

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2790-07/AA (Rev)
March 8-9, 2007

Graduate Education Development in the California State University (CSU)

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU is pleased to acknowledge that the CSU Academic Council's paper on "The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU" clearly reinforces prior ASCSU recommendations contained in:

- New Study of Post-Baccalaureate Programs in the CSU (see attached AS-2534-01/AA),
- Recommendation on the Report from the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the California State University (see attached AS-2652-04/EX), and
- Rethinking Graduate Education in the CSU: Meeting the Needs of the People of California for Graduate Education in the 21st Century (see attached 2004 Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the CSU); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that further study which address state and campus issues is needed on the recommendations; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that an ASCSU/CSU Academic Council Task Force on Graduate Education in the CSU be formed to ensure that the basic principle of faculty responsibility for the curriculum is followed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send copies of this resolution to the Chancellor, campus presidents, CSU Academic Council, deans of graduate education, and campus senate chairs.

RATIONALE: The CSU Academic Council (composed of CSU provosts) developed a paper entitled "The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU" in December, 2006. In this paper, the Council makes the case for enhancing graduate education in the CSU. Further, the paper suggests several possible new areas for graduate study.

The Academic Senate CSU has expressed support for graduate and postbaccalaureate education in the CSU contingent on adequate funding and assurances that those programs not undercut the CSU commitment to its mission of providing quality undergraduate education. In March 2001, AS-2534-01/AA reaffirmed support for the recommendations in the earlier study of graduation education in the CSU. In March 2004, AS-2652-04/EX, the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the CSU made numerous recommendations on graduate education and adequate funding.

The Academic Senate CSU recognize that further study be undertaken before implementing the recommendations offered to campuses such as:

- *the feasibility and process of intra-university graduate programs based on social need and effective demand prior to implementing such programs;*
- *the effect of additional fees on the CSU mission of providing accessible education;*
- *the quality of high service/high-price programs, the professional orientations for graduate degree programs in the liberal arts and sciences, and the Professional Science Masters (PSM) programs; and*
- *the use of alternative structures as “incubators” for State-supported graduate programs, and innovative program variations to respond to the increasing complexity of the work force.*

Graduate education in the CSU has provided a needed and necessary pool of graduates for California. In spite of these efforts, the State Legislature and Governor have not adequately funded graduate education in the CSU in the past, and their recent efforts to address this problem have only provided additional funds for increased graduate enrollment. This action guarantees a continual under funding of our graduate programs. At the same time, the State has adopted differential funding for all University of California graduate students.

Approved Unanimously – May 10-11, 2007



Academic Affairs
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer
562-951-4710 / Fax 562-951-4986
E-mail greichard@calstate.edu

January 4, 2007

Dr. Marshelle Thohaben, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

Dear Marshelle,

I am pleased to transmit to you a paper that was developed by the Academic Council, *The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU*. As you know, the final version already reflects some helpful comments from the Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee. Since the paper is the product of the Academic Council, this is not a request for further suggestions for amendment. Rather, on behalf of the provosts, I invite the Academic Senate CSU to give formal consideration to the paper, including the several recommendations included in it.

As you know, this paper is the first product to emerge from a new pattern of Academic Council deliberations on academic issues of major significance. Although there is no pre-established plan to this effect, it may be that additional such papers will be developed by the provosts on other subjects. As I have discussed with the Executive Committee, this is in no way an attempt to circumvent established patterns of shared governance. It is an effort on the part of the provosts to help to initiate and/or further concerted discussion and consideration of major aspects of our academic mission. For example, as you know, at its November meeting the Academic Council engaged in an initial conversation about research and creative activities in the mission of the CSU, based upon "talking points" that had been developed by campus research officers. Whether an Academic Council statement about research will eventually parallel this *Graduate Education* paper is still to be determined. For now, however, the "talking points" paper has been included among readings that are available on the CSU's *Access to Excellence* planning web site as a possible input to the campus conversations in connection with the planning exercise.

