 semester) at average replacement cost and benefits	225,000	450,000
travel \$500 ea. x 240 (y2-100 mentors, 120 committee members, 20 on released time; y1=1/2 of y2)	60,000	120,000
4. Administration:		
Coordinators: .5 position CSU, .5 position UC	64,000	64,000
Management costs: 10%	121,750	236,300
Totals	\$1,339,250	\$2,599,300

\* The budget assumes that all stipends are paid by the program; to the extent that students receive other financial aid, the budget could be reduced or more students included. The goal is to provide sufficient support that students do not need to hold outside jobs.

## Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program: The Ideal Program

The ideal Forgivable Loan Program is one that will continue the current program of improving the recruitment of minorities and women to the CSU faculty with a supplemental program which will extend the current program to increase the supply of ethnic minority and women doctorates in underrepresented disciplines. The CSU Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program for Minorities and Women was implemented to achieve the University's goal to increase the diversity of its faculty. The current program achieves that goal by providing loans of \$10,000 for three years to minority and women doctoral students and "forgiving" the loans if the students become CSU faculty members after completion of their doctorates. The current program improves the ability of the CSU to recruit minority and women faculty. The proposed supplemental program will seek to increase the number of minority and women in the CSU faculty by more directly increasing the supply of minority and women doctorates.

## Extending the Current Program

The effectiveness of the Forgivable Loan Program will be evaluated by its ability to bring about the ethnic and sex diversity of the faculty. Since the program is entering its second year, questions about effectiveness of the program cannot be answered. However, the goal of the Forgivable Loan Program is clear. It is a response to the projections of the Daigle-Rutemiller study of CSU faculty flow which had projected an increase of ethnic minority faculty from 14% to 17% and women faculty from 23% to 29% by the year 2000. Those figures are expected if the pool of doctorates and the hiring patterns of the previous ten years is maintained. The Forgivable Loan Program is an attempt to change the supply pool and the hiring patterns of previous years.

The amount of change from the projected percentages will be a function of the success of the program in hiring Forgivable Loan Program participants into the CSU faculty. A program which funds 200 students per year for the next 12 years will create 2,000 potential faculty recruits for the CSU. If we assume the ethnic and sex composition of the 2,000 students to be the same as in the current program, 60% of the participants will be minorities and 70% will be females (minority women students appear in both categories). Based on a projected total faculty of 12,000 in the year 2000 and estimated success rates which include both projected rates for completion of the doctorate and recruitment rates, the number of additional minority and women in the CSU faculty at different projected success rates are:

Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
70%	840	24%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	980	37%
Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
50%	600	22%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	700	35%
Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
30%	360	20%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	420	33%

For instance, if the program is successful in recruiting 50% of the participants, then an additional 600 minority faculty and an additional 700 women faculty members would be added to the CSU, resulting in a faculty with 24% ethnic minorities and 37% females, increases of 41% in ethnic minorities and 28% in women beyond the projected percentages if the supply and CSU hiring pattern is not changed. The effects of 70% and 30% success rates of the Forgivable Loan Program in recruiting faculty are also shown above.

Because the program supports students for three years, the program will need 12 funding years. The program would cost \$2 million the first and 12th years, \$4 million the second and 11th years and \$6 million for years 3 through 10, totaling \$60 million. The final cost of the program will be less than \$60 million depending on the percent of students who pay back their loans.

## The Next Program, Early Identification

The obvious next step in the Forgivable Loan Program is to institute a program to increase the number of minorities and women who choose to enter doctoral programs by identifying, assisting and supporting minority and women undergraduate students. The current Forgivable Loan Program recruits potential doctoral students as they enter doctoral programs or are already in doctoral programs. It does not increase the number of minorities and women in the doctoral "pipeline;" it serves to direct those already in the pipeline to the CSU. A supplementary program is needed to increase the number of underrepresented students entering the pipeline and to direct them to the CSU. An Early Identification Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program, to identify CSU minority and women juniors and seniors who have the potential to complete doctorates and have the desire to be faculty members, will be a necessary supplement to the Forgivable Loan Program.

The Early Identification Program will have faculty identify 200 junior and senior CSU students per year to prepare them to apply for and attend doctoral programs. While the students are undergraduates, they will be assisted to maximize their acceptance by doctoral programs. Such activities as participation in research projects, visits to doctoral campuses and attendance at workshops on such topics as how to take the Graduate Record Exam, how to obtain fellowships, will be provided. Two thousand students will be served over a 12-year period. The effects of this augmentation to the Forgivable Loan Program will depend on the degree of success of the program and are based on the assumption of continuous, full-time attendance in graduate school which is a

condition of the Forgivable Loan Program. The figures below are the projected percentage of minorities and women in the CSU faculty in the year 2000 at different estimated success rates for the Early Identification Program with the assumption of a 50% success rate for the primary Forgivable Loan Program:

Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
40%	1,400	29%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	1,500	42%
Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
30%	1,200	27%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	1,300	40%
Success Rate	# Minorities Added	Projected Percentage
20%	1,000	25%
	# Women Added	Projected Percentage
	1,100	38%

Thus, even assuming a 20% success rate for the Early Identification Program and 50% success rate for the main Forgivable Loan Program, the projected percentage of minorities and women would be 25% and 38% instead of the projected 17% and 29%, increases of 47% and 31% for minorities and women, respectively. This program will cost \$64 million for the 12 years needed to fund 2000 students at the cost of \$2,000 per student for the one or two years preparation period while they are undergraduates, and loans of \$10,000 per year for three year periods. Depending on the number of who will have to repay their loans, the final cost will be less than \$64 million.

For a maximum of \$124 million, the CSU can achieve a faculty which is 25% ethnic minority and 38% women by the year 2000. The goal of having a diverse CSU faculty is important in preparing the University to respond to a state population which is approaching 50% ethnic minority and a multicultural student body which is now 30% ethnic minority and 53% women. The Forgivable Loan Program and the Early Identification Forgivable Loan Program are efforts to do more than we have done in the past ten years to increase the diversity of the CSU faculty. Whether the assumptions made above for the ability of the programs to achieve 25% minority and 38% women faculty will hold or not, it is imperative that in the year 2000, the CSU has more than the projected 17% minority and 29% women faculty. Programs to recruit and to increase the supply of ethnic minority and women doctorates in underrepresented disciplines are central to the CSU goal of a ethnically and sexually diverse faculty.

## **CSU Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty**

Co-Chairs: Lee R. Kerschner, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Caesar J. Naples, Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations

Members: June Cooper, Vice President for Faculty and Staff Relations, California State University, Long Beach

Thomas B. Day, President, San Diego State University

Robert C. Detweiler, Vice President for Academic Affairs, California State University, San Bernardino

Milton A. Gordon, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Sonoma State University

D. Dale Hanner, Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs

James M. Highsmith, Professor, Department of Finance and Business Law, Fresno State University

Mark Leuteritz, Student Body President, California State University, Long Beach

Susan D. Schaefer, Professor of Business Administration, California State University, Hayward

Peter H. Shattuck, Professor of History, California State University, Sacramento

Sandra Wilcox, Professor of Psychology, California State University, Dominguez Hills

Staff: Judith A. Hunt, State University Dean, Faculty Affairs

The Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of a High Quality Faculty was created in response to a Priority Item sponsored by William D. Campbell, member of the CSU Board of Trustees, and passed unanimously by the Board. Trustee Campbell attended the meetings of the Task Force and participated in all aspects of its deliberations. We are grateful for his interest and support for this important endeavor.

(Approved January 1990, as part of AS-1899-90/FA)

# The Educational Implications of the Use of Temporary Faculty in Faculty Positions in the California State University in 1990 and Beyond

**WHEREAS**The Academic Senate of The California State University resolved in March, 1987, that local campus senates adopt key policy recommendations arising from the report of the Academic Senate CSU Committee to Study the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers in the California State University (AS-1703-86/FA, Approved Unanimously, March 5-6); and

**WHEREAS**Local senates were encouraged by the Statewide Academic Senate

1. to study their current use of temporary faculty to determine whether such use is educationally sound, and consider adopting goals for the proportion of temporary faculty in the mix of faculty,
2. to encourage departments to identify positions filled by temporary faculty which do not conform to educationally sound uses of temporary faculty,
3. to ensure that departments not be required to utilize temporary faculty as a continuing means of coping with externally imposed budgetary constraints, and
4. to ensure that campuses and departments not require temporary faculty to perform instructionally related duties without compensation comparable to that provided to tenure-track faculty for such duties; and

**WHEREAS**Current and projected budgetary shortfalls for the California State University may make the use of temporary faculty financially attractive in the narrow frame, but not necessarily academically and educationally sound; and

**WHEREAS**The release of the *CSU Faculty Workload Study* (dated May 30, 1990) offers new information and the possibility of new perspective on the array of issues pertaining to temporary faculty in the CSU; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its March 1987 position that the campus senates review as necessary, and adopt as necessary, the following policy recommendations:

1. That local campuses and individual departments study their current use of temporary faculty to determine whether such use is educationally sound, and consider adopting goals for the proportion of temporary faculty in the mix of faculty; and
2. That departments identify positions currently filled by temporary faculty which do not conform to educationally sound uses of temporary faculty, and which should be converted to tenure-track positions consistent with sound academic planning; and
3. That departments not be required to utilize temporary faculty as a continuing means of coping with externally imposed budgetary constraints; and
4. That campuses and departments not require temporary faculty to perform instructionally related duties without compensation comparable to that provided to tenure-track faculty for such duties.

(This resolution, 1977, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1991.)

# Recruitment and Retention Incentives for Maintaining a High Quality and Diverse Faculty

**WHEREAS**, in the next decade faculty retirements and enrollment growth will require the California State University to recruit and hire at least one thousand faculty per year; and

**WHEREAS**, it is crucial that the CSU give high priority to investing in its faculty; and

**WHEREAS**, present budget conditions in the CSU make it increasingly difficult to compete with other institutions to recruit and retain faculty able to maintain CSU standards; and

**WHEREAS**, among the conditions likely to jeopardize recruitment and retention of a quality and diverse faculty are: (a) direct instructional assignments significantly higher than that at almost all comparable institutions; (b) inadequate funding for faculty professional development; (c) an increasing need for faculty to expend their own funds to stay current in their disciplines; (d) the possibility of suspension of annual salary increases; (e) salary ranges which lag behind those of comparison institutions; (e) the high cost of living in California, especially the absence of housing affordable to faculty in many parts of the state; and

**WHEREAS**, it is essential that the CSU regain its competitive position in recruiting and retaining a high quality and diverse faculty; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend to the Governor, the Legislature, the Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the California Faculty Association that the following initial steps be taken to help the CSU improve its capacity to recruit and retain a high quality and diverse faculty:

- (a) establish direct instructional assignments that are competitive with teaching responsibilities at comparable institutions;
- (b) provide adequate support for faculty professional development, including funding to maintain faculty's currency in their disciplines;
- (c) provide appropriate annual salary increases;
- (d) restructure salary levels and ranges to make the CSU competitive with comparable institutions; and
- (e) attempt to assist faculty financially in their efforts to secure housing.

(This resolution, 2068, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1992.)

# Faculty Professional Responsibilities

**WHEREAS** faculty bear special responsibilities which grow out of their roles as scholars, teachers, colleagues, members of the academic community, and informed citizens; and

**WHEREAS** fulfilling these responsibilities is primarily a matter of self-discipline rather than institutional enforcement; and

**WHEREAS** it is desirable that the faculty act collectively to maintain a climate supportive of the highest standards of professional ethics; and

**WHEREAS** the Academic Senate of the California State University initially adopted a position on professional responsibility (AS-382-70/FA-I) in 1971; and

**WHEREAS** some parts of the statement have been affected by changed conditions and are inappropriate at the present time; and

**WHEREAS** the American Association of University Professors has developed a national standard for professional ethics and responsibility which has been adopted by many institutions of higher education; and

**WHEREAS** it is desirable to reaffirm the commitment of the Academic Senate CSU to self-disciplined professional responsibility; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the attached American Association of University Professors' documents, *A Statement of Professional Ethics* (1987) and *A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility* (1990); and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the American Association of University Professors' documents, *A Statement of Professional Ethics* (1987) and *A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility* (1990) jointly supersede the position on professional responsibility (AS-382-70/FA-I) initially adopted in 1971; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus academic senates to adopt the American Association of University Professors' documents, *A Statement of Professional Ethics* (1987) and *A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility* (1990); and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU inform the Board of Trustees of the California State University of the adoption of the American Association of University Professors' documents, *A Statement of Professional Ethics* (1987) and *A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility* (1990).

(This resolution, 2118, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1993.)

## Statement on Professional Ethics

*The statement which follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics, adopted by the AAUP Council, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting in June 1987.*

### Introduction

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of their responsibilities to students and colleagues, and their conduct when resigning from an institution or when undertaking sponsored research.<sup>1</sup> *The Statement on Professional Ethics* that follows sets forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1961 *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*  
1964 *Committee A Statement on Extramural Utterances*  
(Clarification of sec. 1c of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*)  
1965 *On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government-Sponsored Research at Universities*  
1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*  
1967 *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students*  
1970 *Council Statement on Freedom and Responsibility*  
1976 *On Discrimination*  
1984 *Sexual Harassment: Suggested Policy and Procedures for Handling Complaints*

In the enforcement of ethical standards, the academic profession differs from those of law and medicine, whose associations act to ensure the integrity of members engaged in private practice. In the academic profession the individual institution of higher learning provides this assurance and so should normally handle questions concerning propriety of conduct within its own framework by reference to a faculty group. The Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and Committee B, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, or the applicable provisions of the Association's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

## The Statement

- I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to examine critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.
- II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.
- III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
- IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.
- V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

## A Statement of the Association's Council: Freedom and Responsibility

*The following statement was adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in October 1970. In April 1990, the Council adopted several changes in language that had been approved by Committee B on Professional Ethics in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.*

For more than half a century the American Association of University Professors has acted upon two principles: that colleges and universities serve the common good through learning, teaching, research, and scholarship; and that the fulfillment of this function necessarily rests upon the preservation of the intellectual freedoms of teaching, expression, research, and debate. All components of the academic community have a responsibility to exemplify and support these freedoms in the interests of reasoned inquiry.



The 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* asserts the primacy of this responsibility. The *Statement on Professional Ethics* underscores its pertinency to individual faculty members and calls attention to their responsibility, by their own actions, to uphold their colleagues' and their students' freedom of inquiry and to promote public understanding of academic freedom. The *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* emphasizes the shared responsibility of all members of the academic community for the preservation of these freedoms.

Continuing attacks on the integrity of our universities and on the concept of academic freedom itself come from many quarters. These attacks, marked by tactics of intimidation and harassment and by political interference with the autonomy of colleges and universities, provoke harsh responses and counter-responses. Especially in a repressive atmosphere, the faculty's responsibility to defend its freedoms cannot be separated from its responsibility to uphold those freedoms by its own actions.

- I. Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and trustees an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways which injure individuals or damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's teachers or colleagues. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but also be given an opportunity to be heard. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that significantly impede the functions of the institution.

Students are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to even-handed treatment in all aspects of the teacher-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach students on the grounds of their beliefs or the possible uses to which they may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. Students should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional role to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own part in society. Evaluation of students and the award of credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance, whether personality, race, religion, degree of political activism, or personal beliefs.

It is the mastery teachers have of their subjects and their own scholarship that entitles them to their classrooms and to freedom in the presentation of their subjects. Thus, it is improper for an instructor persistently to intrude material that has no relation to the subject, or to fail to present the subject matter of the course as announced to the students and as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum.

Because academic freedom has traditionally included the instructor's full freedom as a citizen, most faculty members face no insoluble conflicts between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience, on the one hand, and the claims and expectations of their students, colleagues, and institutions, on the other. If such conflicts become acute, and attention to obligations as a citizen and moral agent precludes an instructor from fulfilling substantial academic obligations, the instructor cannot escape the responsibility of that choice, but should either request a leave of absence or resign his or her academic position.

- II. The Association's concern for sound principles and procedures in the imposition of discipline is reflected in the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, the 1938 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, and the many investigations conducted by the Association into disciplinary actions by colleges and universities.

The question arises whether these customary procedures are sufficient in the current context. We believe that by and large they serve their purposes well, but that consideration should be given to supplementing them in several respects:

First, plans for ensuring compliance with academic norms should be enlarged to emphasize preventive as well as disciplinary action. Toward this end the faculty should take the initiative, working with the administration and other components of the institution, to develop and maintain an atmosphere of freedom, commitment to academic inquiry, and respect for the academic rights of others. The faculty should also join with other members of the academic community in the development of procedures to be used in the event of serious disruption, or the threat of disruption, and should ensure its consultation in major decisions, particularly those related to the calling of external security forces to the campus.

Second, systematic attention should be given to questions related to sanctions other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands, in order to provide a more versatile body of academic sanctions.

Third, there is need for the faculty to assume a more positive role as guardian of academic values against unjustified assaults from its own members. The traditional faculty function in disciplinary

proceedings has been to ensure academic due process and meaningful faculty participation in the imposition of discipline by the administration. While this function should be maintained, faculties should recognize their stake in promoting adherence to norms essential to the academic enterprise. Rules designed to meet these needs for faculty self-regulation and flexibility of sanctions should be adopted on each campus in response to local circumstances and to continued experimentation. In all sanctioning efforts, however, it is vital that proceedings be conducted with fairness to the individual, that faculty judgments play a crucial role, and that adverse judgments be founded on demonstrated violations of appropriate norms. The Association will encourage and assist local faculty groups seeking to articulate the substantive *Principles* here outlined or to make improvements in their disciplinary machinery to meet the needs here described. The Association will also consult and work with any responsible group, within or outside the academic community, that seeks to promote understanding of and adherence to basic norms of professional responsibility so long as such efforts are consistent with principles of academic freedom.

(Approved January 1993, as part of AS-2118-93/FA)

# Endorsement of the Statement in Attachment B of the January 1993 Board of Trustees' Agenda Item "Procedures for the Selection of Presidents"

**WHEREAS**The process of selecting a campus's president should be a consensual one in which a central role is assigned to campus representatives; and

**WHEREAS**The process for the selection of a president should result in the appointment of an individual who has the support and confidence of the campus, the community, and the Trustees; and

**WHEREAS**A statement of intent embracing these principles is contained in Attachment B of the item on the selection of a president in the January 1993 Board of Trustees' meeting agenda; and

**WHEREAS**The statement of intent also assists implementation of the California State University's policy for the selection of a president by clarifying several aspects of the selection process; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the statement contained in Attachment B of the January 1993 Board of Trustees' Agenda Item called "Revision of Trustees' Procedures for the Selection of Presidents" and convey its appreciation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for the cooperative process through which this statement was developed.

(This resolution, 2124, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1993.)

## Attachment B • U&FP • Item I • January 26-27, 1993

### To Those Engaged in the Presidential Selection Process

This statement is intended to assure the campus groups—the faculty, the staff, the students, the alumni, the community—that the presidential selection policy, as revised in January 1993, does not alter past practice regarding the role and involvement of campus representatives in the various steps of the search process. It is expected that the trustees' selection committee chair and the staff will foster an environment of trust, respect, and collegiality so that the activities and deliberations of the selection committee and its advisory committee described in the policy are harmonious. The underlying goal of the presidential search process by the Board of Trustees is the appointment of a campus chief executive who has the active support of the campus constituent groups and in whose leadership the chancellor and the Board of Trustees have confidence. Everyone benefits from a presidential selection process that is based upon the spirit of consensus building, cooperation, and representation.

