

**RETHINKING GRADUATE EDUCATION IN
THE CSU: MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE
PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA FOR GRADUATE
EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

REPORT OF THE

**TASK FORCE
ON
GRADUATE AND POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATION
IN THE
CSU**

**SEPTEMBER 2004
ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE ON GRADUATE AND POSTBACCALAUREATE EDUCATION IN THE CSU

CRISTY JENSEN,
Professor of Public Policy and Administration, California State University, Sacramento (Chair)

JOANN AGUIRRE,
Director, California Pre-Doctoral Programs, Chancellor's Office, CSU

CAL CAPLAN,
Professor of Kinesiology, California State University, Hayward

TED CROVELLO,
Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, California State University, Los Angeles

GENE DINIELLI,
Professor of English, California State University, Long Beach

SAMUEL EDELMAN,
Professor of Communication Studies, California State University, Chico

NABIL IBRAHIM,
Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, San Jose State University
(through Spring 2003)

KEN NISHITA,
Professor of Psychology, California State University, Monterey Bay

LESTER PINCU,
Professor of Criminology, California State University, Fresno, Vice Chair

BRENT RUSHALL,
Professor of Exercise and Nutritional Science, San Diego State University

JOLAYNE SERVICE,
Dean, Academic Program Planning, Chancellor's Office, CSU

DONNA SHAFER,
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Humboldt State University

ROBERT SNYDER,
Professor of Philosophy, Humboldt State University

Research Assistance provided by Season Eckardt, Chancellor's Office

PREFACE

In May 2001, the Academic Senate of the CSU passed Resolution AS-2534-01 reaffirming its support for the recommendations contained in the 1989 study of graduate education in the CSU, chaired by Gene Dinielli (Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU, 1989). The resolution also called for a Senate Task Force to examine the implementation of earlier recommendations, update those recommendations, and develop new recommendations based on the current context.

For the past several years since the adoption of the *Cornerstones* plan, the CSU has unsuccessfully sought funding from the Legislature for a “graduate differential” to assure more appropriate funding for graduate education in the CSU. The faculty remains strongly committed to recognizing the need for a “graduate differential” and the importance of documenting the case for the needed funding.

The Legislature’s recently completed review of the Master Plan for Higher Education was a second stimulus for the resolution. Senator Dede Alpert, Chair of the Joint Committee for Developing a Master Plan for Education, had requested Academic Senate participation in identifying the needs and priorities for higher education in California. The CSU Academic Senate’s review of the Master Plan Committee’s questions affirmed the concern for funding levels (see the Academic Senate’s report, *The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*; Cherny, 2001), but also stimulated interest in exploring an expanded role for the CSU in doctoral education.

An increasingly urgent discussion in the legislature and higher education community has focused on the need for more educational administrators whose preparation includes professionally oriented, effective doctoral programs in education. In Spring 2001, the Chancellor raised the possibility of seeking legislative authorization for the CSU to offer a “stand alone” doctorate in the field of education administration and leadership. This action led to preliminary discussion about the desirability and feasibility of CSU doctoral programs in fields where the CSU has assembled significant expertise in its existing graduate programs and where there are few publicly supported and therefore widely accessible programs. These early discussions also contributed to the Senate’s resolution.

The Governor’s 2004-05 Budget Proposal and subsequent action by the CSU Board of Trustees introduced a graduate fee differential, renewing interest in differential costs of providing graduate education. The interdependence of fee cost/resource and faculty workload differentials is on the policy agenda once again link to the work of the Task Force.

