1. Call to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the agenda.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of May 6-7, 2004.

4. Announcements.

5. Times certain. None scheduled at this time.

6. Liaison Reports
   a. Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

7. Items of business

7.1 Lower division core project
   a. Reports from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on the implementation process.
   b. Background information:
      ASCSU Resolution of support, with conditions, May 2004: AS-2645-04/AA
      ASCSU Resolution re the three-fourths majority, May 2004: AS-2648-04/AA
      ASCSU Resolution supporting the CSU POL program, January 2004: AS-2637-04/EX/AA
      Board of Trustees resolution and policy – adopted July 2004
      http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/Resolutions/jul2004.pdf [look for Committee on Educational Policy]
      Letter to campus Provosts and Senate chairs – K. Boyum to supply electronic copy.
      Faculty Trustee description of BOT consideration of the LDCP.
      http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/04-07.shtml
      (NEW 8/29/04) Letter sent to Provosts and Chairs, 8/13/04, from David Spence and David McNeil
      o Attachment A

7.2 Remedial programs
   a. Thompson communication to the committee (04-2)
      o Attachment B

7.3 Required Community Service
   a. George Skelton article on the California Performance Review recommending that all college students do community service.
      o Attachment C
   b. LA Times Editorial, 8/14/04
      o Attachment D
   c. LA Times on CSU Monterey Bay’s Comm Service requirement 8/10/04:
      o Attachment E
   d. Sacramento Bee Op Ed Page Piece, 8/27/04:
      o Attachment F

7.4 Cost of Textbooks
   a. CalPirg report (450K)
7.5 Intra-CSU Transfer.
   a. This item was discussed at the May, 2004 meeting, with a determination that we would bring it up again in the Fall. The following is from the May meeting minutes:

   “Intra-CSU transfer has a low systemwide priority. To change the priority would require legislation. We could do a resolution on this, which would be advisory. Relevant issues include
   • Whether to support the general idea or to be more specific
   • Whether an advisory resolution would do any good
   • Whether the “Golden 4” (English, critical thinking, oral communication, mathematics) must be completed prior to transfer
   • Whether any specific number of units must be completed
   • Some members felt that in the absence of intra-CSU transfer, the meaning of CSU as a “system” is lessened.
   • Whether special admits should be included and if so, with what language or conditions
   • Whether, with a large and mobile state, allowing eligible good students to move from one campus to another more easily is a “natural”
   • What to say about major course GPA requirements – whether the requirements of one campus would meet another campus’ different requirements

   Committee consensus was to bring the issue back in September.”

7.6 More issues?

7.7


8. Information items – could be moved to business items if desired.

   8.1. Responses to M. Thompson’s query on the extent to which Executive Committee members feel obligated to follow ASCSU resolutions.
       o Attachment K

   8.2. UC Intermediate Algebra Letter.
       o Attachment L

   8.3. Community College BA degrees. See email correspondence with Senate Executive Committee. Need liaison to FGA to find out where they are on this.
       o Attachment M
MEMORANDUM

Code: AA-2004-31
Date: August 13, 2004

To: Academic Council
    Chairs, CSU Campus Academic Senates

From: David Spence
    Executive Vice Chancellor

Subject: Systemwide Lower-Division Transfer Patterns by Major

At its July 2004 meeting, the CSU Board of Trustees modified Title 5 to encourage community college students who wish eventually to transfer to the CSU to choose efficient patterns of classes. The central purpose is to help those students to avoid the now-common pattern of accumulating units well beyond what they need in order to accomplish their educational goals.

We are writing now to inform you of a large and very significant project, based on that decision. Its goal, for the coming academic year, is to identify a pattern of lower-division course work to be taken in the community college for each of twenty-six high-demand majors, so that students who take the recommended path may be given priority admission status when they transfer to a CSU campus.

The Lower-Division Transfer Patterns by Major project to which we now alert you is sponsored jointly by the Academic Senate CSU and the CSU Chancellor's Office and includes a process for coming to agreement on a transfer pattern for each designated major. (For this purpose, "major" is defined in Attachment 3.) Faculty representatives from twenty-six baccalaureate majors will be asked to meet; each group will have one representative from each CSU campus that offers that particular major. Each group will be responsible for defining for the CSU system the recommended lower-division transfer pattern for that major.

Because faculty have primary responsibility for degree requirements and the curriculum, it is important that the faculty of each major have the primary voice in the selection of their representatives. Normally this will be done by departments or programs through their usual governance or curricular processes. (Provosts and Campus Senate Executive Committees should agree on other appropriate processes on each campus where majors do not coincide with departmental structures; it is vital that the faculty who have primary responsibility for the curriculum in this program take leadership for each project.)
Faculty representatives will attend a series of statewide meetings of their major group and will be empowered to join with their counterparts from the other campuses in designating a least 45 semester units of lower-division course work that will count toward graduation with that major at all CSU campuses offering it. In most cases there will be two meetings, of a day and a half in duration. Initial agreements developed at the first statewide meeting will be taken back to campus program faculty for consultation; final agreement at a subsequent meeting will require no further statewide or campus ratification. This process has worked well in previous projects.

The Chancellor's Office will support travel costs. You will be copied on all correspondence with the campus representatives.

Please find attached three items.

- **First**, please find a statement that provides more detailed description of the activities of the Lower-Division Transfer Patterns by Major project.

- **Second**, you will find a list of the twenty-six majors identified by the Chancellor's Office as initial best candidates for establishing systemwide lower-division transfer patterns. These were chosen principally because they are high-frequency major choices of incoming community college transfer students; for most, we believe there is also a commonality of degree requirements across CSU campuses. Other majors may be added in subsequent years.

- **Third**, we enclose a timeline that begins with a response by each campus Provost/Vice President providing us with the names of and contact information for designated disciplinary representatives from each campus.

We hope that you will join us in encouraging your campus representatives to work with energy and good spirit in a process that we expect will serve the people of California well. If you have questions or concerns, please contact David Spence at 562/951-4710 or David McNeil at 562/951-4014.

Attachments

c: CSU Presidents
Chancellor Charles B. Reed
Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum
Assistant Vice Chancellors and Deans, Academic Affairs
Systenwide Lower-Division Transfer Patterns by Major

To begin the project, we are asking faculty members from each CSU campus to come together by major to identify 45 to 60 semester units (68 to 90 quarter units) of lower-division courses that will satisfy graduation requirements for that major at all CSU campuses. For these purposes, "major" may refer to a closely related group of degree majors, options, and/or concentrations. Majors are identified by program code, not title.

The typical pattern will begin with the completion of lower-division course work that satisfies CSU General Education-Breadth requirements and the CSU's United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals requirement. It will continue with six or more units of designated lower-division course work that will meet graduation unit requirements at all CSU campuses offering that major program. Additional semester units that will apply to the baccalaureate degree for that major at a particular CSU campus—for a total of 60 to 70 lower-division units—will subsequently be designated by faculty responsible for the major at that campus. It is not required that six of the units be "major units," only that the 45 lower-division units accepted all reduce the number of units left to take for the degree. A major with no lower-division requirements can agree on general education and six units of unrestricted electives. In all instances, the resulting transfer course patterns should be at least roughly comparable to lower-division course work taken by CSU first-time freshmen.

In most cases, we anticipate, it will not be necessary to identify particular courses to meet general education requirements, but instead only to specify that students should complete all lower-division general education and requirements in U.S. history, Constitution, and American ideals. Only for high-unit, highly sequential majors do we anticipate that it will be necessary to limit the selection of courses meeting general education requirements. For most majors, therefore, the key task will be to identify six or more units of course work beyond general education that will count for the major. Similarly, many of the campus-specific units may be designated as unrestricted electives if a major has six or fewer units of lower-division course work.

If agreement is reached prior to the scheduled adjournment of a meeting, the remaining time may be used to discuss other curricular matters of importance to the major across the system.

Clear information can support efficient course choices by community college students, and in turn such choices can lead these students to the baccalaureate degree in fewer total units. Speedier progress to the baccalaureate should allow the California State University to serve a larger total number of students, as graduates leave room for new students. It should be emphasized that the current minimum requirement for the baccalaureate degree is not changed by this project, which is designed to reduce the number of "excess" units taken by many students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Major</th>
<th>ERSS Program Code(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration, International Business</td>
<td>All codes between 05011 and 05073, all codes between 05091 and 05161, all codes between 05091 and 05097</td>
<td>Includes undergraduate programs in Accountancy, Management, Finance, Marketing, etc. but not Information Systems, Hospitality/Tourism/Entertainment/Sports Management</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>All codes between 07021 and 07026, 05999</td>
<td>Includes options or concentrations within majors in Business Administration</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>All codes between 20011 and 20101, 20992</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>07011</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>22081</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>21041</td>
<td>May include options or concentrations in social work within other B.A. programs</td>
<td>Chico, Fresno, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15011, 15021, 15031, 15071</td>
<td>Includes English Literature, Comparative Literature, Creative Writing</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>21051</td>
<td>Bakerfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Major</td>
<td>ERSS Program Code(s)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nursing</td>
<td>12031</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kinesiology/Physical Education</td>
<td>08351</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 History</td>
<td>22051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Biology</td>
<td>04011, 04012, 04021, 04071, 04101, 04121, 04161, 04171, 04181, 04182, 04201, 04221</td>
<td>Includes Environmental Biology, Botany, Zoology, Physiology, Anatomy, Cell and Molecular Biology, Marine/Aquatic Biology, Ecology, Genetics</td>
<td>Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Journalism</td>
<td>06021</td>
<td>May include Journalism options or concentrations within Communication majors.</td>
<td>Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Radio-Television-Film/Telecommunications</td>
<td>06031</td>
<td>May include Radio-Television-Film options or concentrations within Communication majors.</td>
<td>Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Speech Communication</td>
<td>15061</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Electrical Engineering, Electrical &amp; Electronic Engineering, Computer Engineering</td>
<td>09091, 09092, 09093, 09094</td>
<td>A single systemwide transfer pattern will be sought for these undergraduate majors/options.</td>
<td>Chico, Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Major</td>
<td>ESS Program Code(s)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mechanical Engineering, Civil</td>
<td>09081, 09101</td>
<td>A single systemwide transfer pattern will be</td>
<td>Chico, Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>sought for these two undergraduate majors.</td>
<td>Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San José,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mathematics</td>
<td>17011, 17031</td>
<td>Includes applied mathematics</td>
<td>Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Spanish</td>
<td>11051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Geography</td>
<td>22061</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Economics</td>
<td>22041</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Anthropology</td>
<td>22021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San José, Sonoma, Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>13011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno, Long Beach, Northridge, Sacramento, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Chemistry</td>
<td>19051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By September 23:</td>
<td><em>All CSU campuses have commenced Fall 2004 instruction</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Later Than: October 15</td>
<td>Provosts submit names of campus representatives for each major to Dr. David Spence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late October</td>
<td>Selected representatives convene at the invitation of Dr. David Spence and Dr. David McNeil for leadership orientation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1 – December 10</td>
<td>Initial meetings are held for each major.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1 – April 30</td>
<td>Second and final meetings are held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All, remediation is an issue I would like to see on the AAC agenda:

I read in the May 24th Modesto Bee that in our campus' home county, Stanislaus, population around 500,000 only 13% of those 25 or older have a college degree; nationwide, "that places Stanislaus fourth from the bottom on a list of 231 counties with populations of 250,000 or more surveyed." The national rate was 25.9% and California's 28.5%. The article goes on to note that the valley "serves as a launching pad for the upwardly mobile," but that our ratio of college graduates both deters businesses and prompts "talent flight." I have taught at Stanislaus for 11 years and believe that our campus is enacting that American ideal of upward mobility through education; at the same time I understand that we must provide balanced access and a fair chance at an education for all of our eligible students if the CSU is to serve as a platform for upward mobility. That access includes, and must include, eligible students who are required to take remedial courses.

