

1999-2000  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA ADDENDUM**  
Thursday, December 16, 1999  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

**FIRST READING**

*[Discussion only—10 minute limit, unless extended by majority vote; no action.]*

FS 99-108/FPC, Ex. COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUITY (CODE),  
ESTABLISH FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate establishes the Committee on Diversity and Equity with the following charge and membership:

COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUITY

Charge:

Based on federal equal opportunity and affirmative action guidelines, <sup>the committee</sup> develops, reviews, and recommends goals, policies, and procedures in accordance with the University non-discrimination policies. Develops and <sup>recommends</sup> implements policies in consultation with the University's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Office. Participates in establishing both short-term and long-term goals for equity and diversity and evaluates progress toward achieving those goals. Heightens faculty's awareness of equity and diversity goals, policies, and procedures, and recommends training for department affirmative action representatives on search committees. Reviews and recommends programs to improve recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. Reviews Department and College long-range plans for equity and diversity hiring and retention. *for what purposes?*

Meets two to three (2-3) hours per month with additional subcommittee meetings, liaison activities, and service on administrative search committees.

Members should have a strong commitment to promoting equity and diversity.

Membership:

- (7) Faculty members *at-large*
- (1) Faculty Senator
- (1) Staff member
- (1) Student member
- (10) Total voting members
  
- (1) Affirmative Action Officer or designee (ex officio, non-voting)

The Senate in making appointments shall attempt to represent the University as broadly as possible. In addition, the Senate shall also consider representation from protected classes, including persons with disabilities.

*chair*

1999-2000  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA**

Thursday, December 16, 1999  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00-5:00 p.m.

**OPEN FORUM**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

FS 99-102/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – SENATE

Readmission Subcommittee:

BILL MITCHELL, E&CS, 2000 *cannot serve*

FS 99-103/Ex. DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION--ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR  
SELECTION OF (if needed)

JEAN TORCOM, At-large

OTIS SCOTT, At-large, with expertise in issues in achieving campus diversity

FS 99-104/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—UNDERGRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the program changes shown in Attachment A.

FS 99-105/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS—GRADUATE

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the program changes shown in Attachment A.

FS 99-106/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW—DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION  
STUDIES

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment B) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Communication Studies and recommends that the programs in the Department of Communications Studies be approved for a period of six years.

FS 99-107/Ex. SENATE FLOOR PROCEDURES (FS 99-68)

The Faculty Senate approves the continuation through Spring 2000 of the "Senate Floor Procedures for the Fall 1999 Semester" (*shown in September 23, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment J*), adopted in FS 99-68.

**REGULAR AGENDA**FS 99-101/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of Minutes of December 9 (#7), 1999.

**SECOND READING ITEMS**

*[Action may be taken]*

FS 99-99/FPC, Ex. UNIVERSITY ARTP DOCUMENT—ADD SECTION 6.10.E, OPEN RECRUITING

The Faculty Senate recommends amendment of the University ARTP document as shown in Attachment C [*see December 9, 1999, Faculty Senate Agenda Attachment F-1 for background information*].

**INFORMATION**

1. Hate Violence and the Campus Response – Director Norm Scarr and Lieutenant Ken Barnett, Public Safety  
TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 p.m.
2. Response to Governor's Proposed Community Service Graduation Requirement (Attachment D) [B. Buckley]
3. Update from the Governance [T. Lascher], Pedagogy and Technology [G. Wheeler], and Program Improvement [A. Jensen] Committees
4. Update on FMI review by Faculty Policies Committee [F. Baldini]
5. "The pillar-to-post nonsystem of funding California's colleges" by Peter Schrag (Attachment E)

6. Tentative Spring 2000 Faculty Senate meeting schedule [*Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled*]:
  - February 17, 24
  - March 9, 23
  - April 13 (3:00-3:30, Nomination of 2000-2001 Officers), 27
  - May 4 (3:00-3:30, Election of 2000-2001 Officers), 11, 18
  
7. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate

**Program Changes – Undergraduate:**

**College of Arts and Letters**

- a. Department of Communication Studies – Digital Media Concentration: Adds a 48-unit Digital Media Concentration.
- b. Department of Theatre Arts: Change Drama BA/Minor to Theatre Arts BA/Minor.

