

1999-2000
FACULTY SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA

Thursday, October 28, 1999
Foothill Suite, UU
3:00-5:00 p.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

VIOLA BOEKELHEIDE
Professor of Music Emeritus
CSUS 1955 - 1976

OPEN FORUM

CONSENT CALENDAR

FS 99-78/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – SENATE

Research and Creative Activity Subcommittee:
ELIZABETH STRASSER, At-large, 2002

FS 99-79/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--UNIVERSITY

Council on Information Technology:
BOB BUCKLEY, At-large, 2001

Institutional Scholarship Committee:
PETER SHATTUCK, At-large (Emeritus), 2001

University Union Board of Directors:

At-large, 2000 (one position for which the following have agreed to be interviewed by the President):
MIKE LEE
LOUISE TIMMER
MICHAEL FITZGERALD
ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY

FS 99-80/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—GRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

College of Arts and Letters

Department of History: To comply with University policy that graduate programs require 18 units of 200 level courses, increases required courses in M.A. Standard History program from 15 to 18 units. Students must enroll in an additional History 280 or History 281. Instructor may be the same, but topic must be different. Reduces electives from 12 to 9 units.

College of Business Administration

Department of Accountancy, Master of Science in Business Administration-Taxation: Revises foundation courses for those seeking entry into MSBA-Taxation program, reducing them to three specific areas: 1) accounting, 2) economics, 3) business law and legal research.

College of Health and Human Services

Division of Nursing, Master of Science in Nursing: Modifies existing MS degree program to offer the advanced practice functional role preparation of clinical nurse specialist to meet expressed community need and national trends. Also modifies existing core requirements adding courses in community and health policy. Increases units for completion of the MS from 36 to 39-44, depending on the functional role preparation.

FS 99-81/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—UNDERGRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

College of Arts and Letters

Department of Communication Studies: Adds ComS 163 and ComS 182 as alternatives to ComS 143 requirement for Interpersonal/Small Group area of study. Adds ComS 188 to requirements for the Intercultural/International area of study. Adds a choice of ComS 159 or ComS 187 to the requirement for Public Relations areas of study. Cleans up elective language and advises students to take a public speaking G.E. oral communication requirement.

Department of Music Minor: To bring currency and more options to the music minor, increases units required from 16 to 20.

College of Business Administration

Department of Management—Marketing Minor: Creates Marketing Minor requiring MGMT 120 (3 units) and an additional 12 units selected from eight elective courses.

Department of Management—Risk Management and Insurance (RMI) Minor: Creates RMI Minor requiring 12 units (MGMT 20, 138, 139A, 139B).

College of Health and Human Services

Division of Nursing: Requires service learning course (NURS 191, 2 units) in fourth clinical nursing semester which is completed in the fifth clinical nursing semester. This requirement has existed for nearly 20 years but students have not received academic units for the required project. Given the University, state and national emphasis on the importance of a service-learning component in the educational program, NURS 191 will give the students credit and formal recognition for the collaborative community experience.

FS 99-82/CPC, Ex. CERTIFICATE, DISCONTINUATION OF RECREATION THERAPIST ASSISTANT

The Faculty Senate recommends discontinuation of the Recreation Therapist Assistant Certificate.

CONSENT-- INFORMATION

FS 99-77/Ex. NAMING OF BUILDINGS—STEVEN LEE YAMSHON [ALUMNI] CENTER

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate, unanimously approves the proposal to name the Alumni Center (currently under construction) the Steven Lee Yamshon Center.

REGULAR AGENDA

FS 99-76/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of October 14 (# 4), 1999.

FIRST READING ITEMS (Discussion only; no action)

FS 99-83A/Ex. WAIVER OF FIRST READING OF FS 99-83

The Faculty Senate waives the first reading of FS 99-83, Endorsement of ASI Resolution In Support of University Union Student Recreation Center.

[Note: FS 99-83 is forwarded from the Executive Committee without recommendation.]

FS 99-83/Ex. STUDENT RECREATION CENTER, ENDORSEMENT OF ASI RESOLUTION
IN SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY UNION

The Faculty Senate endorses the ASI "Resolution in Support of the Associated Students, Inc. and University Union Student Recreation Center Project" (Attachment A)

FS 99-84/APC, Ex. ENGLISH DIAGNOSTIC TEST

The Faculty Senate recommends replacing current catalog language regarding the English Diagnostic Test (page 69, 1998-2000 CSUS Catalog, Attachment B-2) with the language contained in Attachment B-1.

FS 99-85/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS—ELIMINATE APPEALS
FROM PANEL TO PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
{Ann Haffer}

The Faculty Senate recommends that the Program Review Process be amended to eliminate procedures for an appeal from panels to the Program Review Subcommittee.

INFORMATION

1. CSUS response (Attachment C-1) to CSU "Draft Accountability Process" (Attachment C-2).
2. Tentative Fall 1999 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule:
November 18 Senate Meeting
December 9 Senate Meeting
3. Senate Home Page (<http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page then Administration and Policy then Administration then Faculty Senate) - Senator Arthur Jensen

*RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE
ASSOCIATED STUDENTS, INC. & UNIVERSITY UNION
STUDENT RECREATION CENTER PROJECT*

