

Domain Two: Connecting to P-12 Schools and to Community Colleges and Domain 1: Section that deals with transfer

- **Marshall Cates and Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Two**
- **[Wellman's comments are at the end of the report]**

1. P-12

- P-12 is our pipeline, but this is circular since we provide the teacher
- Students need more info about higher ed
- We need to change perception that college is not affordable and education ends at 12th grade.
- Increase the number of pre-college initiatives
- Middle and Elementary Schools
 - Outreach to elementary and middle school
 - Begin in elementary school to show that career choice and education are linked.
- Higher expectation must start before college
- Prepare students before they get to college, support them once they get here
- A specific suggestion was to mandate the a-g for all students

2. System responsibilities

- Web based transfer common across CSU
- Common audit, electronic systems
- Common feel to campus web pages
 - Make it easier for students to navigate our different sites
 - If registration and such looked more like the CCs it would be easier
- Common CSU system of roadmaps
- A specific example is: All CSUs on same semester system

3. Transfer

- Develop lower division transfer modules and offer on-line
- Make pathway from CC to CSU apparent
- Process transfer credit reports better

4. Teacher preparation for P-12

- Improve p-12 image as a profession
- Train more effective teachers
- Provide professional dev for teachers
- Produce competent teachers
- Assure that only demonstrable well trained teachers are hired as teachers in the public schools.

5. Teacher preparation for CCs

- Programs connecting Masters degrees and CC teaching
- Formal program between CSU and CC for master trained teachers for the CC

6. College readiness

- Bridge the gap between k-12 and college readiness
- Better prepared students and enough classes to meet demand
- EAP , CSU and America Reads are good examples
- Overcome disconnect that students have between testing and grades
- Overcome the confusion about passing the CASEE, but not passing the ELM and EPT

7. Advising

- Improve advising
- Advising needs to be valued in RTP
- More advising
- Onsite HS student advising
- Engage in stronger advisement collaboration with CCs
- Have student advisors out to feeder schools
- Need dedicated advisors for students who want to transfer to the CSU
- More info to HS students to make college a reality
- Student advising a priority
- Specific examples
 - Engage alumni with campus advising
 - Integrate advising forms across the CSU
 - Require study plans after 90 units

8. Community

- Expand partnerships
 - Hospitals for nursing
 - Community service organizations.
- Community services class—less red tape
- Modify risk management for field trips, service learning, civic engagement

9. Community Colleges

- CCs working with UC as well as CSU
- Consult CC before not after decisions are made
- Align curriculum with CCs
- Need a CC advocate
- Strengthen partnerships with CCs
- Partnering with CCs very important
- Partnership a two way street
- Formal connections with CC to increase transfer
- Improve training of CC counselors in CSU requirements
- Increased communication with CCs
- CC friction, need more team work
- Align learning objectives with CCs

10. Articulation

- Improve articulation
- Expand articulation

11. RTP

- Recognize service learning and teacher ed in RTP
- Advising, community Service, working on transfer are time consuming. Need rewards

12. Soft money

- Programs not dependent on grants and philanthropic gifts
- How to keep projects going once the grant money goes away.
- Too much use of soft money
- For P-14 need starting, sustaining programs that are not dependent on grants.

13. Funding

- Increased fees are a detriment to access.
- EOP has not received funding from the state.
- EAP funding should not be the same for all
- Stabilize projected fee increases
- Need differential funding by campus attributes
- Add mission to the funding formula
- ACR 73 needs support
- Encourage legislators to provide resources

14. Public service

- 1 on 1 relation with every high school, middle school , and elementary school teacher-each to have a contact. Every teacher should have a personal contact on a nearby CSU in their discipline. The CSU ought to be seen as their source of authoritative information
- If a CSU has a special feature such as a planetarium, this should be used as a public relations resource.
- Faculty as a resource

15. Outreach

- More outreach to parents
- More collaboration between outreach programs
- Better message to the public
- Have students go to high schools as role models
- More marketing

P-12 and transfer re-cast into 3 buckets

Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Two [based on Marshall Cates' work]:

Context (*much of this is inferred from the bullets in the report – I don't think it's conflictive, or I don't mean it to be, but not all of these specifics were in the report*)