**College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics**

- c. Department of Geography, B.A.: Adds a requirement of three additional upper division units in human geography; adds Geography 150 (Landscapes) to the courses a student may complete in human geography; adds Geography 132 (The Sacramento Region) to the courses a student may complete in regional geography; and, groups the content of subdivisions of the major in a slightly different manner.

**College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies**

- d. Department of Sociology, B.A.: Reduces 6-unit sociological theory requirement to 3 units (SOC 193 and 194 are eliminated and replaced by SOC 192). Eliminates Social Analysis, Policy and Planning concentration and adds Urban Studies concentration. Makes SOC 140 a required rather than elective course in the Family and Socialization area of study and makes SOC 106 an elective rather than required course. Revises SOC 195 and 199 by reducing this option by 3 units for the General Sociology area of study.

**Program Changes – Graduate:**

**College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics**

- a. Department of Geology, M.S.: New Master of Science Degree in Geology that emphasizes hydrogeology, engineering geology, environmental geology and geologic hazards.

**College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies**

- b. Department of Sociology, M.A.: Changes name of SOC 215 from Inferential Statistics to Data Analysis and expands course to cover qualitative data analysis. Makes SOC 215 a required course. Adds SOC 200A (Orientation to Graduate Studies in Sociology and the Profession) and 200B (Prospectus/Proposal Preparation Seminar).



SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN  
THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES

**The Program Review Team offered the following overall commendations:**

The Department of Communication Studies has strong, involved, scholarly faculty members who work well together despite their diversity of interests and disciplines. Almost all faculty members provided University and community service.

The faculty members of the Department are esteemed by their students as excellent teachers and by others on campus as talented, creative, and dynamic leaders within the University and in external community life.

The faculty members delivered high quality educational programs praised by their students.

The outgoing department chair was well regarded and praised by the faculty members.

The Department ranked among the better such departments in the CSU and had a good reputation in the field for departments offering a graduate degree.

The faculty developed a program assessment plan and was moving toward its implementation. It should be especially noted that the plan was among the first to be developed on this campus; furthermore, some faculty members provided campus-wide leadership for such an undertaking.

All faculty members conducted research, published, presented papers, and participated in professional conferences. This scholarly production, as well as the professional development activity, was impressive. Two faculty members edited prestigious academic journals.

The departmental staff were seen as excellent and were supportive of students and of faculty.

Student advising and mentoring programs are excellent. Departmental support and assistance to graduate students who teach was outstanding. The Honors Program is a model for other departments.

The Department is responsible for the award-winning student newspaper and the debate team.

The undergraduate program was appropriate and consistent with other similar programs in the California State University.

The Department deserved recognition for integrating Journalism, even though there are lingering problems for doing so.

**The Program Review Team developed the following recommendations as the result of this program review:**

Overall

That the Department of Communication Studies revisit its vision/mission statement as the basis for program, structural, and policy change -- in order especially to resolve the difficult decisions pertaining to low enrollment, graduate program change, the undergraduate common core, the full integration of Journalism, distance education, and the multimedia program, its laboratory and special equipment needs.

That the Department and the College of Arts and Letters engage a dialogue to improve trust and to enhance their working relationship.

That the College offer resources in support of the Department's efforts to reduce and/or resolve its internal interpersonal relations.

That the College consider an independent review of Journalism (including the possible utilization of the services of an external consultant). (p. 27)

Curriculum

That the Department of Communication Studies consider reorganizing its graduate curriculum into one concentration with options to specialize. (p. 11)

That the Department consider restructuring how students utilize 12 graduate units (up to six units in the undergraduate program and up to six units in other departments), so that the units are completed within the graduate program in the Department. (p. 12)

That the Department explore future utilization of ComS 199s with Media Services in developing community service and outreach efforts to the University's service region. (p. 14)

Outcome assessment

That the Department of Communication Studies finalize its assessment plan forthwith and present the initial results by the end of Spring 2000 to the Office of Academic Affairs and that the Department implement its student outcome assessment plan in Fall 2000. (p. 20)

That the Office of Academic Affairs make the assessment plan and the report on assessment implementation available to other academic units as a model. (p. 20)

That the Department consider revising the intern performance evaluation form by Spring 2000. (p. 22)