The Task Force was convened in Fall 2001 and included eight faculty members, three graduate deans, and academic program staff from the Chancellor’s Office. This group reviewed the various statewide data bases, campus accountability reports on graduate education, reports from entities within our state, and documents from other national and state-based organizations. Task Force work has included a review of the recommendations of the 1989 study of graduate education and particularly the recommended criteria for high-quality programs that were adopted as Trustee policy. This report examines the opportunities for significant expansion of the CSU role in providing graduate education in a number of emerging fields. Specific attention is given to the possibility of applied doctorates. Also noted is the growing demand for non-degree postbaccalaureate certificates, typically in applied technology and science-based professions. Finally, the report examines the costs of graduate education with particular emphasis on faculty

workload issues that affect how much funding is needed. This report represents the work of the Task Force and includes recommendations for action by statewide and campus Senates in collaboration with Graduate Deans, Provosts, Presidents, the Chancellor, and the Legislature.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The previous study of graduate education in the CSU was completed over a decade ago, and its recommendations were considered during a period of declining state revenues. There was considerable disappointment that resources were scarce for funding implementation of the report's recommendations. Yet when the "bust" of the early 1990s was followed by the "boom" and consequent state budget surpluses of the middle and late 1990s, the relatively strong budgets did not include a differentiation of funding for graduate education or a full recognition of the workloads associated with graduate programs, as recommended in the 1989 study of graduate education. The Task Force is keenly aware that *this* report is being released during a time of unprecedented fiscal crisis in the state. We hope this report can be a focal point of renewed efforts and commitments to ensure that graduate education provided by the CSU, so critical to California's economic and societal strength, be funded adequately. Much is at stake.

Dramatic changes in California present challenges and opportunities for institutions of higher education. The complexity and increasingly global dimension of California's economy creates an increasing need for a highly knowledgeable workforce in which the state's population, rich in demographic diversity, must be prepared to participate. The changes require a responsive and adaptive educational system to design effective curricula and provide the requisite graduate education.

The CSU's coupling of educational equity and academic excellence is a key ingredient ensuring that California's demographics will be a strength, helping to produce an adaptable workforce, strong, diverse markets for California products, and a society in which mutual understanding and civility prevail.

The CSU is a dynamic and responsive system of regional campuses serving California that is capable of:

- Identifying and articulating critical postbaccalaureate needs.
- Selectively developing increased capacity to meet state needs.
- Linking to national and international markets and needs.
- Continuously integrating new and alternative modes of providing education—including technology-based and technology enhanced teaching and learning—when such modes are demonstrated to be effective.
- Forging critical partnerships with other societal sectors including business, industry, research organizations, government at all levels, K-12 schools, the community colleges, the University of California, independent institutions of higher education, non-profit organizations, and the community.

The CSU is uniquely capable of responding to state needs and exhibiting leadership in the development of graduate degree and certificate programs with a regional and applied focus. The Task Force found that a number of changes in California affect the needs for graduate education. These include increasing specialization of the economy coupled with a growing awareness of the interdependence of economic and social forces.

Changes in California That Affect the CSU

- Changes in California's economy are reflected in the growth of specialized graduate certificates and graduate degree programs. The current educational context also presents more opportunities for partnerships in education.
- From 1985 to 2003 ethnic minorities increased as a proportion of California's population, and the participation of underrepresented groups in the CSU graduate student cohort also increased, in some cases at an even greater rate.
- The most recent review of the California Master Plan for Higher Education emphasized an integrated system of education in California that links pre-school through K-12 and higher education and promotes partnerships among educational segments and with business and industry.
- New forms of academic technology are increasingly incorporated into graduate education in the CSU.
- Changes to K-12 education policy have reverberated in the CSU, which continues to lead the state in preparing K-12 educators—still in large part at the postbaccalaureate level.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Master's Program Issues

- The professional Master of Science degree is emerging nationally as a model for advanced-level workforce development. Partnering with business and professional communities, where appropriate, to develop new and valuable graduate degree programs should be encouraged.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to discuss whether it is appropriate and valuable to designate a "graduate faculty," in part to recognize the distinctions between graduate and undergraduate instruction and their workload implications. In those discussions, campuses are encouraged to examine what should be expected of faculty who teach at the graduate level, including any special qualifications.
- CSU master's degree programs are encouraged, where appropriate, to develop links to and articulation with doctoral programs at UC and independent universities. Of particular interest are "bridge" programs that allow students in CSU master's degree programs to pursue a course of study with the assurance that a doctoral institution will recognize it as meeting a portion of the requirements for the doctoral degree.