I look forward to bringing the *Graduate Education* paper to the Executive Council sometime during the spring semester. It would be ideal if the Senate were able to offer comment on it that could be presented to the presidents at that time, along with the paper itself. Thank you in advance for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San Jose
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

Dr. Marshelle Thobaben, Chair
January 4, 2007
Page Two

c : Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, CSU
Chris Hanson, Interim Dean, Academic Program Planning, CSU

The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU

CSU Academic Council

December, 2006

I. Purpose.

As chief academic officers of their universities, the CSU provosts are concerned about the continued vitality, growth, and relevance of their graduate programs. Through the vehicle of the CSU Academic Council and with the leadership of Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard, they have developed this report and recommendations on the challenges and opportunities facing the CSU graduate programs in meeting the needs of California.

II. The Time Is Ripe for Fresh Consideration of Graduate Programs.

- A. *The Contemporary Significance of Graduate Programs.* Graduate programs are taking on larger significance in California and the nation. The Master's degree is increasingly becoming the entry-level degree in a growing number of professions. The CSU has long been involved in this area; this is what we do and do well. The state's need for advanced training and graduate programs that are entries to the professions has also led to a policy breakthrough, as CSU will now be offering the Ed.D. independently. This is widely seen by opponents and supporters alike to be only the first step in a broader array of professional doctoral programs. We look for thoughtful additions to the stable of independent CSU clinical and professional doctoral programs, even as Master's level programs continue to dominate the CSU's graduate offerings.
- B. *CSU Can Respond to Contemporary Issues through Its Graduate Programs.* The CSU is well-positioned to respond to our changing world and state by addressing a wide array of contemporary issues through cross-disciplinary collaborative efforts at the graduate level. The CSUPERB collaborative is one such model that has led to innovative curricular innovations in response to industry needs in the biotechnology sector. There is great potential for collaborative efforts in diverse areas, including for example strategic language education programs, homeland security, agricultural research, radio/television/film production, an array of state government careers, and others. These programs address pressing needs of the emerging workforce involving new fields of study and the growing retirements that are expected.
- C. *New Opportunities in Financing Graduate Programs.* Financial support for graduate programs is also improving. (1) Recent and projected fee increases

assessed upon graduate students are part of a picture of stronger revenue streams. (2) Graduate instruction will be differentially – more richly – supported in CSU marginal cost calculations beginning with the 2006-07 academic year. We note that the enriched funding formula will apply only to new or additional graduate FTES, part of annual growth in campus FTES. As such, a substantial beneficial impact of this formula change will be phased in but only for new programs. For this source of support to be a significant factor in expanding graduate programs, it will have to be extended to cover the existing graduate enrollment base. (3) The University of California has begun to impose professional fees on selected graduate programs, in addition to ordinary fees and marginal cost support from the state. The UC precedent may be a vehicle for the CSU to develop financial support for at least some graduate programs.

- D. *Campus and Constituent Interest in Graduate Programs.* This picture of increasing need and improved fiscal support has led to increasing interest in graduate programs on many of our universities. Campuses are exploring whether and how to encourage enrollments in existing graduate programs that may have growth potential. They are also planning and implementing new graduate programs. In this process, our universities are considering program reductions, resource reallocation and the revision of existing programs.

III. The Functions of Graduate Programs, and their Fit with Faculty Lives.

Campus academic leaders face obvious questions, given all of this. Questions include:

1. *whether to encourage growth* in graduate programs;
2. if so, *which programs should be particularly encouraged to grow*; and
3. *what new programs* should be proposed and implemented.

To properly frame answers to these questions, it is suitable to review the functions of graduate programs and how they may be experienced by faculty.

- A. *The Production of Persons with Advanced Skills.* Graduate programs produce persons with advanced skills, by virtue of which our regions, state, nation, and even our world stand to benefit economically. There are additional benefits – graduate degree-holders may be civic leaders, for example, or may bring special uplift to the arts, fine culture and general discourse of their communities. Yet such generalized benefits, which may compete for priority or significance when considering baccalaureate programs, are incidental to the *raison d'être* for applied graduate programs. Regional, state and national needs for nurse practitioners, school administrators, business managers, public administrators, social workers, marriage and family therapists, and advanced practice / professional leaders in a host of other domains justify graduate programs in the CSU. Note also that in emphasizing master's degrees in its graduate programs the CSU is in very good

company. The Council of Graduate Studies reports that 90% of all graduate degrees awarded nationally are master's degrees.