That the Department consider other course evaluation instruments and include questions on the course (content, structure, objectives, assignments) and on student investment and learning in the course. (p. 17)

Enrollment management (see also items listed under Curriculum)

That the Department consider restructuring how and what information it secures from students as the basis for the planning of course offerings. (p. 12)

Students

That the Department of Communication Studies plan a visible Honors Society event during the Fall 1999 semester to link "old" and "new" Honors students, to inspire them, to publicize the Society's activities, and to build a base for continued mentoring activities in Spring-Fall 2000. (p. 13)

That the Department review how it publicizes its Honors Program and that it make the information available to all students in the Department. (p. 15)

That the Department consider establishing regular meeting time with students -- say once each semester -- in order to structure the means for feedback from students. (p. 15)

That the Department provide for students to sit as voting members of standing committees. (p. 26)

Alumni and employers

That the Department of Communication Studies develop a formal plan of alumni relations. (p. 19)

That the Department develop the means for securing employer feedback. This might entail surveys, focus groups, and formally structured advisory groups. (p. 19)

That the Office of University Affairs develop and disseminate a handbook on alumni relations which would support departmental efforts. (p. 19)

That the College provide resources to support alumni relations. (p. 19)

Equipment and facilities

That the Department of Communications Studies explore CSU, Chico and other CSU campus' models for providing facilities, equipment, and resources to meet academic department media and equipment needs. (p. 24)

That the Department explore and develop collaborative efforts with Computer Science and Theater Arts to pool and share media and equipment resources. (p. 24)

That the Department, College, and UMS continue discussions to determine how to meet the Department's needs. (p. 24)

Assigned time

That a part-time associate field coordinator be instituted for internships in Journalism.

(p. 22)

That the Department re-evaluate its use and distribution of assigned time. (p. 25)

Faculty Senate Program Approval

That the programs in the Department of Communication Studies be approved for a period of six years. (p. 28)

12-1-99

6.00 APPOINTMENT

...

6.10 Vacancy Announcements

A. – D. ...

E. Open Recruiting

1. Open recruiting is a means of eliciting applications to teach in the University from sources unanticipated in the usual course of inviting applications. It is used to encourage qualified applicants to seek employment in any campus department or program even if the department or program is not at the time of the application formally conducting a search to fill an already authorized position. Its use assumes that departments or programs continue in every case of appointment to determine the normal minimum qualifications for a full-time appointment.
2. Open recruiting advertisements developed by Academic Affairs or Faculty and Staff Affairs shall be widely disseminated. Such advertisements may be used as a supplement to other recruiting efforts.
3. Applications generated through open recruiting shall be directed initially to the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs. That office shall then forward them to the appropriate College Dean or Deans each of whom shall notify and make available to every department in his or her college a copy of the materials.
4. If a department is currently recruiting in the area of expertise of the applicant responding to open recruiting, his/her application shall be included in the applicant pool. The candidate's application shall be reviewed in due course under currently approved appointment procedures.
5. If a department is not currently recruiting in the area of expertise of the applicant responding to open recruiting, the department may consider the applicant for appointment. The Department shall determine whether to pursue the appointment. If a department determines that it does not want to consider the applicant for an appointment, the application shall be returned to the Dean's Office. The Dean shall then notify the applicant of the department's decision. If the department determines that it wants to consider the applicant for appointment, it shall confirm with the College Dean that a position is available. Consideration shall be subject to the department's currently approved screening process and applicable university procedures and practices, such as those described in the current Guidelines for Full-Time Faculty Recruitment and Section 6.06.B of this document.

6. In any case of an application arising out of open recruiting, the department receiving the application shall consider it in light of the department's previously announced curricular needs and its previously developed hiring plans. While an appointment despite these needs and plans may on occasion be justified, a department shall usually recommend an appointment consistent with these needs and plans and not otherwise.
  
7. In accordance with Section 6.06.B of this document, recommendations for appointment of applicants responding to open recruiting shall originate in the department or equivalent unit.

## RESPONSE TO GOVERNOR'S INITIATIVE ON COMMUNITY SERVICE

The California State University, Sacramento response was prepared by an ad hoc committee of faculty and presented to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1999 and reported to the Faculty Senate on December 16, 1999. The committee members are listed below.

