

*Evaluation of Achievements Under Cornerstones*

*Presented to the*

*Board of Trustees of the California State University*

*September 2006*

## *Evaluation of Achievements under Cornerstones*

### ***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY***

In the years since the Board of Trustees adopted *Cornerstones* and the *Cornerstones Implementation Plan*, much has been accomplished within the CSU to achieve the principles and priorities identified in those documents. Especially by means of the Accountability Process adopted by the Board in November 1999, extensive data have been gathered and reported over these years that confirm the significant progress that has been made in many of these identified areas. The Facilitating Graduation Initiative that was adopted by the Board in 2003 has served to enhance such progress, especially in areas related to quality of student experience, retention, time to degree, and graduation rates.

The survey of achievements under *Cornerstones* that forms the basis of this report should give the Board of Trustees great satisfaction in the progress that has been made. To summarize the findings of this analysis, achievements across the system have been especially noteworthy in the following areas:

- Principle 1: CSU faculty have worked assiduously to define outcomes and assessments for courses and for major degree programs. With faculty partnership, we are now experimenting with ways to assess the baccalaureate as a whole and ways to provide public indicators of “value-added” learning.
- Principle 2: The CSU has added fresh emphasis on student success, has reviewed and streamlined degree programs, has developed and shared ways to facilitate the progress of students toward their degree, and has launched a major reform of lower division transfer programs for California Community College students who wish to pursue a CSU degree.
- Principle 3: Progress in increasing student partnership in active learning has been encouraging, though somewhat uneven. Especially positive developments have occurred in the areas of Community Service Learning, student research and creative activities, establishment of learning communities, and increasing development of internships.
- Principle 5: The CSU has increased its outreach efforts to underserved communities and has continued to implement strategic initiatives designed to increase the academic preparation of first-time freshmen and transfer students.
- Principle 7: The CSU has successfully negotiated compact agreements with two separate State administrations in the past decade. Although work with state officials and other higher education institutions to develop a statewide student fee and financial aid policy has not been successful, some elements of a student fee policy are contained in the compact agreement with the current Governor.
- Principle 8: Significant progress has been made in developing strategies for funding in the identified areas, although intervening State budget problems have delayed the implementation of such strategies in some areas—notably including the strategies for achieving competitive salaries for all groups of CSU employees.

- Principle 9: The CSU has developed multiple ways of increasing its accountability to the Board of Trustees and to external stakeholders, including the Accountability Process, the CSU Economic Impact Study, and Annual Teacher Education Evaluation and Accountability initiative.
- Principle 10: The CSU has remained consistent in respect for the autonomy of campuses in developing their respective missions, and has implemented many policy changes over the past decade to reduce or eliminate, where possible, policy and regulatory constraints in program development.

A few of the principles and priorities identified under *Cornerstones*, however, have not been as well addressed. Lack of progress in these areas has been due primarily to constraints (and contractions) resulting from budget difficulties at the state level. These areas include:

- Principle 4: Whereas there has been a significant effort to improve teaching and learning in the CSU, there has been only a modest increase in the infrastructure to support all of the crucial duties of a faculty member.
- Principle 6: Although continuing/extended education has been a source of program innovation, there have been few sustained initiatives in graduate education within the CSU during the past decade, as the CSU has sought—unsuccessfully, until the current budget year—a “differential” in funding for graduate-level FTES and authority to offer an independent Ed.D. degree.
- Principle 8: As noted above, it will be important for the CSU to identify resources to implement the strategies that have been developed to reduce salary gaps for all categories of employees for whom such gaps exist.

Given the successes achieved by the CSU and its constituent campuses under the strategic plan known as *Cornerstones*, and the degree to which progress in many of these strategic areas has become part of the way the CSU does business, it would not seem necessary for a successor strategic plan to focus on those same areas. The smaller number of strategic areas where progress has been more limited, however, should probably be considered as potential concerns and priorities in the planning exercise.

**INTRODUCTION :**  
**THE DECADE SINCE THE LAUNCHING OF CORNERSTONES**

Cornerstones was launched in 1996 by the CSU with a 24-member group representing trustees, faculty, students, presidents, and senior system administrators. The task forces completed papers in March 1997 and the group developed basic principles involving a series of areas:

- **Principle 1.** Undergraduate student learning.
- **Principle 2.** Efficient and effective programs and services for undergraduates.
- **Principle 3.** Active learning and partnerships for undergraduates.
- **Principle 4.** Rewards and development in faculty teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity.
- **Principle 5.** Undergraduate access to and retention in the CSU.
- **Principle 6.** Graduate and continuing education.
- **Principles 7 and 8.** Higher education financing shared among the State, the CSU system, the CSU campuses, CSU faculty and staff, CSU alumni/ae, and CSU students and their families.
- **Principle 9.** CSU accountability in facilitating the development of its students, in serving its communities, and in contributing to the State's economy and society.
- **Principle 10.** CSU campus autonomy in mission, identity, and programs within system policy goal.

In January 1998, the *Cornerstones Report* was endorsed by the Board of Trustees, and in March 1999, the Board approved the *Cornerstones Implementation Plan*. In November 1999, the Board approved the CSU Accountability Process, which – under *Cornerstones* Principle 9—called on campuses to report on progress in eight performance areas, selected as of most interest to the State, Trustees, alumni/ae, students and their families. These performance areas, relating primarily to Principles 1, 2, 3, 5, and 8, are:

- **Quality of baccalaureate degree programs**
- **Access to the CSU**
- **Progression to the degree**
- **Persistence and graduation**
- **Relations with K-12 – College readiness**
- **College readiness after one year**
- **Facilities utilization**
- **University advancement**

In response to the Accountability Plan, three biennial reports have been presented to the Board, in the fall of 2000, 2002, and 2004, with a fourth due in November 2006. Beyond these Accountability reports, there has been no single summary of the CSU's achievements under the *Cornerstones Implementation Plan*.

Recognizing that ten years have passed since the launching of the *Cornerstones* initiative, the Board of Trustees resolved at its July 2006 meeting to receive and consider a report at its September 2006 meeting on the CSU's achievements under *Cornerstones*, as well as a proposal for a successor planning initiative.

Underlying every *Cornerstones* principle and recommendation was the objective of developing educated and productive citizens. To achieve that end, faculty were asked to focus their efforts on generating creative, integrative, and collaborative ways in which the system, under the principle of collective investment but respect for variation among campuses, could move forward to implement *Cornerstones*. For example, campuses were asked to commit to development of learning outcomes and their assessment; public school outreach; faculty development and support; baccalaureate education; graduate and post-baccalaureate education; and accountability. The CSU system committed to working to develop a coherent and adequate funding structure for higher education in California, as well as specific funding strategies to support the necessary costs of advancing quality education, including investment in technology and faculty development. The ultimate goal of all of these initiatives was to ensure a productive teaching and learning environment of high quality, strengthen student development, and expand access to CSU's services.

In the course of carrying out the Principles and priorities of *Cornerstones* over the past decade, the CSU has developed a number of *ad hoc* strategies to advance its basic mission, including innovative and effective outreach efforts to P-12 and California's leading industries, institution of the nationally-acclaimed Early Assessment Program to improve college readiness of the State's high school graduates, the Lower Division Transfer Pattern initiative designed to improve articulation for transfer students into the CSU, and the twenty-two initiatives known as the Board of Trustees' Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation Initiative. In some areas, there has been impressive planning and thinking. The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) has completed strong studies on graduate education and faculty workload, and the CSU, ASCSU, and California Faculty Association together developed a far-reaching study with recommendations for improvement of "tenure/tenure-track density" throughout the CSU system. Largely because of California's budget difficulties, however, some issues identified in *Cornerstones* as priorities have not received as much attention as had been hoped. This report discusses both the successful achievements and the areas that may require further sustained attention in a successor planning initiative.

What follows is a discussion of achievements in each of the ten performance areas laid out in the ten Principles of *Cornerstones*.

## PRINCIPLE 1

**The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning as determined by our faculty. The CSU will state explicitly what a graduate of the California State University is expected to know, and will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values.**

1a. Campus Priority -- Each university will have a faculty-determined, comprehensive set of general education outcomes that are sufficiently specific to support a public declaration of educational results, and sufficiently general to allow each college and department to develop its own educational outcomes. (By fall, 2002)

1b. Campus Priority -- Each university faculty will have systems of learning assessment that enable students to demonstrate learning in both courses and programs. These assessment tools will be developed with a broad consensus as to their proper use and will vary substantially among the disciplines. (By fall, 2002)

1c. Campus Priority -- Each university will periodically collect, analyze, and evaluate evidence of the extent to which its students are achieving the learning outcomes to which it is publicly committed. (Beginning fall, 2002 or sooner)

1d. Campus Priority -- Each university will use the assessment results in their process for review and improvement of programs. (Beginning fall, 2002 or sooner)

1e. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will devote sufficient resources to faculty development and the resources and time required to develop appropriate assessment techniques to redesign programs, and to shape definitions of credit, including responding to individual university requests for exceptions, on a pilot-basis, to certain system requirements. (Continuing funding and program priority)

**Progress Summary.** CSU faculty have worked assiduously to define outcomes and assessments for courses and for major degree programs. Course and program reviews are firmly in place. Capstone courses and standardized tests in professional programs (such as business, nursing, engineering, and many others) are widely in use. These assessments have pointed the way to program improvements. Whereas we have made great progress in outcomes and assessments, we are still experimenting with ways to assess the baccalaureate as a whole, and ways to provide public indicators of “value-added” learning.