- Whereas, The Associated Students, Inc. and the University Union have put forth a proposal for a student referendum to increase student fees in support of a new Student Recreation Center, and;
- Whereas, The planning process for the Center has included broad based input from all constituents of the campus community, and;
- Whereas, The Student Recreation Center will be open and available to students, faculty, staff, alumni and community members for recreation, fitness and social interaction, and;
- Whereas, The Student Recreation Center will increase the student life and the collegial environment of the campus and provide opportunities for exercise, social and intellectual interaction and wellness education, and;
- Whereas, Survey data confirms that 59% of the students of California State University, Sacramento support a fee assessment of up to \$100 to build and operate the Center, and;
- Whereas, The Student Recreation Center Project could create as many as 200 student jobs and internships and will provide one-third of the \$99/per semester fee for need-based financial aid programs, and;
- Whereas, The Student Recreation Center will function as a community center bringing diverse groups and individuals of all ages, cultures, and beliefs together to stimulate the learning process on campus, therefore let it be;
- Resolved, That we support the Student Recreation Center Project and its mission to increase campus life and serve the campus community with recreation, leisure, fitness and wellness education programs, and therefore let it further be;
- Resolved, That we will actively encourage all students to Exercise their Vote at the polls on November 16th or 17th.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

For more information contact:

David Patterson, Chair
Student Referendum Committee
(916) 278-4834
david.patterson@csus.edu

October 19, 1999

Sacramento, CA – California State University, Sacramento has retained the services of Brailsford & Dunlavey, a Washington DC based facility planning firm, to assess the current campus needs for recreation and athletic facilities. The firm has recently completed a comprehensive telephone survey of 502 students regarding recreational and athletic facilities on campus. Jeffrey Turner, a facility planning consultant concluded, "the survey found that the current recreational facilities on campus are inadequate to meet student needs and desires."

Of the students surveyed, 59% expressed that they would be willing to increase their fees by \$100 per semester to finance a new Student Recreation Center. The survey has a margin of error of about +/- 5% with a 95% confidence interval. In their findings, B & D concluded that students are most interested in weight machines, fitness machines and free weights. Also topping the list were an indoor walking and jogging track, multipurpose rooms for aerobics, martial arts and dance and a recreational and lap swimming pool. In addition, students expressed a strong desire for gymnasiums to accommodate basketball, volleyball, badminton and indoor soccer. Other components that received high rankings were a rock climbing wall and a wellness education center.

The survey also discovered that 30% of current CSUS students already belong to private fitness centers and pay between \$20-\$35 per month to use those facilities. "The Student Recreation Center will provide a facility ten times the size of a 24-hour fitness at half the cost to students. This facility will also increase campus life and provide up to 100,000 sq. ft. of space for indoor intramural sports and open recreation", stated Geoffrey Sakala, President of the Associated Students, Inc. In other findings, the consulting firm concluded that only about 10%-15% of the students at CSUS have utilized the current facilities for recreation purposes. It is estimated that at least 65%-70% of the students at CSUS would use the new facility. "Most recreation centers such as the ones at UC Davis or San Jose State see as many as 5,000 students a day using their facilities," said Paul Hegyi, ASI Recreation Center Task Force.

The facility planning firm Brailsford & Dunlavey will be on campus Tuesday, October 19th in the University Union Theater to conduct campus-wide open forums. They will present the findings of their survey and take questions from the audience. A Student Referendum Committee has been established to develop informational materials for the campus community regarding the proposed Student Recreation Center. The committee plans to conduct a referendum vote on November 16th & 17th to seek student interest in financing new recreation and fitness facilities at CSUS. David Patterson, Chair of the Student Referendum Committee stated, "Sac State must improve their recreation facilities to meet the demand by students and to stay competitive with other Universities in the region. This facility will greatly improve campus recreational opportunities and create as many as 200 jobs and internships on campus for students."

APPROVED BALLOT LANGUAGE FOR NOVEMBER 16 & 17 ELECTION

Fee Referendum - Recreation/Fitness Center and Financial Aid

An increase in campus-based mandatory fees is proposed to support student programs. Two-thirds of the total increase is proposed to support the construction and operation of a Recreation/Fitness Center as described below and will be administered through the University Union (student body center) fee pursuant to the requirements of Education Code 90010 et seq. and the bond obligations of the Board of Trustees for the Union facilities.

In addition, pursuant to the requirements of Board of Trustees policy (RFIN 05-96-06), one third of the total increase will be used in campus financial aid programs to meet student needs resulting from the fee increase. This component of the increase will be accounted for pursuant to Education Code 89721 (b) as a legally separate fee.

As outlined below a total increase of \$99 per semester is proposed to meet these needs.

The Recreation/Fitness Center of approximately 100,000 sq. ft. will provide spaces for intramural and recreation activities including a weight and fitness center, multi-purpose gyms and activity rooms for basketball, jogging, aerobics, volleyball, and other indoor sports, as well as facilities for racquetball, a wellness center, locker rooms and a swimming pool.

Funding for the proposed Recreation/Fitness Center project will be from the sale of revenue bonds of approximately 25 million dollars, supported by a five step increase in the existing \$71 per semester student body center (University Union) fee.

A "yes" vote is a vote in favor of the Recreation Center project and to increase fees as described for above stated purpose.

A "no" vote is a vote that you are not in favor of the Recreation Center project and to not increase fees as described for this purpose.

STUDENT RECREATION CENTER

Frequently Asked Questions

What is a Student Recreation Center?

A Student Recreation Center is a building like the University Union. It will provide approximately 100,000 sq. ft. of space for open recreation, intramural sports and wellness education. Some of the amenities could include:

- Weight machines, fitness (cardiovascular) machines and free weights
- Indoor walking & jogging track
- Multipurpose rooms for aerobics (dance, slide, step), martial arts (karate, tai chi, tai kwan do), kick boxing, yoga, gymnastics, wrestling etc.
- Pool for recreational & lap swimming, water aerobics & water polo
- Gyms for basketball, volleyball, badminton etc.
- Courts for tennis, racquetball, handball etc.
- Gyms for indoor soccer, floor hockey & broom ball
- Wellness center for health education and a social lounge with a juice bar & vending machines
- Drop-in child care facility

Who will be able to use the Student Recreation Center?