- 1) Demographic trends – mean many if not majority of new students will be coming from families with no prior experience in college, and increasingly low-income
- 2) Economic circumstances mean more students are shifting to community colleges because of financial exigency – will put more pressure on transfer capacity & effectiveness
- 3) Student mobility increasing – more fluid enrollment patterns, greater likelihood of “reverse” transfer as well as conventional 2-4 transfer; stopping out
- 4) K-12 *and* Community College teacher turnover; inadequate supply of appropriately credentialed teachers; issues of quality of teacher training
- 5) High school graduation requirements and assessments in relation to college preparation

Goals

- 1) Eliminate achievement gaps separating low income and historically underrepresented students across the educational pipeline including to graduate school
- 2) Improve the quality of academic preparation for college-level work among high school students (could be a strategy, but since this would be a legitimate measurable outcome on its own I'm sticking it in here as well)
- 3) Improve teacher education for both K-12 and CC teachers
- 4) Build and sustain deep engagements with communities who depend on CSU for education, economic development, job preparation
- 5) Serve communities through civic partnerships and opportunities for continuing education, civic leadership, lifelong learning

Strategies

- 1) Improve college readiness (several recommendations in this arena)
- 2) Communication to communities – parents, employers, college-counselors – including outreach (several in this area)
- 3) Advising (several in this arena)
- 4) Articulation with K-12 AND CC's (several here)
- 5) Partnerships with community members – internships, service learning

- 6) One-on-one relationships with every high school, middle school, and elementary school. Every teacher ought to have a personal contact on a nearby CSU in their discipline. The CSU ought to be seen as a source of authoritative information.
- 7) Stabilize and sustain successful initiatives started on 'soft money'
- 8) Web-based transfer common across CSU
- 9) Common audit, electronic systems, common feel to campus web pages

(I note some tension in recommendations about common CSU system of roadmaps and all CSU's on the same academic calendar and recommendations for greater individuation and differentiation among campuses. Probably not really inconsistent – but it will help to surface this and clarify the basis or circumstances when sameness is a plus.)

Domain Three: Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholders

□ Marshelle Thobaben and Jane Wellman's combined comments on Domain Three

Preliminary sorting of major themes

- State funding prospects - CSU has sustained serious erosion in funding in the last five years. It underscores the need to change the playing field for state policy and funding support for the CSU, through evidence-based advocacy to state policy makers and other key stakeholders who can influence public policy, documenting the compelling arguments in favor of increased funding for CSU.
- The CSU needs to provide more systematic feedback to campuses on a variety of issues and to facilitate communication among campuses so that the “spirit of partnership” of each campus with the Chancellor’s Office and of campuses with each other becomes clearly visible.
- National and State political environment affecting CSU planning and management – and the weakening of the State Master Plan as the basis for higher education planning.
- International context- growing competition, eroding US performance in an international context; opportunities for international collaboration.
- *From Harry:* Few campus conversations saw this question as a way to open dialogue about how the development of new programs can respond to—or even better, anticipate—private sector and federal needs in order to develop revenue streams that can supplement the general fund.
- *From Harry:* Though partnerships, the CSU should be looking to sell lifelong services—professional upgrade contracts to individuals and enterprises, much as software companies do to us.
- *From Harry:* Several campuses believe that the CSU can make common cause, reduce life-cycle expenses if not initial investments unless partly underwritten by third parties, with green interests. CSU campuses can become models—and foci—of sustainability.
- *From Harry:* Success breeds success, yes; advertising success is even more crucial. The CSU needs to tally and call in the chips from those erstwhile partners—legislative aids, teachers’ unions, social workers, accountants, criminal justice system employees who have benefited from our investments in them.

A preliminary reading of campus feedback suggests that there is substantial consensus about these major system goals for CSU.

- 1) understand and meet expectations for outcomes (content, and skills) skills needed from CSU graduates
- 2) increase internship opportunities for students and job placements after graduation

- 3) anticipate needs for new programs; get feedback on effectiveness of existing programs
- 4) enhance service learning as a proven way to improve learning outcomes, through high quality partnerships that work both for students and community partners
- 5) meet state's needs for applied research to promote innovation and economic development and
- 6) improve both undergraduate and graduate student learning outcomes through expanded student research/internship opportunities in real-world settings

The strategies to accomplish these are:

- 1) Funding (there were several funding recommendations);
- 2) System differentiation and clarification of responsibilities (Chancellor's office/campus structures for increased accountability and efficiency and better differentiation of roles);
- 3) Communication and outreach (there were several here too – leveraging connections; building alumni base; marketing CSU based on effectiveness; build better understanding of public benefits from investment in higher education).