- B. ***Access to Professions by CSU Clienteles.*** The typical CSU student and her family are, on average, of more limited economic means than the typical University of California or private / independent university student.
- C. ***Faculty Recruitment and Retention.*** Faculty find that teaching at the graduate level is very fulfilling. Providing an opportunity for such work is a powerful basis on which to enhance faculty recruitment and retention.
- D. ***The Continued Vitality of Faculty.*** The vitality and currency of our universities' faculty is critical to the delivery of high-quality academic programs. The deployment of current information and perspective is of value for advanced undergraduate teaching and community service. Teaching and mentoring in graduate programs depend upon faculty who are current. *Faculty often find their professional lives to be more fulfilling when their teaching and mentoring activities include work at the graduate level.*
- E. ***Faculty Productivity.*** Engagement with the materials of the discipline or profession by faculty is frequently enhanced by the presence of graduate students. Not only does instruction and mentoring at the graduate level stimulate faculty currency, it also motivates faculty to seek and secure grants and contracts. Beyond that, graduate students may become assistants and co-workers in the projects that grants and contracts support. The significance of this should not be overlooked. Frequently, masters-level CSU students who work in labs supported by grant funds emerge with research experiences superior to master's-level students enrolled at Research-I institutions. (Note that benefits accrue also to CSU undergraduates who similarly work on funded projects.)
- F. ***Enhancement of Diverse Faculty Pools.*** Our graduate programs are often breeding grounds for future diverse faculty members, many of whom come back to teach in the CSU. In some modest ways, the CSU does this intentionally, by mounting the Casanova Pre-Doctoral Scholars Program, and the Doctoral incentive Loan Program.
- G. ***Value of Graduate Programs for Undergraduates.*** Graduate students are a little older than undergraduates, on average; show seriousness of academic purpose; deploy learning skills with assurance; know something about the fit of advanced study with occupational success. For these and other reasons, graduate students are role models for undergraduates, and elevate the teaching and learning environment for all. This may most strongly be true for advanced undergraduates, who may sit alongside graduate students in some senior-level classes.

IV. State / System-Level Recommendations

1. **Insure that existing graduate programs have sufficient funding.** The State has recognized that graduate education is inherently more costly than undergraduate programs by providing for a differential graduate student fee and a redefinition of a full-time equivalent graduate student. However, the latter adjustment entailed a redefinition of existing enrollment levels without new funding, and will only provide enhanced funding for new increases in graduate enrollment. We need to also properly support the existing graduate enrollment base (which after all has to be recreated each year with new classes and new students).
 - To that end, Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs recommend that the State provide for full enhanced funding (based on the 12-unit definition of full-time equivalency) for all graduate enrollment. This could be accomplished through a multi-year, phased transition for the existing graduate enrollment base.
2. **The graduate research space entitlement should be reviewed.** The CSU now gets 75% of its graduate research space entitlement, based on a long-standing agreement with the Department of Finance. We have not been able to determine what was the rationale for this under-funding of the CSU, if there ever was one. What is clear is that there is an acute need for this space in our current and future graduate programs.
 - Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs recommend that an effort be made to secure 100% of this needed funding.
3. **Consortial or cooperative programs should be considered.** Some of this may respond to demand that is limited in a given local area, but if aggregated regionally or statewide may constitute an opportunity for service. Cooperative programs among campuses should be considered; and in an Internet era, the campuses undertaking a partnership need not necessarily be neighbors. To do this well and easily, campuses need models for cooperative programs, without which such programs may founder on resource-sharing issues. While Marginal Cost (FTES funding) follows teaching, apportionment of student fees is a thorny issue. The Chancellor's Office should develop templates and new policy directions that will facilitate consortial or cooperative programs between and among CSU campuses.
4. **Provide expanded access through online programs.** Let us take down barriers between and among our universities to allow students to take courses from multiple campuses. This would ease scheduling bottlenecks and shorten time to degree.

V. Recommendations Offered to Campuses

1. Social need and effective demand should be factored in when considering graduate programs.
2. Potential and existing programs can be evaluated along two dimensions: the social need for the graduates' skills, and the willingness and ability to pay for them by the target student population. This can be outlined graphically as shown below.

S o c i a l N e e d	H i g h	High Need, Low Demand	High Need, High Demand
	L o w	Low Need, Low Demand	Low Need, High Demand
		Low	High
		Effective Demand	

Need: consider regional or state need for the program on one dimension. This may say something important about demand, too, the ability to generate enrollment in the program. Assess whether a particular program is high-need or low-need.