Although interest in defining and assessing the outcomes of student learning has grown steadily for at least the past decade, attention to this topic has heightened more intensely in the past few years. Existing grass-roots efforts in the CSU were enhanced by an important emphasis on a “culture of evidence” from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), our regional accreditor, which, in turn, coincided with the renewed commitment to assessment expressed in the *Cornerstones* report which stated that; “The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning, as determined by our faculty” (Principle 1).

Annual campus reports show four key characteristics of the CSU’s approach to identifying and assessing student learning.

- A wide variety of assessment activities are occurring on multiple fronts: at the level of the individual course, the program, and the institution as a whole.

- The most comprehensive and successful assessment activities have been occurring in the professional fields.
- Campuses have made more progress in assessing the outcomes of student learning in academic majors than in general education.
- Campuses are exploring various ways to verify and certify that learning outcomes and assessment methods have been developed.

It appears that assessment is most readily engaged at the most comprehensive or the narrowest level. Institutions find that the most expedient and readily available methods are surveys of student perception and/or satisfaction. At the other extreme, assessment methods focus on course tests. Much more demanding and therefore much more infrequently and more tentatively engaged is the assessment of cumulative and comprehensive student learning. In these efforts, faculty collectively define specific competencies that students must achieve and then measure whether or not a student has achieved these expectations (1b). Achieving this level of assessment is still a challenge for many academic programs in the CSU.

Those who have met the challenge most successfully tend to be professional disciplines that have special accreditations and external state licensing examinations. Special accrediting agencies generally require specification of learning outcomes in programs that prepare students directly for careers, such as nursing, education, business, and engineering. These departments tend to have extensive assessment programs to ensure excellence in student performance and to permit periodic measurement of how effectively students are being prepared for state licensing examinations.

In addition, greater progress in assessment has been made in assessing learning outcomes in degree programs than in general education. There are many reasons why assessing learning outcomes in general education is more difficult. The desired competencies (writing, speaking, critical thinking, etc.) are taught in many different courses and in many different departments, which makes assessment a logistical challenge; many of the courses are taught by part-time faculty who are not thoroughly integrated into the assessment culture of the institution; and obtaining university-wide consensus on specific competencies and assessment methods is no easy task. Nevertheless, most campuses have developed approved statements of general education goals and objectives, and several are experimenting with pilot assessments (1a). Probably the most fully developed general assessment process is in place at San José State. Nonetheless, all of the CSU campuses have embarked upon this difficult endeavor.

Assessment efforts are being monitored, guided, and supported through several different mechanisms. All agree that the assessment of student learning outcomes must be integrated into the regular operations of the university and not be seen as an add-on. Therefore, most CSU institutions include the requirement for outcomes assessment as part of the traditional Program Review process. On some campuses, departments are asked to prepare annual assessment reports, which are reviewed by the college dean, the academic senate, and the provost (1c, 1d).

CSU campuses have worked hard to have fully functioning learning assessment systems in place. This is significant for complying with the criteria outlined in the new WASC Standards. The new accreditation criteria include: “All degrees — undergraduate and graduate — awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.”

Campuses report that every baccalaureate degree program has established student learning objectives, and many publicly have posted degree program learning objectives so that students, the public, and employers all know what the degree means.

Annual campus assessment reports tend to be rich in detail and especially useful in program reviews and in strengthening course expectations and articulation.

## *PRINCIPLE 2*

**Students are the focus of the academic enterprise. Each campus will shape the provision of its academic programs and support services to meet better the diverse needs of its students and society.**

2a. Campus Priority -- In accord with Board of Trustee program review policy, each university shall make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures. These campus criteria and procedures will be designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to, among others, societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities. The views of students, alumni/ae, and employers should regularly be sought concerning what programs are needed and the extent to which existing programs are yielding important student outcomes. (Policies and practices amended by fall, 2000)

2b. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will ensure that all students are able to complete baccalaureate degree program requirements within a reasonable length of time. Recognizing that on some campuses there is a large population of students who must support themselves while attending the university, no time-to-degree limit will be imposed. The Board of Trustees will reduce the Title 5 baccalaureate degree unit requirement from 124 to 120 units. Each campus will re-examine the unit requirements for graduation and provide a monitoring system to ensure that acceptable justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the normative minimum of 120 units. (Policy amended by January, 2000; campus requirements amended by fall, 2001)

2c. Campus Priority -- Each university will ensure effective services for all students, including those with non-traditional schedules, such as older and working students. These academic and student development services should be evaluated regularly to ensure effectiveness. (Continuing commitment)

2d. Campus Priority -- Each university will design its academic calendars and class schedules to maximize the availability of courses in a significantly wider range of times and modes, both with regard to the weekly schedule of courses and the fuller use of the calendar year. (Continuing commitment)

2e. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will redesign current standards and processes for facilities utilization, so that the universities can offer courses when appropriate throughout the year and throughout the hours of every day of every week, to enhance student-faculty contact, advising, and instruction. (Continuing commitment)

**Progress Summary.** At both the campus and system levels, the CSU has added fresh emphasis on student success to a university already deeply committed to that goal. CSU has reviewed and streamlined degree programs, has developed and shared ways to facilitate the progress of CSU's diverse students to their baccalaureate degree objectives, and has launched a major reform of lower division transfer programs at California Community Colleges to the CSU degree.

The CSU can forward notable examples of success in shaping campus academic programs to better meet the diverse needs of both students and society:

- The CSU Board of Trustees reduced the Title 5 baccalaureate degree unit minimum from 124 to 120 semester units in January 2000, and following appropriate faculty review a large number of degree programs accordingly reduced unit requirements (2b). A small number of programs, most driven by technical and accreditation requirements (e.g., engineering) continue above the 120 unit level. Program performance reviews recurrently include review of units to degree in these programs.
- With the goal of forging an efficient pathway to the degree, the Board of Trustees in 2004 established the Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) program to provide for students who begin their academic careers in a California Community College (CCC) a best pathway to graduation in a specific degree major at a specific CSU (2b). Implemented via a strong partnership with the CSU statewide Academic Senate and

CCCs, forty-six degree majors had LDTP's by Fall 2006, providing bright line pathways to more than 90% of students who transfer to CSU at the upper division. The project is continuing, with online implementation and a large course articulation project set for 2006-07 and beyond. (See also discussion at Principle 5.)

Review of academic programs is recurrent and meaningful on all campuses. These reviews have become more assessment-focused over time, in part as institutions have responded to evolving WASC requirements, and to professional accreditation requirements (2a). At Sonoma State University, for example, campus policy specifies that program review "is a periodic process that incorporates the findings of ongoing program assessment and focuses attention on specific areas for program improvement." The campus guide advises that these ongoing processes "are investments in the future of the University." Every campus has made assessment resources available on its assessment web site, providing faculty with "how to" instruction, advice, templates, and sample assessment tools.

Parallel to academic program reviews, CSU campuses have undertaken reviews of student services programs with the goal of best practice implementation and overall improvement (2c). To advance this familiar strong practice, CSU fully implemented in 2006 systemwide policy that mandates biennial systematic program review of student services programs.

More broadly, providing effective academic support services to all students, including those with non-traditional schedules, has long been a CSU and campus priority (2c). In July 2005 the Board of Trustees directed the Chancellor to seek renewed emphasis on this longstanding commitment, which resulted in a "Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation" program. Twenty-two specific points are featured across six general categories:

- ◇ *Efficiency in Program Design* underscores continuing interest in both general education and degree-major curricula that achieve learning outcomes within 120 semester units;
- ◇ *Supporting Students in Choosing an Efficient Pathway to the Baccalaureate* emphasizes aid to students in making timely life, career, and degree-major choices;
- ◇ *Tools to Keep Students on Efficient Pathways to the Baccalaureate* makes a priority of degree roadmaps, class schedules that support roadmaps, and effective tutoring and supplementary learning, together with campus policy action on subjects including withdrawals from classes;
- ◇ *Strong Advising Strategies and Practices* asks campuses to embrace with vigor best practices, including a full utilization of rich Common Management System information capabilities in support for such things as automated degree audits;
- ◇ *Campus Monitoring and Feedback* includes the provision of "dashboard" student success information to key decision-makers, plus focused visits by peer teams drawn from distinguished senior faculty and administrators across the CSU; and
- ◇ *Assuring the Priority of Facilitating Graduation* calls upon presidents to make priority support decisions for these efforts, and so to report to the Board.

Peer teams have found student success to be a high priority at every campus visited. Teams—formed in a strong partnership with the statewide Academic Senate—have also found examples of strong practices that will be featured in an October 2006 systemwide student success conference.

As of the current (2006-07) College Year, the CSU has begun to monitor the extent to which students are efficiently making their way to degree. Initial evaluations are that CSU graduation rates are at or above the rates of comparable campuses, and trends indicate improvement.