Domain 4: Ensuring Success in Student Learning and Domain 1.3

- ❑ **John Tarjan and Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Four**
- ❑ **[Wellman comments are at the end of the report]**

Reconceptualization of Comments and Associated Questions John Tarjan, ASCSU Executive Committee

Goal 1: Students will develop skills for a lifetime.

Objective 1: Students will be able to communicate effectively.

- How do we develop basic proficiencies and develop/reinforce skills throughout the curriculum?

Objective 2: Students will possess and demonstrate the ability to analyze effectively.

- What are the basic analytical proficiencies needed?
- How do we develop basic proficiencies and develop/reinforce skills throughout the curriculum?
- How do we measure proficiency?

Objective 3: Students will be able to work effectively with others in a diverse workplace.

- How do we help students to develop these abilities?
- How do we measure this?

Objective 4: Students will be able to organize tasks and accomplish work effectively.

- Is this better left to the disciplines or can it be built into the general curriculum?
- How can this be measured? When should it be measured (after graduation)?

Goal 2: Every student will succeed.

Strategy 1: Campuses will accommodate student diversity in delivering programs and services.

- What are the critical ways in which our students differ and how can we best accommodate to those differences given our limited resources?
- How can we ensure the faculty and staff will work together effectively to ensure student success?

Objective 1: Students will have a connection with their professors.

- What are the different ways that can best accomplish this objective?
- How do we recognize and reward faculty for the many ways in which they support student learning and development?

Strategy 2: Campuses will take a holistic approach to student development.

- What is the appropriate mix of co-curricular opportunities across a system where the student body profile varies greatly?

Strategy 3: Campuses will intervene early to address student needs.

- What are the best programs and practices across the system?
- How can we eliminate duplication and increase the effectiveness of these programs?
- How can we ensure that faculty and staff work together effectively?

Introduction

I found the task of summarizing the comments and fitting them into a framework daunting. There were many thoughtful and useful insights and suggestions. However, many comments spanned different domains and sub-domains. Some campuses ignored the framework and used their own framework to stimulate discussion. Some emphasized what the campus was currently doing and others broke suggestions down by their level of applicability, usually at the campus and system levels. There was a great variation in amount of abstraction and detail in the reports. I decided not to use staff notes. I also decided to just look for common themes after listing many of the comments from the 22 campus reports.

Repeated Themes/Ideas

- **Resources** constrain MANY worthwhile initiatives and programs. Resource allocations seem to be done without regard to unique campus situations. Too many unfunded mandates take resources away from the core mission.
- **Multiple measures of student success** should be used. Degree completion should not be the sole/primary measure. Many skills were mentioned as being critical including communication, working with others, critical thinking and analysis, and global and intercultural competency.
- There should be more **emphasis on advising and mentoring** including the training of advisors and recognition of their work.
- **Small class size** is a key contributor to quality.
- The **whole campus** should be committed to **supporting outreach**.
- A **holistic approach to student development** needed. Co-curricular activities and civic engagement are important contributors to the college experience.
- I sensed an underlying feeling that **we used to do things better** on our campuses.
- We need to **identify students having problems and intervene early** on.
- We should **communicate more with employers** regarding expectations and actual student outcomes.
- There is widespread support for **diversity** on campuses and in the curriculum.
- **Rigor** is important but should be supported by the administration and by student support services.
- We should find ways to **employ students on campus** rather than off-campus and involve them in research and peer mentoring.
- There should be more **campus autonomy**.
- **Basic skills should be stressed over content**.
- **Global awareness and cultural competency** should be infused into the curriculum.

My Own Observations

- Resource constraints were mentioned a lot by faculty but less by administration. I wonder why this is so.
- Almost every campus seemed to ignore the sub-domain categories/framework.

- Student success/learning-related comments appeared in many domains.

Abstracted Comments by Sub-Domain

Domain 4. Ensuring Success in Student Learning (See appendix for Harry Hellenbrand Summary)

1. Demonstrating the achievement of outcomes-based competencies among students and communicating these outcomes in ways that are clear and accessible to students, parents, and the public.