However, the administration of the CSU, including the academic administration, is distorting the original goal of the Board of Trustees: to reduce the need for remediation. Instead remediation is demonized and held up as a possible target for punishment at every turn. In a meeting with the Chancellor on my campus two years ago, he stated directly that our enrollment management problems would disappear if we got rid of all remediation. It's more than discouraging to have to report that the majority of the many faculty I have spoken with in the CSU join the chorus to attack remedial students. I have enough trust in the fairness of faculty to believe they just haven't thought carefully enough about what a remedial student is.

*****Trustee Pesquiera's remedial tour:
In the mid-90s, then-Trustee Ralph Pesquiera often accompanied by vice-chancellor Peter Hoff toured many campuses of the CSU to help inform the Board of Trustees about remedial issues. I attended the meeting at the Stanislaus campus and noted that the Trustee's introductory remarks included the fact that his children attended private schools where students still learned Latin. With that comparative background in mind, I was relieved to later learn that the Trustees' stance was to reduce the need for remediation in the CSU to 10% by 2007, a very different stance than the ban on remedial classes achieved by the CUNY regents in a revision of their master plan. It is important to keep in mind that the goal is to reduce the need for remediation.

Clearly, some CSU initiatives such as the PAD (pre-collegiate academic development), CAPI (collaborative academic preparation initiative), and EAP (early assessment program) focus on the goal; however, other policies--such as the limitation of remedial work, in some cases to one semester, and proposed policies such as counting prebaccalaureate units in a total of
"sanctionable units"--units beyond which students or campuses will be penalized--have nothing to do with reducing the need for remediation. (For example, a farcical assertion would be that a high school student will better prepare for writing at college because she knows that someday any prebaccalaureate units will count against her as part of her total if she passes 120% of the minimum units required for her future degree program.)

*****Students:
Various sources document that freshman composition courses began at Harvard in the 1880s, a recognition that students who had completed high school were not prepared to write at the university, Harvard University (e.g. Berlin, Boylan). Berlin's rendering has a familiar ring:

In 1874, Eliot [the president of Harvard] introduced a test of the student's ability to write in English as a part of the Harvard entrance requirement . . . . Since the language of learning at the new university was to be English, it seemed appropriate that entering students be tested in this language. Furthermore the test in English ensured that the new open university would not become too open . . . . The fact that no freshman class had ever been able to write in the manner thought appropriate for college work and that additional writing instruction had always been deemed necessary for college students seems not to have been noticed either by Eliot or the staff of his English department. A look at the sample essays from the entrance exam of 1894--published by the Harvard Board of Overseers in indignation at the errors it found--reveals that the best students in the country attending the best university of its time had difficulties in writing. Rather than conclude that perhaps it was expecting too much of these students and their preparatory schools, however, the Board of Overseers excoriated the teachers who had prepared these students and demanded that something be done. This vilification of high school English teacher has since become a common practice as college English teachers have tried to shift the entire responsibility for writing instruction--a responsibility that throughout Anglo-American history has been shared by the college--to the lower schools. (24) [end of quote]

One of the most widely-offered general education courses began as a means to bridge the gap between writing expectations at high school graduation and at university matriculation. Unfortunately, many academics and administrators, once they have completed their degrees, misremember a golden age of writing back in their day, and this mis-remembrance is a step toward demonizing remedial students.

Additionally, over the last 30 years, many university composition programs have shifted from an "introduction to literary explication" focus to an "introduction to academic writing" focus. The vast majority of CSU first-year composition courses fall into the latter category; however, most
high school curricula are still grounded in the analysis of literature and narrative/creative writing. So, many students who must take the English Placement Test are faced with tasks that are quite different from the composition tasks they practiced in high school. If the Early Assessment Project does have an effect on high school curriculum and instruction; part of that change will be to bring the types of writing tasks assigned to high school students into closer alignment with tasks assigned at the university. Ascribing blame to students for different focuses of instruction grounded in state frameworks is a step toward demonizing remedial students.

Adjusting to the new type of task and level of expectation in writing performance is a step in the students' development as writers. Another common way of mis-thinking about writing is called the "myth of transience." The myth is that writing is learned as a set of discreet skills that then transfer to all writing situations: they should've learned that in the fourth (or eight or tenth) grade. If we stop and think about it, we know that learning to write is developmental and happens over many years. The university's designation of writing instruction as a required course and/or general education requirement is a recognition that writing is not something one "gets" at a discrete point and that writing is important enough that we require students to submit to instruction. Clearly, "remediation" is every bit as much developmental as it is remedial. (Writing faculty spent years repeating the distinction between developmental and remedial instruction, but that distinction is so ignored in conversations that it is near pointless to keep explaining it.) Many universities, but not most CSUs, require students to take two semesters of first-year composition, an explicit acknowledgment that more than one semester of writing instruction is necessary for most entering university students. Subscribing to the myth of transience is one more step toward demonizing . . .

Another explicit acknowledgement of the importance of writing is that students are tested for placement in appropriate classes if they are not exempted by a passable score on SAT, ACT, or other examinations. Testing in any area will produce numbers of remedial students. If we had no EPT but did have the History Placement Test, the Science Placement Test, and the Philosophy Placement Test, we would also have huge numbers of students who headed to remedial classes in history, science, and philosophy. We could then complain that we didn't want "those remedial (fill in discipline here) students" who couldn't pass the HPT/SPT/PPT in our classes or university. With a placement testing program for each discipline, we might be able to place upwards of 90 percent of eligible incoming students in a demonizable category.

It would be ironic, having spent so much breath recently decrying the demise of the master plan in California, were we to decouple access from remedial programs. If you don't believe that connection exists, I invite you to visit
any remedial writing class on my campus: you will see that remedial programs, at least those in composition, are a bulwark of access sustaining the ethnic and economic diversity in the system. Put more simply: go look at whom the system keeps attempting to pile more sanctions on. If you have ever taught a remedial course, then you aware that these students actually advance and attain degrees. Decoupling remediation from access is one more step toward demonizing . . .

*****Faculty
It is a commonplace, when remedial writing programs are even housed in English departments, that the classes are by and large taught by part-time faculty and graduate-student teaching associates. The disfranchised teaching the disfranchised. Remedial courses are among the cheapest taught at the university; a graduate student teaching 15 students in a remedial course for $2000 is still much cheaper than me as a full professor teaching a freshman composition class of 25 or a graduate course of 15. Remedial composition courses on our campus have high success rates, 75-80% per term (Trustee Galinson was quoted in newspapers allowing that such success rates "don't pass the smell test," an argument that might change once he gets within smelling distance of a remedial writing class for long enough to see what transpires there). Yet, I have heard it repeated in meetings, especially ones connected to the Chancellor's office, that the faculty of these fairly cheap and highly successful programs are protective of these programs, as if a protective attitude toward successful programs that provide access is a negative thing and removes all objectivity of those involved in teaching remedial students. Where else in the CSU system are underpaid instructors who provide the direct instruction in successful access programs demonized for being protective of their programs?

*****System
Beyond EO665 and further sanctions placed on remedial students, it seems that one of the rewards of impaction is a reduction in the number of semesters granted to remedial students to remediate or the use of remedial status to deny students admission altogether. That reduction or denial then becomes the model that the less fortunate un-impacted campuses are directed to aspire to. If another tiering device in the CSU draws a line between remedial and non-remedial campuses, who wants to be in the latter, demonized, group? While the CSU speaks out of one side of its mouth championing outreach programs to save them from the budget axe, it speaks out of the other side by reducing or denying access to the very students it purports to reach out to, including students who are fully eligible for admission under our as yet unrevised master plan.

Soon, when the EAP system is declared functional, valid, and reliable, students will likely be required to take, and perhaps required to complete, remedial work in the summer preceding matriculation as Trustee policy has
been altered to allow them to do. To mount such programs to serve all targeted students in the summer on many campuses would be a monumental undertaking. Would it also be an undertaking that becomes part of the recent budget-driven fetish for conversion back to self-support rather than state support thereby imposing a further economic sanction on the remedial students? The possibilities for sanction seem endless.

Rather than thoughtlessly repeating a mantra to denigrate a certain segment of students, consider what you see as the mission of the CSU--and of your local CSU--and think about how all of your students fit within that mission.


Thanks,

~mt

rhetoric: when the baby says "wah."
FYI. We did a resolution on this (AA?) some time ago when Gray Davis proposed requiring comm service. Now Maris Shriver, who has the Governor's ear, wants it and got the California Performance Review to put it in as one of the 1,000 recommendations. FYI.

Ted
From the LA Times

GEORGE SKELTON / CAPITOL JOURNAL
Forcing Community Service by College Students Would Be Mistake George Skelton

August 5, 2004

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger is asking for "the people's input" concerning a massive plan he commissioned to overhaul state government. So here's my input: Stop picking on college students.

Stop using them as piggy banks for budget-balancing — especially when rich folks aren't being asked to pay anything extra — and don't use the students now as guinea pigs for some elitist social engineering.

Leafing through the 5 1/2-inch thick catalog of 1,000-plus proposals presented to the governor Tuesday by a state study group, one suggestion particularly caused me to wince — an idea inspired by Schwarzenegger's wife, Maria Shriver.

Shriver's life is rooted in volunteerism. Her father, Sargent Shriver, was the first director of the Peace Corps. Her mother, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, created the Special Olympics. Maria Shriver gave a motivational talk to the state study team about the merits of volunteerism. And some staffers then came up with a proposal to require community service as a condition for receiving a "degree or certificate" from any public university or college in California.

Not voluntary, like the Peace Corps. Mandatory community service, like sentencing for some convicted criminal.

OK, they'd only be required to perform 16 hours of community service — maybe for two Saturdays, sometime before graduation. But it's the "you owe us" attitude of the report — called the California Performance Review — that really grates.

"California taxpayers subsidize the education of students," the CPR report states.

"In exchange for the significant investment of taxpayer funds in their education and their future, students attending the state's public colleges and universities should be required to perform a minimum amount of community service. This service requirement will benefit the students, their community and the overall well-being of California and its people….

