

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2472-99/AA  
September 9-10, 1999

**Campus Responses to Draft Accountability Process Document**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University request the campus senates to respond to the call for responses by local senates and appropriate faculty committees to the draft Accountability Process document dated August 16, 1999; and be it further

RESOLVED: That responses from campus senates be directed to their campus president as well as to the Chair of the Academic Senate CSU, for transmittal to Executive Vice Chancellor David S. Spence; and be it further

RESOLVED: That in their consideration of the draft Accountability Process document and in their recommendations for elements to be included or excluded in the planning for accountability in the CSU, local campus senates should carefully consider such issues as the following:

1. Are the accountability indicators specified for administrative and management performance adequate, or commensurate with those spelled out for academic performance?
2. Are the accountability indicators specified for the system as a whole sufficiently parallel to those spelled out for the campuses?
3. Is there enough distinction made in the draft document between “accountability” and “assessment”?
4. Can the individual campuses reasonably be expected to achieve consensus on the parameters of such elaborate assessment processes given the very short timeline for response?
5. Are the specific accountability indicators proposed in the draft Accountability Process document consistent with the academic mission and programs of the individual campuses? Might other indicators be more appropriate? Provide examples.
6. Given that the proposed accountability process is meant to be both formative and summative, might a more open process with less rigidly defined indicators contribute better to the formative aspects of that goal? For example, is three years the most desirable period between accountability cycles?

7. Are adequate mechanisms in place on the campus for appropriate faculty oversight of the process of accountability, especially as regards the quality of degree programs?
8. Is the campus satisfied that the draft document protects against unfair or inappropriate comparisons among campuses and programs?

*RATIONALE: The Draft Accountability Process document, in addition to a recitation of its background, and enunciation of some general principles, sets forth some very specific areas of responsibility and measures of accountability which have a very great potential to affect the academic missions of the CSU and its campuses in various ways. While certain areas and measures (e.g., items 2-9) are already routinely studied, with data generated for possible reporting, other items (especially items 1 and 10-12) are new, are not standardized, and will require considerable work in devising appropriate accountability processes.*

*The Academic Senate CSU recognizes that the November 1, 1999, deadline for responses set by the Executive Vice Chancellor hardly provides enough time for meaningful consideration and response by the local senates. Recognizing the importance of a Compact II agreement, the Academic Senate CSU considers that it is equally important that this systemwide basic strategic accountability plan benefit from the fullest possible input of the faculty, in collaboration with the administration. We note that we would have preferred that the drafting of this Accountability Process document had been postponed until there could be full senate consultation and participation in its initial drafting.*

**APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY – September 9-10, 1999**



# THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

DAVID S. SPENCE  
 EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

August 16, 1999

**To:** Mr. Gene Dinielli, Chair  
 CSU Statewide Academic Senate

**From:** David S. Spence *Dave S.*

**Subject:** Draft Accountability Process

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

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

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

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

Attachment

DSS:ap

cc: Charles B. Reed

**DRAFT****DRAFT**

## DRAFT ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

### BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT**

## PRINCIPLES

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT**

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

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

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

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

#### Performance Areas

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

### 2. Maintaining appropriate balance between system commonality and campus autonomy

#### Performance Areas

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT**

### 3. Advancing the mission of the CSU

#### Performance Areas

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

### **CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY**

#### *Common Institutional Performance Areas and Indicators*

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

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

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

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT***Annual Responsibility Indicators and Reports***1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT****2. Access**

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

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

**3. Progression to the degree**

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

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

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

**4. Graduation**

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

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

**5. Areas of special state need**

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

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

**6. Relations with K-12**

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

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT****7. Remediation**

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

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

**8. Facilities utilization**

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

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

**9. University advancement**

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

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

***Three-Year Performance Areas and Indicators***

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

**10. Quality of post-baccalaureate programs**

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

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

- student outcomes assessment for graduate programs,
- graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates,

**DRAFT****DRAFT**

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

### 11. Contributions to community and society

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

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

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

**DRAFT****DRAFT****12. Institutional effectiveness**

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

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

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

***Campus-Defined Performance Areas and Indicators***

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