Charlotte Cook, Office of Community Collaboration, Chair  
Bob Buckley, Computer Science and Faculty Senate, Chair  
Ken De Bow, Government and Faculty Senator  
Janice Gagerman, Social Work and Faculty Senator  
Robyn Nelson, Nursing, Chair

### GENERAL COMMENTS:

The following comments were prepared as a response to the CSU Academic Senate Resolution 2471-99 concerning Governor Gray Davis' proposal to make community service a graduation requirement for undergraduate students in California public institutions of higher education. This response is consistent with the CSUS Strategic Plan and the "Definition and Guidelines for Service Learning" adopted by the CSUS Faculty Senate October 22, 1998 (see attachment). Before answering the twenty-four specific questions, we would like to make a few general comments.

1. Service Learning (SL), or Community Service Learning (CSL) must be understood as a subset of Community-Based Learning (CBL). Service Learning (SL) incorporates the following three features that may or may not be present in other forms of community based learning:
  - Meaningful community service that is
  - Integrated with academic learning, and that promotes
  - Social responsibility and civic engagement.

Community-Based Learning (CBL) also encompasses internships, cooperative education, and community-based assignments such as conducting interviews with community leaders, job shadowing, attending civic and cultural events. In addition, CBL may include work in laboratories with "real" materials and equipment.

2. CSU must avoid the apparently very narrow conception of SL that is held by the Governor and Secretary Hart. One on one helping, such as tutoring, mentoring, providing companionship for the elderly, assisting limited English speaking adults fill out health insurance forms, etc. is only *one* form of SL. We must spell out that SL *also* includes:
  - Assisting non-profit, public benefit organizations and community groups with activities such as designing informational or educational materials, setting up data management systems, creating/updating web sites, helping to plan and staff an event such as a

neighborhood health fair or job fair, assisting with a community needs survey by collecting and/or analyzing data.

- Conducting technical assistance activities such as cost/benefit analyses and communications analyses, developing technical manuals, e.g. for community groups who need to access census data for the neighborhood.
  - Conducting policy analysis, designing and implementing strategies for policy change.
3. CSU should avoid objecting to the Governor's Initiative on the grounds of government interference in curriculum matters. To achieve the intent of the Governor's initiative, the community service requirement should be implemented as Community Service Learning CSL, as defined above. In this context, CSL is curriculum-free. It is *not* content; it is pedagogy. It is powerful pedagogy that can be utilized to deepen student understanding of content in *every* discipline (although not every course).

The following points serve as an executive summary of the CSUS response to the questions posed by the CSU Academic Senate.

1. We endorse the concept of promoting community service for students in California universities, but only if it is tied to academic learning and only if a broad variety of opportunities for service are provided.
2. We believe that promotion of service would best be accomplished through incentives; not mandates.
3. If service learning is mandated for all students, it will require significant infrastructure in both the university and community organizations to handle 2,000-2,500 students per semester. Significant new resources will be needed to build this infrastructure.
4. We believe in a broad definition of community service that encompass work that strengthens public benefit organizations through development of informational materials, community needs assessments, policy analysis, and design of data management systems.



**NOTE.** The CSUS response borrows extensively from the excellent response prepared by California State University, Fresno. CSUS agreed with much of what was concluded and reported in their response. In fact, CSUS used the Fresno response as a "draft" which it modified only in those cases where our emphasis and/or point-of-view differed. In addition, we liked the manner in which the questions had been categorized and recorded, and kept this same order. We would like to "applaud" and thank CSUF for the quality, thoroughness and thoughtfulness of their work.

In reading the following comments, the questions posed by the CSU Academic Senate appear in **bold Italics**. The responses follow each question with the changes and additions made by CSUS to the Fresno responses appearing in *Italics*.

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

#### CLARITY

***Is the proposal clear in its intent in terms of the breadth of the application of the proposed requirement across programs and the timeline for its implementation?***

The Governor's proposal is clear in its intent. However, the breadth of its application is not clear. The following questions arise whenever the proposal is discussed. What definition of "community service" will be used? *Will there be a tie to academic content (service-learning, public benefit internships & projects/theses)?* Will there be a minimum number of service hours required? What options will students have to fulfill the requirement? Will there be allowances for students to waive the requirement? Additionally, the implementation timeline has still not been clearly communicated.