"The first goal is to draw students into a participatory citizenry, to recognize their efforts and to build their sense of membership within California's global society. The second intent … is to create a societal expectation that each individual has a responsibility to acknowledge the benefits provided them by society [and] accept responsibility to
participate in the betterment of society and not rely exclusively on
governmental institutions."

Reads like a mix of Soviet bloc big-brotherism, Jesuit philosophy and
Heritage Foundation ramblings.

Look, taxpayers don't "subsidize" students as much as they invest in
California's own future by providing affordable educations that develop a
skilled, innovative workforce. It's one of the things that made California
great. Weather alone didn't do it.

Our public universities used to be a lot more accessible and affordable.
This year Schwarzenegger denied admission to thousands of qualified high
school graduates, but backed away from rejecting even more when pressured
by Democratic legislators. Annual student fees were hiked to $780 at
community colleges, $2,334 at state universities and $5,684 for University
of California undergrads.

The CPR staffers also see the mandatory community service as a moneymaker,
"worth approximately $192 million" in free labor.

Community service is terrific, of course. It just should be voluntary. But
if it is to be mandatory, it should be imposed on everybody, not just
students attending public colleges. We should be encouraging their
attendance, not penalizing it.

There's a good argument for requiring national public service, but that's a
policy question for the president and Congress.

It's one thing for a kid with wealthy parents and free time to be ordered
into community service. It's another to force some 28-year-old,
return-to-college waitress with a kid at home to devote any time at all to
this feel-good, ivory tower concept. The average age of community college
students, incidentally, is 28.

And regarding community colleges, their leadership got smacked by the study
group. It recommended that the independent Community College Board of
Governors be eliminated and the entire 107-campus system be overseen by the
governor's office. In the current case, that would mean Schwarzenegger's
education advisor, former L.A. Mayor Richard Riordan.

This smacks of a power grab and an effort to shut up dissident voices at
budget time.

In accepting the restructuring report — to personally read and send to a
separate review commission — Schwarzenegger complained about "the special
interests that will be screaming, that will be complaining and … squawking
about the recommendations, calling them unfair and impractical or maybe
even worse."

Schwarzenegger is a showman who tends toward excessive hyperbole. I doubt
he really regards college students who are just scraping by as special
interests. He may, however, consider community colleges as special
interests when they disagree with him. That seems to be his definition of a
special interest.
My input: Leave the community colleges alone. Leave the college kids alone. Enhance and encourage community service that's voluntary.

*

George Skelton writes Monday and Thursday. Reach him at george.skelton@latimes.com.
EDITORIAL

... and College Students

August 14, 2004

At least the state study group had something sensible to say about kindergarten. Its smug attack on public college students has no place in a report on reshaping government and is a bad idea in any context.

In the last couple of years, the state has more than doubled fees for community college students and cut course offerings. Students commute from campus to campus to pick up enough classes and work extra hours to afford the fees — and, in many cases, to support families. The last thing they need is a group of uninformed elitists telling all public college students that they're sucking the public trough dry and should be required to perform community service in exchange.

Yes, 16 hours of service isn't a lot — which is another problem. That amount of community work is meaningless. The report spins silly fantasies about $192 million worth of free services the state would receive, all for the tiny cost of informing students of the requirement and logging their hours into their records. Forgotten are the expenses of determining which volunteer work will count, providing opportunities for students who have no transportation, checking that the work was performed and dealing with appeals. The study group was supposed to streamline government, not create a new bureaucracy.

College students shouldn't feel singled out. Adults also get snooty treatment in the report, which chastises Californians because only one in four does community service, because they volunteer "too little" time and because they focus on "narrow" interests (that means churches and schools). Never mind that those evaluations don't take into account many kinds of volunteer work or the people whose energy is spent juggling dual incomes and multiple jobs. As it happens, Californians who do volunteer spend 165 hours a year at it, significantly more than people elsewhere in the nation.

With Californians contributing the equivalent of a month of full-time work each year to religious institutions, education and other nonprofit causes, it's hard to feel too apologetic about their supposed laziness and bad values.

Encouraging civic participation is a fine idea. In that case, create college courses in which students get credit for doing meaningful community service and putting some thought and research into the topic. That would also help them get their degrees on time — which would save the state a lot more money than conscripted public service.
Monterey Bay Campus Is a Role Model

Debate on requiring community service for students turns to a university where giving back is a core value.

By Eric Slater
Times Staff Writer

August 10, 2004

SEASIDE, Calif. — To graduate from college, Tracy Burke spent time in a halfway house for female felons. Alicia Gregory filled grocery bags at a food bank. Tiana Trutna taught elementary students how to grow vegetables for their school cafeteria.

Here at Cal State Monterey Bay, it's required work. To the university, it's an essential part of an education. But some educators elsewhere say required community service squanders precious education dollars — and time.

The only public university or college in the state to require such service, Monterey Bay is finding itself at the center of a fast-growing debate as California begins to consider whether to mandate community service for all 3.4 million students in the public system.

The notion that such service should be required for a college degree was among the many proposals to emerge last week from the California Performance Review, a report commissioned by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger that addresses hundreds of aspects of state government.

At issue, first, is whether it is appropriate to require community service as part of what goes into a university degree. Beyond that, even among those who support mandatory service, there is disagreement over how best to make such service meaningful.

Mandatory service might be of little value, some say, without accompanying academic study — "service learning," as it's known.

"Requiring community service is a good first step," said Stephen M. Reed, associate vice president for external relations at Monterey Bay. "But it's only a first step."

Students here not only must work in the community; they also must take courses related to that work.

"The important thing is not contributing hours," said Seth Pollack, director of the
university's Service Learning Institute. "The important thing is learning your own responsibility to your community. That comes not from parking cars or licking envelopes, but from understanding the root causes of our social problems."

The state's colleges and universities have long urged their students to volunteer for good causes of all kinds, and hundreds of thousands of students do. The California Performance Review advocated taking such volunteerism a step further: converting voluntary service into mandatory community work for students.

All but hidden among the 50,000 acres of artillery ranges and deteriorating barracks of the now-defunct Ft. Ord Army base, Cal State Monterey Bay has been an outpost of civic-minded academics since the day it opened nine years ago, a place where theories of ethics, community and multiculturalism are debated while the military detonates aging munitions nearby.

In part because of its service requirement, the school has acquired a reputation as a left-leaning establishment, though the area also is known for military-style conservatism, thanks to Ft. Ord, the Naval Postgraduate School and other military installations.

The university's pioneers laid the groundwork for socially conscious scholarship in the school's vision statement, written in 1994, which pledges to imbue students with the "responsibility and skills to be community builders."

All students must take eight units of service-study courses — four while fulfilling their basic general education requirements and four related to their major, all while working in the community.

They have 40 such courses to choose from — everything from "Museum Studies Service Learning" to classes on tutoring in mathematics — and students are encouraged to explore a field they might otherwise never experience.

As a communications major from a white, middle-class family in the suburbs of San Francisco, Burke chose to work in a minimum-security facility in Salinas for female convicts with young children.

"I knew a couple of people in high school who had drug problems, but their parents had the money to send them to rehab," Burke said. "This was just this huge eye-opener — about how this happens, about how the society is shaped."

The recommendation of the governor's task force, complete with quotes from Gandhi and the governor's wife, Maria Shriver, is not the first time a service requirement has been recommended for all public universities. In 1999, Gov. Gray Davis floated a nearly identical proposal.

Thomas Sowell, a fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, lambasted the notion then. "Forced to volunteer," he wrote of Democrat Davis' proposal, "is the
Orwellian notion to which contemporary liberalism has sunk."

Sowell might have been among the more politically outspoken opponents, but he had lots of company — most notably all three branches of state higher education: the University of California system, the California State system and the state's community colleges.

None implemented Davis' recommendation. The reasons were many, but money was at the top of the list. Student labor is cheap only for the groups employing the students.

"It takes a tremendous amount of resources to properly administer these programs," said Season Eckhardt, Cal State's director of communications for service learning. "Before we would endorse a requirement, we would want to talk to a lot of people."

The Cal State and UC systems agreed earlier this year to expand their voluntary community service programs in a deal with Schwarzenegger that sets fee increases and funding levels for the next several years, even though Cal State had its service budget cut in half last year, to $1.1 million.

All three state systems have offices that help students who want to volunteer find community groups in need, as well as service learning courses in some academic disciplines. About one-third of UC's 200,000 students perform volunteer work, as do 45% of Cal State's more than 400,000 students, officials said.

What is clear is that all three systems have received the new panel's proposal with the same tepid response they gave Davis' plan, noting the cost and pointing out that the average age of community college students, for example, is 28 — and many of them have children and full-time jobs.

"Community service is a very good thing," community college spokeswoman Cheryl Fong said, "but I think that we need to carefully look at whether it should be an institution-wide requirement."

Pollack, the director of Monterey Bay's service learning institute, says he was once a skeptic. But, the key, he insists, is to give students a strong academic foundation in social justice issues, race, poverty and ethics so that when they go out to help in the community, the experience can mean more than just checking off another graduation requirement.

Launching a university with this as a core value, officials here acknowledge, may be enormously simpler than instituting it at existing schools, many of them much larger.

The university here has nine faculty and staff members dedicated to the program, with a budget of $400,000 and $200,000 more in grant money.

Virtually every instructor and many staff members play a role, because every student on campus is involved. Many current and former students said they had been required to perform community service in high school and got little out of it besides the right to
"I think our governor needs to do some more research before taking a step in that direction," said 20-year-old junior Marissa Serma.

Studying drug addiction, Serma and several other students agreed, can make working with addicts educational; learning about the relationship of poverty to crime rates and the demographics of the prison population helps demystify those they meet at shelters and halfway houses.

When combined with academic study, service requirements become "like opera," said Gregory, 19, a junior theater major. "Even if you don't really like it, you can understand and appreciate it."
Mandatory community service for college kids

By Alex Ricciardulli -- Special To The Bee - *(Published August 27, 2004)*

[Op ed page article, Sacramento Bee, Fri 8/27/04]

Requiring public college students to perform community service to graduate is an idea that would enrich students' lives and benefit personnel-starved community groups. The compulsory nature of the service would not detract from the enormous good that would flow to all involved.

The proposal to make community service a college requirement was part of a number of suggestions by the California Performance Review, a state study group formed in response to Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's call to "blow up boxes" in finding ways for streamlining and improving California government to save taxpayers' money. The group consisted of 21 leaders from state and local government, business and labor communities, and public policy experts, representing a broad range of interests and many years of combined experience.

The group came up with more than 1,200 suggestions designed to save the state $32 billion over the next five years, including consolidating boards and eliminating departments with overlapping responsibilities, as well as the community service requirement. It is currently conducting public hearings throughout the state to get feedback on its proposals.

Regarding community service, the group recognized a gaping need for more people to assist community projects, and identified ways students would prosper by service activities, including encouraging citizenship, exploring careers and acquiring practical work skills.