All currently enrolled students will be able to use the facility by showing their CSUS One Card. Faculty, staff and alumni will also be able to use the facility by paying an annual fee, which will be competitive with local health clubs in the Sacramento area. In addition, the Student Recreation Center could create up to 200 student jobs and internships on campus.

When will the Student Recreation Center open for use?

The Student Recreation Center will take about 18-24 months to plan at which time an architect will be hired to develop the working drawings and blue prints. The architectural work will take approximately 18-24 months as well. The building will break ground and start construction at the end of this 3-4 year period. The entire project should take 4-5 years to complete before the doors will open for operations. The center will be open on a year-round basis.

Where will the Student Recreation Center be located?

The University is currently assessing two possible locations on campus. The location may be in parking lot 10 near the football stadium or in parking lot 6 near the University Union. The final determination will be made soon after the referendum. There are plans for it will be centrally located with easy and convenient access to bicycle lockers and within walking distance from most areas of the campus.

How will the Student Recreation Center impact parking on campus?

There will be parking provided to accommodate most high traffic times during the day and evening. The Student Recreation Center will attempt to not reduce parking spaces available to students, faculty and staff without providing for additional parking conveniently located near the center.

Why do students have to raise their fees to pay for the Student Recreation Center?

Buildings such as this one, like the University Union cannot be funded by state general fund dollars. In addition, upon exploration of possible corporate sponsorships it was determined that they would amount to less than 5% of the total cost of the building. This would not provide enough money to cover the projected \$25 million dollars required for the construction and operation of a Student Recreation Center. Once students decide to fund the center, more opportunities will be available to seek supplemental private funding for equipment and programs in the Student Recreation Center.

English Diagnostic Test – Undergraduate International Students and Permanent U.S. Residents from Non-English Speaking Countries

All undergraduate international students (on visa) and permanent residents (green card holders) from non-English speaking countries must take the English Diagnostic Test (EDT) unless they have taken the English Placement Test (EPT) at California State University, Sacramento.

Until the test requirement is met, international students and permanent residents from non-English speaking countries will not be allowed to register for any classes, including ESL (English for Speakers of other Languages) classes.

It is recommended that all other native speakers of languages other than English take the EDT as well. The EDT will determine placement in the most appropriate courses for speakers of languages other than English and will determine which students are eligible for the ESL administration of the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE).

Exemptions are available for those with English as their first language.

& for other compelling reasons. Carried forward!

Students who have not satisfied the freshman composition requirement and who would benefit from ESL instruction will be placed in the following sequence of courses:

- Learning Skills 86
- Learning Skills 87
- English 2

at the appropriate level

Students who have not satisfied the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWAR) by passing the WPE will be placed in the following sequence of courses:

Assessment

- Learning Skills 86
- English 109E
- (passage of the English 109E exam will satisfy the GWAR requirement)

If you are required to take

English Requirements for International Students (on visa) and Permanent Residents

English Diagnostic Test

All undergraduate international students (on visa) and permanent residents (green card holders) from non-English speaking countries must take both the English Placement Test (unless exempt; see above) and the English Diagnostic Test (EDT). All other native speakers of languages other than English are encouraged to take the EDT as well. The English Diagnostic Test will determine placement in the most appropriate ESL course for each student and will determine which students are eligible for the ESL administration of the Writing Proficiency Exam. Until this test requirement is met, international students and permanent residents will not be allowed to register for any classes, including ESL classes.

Students will be placed in the following course sequence according to their score on the English Diagnostic Test:

- Learning Skills 86
- Learning Skills 87
- English 2

If you are required to take the course indicated above and do not register for the prescribed course

during your first semester on campus, you may not be able to enroll in the next semester. To register for the test or to obtain additional information about this test, contact the Learning Skills Center, Lassen Hall, 278-6725.

ENTRY LEVEL MATHEMATICS (ELM) EXAMINATION AND EXEMPTIONS

The Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination tests for mathematics skills acquired through three years of rigorous college preparatory mathematics course work (normally Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry). All undergraduate students must take the test or be exempted from it prior to placement in appropriate university mathematics course work.

The results of the ELM examination will not affect admission eligibility but will be used for placement in appropriate course work.

ELM Examination Exemptions

First-time freshmen can qualify for an exemption on the basis of satisfactory performance on the examinations listed below.

Transfer students can qualify for an exemption either on the basis of satisfactory performance on an examination listed below or by

completion and **October 28, 1999** college course that satisfies the General Education quantitative reasoning requirement or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum requirement in Quantitative Reasoning, provided such course was completed with a grade of C or better.

Exemptions from the ELM Examination are given only to those students who can present proof of one of the following:

- a score of 3 or above on the College Board Advanced Placement Mathematics examination (AB or BC)
- a score of 560 or above on the mathematics section of the College Board SAT taken prior to March 1994
- a score of 560 or above on the College Board Mathematics Achievement Test¹ Level I or Level II taken prior to March 1994
- a score of 560 or above on the mathematics section of the College Board SAT I¹ Reasoning Test OR on the College Board SAT II¹ Mathematics Tests Level I, II or IIC (Calculator), taken on or after March 1, 1994 (see note below)
- a score of 24 or above on the ACT Mathematics Test (taken prior to October 1989)
- a score of 25 or above on the enhanced ACT Mathematics Test (taken October 1989 and later)
- for transfer students, completion and transfer to the CSU a college course that satisfies the General Education requirement or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum requirement in Quantitative Reasoning, provided such a course was completed with a grade of C or better.

Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Equivalency Course Sequence For Students Who Are NOT EXEMPT from the ELM Requirement		
Scores	Planning to take Math 1 for GE area B4	Planning to take a GE area B4 Math Course other than Math 1**
370 or below	LS 7A and 7B Freshmen scoring 370 or below are <u>required</u> to enroll in LS 7A and 7B.	LS 7A and 7B and Math 9*
380 - 470	LS 10A and LS 10B*	LS 10A and Math 9*
480 - 540	LS 10B	Math 9* or Math 11*
550 or above ELM Exam Passed	No ELM equivalency courses required.	
480 or above if ELM Exam taken prior to 5/9/92	Take Math 1	Refer to the catalog for your GE Mathematics course

* This course requires the Elementary Algebra Diagnostic Exam as a prerequisite.
 ** Courses in this category are Math 17, 24, 26A, 26B, 29, 30, 31, 35, and STAT 1, 50. Successful completion of a Diagnostic Exam is a prerequisite.
 NOTE: You may elect to retake the ELM Exam. You are not required to retake the ELM Exam after completion of the course sequence.

¹ The College Board SAT and Achievement Tests were replaced by SAT I and SAT II respectively beginning March 1994. Beginning April 1, 1995, the SAT I and SAT II exams are scored on a new scale; however, the SAT scores qualifying for exemption from the ELM remain the same.

COMMENTS ON DRAFT ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS *
Due November 1, 1999

revised 10.26.99

Principles

- Campus and system focus
- CSU indicators and campus specific indicators
- Student characteristics unique to campus
- Evaluate and report on progress toward educational objectives over time
- The accountability process consists of a limited set of performance indicators deemed most important by the CSU and its stakeholders
- CSU consults widely in development of indicators and reports
- CSU evaluates performance areas to determine appropriateness and usefulness and value of indicators
- CSU relies on existing data, data systems and processes

Comment:

The importance of any of the Performance Areas and the associated Performance Indicators may change over time. The Principles should specify that the accountability process be subject to periodic assessment and that each of the performance areas and indicators be modified when and if necessary.

CSU, CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, TRUSTEES' ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Negotiation and implementation of multi-year performance and budget compacts

Performance areas:

State

- Goals for increased state funding and capital outlay
- Added funding for new or expanded programs and initiatives
- One time funding for such high priority needs as libraries, technology, deferred maintenance
- Funding for enrollment growth
- Provision for competitive faculty salaries

CSU

- Admission of an increased number of eligible students
- Effectiveness of CSU outreach in reducing remediation needs
- Effectiveness of CSU in meeting demand for school teachers AND improving quality

Comment:

We assume that admission of an "increased the number of eligible students" means that the pool of eligible students will increase due to both growth and better preparedness of students at the secondary level. That is, the underlying issue represented by these three areas seems to be the need to better prepare the pool of eligible students as well as increase the pool. This is not a new problem or idea.

* Note. Excerpts from the Draft are provided in non-italicized print. The campus response is provided in *italicized* print.

The role that CSU can play in better preparing high school graduates and in increasing the pool of eligible students and reducing the need for remediation is limited. These performance areas should be restated to reflect realistically the role that CSU can play in working with K-12 and its various stakeholders in making these improvements.

Clearly, CSU has a major responsibility in preparing and credentialing qualified teachers. While CSU should clearly commit to increasing the supply of new teachers and at the same time improving the quality of these new teachers, the performance areas should be restated to ensure that these goals are not be in conflict.

□ Improved transfer process

2. Maintaining balance between system commonality and campus autonomy

Performance Areas:

- Maintenance of effective advisory structure and process
- Desired distribution of decision-making between CSU and campus
- Sustained efforts to respect, preserve and advance campus uniqueness and autonomy
- Stimulation of innovative and creative approaches to teaching and learning

Comment:

Incentives for innovative and creative approaches to teaching and learning must include provision for demonstrated effectiveness. For example, creative and innovative approaches in the use of technology should be encouraged, but such efforts should require an assessment component that identifies outcomes and assesses the effectiveness of these efforts. In addition, if encouraging innovation is to work, we would suggest restating the performance area in a way that truly encourages experimentation and doesn't penalize failure.

3. Advancing the mission of CSU

Performance Areas:

- Work effectively with Legislature, Governor's Office, Office of Legislative Analyst and Department of Finance
- Cooperate with other educational segments, State DOE, and CPEC
- Provide leadership in regional, state, and national educational communities
- Promote welfare of CSU through effective relations with all constituencies, including the media and business community

We suggest the addition of the following performance area to the "CSU, Chancellor's Office, Trustees' Accountability" set.

4. *Developing collegial relations between faculty and CSU administration and campus administration*

This additional Performance Area would provide an opportunity to highlight the need for collaboration and shared governance on all of the issues contained in the Accountability Process. The performance indicators in this area should demonstrate how effectively CSU and its campuses are working together to maintain and improve the quality of the CSU system.

*General Comments on “CSU, Chancellor’s Office, Trustees’ Accountability”:
We expect that a set of performance indicators for each of the performance areas will be provided in the next draft. While we understand the need for a limited set of performance indicators, we would encourage the Chancellor’s office to carefully select the indicators to adequately represent the intent specified in each performance area.*

CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Quality of Baccalaureate Programs

Indicator: (first three years) For each university, descriptions of processes for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree.

Indicator: (after three years) For each university, a report of campus academic program reviews that summarizes assessment results and describes how these results have been used to improve teaching, learning, and programs.