- Core GE that could form a foundation for future coursework.
- Learning outcomes for all GE courses.
- Require learning goals in the catalog for all degree programs.
- Strengthen communication both ways with community partners regarding outcomes. [2]
- We should specify cognitive, interpersonal and civic outcomes for students.
- Look at value-added and the success of alumni.
- Outcomes: communication [3], self-presentation, understanding diverse perspectives [2], engage in research and evaluate sources, present to multiple audiences, teamwork.
- Be clear in learning expectations. [2]
- It is difficult to define student success. How would the system define it?
- We need to focus on writing.
- Outcome-based education is a strong point of our campus.
- The system should look more towards student learning rather than “throughput.”
- Critical thinking is a key component. [2]
- There should be flexibility across programs.
- Use multiple measures of success for alumni.
- Focus on cognitive, interpersonal, and civic measures.
- Stress discipline mastery, environmental stewardship. [2]
- Leadership, problem solving.
- Character development, integrity, tolerance.
- Electronic portfolios.
- Develop a co-curricular transcript.
- Numeracy.

- Students need to “own” their educational process.
- Culture of evidence.
- Writing across the curriculum.
- Systemically address grade inflation.
- Don’t just focus on graduation. Define student success more broadly.
- Work with employers to develop measures. [2]
- Information literacy.
- Global and cross-cultural competencies. [5]
- Lifelong learning.
- Work as individuals and in groups.
- Emphasize learning rather than getting the “right” answer.
- System support for outcomes assessment. [2]
- More support for institutional research.
- Outcomes for technology, communication, critical thinking, literacy, numeracy, social justice, interaction and civic responsibility [2].

2. Awarding of credit to degrees using rigorous learning experiences both inside and outside the classroom and employing both traditional and nontraditional pedagogy.

- Selectively use technology.
- Hard to define what is tradition vs. nontraditional.
- We need to allow flexibility in pedagogy. [3]
- We have been successful but need more resources.
- We should have more student assistantships.
- Use students for peer mentoring/tutoring.
- Small class size is an important component. We get to know our professors. [3]
- Utilize social networking (myspace, facebook) to reach students.
- Utilize streaming video and pod-casting.
- Rigor is good. We need student support services to accomplish it.
- Train faculty in teaching basic skills in all courses.

- Stress learning in the discipline and experientially.
- Service learning mentioned by several campuses.
- Rigor needs to be supported. [2]
- We need technological equity. [2]
- We need more technology support for teaching. [2]
- Learning takes place inside and outside of the classroom. We need to partner with student services.
- Encourage service learning.

3. *Assuring that comprehensive student advising continues through to graduation from the CSU.*

- Career counseling important.
- Lower teaching loads would allow for more mentoring.
- More training in cultural competency.
- Train the faculty. [3]
- Create a learning commons.
- Degree audits useful. [2]
- Improve/increase advising. [2]
- Several suggestions for using technology.
- Require yearly mandatory advising. [3]
- Same advisor always available. Centralized advising.
- Early focus on undeclared students.
- Reward faculty advising.
- More focus on retention. [2]
- Use peer advising.
- More early advising about majors, careers.

4. *Tracking student success beyond the traditional six-year graduation rate.*

- Do research. Find out why some students are not successful in the CSU.

5. *Measuring and improving transfer student success. AND*

Domain 1. Assuring Access

3. Making the pathway to CSU from community college apparent, and removing barriers to transfer and success.

- Develop some on-line transfer courses.
- Better funding of student outreach. [2]
- Have faculty and others visit CC campuses in their area.
- Why are most CC students not transferring?
- We should tap into the alumni.
- Technology can help.
- Make outreach a campus-wide effort.
- Increase communication with CC counselors.
- Important for CC students to have contact with someone on our campus.
- Offer CC courses on our campus. Respect CC faculty.
- Increase articulation.
- Communicate expectations for preparation better.
- These students should be advised by a CSU advisor.
- We need to improve transfer rates.
- Each CSU should have a staff liaison with area CCs.
- Form partnerships with CCs to increase student preparation.

6. Assessing the success of campus internship programs, and contributions to student success as a result of support from parents, community, and donors.

- Establish standards for internships.
- Students should engage in service learning to help them develop useful skills.

7. Assuring "start-to-finish" support for students with deficiencies in academic preparation from the time they are accepted into the university.

- First year experiences are useful and successful. [3]
- Put more basic skills into the freshman course.
- Early identification of at-risk students.
- More opportunities for advising, mentoring needed. [2]
- Get faculty more involved.

- Use cohorting of students. [2]
- Improve orientation.
- We need effective intervention. [2]
- More advisors, resources
- These students work too much. We need to communicate with them better.

8. *Involving student affairs professionals alongside faculty in providing needed support.*

- We should visit schools together.
- Cross-training.