The object of the search process is to identify a pool of finalists who have the leadership qualities, experience, personal attributes, and desire to serve as president. In most instances and to the extent possible, campus constituent representatives should have no reservations about any of the finalists being recommended to the Board of Trustees. Care must be taken throughout the search process to ensure that the candidate selected by the Board of Trustees has the support of the campus.

Although clearly stated in the policy, the following is repeated for emphasis: Recognized campus constituent interests will be involved through the advisory committee in describing the position, the campus, and the desired characteristics of the new president; will participate in the review and discussion of individual candidate application materials; will participate in the interviews of candidates; will advise the trustees on which candidates should be advanced at each decision point including those candidates who are invited to visit the campus; will act as hosts to those candidates visiting the campus; will develop the campus visit schedule and coordinate respective campus constituent group meetings with each visiting candidate, and will advise the selection committee on the constituent response to the semifinalist candidates.

When the trustee presidential selection committee and its advisory committee meet in closed session to discuss the candidate pool and the individual candidates, it is critically important that there be no discussion about candidate qualifications outside of the meeting. This prescription of confidentiality protects (both legally and professionally) the institution, the candidates, and the individual members of the advisory committee and the selection committee. It is expected that all participants in the search process will seek to ensure that confidentiality is not breached.

(Approved March 1993, as part of AS-2124-93/FA)

# Faculty Issues Related to Technology-Assisted Teaching

**WHEREAS**The California State University is planning and developing Project DELTA “an innovative attempt to address the interrelated pressures of enrollment growth, faculty deficits, impending faculty shortages, and fiscal retrenchment”;<sup>1</sup> and

**WHEREAS**One of the major criteria for success of Project DELTA is that it “must sustain the quality of teaching and learning achieved in traditional classroom settings”<sup>1</sup>; and

**WHEREAS**Appropriate faculty consultation is essential if technology-assisted teaching is to improve the quality of instruction in the California State University; and

**WHEREAS**Campus policies are required to protect the ownership of intellectual property developed by faculty for use in technology-assisted teaching; and

**WHEREAS**Faculty must be centrally involved in selection and staffing of courses to be offered using technology-assisted teaching; and

**WHEREAS**Policies for evaluating instruction, courses, and programs may need to be revised to respond to technology-assisted teaching; and

**WHEREAS**Technology-assisted teaching requires support services appropriate to the technology and its applications; and

**WHEREAS**Technology-assisted teaching requires consultation with faculty about workload expectations and class size limitations; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge campus senates to develop campus policies, or revise existing ones, on ownership of intellectual property developed as part of technology-assisted teaching; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to develop policies for course development and staffing, peer and student evaluation of faculty, and outcomes assessment for technology-assisted teaching; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees of the California State University to provide the technical support services needed for technology-assisted teaching; and be it further

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU request the Board of Trustees of the California State University and the California Faculty Association to address workload issues related to technology-assisted teaching.

<sup>1</sup> All quotations from *The Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology*, January 22-23, 1993, Draft Project DELTA Workshop Proceedings (CSU Office of Information Resources and Technology: Seal Beach, March 23, 1993), p. 6.

(This resolution, 2133, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

## Length of Appointments of Interim Presidents

**WHEREAS**The appointment of an interim president for a California State University campus may be periodically necessary, the length of such an appointment should normally be no more than a single year, and two years only in extraordinary circumstances; and

**WHEREAS**Chancellor Munitz has extended a current interim appointment to four years; and

**WHEREAS**The extension of this appointment constitutes an evasion of established procedures for presidential searches; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University express its disapproval of the Chancellor's action in making interim presidential appointments that exceed two years and urge adherence to customary procedures for the appointment of interim presidents in the future.

(This resolution, 2153, was referred back to committee by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

# Policy Regarding Interim Presidential Appointments

**WHEREAS** The appointment of an interim president for a California State University campus being occasionally necessary, it is important that all interested parties share a clear understanding of the conditions pertaining to such appointments; and

**WHEREAS** Because a prolonged period of leadership by an interim president may result in a cascade of other interim appointments (to avoid limiting the prerogatives of the next president) and in various actions which could have long-term impact on the campus, interim presidents should serve for no longer than the time needed to conclude a search and place a new president in office; and

**WHEREAS** As a good working principle, no interim president should serve for longer than 24 months unless a campus-based review of his or her service and the presidential recruitment situation--involving faculty, students, administrators, and community members--leads to a recommendation that this interim appointment be extended for a specified additional period; and

**WHEREAS** Most campuses of the California State University have written policies governing the appointment of interim academic administrators which clarify expectations in this area; therefore be it

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend to the Chancellor that policy regarding all aspects of interim presidential appointments be developed through the usual consultative means, including representation from the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further

**RESOLVED** That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to the Chancellor that until a formal policy is in place this condition be operative:

No interim president shall serve for longer than 24 months unless a campus-based review of his or her service and the presidential recruitment situation leads to a recommendation by faculty, students, administrators, and community members that this interim appointment be extended for a specified additional period.

(This resolution, 2186, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1994.)

# Recognition of Domestic Partnership and Extension of Employee Benefits in the California State University to Domestic Partners and Their Dependents

- WHEREAS**The current employment contract negotiated by the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the California State University (CSU) affords benefits only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil courts; and
- WHEREAS**The exclusion of domestic partners of the same or opposite sex and their dependents from employee benefits packages constitutes discrimination against employees solely on the basis of their nontraditional family status; and
- WHEREAS**A large and growing number of higher education institutions (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Yale, MIT, Stanford, and the Universities of Chicago and Minnesota) have amended their employee benefits programs to provide benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS**Over 136 major corporations in the United States (including AT&T, Apple, Microsoft, Bank of America, Levi Strauss, PG&E, MCA, HBO, Sprint, *Time* magazine, Warner Brothers) provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and
- WHEREAS**Cities such as Seattle, San Francisco, and Berkeley provide employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate of the California State University declare its recognition of the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to declare the legitimacy of domestic partnerships and to support the extension of employee benefits to domestic partners and their dependents; and be it further
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the California Faculty Association to redress the fundamental unfairness of policies that exclude domestic partners and their dependents from employee benefits; and be it further
- RESOLVED**That the Academic Senate CSU urge the California Faculty Association to bargain for agreements with the California State University that afford domestic partners and their dependents those employee benefits currently available only to blood-related families and those specific relationships traditionally recognized in civil court.

(This resolution, 2196, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1994.)

# Endorsement of Position Paper on Peer Review of Instruction

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the position paper, "Peer Review of Instruction in the CSU," and specifically the recommendations contained therein; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge campuses to support efforts to improve instruction through peer support efforts that conform to these recommendations; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and campus presidents to provide financial support and released time to assist in making these efforts successful.

*RATIONALE: Chancellor's Office support of "Peer Review of Instruction" was instituted with little faculty consultation. In response to this, the Faculty Affairs Committee has been examining peer review efforts in this system and elsewhere. The position paper summarizes our position and our recommendations. We support efforts to directly improve instruction through peer review and related methodologies, and recommend that the system and individual campuses provide the resources necessary to make these efforts work.*

(This resolution, 2262, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1995.)

## Peer Review of Instruction in the California State University

### A Position Paper of the Academic Senate, California State University

#### Introduction

Peer review can make teaching more valued in the academy, in the opinion of Lee Shulman, Professor of Education at Stanford and chief spokesman of the current peer review effort. The reason that teaching is not valued, he suggests, is that it takes place in isolation, away from the community of scholars. He believes that by subjecting teaching to peer review in the same manner as research, teaching will achieve a higher status. With this higher status, higher quality will inevitably follow (Shulman 1993).

Others of like mind, primarily in research universities, are working to make peer review of teaching a dominant factor in higher education. This effort is supported by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) and backed by grants from major foundations (Hutchings 1994). The California State University (CSU), while quite different from most other institutions involved in this discussion, has joined this venture. The decision to participate originated with the Chancellor's Office (CO) which funded the project as an Academic Planning Initiative (CSU 1994).

In the major research universities teaching is clearly secondary to research as a source of status and funds. Not everyone in these universities is dissatisfied with this situation, but those who are include supporters of Shulman's thesis that the way to improve teaching is to raise its status through peer evaluation of classroom instruction, and through rewarding effective teaching.

While Shulman remains at its center, this movement is not a unified one. Many are concerned solely with improving the effectiveness of instruction, and not with status. These individuals would generally steer clear of peer review for purposes of retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) and instead focus on supportive ways of directly improving instruction. Many, too, in their attempts to improve instruction, find the focus on classroom observation too narrow and recommend the use of a wider range of related activities (AAHE 1994; CSU Fullerton 1994).

Those most active in the CSU initiative seem to take this broader view of peer review (CSU Fullerton 1994). The CSU is a comprehensive regional university system. Our primary mission is teaching, and CSU policy requires that teaching be valued. Further, we have always engaged in peer evaluation of teaching, including limited classroom observation. While there is much we can learn from the discussion of peer evaluation generated by the research universities, there is much we can offer as well. In some respects the CSU is out ahead in the current peer review effort.

#### Background

The amount of attention being given to peer review of instruction at this time is due in large part to the initiative of the AAHE, a national organization whose direction is greatly influenced by administrators from research institutions. AAHE is committed to the idea that universities can be more effective; it provides a



forum for dissemination of the ideas of major figures in the field of higher education—such as Ernest, David Kennedy and Derek Bok—on how to reach that goal. It takes particular interest in academic quality, assessment, technology, teaching and the reward system.

One of the programs of AAHE is called the Teaching Initiative and has as its goal the creation of a “culture of teaching” on campuses. Under the Teaching Initiative the AAHE has for the past year been directing a project called “From Idea to Prototype: Peer Reviews of Teaching.” This project has major foundation funding and involves teams in departments on 12 campuses throughout the nation working on pilot peer review projects. In June 1994 these teams attended an “Institute on the Peer Review of Teaching” at Stanford University “hosted” by Professor Shulman (AAHE 1994). Although not part of this project, participants from five CSU campuses and the CSU Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning attended this institute.

The AAHE project is to run through 1995. During and after the project, lessons learned from the pilot projects will be disseminated. As this project has progressed, it has adopted a more comprehensive view of peer review. Indeed, the term “peer review” now seems inadequate to describe the initiative. No longer is it simply to raise the status of teaching through peer evaluation of teaching utilizing classroom observation. The broader view focuses on using a variety of approaches to directly improve instruction including teaching colloquia, developing teaching libraries and mutual mentoring (AAHE 1994). This shift has come about as involvement has moved from administrators, who care strongly about evaluation, to faculty, who care strongly about teaching effectiveness. It is a natural outcome of involving a larger group of individuals who care about the quality of instruction: status comes to take second place to quality itself.

Independent of the AAHE project, peer evaluation projects are taking place on the five CSU campuses that were represented at the Stanford Institute. These projects expect to present their results in early 1996 (CSU 1994).

### What Is Peer Evaluation: Ideologies and Methodologies

As in most emerging fields, there is little unity in the peer evaluation discussion. There are those who follow the original Shulman paradigm. Then there are those who would use any technique available to improve instruction, and who are loading a lot of baggage on the peer review bandwagon that the former might prefer not to carry. However, there is no pay-off in challenging projects that others wish to implement. Finally, there are those who wish to extend K-12 assessment practices to higher education [Shulman himself worked on K-12 evaluation techniques in the 1980s (AAHE 1994)].

It is easy to forget in all of this that peer review is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. Ultimately the goal is to improve instruction and achieve a concomitant increase in student learning. There are two general approaches to this goal.

One approach has most currency in the research universities where there is a desire to achieve a prestige and funding balance between teaching and research. This method seeks to emulate the peer review process used by scholarly journals, a system whose validity in achieving excellence is generally left unquestioned. This peer review process relies largely on classroom observation of instruction and would be used in the RTP process in much the same manner as refereed publications. This approach is often called summative or evaluative and seeks to improve instruction through reward (CSU 1994).

The other approach attempts to help individuals improve instruction through a process that engages peers in a dialog sustained throughout an agreed-upon period of time. Those in comprehensive universities, including the CSU, seem more interested in following this path. This approach, usually referred to as formative or supportive, seeks to improve instruction through systematic support of teaching strategies deemed effective by one's peers (CSU 1994).

There is a second dimension that helps describe peer review as it is practiced today: whether the effort relies upon classroom observation, or whether it uses secondary materials prepared by the instructor and discussions. Together these two dimensions suggest the direction of current peer review efforts. A listing of the techniques, devices and materials presently employed or advocated may further help to describe the breadth of the field.

- observation for purposes of RTP
- teaching teams (whose members observe and advise each other)
- identifying master teachers (who serve as models)
- teaching portfolios
- classroom research involving direct feedback from students
- colloquia on teaching
- team teaching
- video tapes
- case-writing
- libraries of materials relevant to excellence in instruction
- teaching academies
- reflective narratives on teaching goals, approaches etc.

These items are not exclusive, and they may be used in various combinations. There are many variations on each technique. The only limit is imposed by the imagination of those involved.

## Reasons for Peer Evaluation

While the reasons for engaging in peer evaluation may be obvious to some, they are more extensive than suggested to this point:

### To Improve Status

- To develop respect for teaching and improve the status of teaching
- To raise the status of teaching to that of doing research
- To balance the demands research puts on faculty time

### To Evaluate

- To improve the personnel process by providing a balance to student evaluations
- To make one accountable for one's teaching performance
- To provide a basis for rewarding faculty for teaching excellence in the RTP process
- To improve instruction directly
- To encourage communication among professors about teaching
- To encourage reflection and thoughtfulness about teaching
- To increase awareness of the complexities of teaching
- To increase awareness that teaching is a life-long developmental process
- To encourage reflective teaching, risk-taking and experimentation
- To end the isolation of the classroom and make teaching a shared concern
- To create a culture of teaching
- To provide opportunities for mentoring
- To provide feedback to the instructor about teaching performance

## Issues in Implementation

Few would disagree with the goals of improving instruction. Yet whenever a new effort is undertaken there are pitfalls, false starts and unintended consequences. A number of issues and concerns have been raised by others and should be kept in mind.

1. If peer review is to be done properly, it will be costly and time consuming, both for those giving and those receiving the benefits of the process. Faced with increased demands, faculty are concentrating their efforts on those activities for which there is direct payoff: teaching their classes and doing research leading to publication. If improving instruction through peer evaluation is to be effective, then appropriate compensation for involvement will have to be provided. Universities have provided limited resources in the past to improve the quality of instruction. Unless there is a change now this will be—in a time of already increased demands—one additional demand upon faculty time.
2. Peer review can be threatening. An individual who feels threatened will not participate or will not participate willingly. With that in mind, many feel that peer review for RTP must be kept separate from peer review that is designed to help an instructor reflect upon and improve instruction (Webb and McEnerney 1995).
3. Should observers or mentors be from one's own discipline or from some other discipline? Shulman believes that they must be from one's own discipline to enhance peer review's status within a discipline (Shulman 1993). He feels that faculty development offices have had low status precisely because they were not in departments. On the other hand, if the intra-departmental relationship does not work out, it can have long-term consequences. Some believe that any professor can be trained to observe peers' classrooms—at least for technical aspects of teaching—and that a relationship with someone outside of one's department is less threatening.
4. Not just anyone can provide information on how to improve teaching. Great teachers may not know why they are great nor know how to tell others how to improve. Individuals sent into classrooms need to be trained on what to look for (Webb and McEnerney 1995). They must also be trained in how to offer constructive critiques. And caution must be exercised to ensure that observers are not being trained simply to advocate the latest trend in teaching techniques. Training, too, is time consuming and costly.
5. Techniques and teaching methods that might work well in one classroom might not be appropriate in another. Not all classrooms are the same. Class size, student demographics and preparation, and available technology vary. Approaches that might work when budgets are adequate and class size appropriate might be a disaster in oversized classes. Techniques necessary for technologically advanced classrooms might not work in ordinary classrooms.

6. There is agreement on some techniques. Yet many of these call for more active learning by students and more active involvement of teachers with students. This will take a great deal of time and will therefore be resource expensive. This runs smack into the admonition that we do more with less on the one hand, and with distance learning and some other technologies on the other.
7. Most agree that a single visit to the classroom (sometimes referred to as the *parachute drop*) is not adequate for RTP, even with a before and after conference between the observer and the instructor (Webb and McEnerney 1995). Multiple visits place a great demand on the observer. Since thorough peer review is costly, will it add enough to the personnel process to be worth this cost? Will we gain significant additional knowledge from this process? Student evaluations are blunt instruments, but they are cheap, and they probably serve to eliminate the truly poor instructors. (The possibility of yearly evaluations for merit pay raises coupled with RTP classroom observations suggests a process that may well place excessive time demands on faculty.)
8. There could be a Gresham's law of peer review at work: poor and cheap techniques will drive out more expensive quality efforts.

### Peer Evaluation in the CSU

The situation in the CSU is different from that in research universities. In the first place teaching and learning are preeminent here and teaching is generally well respected in this system. Second, we have always done peer review, at least in the broadest sense, since evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the RTP process is required. On some campuses, some individuals prepare files (akin to a teaching portfolio) that document their approach to teaching and which elaborate upon student evaluations. These files are evaluated by their peers. Classroom observation may also take place. Some campuses require it, others prohibit it, on most it is generally an option for faculty. However, even where it is used, it often is felt to be perfunctory. Nonetheless, peer evaluation has a strong foothold in the CSU system, and in many respects the CSU has more to teach the research universities than it has to learn from them.

As mentioned above, the five campuses that attended the Stanford Institute are each carrying out peer evaluation projects sponsored by the Chancellor's Office. These projects are described below:

- Fullerton: The Fullerton project is developing different models of peer evaluation. These models include: classroom visitation model, portfolio model, classroom research model, and colloquium model.
- Dominguez Hills: The Dominguez Hills project is called TOPS (Teacher Observation/Peer Support) and is designed to train peers to observe each other's classroom.
- San Jose: San Jose has a Teacher's Classroom Visitation program which provides an opportunity to: see "master teachers" in action, develop portfolios and teaching narratives, and meet together in weekly seminars.
- San Francisco: San Francisco is developing a conceptual six-cell model and reviewing guidelines for classroom visitation and evaluation of course material.
- Sacramento: The Sacramento project involves professors doing peer coaching. Peers help colleagues think about and evaluate their own work.

### Recommendations

If the CSU peer review effort only develops a climate for discussion of effective teaching in our system, it will have served a useful purpose. It is beginning to do that, but the discussion needs to be broadened, and to go forward in a helpful, non-threatening manner under the direction of faculty. A number of specific recommendations should be considered:

1. Improve the reward system. The CSU needs to put far more resources into improving instruction than it has in the past. Many faculty are willing, even anxious, to work on improving their teaching, but find it difficult to do so without institutional support. If peer review is to be successful, the system cannot rely on simply increasing demands on faculty.
2. Focus on direct improvement of instruction and not on RTP. Efforts to help faculty improve instruction are generally well received. Most faculty are open to change and improvement if they are approached appropriately. Efforts to add additional requirements to the RTP process are treated more skeptically, especially if not well thought out and if not developed with a great deal of faculty input. As an option in the RTP process, peer review has a degree of acceptability, but in the near future peer review can have its greatest impact on the supportive improvement of instruction.
3. Encourage, but do not force, faculty participation. If opportunities to learn how to improve instruction are offered—and supported—many faculty will respond positively. This is especially true in these times of rapid demographic, technological and budgetary change. Even the best teachers know that they can benefit from increased knowledge.

