Academic Senate of the California State University
Academic Affairs Committee

Agenda
Meeting 10/8/04

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

2. Approval of the agenda.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of September 9-10, 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. Update reports from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on the implementation process.
   b. Keith is about to put a FAQ statement on the CO web site. You will be notified as to the URL as soon as we
      hear what it is. In the next version, I will have a link to an early draft, but it is a 2.5 mb PDF file, so you need
      a high speed connection to download it.
   c. Memo from Keith Boyum to Provosts and Campus Senate Chairs (1.1 mb in size).
      o Attachment A

7.2 SCIGETC – John Tarjan, Time Certain, 11:00 a.m.
   a. John Tarjan, our liaison to the Executive Committee, asked me to add this item to the agenda. The documents
      will explain it. We may be asked for a statement of support.
   b. Communication from Julie Adams, Executive Director of the CCC Academic Senate and the IMPAC project:
      “During the IMPAC Steering Committee meeting on Friday, September 24th, the committee reviewed the
      SciGETC proposal and found minor errors in the table circulated by Larry Pitts. Attached is an updated
      version of the SciGETC Proposal. In addition, the Steering Committee felt that Q&As should be developed
      to help others understand what SciGETC is and how it will work. Attached are some of the questions have
      been developed.”
   c. SCIGETC Proposal, 9/30/04
      o Attachment B
   d. Questions and Answers About SCIGETC, 9/30/04
      o Attachment C

7.2 Remedial programs
   a. Thompson communication to the committee (04-2)
      o Attachment D
   b. Report and recommendations from the Thompson/Anagnoson/Arroyo subcommittee.

7.3 Required Community Service
   a. (Sept) George Skelton article on the California Performance Review recommending that all college students
      do community service.
      o Attachment E
   b. (Sept) LA Times Editorial, 8/14/04
      o Attachment F
   c. (Sept) LA Times on CSU Monterey Bay’s Comm. Service requirement 8/10/04:
7.4 Intra-CSU Transfer.
   a. This item was postponed from the September meeting.
   b. 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.”

7.5 Faculty Role in Intercollegiate Athletics – Time Certain: 12:45 p.m.
   7.5.1 Please read the material John Shields distributed at the last meeting.
   7.5.2 Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics: http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/COIA-Home.html
   7.5.3.1 Attachment I
   7.5.4 Options:
      7.5.4.1 Resolution with Myron’s language –
      7.5.4.2 Resolution of support for the general idea of reforming college athletics, urge campuses to consider joining COIA, include Myron’s resolution?
      7.5.4.3 Consultation with the campuses before doing a general resolution?

7.6 Community College BA degrees. See email correspondence with Senate Executive Committee.
   7.6. Attachment J

7.6 Maintaining the Quality of Faculty Who Teach in the Extended University – from Len Mathy
   a. Proposed resolution

Information items.

8. Liaison Reports.

Adjournment
MEMORANDUM

Date: September 20, 2004

To: Campus Provosts / Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
   Campus Senate Chairs

From: Keith O. Boyum
      Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Subject: Lower Division Transfer Project: Calendar and Other Updates

From a number of campuses we have heard of good progress on identifying persons who will serve as Disciplinary Representatives for the Lower Division Transfer Project (LDTP). Please accept our thanks for that. In continuing and fruitful partnership with the Academic Senate, CSU, we look forward to gathering these Disciplinary Representatives, and to the consensuses that they will be reaching on the forty-five or more lower division semester units that will with certainty, if taken at a California Community College, count for the indicated undergraduate degree at all CSU campuses.

I am pleased to provide a calendar, together with assignments of disciplines (majors) to meeting dates, so that Disciplinary Representatives may incorporate this information into always-crowded datebooks. Please find this information in Attachment A to this memo. Note that all of the initial meetings are scheduled for a hotel near the Los Angeles airport (LAX). We anticipate convening second disciplinary meetings, if needed, later in the spring at a convenient facility near the San Francisco airport.

We note that some campuses have named an individual who for that campus will coordinate the processes related to the Lower Division Transfer Project. These persons, if so named by a campus, are cordially invited to the Saturday, November 13th training date for Disciplinary Facilitators that is described in Attachment A.