Demand: on the other dimension, consider the economic attractiveness of the program, in terms of the wages and working conditions expected upon completion of the degree. Assess whether graduates of a particular program may expect high salaries, or low.

The most attractive programs to begin are high / high (green area).

The least attractive programs to begin are low / low (red area).

➤ When there is a high need for a program in a market with a high ability and willingness to pay, Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs recommend that **campuses be permitted to charge an additional "professional program fee" to supplement State funding**, as an alternative to running programs entirely on a self-support basis through Special Sessions.

3. **Where appropriate, develop high services/high-price programs.** For some programs (e.g., MBA, Masters in Nursing), student may prefer to pay a higher price if it guarantees a higher quality program and a more direct access to degree. The time to degree and access to courses in a timely manner might be more important than the fees paid. For some students (e.g., MBA) an off-site, higher-service/higher-price degree program might be preferred to a lower cost program

on campus. Cost may not be as big an issue as convenience, and time to degree. Convenient location and high service levels, in some combination, may attract students. Programs (or courses) that are offered on-line may also fit into this convenience/cost consideration.

4. **Seek professional orientations for graduate degree programs in the liberal arts and sciences.** CSULA repositioned its economics master's as a career oriented, applied economics degree. At East Bay, Anthropology was redesigned. We should be creative in identifying career outcomes, perhaps interdisciplinary, for programs that otherwise are narrowly construed as topics for academic consideration only. For example, business ethics may be a better program than a traditional master's in philosophy. Translation or some similar professional application may be a better focus than a humanities-oriented master's degree in French that is focused on period literature. Successful Masters' programs are usually not "junior doctoral programs." A notable exception: Masters programs that create a pipeline to doctoral programs for students from disadvantaged backgrounds that would not otherwise have considered such programs.
5. **Encourage Professional Science Masters (PSM) programs.** Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs are aware of plans for new emphasis on special programs designed to provide graduates ready for high-level professional practice in science-oriented business and industry. Such programs may serve important state and regional needs, buttressing the position of California and regions within it as leaders in 21st-century employment and service. As assessments confirm their success and good fit with state and regional needs, such programs should be strengthened and encouraged.
6. **Use alternative structures as "incubators" for State-supported graduate programs.**
 - Special Sessions. Can a new program develop a business plan for generating enrollments, securing a sufficient funding stream? Then, particular programs could be moved to state support if and when needed for making campus enrollment targets, if and when the size and significance of the program means that state support should be secured as a means of access.
 - Interdisciplinary Studies. Some campuses initially mount graduate academic programs under an interdisciplinary rubric. Student demand, faculty interest, and other crucial factors can be tested on a pilot basis, prior to making a formal proposal for a [named] degree program.
 - Research Centers. Master's programs may grow out of organized research centers, with the support of leveraged funds from external grants. Experience with this may be strongest in the sciences. Examples include CSU Los Angeles' CEA-CREST, which employs graduate and undergraduate students in integrated research teams tackling key

environmental research questions, resulting in a superb educational experience.

Finally in these areas collaboration can be useful. For example, Long Beach has helped spin off programs at Humboldt, Chico, Bakersfield and East Bay.

7. **Expand enrollment of international students to help the CSU achieve its goals for internationalization of the campus experience, and to secure highly talented students.** International students have long been contributors to American higher education. Moreover, we need to assure an international dimension to the learning experience of our students, and that includes the special diversity that international students bring to the learning environment.
8. **Develop innovative program variations to respond to the increasing complexity of the work force.** Campuses should consider more interdisciplinary programs for well-chosen, targeted markets. Special attention is needed to the administrative and curricular barriers that can impede program design, faculty assignments, and student progress to the degree. Campuses should consider 5- year, integrated bachelor/master's programs, in which undergraduates are contingently admitted to the master's program and begin taking graduate courses in the last semester of undergraduate status. Campuses should consider also joint master's programs. A partial illustrative list of examples includes MSW / MPA; MPH / MPA; Museum Studies / MBA; Biology / MBA.
9. **Target science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programs for growth.** The state, region and nation stand in special need in these areas. CSU campuses should explore innovative approaches to preparation for STEM careers, including the option of Professional Science Master's programs (PSM's).
10. **CSU campuses should offer innovative programs to equip persons with critical understanding of global culture, politics and language** in a post- 9/11 era. The state, region and nation stand in special need of persons possessing these skills. Programs in the humanities and social sciences should be considered for configuration or reconfiguration to supply this work force need.
11. **In all of this, campus student services and support should be enriched.** For understandable and well-understood reasons, most Student Affairs programs are designed with undergraduate clienteles in mind. Particularly if CSU campuses begin to newly emphasize the importance of graduate programs, and to seek their growth, new thinking about ways of supporting these students should be sought in partnership with campus Student Affairs professionals.