4. Keep the focus broad. Peer evaluation is not just going into classrooms and teaching is not just techniques. Multiple approaches should be explored, especially at this early point in the discussion. Rigid adherence to a particular approach, method or technology should be avoided. The CSU should support and encourage a wide range of approaches. The individual department or even the individual instructor must choose the particular approach that serves a particular need and context.
5. Provide opportunity for regular, sustained and energized discussion of teaching approaches. There is probably no more effective means to disseminate ideas of teaching successes than to provide opportunities for faculty to talk together. Incidentally, this will help create the "culture of teaching," strengthen the university community and improve morale.
6. Pay attention to the entire career, but give special attention to new instructors. New instructors need the help that they have historically never been given. But a career is a long time, and periodic rejuvenation could have a major impact on teaching effectiveness.
7. Do not overlook part-time faculty and graduate students. On some campuses there are nearly as many part-time faculty as full-time faculty. With so much instruction being provided by individuals in these positions, they must be included in any attempt to improve instruction.
8. Consider the role of technology in effective teaching. At this point we have little idea of what impact technology can have on teaching effectiveness. Some technologies may undermine good teaching while others may be an important boon. It may be coincidental or not that this discussion of peer review comes at a time of rapid technological change. But the moment should be seized.
9. Offer training to meet other changing demands. Technology is not the only change that we face. Demographics and budgets also have a major impact on how one can teach effectively. Those changes must be considered in any attempt to improve teaching effectiveness.
10. Be alert to the pressures to do more with less. It is probably not a coincidence that the discussion of peer evaluation takes place in a time of budgetary restraints, but peer evaluation does not need to be a tool of these restraints. Indeed, if the discussion is shifted from peer review to effective instruction, it may become a basis for requesting greater resources.
11. Train observers. Just because one can teach well does not mean that one can instruct others how to teach. In fact, it may make it harder. Training is required to develop effective observers.
12. Explore the concept of the "scholarship of teaching" and find ways to recognize and reward scholarly and creative teaching activities. In order for effective teaching to be considered as scholarship, the faculty and the classroom must have peer support and recognition. To be valued and rewarded, scholarly work in teaching must be shared as is scholarly work in the disciplines.

## References

- American Association for Higher Education. 1994. "12 Universities to Pilot New Methods for Evaluating Teaching." Press Release. January 26.
- Angelo, T. and K. Patricia Cross. 1993. *Classroom Assessment Techniques*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- California State University. 1994. "Stanford Institute on the Peer Review of Teaching." Working Paper. Long Beach: The California State University.
- California State University, Fullerton. 1994. "From Idea to Prototype: Developing Reflective Peer Teacher/Scholars." Working Paper. Fullerton, CA: California State University, Fullerton.
- Centra, J. A. 1993. *Reflective Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K. Patricia. 1987. "Feedback in the Classroom: Making Assessment Matter." Working Paper. Washington, DC: The American Association of Higher Education.
- Hutchings, Pat. 1994. "Peer Review of Teaching: From Idea to Prototype. Lessons from a Current AAHE Teaching Initiative Project." *AAHE Bulletin*. November: 3-7
- Shulman, Lee. 1989. "Toward a Pedagogy of Substance." *AAHE Bulletin*. June: 8-13
- Shulman, Lee. 1993. "Teaching as Community Property." *Change*. November/December: 23(6), 6-7.
- Webb, Jamie and Kathleen McEnerney. 1995. "The View from the Back of the Classroom: A Faculty Based Peer Observation Program." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, in press.

(Approved May 1995, as part of AS-2262-95/FA)

## Policy on E-mail Privacy

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor and the individual campuses to support privacy in the use of e-mail to the maximum extent possible under state and federal laws, consistent with computer system maintenance demands; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the individual campuses to institute policy to implement this goal in keeping with the following principles:

1. All authorized e-mail accounts stored on the CSU telecommunications network shall be considered to be confidential.
2. Requests for access to these accounts or disclosure of confidential information for any purpose other than technical problem resolution will be reviewed by the senior Academic Affairs Officer, and honored only when required by state or federal law, or when there is probable cause to suspect illegal activity.
3. Inspections solely for the purpose of technical problem resolution must be approved by the appropriate computer affairs administrator and only for the resolution of a specific technical problem.
4. Except when under extraordinary circumstances or when prohibited by law, computer users will receive notice prior to such inspections, access, or disclosure.
5. Except where prohibited by law users not notified prior to inspection, access or disclosure will receive notice after the fact within three working days; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and individual campuses to adopt policies in a timely fashion; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor's Office and the individual campuses to inform all authorized accounts of their e-mail privacy policy and of the limitations of privacy on e-mail. E-mail is subject to disclosure under the Public Records Act, and when relevant, to discovery in civil litigation.

*RATIONALE: Chancellor's Office Interim Counsel has circulated a memo describing the limits of e-mail privacy and noting that "in limited and appropriate circumstances ... e-mail messages may become subject to internal monitoring by an employment supervisor." This resolution attempts to limit e-mail access to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the law and technical problem resolution.*

(This resolution, 2263, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1995.)

# Rewards for Faculty in the California State University

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the position paper *Rewards for Faculty in the California State University*; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU work with the California Faculty Association to solicit its support for those “Principles” in the position paper *Rewards for Faculty in the California State University*, that may fall within the scope of the Agreement between CFA and CSU; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to endorse the “Principles” in the position paper *Rewards for Faculty in the California State University*; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to work with the Academic Senate CSU to establish a timetable to review systemwide personnel policies in order to make any revision required to effect the “Principles” in the position paper *Rewards for Faculty in the California State University*.
- RATIONALE:** *Trustee policy governing the categories for evaluation date from the years before the passage of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). Since 1987, matters that fall within the scope of bargaining have been referred to CFA, and there seem to be some aspects of the “Principles” that concern wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. As they have very successfully in the past, the Senate and CFA need to work together to guarantee the best outcome for the CSU. Trustee policy in FSA 70-80, **Report of Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty - New Systemwide Guidelines for Written Procedures on Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Tenure and Promotion** (September 29, 1970), establishes as the evaluative criteria “teaching performance, research and creative activity, contributions to the community, contributions to the institution, and possession of appropriate academic training” and states that evaluation procedures “should reflect primary emphasis on teaching ability” (p. 7). The “Principles” are not a major departure from this policy; they are an elaboration that takes into account contemporary faculty concerns and the redefinition of scholarship.*

(This resolution, 2268, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1995.)

## Rewards for Faculty in the California State University

The rewards for faculty in the California State University have followed the system generally adopted by higher education in the United States. The basic ones are the retention for a series of probationary years, the award of tenure, and promotion. There are, of course, other programs in the CSU to reward faculty, and individual campuses use them in a variety of ways. Some share with retention, tenure, and promotion, a reliance on past accomplishment. These include award programs like the Trustees’ Outstanding Professor Award Program and campus-based teaching, research, and service awards.

A second group of rewards includes those that are based more heavily on proposed activities than on past accomplishments. Sabbaticals or leaves with pay are included in this second group. However, although paid leaves are available, in theory, to all full-time faculty, in practice, the number each campus dispenses is considerably smaller than the number requested by faculty who are eligible and have submitted proposals that department and campus committees have approved. Also included in the second category are a variety of systemwide and campus supported faculty development programs to provide assigned time, financial support or both for projects deemed worthwhile by peer committees and administrators.

The rewards listed so far are typically available only to tenure-track faculty; the range of rewards for lecturers is considerably narrower at this basic level since virtually the only one is retention (called *reappointment* in the case of non-tenure-track faculty) on a year-by-year basis. This situation seems particularly anomalous since evidence is clear that lecturers constitute a substantial proportion of instructors not only in the CSU but internationally. In the January 1995 article “Part-Time College Teaching Rises, as Do Worries,” Jack H. Schuster, professor of education and public policy at the Claremont Graduate School, is quoted as stating that roughly 40 percent of college faculty today are part-timers, twice the number of two decades ago (Mydans). Mydans also reports that there are 237 part-timers out of a total faculty complement of 626 at CSU San Bernardino. Our own inquiries have discovered that at another campus, San Francisco State University, there are 770 lecturers among the total 1,528 on the instructional staff.

These data coincide generally with those produced by other studies. In a Carnegie Foundation study of higher education in fourteen countries, "research directors in many countries reported that the number of part-timers seems to be growing, and a recent report from the American Association of University Professors ["The Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty," *ACADEME*, July-August 1993, pp. 39-46] concludes that part-time faculty hold 38 percent of faculty appointments in the United States" (Boyer 1994, 6).

Just as in the case of rewards themselves, the CSU has been traditional in following the categories used by similar institutions to describe aspects of professional life that colleagues and administrators will assess to determine who receives the rewards. The usual categories are teaching effectiveness, research and publication (or sometimes a broader construct of professional achievement and growth), and service to campus and community, all of which the Academic Senate CSU included in its 1988 paper on "The Role of Scholarship in the Comprehensive University" (*Principles and Policies*, Vol. I, pp. 87-94).

In the past four or five years we have witnessed several trends that converge and have an impact on the system of rewards in the CSU. Reduced budgetary support from the state has provoked an academically unhealthy increase in the number of students many administrators ask individual faculty members to serve. At the same time there has been a "ratchetting up" of expectations for increased contributions in the non-teaching categories. There have also been rumblings from politicians and from the public at large that professors generally do not spend enough time in the classroom. These phenomena, not limited to the CSU, have provided the impetus for a series of studies that examine what the professoriate does or should do to merit rewards.

The most widely discussed examination and set of recommendations is Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), a special report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer proposes a basic redefinition of scholarship, suggesting we establish categories that correspond more realistically with the current and developing academic and civic mandates. The four categories are the scholarship of *discovery* (including what we have traditionally labeled research), the scholarship of *discovery* (inter-or cross-disciplinary efforts), the scholarship of *application* (service), and the scholarship of *teaching*.

While redefining the evaluative categories, Boyer expects them to be governed by three constants: "First, all faculty should establish their credentials as *researchers*. Whether or not they choose specialized, investigative work on an on-going basis, every scholar must, we believe, demonstrate the capacity to do original research, study a serious intellectual problem, and present to colleagues the results. Indeed, this is what the dissertation, or a comparable piece of creative work, is all about" (27). Second, faculty must keep current in their field, *but not held to publishing on a regular timetable*. Third, faculty must have the highest standards of integrity. Fourth, "the work of the professoriate—regardless of the form it takes—must be carefully assessed" (28).

Boyer calls attention to a persistent shift from the priority given to teaching and towards a greater value being placed on research as traditionally defined. The shift existed as early as 1958, but Boyer indicates that it became dramatic between 1969 and 1989, as revealed in responses to two national surveys conducted by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: "Twenty-one percent of the faculty surveyed in 1969 strongly agreed that it is difficult to achieve tenure without publishing. By 1989, the number had doubled, to 42 percent...The change at comprehensive colleges—from 6 percent to 43 percent—is especially noteworthy since these institutions have virtually no doctoral programs and only limited resources for research. Even at liberal arts colleges, where teaching has always been highly prized, nearly one in four faculty strongly agreed in 1989 that it is difficult to get tenure without publishing" (11).

The National Education Association's *Statement on Faculty Reward Structures* (June 1994) ties this shift to the "ratchetting up" we mentioned earlier: "The result is that faculty workload pressures have increased and reward structures increasingly require research and publication for tenure, promotion, and merit pay" (2). The *Statement* also points out that two popular myths, according to which faculty members don't work hard enough and don't value teaching, are proven untrue by every recent national and state survey. For instance, "faculty members work an average of 53 hours per week and...workloads have increased steadily in the last decade" (6).

This same theme appears in the slightly earlier American Association of University Professors' report "The Work of Faculty Expectations, Priorities, and Rewards" and it makes clear that public pressure has displaced the emphasis from quality to quantity in teaching; "...much of the extra-mural discussion is focused on measuring output rather than evaluating quality. Reformers' calls for improved teaching often translate, in their public echo, into a call for *more* teaching" (37-38). As regards the average work week, the report states that a "considerable fraction" of the average 53 hours is "maintained during vacation weeks as well" (39). One of the report's conclusions is that the "'ratchetting up' of expectations is detrimental to students as well as to faculty" (48). Besides being detrimental, this unfortunate trend also is contrary to the CSU Academic Senate's statement that "appropriate workload credit for faculty scholarly activities is critical for the fulfillment of the mission of the CSU as a premier teaching institution among the nation's comprehensive universities" (*Principles and Policies*, Vol. I, p. 94).

Since 1991, the National Project on Institutional Priorities and Faculty Rewards has been working towards review and reform of the reward system in higher education. Coordinated at Syracuse University and sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, and the Pew Charitable Trust, it has involved some 20 national professional associations. As reported by R. M. Diamond, the project director, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* article "The Tough Task of Reforming the Faculty-Rewards System," the project has revealed several facts:

"Every discipline includes scholarly and professional activities that traditionally have not been rewarding faculty members.

Agreement exists, however, on the characteristics of an activity that can be considered scholarly or professional.

The process of expanding the scope of what is considered scholarly or professional work is far more difficult for some disciplines than for others.

Significant differences exist among the disciplines in what faculty members do and how those activities are described and valued.

The differences among disciplines have direct and immediate implications for faculty members serving on promotion and tenure committees.

The differences among disciplines also must be recognized by the candidates themselves.

The proposed expansion of activities considered to be legitimate scholarly or professional work will be much easier for some faculty members to accept than for others."

The studies we have highlighted have several themes in common, with greater or lesser emphasis on each of them. They all strive to ensure a prominent place for teaching, whether it is the NEA's affirmation that "teaching takes up the majority of faculty work time" (8) or the AAUP's that "[t]eaching is a basic activity of the professoriate, and institutional reward systems should reflect the fundamental importance of effective teaching" (47). They agree that the concept of research needs to be redefined so as to accommodate a broader range of scholarly endeavors since expectations differ across disciplines. They also are of one mind that service is an important activity, although the AAUP does "not urge that the rewards for service be commensurate with those for dedicated teaching and scholarship" (48) while the NEA asserts that "[i]nstitutions whose mission is community outreach should reward service" (8) and Boyer believes that "service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity. Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor—and the accountability—traditionally associated with research activities" (22). And whether implicitly or explicitly, all studies make assessment an imperative component of any rewards structure.

Two words about the category of *service* before continuing. As we have just pointed out, there is a diversity of opinion concerning the appropriate boundaries for it. While Boyer himself points to "administrative centralization [that] may be causing faculty governance to decline at the very moment higher learning faces the challenge of renewal" (71), he does not explicitly include participation in governance as a service activity. We therefore prefer the approach taken by the Writing Program at Syracuse University: "Faculty are evaluated for their constructive contributions to sustaining or leading the communities in which they do their professional work: program, department, or center; college; university; and disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or professional communities" (Diamond and Adam, 117).

Institutions in other states have already begun the process of reexamining, redefining and broadening the categories in the reward system. In our own state, we need go no further than CSU, Long Beach, where the process began in 1991 and has included a 1992 report with recommendations in four categories: "a broadened definition of scholarship, using Boyer's four categories; faculty empowerment, by recognizing growth and change over a faculty member's career and various faculty specializations among the scholarship categories; realistic expectations, given available levels of support; and faculty career plans, beginning at the point of hire and renewed every four years" (Roberts et al, 82).

The AAUP sounds an important note we surely must heed as we move forward. It cautions against assigning a minor role to research as a reaction to the political and popular misconception that faculty research is to blame for a so-called decline in the quality of teaching. "The arguments offered against academic research — that if faculty did less research they could teach more — disregard the quality of teaching that students would receive were professors to become mere transmitters of received information, rather than explorers and discoverers" (48). The Carnegie international study completes the picture from the faculty point of view. It found that "the majority of faculty, except Hong Kong, do not agree that the pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching. A conflict is felt, however, by a significant minority in Australia, Germany, the United States, the Netherlands, Israel, the United Kingdom, and Chile" (11).

The list that follows depends on this overarching principle: The assessment categories in the CSU reward system need to be reexamined with a view to broadening the range of activities appropriately placed in each one so as to correspond with local campus missions and disciplinary diversity. As this reexamination takes place, the CSU and individual campuses need to pay close attention to the interrelation between the cumulative effect of



seriously reduced resources over the past few years and the pressures from many quarters to shoulder new responsibilities. The CSU would do well to adopt one of the concepts used by CSU Long Beach—that is, there must be “realistic expectations, given available levels of support” (Roberts et al, 82). For instance, it is unclear how professors can remain current in their fields when library acquisitions have been virtually frozen, and when campuses have cancelled subscriptions to important professional journals. The faculty and the administration must keep the same contradictory forces in mind when addressing the impact on workload of using technology in instruction.

## Principles for CSU Faculty Rewards Categories and Criteria

1. Whatever other criteria or categories it suggests, the CSU continues to require that excellence in teaching be at the center of any system of rewards.
2. The concept of *teaching* is broad and inclusive. It encompasses such activities as advising, supervision in all its guises (individual studies, thesis direction, field supervision), and a range of demonstrable and assessable contributions to improving student learning (e.g., curriculum revision, course/program coordination, technological applications). At least in the area of supervision, if not in other activities included in an expanded definition of teaching, direct workload credit will accrue to the individual faculty.
3. Evaluation of good teaching requires an array of methods to document and evaluate it. For instance, the use of a teaching portfolio could be one supplement to evaluations by students and peers.
4. The relative values assigned to the categories for RTP evaluation vary from discipline to discipline. While the traditional concept of research and creative activities may be of importance to one department, a redefined category of service may be crucial to another department’s fulfilling its academic mission.
5. The service category includes those activities necessary to the continued, healthy faculty role in shared governance. It is not limited to commitments defined in relation to disciplinary expertise nor by ties to the community beyond the university.
6. The CSU encourages approaches to knowledge and to its presentation that integrate more than one discipline. Interdisciplinarity may be in teaching, research and creative activities, or service.
7. Retention, tenure, and promotion policies acknowledge changing faculty and programmatic emphases. For instance, campuses could encourage the concept of a compact or academic work plan between the individual faculty and the department. This permissive agreement (that is, not forced on colleagues who do not want to participate in it) is for goals and periods of time tailor-made to the individual.
8. Opportunities for professional development (e.g., sabbatical leaves and assigned time) are essential to maintaining faculty currency and vitality and are to be supported and expanded.
9. The evaluation of faculty is based on the quality of the educational experience they provide, not on the modality of instruction. Although traditional modes of instruction and the use of technology in instruction are vital to meeting curricular needs and student demand, faculty involvement in the development, implementation, and evaluation of instructional technology requires the assignment of workload credit.
10. Lecturers who are less than full-time comprise a substantial and important portion of the academic enterprise. They require a level of support comparable to that of other colleagues through programs of faculty development specifically designed for them. Such programs include assigned time and subventions for maintaining currency in the discipline.

### References

- Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Lawrenceville, N. J. Princeton University Press, 1990. Second Printing 1991.
- Boyer, Ernest L., Philip G. Altbach, and Mary Jean Whitelaw. *The Academic Profession, An International Perspective*.
- A Special Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994.
- Cohen, David C., Ed. *Principles and Policies. Papers of the Academic Senate, the California State University*, Volume I. 1988.
- Diamond, Robert M. “The Tough Task of Reforming the Faculty-Rewards System” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 11, 1994).
- Mydans, Seth. “Part-Time College Teaching Rises, as Do Worries.” *The New York Times*, January 4, 1995, p. B6.