Campuses have little in the way of sustained progress to show in the matter of scheduling classes at nontraditional days and hours (2d, 2e). In the baseline year, 1998-99, 68,713 College Year FTES of instruction were held after 4 pm, for example. By College Year (CY) 2002-03, the amount of instruction offered and taken after 4 pm had risen to 84,083 CY FTES. This four-year increase was equivalent to the amount of instruction offered and taken annually at a campus the size of East Bay. A fair observer could have concluded that CSU was making progress in assuring a class schedule that responds to the needs of working adults. Unfortunately, the recession and budget exigencies reduced the level of such offerings by about 2,000 CY FTES in 2003-04 and 2004-05.

At the same time, growth in state-supported summer instruction has stalled in the face of both budget woes and interpretations of the faculty contract that removed degrees of scheduling freedom from the campuses. In summer 1998, 5,074 CY FTES of instruction was offered and taken. By summer 2002, this figure had risen to 19,645 CY FTES. As above, this four-year increase in state-supported summer instruction was akin to that offered and taken at a campus the size of East Bay. Working adults, graduating seniors, and incoming fall freshmen to address remedial needs before the start of the academic year were provided a substantial increase in true access. However, in summer 2004, state-supported summer instruction dropped to a little under 10,000 FTES. While summer 2005 and summer 2006 are showing rebounds, they have not yet reached the summer 2004 high point.

The use of Fridays for instruction continues to be light. While a little over 20,000 FTES are offered and taken systemwide on Fridays, this represents no change between 1998-99 and 2004-05. Yet we have seen examples of successful Friday class schedules at few CSU campuses. For example, at CSU Long Beach, Friday FTES in 1998-99 was 908, and that had risen to 1,234 CY FTES by 2004-05. This was achieved largely by scheduling first-time freshman classes on Monday, Wednesday, *and* Friday.

It also has been assumed that technology-mediated instruction—especially the type of instruction that does not require seat time at a specific location—would increase substantially with the investments that the system and campuses have made in technology. Many observers agree that nontraditional students, including time-constrained working adults, are especially attracted to such “e-learning.” Enrollment figures in state-supported instruction were first collected in college year 2001-02, when 2,164 FTES were served. By college year 2004-05, the figure had risen to 3,345 CY FTES.

As of 2006 it seems clear that increases in the provision of instruction at convenient days and hours are being realized, and will be yet more evident in years immediately ahead,

through the use of Internet-based course and degree program offerings. A survey completed in June 2006 found that thirty full CSU degree programs were being offered online at the master's level, with 12 fully online bachelor's-level degree programs and 2 fully online credential programs also provided. Senior leaders in the Chancellor's Office are making plans to encourage the strategic development of additional baccalaureate degrees as a means for reaching time- and place-bound students who otherwise find access to CSU difficult.

### *PRINCIPLE 3*

**Students will be expected to be active partners with faculty in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.**

3a. Campus Priority -- Each university will require that all students work with faculty and staff in planning their academic careers to include taking a more active role in their own learning and the development and improvement of academic programs and services. (Continuing commitment)

3b. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each campus will facilitate such practices of active learning as collaborative learning, internships, problem solving, and the use of interactive technology. (Continuing activity)

3c. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each campus will provide opportunities and arrangements for students to engage in community-service learning experiences. (Continuing activity)

3d. Campus Priority -- Each campus will expand student involvement in scholarship, research, and creative activity under faculty guidance, because these activities are central to the teaching and learning mission of a comprehensive university. (Continuing activity)

**Progress Summary.** Progress has been encouraging but somewhat uneven. Since 2000, the CSU has allocated \$8.8 million in supplemental funding to provide infrastructure for community service learning, and this investment has paid off extremely well. In addition, the CSU has invested significantly in instructional technology and has continued its ongoing programs to encourage undergraduate research. However, there has not yet been a well-funded, sustained effort to promote faculty-student partnerships in the areas of internships, research, and creative activity in the undergraduate program.

A major development in the past decade has been the creation of “learning communities.” (3a, 3b) These are classes that are linked or clustered during an academic term and enroll a common cohort of students. The goal of learning communities is to encourage students to be engaged with their coursework and with the university community. In fostering learning communities, the CSU has developed many models for helping students become more involved in the learning process. These models include various forms of learning communities, such as intensive seminars and first-year experience courses.

Learning communities are characterized by courses that are thematically linked and through which students proceed as a cohort. At CSU East Bay, the learning community is called the Freshman GE Cluster Program and is structured so that entering freshmen complete all lower-division GE in their freshman and sophomore years. Freshmen enroll as a cohort in a three-quarter thematically linked sequence. At Humboldt State, freshmen can choose to enroll in the Freshman Interest Group (FIG), which clusters from two to four courses related by a theme such as “exploring natural resources.” These courses meet GE or major requirements.

A second model in the CSU is the intensive seminar for new freshmen. At San José State, for example, the Metropolitan University Scholar's Experience (MUSE) program for new freshmen includes over 100 seminars that are limited to 15 students per seminar. In addition to intensive study, freshmen are expected to participate in a variety of other colloquia and cultural activities.

Because many students enrolling in the CSU are first-generation students who are unfamiliar with the practices of higher education, the first-year experience courses, for which students earn GE credit, cover a range of topics, including academic skill development, the values of higher education, introduction to the academic disciplines, knowledge of campus support services, leadership skills, and transitioning to college.

In addition to helping new students become more engaged with their studies, the CSU also provides opportunities for upper-division students to deepen their knowledge of their chosen fields of studies. Many students participate in internships and work about ten to twenty hours a week in a community setting. In addition to learning more about the professional fields via their internships, students are also expected to produce a body of work that is of value to the community site. Whereas most students take an internship near the university, CSU students also have access to internships in other locations. The Sacramento Semester Internship, for example, places students in a variety of state government and legislative internship positions. Other CSU students get on-the-job experiences through the Washington Center in Washington, DC, which enables students to serve as interns in offices of the federal government.

The CSU system has recently made a significant commitment of funds for internships as part of the Chancellor's advocacy effort, focusing specifically on California's entertainment industry. The CSU will provide \$500,000 and expects CSU presidents to equal that amount in order to provide internships for CSU students who want to work in the entertainment business.

### **Community Service Learning**

One clear example in which the CSU stands out as a national leader is in the area of community service learning (3c). The momentum for community service learning began with *Cornerstones*, and since that time, the movement has flourished in remarkable ways. In 1997, representatives from across CSU campuses came together to develop the CSU Strategic Plan for Community Service Learning, the first type of its kind in the nation. The plan stated a primary objective of offering service-learning and community service opportunities for each CSU student prior to graduation, thus reinforcing *Cornerstones'* Principle 3.

In the years that followed these early successes, faculty enthusiastically embraced the service-learning pedagogy and students positively responded to this hands-on and meaningful educational experience. The interest and innovation demonstrated by these and other stakeholders gave the initiative further momentum. And in March 2000, the CSU Board of Trustees passed a landmark resolution that moved service learning from the periphery into the mainstream of the CSU's culture. The resolution called for the Chancellor and each CSU campus president to "ensure that all students have the opportunity to participate in community service, service learning, or both" (2000). Since the passage of the resolution, the CSU has allocated \$8.8 million supplemental funding (ranging from \$40,000 to \$100,000 for each campus, each year) to support service learning at the campus level. The number of

service-learning opportunities has more than doubled to its current level of approximately 65,000 annual opportunities since 2000.

Through campus-based successes and systemwide coordination, the CSU has emerged as a national leader in developing opportunities for university students to serve California communities through civic engagement, academic service learning, community service, and national service programs.

### **Student Research and Creative Activities**

Long-established and ongoing programs provide opportunities for student research and creative activities (3d). Several are listed below.

**CSU Pre-Doctoral Program.** Working one-on-one with faculty members from both CSU and doctoral-granting institutions, students receive funding for activities such as participation in a summer research internship program at a doctoral-granting institution to receive exposure to the world of research in their chosen fields.

**CSUPERB.** CSU Program for Education and Research in Biotechnology (CSUPERB) is a consortium that promotes biotechnology education and research within the CSU by securing several grant programs annually, including providing funding for student-faculty collaborative research, student research-related travel (among other projects that advance biotechnology in California), and promote the role of biotechnology in future workforce development.

**CSU Student Research Competition.** This competition, initiated in 1985, features research achievements of undergraduate students, graduate students, and recent alumni/ae from all academic disciplines. Approximately 200 students from the 23 CSU campuses submit written papers and make oral presentations before juries of professional experts from major corporations, foundations, public agencies, and universities in California. Cash prizes are awarded.

**CSU Media Arts Festival.** This annual event provides talented CSU students studying film, video, and interactive media an opportunity to present their work for critical review, and through workshops and seminars, they become better prepared to enter related professional fields.

**CSU Summer Arts.** Students engage in intensive creative growth under the guidance of CSU faculty and guest artists. Student work in the performance, literary, and visual arts is mentored and critically evaluated. Some Summer Arts students take their workshops out of the classroom and into the community, working with local elementary schools and other community groups to share the excitement of the arts.