#### INCENTIVES VS MANDATE

***Do you agree with the statement in the May Academic Senate CSU resolution that a service ethic is fostered better by providing incentives and opportunities than by mandating service?***

*We agree with the AS CSU resolution with the caution that this is an empirical question and policy regarding the effects of service on students who would not have elected to perform service should have a foundation in evidence. There is too much emotional rhetoric – on both sides – regarding this question. If data are inconclusive or too sketchy to guide our policy, then we should call for a major study of the mandatory service question.*

*If service is built into requirements for courses receiving the SL designation and are NOT add-ons, and IF a variety of opportunities for service is provided (including activities that do not involve travel to a site) then many of the arguments against a mandate are moot, including:*

- *Students don't have transportation*
- *Students can't take time away from paid work*
- *Liability will be too formidable*
- *Some students don't perform well in a community setting.*

*However, we do wish to note that some students have family and employment needs that would restrict the service options that they could perform.*

*While there is significant need in our community, which can be addressed through service activities, quantity of need does not always equate to the quality of placement opportunities. Students must be properly screened, oriented, trained, supported and supervised if they are to have a valuable community service learning experience. This requires staffing resources which are not available to most community based organizations or individual faculty members. In addition, it is an unfortunate fact that many service opportunities are primarily clerical or labor oriented, diminishing the opportunities for higher education students to gain a meaningful learning experience.*

## **BENEFITS**

*What would you foresee as benefits to students in the performance of (service)? How and why could this enhance their learning?*

Involvement in meaningful service activities can provide a number of benefits, including: *learning of academic content*, enhancing student's self-esteem; increasing leadership skills; improving career related skills; strengthening students' civic or service-ethic; greater knowledge community resources and needs of special populations; and enhancing their awareness and appreciation of diverse cultures. *Existing research suggests that* those many of these benefits are diminished, if not eliminated, when service is mandated (January 1999, Psychological Science).

Service-learning brings with it all the benefits of community service, plus a new layer of benefits, such as: providing a practical setting to apply and test classroom learning; increasing cognitive abilities, such as critical thinking skills; and allowing for interdisciplinary approaches to problem solving.

## **CREDIT**

*To what extent should community service be (or not be) credit bearing?*

Credit should not be given merely for the activity of service. Instead, academic credit should be awarded for the learning that is gained and demonstrated from a service experience. For this reason, credit would be much more appropriate if the service activity was part of a course that utilized valid service-learning approaches.

*Would this requirement be met in the lower division or upper division years? How would you address transfer and articulation issues with community colleges in your service area?*

With appropriate preparation, service could be preformed at any level of education. Ideally, students would be provided with a number of opportunities throughout their academic careers. *For service learning courses* articulation issues would most likely be handled on a course-by-course basis through mechanisms already in place.

## HOURS OF SERVICE

***What limits, if any, should be attached to the terms “service” and “community,” assuming that a “community service graduation requirement” should be multifaceted?***

*Providing broad definitions for these terms will allow each campus greater flexibility and opportunities for student service activities. The term “service” should be applied to any non-paid (hourly or salary) work in a nonprofit or public benefit endeavor that serves a real need in the community. This could include work for a nonprofit or public benefit organization, as well as independently planned projects that meet specified guidelines and are approved by a course instructor (service-learning) or community service office (community service). In addition to direct service, applied research and other non-direct services should be considered as appropriate service. “Community” can be applied to the general community, individual sub-groups, and even to the campus community.*

***What would be an appropriate amount of community service (e.g. number of hours) to be required for graduation?***

As indicated above, to meet the specified intent of the Governor's proposal community service must be embedded in curriculum require "structured reflection". With this in mind, the quality of the experience when integrated with academic learning is a more critical issue than a simple measure of hours. Consequently, estimating the number of hours required for a meaningful service-learning assignment is a complicated issue. Clearly, one "size" would not be suitable for each discipline or for each course. Our campus policy on Community Service-Learning (CS-L) provides the following guidelines:

"Community Service-Learning units that are optional add-ons to regular courses shall require for each unit of credit, 30 hours or more of community service with a public benefit organization or program, and 15 hours of structured reflection activities. CS-L embedded in course requirements may vary from 10 hours to 60 or more hours, depending on whether a CS-L project is the central focus of the class or only one of several requirements. The number of hours of reflection activity needed to relate the CS-L experience to course content will vary accordingly."