"NEA Statement on Faculty Reward Structures." Approved by the NEA Executive Committee in June 1994.

Roberts, Alton O., Jon F. Wergin, and Bronwyn E. Adam. "Institutional Approaches to the Issues of Reward and Scholarship." In Robert M. Diamond and Bronwyn E. Adam, eds. *Recognizing Faculty Reward Systems for the Year 2000*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993. pp. 63-86.

"The Work of Faculty: Expectations, Priorities and Rewards., Report by Committee C on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publication. *ACADEME*, 80:1 January-February 1994, pp. 35-48.

(Approved May 1995, as part of AS-2268-95/FA)

# Statement of Principle on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the position paper of the Task Force on Technology entitled *Statement of Principle on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning*.

(This resolution, 2295, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in September 1995.)

## Statement of Principle on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning

### Introduction

Instructional technologies have increased, both quantitatively and qualitatively, at a rapid pace in recent years. For most faculty who began their careers in the 1960s and 1970s, instructional technology meant threading a film projector, sorting slides into a Kodak carousel, or producing overhead transparencies. These were simple and easily learned technologies. However, contemporary computer and video technologies have vastly altered the scale upon which we must now contemplate the utility and impact of instructional technology. Few of us are trained to use these technologies; fewer still can author materials for these technologies.

### Impact upon Curriculum and Pedagogy

While instructional technologies can improve the quality of teaching and learning in the CSU, it should be kept in mind that technology will not necessarily impact positively on all instructional strategies. On-campus lecture, lecture discussion, seminar, and laboratory experiences will remain paramount where they effectively promote creative thinking, group processes, or individualized instruction and supervision. However, these strategies can be enhanced by the creative use of technology. There is evidence that carefully developed multimedia packages can facilitate the teaching and learning process more effectively than the traditional lecture. Computers can provide access to vast databases of information with an efficiency of selectivity unmatched by traditional means. Multimedia technologies have allowed manifold means of access to learning materials by students with varied learning strategies. Video and computer technologies can provide access to remote or nontraditional students who might otherwise be unable to participate in higher education.

### Implications for Faculty Professional Development

The experience of private industry in seeking productivity gains through investment in technology has taught us that positive results are not usually realized for a decade or longer, if at all. The same will undoubtedly be true in higher education. The use of technology in instruction will require continuing capital investment in equipment and classroom renovation. Faculty professional development in the use of new technologies will also require investments over a long period of time. Indeed, technological obsolescence and faculty turnover will necessitate permanent training programs and a permanent expansion of capital budgets. Investment in educational technology solely as a means of increasing productivity is clearly a dubious strategy. However, this does not diminish its imperative for providing access to remote student populations and for improving educational quality.

The professional development necessary to implement and utilize these new instructional technologies is qualitatively and quantitatively different from prior pedagogic and epistemological training and development. It is qualitatively different because these technologies require training that is outside the professional expertise of most faculty. It is quantitatively different, because the number of diverse technologies being integrated is large and because the amount of training necessary to become technically proficient is extensive. Paradoxically, the high initial costs of hardware investment for most of these technologies has in the recent past made comparatively less money available for faculty training in their use.

## Recommendations

1. The CSU must prepare a comprehensive strategic plan with a major commitment of resources over a multi-year period of time to develop and implement faculty professional development. This must include training in the appropriate use of instructional technology. This strategic plan should strike a proper balance between systemwide initiatives and campus-specific programs. This recommendation is consistent with recent recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.
2. The CSU's efforts in faculty professional development in uses of instructional technology for teaching and learning should be coordinated and focused in order to maximize their effectiveness. at the systemwide level; the Institute for Teaching and Learning should direct this effort.
3. The CSU needs to develop long-term, non-exclusive corporate partnerships with companies that can provide the hardware, software, and training for an expansion of instructional technology in ways that can reduce the risks of technological obsolescence and minimize replacement costs.
4. Faculty must be given access to development opportunities that address the effective use of new technologies. These opportunities may take different forms ranging from formal presentation to self-taught modules. All of this requires that faculty must be partially released from teaching or administrative duties in order to engage in professional development for instructional technology.
5. The CSU, working with campus Academic Senates and the California Faculty Association, should adopt policies that recognize the scholarship inherent in the use of new technologies and the preparation of instructional materials by those faculty willing and capable of doing so. These policies include retention, tenure, and promotion; intellectual property rights; and terms and conditions of employment.

(Approved September 1995, as part of AS-2295-95/TTF)

## Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to investigate the circumstances leading to a vote of no confidence when the Chancellor is notified that a campus president has received a vote of no confidence (or its equivalent) from the faculty or Senate of that campus and to share the findings of the investigation with the campus senate and inform the Academic Senate CSU of the completion of the investigation.

*RATIONALE: Although many circumstances may contribute to a vote of no confidence, such a vote, ipso facto, is significant. Whenever a majority of the faculty, or their representatives, conclude that a situation on their campus is sufficiently serious to warrant voting no confidence in their president, the Chancellor should be concerned about the conduct of administrative leadership and the effects on the integrity of campus educational programs and campus morale. The Academic Senate calls upon the Chancellor to make that concern known to the campus and inform them, and the Academic Senate CSU, of steps s/he will take to ascertain the circumstances surrounding the vote of no confidence.*

(This resolution, 2305, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1996.)

# Encouraging the Establishment of Faculty Leadership Awards

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University encourage each local campus senate to establish an annual award for faculty leadership to acknowledge and reward significant contributions to the principle and practice of shared governance.

*RATIONALE: Faculty Leadership in shared governance is critical to the functioning of a university. Participation in collegial governance is one of the professional responsibilities of faculty in the California State University system. Increased teaching and research demands tend to make faculty, especially junior faculty, less engaged in governance, thereby seriously undermining the quality of education offered by our campuses. Acknowledging outstanding efforts in this area will demonstrate the importance of collegial governance and will encourage more faculty to participate and to participate well.*

(This resolution, 2306, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1996.)

# Recommendations Regarding New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in the CSU

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the attached *New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in the California State University*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus Academic Senates and Vice President for Academic Affairs on each campus to develop policies and procedures implementing the recommendations contained in *New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in the California State University*; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU specifically endorse the following recommendations contained in *New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in the California State University*:

- First, the Academic Senate of the California State University urge each campus of the CSU system to look carefully at its programs for new faculty orientation and to development of long-term orientation programs, extending over one or more terms. Such programs provide the opportunity for contact between new faculty and existing faculty from across the campus.
- Second, the Academic Senate CSU urge the development of systematic mentoring programs. The form of the program will be largely dependent on the goals which must be developed on each campus. It is not unlikely that a campus could simultaneously have two or three different types of mentoring programs.
- Third, the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus to consider development of orientation and mentoring programs for lecturers.
- Fourth, the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates and experienced faculty to become closely involved with these programs.
- Fifth, the Academic Senate CSU urge that new faculty orientation programs and faculty mentoring programs should be housed within the Academic Affairs office, since these activities are so central to the retention and growth of a strong faculty.

(This resolution, 2320, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1996.)

## New Faculty Orientation and Mentoring in The California State University Faculty Affairs Committee • CSU Academic Senate • March 1996

It is widely recognized that the recruitment of a high quality faculty is but the first step in developing and maintaining superior academic programs. Given the high cost of living in many of the areas where CSU campuses are located, it is particularly difficult to recruit young faculty who can expect to be placed toward the lower end of the salary schedule. This problem is doubly true in the case of women and minority faculty, who are being aggressively recruited by colleges and universities nation-wide, many of which can offer higher salaries, lower teaching loads, and greater support to new faculty. Under such circumstances, it is especially critical that we retain those that we have successfully recruited. As part of an effort to examine the current state of efforts to maintain a high quality faculty, the Faculty Affairs Committee of the 1995-96 CSU Academic Senate instituted a series of studies of various aspects of this issue.

One portion of this study was to determine the extent and success of programs to provide new faculty orientation and follow-up mentoring programs. Inquiries were sent to the Academic Vice Presidents of each of the campuses, requesting that they be forwarded to the appropriate office for response. Replies were received from nearly every campus, and the names and addresses of those in charge of such programs are appended to this report.

There is essentially universal agreement that an orientation program for new faculty is needed, and widespread support for some sort of mentoring program to assist in their socialization during their first few terms on campus. There is far less unanimity on the form these programs do (and should) take, and virtually no data to indicate the success or failure of any of the programs currently in place.

This report summarizes the programs which are now being tried, with comments on the perceived success or failure of the various approaches, and makes recommendations of programs which seem to be particularly promising.

## New Faculty Orientation

### Existing Programs

New faculty orientation programs currently in use in the CSU fall into two categories: one-day, or extended programs.

#### One-day programs

By far the most common new faculty orientation is the half-day or one-day model. Typically, all newly hired faculty are invited to attend a session a few days before classes for the fall term are to begin. The usual pattern is for a brief greeting from the President or Provost and chair of the academic senate, followed by presentations from various offices on such topics as payroll procedures, details of the benefits package, grading policies and procedures, the library, and other campus activities. It may also include presentations from CFA and Associated Students. Depending on the length of the program, it often includes lunch, which allows new faculty a chance to meet each other, but provides for little interaction with existing faculty.

#### Reactions to one-day programs

Virtually everyone who commented indicated dissatisfaction with this approach. Attendance at such sessions is voluntary, so many new faculty do not receive even this minimal introduction to their new campus, and must rely on their own resources, or whatever informal aid they may receive from colleagues in their department.

While such programs briefly expose new faculty to a number of administrators and representatives of a number of offices they will need to deal with, they provide little or no opportunity to meet and interact with colleagues in other parts of the university and do little to foster the informal links that are so valuable to academic activities.

Probably more importantly, the barrage of spoken and written material received in a very short time is difficult to assimilate. Many of the new faculty are still in the process of moving into new housing, unpacking their professional materials, and preparing for a series of new classes due to begin within a few days. As a result, much of the written material is given low priority and is often either trashed or dumped in the bottom of a file cabinet to be found months or years later. An additional factor that should be considered is that none of the new faculty orientation programs as presently constituted provide any opportunity for the new faculty to meet and get to know established faculty from other parts of the campus.

Many campuses indicated that they have made, or are making, changes in their approach, and expressed a desire to hear about programs on other campuses which seemed to be more effective.

#### Extended programs

A few campuses have instituted orientation programs which extend over periods of several weeks, often continuing through the first term, and (apparently) in some cases throughout the entire year. Such programs are few in number as yet, making it difficult to generalize, but some patterns seem to be emerging. There is usually an initial reception for new faculty, with welcoming comments from the President or Provost, and discussion of a few items of immediate importance, such as completion of payroll documents and enrollment periods for health plans. This reception is held in an informal setting such as the President's residence or a faculty club, with refreshments served.

The initial gathering is followed by regularly scheduled workshops at intervals of every two or three weeks, dealing with various other topics of concern and interest to the new faculty. These workshops are scheduled in afternoons or evenings, allowing for leisurely discussion of each topic. This format allows for the new faculty members to request discussion of topics which have come to their attention in the course of the term.

Within the CSU, Fullerton and Sonoma are among the few which have extended programs. Outside of this system successful programs include those at the SUNY Oswego campus, and at the University of Colorado.

#### Reactions to extended programs

Since only a handful of campuses have instituted such programs, and all are of recent vintage, it is difficult to make any general statements about how they are perceived. However, most comments indicated generally greater satisfaction with these programs than with the one-day programs. A small sample of faculty who have recently taken part in each of these approaches echoed the sentiments of administrators in finding the extended programs much more valuable than the one-day program.

An indication of the importance being given to orientation programs is the number of campuses who have recently designated, or expanded the responsibilities of, individuals or offices charged with the responsibility of faculty development.



## Mentoring Programs

It is obvious that *mentoring* in the broad sense of the term, occurs for most new faculty. In most cases this is not the result of any formal structure, but rather results from the links of new or pre-existing friendships with other faculty members. Unfortunately there is no guarantee that the informal mentor will be able to provide accurate, useful information. In addition, not all new faculty take advantage of such opportunities, or even have the opportunity to do so presented to them. Departments which have made few if any hires for extended periods often have no memory of the issues facing beginning faculty, and make no effort to assist their new colleagues. Such situations are all too common on many CSU campuses.

Formal mentoring programs are far less common than new faculty orientation. Some campuses have had mentoring programs in the past but have abandoned them, while other campuses have never had them, and existing programs take a wide variety of forms. The specific form of the mentoring reflects the goals of the program, some of which are noted below. It is significant that the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning will be sponsoring a workshop on June 12-13, 1996, on mentoring entitled "Enhancing Experiences of Junior Faculty," conducted by Bob Menges (Northwestern) and Ray Perry (Manitoba).

### **Orientation to campus**

In some cases mentors are expected to provide guidance to the ins-and-outs of the local campus's formal and informal structure, provide introductions to people, and provide an informal sounding board and information source which is independent of the RTP process. In such cases mentors are often specifically chosen from outside the new faculty member's department or college.

### **Disciplinary mentoring**

Some programs, usually departmentally based, are for the specific purpose of aiding new faculty in the RTP process. Guidance in the sorts of activities that are likely to be rewarded, such as appropriate outlets for research papers and particularly important campus committees, is valuable information for any new faculty. Some departments have formalized the process by designating mentors from within their own department for new faculty. In other cases this is done at the school or college level.

### **Specialized categories**

On at least one campus, mentoring is provided to new women faculty by the Women Faculty Association, and similar programs would probably prove of benefit to other populations as our faculty becomes more diverse, incorporating individuals who may face specific issues as a result of ethnicity, gender, or other factors.

### **Peer Coaching**

Peer coaching is a voluntary process in which two faculty members observe each other's classroom teaching and confer afterwards on teaching strategies. Peer coaching is not usually thought of when discussing mentoring, but it is in fact one of the best examples of how mentoring can benefit both partners in the process. While it need not involve new faculty, peer coaching could easily be part of a broader mentoring program for new faculty. Several CSU campuses already have, or are instituting, peer coaching programs.

## Conclusions

There is broad recognition that the retention of high quality faculty requires a variety of programs that assist new faculty in becoming socialized to their new work environment, that will aid them in improving their teaching, and will assist them in working through the RTP process. Mentoring programs, and especially new faculty orientation, are viewed as important parts of this process. However, there is also widespread dissatisfaction with both as they are currently practiced, as indicated by the recent changes that several campuses have made, and the recent creation or expansion of faculty development offices within the system.

Although we have no assessments of the success or failure of any of the approaches used, there is a consensus that one-day orientation programs are much less effective than those programs which extend over a period of several weeks or more.

It is also generally assumed that some form of mentoring is also highly desirable, and that this should have some formal structure to ensure that it is available to all new faculty. The specific form of the mentoring must depend on the goals of the particular program. Mentoring programs in the CSU are poorly developed, with a few exceptions. Most are not systematic, so the program is not available to all new faculty, and that those most in need of mentoring are probably not getting it.

It also became clear that there is no systematic orientation or mentoring for lecturers within the California State University system. While some departments have an enviable record of guiding their temporary and part-time faculty, most lecturers receive little if any assistance beyond some written materials relating to

payroll and grading policies. Given that a significant proportion of instruction in the system is by lecturers, it is in our own best interest to see that these faculty are given appropriate help in giving the highest quality instruction to our students.

#### Recommendations

First, the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus of the CSU system to look carefully at its programs for new faculty orientation and to development of long-term orientation programs, extending over one or more terms. Such programs provide the opportunity for contact between new faculty and existing faculty from across the campus.

Second, the Academic Senate CSU urge the development of systematic mentoring programs. The form of the program will be largely dependent on the goals which must be developed on each campus. It is not unlikely that a campus could simultaneously have two or three different types of mentoring programs.

Third, the Academic Senate CSU urge each campus to consider development of orientation and mentoring programs for lecturers.

Fourth, the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates and experienced faculty to become closely involved with these programs.

Fifth, the Academic Senate CSU urge that new faculty orientation programs and faculty mentoring programs should be housed within the Academic Affairs office, since these activities are so central to the retention and growth of a strong faculty.

**(Approved May 1996, as part of AS-2320-96/FA)**

## Section V

---

Quality Education and Funding Levels in the CSU.....	247
<b>Support for “Campus Climate: Forward Appreciating Diversity” A Report Prepared for the California State University by the Panel of Experts on Campus Climate.....</b>	<b>256</b>
Attachment B: AS-1975-90/FA :	
Cover Memo for “Campus Climate: Forward Appreciating Diversity” Report.....	256
Panel of Experts.....	257
Executive Summary	
Campus Climate: Forward Appreciating Diversity.....	259
<b>Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older Part-Time Students.....</b>	<b>264</b>
Recommendations of the CSU Commission on the Older Part-Time Student “Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older Part-Time Students”.....	264
<b>Policy Position Regarding 1992-1993 CSU Budget Requests and Proposed Student Fees.....</b>	<b>266</b>
1992-1993 Budget Shortfall.....	266
<b>Faculty Role in the Establishment of Charter Campuses.....</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>Responses to the Crisis Facing California Higher Education: Concerns About Differential Fees for Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Study for Students Attending The California State University.....</b>	<b>268</b>
<b>Mandatory Catalog Copy on Nondiscrimination.....</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University.....</b>	<b>271</b>
Position Paper: Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University.....	271
<b>Student Fee Policy in the CSU.....</b>	<b>273</b>
Information Item • Committee on Finance • Agenda Item 5 • January 23-24, 1996	
Student Fee Policy.....	273
Brief.....	273
Summary	
Item.....	273
Introduction	
Fee Authority	
History of CSU Fee Policies and Practices	
Proposed Fee Policy	
Attachment A • Finance • Agenda Item 5 • January 23-24, 1996	
Table 1. Statutory Authority for CSU Fees.....	276
Table 2. Authorized CSU Fees.....	277



# Section V

---

## Quality Education and Funding Levels in the CSU

Most of us ordinarily presume to know what we mean when we speak of quality education. For academicians, it is a central concern of their professional lives. Legislators, legislative staff, the Governor, the Chancellor, the Chancellor's staff, the Board of Trustees of the California State University and others continually make decisions which bear upon the quality of education available to Californians, and we are confident, therefore, that a serious concern for quality education has an impact on these decisions. Even so, an agreed-upon definition of quality education remains elusive. In what follows, we attempt to make explicit what we mean by the phrase and to outline some of the conditions which have important bearing on the quality of education which can be achieved. We believe that some of these conditions can be measured and that elucidation of their relationship to quality education can only serve to improve that quality through more knowledgeable decision making.

There is broad consensus that the aims of education include the abilities to think clearly and logically, to reason from premises and facts to valid conclusions, to search out, develop, and critically evaluate information, to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and to perform quantitative functions. In addition to these basic intellectual abilities, students should acquire an understanding of themselves as integrated physiological, psychological and social entities, of how human society has developed and how it functions, and of the physical world in which they live and the forms of life with which they share the physical world. Finally, our students should acquire an understanding and appreciation of the diverse cultural endeavors and legacies of human civilization. At the same time, students should learn to understand, to appreciate, and to apply the principles, methodologies, value systems, thought processes, and professional skills employed in both general and specialized areas of inquiry. The Board of Trustees of the CSU has, in fact, endorsed these principles and ideals by including them in Title 5 of the Administrative Code (Section 40405).