Community colleges, California State University and University of California students would be required to log a total of 16 hours per pupil to obtain an undergraduate degree. That's fair because public college tuition is heavily subsidized by taxpayers. Even with recent increases, the nearly $6,000 yearly tuition at UC schools for undergraduate education is a bargain compared to comparable private universities such as the University of Southern California and Stanford, which charge about $30,000 a year.

The proposal is definitely lawful. A federal court in 1993 upheld the constitutionality of a Maryland requirement that all high school students in the state perform at least 60 hours of community service to graduate. The court found that so long as the school did not force students to work for groups that were contrary to students' beliefs, neither the First Amendment nor due process was violated.

The savings to California are clear: An estimated $192 million in service hours would be generated. Costs of enforcing compliance and keeping records could be offset by having students help administer the program as part of their community service requirement.
The big question is whether students’ lives would truly be enriched. The experience of participants in compulsory service programs such as jury duty and court-ordered community service for criminal offenses indicates that students would benefit. Several studies have shown that most jurors view their experience favorably, with jurors characterizing their service as "interesting," "important" and "educational," even though they were forced to serve.

Criminal offenders try not to get caught doing their crime, and once caught would rather not do time, whether in jail or a community service assignment. However, community service has therapeutic value and plays a crucial role in rehabilitation. Despite its compulsory nature, offenders are often enlightened by the positive psychological impact of providing service to the community.

Given the benefits of a graduation service requirement to the state, to community groups and to participating students, the appropriate question to ask is not, "Why?" It's, "Why has it taken so long to be seriously considered?"

About the Writer
-----------------------------

Alex Ricciardulli is a Los Angeles County deputy public defender and teaches law school part-time at the University of Southern California and Loyola. He can be reached at aricciar@co.la.ca.us.
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“This report is an impressively researched piece of work and gives a fine perspective on the problem of high textbook prices along with some possible solutions. It should be carefully reviewed by everyone who has buying authority for college textbooks.”

- Erwin V. Cohen, Former publishing industry executive for the Academic Press

“A hard-hitting report. Solid research and effective recommendations. This is not just a student issue but a faculty issue, too. Students need choices and faculty need to insist they be given choices.”

- Christy A. Jensen, Professor of Public Policy Administration, California State University, Sacramento, and Chair of Fiscal and Government Affairs, CSU Academic Senate
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With student and faculty complaints about the price of college textbooks on the rise, the California Student Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG), the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group (OSPIRG) and the OSPIRG Foundation conducted a survey of the most widely assigned textbooks in the fall of 2003 at 10 public colleges and universities in California and Oregon. Student volunteers and staff also interviewed 156 faculty and 521 students about the cost of textbooks and their purchasing practices. Key findings from this survey include:

Textbooks are Expensive and Getting Even More Expensive

- Students will spend an average of $898 per year on textbooks in 2003-04, based on surveys of University of California (UC) students in the fall of 2003. This represents almost 20 percent of the average tuition and fees for in-state students at public four-year colleges nationwide. In contrast, a 1997 UC survey found that students spent an average of $642 on textbooks in 1996-97.

Textbook Publishers Add Bells and Whistles that Drive Up the Price of Textbooks; Most Faculty Do Not Use These Materials

- Half of all textbooks now come “bundled,” or shrink-wrapped with additional instructional materials such as CD-ROMs and workbooks. Students rarely have the option of buying the textbook “a la carte” or without additional materials.

- In the one instance that a textbook was available both bundled and unbundled (only the textbook), the bundled version was more than twice as expensive as the unbundled version of the same textbook.

- Sixty-five (65) percent of faculty “rarely” or “never” use the bundled materials in their courses.

Textbook Publishers Put New Editions on the Market Frequently – Often With Very Few Content Changes – Making the Less Expensive, Used Textbooks Obsolete and Unavailable

- Seventy-six (76) percent of faculty report that the new editions they use are justified “never” to “half the time.” Forty (40) percent of faculty report that the new editions are “rarely” to “never” justified.

- A new textbook costs $102.44 on average, 58 percent more expensive than the price of an average used textbook, $64.80.

- Fifty-nine (59) percent of students who searched for a used book for the fall 2003 quarter/semester were unable to find even one used book for their classes.
Faculty and Students Support Alternatives That Lower Students’ Costs, Maintain Quality

- Eighty-seven (87) percent of faculty support including new information in a supplement instead of producing a new textbook edition.

- Eighty-six (86) percent of students are considering buying and selling used textbooks through an online bookswap; 14 percent reported already using online bookswaps.

Online Textbooks Hold Promise for Dramatically Lowering the Cost of Textbooks

- According to the Association of American Publishers and the National Association of College Stores, paper, printing and editorial costs account for an average of 32.3 cents of every dollar of the textbook cost – the largest share of the total.

- Online textbooks could eliminate this cost and significantly lower the retail cost of textbooks.

- Some authors and publishers are currently experimenting with online textbooks, a new industry trend that holds great promise.

The production and pricing of college textbooks merits scrutiny from educators and lawmakers because they affect the quality and affordability of higher education. As this report shows, the cost of textbooks is a growing expense for students. The high cost is primarily due to publishers producing new editions like clockwork, regardless of how much new educational content exists, and including expensive bells and whistles, such as CD-ROMs, that professors rarely find useful. The more expensive new editions force the older, less-expensive editions off the market.

Publishers should produce more affordable, quality textbooks. They also should offer faculty and students the option to purchase textbooks unbundled and provide faculty with more information on the company’s materials, their prices, intended length of time on the market and substantive content differences from previous editions. Faculty should use their decision-making power to demand substance over bells and whistles and should consider cost and accessibility of previous editions secondary only to educational value when selecting books for their courses.

Finally, students and universities can help make used books available to students by sponsoring on-campus and online bookswaps, campus rental programs and other means.
INTRODUCTION

“Publishers release new editions of successful textbooks every few years — not to improve content, although that may be a byproduct — but to discourage the sales of used books by making them seem obsolete.”

- Erwin V. Cohen, former publishing industry executive for the Academic Press

An educated, skilled and engaged citizenry is essential to the economic and social health of a nation; ensuring that all Americans can afford a college education — by funding higher education institutions and student aid programs and keeping students’ costs low — is a critical tool to pursue such ends.

College costs are rising; according to The College Board, tuition and fees in 2003-04 are 14.1 percent higher than last year for public four-year institutions. Student grant aid is failing to keep up with mounting costs. Over the past ten years, grant aid has increased by 85 percent while loans have increased 173 percent. As a result of this gap, borrowing is on the rise. Thirty-nine (39) percent of student borrowers now graduate with unmanageable levels of debt, meaning that their monthly payments are more than 8 percent of their monthly incomes. According to recent data from the Department of Education’s National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, not only are the majority of students turning to loans to finance college, but debt levels are also escalating. In 1999-2000, 64 percent of students graduated with student loan debt, and the average student loan debt has nearly doubled over the past eight years to $16,928.

In addition to borrowing, many students must work long hours to finance their education. According to a survey conducted by the State PIRGs, nearly half of all full-time working students are working enough hours to hurt their academic achievement and the overall quality of their education. At the same time, the majority of these students (63 percent) reported that they would not be able to attend college if they did not work.

Given the current trends in higher education funding, the rising cost of textbooks has come under intense scrutiny. In October 2003, the New York Times reported that American textbook publishers sell textbooks overseas for as little as half the price of the same textbook sold in the United States.

Even insiders from within the textbook industry have joined the growing criticism of the publishing industry. According to Erwin V. Cohen, a former publishing industry executive for the Academic Press, “Publishers release new editions of successful textbooks every few years — not to improve content, although that may be a byproduct — but to discourage the sales of used books by making them seem obsolete.” He goes on to say, “Before color printing, fancy graphics and electronic supplements, it was no harder for students to learn chemistry, physics and psychology than it is now. Costs could be cut in half by using simple book designs, streamlining the review process and adding less fluff. And, most important, by publishers not churning out more of the same each year.”

Several policy-makers have proposed solutions to address the rising cost of
textbooks at American colleges and universities. U.S. Senator Charles E. Schumer (NY) released a study showing that undergraduates at New York colleges and universities are confronting skyrocketing costs for textbooks. The Schumer study found that the average New York freshman or sophomore paid $922 for textbooks this year – an increase of approximately 41 percent since 1998. Senator Schumer has proposed making up to $1,000 of textbook costs tax deductible to help lower the overall cost of higher education for working families.

Similarly, Congressman David Wu (OR), a member of the House Education Committee, has introduced legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives to require an investigation of the college textbook industry’s pricing practices.

These skyrocketing costs would be reason for concern under any circumstances. Coupled with a political context in which state and federal aid for higher education has been failing to keep pace with rising college costs, high textbooks costs may be prohibitive to many already struggling to pay for college.
SURVEY FINDINGS

"Textbooks have become ridiculously expensive because the people who choose the books (faculty) are not the ones who pay for them (students). Publishers spend a lot of money trying to get me to choose their book. They sponsor wine and cheese parties at conferences, they mail me free sample books and they send representatives from Portland (to Eugene) to sell to me.... This is a problem that needs addressing."
- Lane Community College Math Professor

In the fall of 2003, the California Student Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG), the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group (OSPIRG) and the OSPIRG Foundation conducted a survey to address increasing student and faculty complaints about the rising cost of college textbooks. Surveyors identified the five most widely assigned textbooks for the fall 2003 semester at 10 public colleges and universities in California and Oregon. From that list, surveyors found and compared consecutive editions of 33 textbooks. Approximately 30 student volunteers and 15 staff examined the textbooks and interviewed 156 faculty who used one or more of those books. Volunteers and staff also surveyed 521 students about the total cost of their textbooks and methods used to purchase textbooks.

The survey resulted in the following findings:

0 Textbooks are Expensive and Getting Even More Expensive

Students’ Textbook Costs Are On The Rise
Based on surveys of University of California (UC) students in the fall of 2003, students will spend an average of $898 on textbooks in three quarters or two semesters (Figure 1A). If they attend summer school, they are likely to spend more than $1,000 a year. The University of California Office of the President has tracked students’ textbook costs over the last seven years and found that their textbook expenses have increased 24 percent since 1996-97.12

Figure 1A. Average Amount Spent on Textbooks by School Surveyed for 2003-2004

![Figure 1A](image-url)
Textbook Publishers Add Bells and Whistles that Drive Up the Price of Textbooks, But Faculty Do Not Use These Materials

“I had to (use the bundled materials) once because that was the deal that was struck with the book company, but I generally wouldn’t do that. Most ancillary material is not all that useful to students.”
- Lane Community College Psychology Professor

“I find that moving the class to the computer lab (to use the bundled CD-ROMs) causes time waste and logistics issues and asking everyone to do stuff ‘on their own computer/own time’ is rather hit and miss.”
- Lane Community College Math Professor

Half of All Textbooks Now Come “Bundled” – Shrink-Wrapped with Additional Instructional Materials, Such as CD-ROMs and Workbooks

The practice of bundling the required textbook with non-required materials such as dictionaries, CD-ROMs and study-guides increased 21 percent between the consecutive editions surveyed (issued an average of 3.8 years apart). The older edition surveyed was bundled 46 percent of the time compared with the newer edition of the same textbook that was bundled 53 percent of the time, a seven percent increase (Figure 2A).