## ACCEPTABILITY

***For courses on our campuses that have a service component, who will evaluate the appropriateness of that service toward satisfaction of the community service graduation requirement under this program?***

*A Service Learning Review Committee will need to be constituted to review and approve courses for the SL designation. Service connected with other academic requirements (internships, projects/theses) will need another mechanism for evaluation on a case by case basis. This evaluation process should encompass input from all stakeholders, including community organizations that serve as host sites for students performing service, faculty, students, and Student Affairs professionals.*

## ARTICULATION

*Do you anticipate any special problems concerning transfer and articulation issues between CSU and the UC and/or Community Colleges related to a community service graduation requirement?*

Articulation procedures are already in place and they will have to be used for this requirement. Significant issues could arise regarding articulation, *such as definitions and guidelines with respect to what constitutes community service.*

## WAIVER

*If community service is not to be a blanket graduation requirement, which programs should be excluded and/or which students should be exempt?*

Again, our belief is that there should not be a graduation requirement. *If service is integrated with course work and viewed as powerful pedagogy that enhances learning and NOT as an add-on requirement, AND if a variety of service experiences are offered, then VERY few exemptions would ever be required. Exemptions based on the number of units in a program, whether students are re-entry or have a disability, a temperament problem, etc. would almost always be inappropriate and/or unnecessary.*

## LOGISTICS

*If a student volunteer is rejected by the proposed agency, what provisions will you be able to make to accommodate the student?*

By creating a wide variety of service options, we would hope to allow enough flexibility in placement opportunities to accommodate most students. Students with poor personal, professional and/or academic skills will be difficult to place *in the community, which underscores the need for service options to include activities that can be completed on campus or at home.*

## TIME TO GRADUATION

*What effect would you anticipate on time-to-graduation?*

*If service assignments are integrated into students' academic programs as we suggest, there should be no effect on time to graduation. If, however, a stand-alone (add-on) service requirement were mandated, fulfilling the requirement would be similar to adding another course and could have an impact on time to graduation. The amount of impact should not be significant for the majority of students, but could delay graduation for some by a semester.*

## ASSESSMENT

*What assessment measures are you prepared to set up to evaluate the success or failure of the community service program?*

Assessment is generally left to individual instructors and/or the academic departments. If overall impact on students, faculty and the community are needed, significant new resources will be required.

## LIABILITY QUESTIONS

*Would you anticipate any new, burdensome issues regarding legal liability between the campus and the community?*

Possibly. Liability and risk management are significant concerns, not just for the state, the CSU System and the university, but for all parties involved. Issues include:

- Institutional liability
- Community based organization liability
- Faculty/staff liability
- Liability for harm caused by students
- Liability for harm caused to students
- Worker's Compensation issues

*Would there be any unusual dangers and risks in your service area?*

Probably no more or less than in any region. However, if thousands of students per semester are to be sent out into the community, significant attention must be paid to risk management, *including the need for MOUs and contracts, on-site supervision, adequate orientation and training for students.* Again, this issue will require significant new resources.

*If your students in clinical professional programs perform community service, will they be risking any particular liability?*

Most clinical programs (nursing, physical therapy, athletic training) have procedures in place to deal with liability and risk management, such as professional insurance coverage, *MOUs, guidelines for on-site supervision, orientation and training for students that at least equals that given to volunteers or professionals who perform similar tasks.* With academic programs that have not traditionally sent students into the community problems could arise.

*What area of campus will take on the responsibility for resolving legal issues arising from the performance of community service?*

The University Counsel.

*If the community service is to be done in K-12 classrooms, can issues and costs of fingerprinting, character references, drug testing, and the like be resolved?*



The needs in K-12 settings, child welfare, probation services, etc., are extensive, as is the opportunity for meaningful service experiences. Therefore, dealing with fingerprinting and screening issues is imperative. At this time, unless special funds are available, the burden is placed on the student to pay for fingerprinting and Department of Justice screening. At a cost of up to \$70 and delays of more than three months, significant changes in the system will need to be implemented on a statewide level if services are to be rendered in an educational setting. Simply passing these costs on to students is not a reasonable alternative.