2. Access to CSU. The CSU will admit all eligible undergraduate students who complete the admission process.

Indicator: For each university, the percentage of eligible first-time freshmen and transfer applicants who are admitted to the university in non-impacted programs.

Comment:

The indicator associated with “Access to CSU” is somewhat confusing. The percentage of eligible applicants admitted is, in fact, 100% for non-impacted programs (or campuses). We assume this performance area relates to the CSU service criteria, as specified in the Master Plan. If this is the case, the performance area should be restated and an appropriate indicator identified. Both would then adequately demonstrate how CSU is meeting its mandate to serve eligible students.

3. Progression to the degree

The CSUS will provide clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for both first-time freshman and transfer students

Comment:

This Performance Area assumes a rather simple relationship between a “clear path” to a degree and the time it takes to earn the degree. The indicator provides no insight into what is meant by “provide a clear path”. If the time to degree should be shortened, what are the primary determinants of affecting such a change? CSU can make changes to some of its “supply side” effects but not to the student controlled, “demand side” effects. For instance, a major determinant in time to degree may be the cost of the degree. If this were the case, lowering fees and “tuition” might prove to be the most cost-effective approach.

This Performance Area should acknowledge the diversity of our student population and that the progression to degree is affected by each student's family, health, and financial responsibilities as well as the student's personal goals. CSU should endeavor to understand the circumstances affecting students' progression to degree and provide appropriate paths to the baccalaureate degree, which are consistent with these circumstances. This understanding should be communicated, through this document, to both the Governor and the State Legislature.

General Comment. Success in many of the cited performance areas in the Draft Plan is derived from a rather complex set of determinants, not all of which are under the control of CSU or its campuses. If the system is to most effectively use its limited resources, a clearer understanding of what can be achieved by any specific action should be a major goal of the improvement process. We agree with the general intent implied by the Accountability Process Plan but suggest that the Areas and Indicators be reviewed and revised where necessary so that the Process more accurately reflects what CSU can do and how it should be measured.

4. Graduation

The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, disaggregated advising, and effective access to courses will allow students to achieve their degree objectives.

Indicator: For each university, student graduation rates, disaggregated by major sub-populations (first-time freshman, lower division transfer students, upper-division transfer students) and by key student characteristics (such as full and part-time attendance).

Comment:

Again, the Performance Area and its Indicator presume that there are ways in which graduation rates can be significantly improved and these ways are controllable by each campus. The issue is not whether such ways exist, but the role campuses can play and whether that role is cost effective. Increased graduation rates may not be achieved solely by providing a “clearer statements of graduation requirements, more effective advising, and more effective access to courses.” In fact, the returns to

increased "expenditures" in these three areas may be negligible. Again, a clear understanding of cause and effect is necessary if desired results are to be achieved in a cost-effective manner.

This Performance Area is similar to the "Progression to the Degree" indicator and, as indicated above, should acknowledge the diversity of our student population and that graduation rates are affected by each student's family, health, and financial responsibilities as well as the student's personal goals. CSU should endeavor to understand the circumstances affecting these graduation rates and provide, where appropriate, services that would improve students' chances and opportunities to graduate. This understanding should be communicated, through this document, to both the Governor and the State Legislature.

Note. CSUS provides students with a "four year pledge" program, which provides a clear path to graduation in four years. To date the interest and the participation rates in this program have been negligible. In this case a clear path is available for students. The lack of interest indicates that much more is involved, much of which is beyond the control of CSU campuses.

One final comment on the specification of the Indicator for this Performance Area. Care should be taken to ensure that performance in this area is at the University level and not program specific. Accountability at the department level, while important, is more appropriately handled through the program review process on each campus. The stated principles that "introduce" this Accountability Process Plan clearly make this distinction.

5. Areas of special state need

Comment:

We would suggest some rewording of this performance area which would acknowledge the importance of our traditional and core value as an institution of higher education dedicated to undergraduate education. While maintaining this core value, the CSU also assumes the responsibility to be responsive to the special needs of the state.

An Indicator should be added to reflect campus responses to the need for continuing education. The potential value-added to the community by the University in providing retraining and retooling through extension programs is significant.

6. Relations with K-12

In and effort to improve the academic preparation of entering students, the CSU will be responsive to the needs of K-12 education.

Comment:

CSU will (and should) continue to be "responsive to the needs of K-12 education" CSU should accept responsibility for the role it can play. This includes the preparation of

teachers, efforts at outreach and our ability to serve more students. CSU can (and should) work with K-12 to improve the academic preparation of high school graduates. We should share this responsibility and be held accountable for our role.

The Indicator for this particular Area is stated as the “percentage of regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in math and English composition” when they enter the university. Clearly, the causes of the poor preparedness of eligible students are complex, as are the remedies. CSU has a role to play in improving student preparedness but needs significant help and cooperation from other entities. CSU performance in this area would be better indicated by outreach efforts and partnering with UC, Community Colleges and the public schools to improve the academic preparation of entering students.

7. Remediation

The CSU will successfully remediate, within one year, entering students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English composition.

Comment:

The Indicator for this Area is stated as the “percentage of students requiring remediation that complete the remediation within one year.” Significant progress has been made through current remediation efforts at the campus level. However, until the remediation needs of entering students become negligible, the need for resources to continue these efforts is essential. In addition, we should be mindful that we do not inadvertently create a bias against students that are underprepared, economically disadvantaged, or responsible for families; all of whom may need more time to complete their remediation.

Clearly, a lowering of requirements could produce improvement but not the desired result. One of the Principles that “introduces” this document should assert that this is the case.