The name of the LAX-area hotel(s), procedures for reimbursement of travel expenses, and other details will be forthcoming in subsequent communications. In early October we will have a web site available for the LDTP that will include background information, procedural details, and a Frequently-Asked Questions compilation, among other items. Throughout this project, I will be pleased to receive questions and comments at kboyum@calstate.edu, or at (562) 951-4712. My
assistant, Ms. Kelley McCoy, is also available to answer questions at kmccoy@calstate.edu, or at (562) 941-4669.

We look forward to a busy year in pursuing this important work. Thank you for your continuing strong cooperation.

Attachments

c:  Dr. David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
    Dr. David McNeil, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
    Dr. J. Theodore Anagnoson, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, ASCSU
Attachment A.

The California State University
Lower Division Transfer Project
Calendar and Meeting Dates for Disciplines

**Tuesday, October 5, 2004.** At the Academic Council meeting set for this date, details including procedures for reimbursement of travel expenses for Disciplinary Representatives will be discussed with Provosts / Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs. Dr. David McNeil, Chair, ASCSU, participates in all meetings of the Academic Council.

**Friday, October 8th.** We anticipate beginning the selection of Disciplinary Facilitators on this date, quickly following which persons named to these positions will be notified. Please be reminded that your early provision of names of Disciplinary Representatives from campuses will assist the Academic Senate, CSU Executive Committee in considering who best may be invited to take Disciplinary Facilitator positions. Disciplinary Facilitators may be named from among the campus-chosen Disciplinary Representatives, or may, where appropriate leadership already exists, be persons in addition to the (up to 23) Disciplinary Representatives that will speak for campus undergraduate majors.

**Friday, October 15th.** Deadline for campus Provosts / Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs to submit names and contact information for Disciplinary Representatives. Please provide this information to Ms. Kelley McCoy at kmccoy@calstate.edu

**Saturday, November 13th.** At a hotel near LAX
Training date for Disciplinary Facilitators. **Disciplinary Facilitators will be asked to lead meetings of their colleagues that will be considering best specifications of lower-division courses for the major, to make a formal report of the arrived-at consensus, and to provide descriptions of the courses agreed to, among other things. Disciplinary Facilitators’ campuses will be provided with a small O/E allocation intended to cover reasonably foreseeable communications and other costs incurred by Disciplinary Facilitators in the course of this work. Consistent with our practice for POL projects, Disciplinary Facilitators who are faculty will be offered a small honorarium in recognition of their efforts.**

Led principally by LDTP Faculty Coordinator Dr. Marshall Cates (Mathematics, CSU Los Angeles), this meeting will be scheduled for 10 AM – 3PM, thus allowing at least some northern California Disciplinary Facilitators to fly in and fly out on the same day. **Note. ASCSU Executive Committee members are invited to this meeting. Some campuses have assigned a local coordinator to oversee the LDTP process. Such persons are also invited.**
Saturday, December 4th.  At a hotel near LAX
  Initial meetings for:  Chemistry  Criminal Justice
                        History  Geography
                        Psychology  Sociology

Rationale: Most or all of these disciplines have had opportunities to think about
what may work well, may "fit," in a lower-division pattern. Disciplines
scheduled for January meetings have had fewer such opportunities, or for other
reasons seem better-suited for January meetings.

Saturday, January 22, 2005.  At a hotel near LAX
  Initial meetings for:  Anthropology  Biology
                        Computer Science  Engineering [all]
                        Family & Consumer Sciences  Journalism
                        Kinesiology  Political Science
                        Speech Communication  Nursing (if needed)

Saturday, January 29th  At a hotel near LAX
  Initial meetings for:  African-American Studies  Art
                        Asian-American Studies  Business [all]
                        Chicana/Chicano Studies  English
                        Native American Studies  Economics
                        Information Systems  Radio-Television
                        Social Work  Spanish