## **COMMUNITY ISSUES**

### **DEMAND**

***Are there enough off-campus service demands and opportunities for your campus population for the performance of community service?***

As stated earlier, the quantity of demand is not the issue. It is the number of quality service opportunities that is of major concern. Service assignments that are both meaningful to the community and meaningful to the student take careful planning and coordination, as well as significant resources. Building an adequate relationship with community partners is both an issue of time and resources. The needs are there; however the infrastructure to provide meaningful community service learning assignments *and other curriculum-linked service experiences for 2000-2500 students per semester* is not.

***Are there potentials for damage to already-accredited professional programs because of an increase in the ratio of students to supervisors (or volunteers to agencies)?***

Doubtful, however, this does raise the issue of whether or not non-paid fieldwork placements, such as student teaching or nursing practicums, would satisfy the Governor's proposed mandate. In the end, this impact of student-to-supervisor ratios (or volunteer to agency) will be most apparent and impacting on the agencies. This issue will have a significant impact on agencies' abilities to absorb the increased numbers of potential student service providers. Many of the nonprofits where students would be placed will not be able to accommodate the number of potential student "volunteers".

***Do you anticipate your students competing with other state interests – e.g., a need to place welfare recipients in community service jobs?***

More and more segments of our state are requiring service of their constituents. This includes large segments of the K-12 educational system, welfare agencies, court-mandated service, and higher education. There is a limit to how many placements nonprofits and service sector agencies can reasonably handle.

*Competition between service learning students and welfare recipients for each community's available service placements has been cited as an issue. For service that is integrated with college-level learning, this would not be an issue. In addition, service activities assigned to*



welfare recipients do not require the same level of knowledge and skills as those that would be assigned to college students.

Competition between students fulfilling a service requirement and paid employees is also extremely unlikely. The service requirement for students would probably range from 10 to 30 hours only and as such would not be equivalent to full time employment. Furthermore, the work provided by students would be subject to student schedules and the vagaries of the academic calendar.

## **AREAS OF NEED**

*What community needs in your community might be addressed by community service done by your students? Who would determine what these community needs are?*

*The community and university should work jointly to design descriptions of service opportunities that would*

- *Meet community needs*
- *Fit educational needs of students in SL courses, internships, projects/theses*
- *Be mindful of the academic calendar.*

This includes the nonprofit service sector agencies. Needs do exist in almost every conceivable facet of education, health care, public safety, the environment and other areas.

*Should assessment of community needs be done with attention to the effect of mandatory community service on town/gown relationships?*

Assessing community needs is important, especially with respect to such overriding issues as the capacity of various agencies for supporting students who are only available for a minimal number of hours. *If a "title wave" of university students puts a severe burden on community organizations, then town/gown relationships could likely deteriorate and the experience counterproductive.*

## **COMMUNITY CAPACITY**

*Have you done or anticipated a survey of your community's ability to train, accept, and monitor alternating flows of student volunteers? How will they affect agency profiles?*

*CSUS has not conducted such a survey nor do we anticipate using our limited resources to do so, unless or until we know WHAT the requirement will be, HOW it will be phased in, and WHAT additional resources will be available to both the university and the community to conduct the survey and implement the requirement.*

## **INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES**

*On your campus, who would monitor completion of this requirement?*

As stated, our recommendation is to provide a variety of opportunities and incentives, not mandate to service. If a mandate does become a reality, the *Office of Community Collaboration (OCC)* would be the primary program responsible for facilitating all community service and service-learning planning and programming, as well as for monitoring completion of the requirement. *OCC* would need significant support and assistance from various academic departments (related to service-learning coursework, *internships and projects/theses*) and from the Admissions, Records and Evaluations department.

***How efficient would this be?***

*Efficiency would depend on what definitions and guidelines will direct the implementation of the Governor's initiative and whether adequate resources are made available.*

***What additional resources would be needed for this?***

The first resource issue that would need to be addressed is facilities for a significantly expanded community service/service-learning program. Given the extremely limited office space available on our campus, this would be a challenge. Other resources would include office equipment, including furniture, computers and other supplies needed by an expanded staff. *In addition, Data management systems would need to be updated, and personnel resources would be needed for developing service opportunities in collaboration with both faculty and community organizations*

***What specific costs (resources, staff, supervising, and reporting) would you anticipate in implementing such a requirement?***

*We do not believe that we can answer this question intelligently. We suggest that estimates should be based on evidence vs. speculation, and recommend that programs currently implementing service requirements on a large scale be subjected to a cost analysis. (These would include Portland State, University of Utah and CSUMB.) Based on their cost figures the CSU could generate meaningful projections.*

# The pillar-to-post nonsystem of funding California's colleges

**N**ever underestimate the political power of bad ideas or the aversion of politicians to good sense, even when it comes from the most respected sources.