California has a diverse, heterogeneous population engaged in a complex, technologically oriented way of life, success in which requires creative people with a diversity of high level abilities and knowledge. These creative people become available through a high-quality education which hones intellectual skills and develops specific areas of knowledge. To the extent that CSU graduates have acquired such abilities and understanding, we offer quality education which will benefit the people of California.

Among the variables which bear powerfully on the quality of educational processes and achievements we would include the extent to which educators and students conscientiously apply themselves to the pursuit of educational goals. Equally important in the thrust toward academic quality is the adequacy of resources available to educators and students. Our immediate concern here is with the latter factor. The level of funding directly affects the quality of education either positively, by providing the means by which the creative energies of educators and students can find expression, or negatively, by imposing barriers to the achievement of a quality education. Every decrease in the level of support per student constitutes such a barrier and results in a

cumulative reduction in the opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and understandings expected of well-educated citizens.

We recognize, of course, that quality education does not depend solely upon levels of financial support. For example, many nontraditional and affirmative action students come to the university facing other unique barriers which are the consequence of their status in society. Additional support services are needed to ensure that they will have equal opportunity to achieve a quality education. We as faculty are committed to challenging these barriers to quality education, but in the absence of adequate resources and support, such efforts are not likely to succeed.

Californians are concerned, and properly so, with maintaining high quality in their institutions of higher education. Faculty believe it is their responsibility to alert the public when that high quality is threatened. We are convinced that the danger is at hand.

Below, we identify six areas which are relevant to our common concern with quality education in the CSU. To the extent that financial support is lacking for the activities essential to these areas, the quality of the education available to students is thereby diminished.

### **Direct Instructional Activities**

The essence of quality education is in the faculty-student relationship. A key determinant of the effectiveness of this relationship is the student/faculty ratio. Any change in this ratio requires adjustment, either of the average class size or of the faculty workload. Although we cannot state the relationship between student/faculty ratio and academic quality with mathematical confidence, we do find the following arguments highly persuasive. The greater the number of students per full-time faculty member or full-time equivalent faculty position, the lower the average amount of faculty contact time available for each student. This factor is directly related to quality in a number of ways, including less time per student for advising, for individual assistance with coursework, and for providing individualized judgments and comments concerning the quality of his or her work. Guidance, feedback, assistance, and encouragement provided on a one-to-one basis are of utmost importance to quality education, and those academic institutions with enviable records of achievement make extensive use of such individualized instructional methods. We will neglect them in the CSU only at the risk of providing inferior education.

Related matters include the quantity, level, and type of work which faculty members can require of their students. As the number of students in a given class increases, it becomes more difficult to employ and evaluate essay (rather than objective) examinations, to assign and evaluate term papers, and to require and evaluate such applications of learning as fieldwork or laboratory experiences. Although there obviously are practical limits, the more that students are required to do in the way of work pertinent to their classes and courses of study, the better. Merely assigning great quantities of work, however, accomplishes relatively little unless the total body of the student's work is thoroughly evaluated and feedback is provided. The greater the number of students served by each faculty member, the less the opportunity for individualized and timely education.

The *one-on-one* approach to learning necessarily remains an ideal. In the CSU we have attempted to provide such learning experiences on a limited basis through such approaches as independent study, faculty supervised internships, clinical experience, and student teaching. These individualized experiences are essential but expensive components of many programs (e.g., nursing, social work, health science, and teacher preparation) where students need in-service training. Individualized forms of instruction are required for accreditation in a number of fields and appreciably improve job eligibility or are even prerequisites for employment in some areas of study.

Although individual instruction is essential to quality education, its high cost renders it especially vulnerable to instructional budget reductions. Budgetary restrictions mandated by Proposition 13 illustrate this point by threatening the feasibility of providing such educational experiences for our students. Future budget reductions, whatever their genesis, would only magnify present difficulties.

Increasingly, students are coming to college less prepared to persist and succeed in collegiate work. The decline in writing skills is well documented and widely known, and the level of other basic intellectual skills, such as reading and computation, also has declined over the past several

generations of college students. The state recently has recognized the extra educational burden created by these deficiencies and has provided some additional resources, at least in the area of writing proficiency. We have argued that higher education alone cannot deal with these conditions and that educators at all levels must recognize that this is a situation of crisis proportions and respond with programs and efforts to regenerate these abilities among the young. We would expect the few small gains of the recent past and the growing momentum of the search for solutions to these problems to be lost if our instructional resources do not permit continued efforts in the CSU. In the meantime, however, faculty increasingly find it necessary, as part of their regular instructional activity, to work toward improvement of basic skills such as writing, computation, etc., in addition to providing specialized instruction in their discipline. This addition to the already high regular workload occurs without any augmentation in resources and, therefore, at some cost to the regular instructional program.

Unfortunately, present funding of CSU instructional programs does not for the most part provide adequately for substantial differences in *mode and level* of instruction. Various staffing formulas have recognized the different costs of instruction, depending on instructional mode (lecture, laboratory, seminar, independent study, etc.) and level of instruction (lower division, upper division, and graduate). Actual funding and allocation of funds, however, have failed to reflect these variations according to standards long regarded as appropriate. Instruction in the more costly modes and at the more costly graduate level is purchased at the cost of fewer resources available for instruction in the other modes and at the undergraduate level. Where too many large undergraduate lecture classes have to be offered in order to provide seminars for graduate students, the quality of the undergraduate programs may suffer.

Faced with the necessity of eliminating or reducing instructional activities as a consequence of having the responsibility for more students, more courses, or both, conscientious faculty members encounter difficulty deciding which instructional activities can be sacrificed with the least damage to quality. We can conceive of no way to teach more students with fewer faculty which does not have deleterious effects on students.

## Curriculum

The university might be defined and its mission described in terms of that body of information and instruction known as curriculum. The curriculum has recognizable parts—English, history, and mathematics are familiar examples—but the curriculum also must be understood as a unified whole. Three different situations can force reductions in the curriculum: enrollment increases not accompanied by increases in faculty positions; faculty reductions unaccompanied by enrollment reductions; and simultaneous reductions in enrollment and faculty. Curriculum reduction poses a question with respect to quality: Which is less destructive, reducing each of these component parts equally, or cutting entire instructional areas or subjects from the offerings of the university? We submit that each approach negates our thrust toward quality, though in different ways.

On one level, the effects of *across-the-board* program reductions are obvious. The geology graduate who has never had a field experience is less of a geologist; the chemistry graduate who has not had exposure to a sufficient variety of laboratory experiments is less of a chemist; and the philosophy major who has never had a class small enough to engage in philosophical discourse is less of a philosopher. Every major, every subject, has a unique body of knowledge, expected skills, and required experiences. Although each campus faculty determines how these are to be provided, the substance of each degree program has evolved over many years in accordance with standards which are nationally recognized, continually updated, and rigorously applied.

Sometimes these standards are articulated formally by national accrediting associations. More often, these standards are the products of decades of extended deliberations among scholars which result in nationally acknowledged understanding of what a history major, for example, should know and be able to do to qualify for a bachelor's or master's degree. As a consequence, the history major who misses part of the required training and experience not only is less of an historian but actually is disadvantaged should he or she attempt to transfer to another institution, pursue graduate study elsewhere, or compete in the job market. Articulation and employability are even more hampered for those students in programs which may have lost their professional

accreditation because important parts of the curriculum had to be eliminated. Such losses of national professional accreditation not only would be harmful to students but would negate many years of successful efforts to bring CSU programs to levels where such accreditation could be granted—an effort which resulted in the recognition by 1980 of 171 CSU programs.

The curriculum in general would suffer should less faculty time be available for curricular review, updating, development, and improvement. The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business specifies that “the curriculum shall be responsive to social, economic, and technological developments and shall reflect the application of evolving knowledge in economics and the behavioral and quantitative sciences . . . the assembly encourages continuing development and appraisal of both new and existing curricula.” Every discipline, whether or not it is technologically or occupationally oriented, must be responsive to emerging areas of knowledge and research and to new methodologies. Should faculty not have the time to update courses, to develop new courses when they are needed, and otherwise to adapt the curriculum to incorporate expanding knowledge, our students will not graduate with the currency desired by employers, with knowledge comparable to that of their counterparts graduating from other institutions, or with levels of understanding and ability which we ourselves would find acceptable.

The alternative to across-the-board program reductions, namely, the selective discontinuation of certain programs, appears deceptively simple. But if the mission of the institution is expressed through its curriculum, then major changes in the curriculum force changes in that mission. Moreover, what may appear to be distinct areas of instruction in fact do not exist independently. Engineering graduates rely on strong departments of mathematics and physical sciences, not to mention strong general education programs. Future physicians, lawyers, and politicians surely should be conversant with processes of rational evaluation. The complex interrelations among subjects are well expressed by the National Architectural Accrediting Board in its program guidelines: “An institution can provide a context for interdisciplinary endeavor and new approaches to knowledge that are needed in the professions. Academic disciplines, such as art, psychology, physics, mathematics, the earth sciences, language and the liberal arts, make important contributions to architecture.”

The vital contributions which the arts provide to architecture; which the humanities and social sciences give to business administration; which the graduate program brings to the undergraduate—and vice versa—are part of a balance which can be destroyed, perhaps unwittingly. It is not untouchable, but it is delicate. Thus, elimination or substantial reduction of liberal arts and sciences programs which are necessary to professional and vocational programs will change the curricular balance and seriously deprive our students of quality education.

## **Instructional Support**

In addition to its direct instructional services to students, an institution of higher education also must be able to maintain and provide a number of ongoing services which, although not directly instructional in nature, are necessary to support the process and quality of instruction. These include the library, instructional supplies and services, and support staff. The consequences for academic programs and the additional barriers that would be created for students as a result of reductions in each of these areas are addressed in the balance of this section.

The 19 CSU campus libraries develop their collections to support existing and planned degree programs. The libraries are not intended to be research libraries in the formal sense, but rather are guided by a common commitment to developing collections of books, periodicals, and other materials that complement and support the learning experience of students. As with many other CSU programs, however, our libraries' resources are generated according to established formulas that have been subject to numerous downward revisions during the past decade. Fewer publications are purchased today than ten years ago in spite of geometric growth in the rates at which new knowledge is published. Cost-saving methods such as microfiche storage, automated circulation control, and cooperative collection development have been tested and implemented, but their main effect has been to slow down the rate of growth in library costs, not to increase student and faculty access to needed materials. Libraries also have helped to provide learning assistance materials for students needing skills remediation and/or specific course assistance, but increased funding for such added functions generally has not been made available.



CSU libraries already, then, are operating under the constraints of prior reduction in support and of inflation. If their support base were to be reduced further, at least the following could be expected:

- (1) Reduced hours of operation and reduced access for students, particularly for students who are employed;
- (2) Even fewer books and periodicals in support of the instructional program;
- (3) An increasingly obsolete collection of library materials because fewer current and up-to-date publications would be acquired; and
- (4) Reduction of some learning assistance services to students.

It is our hope that these reductions will not be necessary or mandated.

Instructional supplies and services funds are used to cover such expenses as chemicals and supplies for laboratories, materials for engineering and performing arts courses, and repair and maintenance of instructional equipment. The CSU supplies and services budget was reduced by 50 percent (over \$2,600,000) in 1979-80 to meet the requirements of mandated budget reductions after Proposition 13. This resulted in curtailment of laboratory exercises for students, cancellation of courses for which instructional materials could not be purchased, and nonuse of some equipment for which there were no funds for repair or maintenance. Although the CSU once was hopeful that some of these reductions could be restored, it now has become concerned about being able to hold on even to these reduced funds. With further reductions in supplies and services funds, the following could be expected:

- (1) Academic programs such as those in engineering, the performing arts, and the sciences would be reduced to a point where the continued viability of some curricula could be in question;
- (2) Students would face decreased opportunities for laboratory experiences and/or increased costs for materials used in laboratory courses; and
- (3) Instructional equipment, already purchased and paid for, would be rendered increasingly useless by a lack of regular maintenance and repair.

For every academic program, there are support staff who serve to extend the capacity of the faculty to instruct and serve students. These staff positions provide typing and duplicating support to faculty, assist students in understanding and dealing with institutional and departmental policies and procedures, maintain storerooms and laboratories, and assist in media and materials development for courses and activities. The present formula for generating these support positions is .22 clerical/ technical positions for each 1.0 full-time equivalent faculty position. Despite the fact that the formula has been reviewed several times and found to be inadequate for contemporary CSU instructional programs, there has been no recognition of the need for improvement in this formula. Persistence of this unsatisfactory level of support will have the following undesirable circumstances:

- (1) Inadequate assistance for students who need to learn about institutional procedures and resources;
- (2) Fewer activity and performance courses because of lack of necessary technical support personnel;
- (3) Decreased use of mediated instructional materials;
- (4) Accelerated deterioration of supplies and equipment due to lack of routine maintenance and upkeep;
- (5) Loss of control over equipment and supplies inventories; and
- (6) Increased proportions of faculty work time devoted to clerical tasks such as typing examinations, professional correspondence, etc. Faculty time used for such purposes is lost to students and to professional growth.

We assert that barriers of the type noted above limit the opportunities available for students and lower the quality of the education available to them.

## Instructional Maintenance and Improvement

Private industry long has realized that an investment in leadership and staff training for key personnel is necessary to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and profitability. We maintain that in higher education, a similar investment in the faculty means no less for the continuance of academic quality.

Professional and instructional development are the two principal means by which maintenance and improvement of quality take place in higher education. Professional development focuses on the continual growth of faculty knowledge and skills in academic and professional disciplines, expressed in activities such as research, writing, publishing, and active participation in professional organizations. Instructional development centers on the improvement of teaching through the acquisition of new and effective instructional techniques and technologies and the process of curricular redesign. Without continuous advancement in both professional and instructional development, faculty expertise, curricula, and the learning process become outdated and less effective.

The widely recognized congruence between professional development activities and effective teaching is well stated by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges:

Scholarship and instruction are mutually interdependent and mutually supportive activities which are integral to the mission of any educational institution. Research can support instruction by adding to the fund of knowledge or by seeking new applications of knowledge.

This close relationship is recognized in the CSU, where the primary mission is teaching but where there also is explicit incorporation of scholarship and research in the criteria used for judging faculty excellence. Professional development is essential for maintaining and improving the quality of knowledge and skills of faculty, a principle which has been traditionally and unequivocally recognized in higher education.

Although the maintenance and expansion of knowledge and skills rest primarily with the individual faculty member, keeping abreast of new discoveries and current thought in an academic or professional discipline and/or making positive contributions through scholarly research are not simply matters of individual effort and will. The opportunities and assistance provided to faculty in support of the variety of professional development activities have been, and will remain, crucial as long as the faculty remain the essential resource of institutions of higher education. Many of these activities depend directly on budgetary support and, to the extent such support is reduced or eliminated, the quality of faculty expertise will suffer, with the ultimate result that students will be deprived of quality education.

A necessary and critical opportunity for professional development is the leave of absence. *The Statement of Principles on Leaves of Absence* adopted in 1972 by the American Association of University Professors provides perhaps the best statement in this regard:

Leaves of absence are among the most important means by which a faculty member's teaching effectiveness may be enhanced, his scholarly usefulness enlarged, and an institution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of leaves is therefore of vital importance to a college or university... [emphasis added]

As with leaves of absence, travel to professional meetings and conferences is of critical importance in professional development. Peer review of research activity, the establishment and maintenance of professional contacts, knowledge of new developments in a discipline or profession, as well as professional and individual renewal are among the direct benefits derived from this activity. Such benefits are directly relevant to instruction. In addition, publications and participation in professional meetings and conferences result in professional recognition and respect accruing to individual faculty, their institutions and, ultimately, to their students. As we shall note later, support for professional travel and the availability of leaves of absence have become important factors in both the recruitment and the retention of a quality faculty.

Another important aspect bearing on academic quality is instructional development, which in recent years has received increased attention and emphasis. Such recognition is a consequence of

the need for new and varied teaching techniques and strategies which permit faculty in the CSU to deal more effectively with changing student populations and the differential learning abilities and capacities characteristic of such diverse students.

In 1972, the CSU responded to these needs by establishing the Fund for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process (later the Fund for Innovation and Improvement in Education). Given added impetus by the Center for Professional Development, a program federally funded between 1974 and 1977, the Fund for Innovation and Improvement in Education was instrumental in supporting faculty efforts in a wide variety of new instructional projects. Projects have dealt with self-paced learning and modularization, new uses of media, including television and audio and video cassettes, instructional applications of the computer, peer instruction, contract learning, open laboratories, *mini courses*, field work and internships, and interdisciplinary *block* courses. More recently, increased attention has been given to the special needs of disadvantaged and underrepresented students.

The effectiveness of faculty efforts in the areas of instructional development and professional development is heavily dependent upon state support, because neither is cost free. The benefits which are derived from institutional support of these efforts are essential to the maintenance of academic quality.

### **The Quality of Faculty**

The excellence of faculty available to students is the major factor in determining the quality of any instructional program in higher education. Therefore, the most careful attention must be given to the processes by which new faculty are brought into our system. To be effective, these processes require adequate funding, because hiring faculty for permanent positions involves a substantial commitment of resources by the institution. Any failure or error in recruitment because of inadequate funding constitutes a disastrous false economy. Funds are needed for representatives of the departments or the campus to travel for purposes of initially screening candidates. Further, it is essential that a reasonable number of candidates be brought to the campus for interviews, lectures, and participation in seminars and colloquia so that we can assess thoroughly and accurately their qualifications, abilities, and potential. Recruitment of quality faculty for the CSU is severely handicapped by grossly inadequate funding for this purpose.

When the relationship between funding levels and academic quality is considered in connection with recruitment and retention of an excellent faculty, one of the most obvious considerations is salary, including fringe benefits. It is difficult for the CSU to compete effectively in some disciplines, where there is a growing demand and our salary levels are not competitive. Even worse, in many academic programs, we must compete with the attractive salaries and benefits offered by nonacademic organizations.

Salary, however, is by no means the only, or necessarily the dominant consideration on the part of prospective faculty members as they make career decisions. Factors which increase the overall quality of the institution also make a campus more attractive to prospective faculty. Teaching load, library resources, and research facilities and support are among the dominant considerations affecting these career decisions. High student/faculty ratios, inadequate support for libraries or research facilities, or the absence of commitment to support research activity and/or professional development will have a negative effect on the recruitment of quality faculty.

What is true for the recruitment of quality faculty is also true for the retention of excellent scholars and teachers. Time after time we have watched outstanding faculty leave the CSU for institutions where there is a greater commitment to provide support for the pursuit of instructional and intellectual excellence.

It has been suggested by some that the elimination of academic tenure should be considered as a means of dealing with budgetary constraints and with other problems as well. We do not believe that this report should be the vehicle for a detailed justification of the institution of tenure in the modern academy. Suffice it to say the tenure is indispensable to academic freedom and that, in the absence of academic freedom, students are denied the opportunity to engage in the full and free interplay of ideas, to encounter challenges to established modes of thought, and to participate in the progress toward orderly and necessary change.

We are aware that tenure and academic freedom are not well understood or appreciated in many quarters. Elimination or curtailment of either, for budgetary or political reasons, will seriously hamper our students in the pursuit of knowledge and training our society demands. Any institution of higher learning which fails to honor its commitment to academic tenure will not be able to recruit or retain faculty of the same quality as those institutions which continue to honor such commitments.