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2534-01/AA
March 15-16, 2001

New Study of Post-Baccalaureate Programs in the CSU

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its support for Recommendations on Study of Graduate Education (AS-1987-91/AA, attached); and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that its Executive Committee and the Office of the Chancellor develop a new collaborative study of post-baccalaureate programs in the CSU, for the purposes of updating the Study of Graduate Education completed in 1990, determining which of its recommendations have been successfully implemented, developing new recommendations as appropriate, and developing a parallel study of post-baccalaureate programs not part of graduate degree programs; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that the new study of post-baccalaureate programs, as a part of developing new recommendations, address the need for and capability and feasibility of expanding existing master's programs and of developing both new master's programs and applied doctoral programs.

RATIONALE: In 1991, the Academic Senate CSU supported a set of recommendations on graduate education in the CSU that were developed over the preceding several years. At the time, however, state funding precluded implementation of several of the recommendations that required additional funding. After an interval of ten years, it is appropriate to reexamine those recommendations. The original resolution and the recommendations are attached.

At its meeting of April 2-3, 2001, the Education Policy and Programs Committee of the California Postsecondary Education Commission took up the current state of graduate study in California's public institutions of higher education. The report is attached. Among other points, the report states:

The need for increased attention to the graduate level, including research, has been advanced as an area of growing concern not only within institutions of higher education but externally as well. Business and industry leaders in biotechnology, engineering, computer science, and other fields have expressed concern about the availability of graduate students and the linkages between research—be it pure or applied—and the needs of the State. . . .

The Commission believes that a major effort in this decade should be devoted to strengthening graduate education. The exercise of program selectivity, the improvement of the quality of graduate programs, and the recruitment of well-qualified graduate students depend in large part on the academic leadership provided by department heads, deans, and institutional leaders. It depends, also, in the case of public institutions, on the collective will and vision of policy makers, their sustained commitment in terms of financial support, and the expectation that the public interest will be best served by distinguished programs or centers of excellence.

The report notes that nearly all CSU campuses have smaller graduate programs, proportionately, than do comparable institutions such as Arizona State, Wayne State, Georgia State, or SUNY Albany. The report concludes:

The ability of California institutions, public and independent, to meet the competition emanating from a global economy and educational opportunity is limited. To be competitive and fulfill the State's interest as well as contribute to the economic vitality of the state and its citizenry, full attention needs to be given to strong graduate programs. . . . Outstanding graduate students invest their energies and knowledge in institutions boasting strong faculty, sophisticated research equipment and up-to-date library and information resources. Fresh graduate talent should be treated as a serious and ongoing priority. . . .

The Commission believes that by having additional information and discussion as anticipated at this Commission meeting it will be well served to plan for how it can best advise and counsel State policy-makers and educational leaders.

To meet the needs of California residents for advanced degree programs, a careful study needs to be made not only of the needs of the state and of its people for post-baccalaureate study, but, most importantly for the CSU, of the capability (in terms of faculty specialties, support resources, and the like) and feasibility (especially financial feasibility) of the CSU to offer programs to meet those needs. Such a study of needs, capability, and feasibility can be advantageously combined with a study of other aspects of post-baccalaureate education.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY – May 10-11, 2001

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2652-04/EX
March 11-12, 2004

Recommendation on the Report from the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the California State University

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the principles and recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the CSU; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that the Chancellor's Office, together with the Academic Senate CSU, review the recommendations of this report and establish a definite plan of action to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for the development and maintenance of graduate programs in the CSU; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that individual campuses, through the shared governance process, retain autonomy in their graduate degree programs, guided by the principles and recommendations articulated in the Report from the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the California State University; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU, together with the Chancellor's Office, explore the feasibility of differential fees for students in various types of postbaccalaureate programs and graduate degrees.