The number of items included in the bundle also increased by almost 50 percent, from 1.2 items with the older edition to 1.7 items with the newer edition.

Certain Subjects Have More Non-Required Materials Bundled than Others

Textbooks for science and math classes were bundled in 66 percent of the cases we studied, containing an average of 1.75 and 1.3 additional items, respectively. In contrast, only 25 percent of the liberal arts books were bundled, with an average of one other item. Books for other classes, including honors colloquium, business, and business administration, were bundled 50 percent of the time, with an average of one other item (Figures 2B and 2C).
Books that Are Sold Bundled Are Rarely Offered Separately; Indications Are That Bundled Books Are More Expensive

“It seems to me that the “all-in-one package” drives behind these books is what makes them so expensive: if we leave it up to the instructors, who are, after all, trained professionals, to “fill in the gaps” in an edition that is perhaps not “up to the minute,” then we may be able to reduce the cost of these things. New editions are quite simply produced more often than needed and students actively resent this and tend to see it as profiteering.”

- UC Davis English Professor

Of the books surveyed, only one textbook was available for purchase both bundled and unbundled. The bundled version was $130, more than double the unbundled price of $60 (Figure 2D).

Figure 2D. Price Comparison of Bundled and Unbundled Version of Same Book

School: UCSB
Book: Chemistry: The Central Science
Publisher: Pearson Education
Author: Brown
Year: 2003
Edition: 9th
Bundled Cost: $130
Unbundled Cost: $60
Sixty-five (65) percent of professors estimate they “never” or “rarely” include information from the additional bundled items in their courses, compared with only 24 percent who estimated they do “always” or “usually”, and 11 percent use the material “half of the time” (Figure 2E).
Textbook Publishers Issue New Editions Frequently — Often Without Content Changes — Making Less Expensive, Used Textbooks Obsolete and Unavailable

"I know the main purpose for a new edition is for the textbook publisher to make money. Unfortunately, we are forced to go to the new edition because our current edition will be obsolete."

- Lane Community College Math Professor

New Textbook Editions Are Published Routinely

The average time difference between the two consecutive editions of the textbooks surveyed was 3.8 years, with 75 percent of the books surveyed (25/33) in the three to four year range (Figure 3A). This finding falls in line with what many faculty surveyed also reported. It is customary for publishers to issue a new edition approximately every three years for all subjects. According to many professors, three to four years is the industry standard regardless of how the subject has changed since the previous edition.

"In my opinion, they produce a new edition when the number of second hand copies of an old edition seriously dents their sales figures."

- UCSD Math Professor

"New editions are driven by profit potential of publishers. There isn't that much new information in a field to change in an intro text."

- University of Oregon Business Professor

New Editions Replace Used Editions — Costing Students More, Increasing Faculty Workload

"I don't look forward to changing texts because I have to reinvent the wheel every time I re-prepare lessons."

- Lane Community College Math Professor

Of the textbooks surveyed, the new editions cost 58 percent more than the used copy of the older edition. The average price of the new edition is $102.44, compared with $64.80 for the used edition. Because students can earn money selling back their books if they have not been replaced with newer editions, students both save money by buying used books and earn money selling them back.

The following chart (Figure 3B) is an example of the price difference between consecutive editions of the same textbook. While the percentage varies, the overall trend is that each new edition is more expensive than the previous edition purchased new and significantly more expensive than the previous edition purchased used.
### Figure 3B. Example of Price Differences Between Consecutive Editions of Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Old Year/Edition</th>
<th>Cost New</th>
<th>Cost Used</th>
<th>New Year/Edition</th>
<th>Cost New</th>
<th>Cost Used</th>
<th>Buyback Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC-Davis</td>
<td>General Chemistry: Principles and Modern Applications</td>
<td>Prentice Hall</td>
<td>1996/7th</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>2001/8th</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
<td>$84.50</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Oregon</td>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>Thomson Learning</td>
<td>1997/1st</td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>2000/2nd</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$196.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$237.00</td>
<td>$164.50</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$98.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$118.50</td>
<td>$82.25</td>
<td>$46.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Majority of Students are Unable to Find Used Books

Of the students surveyed, 59 percent were unable to find even one used book while buying their textbooks (Figure 3C). This could be because the used books were already purchased by other students or because the textbook was replaced with a newer edition that made the used edition obsolete.

### 3C. Percentage of Students Looking for Used Books Who Found at Least One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not find at least one</th>
<th>Found at least one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Textbook Editions are Often Published With Little or No New Information

"Chemistry updates usually fix errors and add some materials, nothing is new. Added material is usually ancillary."

- Berkeley Chemistry Professor

More than three-quarters (76 percent) of all faculty surveyed estimated the new editions were justified half of the time or less. More than 40 percent of faculty surveyed said that new textbooks were “rarely” or “never” justified (Figure 3D).

### Figure 3D. Professorial Response to Justification of New Textbook Editions
Faculty opinion varied significantly depending on which subject they taught. For example, only 1 percent of math professors estimated that a new math edition is “usually” or “always” justified, compared with 34 percent of science professors who thought the same of new science editions. Twenty-eight (28) percent of liberal arts professors estimated their textbooks were justified “usually” or “always,” and none of the other faculty estimated the new editions were “usually” or “always” justified.

“Probably you will not be surprised to find out that most of the mathematics faculty are as much frustrated by constant production of “new editions” of calculus textbooks as are the students. The subject of calculus did not change much in the last 100 years! And there are no reasons why the textbooks have to be updated every five years or even more frequently. New illustrations are sometimes added, exercises are shuffled and so on, but these do not substantially affect teaching/learning. Textbook publishers produce new editions solely as a means to sell more books and make more profit.”

- UCLA Calculus Professor
Faculty and Students Support Changes that Lower Students’ Costs, Maintain Quality

Faculty Support Teaching with a Supplement or Reordering Older Edition

Eighty-seven (87) percent of faculty surveyed supported including new information in a supplement instead of producing a new textbook edition, with half (53 percent) saying it is a “good” idea and a third (34 percent) saying that it is an “okay” idea. Thirteen (13) percent were opposed to the idea mostly because they were concerned it would be logistically difficult for students to go back and forth between the textbook and the supplement (Figure 4A).

Figure 4A. Faculty Opinion on Issuing Supplements Instead of New Textbook Editions

Students Are Buying and Selling Books Online, and Even More Are Considering the Option

“I strongly recommend that my students obtain previous editions of our text online. Amazon.com and ebay are great sources for used books.”
- Lane Community College Biology Professor

Fourteen (14) percent of students surveyed have bought one or more of their books online. Seventy-eight (78) percent were satisfied with the online book-swap where they buy and sell their books to each other and can negotiate the price. More than two-thirds (86 percent) of the students surveyed reported they would consider buying and selling books online in the future.

“I use law textbooks. Instead of giving a new textbook, they should just provide a supplement to deal with new cases every few years.”
- UCSD Sociology Professor
Online Textbooks Hold Promise for Lowering the Cost of Textbooks

“I would encourage faculty to write their own textbooks and put them online so they would be free to students. This mechanism is also better than paper textbooks because it doesn’t add to the demand for paper, the book can be constantly updated, and it can be linked to other useful sources on the web. That’s what I did.”

- UCI Biology Professor

Several authors and publishers are currently experimenting with online textbooks, a new industry trend that holds great promise. According to the National Association of College Stores, paper, printing and editorial costs account for an average of 32.3 cents of every dollar a textbook costs—the largest share of the total. Moving to online textbooks could significantly lower the retail cost of textbooks.13

New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, who is also an economics professor at Princeton University, has teamed up with fellow Princeton economist Robin Wells and Paul Romer, an economics professor at Stanford University and owner of Aplia Inc., a three-year-old company that develops educational software and materials. Together these three academics are developing online versions of their upcoming economics textbooks at half the price of the paper version. “This is an attempt to get ahead of the curve,” says Professor Krugman. “Over decades if not years, traditional textbook publishing will be a less and less viable model.”14

Elizabeth Widdicombe, president of Worth Publishers and publisher of the forthcoming economics textbook authored by Professors Krugman and Wells, told the Washington Post she is not worried that the online version of the economics textbook will eat into bound-textbook sales. “I think the market will be larger with the two products (paper and online) than one alone,” she says. “We want students to buy our product in whatever format they want to buy it.”15
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The production and pricing of college textbooks merits scrutiny from educators and lawmakers because they affect the quality and affordability of higher education. As this report shows, the cost of textbooks is a growing expense for students. The high cost is primarily due to publishers producing new editions like clockwork, regardless of how much new educational content exists, and including expensive bells and whistles, such as CD-ROMs, that professors rarely find useful. The more expensive new editions force the older, less-expensive editions off the market.

Based on our findings, we recommend the following policy changes. These changes would make higher education more affordable by lowering the cost of textbooks without sacrificing educational quality.

Textbooks Should Be Priced and Sold at a Reasonable Cost to Students

- Publishers should work to keep the cost of producing their books as low as possible without sacrificing educational content.

- When publishers sell their textbooks bundled with other items, they also should sell the same textbook separately. Senator Schumer (NY) has advised the Department of Education to encourage schools to sell materials separately and has similarly urged publishers to sell books unbundled, so students need not buy extraneous materials.16

- Publishers should pass on cost-savings from online textbooks to students.

- Faculty should have the right to know how their textbook choices will financially affect students.

- Publishers should disclose all of the different products they sell - including both bundled and unbundled options - and list how much each of those products costs. This information should be made available to faculty and departments when they are considering which textbooks to order.

- Publishers should disclose how the newest edition is different from the previous edition. This information should be made available inside the books and posted where textbooks are sold.

Publishers, Faculty and Universities Should Build a Vibrant Used Textbook Market

- Each textbook edition should be kept on the market as long as possible without sacrificing the educational content.

- Publishers should give preference to paper or online supplements to current editions over producing entirely new editions.

“Faculty do not often know the cost of textbooks they require students to buy. It may help to reduce costs if there was a way to get this information routinely to the faculty – if the options are not simply book A versus book B, but book Q at $130 versus book B at $90.”

- UCSC Math Professor
- Publishers should disclose the length of time they intend to produce the current edition so that professors know how long they can use the same book.

- Faculty should give preference to the cheapest textbook when the educational content is equal.

- There should be many forums for students to purchase used books.

- Colleges and universities should consider implementing rental programs similar to those at several universities in Wisconsin and Illinois. Students would rent books similar to the way they are shared in K-12 but the students would pay a fee that covers the cost of the books.

- Colleges and universities should encourage students to consider using online book swaps so that students can buy and sell used books and set their own prices. CALPIRG has set up a non-profit, student-run, online book swap, [www.campusbookswap.com](http://www.campusbookswap.com).