For many years, part-time faculty have provided a valuable service to instructional programs in the CSU, providing classes taught by experts in various areas of specialization which would otherwise not be available to students. Also, the practice of staffing a modest number of classes with part-time faculty each term makes it possible to respond with great flexibility should there be unexpected changes in levels and areas of student needs. A surge in student demand in a given program can initially be accommodated by hiring additional part-time faculty, and declining enrollments will not provoke institutional dislocation if it is possible to release part-time faculty who are hired with the full understanding that employment is contingent upon enrollment.

In the recent past, management decisions have been made concerning the availability and utilization of part-time or temporary faculty to generate salary savings in response to budget reductions mandated by Proposition 13. These decisions have had little to do with program needs for particular expertise or with accommodating enrollment fluctuations. Positions filled by part-time or temporary faculty instead turn almost of necessity into budget *safety valves*. Such measures as reducing the number of part-time faculty, lowering entry level salaries, and reducing or withholding merit salary adjustments are neither responsive to curricular needs nor are they conducive to attracting and retaining the most able part-time faculty. As a result, highly competent and valued part-time faculty have been lost (replaced in essential courses by third or fourth choices), problems of morale have developed among temporary faculty, and increased faculty and administrative time has been spent in the recruitment of part-time faculty and in salary negotiation. We have no doubt that the end result of these conditions is a lowering of quality in our instructional programs.

### **Instructional Breadth**

The quality of education in the CSU is related not only to the opportunities within the regular curriculum (in terms of both general education and specialized areas of knowledge and skills) but also to the availability of other programs. Opportunities for participation in activities such as Honors Programs or International Programs and at specialized facilities such as Moss Landing Marine Laboratories or the Desert Studies Center supplement the regular curriculum by providing a breadth of experience and an enriched, more valuable, and complete education for our students. The worth of such experiences is reflected in the participants' increased ability to make significant contributions to the larger society, through a probable commitment to active community involvement and the likelihood that career effectiveness and success will have socially positive consequences. To the extent that financial support for these kinds of activity is lowered, barriers are established which limit the opportunity for students to maximize the benefits of their higher education experience.

An Honors Program, with the goal of expanding scholarly and intellectual opportunities, depends on intensive, individualized instruction. Such a program, emphasizing creativity, independent thought, commitment to scholarship, and dedication to the pursuit of excellence, depends heavily on the expertise, judgment, and efforts of our faculty as well as on the ability of our students. To the extent that faculty participation in an honors program is precluded or diminished as a consequence of decreased funding, the quality of education is lessened.

The International Programs provide students with the opportunity to study at distinguished foreign universities or in special programs abroad. By studying abroad, our students gain first-hand knowledge and understanding of other countries and cultures, which is especially valuable for those planning careers in such areas as teaching or government. In addition, increased knowledge and understanding of California and the United States is provided by our students for their hosts. Such benefits are significant particularly in light of the costs to the state of California for, as noted in the *International Programs Bulletin, 1978-79*, "The International Programs is supported by state

funds to the same extent that such funds would have been expended had the student enrolled overseas continued to study at his home campus in California." Almost without exception, such students would enroll at their home campuses if the International Programs were not available.

Additional components of the CSU which add to instructional breadth in unique and valuable ways include such specialized facilities as the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories and the Desert Studies Center. The quality of educational opportunities available at such sites, as well as the maintenance of the sites themselves, depend to a large extent on levels of funding.

Moss Landing Marine Laboratories was created to meet an increasing demand for marine scientists due to the critical reliance of California on its 1,000-mile coastline. This reliance encompasses a wide variety of industrial and commercial activities. In addition, the ocean constitutes a vast frontier which contains likely solutions to the growing needs for new sources of food and raw materials.

The Desert Studies Center at Soda Springs was established to provide educational programs which would prepare students to play important roles in exploring the potential of desert regions and to provide solutions to a number of problems, including the provision of alternate sources of energy for large population centers such as Southern California. Also of vital concern is the human impact on these natural desert environments. Thus both the development of management programs and the education of the general public must receive increasing attention.

Any decrease in funding for specialized facilities such as these would have adverse effects on their ability to provide the quality of education necessary to accomplish their vital objectives.

### **Concluding Remarks**

We have offered a view of what we, as faculty, believe constitutes educational quality and, more specifically, of how quality so defined is fundamentally related to levels of financial support. We affirm that quality in higher education is of absolutely vital importance and is presently at risk. If education in the CSU is to realize its goals and if the people and the state of California are to benefit and prosper as a result of the efforts and accomplishments of CSU graduates, the quality of their education must be addressed directly.

We have noted, and we re-emphasize here, that although adequate financial support is not the sole determinant of educational quality, quality cannot be attained in the absence of reasonable levels of funding.

(This document was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in November 1980.)

# Support for "Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity" A Report Prepared for the California State University by the Panel of Experts on Campus Climate

**WHEREAS,**In response to rising concerns on college campuses about incidents of hostility based on such characteristics as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or sexual orientation, the Chancellor of the California State University established a panel of experts to review campus climate; and

**WHEREAS,**The Academic Senate CSU deplors incidents of hostility based on such characteristics as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or sexual orientation, and believes these to be inimical to the academic mission of the CSU and deleterious to the academic environment on campuses; and

**WHEREAS,**The Panel of Experts on Campus Climate has prepared a report for the California State University entitled "Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity" which while maintaining full respect and appreciation for freedoms of speech and thought on campuses, recommends principles and programs designed to foster hospitable and equitable learning environments for all persons and to condemn and discourage intolerance; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the spirit and recommendations of the report entitled "Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity;" and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, the Chancellor and the Presidents to endorse the recommendations contained in the report entitled "Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity;" and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate CSU, the Board of Trustees to consider especially the adoption and issuance of a CSU statement of policy similar to that proposed in recommendation 1, "Principles of Campus Community Statement," and development of policies to respond to bias-related incidents as suggested in recommendations 3, 3a, 3b, and 3c.

(This resolution, 1975, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1991.)

## Attachment To: AS-1975-90/FA : Cover Memo for "Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity" Report

State of California  
Trustees of The California State University  
Memorandum

To: Dr. Sandra G. Wilcox, Chair Academic Senate

Date: November 8, 1990

From: Ellis McCune, Acting Chancellor

cc: Dr. Lee R. Kerschner  
Dr. Charles W. Lindahl  
Ms. Lori J. Erdman

Subject: Report of the Panel of Experts - Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity

Increasing reports of bias-related behavior directed toward some students or groups of students on college campuses across the county prompted the CSU to convene a panel of experts to review campus climate, focusing on such issues as racism, homophobia, and religious intolerance. The panel also was charged to assess the adequacy of existing system policy and make recommendations regarding actions the CSU should take.

I am conveying the report of the panel for your review and comment [see page 259]. The report should be considered a completed document. Your suggestions, therefore, should focus on what information, ideas or recommendations contained in the panel report should go to the Board of Trustees.

It is our intent to present the panel report to the Board of Trustees at its May 1991 meeting and we will need your comments by February 1, 1991. If you have any questions regarding this request or the report please contact Ms. Lori J. Erdman at (213) 590-5480.

The California State University is committed to maintaining an educational environment that encourages full and equal participation by all members of the campus community. We look forward to your assistance in helping us maintain this climate.

EEMcC:lje:00211

Attachment

## **Panel of Experts Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity**

Dr. Keith Boyum

Professor of Political Science  
Human Relations Task Force  
CSU Fullerton

Dr. Carol Burr

Chair, English Department  
Co-Chair, Womens Council of the California State University  
CSU Chico

Mr. Frederick S. Edmondson

Assistant Vice President for  
Educational Services  
CSU Stanislaus  
Consultant with National Training Laboratory  
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Martha A. Galaif

Administrative Director of Obstetrics & Gynecology  
Cedars Sinai Medical Center  
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Robert Genty

Associate Dean of Students  
UC Irvine  
City Council Member and Former Mayor  
Laguna Beach, California

Joshua (Joe) Golden, M.D.

Clinical Professor of Psychiatry  
UC Los Angeles

Mr. Eric Mendia

Student  
Human Relations Task Force  
CSU Fullerton

Dr. Eugene Mornell  
Executive Director  
Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations

Ms. Rose Ochi, Esq.  
Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Planning  
Office of the Mayor  
City of Los Angeles  
Member, Attorney General's Asian and Pacific Islander Advisory Committee

Ms. Esther M. Rodriguez, Esq.  
Associate Project Director  
Minority Student Achievement Project  
State Higher Education Executive Directors  
Denver, Colorado

Mr. David Tatel, Esq.  
Attorney at Law  
Hogan & Hartson  
Washington, D.C.  
Director, Office of Civil Rights  
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1977-79)

*Office of the Chancellor  
The California State University*

Dr. Lee R. Kerschner  
Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs  
Chair

Ms. Lori J. Erdman  
Academic Affairs, Educational Support  
Staff to the Panel

### Executive Summary

There is increasing recognition that quality in a university education is heavily dependent on the formal and informal environment of the campus. Campus environment or climate encompasses the policies, programs, practices, attitudes, and behaviors of every individual who lives, works, and learns on the campus. There is growing interest in the extent to which campus climate contributes to a positive, pluralistic learning environment for every member of the community.

A number of factors converged to prompt the leadership of the California State University to review the climate on its campuses: the increasing amount of attention intergroup conflict was getting from the media, concerns expressed by groups within the CSU, and the passage of two measures by the California Legislature. In January 1990, Chancellor W Ann Reynolds, with the concurrence of the Executive Council, convened a panel of experts to review and make recommendations regarding climate within the CSU. The panel was drawn from around the country, both within and beyond education. Panel members, including CSU faculty students, and administrators, were selected on the basis of their expertise in addressing various aspects of intergroup conflict on college campuses and in the broader community.

The panel has completed its work and sent its report to the chancellor. The report includes the following recommendations:

- Adoption by the Board of Trustees of a "Principles of Campus Community Statement" articulating the expected behavior of all members of the CSU community;
- Enhancement of educational programs which further pluralistic values and goals;



- Development of measures designed to prevent bias-related incidents;
- Clear articulation of acceptable behavior by the campus leadership in response to particular incidents;
- Development of procedures for managing disputes, handling conflicts, and seeking redress which should be clearly enunciated, widely disseminated, and readily accessible throughout the campus;
- Regular collection of data on the number and type of intergroup conflicts;
- Conduct in-depth self-studies of the campus climate every three years and
- Establish a standing committee to advise the chancellor on the status of campus climate.

## Campus Climate: Toward Appreciating Diversity (Report)

### Introduction

California is the second most ethnically and culturally diverse state in the nation. This has changed the nature of postsecondary education and brings with it both advantages and challenges, particularly at the California State University

There have been reports of growing levels of insensitivity and even open hostility toward people of color members of the gay community or anyone who is "different." College campuses have not been immune to this problem. Charles Farrell, writing in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, has characterized intolerance on college campuses as the "new racism." Deeply rooted societal and individual prejudices persist. Any lack of understanding and respect is particularly disturbing because it is in direct conflict with the spirit, mission, and conduct expected of universities.

Thoughtful leaders throughout the United States, including many university leaders, are struggling with the problem of intolerance and the harm it brings. But the problem is not simple, for attempts to sanction such unacceptable behavior can produce unacceptable impacts on speech freedoms (and in the university context, academic freedoms).

The California State University (CSU) was one of the first to conduct a comprehensive review of the situation on its campuses and should be commended for taking positive and active steps. The chancellor of the CSU asked staff to collect and analyze available information on bias-related incidents for the CSU. After collecting and reviewing this information the chancellor, in consultation with the campus presidents, decided the issues were of such complexity and seriousness that the topic was deserving of attention from a panel of experts.

This panel convened in January 1990. It is composed of both educators and non-educators who have distinguished themselves in dealing with various aspects of intergroup conflict on college campuses and in the broader community. The panel was asked to review existing CSU system policy and programs and to recommend practical guidelines and strategies for addressing bias-related behavior and speech. Some of the materials reviewed in the course of conducting the analysis included:

- Summary of principal federal and state laws relating to discrimination applicable to the California State University;
- Applicable CSU Trustee policy and Executive Orders;
- Discipline or fighting words policies from the University of Wisconsin (1989), University of Michigan (1988), and University of California (1989);
- Report on "Intergroup Conflict in Los Angeles County Schools" from the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (1989);
- Responses from CSU campuses to the surveys conducted to identify the number and type of incidents, grievance procedures, and educational programs;
- A State Higher Education Executive Officers Minority Student Achievement Project Policy Report (1989); and
- Pertinent essays and articles written in topical journals and newspapers.

The panel has identified three broad areas where the CSU should take action:

- Issue a strong moral statement that clearly and forcefully articulates the university's standards for appropriate behavior;
- Implement broad-based educational efforts, including orientation and training programs, appropriate coverage in the curriculum, and cultural programs to develop a campus community where the well being of each individual is supported and diversity is cherished;
- Assure a process to intervene, respond, and manage incidents.

The panel makes the following recommendations to advance CSU pursuit of a positive, pluralistic learning environment.

## Principles of Campus Community Statement

1. *The Board of Trustees should issue a strong moral statement articulating unequivocally that the CSU is committed to creating and maintaining a campus environment free of behavior, policies, or practices that denigrate individuals on the basis of any personal characteristics.*

The following statement of policy is proposed for issuance by the Trustees of the California State University.

The California State University reflects California's rich cultural diversity. The varied backgrounds of students, faculty, and staff enrich the university's intellectual life and create its unique community.

While the university views diversity as a great source of its strength, some people on campus, as elsewhere in society, feel threatened by those who are different and act in disregard of the personal dignity and rights of others. Discrimination and harassment have no place in a university community. They damage the educational aspirations of students, interfere with the performance of faculty and staff, and destroy the environment of tolerance and mutual regard that must prevail for a university to fulfill its mission.

The university is therefore committed to maintaining an environment free from discrimination and harassment. To fulfill this commitment, the university will work to prevent discrimination from occurring and will ensure that federal and state laws as well as university regulations are fully enforced.

Demeaning and gratuitously offensive conduct sometimes takes expressive forms that, although repugnant, cannot be prohibited or punished. Both the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and Article 1, Section 2 of the California Constitution limit the university's power to punish free speech. To do so, even in the case of speech that is offensive and demeaning, would undermine basic principles of free discourse fundamental to any university.

As an educational institution, the university will use its intellectual and persuasive powers to discourage offensive and harassing speech from occurring and to encourage civil exchange. The university will attempt to teach its students and employees to listen as well as to speak, and to do both with an open mind. This is consistent with the university's mission to foster dialogue that educates students and prepares them for citizenship. That mission requires respect for differing viewpoints, but not license for demeaning language and harassing behavior that stifle free exchange of ideas and compromise the university's educational goals.

Respect throughout the university for the dignity and rights of others, including the right to be free from discrimination and harassment and the right to speak freely, is essential to creating and maintaining an environment conducive to learning.

This statement should be highly publicized, included in the chancellor's public remarks, and used as a focal point for the campuses in carrying out the remaining recommendations. Administrative, faculty, and student leaders would be expected to draw heavily on this statement in leading campus efforts to effectively address these issues. It is critical that administrators, faculty, staff, and students all join in a vocal and strong institutional commitment to diversity.

Statements of expected behavior provide only the first step in educating and preparing people for living in a pluralistic society. The causes of intolerant behavior must be addressed through broadly based educational efforts. The university must be willing to dedicate resources and programs to efforts which will assist in changing inappropriate individual behavior and foster understanding and respect.

## Campus Programs

2. *Each campus should enhance educational programs which have as their goal increasing the knowledge, sensitivity, and awareness of all members of the campus community regarding cultures and peoples different from themselves.*

We are pleased that the incorporation of material from minority women, gay and lesbian individuals into the curriculum has been a continuing pursuit of faculty in the California State University. Continuing oversight of the curriculum with an eye toward the inclusion of pluralistic values should be the subject of vigorous conversations among faculty and between faculty and campus leadership. Campus and system leaders can begin such conversations, can encourage them through incentives such as assignments of time where appropriate, and can certainly applaud and endorse the curricular revision that may result. We believe an important goal of any revision would reflect an educational, rather than an indoctrinational, emphasis. As increasing numbers of faculty and staff begin to alter the material they use while working with students, it is expected that those

changes will influence their colleagues.

Orientation programs for students and staff should be used to advance pluralistic education and sensitivity programs for all members of the campus community. These programs are regularly conducted for individuals who are new to the campus, such as freshmen and new staff. Orientation provides an early opportunity for the institution to set forth its expectations, as well as provide sensitivity training and increase awareness within the university setting. Such programs can communicate to the participants that diversity and respect for individual difference are highly valued by the institution.

Professional development and training programs for faculty, administrators, and staff can be conducted to increase awareness and knowledge of differences. These programs would have several goals, including: providing methods for improving cross-cultural communication and recognition of differences in learning and teaching styles; increased awareness and knowledge about social, cultural, and lifestyle differences; and the ability to respond appropriately and resolve disputes and conflicts which may arise between students or co-workers. These are complex goals for professional development, and it is critical that programs be of high quality. Positive, explicit recognition and appreciation for individual behavior which seeks to improve the campus climate and foster mutual respect can be an important element in effecting individual change.

Research and other scholarly activity by faculty that address campus climate issues should be encouraged. Other incentives which would encourage and give recognition to faculty making positive contributions in this area should also be developed.

Most campuses parade multicultural and lifestyle enrichment programs throughout the year, which usually include using a thematic approach to programming for specified periods during the academic year such as Black History Month, Cinco de Mayo, and Gay and Lesbian Awareness week. These programs provide a useful way to celebrate heritage or lifestyle, but should not be done to reinforce segregation of individuals on campus. The most beneficial approach is one which seeks to educate other members of the campus regarding difference and how best to interact with others. This broad programming approach to educating the campus about diversity is also combined with smaller workshops, lectures, and other programs dedicated to cultivation of respect and understanding. We encourage the campuses to continue in these efforts, promote and encourage participation in these activities from all members of the campus community, and share information about innovative and effective programs among the campuses.

The campuses are also encouraged to review their own policies regarding such matters as residence hall room assignments, racial and ethnic theme houses, fraternities and sororities, etc., and how those activities might contribute to self-segregation and racial isolation.

Although the panel was not asked to evaluate affirmative action efforts for faculty, staff, and administrators, we feel compelled to mention the importance of such programs. The success of such efforts for students, faculty, staff, and administrators to improve participation in all aspects of the university is an essential component in effectively addressing campus climate.

We understand that eight of the CSU campuses have created special commissions or task forces to specifically address human relations and campus climate issues. These committees generally have been charged by the campus president to examine the state of human relations on the campus, to identify problems that need to be solved, to design programs to increase sensitivity of students, faculty, and staff, and to develop a systematic approach to reporting incidents and achieving appropriate resolution. During the past year several campuses have used these committees or a similarly constituted group to hold open forums in response to specific incidents and to develop responses to the problems identified. These approaches should be considered for adoption on all CSU campuses.

## Disciplinary Policies

We have reviewed applicable federal and state law, existing CSU Trustee policies, and executive orders regarding discrimination, disciplinary procedures, and grievance procedures. We have also reviewed summary reports of bias-related incidents which occurred on CSU campuses during the past year and a half. The CSU campuses appear to be earnestly engaging the issue and seeking for the appropriate balance between the interest of free speech and applying sanctions for egregious behavior.

