

Testimony by Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education- Kindergarten-University
Public Hearing- “Affordability” –June 18, 2002

I want to thank the Joint Committee again for an opportunity to provide public comment on the draft Master Plan. The CSU Academic Senate believes this effort is a highly significant one for the future of California and that it will establish an action plan for providing the highest quality educational experience for the citizens of this state. To demonstrate our commitment to this effort, senate members have been present at all the workgroup deliberations and we have provided you with our best reflections on the issues before the committee. The topic of today’s hearing is of special concern because it deals with the troublesome issue of adequate financing for a high quality education while, at the same time, also providing both opportunity and affordability for all students.

“Affordability,” is, of course, a term that is defined in various ways and in terms of many factors. As a first generation student from a poor working class family living in the state of New York, I and my family struggled much with the meaning of the concept of affordability. We did not have the benefit of the rich financial aid formula California provides for those seeking a higher education, nor was there the low fee structure of our California public institutions of higher education. During my four years of undergraduate education, I, like many of our CSU students, worked many hours. In fact, I held four “jobs,” working in the university cafeteria, serving as the night switchboard operator, serving as a tutor, and working as a student assistant for the biology department. One of my tasks in the student assistant position was to feed our university mascot – the Allegheny Alligator. That task I would not want to repeat. However, I do not regret at all the contribution I made to my own education and, in fact, I value that education all the more for the amount of effort and sacrifice that it required.

I share this with you neither for drama nor for sympathy but to argue, again, that “affordability” is a relative term and we must recognize that California has one of the lowest cost systems of higher education in the world. My neighbor’s son who will be a freshman next year at CSU, Bakersfield told me: “I can go to the university next year at half the cost of my high school experience.”

Let me now address some of the specific recommendations in the draft Master Plan in the section entitled “Affordability.”

Recommendation 48- The State should adopt policies to provide more stability for finance and dampen the ‘boom and bust’ swings of state appropriations for postsecondary education.

The Academic Senate CSU strongly supports this recommendation. We believe that state government should provide funding for ‘core budget items,’ such as adequate

enrollment support, appropriate compensation increases, and funding for key instructional support items such as libraries and instructional equipment, including that needed for technology mediated instruction. This predictability and stability in funding is absolutely crucial if the CSU is to meet its commitment to provide accessible, high quality education to the citizens of California.

I had the privilege of sitting with the Finance and Facilities: Postsecondary workgroup and can attest that stability of funding for postsecondary education was an idea strongly supported by all the members of that group. Although there are Partnership agreements with both the CSU and UC that provide some element of stability, there is no mechanism to deal with hard financial times when those agreements cannot be fully honored. Further, certain items we believe to be essential to high quality education are not included in the Partnership such as adequately funding libraries and purchasing and maintaining instructional equipment including the technology needed for use in instruction. As the staff analysis of the Finance and Facilities workgroup report notes: “Research findings and practices in other states suggest that technology, if sensitively employed, can be helpful in improving the quality of teaching and learning and in mitigating the facilities impact of enrollment demand exceeding current capacity.”

The CSU Academic Senate believes that there are “core needs” for a high quality public education that must be adequately funded. These core needs have been addressed in our document, *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California.*¹ I quote briefly from that document. “Quality results from the preparation of teachers and learners, opportunities for close contact between teachers and students, the currency of the knowledge resources, the availability of up-to-date equipment and technology, and physical housing.²” These are elements are very similar to the indicators of high quality that are identified for K-12 Education in the draft Master Plan document. Thus, again, we support this recommendation.

Recommendation 48.2- The State should analyze the appropriateness of maintaining a ‘marginal cost’ approach for funding all additional enrollments in colleges and universities.

The Academic Senate CSU strongly supports the need to review the adequacy of the marginal cost funding formula. An analysis of marginal cost funding is part of our 21st Century document and our conclusion is that the factors in the calculation need to be re-examined because this funding formula no longer reflects the real costs to serve students today. The faculty salary rate used in this outdated methodology dates back to a budgeted position calculation used by the CSU for new faculty positions prior to 1993/94, but one that is no longer relevant given major salary increments over the past nine years. This step on the salary schedule used in the funding formula (Faculty Salary Step III, currently \$44,800) is supposed to reflect the average cost for hiring a new faculty member. However, the average amount actually paid to new hires in the CSU (on average, \$52,000

¹ *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California.* The Academic Senate, CSU, September 7, 2001.

² Ibid. 11.

in 2002) is significantly higher than the cost represented in the marginal cost funding formula.³ In addition, the Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) used in the formula is too high, reflecting the crisis of the early 1990's rather than the reality of either the previous decade or good educational practice.

Recommendation 48.3- The State should earmark a percentage of its annual investment in state-supported research by public postsecondary education institutions for applied research in areas of public priority as identified by the Legislature.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports this recommendation. As a public institution, we are dedicated to serve our communities as well as interests of the state. Further, many CSU faculty members are engaged in applied research that directly benefits the communities served by their universities. Much of this research involves students thus it fosters research skills that will provide future benefit to the state. CSU faculty members very much consider themselves as members of a universities who work in close partnership with their surrounding communities and not as members of 'ivory tower' institutions.

Recommendation 49: The Legislature and Governor should reform the State's approach to student charges in the public segments and maintain the Cal Grant need-based financial aid entitlement.