---

“We should even consider standardizing to the extent that the university commits to using a certain edition of Stewart [the widely used math textbook] for the next five years.”

- Berkeley Math Professor
The author, along with students at the ten different colleges and universities, conducted three different areas of research for this report: a survey of students, a survey of faculty, and a comparison of consecutive editions of the same textbook.

First, 521 students at seven of the University of California campuses were randomly surveyed: University of California (UC) San Diego (UCSD), UC Irvine (UCI), UC Los Angeles (UCLA), UC Santa Barbara (UCSB), UC Santa Cruz (UCSC), UC Berkeley (UCB) and UC Davis (UCD). A CALPIRG staff person or student volunteer asked students to fill out a survey after they finished buying their books at the campus bookstore. A total of 521 students answered the survey: 169 at UCSD, 48 UCSB, 69 at UCD, 135 at UCLA, 23 at UCB, 21 at UCI and 56 at UCSC. The student surveys were conducted during September and October 2003.

The student survey included the following questions:

- Year in school?
- Approximately how much you spent/will spend on textbooks this quarter/semester?
- List your most expensive textbooks including cost.
- Did you look for a used version?
- If you looked, did you find a used version?
- Have you used an online book-swap?
- If no, would you consider using one?
- If yes, were you satisfied? Why?

Second, we interviewed a total of 156 faculty at nine public universities and one community college: University of California (UC) San Diego, UC Irvine, UC Los Angeles, UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, Southern Oregon University (SOU), Lane Community College (LCC) and the University of Oregon (UO).

We chose the list of faculty to interview based on what books they used in their classes. The goal was to interview faculty who teach large classes and therefore assign books for a large student population. The bookstore at each of the ten campuses surveyed provided a list of the five most assigned textbooks for the fall quarter/semester and the professors who teach with at least one of those textbooks. Each campus had a different list of books. From this list, we surveyed 156 faculty: 22 at UCSD, 20 UCSB, 19 at UCD, 18 at UCLA, 8 at UCB, 6 at UCI, 15 at UCSC, 10 at SOU, 29 at LCC, and 9 at UO. We surveyed the faculty during October and November 2003.

Of the 156 faculty surveyed:

- 151 answered the question about whether the content differences between new and older textbook editions are educationally significant enough to justify the new edition. (97% response rate); answers were classified as “always”, “usually”, “half the time”, “rarely”, or “never”.
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• 153 answered the question about how often they include these materials in their syllabi. (98% response rate); answers were classified as “always”, “usually”, “half the time”, “rarely”, or “never”.

• 153 answered the question about whether they plan to incorporate these additional materials into future syllabi. (98% response rate); answers were classified as “yes”, “maybe”, or “no”.

• 151 answered the question about whether they support providing new educational material in the form of a supplement. (97% response rate); answers were classified as “good idea”, “OK idea”, or “bad idea”.

• 152 answered the question about if they support ordering the existing textbook version instead of ordering the new version (in the same way that readers are currently produced). (97% response rate): answers were classified as “yes”, “maybe”, or “no”.

Third, we compared different editions of the five most assigned textbooks at each of the campuses surveyed. Of the 50 books recommended by the bookstore managers, we were able to compare 33 pairs of editions with the following breakdown: 5 at UCSD, 5 at UCSB, 5 at UCD, 5 at UCLA, 5 at UCB, 2 at UCI, 5 at UCSC, 3 at SOU, 5 at LCC, and 1 at UO.

We surveyed the 33 textbooks with two consecutive editions for the following parameters:
• Year published
• Edition
• Number of chapters or sections
• Number of pages
• Number of visuals
• Cost new
• Cost used
• Buyback value
• Available as soft-cover, hard-cover or both
• Bundled with other items
• How many items in the bundle

**Detailed Account of How Each Finding Was Determined**

1. **Students’ Textbook Costs Are on the Rise**
We calculated the average amount that UC students will spend on textbooks in 2003-04 by multiplying the average amount reported for the Fall by three for quarter schools and two for semester schools. Then we added the annual totals together and divided that total by the number of schools.

2. **Half of All Textbooks Now Come “Bundled” – Shrink-Wrapped with Additional Instructional Materials, Such as CD-ROMs and Workbooks**
Of the 33 books the students surveyed, the students reported whether 31 pairs of editions (both the old and new edition of the same book) were bundled or unbundled; of those, the students
reported the book’s subject for 26. Twenty textbooks were for science classes, 5 for math, one for “other” and zero for liberal arts. Twelve of the 26 old books (46 percent) were bundled and 14 of the 26 (53 percent) new books were bundled, a seven percent increase of bundling among the newest editions.

3. Certain Subjects Have More Non-Required Materials Bundled than Others
The percentage of books bundled and the number of items bundled varied by textbook subject. Science classes were bundled the most, 66 percent (12/18) of the time, with an average 1.75 items. Fifty-eight (58) percent of the bundled science books come with two or more items added to the textbook.

4. Books that Are Sold Bundled Are Rarely Offered Separately; Indications Are That Bundled Books Are More Expensive
Of 33 textbooks surveyed, one indicated the option of buying the book bundled or unbundled. The bundled version was $130, compared with $60 unbundled. If this sample is any indication of a larger trend, it is likely that students are rarely given the option to purchase unbundled versions of the same textbook.

5. Professors Rarely Include Non-Required Bundled Materials in Curriculum
Of the 153 faculty who responded, 18 (11 percent) reported they always use the bundled materials in their syllabi, 19 (12 percent) reported “usually”, 16 (10 percent) reported “half the time”, 43 (28 percent) reported “rarely” and 57 (37 percent) reported “never”.

6. New Textbook Editions Are Published Routinely
To determine the average time period between editions being published, we added the total number of years between each book and divided the years by the number of books. The average publishing frequency of all 33 books was 3.8 years, with 75 percent of the books surveyed (25/33) in the 3-4 year range. The breakdown of the publishing frequency of the textbooks surveyed is:
   a. 1 year- 1 book
   b. 2 years- 2 books
   c. 3 years- 11 books
   d. 4 years- 14 books
   e. 5 years- 0 books
   f. 6 years- 3 books
   g. 7 years- 2 books
Total: 33 books

7. New Editions Replace Used Editions -- Costing Students More and Increasing Faculty Workload
Of the 33 books surveyed, we had information on the used price for the previous edition compared to the new price of the new edition for nine textbooks. The nine used books sold for a total of $582.25, an average of $64.80. The new edition of these books sold for a total of $921.93, or an average of $102.44 per book, which is 58 percent more expensive then the cost for the average used edition.

8. Students are Unable to Find Used Textbooks
Of the 521 students surveyed, 281 reported whether they looked for used textbooks and if they were successful in finding at least one (53 percent response rate). Of the 281 students that reported, 166 (59 percent) reported they were unable to find at least one used book to buy and 115 (41 percent) reported that they were successful.

9. New Textbook Editions Are Often Published With Little or No New Information
Faculty Survey Questions/Results: 156 faculty surveyed, 151 answered

- Percentage of Professors that thought new textbook editions were
  - Never justified: (5/151) 3.3%
  - Rarely justified: (56/151) 37.1%
  - Half the time: (54/151) 35.8%
  - Usually justified: (32/151) 21.2%
  - Always justified: (4/151) 2.6%

The following is a breakdown of each category of professors by general subject area (i.e. math, science, social science). Of the professors responding, 134 answered and reported the subject taught: 49 science, 47 math, 32 social science, 6 other.

- Science (51 science surveyed, 49 answered): Including Chemistry, Sociology, Physics, Anthropology, Biology, Astronomy, Psychology, Economics
  - rarely – 12 (28% rarely or never)
  - never – 2
  - half – 18 (36% half)
  - usually – 15
  - always – 2 (34% usually or always)

- Math (49 surveyed, 47 answered): Including Calculus, Statistics
  - rarely – 21 (51% rarely or never)
  - never – 3
  - half – 18 (38% half)
  - usually – 5
  - always – 0 (1% usually or always)

- Liberal Arts (32 surveyed, 32 answered): Including Writing, English, Philosophy, History, Romance Languages, Spanish, Politics
  - rarely –12 (37% rarely or never)
  - never – 0
  - half – 11 (43% half)
  - usually – 8
  - always – 1 (28% usually or always)

- Other (7 surveyed, 6 answered): Including Honors Colloquium, Business and Business Administration
  - rarely – 3(50% rarely or never)
  - never – 0
  - half – 3 (50% usually or always)
usually - 0
always - 0

10. Faculty Support Teaching with a Supplement, Reordering Older Edition
Of the 156 faculty surveyed, 151 responded to this question (97 percent response rate). Of the 151 who responded, 80 said a supplement was a “good” idea (53 percent), 51 said it was an “okay” idea (34 percent) and 20 said it was a “bad” idea (13 percent).

11. Students Are Buying and Selling Books On-line, Even More Considering Option
Of the 521 students surveyed, 191 students responded to this question (36 percent response rate). Of the 191 who responded, 27 reported they had used an online bookswap (14 percent) and 164 reported that they would consider using one (86 percent). Of the 27 who reported using an online bookswap, 21 were satisfied with their experience (78 percent).
END NOTES

12 Provided by Student Financial Support unit of the University of California Office of the President. The figures are based upon the UC Cost of Attendance Survey, a survey of approximately 10,000 undergraduate UC students conducted every three years.
FYI,
The textbook bills may continue to have a live after this legislative session...
Marshelle
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On Tuesday, Congressional Hearing Accuse Textbook Publishers of Price Gouging
By THOMAS BARTLETT <mailto:thomas.bartlett@chronicle.com>
Washington

Textbooks are expensive because publishers inflate prices by adding "bells and whistles" that professors don't want and students don't use, an official of a student-advocacy group told the U.S. House of Representatives' principal subcommittee on higher education on Tuesday. "The high cost of textbooks has perplexed and frustrated students, parents, and faculty for many years," said Merriah Fairchild, higher-education director of the California Student Public Interest Research Group. She also argued that publishers too often needlessly issue new editions of textbooks to prevent students from buying cheaper, used copies.

Such complaints are not new, but they seem to be receiving more attention lately. The Government Accountability Office, as the General Accounting Office was recently renamed, is investigating textbook prices, and several lawmakers at Tuesday's hearing expressed dismay at the hundreds of dollars students are forced to shell out at the bookstore. "I believe that the costs of textbooks are too high and are one of the many factors jeopardizing our efforts to keep college affordable," said Rep. Howard P. (Buck) McKeon, the California Republican who heads the panel, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. However, no member of the subcommittee seemed to be pushing for a specific legislative solution to the problem.

While witnesses and lawmakers used words like "exorbitant" and "unfair" to describe textbook prices, a representative of the book publishers' national trade group countered that such charges were exaggerated. John C. Isley, chairman of the Association of American Publishers' higher-education committee and a vice president at Pearson Education, a leading textbook publisher, said that most textbooks are updated every three years because of the need to keep content and pedagogical techniques up to date. He also said that publishers like Pearson offer low-cost versions of their textbooks and that it's up to professors which version to use.