Therefore, unlike other universities across the country which have felt the need to issue specific policy regarding "fighting words" or behavior intended to inflict emotional injury, we believe existing CSU policies and regulation appear adequate to deal with any egregious incidents which may occur. Instead, the focus of the CSU should be on educational programs and prevention. We have confidence that the campuses can deal with any problem consistent with the U.S. and California Constitutions.

From time to time a review body such as this panel should evaluate whether any further policy guidance is necessary and make appropriate recommendations.

While there is no need to develop new or additional policy in this area, there is a need to ensure each campus has appropriate procedures in place for responding to bias-related incidents.

### Response to Bias-Related incidents

3. *Each campus should develop procedures to prevent intergroup, bias-related conflicts from occurring, and develop intervention and conflict resolution procedures to address conflicts when they do arise.*

Campuses which have developed prevention procedures to handle situations as they occur are the best prepared to ensure a situation does not escalate into a campuswide problem. This is the critical first step in a comprehensive approach to managing incidents.

- 3a. *Each campus should develop procedures designed to prevent bias-related incidents from occurring.*

Such procedures are more likely to be effective if developed through a consultative process involving all members of the campus community. At a minimum those most likely to use the proposed policy and those who will be expected to make it work should be involved in its development. We encourage the campuses to give any interested individual or organization the opportunity to respond to proposals before they are implemented. It is the belief of the panel that the focus of such procedures should be on intention, not discipline, and have a goal of expeditious resolution and appropriate educational emphasis.

When the campus administration becomes aware of a bias-related incident, it is critical that an appropriate process to respond be in place. Experience indicates that one of the first responses to an incident should be made by the campus president.

- 3b. *When an incident occurs, the campus president should promptly issue a statement condemning intolerance in general terms, and to the extent appropriate, as facts may be sufficiently clear, condemning particular incidents. This should be done while at the same time reiterating university and campus policy pertaining to nondiscrimination and harassment.*

Each president can use the strong, moral statement adopted by trustees to articulate a strong stance against harassing behavior and continue to challenge intolerance openly and publicly at every opportunity. "The message needs to go out loud and clear that in each of our institutions we are trying to develop a campus environment in which students from every racial and ethnic background are valued for their unique perspectives and can flourish intellectually and emotionally culturally and socially. We also need to emphasize that to develop this kind of environment, all components of the campus community—students as well as faculty custodians as well as deans, and vice-presidents as well as secretaries, townspeople and members of the board—share responsibility and a collective dedication."\* The elimination of bias-related behavior should be one of the president's highest priorities, and that commitment should be communicated to every person associated with the campus.

While not choosing sides in particular disputes, the facts of which may be unclear, it is imperative that the campus leadership, especially the president, speak boldly in general forthright opposition to behavior that harasses individuals. This should be done regardless of whether any specific offended individual has come forward to complain. Once a president becomes aware of an incident, he or she is responsible for reinforcing principles of nondiscrimination. It is important to recognize that the institution has rights to free speech and institutional leaders should never hesitate to express disapproval of intolerant behaviors, or for that matter, of intolerant speech.

- 3c. *Procedures for responding to bias-related incidents should be clearly enunciated and widely disseminated throughout the campus community and be readily accessible.*

Perhaps no other aspect will as clearly signal to the campus community that the institution is genuinely committed to maintaining a positive learning environment as the adoption and promulgation of unambiguous, widely disseminated, easily understood, readily accessible and expeditious procedures for dealing with incidents of harassment. We were pleased to learn that formal grievance or complaint procedures exist on every campus; they should be invoked promptly when the situation dictates. Every effort should be made to ensure both students and campus personnel are aware of these procedures and how to access them.

Campuses also have at their disposal many additional options for managing disputes and resolving conflicts. These actions include the availability of staff to listen to complaints, counsel the individual on options available to remedy the problems and assist if possible in that

---

\* "Hughes, Eugene M., "A Design for Diversity: Proactive Planning to Reduce Ethnic Tensions and Enhance Human Resources," in *The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus*, ed. Robert Hively, (Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1990), pp. 59-66.

resolution. Conflict resolution at the informal level should be highly valued and supported. Several campuses have developed generic complaint procedures, not directly related to the disciplinary process or to academic complaints. Appropriate individuals should be identified to be responsible for managing incidents and ensuring all necessary actions are taken. We encourage all campuses to consider implementing similar procedures.

### Incident Reporting

4. *The chancellor, in consultation with the campus presidents, should identify common definitions and coordinate data collection procedures to periodically monitor both the number and type of intergroup, bias-related conflicts occurring on campus.*

The regular and continuing collection of data on incidents will serve several purposes. Most important, the data will allow individual campuses and the system to monitor incidents, both the type and number and will permit identification of possible patterns of behavior by members of the campus community. This information can then be utilized as the campus considers appropriate prevention and intervention procedures. Data collected will also give some evidence about the effectiveness of educational programs designed to improve the campus climate and reduce bias-related incidents. These data can be made available to interested parties on the campus who may be engaged in research related to campus climate, or in preparation of the campus self-study.

A concern of the panel was the failure of victims, particularly students, to report incidents. Campuses should not depend solely on students or other victims to report incidents. In the best of all possible worlds, personnel who become aware of incidents should pass this information along to a central authority. It is preferable for campuses to designate one person who would be responsible for coordinating and collecting information and reports from various individuals around the campus who receive complaints, whether formal or informal.

### Continuing Review and Evaluation

The campus environment needs to be carefully and continually scrutinized. The university community can contribute to a positive, pluralistic learning experience, or it can be a source of tension and polarization. Campus and system officials must maintain a regular process of institutional self-examination and rectification that involves all segments of the campus community.

5. *Each campus should conduct an in-depth self-study of campus climate at least every three years.*

This recommendation is similar in concept to the self-studies conducted every five years as a part of the accreditation process. Regular, systematic, and in-depth reviews for members of the campus community to focus on a particular program, in this case, issue.

6. *The chancellor should maintain the panel of experts as a standing committee to advise on the status of campus climate, bias-related incidents and educational programs and to advance recommendations for improving campus climate throughout the system.*

This committee should be composed similarly to the one which issued this report. Committee members should be individuals with expertise in various aspects of campus climate matters and appropriate response to bias-related incidents in a broader context. The panel should be composed of both educators, from within and beyond the California State University, and non-educators. Some continuity of membership would be of benefit to the continued functioning of the committee.

Universities have a deep obligation to be tolerant of diversity among people and among ideas. Universities must be more understanding than society in general, for appreciation of diversity in nature, in human culture, and certainly in ideas, is fundamental to higher learning. Appreciation for diversity stands at the heart of the university's mission. "Academic institutions have never been just beautiful buildings. They have always open complex human organizations brought to life by the attitudes and beliefs of each member of the campus family."

Mindful of its high calling to promote diversity in thought, and to assure all students an appropriate learning environment, the panel challenges the California State University's students, faculty and administrators to promote a hospitable and equitable learning environment for all persons and to condemn and discourage all forms of intolerance.

(Approved January 1991, as part of AS-1975-90-FA)

---

\* Ceddia, Anthony F., "Spirit of a Campus," in *The Lurking Evil: Racial and Ethnic Conflict on the College Campus*, ed. Robert Hively, (Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1990), pp 11-15

# Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older, Part-Time Students

**WHEREAS,**The Report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, "The Master Plan Renewed" (July 1987), recommended the California State University have primary responsibility for meeting the needs of older part-time students; and

**WHEREAS,**The CSU Commission on the Older Part-Time Student was established in Spring 1988 to study this recommendation and to advise the Chancellor concerning its implementation; and

**WHEREAS,**The CSU Commission recommended specific long-range policies and procedures, as well as system goals and a strategic plan for achieving these goals, pertaining to improved access to the programs, services, and resources of the CSU for older part-time students, on and off campus; and

**WHEREAS,**Acting Chancellor Ellis McCune has stated (Memorandum to Presidents, September 24, 1990) that the recommendations of the Commission on the Older Part-Time Student "will help to inform the planning of policies and practices at both campus and systemwide levels as opportunity and resources permit;" and

**WHEREAS,**It is important to have policies in place for implementation when the CSU budget improves; and

**WHEREAS,**CSU campuses have long been implementing various Commission recommendations and should be encouraged to continue doing so; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the recommendations of the CSU Commission on the Older Part-Time Student in its March 1990 "Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older Part-Time Students"; and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate CSU go the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to endorse the recommendations contained in the Report entitled "Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older Part-Time Students," and to endorse their implementation as funds become available; and be it further

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate CSU urge that the campuses act to implement wherever possible the recommendations of the CSU Commission.

(This resolution, 1991, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1991.)

## Recommendations of the CSU Commission on the Older, Part-Time Student, "Policies and Practices to Meet the Needs of Older, Part-Time Students"

1. Modify the CSU Mission Statement so that it indicates a commitment to meeting the specific needs of this segment of the student population;
2. Document the characteristics and needs of potential older part-time learners throughout the state;
3. Enroll an older part-time student body that reflects the ethnic characteristics of the state;
4. Provide the programs and services that meet the higher education needs of older part-time students among ethnic groups throughout the state;
5. Attract older part-time students through the use of recruitment procedures that match their personal, work-related, and learning preferences;
6. Ensure that admissions criteria are sufficiently flexible to account for the unique skills, abilities, and learning derived from experiences of older part-time students;
7. Award institutional, state, and federal financial aid to older part-time students in ways that ensure that their needs are met on an equitable basis;
8. Provide sufficient numbers of courses and programs that are scheduled at times and locations necessary to complete degree requirements;
9. Supply educational support services that are designed to help older part-time students meet their educational objectives and that are scheduled at times and places convenient for them;

10. Encourage older part-time students to complete, on a timely basis, degree programs or other academic goals that they have initiated;
11. Provide alternative credit-bearing programs at upper-division and graduate levels which precede or substitute entirely for degree study such as shorter-term certificates;
12. Provide appropriate information technologies—computing, video, audio, teleconferencing—to enable older part-time students access to academic programs and resources;
13. Supply upper-division and graduate programs and services through contractual arrangements to organizations on a self-support basis that require upper-division and graduate level higher education for their employees, clients, or members; and
14. Work with faculty and staff to meet the educational and support service needs of older part-time students.

(Approved May 1991, as part of AS-1991-91/AA/CSIP)

# Policy Position Regarding 1992-1993 CSU Budget Requests and Proposed Student Fees

**WHEREAS,**The Governor's proposed 1992-93 budget for the California State University is \$137 million below the Board of Trustees' 1992-93 requested budget and the Legislative Analyst projects a total deficit of \$219 million for the CSU; and

**WHEREAS,**The Board of Trustees' 1992-93 requested budget was a minimum essential budget to continue serving the number of students (FTES) currently enrolled; and

**WHEREAS,**The Governor has proposed an increase of student fees up to \$372 per year for a full-time student if the Trustees and the Legislature authorize it; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the attached statement entitled "1992-1993 Budget Shortfall" as its policy position regarding the 1992-1993 CSU budget requests and proposed student fees.

(This resolution, 2079, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1992.)

## 1992-1993 Budget Shortfall

The anticipated shortfall between the CSU Trustees' 1992-93 budget request and the CSU budget proposed by the Governor is \$137 million; the Legislative Analyst projects a shortfall of \$219 million in the CSU budget. This funding gap would further diminish the quality of the education the CSU can offer its students. The Academic Senate's first principle in addressing this shortfall is that general fund support of at least \$137 million dollars over the Governor's proposal should be provided. This principle recognizes the severe underfunding the state has provided the CSU during the last several fiscal years. It also recognizes the Senate's firm support for the state's long-term commitment to low CSU student fees as sound social and economic policy. The Senate believes the state should provide sufficient additional funds over the Governor's proposal to provide for payment of mandatory and necessary costs, to increase class sections and instructional support, and to permit payment of merit-step adjustments to faculty. The funding of these costs is critical to assure both the long-term and short-term quality and viability of CSU institutions, not only for current students, but also for the thousands of future students who will look to the CSU as the primary affordable university available to them.

The Senate recognizes also that the state may not provide the total resources needed because of inadequate state revenues and the other demands for funding of state programs and services, conditions which have led to the reduction in the CSU budget from 4.6% to 3.6% of the state general fund budget in the last several years. We believe our long-term commitment to affordable student fees remains sound; therefore, any fee increases that may be necessary to preserve educational quality should be reasonable under the economic circumstances we all face.

The Academic Senate's acceptance of a \$372 per year increase in student fees following a 20% increase last year must be predicated on the expectation that certain conditions will be satisfied, specifically:

- A. The State of California provide expanded financial aid effectively accessible to lower-income and middle-income students who would be substantially impeded by barriers presented by a precipitate fee increase.
- B. The State of California establish a long-term and stable methodology that would assure that the share of the cost of higher education that students pay will be reasonable and predictable over the long term.
- C. The State of California (through the legislature and the Governor) commit to increasing the CSU budget, as the state's economic condition improves over the next few years, to a minimum of \$6,994\* per FTES, adjusted each year to reflect cost increases and approved programmatic changes. This level of funding will insure customary access and restore student services which have degenerated as a result of large unallocated reductions which have occurred to the CSU budget in recent years.

(Approved March 1992, as part of AS-2079-92/EX)

---

\* This figure represents (in 1992 dollars) the level of state support in the last year (1986-87) in which no unallocated reductions were included in the CSU budget.



# Faculty Role in the Establishment of Charter Campuses

- WHEREAS**,The Chancellor is proposing to establish at least two Charter campuses; and
- WHEREAS**,The establishment of a charter campus or charter campuses has immediate and far-reaching implications for the California State University; and
- WHEREAS**,The Charter concept is not generally understood or clearly defined, nor are the criteria that would guide the selection of these charter campuses; and
- WHEREAS**,Significant faculty participation is required in deciding whether to have charter campuses and, should there be Charter campuses, in determining their governance, employee relations, and funding structure; and
- WHEREAS**,The "CSU Statement on Collegiality" assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the University in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees; and
- WHEREAS**,The Academic Senate of the California State University is the appropriate consultative body for the establishment of systemwide policies regarding the Charter campuses concept; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**:That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the Academic Senate CSU in defining the concept of Charter campuses; and be it further
- RESOLVED**:That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to keep the Academic Senate CSU involved in those aspects of planning for any Charter campuses that may affect the stability and integrity of other campuses; and be it further
- RESOLVED**:That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees that any decision to reconfigure a CSU campus as a charter campus be made only after a positive recommendation from the campus' academic senate.
- RESOLVED**:That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus Academic Senates which may be addressing the desirability of assuming charter status to develop policies providing for appropriate faculty involvement in employee relations and funding structure as well as in the development of the charter campus' mission statements and academic master plans; and be it further
- RESOLVED**:That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to withhold support for any proposed Charter campus legislation until such proposed legislation has been reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate of the California State University

(This resolution, 2138, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

# Responses to the Crisis Facing California Higher Education: Concerns About Differential Fees for Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Study for Students Attending The California State University

- WHEREAS** A candid and realistic appraisal of the evidence at hand requires the conclusion that California's commitment to generous support for a high quality higher education has been substantially lost, and will not be recovered in the reasonably foreseeable future; and
- WHEREAS**, Without a significant enhancement of revenues received from students, either the quality of instruction in the California State University will be unacceptably reduced, or access will be artificially and unacceptably reduced as professors are laid off and classes are canceled due to budget reductions; and
- WHEREAS**, The Trustees of the California State University have responded to this new policy environment by adopting on March 17, 1993, a policy entitled "Quality and Affordability: Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying"; and
- WHEREAS**, As a part of its broader policy statement, "Quality and Affordability: Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying" the CSU Board of Trustees included a section on "Principles for a New Pricing Structure"; and
- WHEREAS**, The third such principle for a new pricing structure is "Differential Fees for Graduate (Postbaccalaureate) Study"; and
- WHEREAS**, The CSU Trustees' policy statement entitled, "Quality and Affordability: Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying" envisions, with further respect to principle three, "a specific exception to the policy of differential fees for postbaccalaureate education credential candidates, whose success is so essential to the future of California that the lower undergraduate fee structure should continue for those students"; and
- WHEREAS**, Not all instruction offered at the graduate level benefits from resource allocations per FTES larger than those given for undergraduate instruction; and
- WHEREAS**, Graduate and postbaccalaureate students who enroll in undergraduate courses do not ordinarily receive instruction that is supported more generously than that received by undergraduates in the same class; and
- WHEREAS**, Ordinary principles of fairness would militate against charging graduate and postbaccalaureate students a differentially higher fee on the basis that their instruction is more costly unless it is; and
- WHEREAS**, A further "principle for a new pricing structure," namely "continue fee structures that differentiate for part-time and full-time study" apparently contemplates maintaining one fee for students enrolled in six units or fewer and another fee for students enrolled in more than six units; and
- WHEREAS**, Job demands, economic resources, and family responsibilities typical of graduate and postbaccalaureate students in the California State University often make it impossible for them to enroll in more than one course per quarter or semester; and
- WHEREAS**, Many graduate and postbaccalaureate students would be inappropriately required to pay fees as if taking two courses when in fact enrolling in only one course, if fee structures included different prices pegged only to a six unit divide; and
- WHEREAS**, CSU graduate and postbaccalaureate students are typically self-supporting and hence economically vulnerable to differentially higher fees; and
- WHEREAS**, Advanced degree holders are critical to the future well-being and economic and social health of the state; and
- WHEREAS**, Differentially higher fees for baccalaureate and postbaccalaureate students or instruction will discourage the taking of classes at California State University; therefore be it
- RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate of the California State University regard the option of charging graduate and postbaccalaureate students differentially higher fees to be poor public policy and regret the extremely adverse budget and policy circumstances that led the Board of Trustees to adopt it; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU go the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees to work with it to lessen the negative impact of proposed differentially higher fees for graduate and postbaccalaureate students, if and when any such fees are authorized by the legislature, by adopting the following principles for the levying and use of any such fees:

- Fees and other charges to students be levied not on the basis of student status (such as graduate or postbaccalaureate versus undergraduate), but instead on the basis of the level of the course offering (undergraduate versus graduate);
- If students are charged differentially higher fees for instruction beyond the undergraduate level, that any extra funds received be used to support instruction beyond the undergraduate level;
- Presidents be required to account in detail for the use of funds received from students taking instruction beyond the undergraduate level in order to demonstrate the use of any extra funds for the support of graduate or postbaccalaureate instruction;
- Presidents be charged to recognize in internal campus allocations that graduate and postbaccalaureate education are both integral to the mission of the CSU and deserving of resource support appropriate to the extra effort that faculty must provide for quality graduate and postbaccalaureate instruction;
- A fee structure be developed on a per-unit basis for graduate and postbaccalaureate students;
- Fee and/or tuition waivers be provided on a wide basis to graduate and postbaccalaureate students on the basis of their contributions to the campuses (e.g., as teaching or research assistants), on the basis of economic hardship, on the basis of displaced worker status or job retraining needs, and on other suitable bases;
- Financial aid through grants and loans be made widely and generously available to graduate and postbaccalaureate students; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU go the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees to work with it to evaluate any new fee policy imposing differentially higher fees for graduate and postbaccalaureate students and, if it is found to adversely impact state priorities for higher education, including the preparation of persons from traditionally underrepresented groups and women for entry into the professions and other leadership positions, to modify the policy as rapidly as possible.

(This resolution, 2151, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in May 1993.)