The immediate case at hand is last week's proposal from two California Republican state senators, Minority Leader Ross Johnson and caucus chairman Jim Brulte. They want California to put a hefty chunk of its expected budget surplus – all told some \$400 million – into 50 percent across-the-board cuts in student fees at the University of California and the California State University. Johnson described the reductions, which would bring UC fees down to about \$1,750 a year, as “a significant tax cut for middle class families.” Better to describe it as another illustration of how California remains chronically unable to develop a consistent, well-planned funding policy for its colleges and universities.

Just last year, the eminent California Citizens Commission for Higher Education asked for “a commitment by state government to stabilize long-term funding [for UC and CSU]” and to abandon “the current pattern of reducing student charges in good years and then raising them drastically – by 40 percent or more – in bad years,” which is what happened during the lean years of the early 1990s. During the same period, tight budgets triggered sharp reductions in course offerings and generated other major dislocations for California's college students.

How quickly those pleas and that history get forgotten when there's an opportunity to score some quick political points with middle-class voters. Particularly in this boom period for the already affluent in California, what evidence is there that it's the middle class – and especially the upper reaches of the middle class – that needs help in paying university fees? The average family income of UC undergraduates these days is about \$67,000, and many come from homes with incomes far above that.



**PETER SCHRAG**

**T**hat's not to suggest that a lot of California students don't need help. On the contrary, some need a great deal of help, but if politicians feel they have that much money to help struggling students, why not put it into California's financial aid system and direct it to those – whether they are poor or at the lower end of the middle class – who really need it? At a time when there is great concern about diversifying enrollment in California's most selective institutions, generous financial aid is likely to do more than all the finagling at the admissions office.

That's particularly important in an era when the federal tuition tax credits and the largest share of other federal benefits for higher education enacted in the federal Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 go to families with incomes between \$40,000 and \$90,000. Because of the way the federal tax credits are structured, lowering the fees for many of those students would do little more than replace a chunk of federal money with state money. In part, Johnson and Brulte's proposal is a gift not to the taxpayer-parent, but to the feds. It thus makes much more sense to direct the aid to the low-income students who don't earn enough to qualify for those tax credits. Johnson and Brulte want to allocate an additional \$125 million for that purpose, but compared to the proposed fee reduction, it's little more than tokenism.

One shouldn't, of course, single out Johnson and Brulte on this issue since Gov. Gray Davis was the first to push the Legislature (in his 1999-2000 budget) to use some of the state's surplus for a 10 percent reduction in university fees. But that doesn't make it wise policy, either now or, more emphatically, for the long run.

**A** legislative committee headed by Sen. Deirdre Alpert is now trying to develop a long-term master plan for all of California education, from kindergarten through college and perhaps beyond. Like any project of such ambition, it's hardly assured of success, and so far it's running on a four-year timetable that's far too leisurely for the purpose.

But clearly somebody is going to have to take on California's unplanned and often chaotic education system – and that includes everything from accommodating hundreds of thousands of additional students, to more efficiently using space and other resources, to developing smoother and more rational transitions from school to college and, beyond that, to broader questions of access for the growing diversity of California students. It also comprises broad philosophical issues – about the kinds of qualities, other than economic viability, that California colleges should foster; about accountability, both in the universities and the schools; and about who should pay how much for what.

In the past decade, almost all major policy decisions affecting that system have been made on an ad hoc basis, either in response to fiscal emergencies, or out of political opportunism or in quick-fix attempts to cope with the crisis of the moment. So far, instead of trying to use the state's recovery to build a stabler higher education system, we seem to be ad-hocking merrily along. We could do a lot better.

*Peter Schrag's column appears in The Bee on Wednesdays. He can be reached by fax at 321-1996; or by letter at Box 15779, Sacramento, CA, 95852-0779.*