Certificate Program Issues

- **Certificates represent a focused response to specific continuing education needs. They can also strengthen the pipeline for graduate degree programs.**
- The CSU should develop a standardized terminology for graduate-level certificates.
- CSU campuses are urged to develop further their own certificates policies. Campus policies for graduate-level certificate programs should address such elements as unit

requirements, links to academic departments, and admission standards appropriate to courses that could be part of graduate degree programs.

Funding Issues

- Funding for CSU graduate education must be reliable, stable, and sufficient. It should be
 - linked to a graduate differential in state financial support (e.g., through the redefinition of a graduate FTES, as proposed in the Trustees' budget for 2001-2002);
 - grounded in a full recognition of the work involved; and
 - incorporating recognition of the student and faculty research and scholarship critical to graduate education and the infrastructure needed to support them.
- While partnerships may lower the total cost of a graduate-level initiative by eliminating the need to duplicate certain resources, it should be recognized that sustaining most partnerships requires the investment of at least a modest amount of resources for continuing coordination. Policies and practices should be examined for their potential to become disincentives for collaboration.
- Internal campus policies and priorities need to reflect the campus's commitment, in resource and workload terms, to graduate programs.
- When resources to offer a graduate program wholly through state support are not available, CSU campuses should be free to explore a hybrid model, combining state support and self-support components programmatically while maintaining the fiscal integrity of each component.
- The CSU should continue to explore uses of academic technology and ways to fund it.
- The CSU should advocate aggressively for federal support of CSU research. Exploration of partnerships with the private sector that would enhance the CSU's research infrastructure is encouraged.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to explore a zero-unit enrollment policy that establishes a fee appropriate to the faculty work involved in thesis supervision that extends beyond enrollment in a thesis course.
- Greater flexibility in providing fee waivers for graduate students is encouraged.
- Current disincentives to sharing resources in a variety of graduate education partnerships constrains innovation. Strategies for reducing the impact of those disincentives can foster the development of new initiatives. The 2003 Report of the Academic Technology Planning Committee recommends an initiative, and potential starting point, that would proposed new policies and identify practices that would remove the fiscal disincentives to multi-campus collaborations.
- All doctoral education conducted by the CSU needs funding commitments at least equivalent to the funding commitments for joint CSU-UC EdD programs. The joint EdD programs should be monitored, especially with respect to the division of funds and workload parity, to determine whether the model should be extended to other joint doctoral programs.

Doctoral Program Issues

- Joint PhD programs have not in general lived up to their promise, though individual programs have achieved some success. The commitment to joint doctoral programs has been uncertain over time, the approval process is cumbersome, the funding has not been commensurate with the costs of current programs, and sufficient start-up monies have not been readily available. Ways to make joint doctoral programs more effective should be explored.
- The CSU is urged to study further the experience of the existing programs to determine the most useful practices for future joint work, with a special focus on faculty workload. Start up funding has not been consistently available for these joint efforts. We recommend funding and support for Joint PhD comparable to that provided the Joint CSU-UC Ed.D Program
- *If*
 - the need for publicly supported doctoral programs in one or more selected fields is well established,
 - the UC does not respond by developing its own doctoral programs or joint doctoral programs with the CSU,
 - the faculty at one or more CSU campuses has the expertise to offer the programs and is interested in doing so, and
 - adequate funding is made available,

the CSU should seek the authority to offer doctoral programs in those fields, independent of other universities. A focus on applied fields and the education of advanced-level practitioners is encouraged.

- The Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate CSU should create a subcommittee for doctoral program review and planning. In addition to program design, the subcommittee should consider issues of workload parity and dissertation supervision.
- CSU campuses are encouraged to develop policies and criteria for faculty participation in doctoral education. Comparable policies should apply to faculty in all the partnering institutions in a joint doctoral program. The CSU graduate deans are encouraged to stimulate campus discussion on these issues.

The CSU is a responsive, responsible, flexible higher education system that plays an important role in ensuring and sustaining California's prosperity and quality of life. It can play an even larger role, cost-effectively, if given the opportunity to do so.