## ***PRINCIPLE 4***

**The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university. Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity are essential components of that mission.**

4a. System Priority -- The CSU system will provide faculty with a fair and reasonable incentive and reward system, including closing the faculty salary gap. (Continuing funding priority)

4b. Campus Priority -- Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity will be broadly defined and recognized as appropriate to each campus. (Continuing activity)

4c. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will support research, scholarly, and creative activities for the faculty as a central element of a rich learning environment for our students. (Continuing activity)

4d. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will provide a more coordinated and substantive faculty development effort. These efforts will be supported by seeking new resources and by recognition of faculty time needed for these purposes. The Academic Senate, the California Faculty Association, and the CSU administration should be appropriately involved in developing this effort. (Continuing funding and program priority)

4e. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will seek resources for instructionally-related technology support. (Continuing funding priority)

**Progress Summary.** Whereas there has been a significant effort to improve teaching and learning in the CSU, there has been only a modest infrastructure to support all of the crucial duties of a faculty member. The system has maintained a consistent level of funding to campuses to support research, scholarship and creative activity, but campuses are unevenly positioned to augment this funding.

With *Cornerstones*, issues of faculty development became prominent in the 1990s. In the early '90s only fifteen CSU campuses had a director of faculty development, whereas in the late '90s twenty campuses had a faculty development staff. In addition to a designated faculty development leader, the late 1990s saw more faculty development directors having full-time appointments and more support staff. Over that same period, the number of campuses that had a faculty development advisory board doubled.

In the decade after *Cornerstones* was launched, each one of the 23 CSU universities funded a faculty development office leading to improvements in instruction on campus. This is a sign of the importance of teaching and learning in the CSU (4d).

Encouragement for faculty development also emanated from the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL), a systemwide unit created by the CSU Administration and the ASCSU. ITL has offered faculty training in technology, help with outcomes assessment, a grants program, training in information literacy, and a large number of workshops, ranging from promoting student engagement to writing across the curriculum.

In addition to developing the teaching-and-learning infrastructure, the CSU also has ongoing programs to foster research and creative activity. The CSU system continues its annual \$2.5 million support for faculty scholarly and creative activity. The funds are allocated in three categories: mini-grants for scholarly research up to \$5000, summer fellowships for one or two months, and semester leaves with pay. The criteria for evaluating proposals address the

educational impact of the proposal on students and the nature of student involvement. Most recipients involve students in their research or use the research as the basis for seeking external funding (4c, 4d).

Because the system funds for this purpose are limited, many individual universities have tried to develop a strong infrastructure for encouraging research, scholarship, and creative activity. This is especially important in order to retain the thousands of newer faculty throughout the system, most of whom come to the CSU with strong interest in scholarship and/or creative activity, but also to stimulate external funding. Directors of research have been appointed at all campuses, and they have been active in attracting external grants and contracts. The most available annual data indicate that, collectively, CSU institutions have attracted \$140 million from federal grants and contracts (this is excluding student financial assistance grants), \$267 million from state and local entities, and \$83 million from non-governmental agencies.

Most recently, the CSU has attempted to foster consortia among the CSU institutions to attract external funds for important CSU priorities in applied research, including agriculture, strategic languages, national security, and science and engineering.

Research and creative activities are foundations of effective teaching. Both the process and product of research are important to the educational enterprise. However, budget exigencies in the state have not made it possible to seek and receive new resources to support faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity.

Progress on Principle 4a is addressed under Principle 8.

## *PRINCIPLE 5*

**The California State University will meet the need for undergraduate education in California through increasing outreach efforts and transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and providing students a variety of pathways that may reduce the time needed to complete degrees.**

5a. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will continue the current Trustee policy to strengthen the connection between the CSU and K-12, and our collaborative relationship with the California Community Colleges. (Continuing activity)

5b. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will devote greater attention to the articulation of required lower-division, major courses and/or competencies, both within the CSU and between the CSU and community colleges. Both systems will help define the nature of any problems and, if warranted, ask faculty disciplinary groups across the CSU to seek common requirements. (By winter, 2001 or sooner)

5c. Campus Priority -- Each university will continue and expand programs to reach traditionally underserved communities through increased efforts at outreach and retention. (Continuing activity)

5d. System Priority -- The CSU system will revisit the competencies needed to begin college-level work and how best to assess them. This review will focus on the relationship of CSU's general education expectations to the skills and knowledge students should bring to college. (By January, 2000)

5e. System Priority -- The CSU system will intensify its support for early diagnostic testing of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade high school students in English and math to determine progress being made in meeting CSU expectations. (Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority)

5f. System Priority -- The CSU system will make standardized, nationally normed, placement tests available to K-12 students in English and mathematics during their junior year. Students who pass would be granted appropriate CSU placement. (Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority)

5g. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will strengthen alliances with the public schools. These alliances will focus on developing a clear understanding of what the CSU math and English placement standards are and how best to achieve them. Special funding will support these efforts. (Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority)

5h. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will expand the number of well-trained CSU students helping K-12 students achieve stronger English and math skills. (Continuing commitment)

5i. System Priority -- The CSU will seek more effective methods and structures by which remedial education will be provided, including extended learning and expansion of partnerships with community colleges, public schools, and other institutions. (Continuing commitment).

**Progress Summary.** The CSU has continued to implement in a deliberate, consultative manner several strategic initiatives designed to increase the academic preparation of first-time freshmen and transfer students that are necessary to ensure student success in meeting the academic challenges required to earn a baccalaureate degree. The programs described below demonstrate effective steps that help students to reduce the time needed to complete their degrees.

In today's economy, going to college is more important than ever. A college degree is a ticket to a better job and a better future. It can improve the economic situation of both individuals and their communities. But, CSU has learned that too many students are being left behind. Some do not understand fully the requirements. Others are just simply not prepared enough to enroll in college or to stay in college. One of the biggest challenges that higher education will face in the coming decade is the challenge of reaching out to the growing number of minority students who are underrepresented in higher education.

If CSU is able to succeed in reaching this group, it will be able to help them climb the ladder to college and later to success in the workforce.

The CSU has a national reputation for providing college access to students across California's increasingly diverse population. The CSU provides more than half of all undergraduate degrees granted to the state's Latino, African American and Native American students. Fifty-four percent of the CSU's students are students of color. While this appears to be a large number, approximately two-thirds of California's K-12 students are students of color. CSU believes the future of higher education in this country depends on its ability to reach those students of color and students from traditionally underrepresented groups whom we have not yet reached.

Given that public schools are the source of nearly all CSU students, the CSU spends a great deal of time building bridges with the state's K-12 partners. Specifically, CSU has been reaching out to middle and high schools to try to help more students prepare for and get ready to succeed in college, especially underserved and first-generation college students. In response to this challenge, CSU has developed and implemented several key outreach programs: Steps-to-College poster, Super Sunday, foster youth programs, California Veterans Education Opportunity Partnerships, Math, Engineering, and Science Advancement (MESA), TRIO, and GEAR UP. Each of these programs supports student academic preparation and access (5c).

CSU outreach to traditionally underserved communities continues to be among the best among senior institutions. CSU is working to increase parent, family, and community awareness by appealing directly to California communities. One of the lessons CSU has learned is that it has to take the University to California's underserved communities rather than waiting for those communities to seek information from CSU. With this in mind, CSU continues to travel around the state to meet with various industry groups and community groups to talk to them about the impact of the CSU and how we can better prepare students for future success in college and beyond. CSU has held community events with Latino, African-American, Chinese, and Vietnamese communities. To reach out to underserved communities and students, CSU is working with churches in the Los Angeles Basin and San Francisco Bay area in an effort to increase the pool of African-American students. Similar programs will reach out to all underserved communities.

CSU wants to increase the pool of students who are eligible for CSU. CSU is working with the Alliance for Better Communities and the Tomas Rivera Policy Institute to promote improvements in public schools by urging the adoption of college preparatory classes as a requirement for graduation in the state's largest school districts.

For the past several years, the CSU has faced a major challenge with the large number of students who meet all of the qualifications for admission but who need remedial education when they enroll. The CSU Board of Trustees set a goal in 1998 to reduce the need for remediation in English and math to 10% by 2007. Although CSU is making some progress in mathematics, the majority of students who enter CSU as first-time freshmen require remediation. To address this issue, CSU partnered with the California State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to develop the Early Assessment

Program (EAP). Centrally, this program lets students know in the 11<sup>th</sup> grade whether they need to do additional work in their senior year to improve their English and math skills.

The CSU is the first higher educational system in which faculty members have reviewed and aligned its college readiness expectations with K-12 standards and assessments. The EAP incorporates CSU placement standards into the California Standards Test (CST). With short augmentations to 11<sup>th</sup> grade tests, the CSU provides end-of-year juniors with early readings of readiness for college at the start of their senior year, thus enabling most of them to continue their college preparation.

To address the need to involve more actively CSU students in the system's initiative to help increase the participation of historically underrepresented groups in college, the CSU will introduce in 2006-07 the CSU College Counseling Corps. CSU students will be trained as college admission advisors and academic preparation tutors to provide middle and high school students (1) with information about the steps students and their families need to take to prepare for college at each grade level beginning with students enrolled in elementary schools and (2) to provide academic advising to help them to prepare academically for success in college.