Note. No meeting is presently planned for Mathematics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGETC</th>
<th>SciGETC</th>
<th>Notes for SciGETC Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Area 1 English  
Written and Oral  
Composition UC 2 courses  
CSU 3 courses | Same |  |
| Area 2 Math/quantitative reasoning  
1 course | 1 course from CAN SEQ B, or  
C or (for Biology) D. | Many CSU and UC science programs require a year of calculus minimally; some (such as Engineering) require four semesters. Minimum preparation may require you to take additional math before you can take upper-division courses in the major discipline. |
| Area 3 Arts and Humanities  
3 courses including at least one from each | 2-3 courses  
defer up to 1 course | If you defer one course, you must complete one additional lower-division GE course in this area after transfer. The transfer institution determines applicable GE courses. |
| Area 4 Social and Behavioral Sciences  
3 courses from at least 2 disciplines | 2-3 courses  
defer up to 1 course | If you defer one course, you must complete one additional lower-division GE course in this area after transfer. The transfer institution determines applicable GE courses. |
| Area 5 Physical and Biological Science one course each, one with lab | CAN Chem. Seq A  
10 units (2 courses)  
OR  
CAN Phys. Seq B  
8 units (2 courses)  
OR  
CAN Biol Seq A  
10 Units (2 courses)  
OR  
One life science and one physical science course including one lab course  
7 units (2 courses) | Please note that these are minimum requirements. Individual majors require considerably more in addition to the SCIGETC requirements. Please see ASSIST and your counselor/advisor for suggestions for specific majors.  
Many programs require completion of calculus-based physics. Students are urged to review the discipline program requirements for prospective transfer schools |
| Foreign language  
UC only | same |  |
| US History and Government - CSU only - 2 courses | same  
2 Courses – CSU only | This is not part of IGETC, but is listed for information only. |

**39-44 units**

**33-44 units**

Lower-division course to be taken after transfer:  
none  
Lower-division course to be taken after transfer:  
2 courses maximally  

**Major preparation** is not required for certification but, where noted at right, completion of the major requirements prior to transfer is strongly recommended by the major discipline faculty.  

**Major Preparation**  
IMPAC core  
Major preparation  
12-15 units (3-4 courses) plus  
additional math, chemistry, physics or biology courses required by the major discipline.  
(It is strongly recommended that you complete these requirements prior to transfer).  

**Units including Major Preparation**  
60-72 units (semester units)**
Questions and Answers about SCIGETC
September 30, 2004

What’s the point for the student?
SCIGETC provides a path to meeting the major lower-division transfer requirements for technical major while at the same time retaining many of the features of IGETC. It also means students will complete advanced mathematics, chemistry and physics courses at the lower division in community colleges, resulting in a cost-savings for them.

Why not stay with IGETC?
In high-unit transfer-requirement majors, students taking the required major courses AND IGETC take longer than two years and enter the upper division without full preparation required to enroll in upper division courses.

What’s the advantage for counselors?
SCIGETC provides a defined path that an advisor can recommend to the student and that is better than IGETC for a student who pursues a science or technical major.

What majors will be included in SCIGETC?
At the moment the faculty who have taken part in IMPAC meetings in Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Geology recommend acceptance of the SCIGETC for admission to their various universities.

Will other majors be included in SCIGETC?
We anticipate that other majors that have high-unit requirements for transfer will be wish to be included in SCIGETC (or the same program with a different name), if SCIGETC is approved and seen to be successful.

How does SCIGETC differ from IGETC?
At the moment IGETC allows for two courses to be postponed “for good cause” and taken at the transfer school. SCIGETC calls for two courses to be postponed and taken at the transfer school. The difference is that for SCIGETC, the postponing of the two courses would be expected and not an exception. The attached chart offers further details.

Who certifies SCIGETC completion?
The IGETC web site says:

IGETC provides a pattern of courses that fulfills the transfer general education requirements at both the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU). Each California community college offers a complete set of courses that satisfy IGETC. If you attend more than one community college, the campus you attend just prior to transfer will certify your completion of IGETC, including courses taken at other California community colleges.

At present, there is a petition for partial certification of IGETC (for good cause). A similar petition would be routinely available for SCIGETC; it would not require the statement of good cause but would require the specification of a major.
What happens if the student changes his/her mind about pursuing a science major, prior to transfer?
In most cases the student can go on to complete IGETC with no loss of time or effort. Of course details depend on when the student changes his /her goals and from what major to what other major.