RATIONALE: The committee structure and process that developed the report, California's Prosperity at Stake, was a model of shared governance. The committee comprised selected members of the Academic Senate CSU, representatives of the CSU Graduate Dean's Council, and representatives of the Chancellor's Office. The committee's work was done in consultation with the campuses, very frequently with the offices responsible for graduate and postbaccalaureate education, along with campus senates. It was this balanced solicitation of input from sources external to the committee that marked its adherence to shared governance principles.

This report builds upon and extends the previous CSU evaluation of graduate education, The California State University Master's Degree: Implementation and Quality (Dinielli, 1989). The Task Force found this report as relevant today as it was 15 years ago.

APPROVED – May 6-7, 2004

**RETHINKING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN
THE CSU: MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA FOR GRADUATE
EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

REPORT OF THE

**TASK FORCE
ON
GRADUATE AND POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATION
IN THE
CSU**

**SEPTEMBER 2004
ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE ON GRADUATE AND POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATION IN THE CSU

CRISTY JENSEN,

Professor of Public Policy and Administration, California State University, Sacramento (Chair)

JOANN AGUIRRE,

Director, California Pre-Doctoral Programs, Chancellor's Office, CSU

CAL CAPLAN,

Professor of Kinesiology, California State University, Hayward

TED CROVELLO,

Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, California State University, Los Angeles

GENE DINIELLI,

Professor of English, California State University, Long Beach

SAMUEL EDELMAN,

Professor of Communication Studies, California State University, Chico

NABIL IBRAHIM,

Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, San Jose State University
(through Spring 2003)

KEN NISHITA,

Professor of Psychology, California State University, Monterey Bay

LESTER PINCU,

Professor of Criminology, California State University, Fresno, Vice Chair

BRENT RUSHALL,

Professor of Exercise and Nutritional Science, San Diego State University

JOLAYNE SERVICE,

Dean, Academic Program Planning, Chancellor's Office, CSU

DONNA SHAFER,

Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Humboldt State University

ROBERT SNYDER,

Professor of Philosophy, Humboldt State University

Research Assistance provided by Season Eckardt, Chancellor's Office

PREFACE

In May 2001, the Academic Senate of the CSU passed Resolution AS-2534-01 reaffirming its support for the recommendations contained in the 1989 study of graduate education in the CSU, chaired by Gene Dinielli (Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU, 1989). The resolution also called for a Senate Task Force to examine the implementation of earlier recommendations, update those recommendations, and develop new recommendations based on the current context.

For the past several years since the adoption of the *Cornerstones* plan, the CSU has unsuccessfully sought funding from the Legislature for a “graduate differential” to assure more appropriate funding for graduate education in the CSU. The faculty remains strongly committed to recognizing the need for a “graduate differential” and the importance of documenting the case for the needed funding.

The Legislature’s recently completed review of the Master Plan for Higher Education was a second stimulus for the resolution. Senator Dede Alpert, Chair of the Joint Committee for Developing a Master Plan for Education, had requested Academic Senate participation in identifying the needs and priorities for higher education in California. The CSU Academic Senate’s review of the Master Plan Committee’s questions affirmed the concern for funding levels (see the Academic Senate’s report, *The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*; Cherny, 2001), but also stimulated interest in exploring an expanded role for the CSU in doctoral education.

An increasingly urgent discussion in the legislature and higher education community has focused on the need for more educational administrators whose preparation includes professionally oriented, effective doctoral programs in education. In Spring 2001, the Chancellor raised the possibility of seeking legislative authorization for the CSU to offer a “stand alone” doctorate in the field of education administration and leadership. This action led to preliminary discussion about the desirability and feasibility of CSU doctoral programs in fields where the CSU has assembled significant expertise in its existing graduate programs and where there are few publicly supported and therefore widely accessible programs. These early discussions also contributed to the Senate’s resolution.

The Governor’s 2004-05 Budget Proposal and subsequent action by the CSU Board of Trustees introduced a graduate fee differential, renewing interest in differential costs of providing graduate education. The interdependence of fee cost/resource and faculty workload differentials is on the policy agenda once again link to the work of the Task Force.