9. *Ensuring that campus and system policies work in support of student success.*

- Increase opportunities for interdisciplinary cooperation across the system.
- Student aid rules and unit rules cause problems.
- Recognize differences across programs and campuses when it comes to funding.
- The system should support and prioritize its mandates.
- There is not enough aid available to students. [2]
- Reexamine the system funding formulas.
- Long-term class scheduling for predictability.
- Encourage more collaboration across campuses.
- Give incentives for graduation to students.
- The system should provide campuses with more data on students.
- No more unfunded mandates. Give us the resources. [2]

System-Related Comments

- Measures other than graduation.
- Better system-wide tracking of students.
- More shared courses across the system.

10. *Supporting student participation in the research and scholarly and creative activities of faculty*

- Perhaps centralized funding for research (small campuses at a disadvantage). [2 mentions]
- Sponsor discussion on how to do this.

- Recognize the need for funding of research in all disciplines.
- Increase funding for CSU Student Research Competition.
- Publicize what we do.
- We should do more. [2]
- Community-based research is important.
- More resources to support student involvement. [2]

11. Preparing students with a global perspective, language abilities, cross-cultural competencies, and technological capabilities that will lead to successful lives and lifelong learning skills.

- Several mentions of the importance of these. Listed in subdomain 1.
- More study abroad opportunities.

Miscellaneous Comments

- Involve parents in their students' academic career.
- Take a holistic approach to student development. [2 mentions]
- Set expectations at a reasonable level.
- Student engagement is critical to student success. How do you engage our CSU students when they have so many constraints?
- Include diversity in the curriculum and in learning outcomes.
- We need more scholarships.
- Make GE more major-related.
- More support for the scholarship of teaching.
- Co-curricular activities essential for our students.

Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Six [based on John Tarjan's work]:

Strategic context:

- Diversity of students require new strategies for outreach and engagement
- Academic preparation for collegiate level success not adequate among many entering students
- State funding declines has seriously affected capacity and quality
- Rapid changes in economy require commitment to lifelong learning opportunities to meet skills of state
- Technology and impact on learning & delivery of instruction

Goals:

- Demonstrating success in learning outcomes
- Coherence in core GE requirements, w/clear expectations for outcomes
- Increasing global awareness and cultural competency as core outcome
- Learning to learn versus having the right answer
- Cognitive, interpersonal and civic measures
- Leadership, problem solving, character development, integrity, tolerance, numeracy, writing, information literacy
- Meet employer and community expectations for learning results
- Increasing graduation and degree completion

Strategies for achieving goals:

- Assessment of learning – multiple measures; electronic portfolios,
- Review GE curriculum & set clear outcomes based on goals from above
- Outreach
- Awarding of credit using both traditional and nontraditional pedagogy
- Focus on first year student success for high risk students (#7)
- Remove barriers to transfer; increase opportunities for on-line transfer courses
- Improved outreach
- Better orientation and counseling, including peer advising
- More on-campus employment opportunities
- Prioritizing major system initiatives to focus on whole-system needs
- Increase resources, and review funding criteria and formula
- Try to reduce class size, particularly w/high risk students
- Faculty development and training in teaching basic skills in all courses
- Improve use of data (re: graduation; what happens to students after they graduate)

Domain 5: Faculty/Staff Excellence to Promote Student Success

- ❑ **Henry Reichman and Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Five**
- ❑ **[Wellman comments are at the end of the report]**

General Comment:

This is perhaps the easiest domain to summarize, since the consensus across campuses was overwhelming: the CSU needs to rebuild and reinvest in its faculty and staff and provide adequate support for their work, the nature of which has changed dramatically in recent decades. Although I found no specific reference to Cornerstones Principle 4 in any of the campus reports (although admittedly I skimmed some), one could readily describe the consensus that emerged in this domain as advocating a reaffirmation of that principle, perhaps expanded to highlight in particular the need to rebuild the full-time tenure-track faculty. There was also a strong consensus that rebuilding and reinvesting in faculty and staff is an extremely high resource priority.

Major Themes:

The following quotes (slightly edited) from the reports represent themes that were frequently repeated in nearly all the reports.