One lesson learned regarding Principle 5 is the primary importance of providing appropriate professional development for existing high school teachers combined with strengthened preparation for students preparing to teach single-subjects in middle- and high-school. It is imperative that teachers understand CSU standards and how to convey the skills and knowledge in improved ways (5h). In cooperation with county offices of education, CSU offers professional development to help teachers better understand the expectations of college-level English and math. The development of a 12<sup>th</sup> grade Expository Reading and Writing Course has been accompanied by provision of professional development to high school English teachers specifically to learn how to teach expository reading and writing to their students. Another CSU professional development program, the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation (RIAP), helps high school teachers in all subject areas to strengthen the teaching of reading and academic literacy across the curriculum.

Under the leadership of the CSU Academic Senate supported by Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's Office, the Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) program has developed common major core course requirements for the CSU in 46 undergraduate degree programs (5b). The Lower-Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) project presents potential transfer students with the most efficient path to a bachelor's degree from the CSU. The LDTP project provides a set of "road maps" for students to follow that will ensure appropriate academic preparation and that will decrease time to graduation once LDTP students enter the CSU. These "road maps" serve as an advising tool for students as they prepare to enter the CSU system. Students will know which courses at their respective CCC they should complete to develop a good foundation for upper-division study in the major and to satisfy general education and other requirements for graduation from the CSU. Following the "road maps" ensures that students entering a California Community College who are certain of their choice of baccalaureate major will be able to transfer their coursework efficiently to any CSU campus offering that major.

Finally, one of the most important lessons learned regarding Principle 5 is the importance of ensuring that the CSU – the system and the campuses – are doing everything that they can to facilitate effective and efficient progress to degree. Many of the efforts at outreach involve academic preparation for college.

## *PRINCIPLE 6*

### **Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.**

6a. Campus Priority -- The CSU system will provide increased access to graduate education and continuing education in programs central to the mission of the university, to lifelong opportunities for our students, and to the continued health of California's community and economy. These programs include the liberal arts and sciences that define a university, teaching, nursing, and such newer fields as biotechnology. This recommendation suggests a significant expansion of professional and other programs in areas of high need, financed at least partly through program reductions in other areas. New systems of financing these programs will be explored. (Continuing activity)

6b. System and Campus Priority -- In support of the CSU mission and recognizing its proven capacities to be creative, flexible, and innovative, continuing education is able to undertake key roles in such areas as assessing needs, testing new technologies, promoting collaboration among universities, starting new programs, and responding to emerging, transient, or cyclical needs. (Continuing activity)

6c. System and Campus Priority -- The expansion of opportunities in these areas will require a significant integration of programs in both the state-supported and fee-supported modes; the specifics of a more integrated program need to be developed, including the proper institutional and financial relationships. (Continuing exploration)

6d. System Priority -- The expansion of opportunity in these areas requires significant increases in financial aid for graduate, credential, and continuing education students. This initiative will require both institutional aid and a commitment to amend state and federal aid policies. (Continuing commitment)

6e. Campus Priority -- Universities will build new partnerships with community and business institutions to make education available beyond the campus, and to increase the immediacy of education that is applied and professional. (Continuing activity)

6f. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU and its universities will increase investment in their graduate and post-graduate educational programs while maintaining the CSU's commitment to undergraduate education. Consideration will be given to the following possibilities for increased support. Seek State recognition of the higher cost of graduate (relative to undergraduate) education and the alignment of funding accordingly (without reducing support of undergraduate education). (Continuing funding priority). Establishment of differential fees for undergraduate and graduate students to reflect the higher costs associated with graduate education, in parallel with increased financial aid for graduate students. (Continuing assessment). Allowing campuses and programs to charge differential fees in accordance with costs, competition in the marketplace, and demand, subject to adequate financial aid to assure access. (Continuing assessment)

6g. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU's role in doctoral and professional education will be increased through relationships with the University of California and other public and private higher education institutions. (Continuing commitment)

**Progress Summary.** Few sustained initiatives have emerged in the previous decade, as CSU sought funding support for graduate education at levels consistent with national norms, and enhanced authority to train professionals to the highest level consistent with accreditation standards and state needs. Recent successes in achieving “graduate differential” funding and in authority to offer an independent Ed.D. signal that it is timely to think strategically and systematically about graduate education in the context of economic development needs in California. Continuing/extended education has been a source of innovation, however, as campus extended education units reacted to the shift of summer instruction to state support and to opportunities wrought by the Internet and by globalization.

The number of graduate students in the CSU was 41,190 in Fall 1998, comprising 11.77% of enrolled headcount. The comparable numbers for Fall 2005 were 51,136 and 12.62% (6a). Reacting to labor markets, the number of post-baccalaureate students (a great many of whom have public school teaching as a career goal) declined in the same years, from 25,844 in Fall 1998 to 19,038 in Fall 2005. Interestingly, the number of students enrolled in joint doctoral programs rose from 251 in Fall 1998 to 359 in Fall 2005.

Given its role in the preparation of teachers and administrators, in 2005 the CSU sought and finally was given the assignment to provide a professional doctorate in educational administration and leadership. P-12 and community college leaders joined the sustained efforts of the Chancellor, the Trustees, and all other segments of the CSU family to ensure that state policy leaders recognized the need for a CSU role in developing K-12 and community college leaders. Instruction in the first independent doctoral programs will begin not later than Fall 2007. This successful initiative followed upon a substantial effort to develop joint programs leading to the Ed.D. with the University of California. In CSU's view, these joint programs were too small to meet California's need for doctorally-prepared leaders in the P-12 and community college systems (6g).

Similarly, changes in California and the nation are moving the CSU towards the offering of doctorates in audiology, physical therapy, and other allied health areas. Needs for doctorally-prepared nurses are acute. Discussions with the University of California are underway concerning joint programs in audiology. A CSU role in the preparation of doctorally-prepared professionals in many areas seems certain.

A graduate student fee differential was established in 1999 to help offset the costs of graduate instruction, and beginning in CY 2006-07, the state finally recognized that the CSU should count graduate student instruction in the same way that the University of California and the rest of nation do – 12 student credit units per FTES rather than the 15 student credit units typically used to track undergraduate instruction (6f). With this enriched formula by which marginal cost support may be accessed for new enrollments in years to come, as of Fall 2006 the CSU appears poised to consider freshly the priority of graduate education within essential mission.

Recent and fresh considerations of graduate education include a fine study released in September 2004 by the CSU Academic Senate entitled *Rethinking Graduate Education in the CSU: Meeting the Needs of the People of California for Graduate Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Additionally, as of Fall 2006, CSU provosts through their Academic Council work were circulating a draft report, *The Place of Graduate Education in the CSU* (6a, 6c).

The business focus for extended and continuing education changed remarkably in the period under consideration, as the CSU moved to a state-supported model for summer instruction. At the same time, the rise in significance of the Internet and the globalized economy has provided new directions for service, featuring web-based instructional delivery, and partnerships transcending national borders (6b, 6e). During FY 04-05, systemwide Extended Education programs recorded 315,649 registrations. That level of registrations was the second highest in CSU self-support history. Among these, technology-delivered courses and programs generated 30,673 registrations, thus approaching 10% of the systemwide registration base. It constituted a remarkable transition for the CSU.

Extended education units are also involved in the delivery of Internet-based degree programs. Of the 44 online degree programs offered in the CSU that were identified in a spring 2006 survey, two-thirds were self-supporting. These are in addition to the Internet-delivered courses and certificate programs that constitute a core business for extended education units on the campuses. To cite just one example, the CSU Extended Education web site lists eight certificates delivered online by the Cal State Fullerton Extended

Education unit, together with 96 online courses in education and educational technology alone. Meanwhile, CSU Bakersfield via its Extended Education unit provides off-campus delivery of eight bachelor's degree programs, and five master's degree programs. In all, campus extended education units offer certificates in sixty-one general areas, from Agricultural Science and Arts, to Technical Writing and Youth-related programs.

Campuses thus have experimented with offering new "convenient" master's and joint doctoral degree programs with the help of continuing/extended education. Systemwide, a consortium of CSU campus faculty and administrators, together with Chancellor's Office professionals, developed CalStateTEACH, a regional approach to meeting teacher preparation needs using a mix of online, face-to-face instruction and supervision.

New partnerships with business and industry that have significant potential for both graduate and extended education outreach have emerged, and been strengthened. For example, P-12 and community college professionals are positioned as strong, contributing partners to new CSU Ed.D. programs, and hospitals and health care providers have joined with CSU campuses to add new and additional students to nursing degree programs (6c). The people of California likewise stand to benefit from the fresh thinking and emphasis emerging from the CSU and Industry/Business Outreach and Partnerships.

## *PRINCIPLE 7*

**PRINCIPLE 7: The State of California must develop a new policy framework for higher education finance to assure that the goals of the Master Plan are met. This framework should be the basis for the subsequent development of periodic "compacts" between the State and the institutions of higher education.**

7a. The California State University is a public teaching-centered institution. The State of California must maintain its basic commitment for public tax support of this institution now and into the future. As a result, the CSU must acknowledge, ensure, and document, that it is fully accountable to the people of the State of California.

7b. The public tax base must be supplemented by private revenues in order to assure continued access and quality in the future. A policy framework that identifies how private revenues can be used to supplement public funding is needed to allow this to occur.

