AGENDA

AD HOC COMMITTEE OF OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

Meeting: 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 11, 1999
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Anthony M. Vitti, Chair
William D. Campbell
Martha C. Fallgatter
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio

Consent Items
Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1999

Discussion Items
1. San Diego State University’s Proposal for an Off-Campus Facility in the South Bay Area of San Diego, Information
2. Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers, Committee Action
3. Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University, Committee Action
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

March 16, 1999

Members Present
William D. Campbell
Martha C. Fallgatter
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Antonio Villaraigosa, Speaker of the Assembly, ex officio

Members Absent
Anthony M. Vitti, Chair

Other Trustees Present
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Eric C. Mitchell
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Michael D. Stennis
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor’s Office Staff
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

Trustee Campbell called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.
Executive Vice Chancellor West prefaced his remarks by noting that all three items being presented to the committee were for discussion only at this time.

Mr. West began the discussion by noting there has been an increasing demand over the past few years for the CSU to provide additional services to areas that are not currently served by our existing campuses. It is anticipated that this demand will continue to grow for quite some time. Therefore, it has become imperative that the board review the current policies in place and consider changes or create new policies to reflect this new trend.

Trustee Razi said he agreed with the premise and added it was important to assess that there is adequate general support from the surrounding communities in order to obtain private participation in any new projects. He expressed concern that the CSU not focus solely on establishing off-campus centers in areas of obvious economic prosperity and growth. He would like to ensure that students living in areas where there is less economic empowerment are also afforded the opportunity to be served by these centers. He suggested including a policy for obtaining public as well as private sector support when considering establishment of off-campus facilities.

Mr. West noted that by thinking this idea through on a systemwide basis, it would be necessary to look at the demand in various areas and assess not only traditional but alternative means of delivery prior to committing to any facility or program.

Trustee Pesqueira said he was glad to be discussing this important issue and that he hoped the board would be able to create some type of trustee policy that would provide the necessary guidance in creating future off-campus sites. He added he would like to see an attempt to encourage communication with community colleges in the respective areas, to allow for smoother transitions for students from undergraduate to upper division work. He also mentioned it would be a good idea to explore options for making the budgets of these centers more independent from their parent campus.

Mr. West agreed with Trustee Pesqueira’s remarks with regard to communication with the community colleges, and acknowledged that the funding issue he raised is already being explored and discussions to that effect would eventually be initiated with the presidents.

Trustee Gould asked if there had been any analysis to determine if the off-campus centers are economical. Mr. West replied that no formal analysis had been done, but that in general, instruction and costs of student services at the centers are lower than at the main campuses.

Trustee Campbell commented that he thought it would be difficult to establish a broad brush type policy for off-campus centers due to their individual and unique missions. He recommended looking at each proposed site on an individual basis.
Chairman Hauck cautioned that attention needs to be paid to operating costs for these facilities. Such expenses are critical. He suggested that there be at least some type of template for analyzing proposed centers/sites.

Trustee Pesqueira suggested that distinction should be made when considering any proposals as to whether it would be a potential future institution or intended strictly as an off-campus center.

Chairman Hauck recalled the process by which the Stockton Center was initially acquired and developed as an example of the need for a more defined method of project development and guidelines.

Trustee Campbell inquired about what the next steps would be. Mr. West replied that the plan is to return to the board via the Educational Policy Committee with specific reaffirmations and recommendations at a subsequent board meeting.

**Report on Policies and Criteria Regarding Conversion of Off-Campus Centers to Full University Status, and Recommendations for Additional Policy Consideration**

Executive Vice Chancellor West explained the item dealt with determining criteria for the possible conversion of certain currently operating off-campus facilities to full-time campus status. Policy does exist in this area, and additional suggestions and considerations are being developed to update the current policy. A brief discussion took place echoing many of the comments and concerns mentioned in Agenda Item 1.

Trustee Pierce presented some of his observations on methods to better position the university to improve our leverage when approaching a community where we are negotiating a new site or attempting expansion of an existing one. He noted the critical need to explore at the front end the potential benefits and drawbacks to a community, and attempt to capture the demands of the community in our favor.

Mr. West noted that the item was presented for discussion only at this time.

**Report on Progress of Permanent Off-Campus Center Facilities**

Executive Vice Chancellor West reported on the status of the Stockton Center noting that the site is proving to be a success. Services to students are continuing to improve and occupation of the site has been completed. As approved in January, there is a trustees legislative item initiative in place to request augmentation to the CSU budget of $1.3 million on an ongoing basis to meet the operational needs of the Stockton Center.
Mr. West informed the committee of a potential new opportunity for the CSU with regard to closure of the El Toro Marine Naval Air Station in Orange County. The Orange County Supervisors have approached CSU through the Fullerton campus to look at the possibility of housing an off-campus center on a portion of the base. Mr. West informed the committee he would keep them advised of any developments in this area.

The meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.
AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

San Diego State University’s Proposal for an Off-Campus Facility in the South Bay Area of San Diego

Presentation By
Stephen L. Weber, President
San Diego State University

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

Summary
This item provides a review of a proposal for a collaborative arrangement between San Diego State University, the Southwestern Community College District, and the Sweetwater Union High School District to provide new educational programming for students in the South Bay area of San Diego.
BRIEF

Committee Action Item

AGENDA ITEM 2

MAY 11-12, 1999

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers

Presentation By
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

Summary
At the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities meeting in March 1999, an agenda item was presented which provided background information on off-campus centers and summarized existing policies which guide the establishment of new off-campus centers and the approval of permanent off-campus centers. The Ad Hoc Committee asked staff to return to the May 1999 meeting with a proposed resolution affirming existing policy and introducing additional criteria recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Staff recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee act to forward an updated policy on the establishment of new off-campus centers and development of permanent facilities to the Committee on Educational Policy for its consideration and endorsement for approval by the Board of Trustees. This updated policy both affirms existing trustee policy and adds new criteria addressing distance learning technology and documentation of need. Upon approval of the Ad Hoc Committee, this item will be presented to the Committee on Educational Policy at this board meeting.

Recommended Action
Adoption of the resolution.
Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers

Background
In March 1999, the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities discussed background information on off-campus centers and the existing policies that guide establishment of new off-campus centers and permanent center facilities. The members of the committee asked staff to prepare a resolution that would affirm existing policy while recommending new criteria to address some issues not covered in the original policy. Out of this discussion and after further review, staff developed a recommendation that affirms existing policy and proposes a two-step process for establishment of new off-campus centers, what CPEC refers to as “outreach operations,” and approval of permanent off-campus centers, with the addition of new criteria.

Policy and Criteria for the Establishment of New Off-campus Centers
The basis for off-campus education programs is to provide regular academic degree programs in geographic areas not adequately served by existing CSU campuses. The area should demonstrate a population base or growth with demand for such programs that cannot be met by the regional four-year campus, or other public or private higher education institutions in the area. The centers should not compete with existing community colleges, other local institutions, or with the four-year “home” campus. They are limited in enrollment to CSU eligible students, with all fees and academic requirements consistent with CSU policy for matriculated students. Off-campus centers are an integral part of the “home” campus academic program, offering upper division and graduate courses allowing students to complete specific degree programs.

The 1985 statutes authorizing the trustees to pursue planning for three new centers included language regarding development of criteria for approval of state-funded centers, as follows:

“The Trustees shall develop explicit criteria for the approval of any proposals for the state-funded purchase or construction of off-campus centers of postsecondary education, and shall submit the criteria to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) for its review. No later than July 1, 1986, the Trustees shall submit the criteria to the legislature, and the commission shall submit to the legislature its recommendations concerning the criteria.”

In January 1986, the board adopted criteria for new centers to be applied to the three new legislatively proposed centers, as well as other future proposals. The following criteria from those adopted in January 1986 will apply to the establishment of new off-campus centers.

1. no negative impact on established higher education institutions in region
2. alternative instructional delivery insufficient to meet regional demand
3. enrollment of at least 200 FTE, with anticipated growth to 500 FTE over 5-10 years
4. at least three academic degree programs offered with full upper division program
5. staffing with regular CSU faculty at ratio similar to on-campus staffing
6. academic resources sufficient for continuity without impacting “home” campus programs.
In addition, the following new requirements are proposed for the establishment of new off-campus centers.

**Distance Learning**

Given sufficient enrollments, distance learning technology can deliver educational programs from an existing university campus (or multiple campuses) to remote sites at lower costs than traditional delivery methods. As campuses identify educational needs that they are not currently serving, the possibility of serving those needs through distance learning systems must be considered as an alternative to establishment of a new off-campus center. The effectiveness of distance learning technology in any particular case will depend on its ability to deliver the specific types of instructional content that are needed. To ensure that distance learning technology is considered, staff recommends adding the following additional requirement to the trustees’ previously approved list:

7. For the establishment of new off-campus centers serving up to 500 FTE, it must be demonstrated that the projected center enrollment cannot be accommodated through distance learning technologies or other alternative instruction delivery methods that meet pedagogical requirements for effective instruction.

**Reporting Requirement and Delegation of Authority to Chancellor**

To address documenting the need for new off-campus centers that have enrollments of up to 500 FTE, staff recommends introducing the following additional requirement to the trustees’ previously approved list:

8. In the proposal for a new off-campus center, the “home” campus shall show how the proposal meets trustee policy requirements and affirm that the proposed center does not require additional support costs above the campus’s allocated enrollment budget. Based on this report, the chancellor is delegated the authority to approve the establishment of a new off-campus center, not to exceed 500 FTE, without Board of Trustees’ approval.