General

1. "Faculty and students emphasized that the quality and diversity of the faculty and staff are central to student success because it takes dedicated people to offer the instruction and provide the services that students need to learn effectively. They specifically called for the system and the State to address faculty workload, compensation and the composition of the faculty (the latter through implementation of ACR 73...)." (CSUEB)
2. "To achieve excellence the CSU must pay attention to the morale of its faculty and staff. Currently, faculty and staff morale is at an all-time low. The CSU must invest financially in its labor infrastructure and in effective management of that labor infrastructure. Only through this commitment will it earn the "devotion" of the staff and the faculty to achieve excellence."(CSUB)
3. "Faculty and staff do not have enough time to meet the increased demands and expectations of their jobs. Rising expectations and finite time affect their ability to adequately address the needs of students. . . . There is also frustration with the current system of roles, rewards and recognition among faculty and staff. Needs include affordable housing, better communication tools and websites that carry vital information. Faculty and staff want both monetary and psychic recognition for where they are, where they are going, and what they are doing very well." (CSUN)
4. "Increase substantial support for the library as the preeminent learning resource for faculty and students (traditional collections and digital resources)." (Stanislaus)
5. "It is perhaps an understatement to say that this topic permeates many others. Faculty especially – but staff, too – feel underpaid, overwhelmed by housing costs, overworked,

swamped by updates and mandates, and under-appreciated.” (Hellenbrand summary, but worth repeating)

Faculty

1. “We cannot achieve excellence without excellent faculty.” (Sonoma)
2. “The importance of faculty quality can not be understated as it pertains to student success. Currency I the course content and awareness of future trends in the field are central to the quality experience for students. The recruitment and retention of these high-quality and diverse faculty provide the stability and direction for the campus. . . . Faculty are the heart of the institution, in fact they ARE the institution. So recruiting new faculty who are committed to the dual mission of teaching/scholarship is critical.” (CSUSB)
3. “Hiring faculty, especially in the professional fields such as business and nursing, has become a significant challenge. However, keeping faculty once hired is becoming an even greater challenge.” (CSUB)
4. “Increased reliance on temporary faculty has reduced tenure-track faculty, which impacts students and remaining tenure-track faculty in negative ways. The Board of Trustees needs to provide funds for tenure-track faculty and ACR 73 implementation.”(CSUDH)
5. “Mandates from the Chancellor’s Office add to the workload of faculty.” (CSUDH)
6. “Salaries have gone down in five years, but workload has increased. How can we sustain the university without adjusting the funding formula?” (CSUDH)
7. “Offer access to affordable housing (lower-interest rates/short-term housing for incoming faculty and administrators); day-care; offer higher relocation dollars.” (CSUFr)
8. “In Cornerstones, the CSU recognized the relationship between research and teaching effectiveness, yet there is currently no recognition in a faculty member’s workload that RTP requirements necessitate research/creative activity. The CSU should provide sufficient support for, and reward to, teacher-scholars and it should redefine the faculty workload to provide time for research/creative activity.” (CSULA)

Staff

1. “There are embarrassingly few recognition/award programs for staff. Salaries for staff are frequently insensitive to educational level, unlike that for most of the faculty.” (CSUB)

Consensus on System Goals and Priorities:

1. Increase compensation and decrease/adjust workload for faculty and staff in order to recruit and retain quality individuals and address morale problems.

2. Implement ACR 73.
3. Improve labor relations and ensure that the system of roles, rewards, and recognition aligns actual work assignments with clear rewards and recognition.
4. Invest in and rethink faculty development efforts to address needs in *both* traditional classroom teaching and online education.
5. Provide greater support for faculty research/creative activity and reexamine the appropriate role of research in the CSU.
6. Rethink the enrollment-based funding model in light of the above goals and priorities.
7. Strengthen shared governance, planning and decision-making in order better to involve faculty and staff in the future of the institution.

Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Five [based on Hank Reichman's work]:

This is very straightforward as the author suggests – but may present some challenges if you do want to consider some recasting of themes into the buckets of context, goals, and strategies. If you do want to do that, I think it breaks down as follows (with some extrapolation between the lines to fill in context where it's been left out):

Strategic context

- 1) Funding erosions combined with student enrollment growth and change – reductions in tenure-track faculty; growth in part-time faculty – fundamentally challenging capacity to sustain teaching-intensive learning environments needed for student success
- 2) In addition, compensation has failed to keep pace with comparison institutions – compensation problems seriously affecting capacity to recruit and retain, particularly in certain high demand/high cost discipline areas – but generally as well
- 3) Growing expectations for responsibilities for faculty work in assessment and improvement of learning – from significant and relatively recent expectations for 'accountability' – more workload pressure on faculty and academic leadership
- 4) Growing responsibilities and needs for professional student service and academic support – advising, counseling, reaching new student populations, distance-learning and technology
- 5) Rapid changes in technology and changing student circumstances increase need for continuous attention to faculty development