And what happens if the student changes his/her mind after transfer, say from chemistry to history--would the certification remain?
The student would be held to completing the SCIGETC as originally specified in the petition. In most cases they will have taken more courses by doing SCIGETC than by taking IGETC.
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 are 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
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.
The Faculty's Role in Reforming College Sports

The commercialization of intercollegiate athletics threatens academic values. Working together, professors forge a new model of the academics-athletics connection.

By James W. Earl


Last fall, I addressed the AAUP's 2003 governance conference about a faculty-led initiative to reform college sports. The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) grew out of a meeting one afternoon in the student union at the University of Oregon among a few senior professors who had recently been appointed to the faculty senate. Those who get involved in faculty governance, on my campus and on virtually every other U.S. campus, quickly become bothered by athletics. It dawns on them that the firewall between academics and athletics is thin; in fact, it can barely hide an awful contradiction in the university they love.

That afternoon, we hatched a simple plan to contact the senate presidents at the other nine universities in the Pacific-10 athletics conference to see if they shared our concerns. Perhaps the ten senates could act together to urge our presidents to discuss the issues. We were naïve, but the plan turned out to be much better than we could have imagined. It gave rise to a grassroots movement among faculty leaders across the country.

The COIA's immediate goal is to have faculty senates from coast to coast agree on achievable, enforceable, and meaningful reforms, starting with the academic standards and governance practices most clearly within the purview of the faculty. Unlike earlier faculty movements, ours relies on well-established faculty governance procedures, so that our efforts can take official form through faculty action.

My Story

I wasn't hired by the University of Oregon to worry about intercollegiate athletics, and I am sure that those who appointed me wish I'd never gotten into it. I was hired to worry about the Old English language between the seventh and eleventh centuries, and Beowulf, the epic poem written in it. I also teach other ancient and medieval literatures, and, in my spare time, I study ancient languages, translate an epic poem of Provence, chip away at a study of Indian literature, and run adult seminars in the humanities for the community. This is my profession. And as every professor knows, in addition to all these things, I advise students, direct dissertations, and serve on numerous committees and, occasionally, the university senate.

Is it beside the point to talk about my professorial occupations here? I think not, because when I talk about college sports, I talk as a professor. In this magazine, obviously, or at an AAUP conference, I don't have to defend the faculty's role at the university. But in my dealings with those involved in athletics, I have to defend it every day. I have to explain what I do and how it embodies the university's mission, over and over again, to everyone, from the fans in the stands right on up to the trustees and the president.

Only the faculty seems to understand that professors are real stakeholders in the university, living as we do, totally immersed in it and devoted to its traditional mission. No one can stake a more genuine claim to the university than the faculty. What we do at the university isn't some sideshow; we are the main event.

One of the witty things that sports fans say to me is, Don't you wish you could pack 60,000 people into the stands for a lecture on Beowulf? This tiresome question is supposed to remind me that more people care
about what happens at the stadium than in my classroom, that classrooms are in fact boring, that literature isn't nearly as exciting or as popular as football. So, who am I to be criticizing athletics? Obviously, I'm just envious.

My answer is no, I'm not motivated by envy. The parents of America aren't shelling out $10,000, $20,000, or $30,000 a year to send their kids to watch football games, I remind them, but to get an education. There are tens of millions of parents out there refinancing the house and going into lifelong debt because they consider the classroom experience that I provide just that valuable. I have no doubts about the value of what I do.

For all of our concern about athletics, it is still just a sliver of the total university budget (about 4 percent). It's an auxiliary. Even if it sometimes seems as if the tail's wagging the dog, nobody could think that athletics is the dog, and education the tail. We are the university. We are the chief guardians of what makes it valuable, what makes it worth the high price parents pay. As former Harvard University president Derek Bok says in his 2003 book, *Universities in the Marketplace*:

Of all the major constituencies in a university, faculty members are in the best position to appreciate academic values and insist on their observance. Since they work on campus, they are better suited than trustees to observe what is going on. They have the most experience with academic programs and how they work. Most of all, they have the greatest stake in preserving proper academic standards and principles, since these values protect the integrity of their work and help perpetuate its quality.