Consistent with existing CPEC Guidelines, the establishment of a new off-campus center does not require CPEC review.

**Policy and Criteria for the Board Approval of Permanent Off-campus Centers**

Existing CPEC policy requires review by CPEC of the proposed establishment of off-campus centers with enrollment in excess of 500 FTE. Therefore, prior board approval and designation as a permanent off-campus center is required in such cases.

A previously established off-campus center will have been supported through normal campus resources. Facilities may have been leased or donated. A permanent off-campus center may continue to function in leased or donated facilities but will also qualify for owned facilities. Thus, it is expected that budget support requirements may impact systemwide resources including capital outlay. Thus, the needs for expansion of the off-campus center beyond 500 FTE must be consistent with the necessary reallocation of systemwide resources to support this expansion.
In addition to the satisfaction of all criteria for the establishment of new off-campus centers cited in the prior section, the following criteria for Board of Trustees’ approval adopted in January 1986 will apply.

9. existing center operated 3 years prior to consideration for permanent status
10. needs commensurate with anticipated costs
11. recognized General Fund budget support
12. campuses other than “home” may offer degree programs at center
13. strong community support

Proposed Resolution
The following committee resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities that the updated policy on the establishment of new off-campus centers and development of permanent off-campus centers be forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy for its consideration and endorsement for full Board of Trustees’ approval.
BRIEF
Committee Action Item
Agenda Item 3
May 11-12, 1999

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University

Presentation By
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

Summary
This item presents a recommended policy for establishing an existing off-campus center as a full university. Staff is recommending that the Ad Hoc Committee act to forward this policy to the Committee on Educational Policy for consideration and recommending to the board.

Recommended Action
Adoption of the committee resolution.
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES

Recommendation for Review by the Committee on Educational Policy—Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University

Background
At the Ad Hoc Committee’s March 1999 meeting, the members of the committee discussed an agenda item summarizing current policies and criteria used when converting an existing off-campus center to full university status. The committee found that these policies are essentially the same as the existing policies for the establishment of a new university campus. After review and discussion, the committee concluded that the existing criteria for establishing a new university are appropriate for converting a permanent off-campus center to a university. The committee then directed staff to return in May 1999 with a resolution recommending that the Committee on Educational Policy affirm existing policy for the establishment of a new campus be applied to converting an off-campus center to university status.

This item includes the proposed resolution plus the CSU’s existing criteria for establishing a new university. It also includes the California Postsecondary Education Commission’s (CPEC) criteria for reviewing new campus proposals.

Conversion of an Off-Campus Center to Full University Status
Staff recommends that existing trustee policy for the establishment of a new university campus be applied in the case where an off-campus center is being converted to a university. Site selection for a permanent off-campus center may include consideration of factors that might make the site potentially viable as a future CSU university campus, i.e., acreage, regional educational needs, availability of transportation, utilities and public services, regional population growth patterns, and proximity of other higher education institutions. However, existence of a permanent off-campus center is not, by itself, justification for establishment of a new CSU campus.

Existing CPEC Policies for Reviewing New Campus Proposals
- Enrollment projections for 10, 15, and 20 years must support the proposal.
- Alternatives, such as establishment of an off-campus center or expansion and increased utilization of existing campuses must be considered.
- Projected statewide enrollment demand should exceed the planned system capacity, or compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.
- Programs must be justified, and access for economically, educationally, and socially disadvantaged population must be demonstrated.
Existing CSU Criteria for Establishing New Campuses

a. Carefully delineated and justified primary service area; this includes growth of student demand and ability of existing and future planned institutions to serve demand.

b. Proposed new campus should not jeopardize operations of existing institutions in the proposed service area.

c. Community interest and support.

d. Accepted community plan for orderly development of adjacent, surrounding land.

e. Proximity to existing and future housing, shopping, employment, cultural and recreational facilities.

f. Accessibility to transit.

g. Adequate shape and size to accommodate projected enrollment.

h. Availability of utilities.

i. Freedom from noise and nuisances

j. Desirable natural features, including “beauty, spirit and feeling.”

It is staff’s judgment that the above criteria, specifically related to the establishment of a new university, are applicable as written to the conversion of an existing, permanent off-campus center to a university.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities, that the Committee on Educational Policy is requested to consider and endorse for full board approval this committee’s recommendation that existing policy and criteria for establishment of new campuses, as described in Agenda Item 3 of the May 11-12, 1999, meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities, be used to determine when an off-campus center should be converted to a university.