8. Facilities utilization

Comment:

This Performance Area calls for increased utilization of facilities in order to “reduce the need for construction of new buildings”. The Indicator is the “percentage of course enrollments occurring during evenings, weekends, summers, and other ‘off peak’ times.” This Performance Area and its Indicator need to be restated in terms that reflect the association between campuses approaching capacity and program and/or campus “impaction” and the need to more fully utilize existing facilities – including a movement to year-round-operation. This is a growth management Performance Area, and the Indicator should reflect this.

In the absence of impaction and the funding necessary to support increased enrollment growth, a move to shift enrollments to evenings, weekends, summers and other “off

peak” times might not be cost effective. In addition, the spreading of limited resources may make it difficult for programs to maintain offerings and/or quality of content. We should recognize that in most cases the ability to use facilities is a function of student needs based on, in part, the students’ extracurricular goals, including work.

9. University advancement

To provide support for margins of educational excellence, the CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions.

Comment:

The phrase “margins of educational excellence” conjures up a multitude of meanings. Alternative wording might be “To provide resources for additional opportunities for students to excel.”

Three-year Performance Areas and Indicators

10. Quality of post-baccalaureate programs

Comment:

The sample of Indicators in this Area implies that the Program Review Process be applied to each post-baccalaureate program. This is a time consuming and labor intensive process. On our campus, Program Reviews of baccalaureate programs are staggered with approximately six (6) such reviews scheduled for completion in any one year. According to the “Three-Year” reporting cycle, this Performance Area is to be reported in the year 2000. A meaningful review of all post-baccalaureate programs in such a short time frame would be impractical.

11. Contributions to community and society

Comment:

This is the area where the campus could effectively and demonstrably inform CSU, the Governor, the Legislature and the public about the benefits and value added to California and, more specifically for our campus, the Sacramento metropolitan region.

12. Institutional effectiveness

The primary mission of the CSU is teaching and learning. Administrative functions and the campus environment should support this mission through responsiveness to the needs of students and faculty, and through increasing efficiencies.

Comment:

The Performance Area description makes reference to “increasing efficiencies”? Without additional clarity, one could propose “functions and an environment” that provide virtual support to virtual students at virtually no cost. All proposed efficiency enhancements must be required to demonstrate educational effectiveness. We suggest adding the clause “while maintaining the educational effectiveness of each campus” to the end of the second sentence describing this Performance Area.

One could assume that a Performance Area titled “institutional effectiveness” would also include outcomes associated with administrative effectiveness. Indicators might include the identification of processes (or activities) which bring faculty together with administration to analyze problems and seek solutions. In addition, Indicators might include a measure of key support services provided by the administration.

Campus-Defined Performance Areas and Indicators

Comment:

A collaborative planning process should be included as one of the Campus Defined Performance Areas. In addition, a collaborative budget planning and development process should also be included.



THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIV

BAKERSFIELD • CHANNEL ISLANDS • CHICO • DOMINGUEZ HILLS • FRESNO • FULLERTON • HAYWARD • HUMBOLDT
LONG BEACH • LOS ANGELES • MARITIME ACADEMY • MONTEREY BAY • NORTHBRIDGE • POMONA • SACRAMENTO
SAN BERNARDINO • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SAN JOSE • SAN LUIS OBISPO • SAN MARCOS • SONOMA • STANISLAUS

Attachment C-2
Faculty Senate Agenda
October 28, 1999

DAVID S. SPENCE
EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

August 16, 1999



California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

To: Presidents

From: David S. Spence *David*

AUG 26 1999

Subject: Draft Accountability Process

Faculty Senate Received
413

At the time of the March 1999 meeting of the Board of Trustees, a draft accountability process was distributed systemwide for review and comment. A number of valuable comments and revisions have been received and incorporated into the attached new draft.

This new draft is being distributed to all campuses, the Alumni Association, the California State Student Association, and the Statewide Academic Senate for consultation and suggested revisions. We will appreciate your providing us with the insights and recommendations of your campus constituencies.

This draft recognizes that the development of Compact II and the WASC efforts underway to reorient the accreditation process toward educational effectiveness and outcomes is closely associated with CSU efforts to strengthen its accountability process. These parallel initiatives will exert considerable influence on how CSU approaches its accountability responsibilities.

To meet our commitment to present a proposed accountability process to the Trustees in November, would you please send your reactions to this new draft by November 1, 1999. Your contributions to this process are deeply appreciated.

Attachment

DSS:ap

cc: Charles B. Reed
Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

DRAFT ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS**BACKGROUND**

As the need for publicly supported services grows, all states face hard choices about how to distribute their limited revenues. Increasingly and particularly for those service areas that are not subject to legally binding funding requirements, states are giving greater scrutiny to how effectively resources are used and, in many cases, linking performance to funding. Public higher education, along with all other services, is being asked to clarify the value it adds to society both in terms of intentions and results.

Public institutions of higher education have a long history of justifying their continued existence to their various constituencies: students, parents, the general public, makers of public policy priorities, accrediting agencies, the providers of financial and other resources, and their various supporters. Institutions do this by paying attention to the goals of their work, by testing results against these intentions and by their willingness to change when confronted with the imperatives that flow from new information about their effectiveness

While the CSU and other educational segments necessarily are part of this increased government-wide emphasis on accountability, the CSU enters this period of heightened responsiveness with significant advantages. First, evidence shows that the public continues to have faith in the value of higher education generally and the CSU, in particular. Second, the CSU and its campuses over the past several years have shown a willingness to define and redefine, to respond to new or restated needs and forces, and to involve their constituents in significant discourse over what ought to change and what ought not to change to meet internal and external pressures. Third, more than most systems, the CSU already has in place a substantial system of evaluation and ongoing improvement procedures. Campuses review academic programs at least every five years and are expected to meet Board of Trustees goals in academic, along with financial and administrative areas. Campuses also respond substantively to regional and professional accrediting agencies. Students regularly are polled concerning their experiences at the CSU.