Yet it's becoming increasingly clear that if we don't continue to set the standards, someone else will—or something else, by which I mean money and the marketplace—and those standards won't be ones we'll want to defend. To some people, the university is a business; to others, it's a state agency; to others, it's an engine for the economy; and for others—many, many others—it's little more than a great team, like the dazzling Ducks. And the university is all these things; but for you and me—for the faculty—the university is obviously something else and something more: it's academic freedom; it's the arts and sciences; it's the library, the all-nighter, the seminar table; it's liberal education, pure research, the sharing of ideas, the love of books, and the Socratic method; it's young people on a steep learning curve; it's Phi Beta Kappa and lifelong learning; and also, to be honest, it's the absent-minded professor—Einstein with his bad hair, Einstein who can't remember his phone number. That's okay with me.

So how did this absent-minded professor get involved with athletics? It's a question I ask myself every day. For the first thirty years of my academic career, I had no occasion and no reason to worry about sports. I followed the Cavaliers, then the Rams, then the Ducks, all from the unluxurious skybox of my ivory tower. Until a few years ago, even the amazing Ducks had no connection to my life as a professor.

It's as if a firewall separated the slightly disheveled intellectual enterprise the professor inhabits and the glamorous athletic one thriving across campus. I carried out my academic career at three schools, hardly aware that athletics was there at all. Maybe I should have been alarmed all along by the total disconnect.

Why am I worried about athletics now? Is it because the role of athletics on campus has changed, so I can't ignore it any more? A breach in the old firewall? Probably not: many of my colleagues remain sublimely uninterested in sports, happily concentrated on their work. Many of them wonder why I'm so interested. I don't bother them with it. I envy their focus on their research and teaching, and I've become resigned to being, for the time being, their firewall.

That's one of the functions of faculty leadership; a few of us at a time take our turns in the senate, or on the athletics committee, precisely so the rest of us don't have to worry about it. By and large, I've learned, the faculty don't really want to be bothered about athletics—even those who enjoy sports, and even those who know there's a real problem.
My involvement began when I became senate president four years ago. Shortly afterward, the athletics department announced a $90 million expansion of our stadium. I first learned about it from the local paper over breakfast one morning. Oddly, in the same issue, I also read about the latest round of cuts to the university's budget by the state legislature. I saw several things at once: a looming crisis in our academic budget; a second crisis in the relationship between academics and athletics, which suddenly looked ironic, if not comically inappropriate; and a third crisis in faculty governance—for I could barely believe that the university could launch such a huge and expensive project without even informing the faculty.

Only a few weeks later, I read another story in the morning paper, which reported that our university's annual "civil war" game against Oregon State had been rescheduled for the Saturday before finals week at the request of network television. I wasn't the only faculty member to learn about this development from the newspaper; not even the provost had been consulted. His precious "dead week," with its elaborate rules forbidding distractions, was now the biggest party weekend of the year.

The Coalition
When we carried out the plan we devised that afternoon in the student union to contact the senate presidents at the other Pac-10 schools, we discovered that although the Pac-10 teams are tough competitors, and the presidents of Pac-10 institutions also see their schools as competing in the academic marketplace, the faculties mostly don't feel this competition. Our allegiance to our professional ideals is almost always stronger than our allegiance to our individual institutions when those two loyalties come into conflict.

We belong to a profession with a shared mission and shared ideals, no matter where we work. If you encourage faculties—at least faculty leaders—to talk to each other, they see the issues surrounding athletics and academics the same way, and they're more eager to cooperate than compete.

So the Pac-10 faculties cooperated, and in spring 2000, nine of them passed resolutions endorsing the "academics first" movement initiated by former Indiana University president Myles Brand, now president of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The movement urges presidents, in Brand's words, to "turn down the volume" of intercollegiate athletics. Faculty leaders in other national athletics conferences read about our campaign, and the following year they, too, began cooperating to urge athletics reform on their presidents.

It was Bob Eno, senate president at Indiana University, who brought the local conference movements together under one umbrella in the COIA. No one had to be asked twice. The coalition quickly found support from faculty leaders in NCAA Division I-A schools across the country. Its steering committee, representing all six Bowl Championship Series conferences, forged a document titled Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform, which is now being adopted by faculty senates in every national college athletics conference. Thirty-seven faculty senates have formally adopted the framework at this point, and another twenty-one are in the process of doing so.