7c. There are public and private benefits to investment in higher education, and the system of finance should recognize both aspects.

7d. Students and their families should bear responsibility for paying a portion of the costs of their education, because there are substantial returns specifically to the individual from achievement in higher education. The State of California must adopt a more realistic and stable long-term student fee and financial aid policy as part of a new state policy framework.

7e. The fees paid by students may increase as they move from undergraduate to graduate and professional education. Professional fees for post-baccalaureate education may reflect differences in program costs; such fees must be matched by adequate financial aid for eligible students. This policy must be monitored carefully to ensure the continued strengthening of graduate programs, and that access is increased, not decreased.

7f. Student fees should not be a barrier to higher education for academically qualified but financially needy students. Economic access can be maintained despite increases in fees through appropriate financial aid programs, which should be maintained as a public priority.

7g. The CSU shall maintain the tradition of not charging differential fees within baccalaureate programs to reflect cost differences, both because of the essential breadth of the curriculum and the potentials for such differentials to serve as barriers to student exploration and choice of alternative courses of study.

7h. The goals of educational quality and institutional efficiency can be complementary. Effective management, including attention to institutional goals and outcomes, must be achieved as a shared responsibility between the faculty and the administration. The public must believe that costs being charged are reasonable and that quality is being maintained, through evidence provided in an accountability system that includes public reports.

**Progress Summary.** Since Cornerstones was completed the CSU has successfully negotiated partnership, or compact, agreements with two separate administrations. Having a stable baseline funding has allowed the University to plan and budget in a more strategic manner. Additionally, it has allowed the CSU to think more holistically about all sources of revenue that come into the institution and what those sources of revenue should support. Work with the administration, legislative representatives and other higher education institutions to develop a statewide student fee and financial aid policy was not successful, although some elements of a student fee policy are contained in the current Compact Agreement with Governor Schwarzenegger.

The CSU Trustees adopted a student fee policy in 1993. That policy calls for students to bear one-third of the cost of their education. The state is responsible for ensuring access and paying the other two-thirds of the cost of a student's education. Fee revenue supports the quality of education. The CSU policy on student fees is moderated by the fee and financial aid policy espoused in the Higher Education Compact, which calls for increases in student fees based on the rise in California per capita personal income, with exceptions

allowed when fiscal circumstances require an increase that would exceed this rate (7d). The Compact policy also allows for the state to “buy out” the revenue that would have been generated from a student fee increase. Efforts to establish a policy framework embraced by legislative representatives, as well as the administration and other educational entities, were not conclusive. However, the CSU continues to follow the guidelines incorporated in the Compact.

The Trustees policy also articulated the expectation that the higher costs associated with graduate study should be recognized by the State University Fee structure. Studies of education costs reveal cost differentials that are highly dependent upon the level and program of academic study, with master’s degree programs costing more than undergraduate degree programs, and doctoral study costing substantially more than study at the master’s level. Such a differential was implemented in 1998-99 (7e) when a proposed fee increase for undergraduates was reduced more than the increase for graduate students. The fee differential has had no impact on enrollment in graduate programs, as graduate enrollment has increased at the same rate as overall enrollment during the same time period. While it was important for the University to implement a differential in fee levels for graduate students, the institution has remained committed to keeping the fee rate within baccalaureate programs the same, regardless of differences in program costs (7g). (See also discussion at Principle 6f.)

Notwithstanding the CSU’s own goal to ensure that limited student aid funds are awarded to students most in need of assistance to ensure educational access, there are extensive statutory and regulatory provisions that govern the administration of student financial aid programs, particularly at the federal level (7f). CSU campuses, as participating institutions in Federal Title IV student aid programs, have the responsibility for ensuring that the right funds, in the right amounts, are distributed to eligible students. Student financial aid programs at CSU are authorized and funded by the U.S. Congress, by the California Legislature and Governor, campuses, and various private entities such as philanthropic organizations and foundations, civic clubs and community groups, and commercial lending institutions. In this past year, the Trustees’ legislative program included an effort to modify the age cap limitation for state-funded Cal Grant Awards, to recognize the average age of students seeking a college degree in California.

In exchange for the long-term stability provided to the University via the Compact funding agreement, the CSU has committed to focusing its resources to address long-term accountability goals for the state. Through its accountability reports to Trustees, annual accountability reports to the State, and, more recently, its “Impact of the CSU” series (see Principle 9 for more detail), the CSU provides evidence of its quality in providing Californians with access to the CSU, with efficient and effective pathways to the degree, and with citizens who contribute economically and socially to the State (7a and 7h) (See also Principle 10c).

The Impact Report demonstrates that the CSU prepares more students than any other university in fields that make California work – agriculture, information technology, communications, business, tourism, life sciences, and education – and therefore, the CSU is vital to California’s economic growth and prosperity. In developing and supporting the

current funding Compact, the state explicitly acknowledges that the University is essential to contributing to a higher standard of living and better quality of life for all the citizens of the state (7c).

Finally, to supplement the General Fund and student fee revenue, the institution has made concerted efforts to increase the amount of money it receives from private entities. Ten years after the adoption of a set of recommendations intended to build the advancement efforts at the campuses, private support for the CSU has doubled. Total giving to the University has exceeded \$2.3 billion and endowments are up over 400%. Advancement programs have grown in sophistication and complexity. Their growth has come in response to a new set of guiding principles and congruent with Board-adopted recommendations in March 2005. Beginning in 2006, campuses develop and submit an annual strategic plan for advancement efforts that outline goals and measurable objectives that can be benchmarked to report progress (7b).

## *PRINCIPLE 8*

### **PRINCIPLE 8: The responsibility for enhancing educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty and staff, alumni/ae and students.**

8a. Development of future budget compacts with the State: The California State University is supported primarily by the State's general fund. The University is subject to the variability of the State's overall revenue and the uncertainty of the legislative budget process. Since 1995, the University has had a "compact" with the state that gives multi-year stability to the revenue expectations for the University. This multi-year expectation allows the University to plan for strategic investments in instruction and such instructional support, as technology, that requires implementation over several years. Other areas of need, like compensation increases and maintenance of plant, can be balanced over several years, allowing the University to make better judgments about the amount to spend on competing high priorities within limited resources. (Under negotiation)

8b. Continued commitment to closing the faculty salary gap: Competitive salaries for all employees of the university are essential. CSU recruits and retains its faculty in competition with all universities. As enrollment increases and as faculty retire, a significant number of faculty will need to be hired. CSU determines the appropriate salary range by using a CPEC-approved comparison salary methodology. In each budget year a majority portion of CSU's budget increase is allocated for keeping salaries competitive, as measured by the comparison faculty salary survey. CSU is committed to closing the faculty salary gap. (Continuing funding priority)

8c. Study of faculty workload issues: The system should respond to faculty concerns about heavy teaching and other responsibilities with a nationally-based comparative study. This review should document how CSU faculty workload compares to other universities with similar missions. To the extent that faculty utilize instructional technology and develop new ways of providing instruction without traditional fixed time classroom sessions, current methods may be no longer sufficient as ways of measuring both faculty and student workload. (By June, 2000)

8d. Seeking funding to support the integrated technology plan initiatives: The CSU has determined that substantial investment in information technology is required to provide students with an educational experience that is appropriate for today's society. The investment in campus networks is a new demand on University resources. There is no doubt that this investment is essential. Today's networks provide access to the data and information of the world. They are an essential part of an educational experience in the 21st century. Also, the University needs to replace and update its current administrative systems for improved fiscal controls and improved student service. (Continuing funding priority)

8e. Seeking special state funding for faculty development and direct instructional support: Instructional support, particularly for information technology equipment and instructional equipment replacement, are among the budget priorities considered by the Board of Trustees each year. A specific budget request will be developed that addresses faculty development required to meet the increased expectations of outcomes assessment and new methods of instruction as outlined in this Cornerstones Implementation Plan. (Continuing funding priority)

8f. Seeking sharper focus of instructionally-related technology support: Over several years, there have grown many different initiatives and consultative structures that encourage new uses of technology, particularly information technology, in instructional support. These consultative structures will be examined to coordinate and focus the University's efforts in using technology to assist instruction. (By January, 2000)

8g. Seeking special funding for specific systemwide public school outreach efforts: California has a diverse population. Students eligible for the CSU have come from schools with varying levels of preparation for CSU level work. CSU takes the responsibility to help students in high schools understand the preparation required to perform successfully at the collegiate level. The outreach efforts outlined in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan will be fully developed and the legislature and the Governor will be asked to provide special funds to implement new and coordinated outreach programs to help students prepare for and succeed in university study. (Continuing funding priority)

8h. Campus reinvestment of productivity. : The CSU has a program of making continuous productivity improvements. These improvements may result in savings or may result in improved services at the same cost. It is critical that these productivity savings be reinvested at the campuses where they are generated and not be used by the state to diminish the state's obligation to support CSU's instructional program. (Continuing activity)

8i. Seeking categorical funding for applied research: Applied research is a critical part of the CSU's mission to the people of California. In the last decade, the state has not provided any new support for this part of the University's activities. Investment by the state in applied research, often matched by industry, helps invigorate the state's economy, and assists in preparing students to address problems facing California's society. (Continuing funding priority)

8j. Seeking funding for joint doctoral programs based on need: There are doctoral programs that CSU is in the best position to provide. Current policy and budget practices work against forming programs that could meet these needs. Fee and funding strategies for high demand doctoral programs should be explored with the state. (Policy under development)

8k. Advancement and fundraising: The Cornerstones priorities, once imbedded in campus academic plans, will provide development directors and other advancement professionals an opportunity to assist with a number of academic and program priorities. The university advancement officer functions best when the university has an academic plan to assist advancement to order its fund-raising, marketing, alumni/ae, and community relations efforts. External fund-raising is becoming extremely important in maintaining CSU's margin of excellence. (Continuing activity)

**Progress Summary.** Significant progress has been made in almost every area of this Principle. Each member of the University community, including alumni/ae, and the state have stepped forward to continue advancing the institution toward the objectives established here.