The CSU is and has been involved in these discussions of accountability and responsiveness and, in many ways, is covering ground not yet covered by many institutions and systems of higher education. Given the quality of the CSU and its established commitment to self-appraisal and consequent action, the increased demands for public make a strong case for the CSU's need for even more support from the state. It is an opportunity to tell a bit more clearly a very positive account of the value and performance of the CSU. The source of this information must flow from a partnership which constitutes the CSU system: campus, faculty, students, administration, alumni/ae, Trustees, and the chancellor's office. Each component has an important role in achieving the kind of public responsiveness which will help assure strong public support for CSU.

The proposed accountability process consists of the underlying principles, descriptions of the performance areas and indicators for which the chancellor's office will be responsible, and descriptions of the institutional performance areas and indicators for which the campuses will be responsible.

PRINCIPLES

- Accountability procedures for the system and its campuses encourage improvement and innovation in achieving CSU's mission of teaching and learning. While efforts directed toward improvement and innovation are carried out by administrators, faculty, staff, and students, the focus here is upon the campuses and system, not the accountability of individuals or other university units.
- Some performance areas and indicators apply to all CSU campuses; others reflect unique missions of individual campuses as determined by the regular processes of campus governance.
- The accountability process takes into account the varied backgrounds, experiences, and abilities that students at each campus bring to their educational pursuits and recognize how each campus contributes to the development of these students.
- Given that continuing improvement and progress is fundamental to accountability, each campus will evaluate and report its progress toward its educational objectives over time. Whenever appropriate, accountability information should be presented in a multiyear format, both to attain a fuller picture of performance and to discern progress over several years. Due to the differences between campuses which relate to mission, goals, and environment, comparisons between campuses are inappropriate.
- The accountability process consists of a limited set of performance indicators deemed most important by the CSU and its stakeholders.
- The CSU consults widely in the development and refinement of accountability indicators and reports.
- The CSU constantly evaluates institutional performance areas to determine appropriateness and accountability indicators to determine usefulness and value.
- To the extent possible, the CSU relies upon existing data, data systems, and processes in the development of indicators and reports.

SYSTEM, CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

The system through the Board of Trustees and chancellor's office should assume responsibility for the following performance areas:

1. Negotiation and implementation of multi-year performance and budget compacts between the CSU and the state administration

The first budget compact between CSU and UC and the State administration was in effect from 1994 to 1998 and ensured stable funding in return for meeting specified enrollment and productivity commitments. It is expected that agreement on Compact II will be reached within the next few months. The following performance areas are likely to be included in the new compact.

Performance Areas

- Funding commitments by State
 - √ Goals for annual increases in State General Fund and Capital Outlay
 - √ Additional funding for new or expanded programs and initiatives
 - √ One-time funding for such high priority needs as libraries, technology, deferred maintenance
 - √ Funding goals for enrollment growth
 - √ Provision of competitive faculty salaries
- Performance commitments by CSU
 - √ Admission of an increased number of eligible students
 - √ Effectiveness of CSU outreach activities to prepare K-12 students to enter CSU without needing remedial education
 - √ Effectiveness of meeting demand for school teachers and improving the quality of teacher preparation
 - Enrollments
 - Credentials recommended; credential requirements met
 - Reforms implemented
 - √ Improvement of transfer process to CSU

2. Maintaining appropriate balance between system commonality and campus autonomy

Performance Areas

- Maintenance of an effective advisory structure and process
- Desired distribution of decision-making between the system and campuses
- Sustain efforts to respect, preserve, and advance campus uniqueness and autonomy
- Stimulation of innovative and creative approaches to teaching and learning

3. Advancing the mission of the CSU

Performance Areas

- Work effectively with Legislature, Governor's Office, Office of Legislative Analyst, and Department of Finance
- Cooperate with other educational segments, State Department of Education, and CPEC
- Provide leadership in regional, state, and national education communities
- Promote welfare of CSU through effective relations with all constituencies, including the media and business community

CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Common Institutional Performance Areas and Indicators

The accountability process addresses twelve fundamental institutional performance areas based on the mission of the California State University system and its campuses:

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
2. Access to CSU
3. Progression to the degree
4. Graduation
5. Areas of special state need
6. Relations with K-12
7. Remediation
8. Facilities utilization
9. University advancement
10. Quality of post-baccalaureate programs
11. Contributions to community and society
12. Institutional effectiveness

Each campus will report to the system annually on its attainment of the first nine of these performance areas using the system-defined indicators described below and one of the final three performance areas using the system-defined reports described below. The last three performance areas must be addressed in a three-year period. Each campus, in addition, may select additional institutional performance areas and indicators/reports based upon its unique mission, goals, or environment.

An overview of the performance areas, indicators, and reports follows.

Annual Responsibility Indicators and Reports

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

In its 1997 report entitled, "Baccalaureate Education in the California State University," the CSU Academic Senate stated,

"The three broad areas of educational achievement expected of CSU graduating students are: (1) acquiring a sophisticated knowledge base, (2) acquiring the skills needed to use knowledge and to learn new knowledge so as to renew their knowledge base, and (3) participating in a mix of collegiate experiences and social processes that contribute to values for successful living."