The Task Force was convened in Fall 2001 and included eight faculty members, three graduate deans, and academic program staff from the Chancellor’s Office. This group reviewed the various statewide data bases, campus accountability reports on graduate education, reports from entities within our state, and documents from other national and state-based organizations. Task Force work has included a review of the recommendations of the 1989 study of graduate education and particularly the recommended criteria for high-quality programs that were adopted as Trustee policy. This report examines the opportunities for significant expansion of the CSU role in providing graduate education in a number of emerging fields. Specific attention is given to the possibility of applied doctorates. Also noted is the growing demand for non-degree postbaccalaureate certificates, typically in applied technology and science-based professions. Finally, the report examines the costs of graduate education with particular emphasis on faculty

workload issues that affect how much funding is needed. This report represents the work of the Task Force and includes recommendations for action by statewide and campus Senates in collaboration with Graduate Deans, Provosts, Presidents, the Chancellor, and the Legislature.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The previous study of graduate education in the CSU was completed over a decade ago, and its recommendations were considered during a period of declining state revenues. There was considerable disappointment that resources were scarce for funding implementation of the report's recommendations. Yet when the "bust" of the early 1990s was followed by the "boom" and consequent state budget surpluses of the middle and late 1990s, the relatively strong budgets did not include a differentiation of funding for graduate education or a full recognition of the workloads associated with graduate programs, as recommended in the 1989 study of graduate education. The Task Force is keenly aware that *this* report is being released during a time of unprecedented fiscal crisis in the state. We hope this report can be a focal point of renewed efforts and commitments to ensure that graduate education provided by the CSU, so critical to California's economic and societal strength, be funded adequately. Much is at stake.

Dramatic changes in California present challenges and opportunities for institutions of higher education. The complexity and increasingly global dimension of California's economy creates an increasing need for a highly knowledgeable workforce in which the state's population, rich in demographic diversity, must be prepared to participate. The changes require a responsive and adaptive educational system to design effective curricula and provide the requisite graduate education.

The CSU's coupling of educational equity and academic excellence is a key ingredient ensuring that California's demographics will be a strength, helping to produce an adaptable workforce, strong, diverse markets for California products, and a society in which mutual understanding and civility prevail.

The CSU is a dynamic and responsive system of regional campuses serving California that is capable of:

- Identifying and articulating critical postbaccalaureate needs.
- Selectively developing increased capacity to meet state needs.
- Linking to national and international markets and needs.
- Continuously integrating new and alternative modes of providing education—including technology-based and technology enhanced teaching and learning—when such modes are demonstrated to be effective.
- Forging critical partnerships with other societal sectors including business, industry, research organizations, government at all levels, K-12 schools, the community colleges, the University of California, independent institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, and the community.

The CSU is uniquely capable of responding to state needs and exhibiting leadership in the development of graduate degree and certificate programs with a regional and applied focus. The Task Force found that a number of changes in California affect the needs for graduate education. These include increasing specialization of the economy coupled with a growing awareness of the interdependence of economic and social forces.

Changes in California That Affect the CSU

- Changes in California's economy are reflected in the growth of specialized graduate certificates and graduate degree programs. The current educational context also presents more opportunities for partnerships in education.
- From 1985 to 2003 ethnic minorities increased as a proportion of California's population, and the participation of underrepresented groups in the CSU graduate student cohort also increased, in some cases at an even greater rate.
- The most recent review of the California Master Plan for Higher Education emphasized an integrated system of education in California that links pre-school through K-12 and higher education and promotes partnerships among educational segments and with business and industry.
- New forms of academic technology are increasingly incorporated into graduate education in the CSU.
- Changes to K-12 education policy have reverberated in the CSU, which continues to lead the state in preparing K-12 educators—still in large part at the postbaccalaureate level.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Master's Program Issues

- The professional Master of Science degree is emerging nationally as a model for advanced-level workforce development. Partnering with business and professional communities, where appropriate, to develop new and valuable graduate degree programs should be encouraged.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to discuss whether it is appropriate and valuable to designate a "graduate faculty," in part to recognize the distinctions between graduate and undergraduate instruction and their workload implications. In those discussions, campuses are encouraged to examine what should be expected of faculty who teach at the graduate level, including any special qualifications.
- CSU master's degree programs are encouraged, where appropriate, to develop links to and articulation with doctoral programs at UC and independent universities. Of particular interest are "bridge" programs that allow students in CSU master's degree programs to pursue a course of study with the assurance that a doctoral institution will recognize it as meeting a portion of the requirements for the doctoral degree.