The committee also heard from a representative of a college that has found a way to deal with the problem of high textbook prices. The University of Wisconsin at River Falls rents books to students, charging them $59 per semester for all of their books. When the semester is over, they must return the books undamaged, or they can buy the books at a discount. The program even makes a profit, according to Virgil Monroe, the university's manager of textbook services.
"The textbook-rental system also has the effect of bringing total college costs down to a more manageable level," he told the committee, "and this makes college more accessible, especially for poorer students."

UC Davis California Aggie
Thursday July 22, 2004
Congressional hearing examines college textbook costs
National and local bills address rising costs, possible alternatives
http://www.californiaaggie.com/article/?id=5108

By MORGAN KANNINEN

The U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee for 21st Century Effectiveness held a hearing Tuesday to examine the question, "Are college textbooks priced fairly?"
Rising education costs are "pricing low-income students out of a college education," said subcommittee chair Rep. Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA). "It's important we don't ignore the staggering costs of textbooks in the total equation of higher education."

The hearing addressed practices by the publishing industry and textbook rental services, as well as the possible role of government in making the materials more affordable. Four witnesses testified at the hearing, including Merriah Fairchild, who authored CalPIRG's January report on textbook costs. Fairchild outlined CalPIRG's requests of the publishing industry, such as offering textbooks separate from CD-ROM or internet accompaniments, disclosing the prices and predicted shelf lives of textbooks to faculty, keeping each edition of a text on the market as long as possible, and passing the savings of online sales on to consumers.

Representing the American Association of Publishers was John Isely, who defended the practice of providing frequent new editions of texts. He said instructors would not adopt texts that are not updated. Isely said that the quality and variety of U.S. textbooks is "without question, the world's best," and that it is up to instructors to determine the textbooks students must buy. McKeon also asked the witnesses for "examples of how innovation can reduce the burden of textbook costs."

From the University of Wisconsin at River Falls, Virgil Monroe explained the textbook services which the university has offered since its inception. For $59 per semester, students are able to "check out" as many textbooks as necessary for their classes, and then return or purchase them at the end of the quarter.

The services are self-sustaining, and can make a small profit, Monroe said. While some faculty members prefer their students to buy the books, Monroe said a survey had found that the vast majority of faculty and students were pleased with the school's service.

McKeon also questioned the role that the government could have in making textbooks more affordable. CalPIRG's recommendation was for the government to "invest in alternatives that are proven to significantly cut students' costs," Fairchild said, noting the River Falls textbook service. Monroe noted that start-up costs for textbook rental services can be very high, and suggested that grants be made to schools to cover those costs temporarily.

Such grants would be preferable to proposed "tax credits, which are subsidizing the high costs of textbooks," Fairchild said. Isley and the fourth panelist, Marc Fleischaker from the National Association of College Stores, did not have suggested actions for the government. House of Representatives bill 4243 was introduced in May to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide
a tax credit for the costs of college textbooks. The bill is currently in the Committee for Ways and Means.

In California, Assembly Bill 2678 was introduced in February and outlines how California public universities and colleges can establish textbook rental services to provide a variety of textbook options for students. Two bills - HR 3567 in Congress and AB 2477 in the California Assembly - have been introduced to investigate textbook prices. Tuesday's congressional hearing can be viewed at edworkforce.house.gov/hearings/hrgarchive.htm after 11 a.m. today.

Merriah Fairchild

*****Note New Contact Info*****
Higher Education Advocate, CALPIRG
p-(916) 448-4516
f-(916) 448-4560
1107 9th Street Suite 601
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.CALPIRGstudents.org
We discussed this briefly last year; I dk what the prospect is for the legislation. fyi.
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Dear CALPIRG supporter,

Students and parents aren't the only ones concerned about the high cost of college textbooks. Congress has taken notice and recently held a hearing to discuss the publisher's practices. Four witnesses testified at the hearing, including Merriah Fairchild, CALPIRG Higher Education Advocate and author of the report "Ripoff 101" released in January.

Congressman Howard P. (Buck) McKeon, the California Republican who heads the panel, shared his concern with the Committee. "I believe that the costs of textbooks are too high and are one of the many factors jeopardizing our efforts to keep college affordable."

Back in California, the Legislature is considering two CALPIRG sponsored bills that will help lower the price of college textbooks in the state. Thanks in part to your e-mails, both bills have passed the Assembly and now face important votes in the California Senate.

Please take a moment to ask your state senator to support the passage of these two textbooks bills. Then ask your family and friends to help by forwarding this e-mail to them.

To take action, click on this link or paste it into your web browser:
http://pirg.org/alerts/route.asp?id=476&id4=ES

Background

In January 2004, university professors, students and legislators from around the country came together to release a new CALPIRG report which found that textbook publishers engage in a number of market practices that drive up the price of textbooks for students.

The report, entitled "Rip-off 101: How the Current Practices of the Publishing Industry Drive up the Cost of College Textbooks," surveyed the most widely-taught books at colleges and universities in California and Oregon and the faculty that teach those books. The report found that even though students already pay $900 a year for textbooks, textbook publishers artificially inflate the price of textbooks by adding bells and whistles to the current texts and forcing cheaper used books off the market by producing expensive new editions of textbooks that are barely different from the previous edition. The report also found that most of the faculty members surveyed in the report do not think many of these add-ons are useful and are supportive of efforts to streamline textbook costs and extend the shelf life of current textbook editions.

Following the report, two bills were introduced, both sponsored by CALPIRG.
AB 2477 (Liu) urges textbook publishers to change many of their current practices so that they, among other things, unbundle textbooks from expensive CD-ROMs and disclose the price of textbooks to faculty. AB 2477 also requires California State University and Community Colleges and requests that the University of California implement alternatives such as textbook rental programs.

AB 2678 (Koretz) urges the California State University, Community Colleges and the University of California to set up textbook rental services. AB 2678 does not require any campus to establish a rental program, but rather provides a process by which a school can successfully implement a campus-supported, self-sustaining rental program.

These two bills will face important votes this week in Sacramento. Please take a moment to ask your state senator to support the passage of these two textbooks bills. Then ask your family and friends to help by forwarding this e-mail to them.

To take action, click on this link or paste it into your web browser:
http://pirg.org/alerts/route.asp?id=476&id4=ES

Sincerely,

Steve Blackledge
CALPIRG Legislative Director
SteveB@calpirg.org
http://www.CALPIRG.org
PERSONAL FINANCE

Textbook Case of Runaway Prices

Kathy M. Kristof

August 29, 2004

Jolene Mitchell can understand the statewide budget crunch that has set her college tuition bills soaring, but the skyrocketing cost of textbooks is something that both baffles and angers her.

Mitchell, a third-year microbiology student at UCLA, says she typically spends $1,000 a year on books — that's about 15% of what she spends on her education. And many of the books are bundled with expensive CDs, workbooks and websites that she says she never uses. When Mitchell goes to sell back the books, she can get creamed because there's a good chance that a new edition of her text is out, which sharply reduces the resale value of the previous edition.

"You talk to almost any student and they will tell you that they are spending a lot on books," she says. "I had this calculus book last year that cost $130. I used it for two quarters, and when I went to sell it back it was worth $2.38 because I had the fourth edition and a fifth edition had come out. It's really getting to be a problem."

Indeed, the rising cost of college textbooks is becoming a hot-button issue among legislators and consumer groups, who maintain that book prices are rising far more rapidly than they should. Textbook prices, which have risen nearly 70% in the last decade, were discussed in recent congressional hearings and are the subject of a continuing study by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

No national legislation has been proposed, but California legislators have introduced two bills that address the issue. One encourages textbook rental services, and the other urges publishers to unbundle their books so that students can buy them without all the expensive extras.

The California Student Public Interest Research Group, a student-run division of consumer group CalPIRG, is organizing student protests against a variety of alleged abuses — including bundling and putting out new editions that change little but the page numbers — that are driving the cost of textbooks into the stratosphere.

Textbook publishers say they are being used as scapegoats.

Pricing is an issue that CalPIRG has "manufactured" and appears to be using as a recruitment tool, says Bruce Hildebrand, executive director for higher education at the Assn. of American Publishers.
Textbook costs have risen, Hildebrand acknowledges, but the cost is largely dictated by the mandates of the professors who order the books, he says.

"We are publishers and we sell books. But we're like auto manufacturers in that if you want your car in black, you get black. If you want fancy hubcaps, we'll give you that," he says. "We are highly flexible. The books and materials are chosen by the professor."

Hildebrand cites one case in point: A social studies text published by one of his group's members has an edition that wholesales for more than $80 and one that wholesales for about $25. It's largely the same book, but one is hard-bound and published on high-quality paper and includes more graphics, so it's considerably more costly. The professor chooses which book to assign and order for the campus bookstore, he says. The bookstore will boost the price by an average of 33% to cover its expenses and profit, he notes.

Mitchell realizes that professors are part of the problem and says some are becoming more sensitive to the prices of the books they assign. But others continue to require expensive texts, bundled with costly extras, and simply expect students to foot the bill, she says.

Still, cost-conscious students can save money on books in a variety of ways, says Merriah Fairchild, a higher education advocate with CalPIRG. Her top tips:

• Buy overseas. American publishers often sell texts in overseas markets at considerably lower prices than they do here, she says. For instance, a popular calculus book that sells here for $125 costs $97 in Canada and $65 in Britain.

Students can buy the British version at http://www.amazon.com/uk, Fairchild notes. Hildebrand cautions that students should make sure it's the same book, however, because some overseas editions are missing some of the graphics and charts that are included in books sold in the U.S. market.

• Use a book swap. Students can buy and sell from one another at online sites including http://www.campusbookswap.com.

• Use a buying service. Steve Loyola, president of BestBookBuys.com, says students can save 30% or more off retail prices on used books by shopping online. Loyola's service sorts by price and can calculate the cost of shipping and sales tax when students include their ZIP Code in the search. The catch: Students can't wait until the last minute, because it can take a week or longer to ship the books — particularly if the seller is overseas.

• Hit the library. Mitchell says she now asks just how much of the text she will need to read before buying the book. If it's just a few chapters, she will borrow the book from the library rather than buy it.

• Ask about the previous edition. In some cases, students can use an earlier edition of the
book — bought cheaply used — because it's not substantially different from the current edition, Fairchild says. However, students should ask their professors first to make sure that the book's revisions were not substantial.

*

Kathy M. Kristof, author of "Investing 101" and "Taming the Tuition Tiger," welcomes your comments and suggestions but regrets that she cannot respond individually to letters or phone calls. Write to Personal Finance, Business Section, Los Angeles Times, 202 W. 1st St., Los Angeles, CA 90012, or e-mail kathy.kristof@latimes.com.
From Mark Thompson:

An issue I'm interested in is not really an academic affairs item but more of a senate one: the relationship between excomm and the senate seems to me different at statewide compared to the way, at least at Stani, our senate exec works with the senate.