6) Aging faculty means turnover highly likely to increase – meaning serious need for attention to recruitment and retention of new faculty

Goals

- 1) Maintain capacity for high quality teaching-centered institution through investment in high quality, committed, involved faculty
- 2) Continue significant faculty leadership in academic policy affecting teaching and learning (I'm not sure how to say this – but one of the goals it seems to me is to have faculty – not administrators – defining academic policy in areas of teaching and learning standards, curriculum development and change, and use of technology to support teaching and research. This has consequences on workload too – strategy issues below – but the goal is academically-defined content and quality expectations. I think...)
- 3) Meet needs of state and regions for workforce, applied research, and high quality professional education (implications for research role for faculty, which I didn't see referenced as much in this document as in some other domains. I suggest thinking of a way to include it here, since the expectation for an expanded research role for faculty should be led by the broader purpose behind that.)

Strategies

- 1) Increase compensation; increase full-time faculty
- 2) Significantly expand professional development
- 3) Recognize workload responsibilities associated with research, academic leadership for accountability, through appropriate compensation or release time for faculty leaders
- 4) Consider faculty housing (? Not sure if that's recommended)
- 5) Comprehensive plan for faculty renewal and replacement (is this system or campus? What is the system role?)
- 7) Implement ACR 73
- 8) Rethink basis for allocation of resources re: workload, enrollment, and faculty
- 9) Not stated in the document, but implicit I think: Better system-level research documenting relation between faculty attributes (small class size, full-time faculty, access to resources for faculty development) and effectiveness in student access and success

Domain Six: Campus and System Identity and Domain One: Section 2

- **Barry Pasternack and Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Four**
- **[Wellman's comments are at the end of the report].**

Domain One Section 2: Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholder – Addressing the Needs of Special Learners

Current Strengths

- System - ATI initiative
- Campuses - Disability Offices
- System - Center for Alternative Media
- Adaptive technology is available to students

What Could Be Done Better in the Future

- Campuses and System – Increase Distance Learning Offerings
- Ensure that course materials are ADA compliant
- Develop programs which comply with ADA requirements

Needed Changes

- Campuses and System – Improve web site access for people with disabilities

How Could the Use of Technology Improve Processes

- System – ATI initiative
- System – Center for Alternative Media

Domain Six: Campus and System Identity

General Comment

As one might expect from campus based conversations, focus on the system identity was not generally the focus of the campus conversations. In fact, a number of campuses did not even include a discussion of Domain 6 in their campus conversations. Below are listed major themes, some interesting ideas, and an identification of strengths, future areas of improvements, needed changes, and how technology could be used to improve processes.

One aspect that did not seem to be addressed in the conversations is the impact of how technology will be changing higher education. As more universities move towards putting educational content on-line freely accessible to the world, it seems reasonable that the way students will get academic content will change dramatically. Additionally, students seem to be doing less reading today than they did a generation ago. Analyzing the effects of these phenomena should be part of the strategic planning process

Preliminary Sorting of Major Themes

- Campus funding is inadequate
- Campus funding formula should move from a strictly FTES model

- Campuses have distinct missions
- Campuses should have freedom to pursue their mission
- CSU provides a high quality affordable education
- The co-curricular experience students gain in college is important
- We need to stop thinking of ourselves as a second choice to the UC

Interesting Ideas

- Have students write letters to policy maker as an assignment for their writing courses
- Offer remedial classes on Friday mornings when campus facilities are not fully utilized
- Fund campuses based on outcomes and not just FTES
- Consider a CSU On-Line University

Current Strengths

- Campuses - Serving as a community resource
- Campuses – Developed unique identities
- Campuses – Developed distinct missions
- Campuses – Graduates are ready to join the workforce
- System – Working together allows unified effort in lobbying Sacramento and Washington
- System - The size of the CSU gives us clout
- Campuses and System – We have many alumni still living in California
- Campuses and System – Education is accessible and affordable
- Campuses and System – Outreach to underrepresented communities
- Campuses – Close student-faculty interactions
- Campuses – A good balance between teaching and research; a focus on applied research

What Could Be Done Better in the Future

- System – Develop campuses where there is a demonstrated need
- Campuses - Better branding at the campus level
- System – Better define its mission statement
- Campuses and System – Maintain facilities and equipment
- Campuses and System – Provide the resources needed for faculty to carry out research
- System – Better communication between the CO and the campuses
- System – Allow more flexibility for campuses to pursue their distinct missions
- Campuses and System – Change the funding formula to recognize distinct missions, campus size, and needs
- System – Improve labor relations with employees
- System – Clear delineation of accountability measures against which system performance can be measured
- Campuses and System – Reduce costs of course materials to students