In recognition of the volatility of state funding provided to the University, the CSU has made efforts to continue compact or partnership agreements with successive Governors. Those efforts have been largely successful, although state support has not always followed the guidelines established within the resulting compacts. The CSU is currently operating under a compact negotiated with the Schwarzenegger administration that runs from 2005-06 through 2010-2011. So far, funding to the University has followed the guidelines established under this compact and this stable baseline funding has allowed the University to plan and budget in a more strategic manner (8a).

Additionally, as part of the new strategic planning process in the Advancement area (see discussion of Principle 7b), campus fund-raising plans are expected to reflect institutional priorities, including academic program priorities. Examples of a fund-raising tie to an academic priority have been provided to the campuses. The first round of these new strategic plans, with evaluation of goals set two years ago, will be submitted during 2006 (8k).

Competitive salaries for all employees of the university are essential (8b). The CSU has developed a five-year plan for reducing the salary gap in all employee classifications. This plan acknowledges that there are many factors that affect the amount of resources that will be available to reduce the salary gap, including possible changes in the Compact for Higher Education and changes in the legislature and other elected offices. The current Compact gives the CSU the funding necessary to project an aggressive strategy to reduce the salary gap significantly by 2010-11. In the case of employees in groups that are represented, of course, implementation of these salary plans will be subject to collective bargaining. It must be admitted, however, that Principle 4a, with its intention to close the faculty salary gap, has not been achieved.

A study of faculty workload was completed in 2002, and recommendations were developed in 2003 (8c). These documents may be found at: <http://www.calstate.edu/acadres/csuFacWkLoad.shtml>). Many of the recommendations offered—such as those dealing with flexible workload models and alignment of evaluation and reward structures with workload expectations—are being addressed at the campus level, although such response has been uneven across the system. There has been some dissemination of best practices in evaluation, reappointment, and range elevation policies. To date, the system has not developed a funding request to implement the reduction in student-faculty ratio that was recommended in the study pursuant to passage of ACR 73.

Efforts to enhance educational excellence by support provided to faculty have been made on multiple fronts. Such support in the area of technology will be significantly improved by the supplemental 2007-08 funding request for academic technology, particularly for information

technology equipment and instructional equipment replacement. The cost of keeping technology current, maintaining relevant library collections, and funding instructional equipment replacement are core needs that require multimillion-dollar annual commitments. In past years these needs were funded as a separate component of the higher education partnership agreements, with 1 percent of CSU's budget earmarked for this purpose. The current Compact agreement calls for restoration of this 1 percent General Fund Commitment in the fourth year of the Compact (2008/09). Until the Compact begins funding these needs at the 1 percent level, the CSU has made efforts to mitigate significant growth in funding backlogs and sustain the current quality of services available to students, faculty and staff (8e).

The CSU has recognized and acted upon the need for additional funding for applied research across the system, specifically in industries that are driving forces in California's economy. Applied Research programs in Agriculture, Biotechnology, Marine Programs and Water Resources have been priorities at the CSU in the last decade. State funding has been sought for these programs multiple times in the last ten years, and sometimes been obtained, although at levels somewhat less than the Trustees budget request (8i). All four applied research programs have managed to secure federal and private industry grants at an average ratio of three dollars for every one dollar in CSU matching funds. Currently, the CSU is seeking \$12 million in new state support to further leverage total dollars available for expanding research projects.

The CSU and UC recognized the need for more public Ed.D. programs in California and in 2001 we developed a Joint CSU/UC Ed.D. board to expand doctoral programs in education throughout the state. Each system agreed to allocate \$2 million over two years for a total of \$4 million that would solicit, develop, and fund new joint programs in the state. The joint Board helped to establish four new joint-doctoral programs between the CSU and UC in the period from 2001-2003 (8j). As a result of legislation in 2006, these joint doctorates will be phased out and replaced by the CSU's independent Ed.D. programs. Starting in the 2007-08 fiscal year, a CSU Doctorate of Education State University Fee will be charged to students in the Ed.D. that will be equivalent to the UC graduate fee rate in Education.

An additional part of the compact/partnership with the state administration has been an increasing funding amount to develop and maintain the technology infrastructure at the University. This funding was used to develop and improve the technology infrastructure on each campus (8d). In the future this funding will be used to refresh that network as new advances in the technology field are made. Funding was initially provided at \$10 million per year and has been increased over time to an annual on-going amount of \$22 million.

As the network and supporting technology has been developed on campuses the university has been able to place a greater focus on developing instructionally-related technology support (8f). The University established the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), which has developed an academic technology plan that currently targets eight different initiatives to provide technology resources and support for the teaching and learning environment. The university also has continued to increase funding in both technology and academic departments to develop and support academic technology.

As described earlier, at Principle 5, the CSU's outreach and student academic preparation programs provide information and academic support to California's diverse population of elementary, middle, and secondary students. The system has succeeded in obtaining State funding to support some of the costs of these programs (8g). In 2004-2005, CSU spent over \$39 million to provide services to over 498,000 K-12 students in over 5300 schools. The Governor's budget proposal for 2006-07 deleted \$7 million from these funds, but efforts by the CSU and its Board of Trustees persuaded the Legislature and Governor to restore these funds to CSU's budget. Nearly \$4 million are received annually from the State to support components of the Early Assessment Program (EAP), including 11<sup>th</sup> grade testing, supplemental high school preparation in 12<sup>th</sup> grade, and teacher professional development (see Principle 5 for more information about the EAP). In addition, the CSU contributes over \$3 million to pay for augmentations to the California Standards Tests for 11<sup>th</sup> graders in English and Mathematics that provide students with an early indicator of their readiness for college English and mathematics.

Prior to the adoption of the *Cornerstones* framework, the system had engaged in several benchmarking and process mapping efforts. Those efforts were quite successful and resulted in the continuous productivity improvement objective incorporated into this Principle (8h). Shortly after *Cornerstones* was endorsed, the Chancellor's Office formerly established an Office of Quality Improvement (QI) to assist campus efforts in continuous productivity improvement efforts. A steering committee of campus representatives established the following goals for this function:

- Systematic identification and transfer of best practices
- Quality enhancement strategies and frameworks
- Assessment of customer needs and satisfaction
- Process measurement and evaluation tools
- Outcomes assessment and performance measures
- Campus and/or system-wide collaboration

In 2006-07, nineteen campuses and the Chancellor's Office are part of the QI program as full participation campuses. For further discussion see also the efficiencies described under principle 10c.

## *PRINCIPLE 9*

**The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society through regular assessment of student achievement and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.**

9. System and Campus Priority. The CSU will expand and/or develop mechanisms for evaluating institutional performance, and develop annual reports appropriately formatted to reach different audiences, describing institutional performance in the areas of student achievement, student satisfaction, the quality of teaching and support services, administrative effectiveness, the provision of service to the community and to the state's economy and society, alumni/ae satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and student, faculty, and staff satisfaction. (By May, 1999)

**Progress Summary.** The CSU Accountability Process, the CSU Economic Impact Study, and the CSU Teacher Preparation Annual Evaluation and Accountability Report are examples of accountability at the system level that have been presented regularly to the Board of Trustees and other constituencies. Campus annual reports, quality improvement assessments, constituent advisory groups, and periodic program reviews that frequently include surveys of alumni/ae and employers address this principle at the campus level. Principle 9 – accountability – largely is incorporated into the system and campus cultures, although it is important for campuses to continue to strengthen the quality of available data about student outcomes – learning (as with the CSU Teacher Preparation and Beyond accountability program), licensure, employment, and other individual achievements that also contribute to California society and its economy.

Biennial CSU accountability reports have been prepared and presented to the CSU Board of Trustees in 2002 and 2004 (biennial systemwide and campus-specific reports are available at <http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/accountability/index.shtml>). The next report is due in November 2006. The CSU has also provided annual reports to the State (Governor and Legislature) as required by budget compact agreements over the last decade. More recently and significantly, the CSU has undertaken a series of “Impact of the CSU” pieces designed to be shared with specific constituencies, including various racial/ethnic communities and partners in business and industry (see <http://www.calstate.edu/impact/>).

Most CSU campuses regularly survey alumni/ae and employer to ascertain their degree of satisfaction with the campus and to seek suggestions in order to improve. In addition, most campuses prepare their own annual reports that provide their regional communities with information about the campus’ service to the community and its economy.