The framework lays out the chief directions for reform in the areas of academic integrity, athlete welfare, governance, finances, and commercialization. Its language is flexible enough to allow for debate and local difference without weakening the drive for a national consensus.

Faculty senate presidents, if I may say so myself, tend to be a responsible lot of leadership types, not firebrands, malcontents, or radicals. Every campus has professors who hate sports and who want to see them slashed or eliminated, but the coalition, following Brand's lead, adopted from the start a moderate long-term reform agenda. We were buoyed by Brand's selection as NCAA president in 2002, and we're eager to see reform take place under NCAA leadership if possible. We also admire the frank reports of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Our immediate goal, as I have pointed out, is to have faculty senates from coast to coast agree on clear, practicable, and meaningful reform of intercollegiate athletics. Our ultimate goal is to help all stakeholders in college sports bring about comprehensive reform of the entire industry, for the sake of both college
athletics and the university system. We are developing best-practices documents to help guide universities through the nuts-and-bolts practicalities of reform.

Our long-range goals lie outside the purview of the faculty. They require alliances with college and university presidents and governing boards. These goals include adjusting the length of seasons and the size of teams, cutting costs, recommitting college sports to amateurism, particularly in revenue sports, and reducing the dependence of sports programs on commercial contracts. Our ambitions are confined to Division I-A, but we encourage colleagues in other divisions to consider formulating and evaluating the issues that pertain to their athletics programs, and to initiate a similar process of faculty engagement.

Obstacles

It's widely felt that the moment is propitious. If reform misfires now, we may have missed our best opportunity to accomplish it. We also know that the immediate future is likely to present obstacles that will slow the pace of reform and tempt us to say that we've gotten as far as we can get, well before meaningful reform can be achieved. Bob Eno compiled a list of the obstacles we can expect:

1. The NCAA has approved a package of initial academic reforms. These first steps may take the steam out of reform by appearing to be an adequate result. But they will not eliminate the tremendous financial incentives that undermine reform.

2. The process of approval by faculty senates of the coalition's framework will be slow and will only partly succeed. That's in keeping with the nature of faculty senates and the unusual nature of what we're trying to accomplish. So we'll have to persist in our reform efforts.

3. Some aspects of reform are truly difficult—workable solutions haven't yet been envisioned. The most obvious problems are in the area of cost reduction, where athletics conferences and the NCAA encounter antitrust strictures that make agreements to restrain costs difficult to design and sustain. And presidents—the only people who can attack these issues—have many other priorities. Inducing them to work together to arrive at practicable solutions will also require persistence. The path of least resistance will always be to answer funding needs by negotiating ever-more-lucrative commercial contracts. Faculty will have to create and maintain a national network to monitor movement, or the lack of it, and to hold presidents and boards accountable for their efforts.

4. We are only beginning the faculty reform movement. We've made progress, but the momentum against us is keeping pace. There are the destabilizing forces of conference realignment and legal infighting for economic advantages; congressional scrutiny inspired by the messy battle over access to championship bowls and dollars; and what seems an unprecedented series of scandals in the player and coaching ranks. Insofar as the acceleration of these phenomena creates additional pressure for reform, it opens up positive opportunities. But unless we respond quickly, universities could lose substantial public credibility, and forces beyond our control will take away some of the options available to us.

Faculty, presidents, trustees, and others need to reach an understanding about the timetable for developing a comprehensive reform plan and stick to it—two years from now seems long enough. Of course, implementing the plan may take as much as a decade. But this year and next year need to be a time of intense, cooperative effort to reach long-term solutions to complex problems.

5. Faculty need to be both impatient and realistic. It is not hard to imagine solutions to athletics issues that conform to widely held faculty values, but that violate antitrust laws, have strong negative unintended consequences on athletes, or unnecessarily raise vocal public (and thus political) opposition. To be true partners in this endeavor, faculty can't voice simplistic solutions based on impressions rather than good data. Faculty leaders must become well educated on the issues and pragmatic in their thinking.

The goal is concrete—to achieve a new model for athletics that can persist over time in spite of real-world pressures. That means working toward a model that is not only practicable but achievable. Designing such
a model is an intellectual challenge; implementing it is a political challenge, and we must discipline
ourselves to contribute to it.