In outcomes-based education, CSU campuses focus on two areas: (a) General Education and (b) the major. In each area, the faculty of each institution should incorporate in its academic program review process each of the following:

- identification of the expected learning outcomes for the program;
- description of the means by which the faculty will assess students' achievement of the expected outcomes; and,
- a report of changes in pedagogy, curriculum, academic support, and other measures taken to enhance students' achievement.

Outcomes-based education is important to assure that students move beyond simple comprehension of knowledge toward the development of their abilities to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and apply that knowledge. Processes to assess student learning outcomes, therefore, cannot be reduced to simple quantitative measures.

Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the university, program, and discipline-specific levels. The first indicator below describes a three year developmental period; the second indicator addresses expectations after development of learning outcomes has been completed.

Indicator: *(first three years)* For each university, descriptions of processes for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree.

Indicator: *(after three years)* For each university, a report of campus academic program reviews that summarizes assessment results and describes how these results have been used to improve teaching, learning, and programs.

2. Access

The CSU will admit all eligible undergraduate students who complete the admission process.

Indicator: For each university, the percentage of eligible first-time freshmen and transfer applicants who are admitted to the university in non-impacted programs.

3. Progression to the degree

The CSU will provide clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for both first-time freshmen and transfer students.

Indicator: For each university, the percentage students who progress from year to year.

Indicator: For each university, the number of units completed by transfer students who graduate as compared to the number of units completed by first-time freshmen who graduate.

4. Graduation

The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses will allow students to achieve their degree objectives.

Indicator: For each university, student graduation rates, disaggregated by major sub-populations (first-time freshmen, lower-division transfer students, upper-division transfer students) and by key student characteristics (such as full- and part-time attendance).

5. Areas of special state need

The CSU will make special efforts to respond to special state needs. At present, the greatest need is for credentialed teachers consistent with the requirements of K-12 education. In the future this might include engineers, nurses, or social workers.

Indicator: For each university, the number of credentials issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to campus-prepared candidates.

6. Relations with K-12

In an effort to improve the academic preparation of entering students, the CSU will be responsive to the needs of K-12 education.

Indicator: For each university, the percentage of regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in mathematics and English composition.

7. Remediation

The CSU will successfully remediate, within one year, entering students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English composition.

Indicator: For each university, the percentage of students requiring remediation who complete remediation within one year.

8. Facilities utilization

In order to reduce the need for the construction of new buildings, the CSU will increase utilization of facilities in “off-peak” times (including state support and continuing education).

Indicator: For each university, the percentage of course enrollments occurring during evenings, weekends, summers and other “off-peak” times.

9. University advancement

To provide support for margins of educational excellence, the CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions.

Indicator: For each university, an annual Voluntary Support Report with indicators for funds raised via alumni/ae, parents, other individuals, foundations, and corporation. This report will include the number of alumni/ae donors, alumni/ae records, and alumni/ae retention in fund-raising programs.

Three-Year Performance Areas and Indicators

Performance areas 10 through 12 should be addressed by the submission of a report from each campus on a three-year cycle. Performance area 10 will be the subject of a report in the year 2000, performance area 11 in 2001, performance area 12 in 2002, etc. Eventually, each report will cover the three-year period since the prior report on that performance area. Initially, the first report on performance area 10 need cover only the preceding year and the first report on performance area 11 need cover only the preceding two years.

10. Quality of post-baccalaureate programs

The CSU will continue its commitment to provide education beyond the baccalaureate as an essential component of its mission through lifelong learning, graduate degree programs, and professional certification.

Indicator: For each university, periodic (three-year) reports describing such areas as:

- student outcomes assessment for graduate programs.
- graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates.
- students' evaluation of their postgraduate experience

- employer evaluations
- graduates engaged in community college teaching,
- graduates admitted to and graduating from doctoral and professional schools, and
- the range of continuing education programs offered.

11. Contributions to community and society

The CSU will contribute to its community and society through the economic impact of its graduates, the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, and the public service provided by faculty, students, and staff.

Indicator: For each university, periodic (three-year) reports describing the various contributions of the campus to its community and society. These reports could include quantitative and qualitative data related to such areas as:

- students performing pro bono community service.
- students earning credit for service-related internship courses, service learning courses, fieldwork courses, and tutorial programs,
- faculty engaged in academically-related community service.
- graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates.
- graduates enrolling in post-baccalaureate programs,
- graduates engaged in teaching, government, or public-service careers.
- grant and contract awards to faculty and staff.
- the economic impact of the campus upon its community and region, and
- collaborative activities with public schools.

12. Institutional effectiveness

The primary mission of the CSU is teaching and learning. Administrative functions and the campus environment should support this mission through responsiveness to the needs of students and faculty, and through increasing efficiencies.

Indicator: For each university, periodic (three-year) reports describing the achievements of the campus in improving its institutional effectiveness, including quantitative and qualitative data related to such areas as:

- effective strategic planning,
- a collegial environment,
- faculty and student participation in shared governance,
- regular surveying of student needs and the effectiveness of support services,
- data from students on satisfaction with access to learning opportunities, the quality of academic advising, and access to faculty beyond the classroom,
- data from students (e.g., SNAPS) or alumni/ae on satisfaction and perceived value of CSU education in the academic program review process,
- employer feedback on the preparation of graduates' skills, knowledge, and ability to continue learning,
- organizational units using benchmarking, satisfaction surveys, or other evaluative measures to assess performance, and
- scholarly and creative contributions of faculty.

Campus-Defined Performance Areas and Indicators

In addition to the above, a campus may choose to identify its own performance areas and indicators. These performance areas and indicators may be used in cases where the campus believes that the system-defined performance areas and/or indicators do not fully address their unique goals and priorities.