The question I would like answered is this: if the senate passes a resolution, would any members of excomm agree to any policies or support any revisions in legislation that are counter to the senate resolution. I'm interested in the amount of latitude excomm believes it has to negotiate once a resolution has been adopted.

I'm specifically interested in excomm, but the question can apply to anyone on senate.

A specific example would be the excess units task force. The definition of excess units approved by the senate excluded prebaccalaureate coursework from the total of excess units. The draft document supplied by Spence to the task force altered the definition to include prebaccalaureate units. The task force included people from headquarters, campus upper administration, and senate reps (mostly from excomm I think). Are the senate members representatives of the senate bound to support only the definition in the resolution or are they faculty who happen to be appointed task force members and so are free to embrace a definition other than that denoted in the resolution? (By the way, the excess units task force seems to have fallen off the back burner and is now somewhere on the floor behind the stove; however, we can take solace that the senate has accepted and tried to define the idea of excess units.)

Responses:

From Kathy Kaiser:

in my opinion a resolution is to respected as the stated intent of the Senate. At the same time we come to the classic query of elected individuals--are they to 'represent' or to act in the best interests of their constituency? Since they meet more frequently and have a great flow of information, it would appear to me that we would expect Ex Com to act in the best interests, unless they regard themselves as clearly instructed by the body of the Senate to take a stand. The closer the timing of the events of a resolution passing and the Ex Com having or facing the issue of how to relate that resolution, the clearer the connection is, I would think. Ex Com is charged with expressing the intent of the Senate in its resolution, but also with acting in the best interests of the ASCSU--that may at times create tension. So we elect wisely as the trust issue can not be ignored nor made less significant by trying to 'stack up' a predetermined set of positions--we all know that events can move swiftly and unexpectedly and our Ex Com as leaders have to respond.

From David McNeil:

There are several questions wrapped up in this one, the big one being what we senators do in addition to preparing, debating, and passing resolutions. We use the resolutions to "push" (or "push back") on a great number of related things. The Chancellor, Trustees, Legislature, Governor, and other higher ed segments do not always do our bidding entirely to our satisfaction, and there is a price to be paid (and therefore estimated) for objecting to what they do and say. The excess/sanctionable unit business is a good example, for the C.O. version of the definition seems different from ours.

I brought this up in a meeting with Marsha, Lorie, and Spence and was assured that there was NO intent to change our definition and (anyway) that the hope and indeed expectation was that the excess task force would never meet to apply a definition, so the matter was (probably) moot. At this point I could have insisted on a written retraction and/or written promise that both the letter and spirit of our definition would be followed if the excess task force were ever to meet and act, but this would be so far from the usual (somewhat loose) practices of Academic Affairs (the department, not the Committee!) -- and the benefit to us (and our students) so slight and in fact probably non-existent -- that the price to be paid for this was (in
my estimation) too high, even far too high at the time. Of course, were the Task Force ever to be convened, I do think the Senate reps are expected to support what the Senate passed, even if pressured to negotiate something "counter to the Senate's position."

Even then, we might not prevail, at which point -- as also frequently happens in working with the Legislature to craft language -- we must choose between 1) insisting on the Senate's position come what may and 2) getting the result as close as possible to the Senate's position. Often the first option has too high a price attached to it, such as losing "a place at the table." The uncomfortable reality is that there are others "at the table" and they may be (or may seem to be) playing with higher cards. So one of the roles of senators at the table is to do our best to play as best we can, hedging bets, bluffling, even folding when we think we need to. I don't think, however, that as representatives of the CSU faculty we can walk away from the table.

I'm going to quit before this metaphor breaks down. I'd like to hear from more of you about this -- about the "latitude" we have -- for senators will be wondering about such things, and we ought to have some common understandings. The issue is not the definition of excess units (may be too late, may be moot, are To Be Rectified) but rather what we do when the Will of the Senate is not embraced by others.

As happened with the Search Committee issue (which we obviously do not consider satisfactorily settled and should add to our August 20 agenda).

David

From Bob Cherny:

In my experience on the ex com--2 1/2 years out of the past 3, plus 2 years of the previous 3 as a committee chair--there was never any discussion of taking a position contrary to that of the senate. On the contrary, there have been any number of times when one or another ex com member has remembered a resolution, sometime in the past, that the ex com has used for guidance in particular situations. I would not take a position that I knew to be contrary to a position taken by the senate, and I don't know anyone who has served on ex com in the recent past who ever suggested that.

Obviously none of us can control what Spence or Reed or any of the administration do once they are given the senate's position on any given issue. There's a lot less accountability from them to us than is the case on many campuses, where a president at least has to indicate why he/she rejects a senate position on something.

I don't think that the excess units taskforce ever took a position--what I recall is mostly just listening to administrators ramble. The senate's resolution on sanctionable units was approved in May. The Chancellor was provided a copy of our resolution. There has been no meeting of that taskforce since then.

There seems to be a good deal of paranoia within the senate about the ex com. I've not seen a basis for it. If someone has something other than the excess units taskforce as an example of a problem, I'd like to hear about it.

Bob
August 10, 2004

Dear California Community College Colleagues:

In an effort to ensure that transfer students receive the same academic preparation and level of rigor as students entering during their freshman year, UCOP faculty and staff periodically conduct reviews of subject areas and prerequisites/corequisites. For the past year we have reviewed the lower division science major courses. Effective fall 2004, the University of California will be implementing a prerequisite/corequisite of Intermediate Algebra for major series courses in Biology, Chemistry and Physics.

Intermediate Algebra is required for admission to the University as a freshman. For the 2004-05 cycle UC admissions evaluators will verify the Intermediate Algebra prerequisite for only the major preparation series of science courses in Biology, Chemistry and Physics. Students who apply for admission to UC for the 2005-06 year and who have completed lower division science courses which do not currently specify Intermediate Algebra as a prerequisite will not be affected by this change. This review will include General Botany, General Zoology and General Cell Biology as well as General Chemistry and Organic Chemistry courses. Courses for non-science majors without this prerequisite/corequisite will not be affected during the 04-05 TCA update cycle review. Each California Community College will be notified during there 2004-05 TCA update of any Biology, Chemistry or Physics course which does not meet this requirement. A note will be placed on the TCA indicating that the course will need to include the necessary prerequisite/corequisite and be resubmitted before Fall 2005. Courses which are not updated by Fall 2005 will be removed during the 2005-06 TCA update.

For additional information please contact Dawn Sheibani at (510) 987-9569 or dawn.sheibani@ucop.edu. We thank you for your continued cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Susan A. Wilbur, Ph.D.
Director of Undergraduate Admissions
Student Academic Services
The bill that Ted’s referring to died in Assembly Higher Ed this spring without any Rep “courtesy” votes for the Rep author. CCs did not speak in support. The CSU spoke in opposition saying there was a current mechanism of "off campus centers" to handle these "geographically challenged" regions...CSU Fresno had been working with the local community colleges. It seemed to be a more "local business community" flexing their muscle than a serious education mission challenge. I was struck that the local cc presidents didn't sound all that excited. You can never say never, but I sure didn't sense a groundswell in the Higher Ed Comm to support the idea of ccs offering degrees. I thought the CSU position that we have collaborative relationships re: off campus centers located at community colleges (like SF State and Canada College) made a lot of sense. So my inclination would be to talk informally with Jason and Bruce Hamlett to see whether they see any legislative support before we bring out the guns. It wouldn't be a bad idea to raise the issue at ICAS but I wouldn't overdramatize it.

Cristy

FYI, today's SF Chron editorializes (in passing) in favor of the CC's offering the BA -- without of course editorializing similarly in favor of the resources it would take for them to offer UD classes, develop quality of programs that would make the degrees worthwhile, etc.

What other states have CC's that offer the BA and how do they do it? I think we need to do lots of homework here, including -- as I suggested to David earlier -- a call to AAUP to find out what they think about this kind of thing.

Jan

-----Original Message-----
From: senxc-owner@calstate.edu on behalf of McNeil, David
Sent: Tue 8/10/2004 7:57 PM
To: Anagnoson, J Theodore; Kaiser, Kathy; Robert W. Cherny; senxc@calstate.edu
Cc: 
Subject: RE: CCC to offer bacc degrees??

Well, waiting until the issue is moot is probably easiest. Do we know that there was serious CCC support for the bills Ted mentions? Was there CSU/UC opposition? Or did the bills simply die for lack of interest? I'm not inclined to get worked up over something that isn't a serious threat to our mission or support. A perhaps more important consideration is my reluctance to join in on the "us versus them" sort of stuff better left to the administration.

On the other hand, it may be that ICAS could address this one. If that's not appropriate, a well-crafted ASCSU resolution could "draw lines in the sand" without offending anyone, and I figure that's what Ted has in mind?

My sense is that the CC's have enough trouble and mission creep as it is without getting into this issue. Should we find out more? (Add to agenda when we meet on the 20th.)

David

-----Original Message-----
From: Anagnoson, J Theodore [mailto:tanagno@exchange.calstatela.edu]
Sent: Tue 8/10/2004 5:28 PM
To: ‘Kaiser, Kathy”; Robert W. Cherny; senxc@calstate.edu; McNeil, David
Cc: 
Subject: RE: CCC to offer bacc degrees??
Maybe we should have an academic affairs person sit with the FGA subcommittee - if we do a resolution, it could come from both committees...??

It may not have legs - but there was a bill this past year which would have given two CCs in the Central Valley the right to award BA degrees on the grounds that there was no close by CSU or UC.

Ted

-----Original Message-----
From: Kaiser, Kathy [mailto:KKaiser@csuchico.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2004 4:58 PM
To: Robert W. Cherny; senxc@calstate.edu; McNeil, David
Subject: RE: CCC to offer bacc degrees??

I think that the fallout is difficult to predict, but having a subgroup looking at this closely (perhaps FGA) would keep us from get caught unprepared if there was a sudden surge near the end of the leg cycle to move something ahead.

> ---------
> From: senxc-owner@calstate.edu on behalf of McNeil, David
> Sent: Monday, August 9, 2004 8:38 AM
> To: Robert W. Cherny; senxc@calstate.edu
> Subject: RE: CCC to offer bacc degrees??
>
> Yes, let's add this to our agenda. We may, however, want to wait before taking formal positions on some things that "have no legs."
>
> David
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Robert W. Cherny [mailto:cherny@sfsu.edu]
> To: senxc@calstate.edu
> Cc:
> Subject: CCC to offer bacc degrees??
>
> The San Francisco Chronicle, in listing the components of Schwarzenegger's reorganization plan, included in the list that community colleges be permitted to offer four-year degrees.
>
> I suggest that we assign some subcommittee of FGA to the task of combing that document and extracting anything having to do with CSU, so that we can take a formal position on whatever may be there.
>
> Perhaps this can be added to our agenda for Aug 20.
>
> Bob