I have two more obstacles to add to Eno's list. First, the millions of avid college sports fans who crowd the
stadiums or watch on television have little reason to believe us when we say that college sports is not as
healthy as it looks. After all, the games have never been better: beautiful facilities, great coaching and
playing, amazing television coverage and analysis. From the fan's point of view, bigger is better, and there's
no such thing as too much.

The fans, of course, can't be expected to consider the situation from the owners' point of view—the owners
in this case being institutions of higher learning, mostly public ones, and almost all in deep financial
trouble. Most fans would be surprised to learn that these tremendously popular spectacles make no money
for their owners, and in fact cost most universities precious millions they can't afford. How could fans
know about the danger posed by athletics budgets that rise at twice the rate of academic budgets? If they
did understand, perhaps they'd worry that what they were watching was really the college sports bubble,
not unlike the dot.com bubble or the Enron bubble. Rapid growth often spells disaster. The fans probably
wouldn't worry anyway. It's not in the nature of fanhood. So it's up to the owners—us—to slow things
down before the bubble bursts.

But the fans are not going to understand why, and they're going to scream bloody murder if they think
professors are interfering in their fun.

And finally, there is the constant temptation for those of us who get into this movement just to throw in the
towel. Derek Bok writes perceptively and eloquently about the problem of athletics and comes to the
"melancholy conclusion" that "it may already be too late to turn back." After reading his book, William
Bowen and James Shulman's *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*, and James
Duderstadt's *Intercollegiate Athletics and the American University* in quick succession, I felt a terrible
heaviness come over me. What will it take for faculty to sustain a long-term commitment when the forces
working against reform are so great and when some of the best spokespeople for reform consider it
impossible?

**Culture of Excess**

I've described the coalition's reform agenda as a moderate and realistic one, and I myself try to walk the
middle path. But let me confess, my personal feelings do fluctuate between extremes. Sometimes you hear
the crowd roar, you root for the team, your students are on the field, you see how much the whole city
enjoys the games and how the local economy is thriving because of them. You ask, Why can't I just join the
crowd and go with the flow? Why complain and make them all so mad at me? Why should I feel
responsible for reforming this giant? And please, let the Ducks win on Saturday!

But then there's another part of me that sometimes takes over, which is simply outraged about the situation
of American higher education in relationship to athletics. I'm lucky: the University of Oregon has a
relatively clean, self-supporting, well-managed, and pretty successful, sometimes even inspiring, athletics
program, and an enlightened administration. But still, the faculty leadership at the university is at this
moment absolutely and totally furious about athletics. Nike wants to build us a new $200 million basketball
arena. I suppose we should be grateful, but the fact is that we don't need or want it, and all the procedures
of shared governance are being bypassed to make it happen.

Oregon is becoming a test case, an extreme example, a cartoon of what's going wrong in higher education
today, with this spectacle of arms race mentality and commercialization. Many of you have local issues like
ours. Oregon isn't so special, and I don't really want to be angry; I'd rather be moderate, thoughtful, and
persuasive.

But I'll probably never have another opportunity as good as this one to make my case. Oh, for the tongues
of angels. Oh, for that rhetorical silver bullet that might convince not only the choir, but even the most
diehard, single-minded, anti-intellectual booster who loves sports but hates universities on principle, that despite all the ratings, the crowds, the excitement, the beauty of the game, and the glory of young athletes in their prime—not to mention the billions of dollars pouring through the sports-entertainment industry—college sports is not in good health. Health depends on moderation, and intercollegiate athletics, at least at Oregon, is nothing now if it's not a culture of wretched excess.

It was inevitable, I knew it, that the longer I went on, the sadder I would become over what has happened to college sports and what has happened to our universities during my thirty-three years as a professor. So I'll stop. I'll end with a quotation from Bob Eno, who seems always to see the silver lining:

Already, in Division I-A, faculty leaders and presidents are working together more closely than before because of a convergence of effort on athletics. The potential benefit to higher education of such enhanced communication and cooperation among faculty, governing boards, and administrations is enormous, and our response to the endemic problems of intercollegiate sports might just be the groundwork upon which a new understanding of shared governance is built.

James Earl is professor of English at the University of Oregon.
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