## Mandatory Catalog Copy on Nondiscrimination

**WHEREAS,**The California State University provides access to all eligible students regardless of race, gender age, ethnicity religion, national origin, disability or sexual orientation; and

**WHEREAS,**It is against California State law for an employer or any public agency to discriminate on the basis of any of these characteristics; and

**WHEREAS,**Some CSU campuses reference all of the above characteristics in the nondiscrimination statements in their catalogs; and

**WHEREAS,**Other CSU campuses have not included sexual orientation in their catalog nondiscrimination statements; and

**WHEREAS,**The CSU statement on nondiscrimination mandated for inclusion in all CSU campus catalogs does not list sexual orientation; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:**That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to include sexual orientation in the mandatory catalog copy as one of the characteristics against which the California State University does not discriminate.

(This resolution, 2194, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1994.)

# Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the attached position paper titled, "Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University" and affirm the principles contained in the position paper as follows:

1. The CSU should encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate education.
2. The CSU should actively seek to enroll a student body that is academically qualified and reflects the cultural, racial, ethnic, economic, geographic, and social diversity of the State.
3. The CSU should make particular efforts to provide access to education and the opportunity for educational success to those who have been and are currently underrepresented in higher education.
4. The CSU should seek to recruit and retain a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State.
5. Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU should actively seek and support qualified students and faculty who might otherwise not have the opportunity to be a part of the CSU.
6. Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU should attempt to redress problems of access and barriers to employment faced by persons from groups who have been and are currently underrepresented in higher education; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU request that the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees affirm and endorse the position paper and continue to implement the principles embodied in, "Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University"; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU assist the Chancellor in identifying faculty whose testimony may lead to a better understanding of the purpose, nature, and value of Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU.

(This resolution, 2274, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in March 1995.)

## Position Paper: Support for the Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity in the California State University

The mission of the California State University is to "encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study" (CSU Mission Statement). In support of this mission, the CSU "seeks out individuals with collegiate promise who face cultural, geographical, physical, educational, or personal barriers to assist them in advancing to the highest educational level they can reach" (CSU Mission Statement). This mission was reaffirmed in the 1989 report "California Faces...California's Future..." and subsequent statutes based on this report (primarily AB 617) in relation to California's changing demographics. In recognition of the fact that California is becoming a State with a new multicultural majority and that the State's future depends upon ensuring that students are prepared for an international, multicultural society, the CSU has in place a number of programs that make particular effort to redress problems of access to the University and barriers to employment faced by persons from groups who have been and are currently underrepresented in higher education.

Programs in the CSU that address concerns about student access and educational success are commonly referred to in the CSU as "Educational Equity Programs." Examples include programs like "The Student Affirmative Action Program," California Academic Partnership Program," and the "Educational Opportunity Program." Programs that address concerns regarding the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty are commonly referred to as "Faculty Diversity Programs." Faculty Diversity Programs

include programs like the "Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Programs in Employment" governed by EO 340, "The Forgivable Doctoral Loan Program," and "The Faculty Development Affirmative Action Program."

In the case of both Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity Programs the aim is to achieve and continuously maintain a diverse student body and faculty. The principle that guides Educational Equity Programs is embodied in Section 66205 of the Education Code as follows: to enroll a student body that meets high academic standards and reflects the cultural, racial, economic, geographic, and social diversity of the State. In the case of Faculty Diversity Programs, the guiding principle is articulated in CSU Board of Trustees Policy adopted in 1988 as follows: "to employ a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State." Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU are mainly of the "voluntary" type, do not set quotas, and do not establish "preference" solely on the basis of race or gender. Rather, they are programs that actively seek and support qualified students and faculty who might otherwise not have the opportunity to be a part of the CSU, and thereby benefit from and contribute to the CSU.

Over the past year programs subsumed under the general title of "Affirmative Action Programs" have been the subject of intense public debate, and numerous legislative efforts that deal with matters related to such programs are under way (e.g., AB 211/SB 939, ACA 2/SCA 10, AB 1793, ACA 16). Although the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) does not choose at this time to take a position in support of, or in opposition to, specific pieces of proposed legislation, the ASCSU does consider it imperative at this time to assert its position on the principles that govern the Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs of the CSU and to reaffirm its commitment to the continuation of these programs.

Specifically the ASCSU supports the following principles that guide Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU:

1. The CSU should encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate education.
2. The CSU should actively seek to enroll a student body that is academically qualified and reflects the cultural, racial/ethnic, economic, geographic, and social diversity of the State.
3. The CSU should make particular efforts to provide access to education and the opportunity for educational success to those who are historically and currently underrepresented in higher education.
4. The CSU should seek to recruit and retain a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State.
5. Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU should actively seek and support qualified students and faculty who might otherwise not have the opportunity to be a part of the CSU.
6. Educational Equity Programs and Faculty Diversity Programs in the CSU should attempt to redress problems of access and barriers to employment faced by persons from groups who have been in the past and are currently underrepresented in higher education.

(Approved March 1995, as part of AS-2274-95/Floor)

# Student Fee Policy in the CSU

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the consolidation of fee policies and procedures into a single comprehensive policy document; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU support the development of a fee policy that delegates the Chancellor's authority to adjust mandatory campus fees, user fees, and penalty fees, to the campus presidents provided that consultation with appropriate campus constituencies on charging fees and allocating fee revenue is exercised in a manner that is consistent with policies adopted by the Board of Trustees; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Board of Trustees in any fee policy they may develop, to set limits on the permissible range of differential fees\* that may be established; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Board of Trustees to continue its student financial aid policy contained in the document, entitled *Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying* (1993), of allocating at least one-third of new student fee revenue to financial aid and consider providing fee waivers, so as to mitigate the effect of new fees upon students eligible for and receiving financial aid; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to continue the consultative process by giving the Academic Senate the opportunity to analyze and respond to any future policy proposals on student fees.

(This resolution, 2301, was approved by the Academic Senate CSU in January 1996.)

## Information Item • Committee on Finance • Agenda Item 5 • January 23-24, 1996 Student Fee Policy

Presentation by: Richard P. West, Vice Chancellor Business and Finance

### BRIEF

#### Summary

An information item was presented to the Committee on Finance at a special meeting on December 8, 1995, that provided a preliminary report of the results of a comprehensive review of all fees charged to students. The purpose of the review initiated by the chancellor was to help determine if changes in policy and/or delegations would be appropriate.

Several questions arose during the last board meeting regarding authority to charge fees other than the state university fee. Other fee policy issues that were discussed revolved around control, consultation, accountability and potential consequences for student access. This agenda item provides an overview of the statutory authority for charging fees and a brief history of fees in the California State University

### ITEM

#### Introduction

In January 1995, the chancellor initiated a review of current CSU fee policies and practices to support the development of a comprehensive fee policy framework for all student fees similar to those adopted for the state university fee. This review included extensive consultation with the California State Student Association, the Academic Senate, and campus presidents to be sure system administration and the Board of Trustees are alert to the status of campus fiscal matters. Preliminary results of this review were discussed with the board at the December 8, 1995, special meeting of the Committee on Finance.

During the Committee on Finance meeting, several questions arose regarding the authority to charge fees other than the state university fee. Other fee policy issues that were discussed revolved around control, consultation, accountability and potential consequences for student access. This item gives an overview of the statutory authority for charging fees and a brief history of fees in the California State University

\* The current annual range of differential fees among CSU campuses is \$370.

## Fee Authority

The Board of Trustees of the California State University has the authority under Education Code Section 89700, to "require all persons to pay fees, rents, deposits, and charges for services, facilities or materials provided by the trustees to such persons." Some fees, such as those charged for parking and housing, are governed by additional provisions of the Education Code. In addition, the governor and the legislature, through the annual budget act, have significant and direct influence over the level of the state university fee and nonresident tuition.

Standing orders of the Board of Trustees delegate to the chancellor authority to establish, adjust, or abolish most fees. The chancellor in turn, has delegated to campus presidents the authority to adjust certain fees. Table I (Attachment A [see page 276]) outlines the statutory authority for each fee.

Fees charged to students fall into three general categories: mandatory fees, user fees, and penalty or deposit fees. A list of authorized fees with amounts and approval authority is provided in Table 2 (Attachment B [see page 277]).

Approximately thirty percent of the total number of authorized fees that may be charged to students are mandatory fees. Mandatory fees are paid to enroll in, attend, or graduate from the university or to take a course offered through the state-funded instructional program. The state university fee, the student body association fee, and the application fee are examples of mandatory fees.

Almost fifty percent of the total number of authorized fees that may be charged to students are user fees. User fees are paid by a student to receive a noninstructional good or service provided by the university or to enroll in a course offered through a self-support instructional program. Student housing fees and continuing education fees are examples of user fees.

The remaining twenty percent of the total number of authorized fees that may be charged to students are penalty or deposit fees. Penalty or deposit fees are charged to reimburse the university for additional costs resulting from dishonored payments, late submissions, misuse of property as a security or guarantee. Examples of penalty or deposit fees are library fines, late registration fees, and enrollment confirmation deposits.

## History of CSU Fee Policies and Practices

State college and university fees have long been a part of higher education in California. Prior to 1933, students attending a state college were charged a three dollar registration fee in addition to various fees for specific individual courses. These course fees ranged from \$5 for a chemistry laboratory course to 25¢ for a class syllabus.

By 1940, the colleges were collecting over 100 distinct fees. In that year study was conducted to determine the feasibility of establishing a uniform fee for all students to reduce the complexity of fee collections and administration. In 1942, on recommendation of the study individual course fees were eliminated and a fee identified as a materials and service fee of \$12 per year was established. In the 1950s, several special purpose fees were established such as the student body association fee and student body center fee. Student body association and center fees were the direct result of strong student interest in funding campus programs. These programs included student publications, student government, child care, and recreational and social activities.

When the Board of Trustees was created by the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1961 as part of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, authority to establish and to collect the materials and service fee was delegated to the Board of Trustees. The board established separate materials and service fee levels for part-time (\$34 per year) and full-time students (\$66 per year). Revenue derived from the materials and service fee was used to acquire instructional supplies and to support various student services program costs. These programs included counseling, testing, housing, placement, and financial aid administration.

In 1973, due in part to the growth in the number of fees and the growing reliance of the instructional program upon fee revenue, the Board of Trustees established a task force to review fee policies and levels. In 1974, as a result of recommendations contained in the "Report of the Task Force on the Materials and Service Fee," the Board of Trustees renamed the materials and service fee the student services fee. Costs for instructional supplies and audio-visual materials were shifted from fee revenue to direct general fund support.

The state university fee was established in 1982 to replace funding reductions from the state resulting from the passage of Proposition 13. Shortly thereafter in 1984, another study group produced the "Report of the Student Fee Advisory Group." This report emphasized the responsibility of the state in funding higher education and expressed concern about the increase in both the level and number of student fees. From 1982 to 1985, students paid both the state university fee and the student services fee. In 1985, the two fees were combined into a single state university fee as a result of recommendations contained in the "Report of the Student Fee Advisory Group."



Though the "Report of the Student Fee Advisory Group" focused on the two major fees charged at that time—the state university fee and the student services fee—more than forty separate fees charged to students were identified of which:

"The greatest number of charges fall into a user/penalty category. These fees account for well over half the number of the total fees in the system."

In March 1989, the Task Force on Campus-Based Student Fees was formed to review policies and procedures governing campus-based student fees and to ensure that the fees "remain reasonable, appropriately comparable, and well administered." The fees considered were the student body association fee, the student body center fee, and the instructionally related activities fee. In the final report issued in October 1991, the task force recommended greater student participation in setting fee levels, determining the use of fee revenue, and administering fee supported programs.

At the March 1993 meeting, the Board of Trustees adopted principles described in the report "Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying." This report identified five principles for a new pricing structure:

- Fee revenue would fund improvements to the direct benefit of students attending CSU while state appropriation funding would determine the number of students who could attend CSU;
- Students and their families should be charged a portion of the costs of education in the form of fees;
- Higher costs associated with graduate study should be recognized;
- Fee structures should differentiate between part-time and full-time study; and
- Revenues from fees should support the program of instruction.

On June 13, 1994, the Advisory Committee on Student Charges and Access, formed at the request of the chancellor, issued a report analyzing current issues related to CSU fee and financial aid policies. The advisory committee affirmed the need to ensure affordability and quality of instruction and recommended that state university fee revenue "support directly the quality of academic programs."

After the report of the advisory committee was issued, several campuses initiated discussions regarding the use of fee revenue to enhance the delivery of technological services to students. Subsequent discussions in Executive Council made clear the need to engage all internal constituencies in a broad consultative process regarding an overall fee and pricing policy. As a result, in January 1995, the chancellor initiated a review of current fee policies and practices to support the development of a comprehensive fee policy framework. Preliminary results of this review were presented to the Board of Trustees at the December 8, 1995, meeting of the Committee of Finance.

### Proposed Fee Policy

At the December 8, 1995, meeting of the Committee on Finance, several themes were discussed that form the basis for further development of a comprehensive fee policy. These common themes are:

- (1) Internal constituencies support consolidating the myriad of fee policies and procedures into a single policy document as a necessary step to provide a comprehensive fee policy framework. This policy document should cite the authority for charging the fee and should describe the process and consultation required to adjust the fee.
- (2) Under strict system oversight, authority of the chancellor to adjust mandatory campus fees, user fees, and penalty fees should be delegated to the campus president. The chancellor should retain authority to approve any new fees. Some differential among campus fee levels is appropriate. However, the range of differential fees should be considered by the board as a significant policy issue.
- (3) Appropriate consultation with campus constituencies on charging fees and allocating fee revenue is a critical factor in assuring that the delegated authority is exercised in a manner that is consistent with policies adopted by the board and consistent with general public policy direction.
- (4) The Board of Trustees should receive an annual report on the number of fees and fee revenue generated at each campus.
- (5) There is an explicit need to link financial aid policies to fee and pricing decisions (consistent with the Board of Trustees, policies related to the state university fee) or access may be placed at risk.
- (6) Further exploration is warranted of specific campus proposals for fee and pricing alternatives that are consistent with the themes described above. Several fee pilots will be supported and monitored by the chancellor to help test and refine the overall fee policy.

As campuses endeavor to build upon individual strengths, a variety of program needs arise that may exceed existing systemwide funding parameters. Several campuses, for example, have proposed to move more quickly to provide ubiquitous access for students to technological services and to begin to redefine

curricula requirements to take advantage of technologically enabled instruction. In some cases, student fees have been proposed to provide a portion of the funding required to meet these program needs.

The proposed fee pilots used to test and refine the overall fee policy include the consolidation of individual fees, the establishment of campus specific fees to achieve defined curricula objectives, and fees to enhance instructional support activities such as technological services. Experience during the implementation of these fee pilots will inform the development of a comprehensive fee policy which is anticipated to be brought to the Board of Trustees for discussion early in 1996.

## ATTACHMENT A

### Finance • Agenda Item 5 • January 23-24, 1996

#### Table 1. Statutory Authority for CSU Fees

<i>FEE CATEGORY/TITLE</i>	<i>EDUCATION CODE</i>
<b>Mandatory Annual</b>	
1. Health Facilities	89702
2. Health Services	89700
3. Instructionally Related Activities	89700
4. State University	89700
5. Student Body Association	89300
6. Student Body Center	89304; 90012; 90068
<b>Mandatory As Applicable</b>	
1. Admission Application Fee	89700
2. Campus Service Card (ID Card)	89700
3. Diploma	89700
4. Duplicate Degree Tuition	66170 et seq.
5. Graduation	89700
6. Miscellaneous Course	89700
7. Nonresident Tuition	89705
8. Special Test Materials	89700
<b>User</b>	
1. Alumni Placement	89700
2. American Dietetics Assoc. Transcript Evaluation	89700
3. Bicycle Storage	89700
4. Campus General Catalog	89700
5. Conference, Short Course Institution	89700
6. Evaluation for Credential Candidate	89700
7. Extension Course	89708-9
8. External Degree	89708-9
9. Housing	89700; 90012; 90068
10. Installment	89700.1
11. Lock and Locker	89700
12. Music Studio Course (Extension/Summer Session)	89700
13. Musical Instrument Repair and Insurance	89700
14. Organ Practice	89700
15. Parking	89701
16. Recreation Facilities	89700
17. Special Examination	89700
18. Special Session	89708; 89709
19. Summer Session	89708
20. Summer Session (Health Facilities)	89702
21. Test Materials	89700
22. Thesis Binding	89700
23. Transcript of Record	89700
<b>Penalty/Deposit</b>	
1. Check Return	89700
2. Credit Card Transaction Voucher Dishonored	89700
3. Delayed Transmittal	89700
4. Enrollment Confirmation	89700
5. Failure to Meet Administrative Appointment	89700
6. Item Lost or Broken	89700
7. Late Registration	89700
8. Library	89700

**Table 2. Authorized CSU Fees**

<i>CATEGORY/TITLE:</i>	<i>AMOUNT:</i>	<i>APPROVED BY:</i>
<b>Mandatory Annual</b>		
1. Health Facilities Fee	\$6	Chancellor
2. Health Services Fee	Varies	Chancellor
3. Instructionally Related Activities Fee	Varies	Chancellor
4. State University Fee	1,584	Board
5. Student Body Association Fee	Varies	Chancellor
6. Student Body Center Fee	Varies	Chancellor
<b>Mandatory As Applicable</b>		
1. Admission Application Fee	55	Chancellor
2. Campus Service (ID) Card	6	Chancellor
3. Diploma Fee	<=20	President
4. Duplicate Degree Tuition	Marginal Cost	Board
5. Graduation Fee	<=20	President
6. Miscellaneous Course Fees	Varies	President
7. Nonresident Tuition	7,380	Chancellor
8. Special Test Materials Fee	<=10	Chancellor
<b>User</b>		
1. Alumni Placement Fee	<=25	Chancellor
2. American Dietetics Association Transcript Evaluation	<=25	Chancellor
3. Bicycle Storage Fee	<=25	President
4. Campus General Catalog Fee	Varies	Chancellor
5. Conference, Short Course Institution	Actual Cost	President
6. Evaluation for Credential Candidate Fee	25	Chancellor
7. Extension Course Fee	Varies	President
8. External Degree Fee	Varies	President
9. Housing Fee	Varies	President
10. Installment Fee	66	Chancellor
11. Lock and Locker Fee	Actual Cost	Chancellor
12. Music Studio Course (Extension/Summer)	Varies	President
13. Musical Instrument Repair and Insurance	<=25	Chancellor
14. Organ Practice Fee	20	Chancellor
15. Parking Fee	Varies	Board
16. Recreation Facilities Fee	<=10 per use	President
17. Special Examination Fee	<=25 per	President
18. Special Session Fee	Varies	President
19. Summer Session (Health Facilities Fee)	<=15 per	Chancellor
20. Summer Session Fee	Varies	President
21. Test Materials Fee	<=25	President
22. Thesis Binding Fee	<=25	Chancellor
23. Transcript of Record Fee	4	Chancellor
<b>Penalty/Deposit</b>		
1. Check Return Fee	<=20	Chancellor
2. Credit Card Transaction Voucher Dishonored Fee	10	Chancellor
3. Delayed Transmittal Fee	Varies	President
4. Enrollment Confirmation Deposit	Varies	Chancellor
5. Failure to meet administrative appointment	<=20	Chancellor
6. Item Lost or Broken Fee	Actual Cost	President
7. Late Registration Fee	25	Chancellor
8. Library Fee	Varies	Chancellor

(Approved January 1996, as part of AS-2301-95/AA/FGA)