Certificate Program Issues

- **Certificates represent a focused response to specific continuing education needs. They can also strengthen the pipeline for graduate degree programs.**
- The CSU should develop a standardized terminology for graduate-level certificates.
- CSU campuses are urged to develop further their own certificates policies. Campus policies for graduate-level certificate programs should address such elements as unit

requirements, links to academic departments, and admission standards appropriate to courses that could be part of graduate degree programs.

Funding Issues

- Funding for CSU graduate education must be reliable, stable, and sufficient. It should be
 - linked to a graduate differential in state financial support (e.g., through the redefinition of a graduate FTES, as proposed in the Trustees' budget for 2001-2002);
 - grounded in a full recognition of the work involved; and
 - incorporating recognition of the student and faculty research and scholarship critical to graduate education and the infrastructure needed to support them.
- While partnerships may lower the total cost of a graduate-level initiative by eliminating the need to duplicate certain resources, it should be recognized that sustaining most partnerships requires the investment of at least a modest amount of resources for continuing coordination. Policies and practices should be examined for their potential to become disincentives for collaboration.
- Internal campus policies and priorities need to reflect the campus's commitment, in resource and workload terms, to graduate programs.
- When resources to offer a graduate program wholly through state support are not available, CSU campuses should be free to explore a hybrid model, combining state support and self-support components programmatically while maintaining the fiscal integrity of each component.
- The CSU should continue to explore uses of academic technology and ways to fund it.
- The CSU should advocate aggressively for federal support of CSU research. Exploration of partnerships with the private sector that would enhance the CSU's research infrastructure is encouraged.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to explore a zero-unit enrollment policy that establishes a fee appropriate to the faculty work involved in thesis supervision that extends beyond enrollment in a thesis course.
- Greater flexibility in providing fee waivers for graduate students is encouraged.
- Current disincentives to sharing resources in a variety of graduate education partnerships constrains innovation. Strategies for reducing the impact of those disincentives can foster the development of new initiatives. The 2003 Report of the Academic Technology Planning Committee recommends an initiative, and potential starting point, that would proposed new policies and identify practices that would remove the fiscal disincentives to multi-campus collaborations.
- All doctoral education conducted by the CSU needs funding commitments at least equivalent to the funding commitments for joint CSU-UC EdD programs. The joint EdD programs should be monitored, especially with respect to the division of funds and workload parity, to determine whether the model should be extended to other joint doctoral programs.

Doctoral Program Issues

- Joint PhD programs have not in general lived up to their promise, though individual programs have achieved some success. The commitment to joint doctoral programs has been uncertain over time, the approval process is cumbersome, the funding has not been commensurate with the costs of current programs, and sufficient start-up monies have not been readily available. Ways to make joint doctoral programs more effective should be explored.
- The CSU is urged to study further the experience of the existing programs to determine the most useful practices for future joint work, with a special focus on faculty workload. Start up funding has not been consistently available for these joint efforts. We recommend funding and support for Joint PhD comparable to that provided the Joint CSU-UC Ed.D Program
- *If*
 - the need for publicly supported doctoral programs in one or more selected fields is well established,
 - the UC does not respond by developing its own doctoral programs or joint doctoral programs with the CSU,
 - the faculty at one or more CSU campuses has the expertise to offer the programs and is interested in doing so, and
 - adequate funding is made available,

the CSU should seek the authority to offer doctoral programs in those fields, independent of other universities. A focus on applied fields and the education of advanced-level practitioners is encouraged.

- The Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate CSU should create a subcommittee for doctoral program review and planning. In addition to program design, the subcommittee should consider issues of workload parity and dissertation supervision.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to develop policies and criteria for faculty participation in doctoral education. Comparable policies should apply to faculty in all the partnering institutions in a joint doctoral program. The CSU graduate deans are encouraged to stimulate campus discussion on these issues.

The CSU is a responsive, responsible, flexible higher education system that plays an important role in ensuring and sustaining California's prosperity and quality of life. It can play an even larger role, cost-effectively, if given the opportunity to do so.