- Campuses and System – Improve inter-campus communication and sharing of ideas. Increase regional meetings in which campuses can share experiences and ideas
- Campuses and System - Increase visibility of the campuses and CSU regionally, nationally, and internationally
- Campuses and System - Better data collection to be able to bolster claims
- System – Better promote distance learning courses
- Campuses and System – Increase focus on graduate education and life-long learning
- System – Campus funding could move to be aligned with the success in achieving its mission
- Campuses – Better tie in with business community through internships and consulting projects
- System – Develop a student fee schedule that is consistent with system goals
- System – Develop a housing assistance plan that would enable newly hired faculty to be able to afford to purchase a home
- Campuses – Be viewed by the community as a resource for lifetime learning
- Campuses – Student recruitment
- Campuses – Offer more students a residential experience
- Campuses and System – Clearly define the technology skill expectations for our students
- Campuses – Give greater prominence to the fact that they are part of a system
- Campuses – Incorporate successful alumni into a campus image campaign
- Campuses and System – Examine whether some functions currently handled at the system level might be better left to the campuses

Needed Change

- System – Modify funding formula to account for different campus missions and needs
- System – Work to change the Master Plan for Higher Education
- Campuses and System – Work to have adequate funds for equipment and facilities so that we can fulfill our mission
- System – Redefine general education requirements to also include technology skills
- Campuses and System - Improve communication with constituencies
- Campuses and System – Fund graduate programs differentially
- Campuses - Increase international exposure of our students
- Campuses and System – Faster responses to legislative threats
- System – Better coordinate distance learning programs on different campuses so that efforts are not unnecessarily duplicated
- System - Investigate the academic calendar
- System – Investigate a student fee schedule that encourages students to be good consumers of state resources
- Campuses – Increase the number of tenured and tenure track faculty
- Campuses and System – Develop a definition of workload that recognizes the multiple dimension of faculty contributions

- System – Compensation system is not competitive for certain disciplines
- Campuses - Development of summer and weekend programs for high school students to acclimate them with a college experience
- Campuses – Develop more on-campus student housing
- Campuses and System – Development of a new costing model for course materials
- Campuses and System - Development of an appropriate balance of centralized and local policies
- System – Hold Trustee Meetings on different campuses so that the campus can get a better understanding of CSU governance
- Campuses - Encourage students to spend all their years in college at the same place

How Could the Use of Technology Improve Processes

- System – Better analysis of information
- Campuses and System – Use of technology to “tell our story”
- Campuses - Increase distance learning courses
- Campuses – Develop electronic waiting lists to assist students in getting needed classes
- System – Use the “bargaining power” of the system to reduce technology costs

Jane Wellman's comments on Domain Six [based on Barry Pasternack's work]

1) Strategic context

- * Funding history and prospects (recent budget cuts; constraints; need for growth)
- * Rising presence of technology - with implications for the timing and delivery of instruction and services (calendar, distance-learning); the role of the system/campus; and for the ways that students learn and organize information (specifically mentioned that students are not reading as much as they used to or should be)
- * State Master Plan in limbo; state "policy audience" no longer located just in Sacramento, but policy audience involves communication to multiple constituencies across the state and nationally (my rephrasing of these issues)

2) Goals - efficient and effective accomplishment of educational goals and learning outcomes accomplished through differentiated strategies across campuses with different strengths and weaknesses; capitalizing on system strengths where there is greatest value-added and capacity

3) Strategic initiatives to meet goals:

- * System-level changes in the distribution of funds, based more on outcomes and recognizing the higher costs of graduate programs
- * Increase full-time and tenured faculty; consider compensation differences for some disciplines
- * System and campus support for high school student summer and weekend programs to acclimate them to a college experience
- * System coordination of distance-learning programs across campuses
- * Increase distance learning courses; develop electronic waiting lists to assist students in getting needed classes
- * System review of academic calendar, costing model for course materials
- * System regulation based on evidence-based accountability for results, less on process; requires better analysis and communication of performance information
- * System level review of general educational outcomes for proper inclusion of technology skills, to increase attention to international exposure,
- * System-level communication strategies - for advocacy, for outreach, to reach multiple policy audiences
- * System attention to state master plan and state policy basis for future funding stability and quality
- * System/campus: hold trustee meetings on different campuses to encourage better understanding of CSU governance