One excellent example of the gains that the CSU has made in the use of specific program evaluation in an area of great public interest is the systemwide evaluation of campus teacher preparation programs, which is reported annually to the Trustees and to each campus. This comprehensive evaluation of teacher focuses entirely on K-12 teaching outcomes and is aligned with the California K-12 Academic Content Standards. The CSU Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs includes annual data on short-term and long-term retention

in teaching by CSU graduates, how well our graduates feel they have been prepared by the CSU, and an assessment of each teacher’s preparation by his/her principal. In addition, each campus then prepares an accountability report based on these findings that specifies improvements to be made, goals, and specific timelines for implementation. To augment this annual evaluation, the CSU has received additional federal funding to measure academic learning by K-12 students who are taught by CSU first-year graduates.

One additional special assessment of CSU contributions to student learning also merits comment. The CSU was one of the first higher education systems to survey its students about their satisfaction, needs, and priorities. A comprehensive survey – the Student Needs and Priority Survey (SNAPS) - was first administered in the early 1980s; the fifth administration of SNAPS took place in February/March 1999. The centerpiece of SNAPS asks students to indicate the importance of 54 university functions and activities to their educational experience, then asks them to rate the quality of each.

Table 1: SNAPS 1999 Highlights – Top Five and Lowest

Importance Rank	Function, Activity, Service	Quality Rank
14	Coursework that is consistent with the instructor’s stated objectives or syllabus	1
8	Faculty preparation for class	2
1	Quality of instruction	3
9	Courses in my major that are required for graduation	4
11	Courses that stimulate intellectual/interpersonal growth or challenge	5
54	Fraternities and sororities	50
29	Pre-college academic advising from my high school	51
5	Convenience of class scheduling	52
2	Availability of necessary classes	53
18	Parking	54

Table 1 indicates that factors related to the quality of instruction in the CSU are rated high in quality and are among the most important functions, activities, and services in students’ eyes. However, availability of necessary classes and the convenience of class scheduling, which historically have been within the top five in terms of importance to students, have ranked just above parking at the bottom of the quality scale. Convenience in class scheduling may, of course, reference survey respondents’ wishes that more classes were at their most-favored days and hours. Yet, as discussed elsewhere, CSU has named goals for improved facilities utilization at less-popular days and hours. The emphases in *Cornerstones* on more efficient and effective services to students were drawn, in part, from the SNAPS surveys. The Trustees’ initiative to facilitate student success likewise focuses attention on student service. The SNAPS surveys have not been administered since 1999. Budget exigencies forced choices, and it was viewed as much more important to support initiatives to meet historical student needs and priorities rather than administer another survey to find that improvements had not yet been made.

## ***PRINCIPLE 10***

**The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.**

10a. System and Campus Priority -- The CSU system and each university will streamline the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. All of this will balance against greater campus and system accountability for outcomes. (Continuing activity implementing July 1998 Board policy)

10b. System and Campus Priority – The CSU system and each university will work cooperatively with external agencies [Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), etc.] to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs and to develop appropriate accountability frameworks. (Continuing activity)

10c. System Priority – The CSU system will review current Title 5 and university code requirements to reduce or eliminate regulatory constraints where possible and will authorize appropriate experiments, to promote ways to increase the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and the general CSU mission. (Title 5 review by fall 2000; continuing commitment to encourage experimentation)

**Progress Summary.** The CSU has been consistent in respect for the autonomy of campuses in developing their respective missions, identity, and programs. In addition, the principle of encouraging streamlining and flexibility has also been well recognized. Many changes in policy and procedure have been made in the past decade to ensure both campus autonomy and efficiency.

In response to Principle 10, the CSU Board of Trustees in July 1997 adopted a revised process for reviewing and approving new degree programs. The intended purpose was to move from a system-level gate-keeping function to facilitation, service, coordination, and support of quality (10a). It was hoped that these processes would speed the review and approval timelines for new programs. Through that revision effort, three avenues for establishing degree program were specified:

1. The existing two-step process, in which a program is first added to the campus Academic Master Plan, after which the campus-approved proposal undergoes system-level review;
2. A Fast-Track process, in which a high-quality proposed program involving no major capital outlay and not subject to specialized accreditation is reviewed at the system level and then reviewed and endorsed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) without first having been added to the campus Academic Master Plan; and
3. A Pilot-Program process, through which campuses may establish a program for a term of five years, without prior Chancellor's Office Approval. At the end of five years, the campus may choose to cease admitting students or propose a conversion from pilot to regular status, subject to system-level review. Campuses are limited to instituting two pilot programs during a three-year period. CPEC is notified of plans to implement new pilot programs.

Continuing the effort to enhance true partnerships between the campuses and the Chancellor's Office, several efforts are underway to improve efficiency, promote campus responsibility, and utilize the cooperative intentions of academic planners. In 2005, a proposal database and tracking system was developed to facilitate careful management of degree proposals. Using a tracking reference number, campuses may now inquire and be informed about the status of their submitted proposals. An electronic submission and notification system is in development to allow a paperless process for submitting academic changes, including those related to options, concentrations, emphases, and degree titles. In fall 2006, Associate Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs will meet with the Interim Dean of Academic Program Planning to discuss options for further improving proposal and review processes. One focus will be on centering student learning outcomes in process of the academic program planning.

The CSU also continues to work cooperatively with external agencies (WASC, CPEC, etc.), to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs, and to develop appropriate accountability frameworks (10b). The "Fast Track" program development process described above, for example, was developed in cooperation with CPEC. An example of cooperative work with WASC can be found in the review and approval process that has been put in place for the new independent Ed.D. degree to be offered by CSU campuses. Because the CSU Ed.D. programs must conform to the standards established by SB 724 and Education Code 66040-66040.7, those programs will be much more uniform than most offered in the CSU. To expedite the substantive change application process necessary for campuses to implement these new programs, WASC has agreed to allow campuses to use system-provided responses to proposal elements that would have common responses from all CSU campuses. Both the WASC substantive change process and the CSU review process require campuses to identify student learning outcomes for the programs and to identify an assessment process for determining and reporting program effectiveness.

During the past decade, the CSU has made many substantive modifications to its business processes to improve efficiencies (10c). Many of these changes were driven by a need to work better with less, and not necessarily to remove the CSU from bureaucratic red tape. Some examples of improved processes include:

- Implementation of the Revenue Management Program (expected to be complete by June 30, 2007), which allows CSU to put all fee monies in a trust account and operate completely outside of the State treasury. This will reduce the number of transactions with the state Controller's Office by 75-80% and significantly streamline financial operations for the entire system.
- Implementation of a system-wide revenue bond program and commercial paper program, strengthening the overall credit pledge of the institution and thereby significantly reducing costs for the debt program of the Trustees and allowing more flexibility for capital projects.
- When the Common Management System (CMS) project is completed in 2008, all twenty-three campuses and the Chancellor's Office will perform administrative

functions with a common set of administrative “best practices” approaches; support administrative functions with a shared, common suite of Oracle/PeopleSoft applications: operate the administrative software suite at a shared data center; and provide a supported data warehouse infrastructure. At the end of fiscal year 2004-05, twenty-one campuses had implemented the CMS/PeopleSoft financial information software; twenty-three had implemented the human resources application; and ten, the student administration system. At that time, as a result of this project, over 100,000 CSU students had web registration available to them through CMS. Over 13,000 faculty were afforded online access to student information for advising that previously required extensive research and effort. Over 35,000 faculty and staff experienced a variety of improvements to their work through such CMS impacts as cost avoidance productivity gains, and reallocation of resources due to efficiencies provided by CMS. By the end of 2004-05, an estimated cost avoidance of \$14.62 million was realized due to administrative system data center consolidation.

- Issuance of consolidated financial statements (for all campuses, plus all eighty-nine auxiliaries), using PeopleSoft software and applying GAAP reporting requirements.
- Implementation of a web based public bid and vendor management system, PlanetBids, resulting in a significant improvement in the procurement process for the campuses.
- Creation of the CSU Risk Management Authority (CSURMA) for the protection of the institution as a whole, its campuses, and auxiliary members of the Authority, from catastrophic liability and other financial losses.
- Development of the Space and Facilities Database (SFDB), which maintains CSU systemwide space and facilities data and serves as the foundation for multiple capital planning processes including requests for new space support budget funding. With the enhanced web-based SFDB, campuses can: 1) enter annual updates directly into the database; 2) correct errors by running a validation edit program in the SFDB; and 3) analyze the space update by system-generated analysis reports. The enhanced web-based SFDB greatly improved the efficiency of the annual SFDB update process by allowing campus users to access the web-based SFDB throughout the year and to submit the error-free and acceptable SFDB update for the Chancellor's Office final review during the annual update window.
- Development of the Land Records Information System (LRIS), a system-wide database of land title information covering all CSU-held real estate. The database includes: campus records of survey which delineate the campus boundaries; encumbrance maps showing easements, leases, etc.; and spreadsheets with pertinent data for each encumbrance. To promote easy accessibility by campus staff to this information, LRIS is maintained on the LUPER website page at <http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/luper/records.shtml>. The campuses and CPDC use this database extensively as a research tool when siting buildings, clearing title, and granting easements.