Recommendation 49.1- The State should adopt a student fee policy aimed at stabilizing student fees and should resist the pressure to buy out student fee increases or reduce students fees at the CCC, CSU and UC during good economic times.

Recommendation 49.2- The State should continue to emphasize financial need in the award of state-supported grants and should continue to fund the Cal Grant 'entitlement' as defined in SB1644 (statutes of 2000).

The CSU Academic Senate supports all three of these recommendations. Each public higher education institution suffers from current unmet needs and will be unable to accommodate the demands of Tidal Wave II unless the long term decline of state appropriations support is reversed. With so many existing constraints on the state budget, the only realistic solution to meeting these needs may well be to allow these institutions to seek new sources of revenue. We believe that students and their families will appreciate a policy that allows for both long term planning as well as stability in fees. Further, the Academic Senate believes the proceeds from student fees should remain with institutions of higher education to directly benefit the students who have paid those fees. The senate also strongly supports the continual funding of the Cal Grant entitlement and the recommendation of the Finance and Facilities working group that all increases in state assistance given to students should be limited to those with financial need.

³ *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California, the Academic Senate of the California State University, September 7, 2001.*

Finally, I would like to address an issue that was discussed by staff comment on the Finance and Facilities: Postsecondary workgroup report, but that is not reflected in the draft Master Plan document. That issue concerns the option of appropriating comparable levels of funding for comparable educational delivery at all three public postsecondary education systems. Both the citizens of this state and their elected representatives expect that all three systems of postsecondary education will deliver a comparable level of quality in lower division undergraduate education. Thus, should there not be identical funding to the CCC, UC and CSU for that lower-division undergraduate education? Should there not be comparable funding to the UC and CSU for upper division undergraduate education? Further, should there not be comparable funding at the UC and CSU for graduate and post-baccalaureate education? If the expectation of each institution is a comparable quality of teaching and learning opportunities, then state appropriations should reflect that expectation. The CSU Academic Senate believes that this Master Plan will take a giant step forward for guaranteeing a high quality education system in California if it establishes a financing system for postsecondary education that aligns expectations with allocations and expenditures with costs.

In conclusion, we wish to stress two points.

First, we welcome many of the new initiatives you suggest, but urge that our primary mission of providing a highly quality education for the citizens of California be adequately financed.

Second, we wish to address two separate but related issues on funding this mission:

The California State University is actively engaged in planning for a future that includes large numbers of new students seeking admission to our institutions. And, yet the funding we receive varies with the State's economy. Just as California citizens deserve some predictability about the fees they will pay for their university education, so do state-supported institutions deserve some predictability about the support they will receive. 'Boom-or-Bust' funding is deleterious to the institutions and unfair to our students. A separate funding issue is the marginal cost formula. Developed during the early 1990's when funding for our institutions had reached a low point, the marginal cost formula has retarded the growth of our universities.

The CSU Academic Senate is very appreciative of the opportunity to provide observations and commentary on the draft Master Plan for Education. Be assured that we will work in appropriate ways to support this highly significant effort for the benefit of the citizens of California and for their educational system.



**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

401 Golden Shore, Suite 139
562-951-4010/4015

Long Beach, California

90802-4210
FAX 562-951-4911

Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair

TO: Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education
Kindergarten through University **DATE:** June 2, 2002

FROM: Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair
CSU Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Responses to the “Master Plan for Education in California”

On behalf of the Academic Senate of the California State University I express my deep appreciation to the committee for undertaking this bold endeavor of drafting a Master Plan for Education for California that will guide state and local policy-makers as well as the state’s educational institutions as they to continue to develop, maintain and move forward a first rate system of schools, colleges and universities. We also thank you for allowing various constituencies and individuals the opportunity to provide comment and suggestions on the May draft plan. Below, on behalf of the Academic Senate of the California State University, I am pleased to provide a series of observations and comments on the draft plan as well as additional information that might help refine the recommendations contained in that draft. These will be organized relative to the sections of the draft.

The Vision

The CSU Academic Senate shares the commitment expressed in the plan to develop a system of education that “prepares all students for transition to and success in the next level of education, the workforce, and the general society, and that is responsive to the changing needs of our state and our people.”(p. 4) In November 1997, the CSU Academic Senate adopted a statement entitled *Baccalaureate Education in the California State University*. This statement evolved during a two-year discussion of the issues related to a baccalaureate education by campus senates as well as by a large conference of faculty from throughout the CSU. In this statement, the Academic Senate, CSU identifies the following purposes of the baccalaureate:

CSU undergraduate education engages each student in the development of advanced knowledge, skills, and understanding that are the mark of educated persons. Such an education is necessary for lifelong intellectual endeavor, for becoming productive members of society, and for participating in democratic institutions and civil society. Equally important the baccalaureate provides opportunities to understand values and ethics and the role they play in the life of the individual and of society.¹

¹ *Baccalaureate Education in the California State University*, Academic Senate, California State University, November, 1997.

Thus, a student with a CSU baccalaureate degree is prepared to contribute broadly to the economy, society, polity and culture of California. Further, as a public university, CSU is committed to the principle of equity, to the need to offer the opportunity and benefits of higher education on a fair basis to all who qualify. In this 1997 statement, the CSU Academic Senate also highlights its commitment to other principles identified as significant in the draft Master Plan. Thus, the report highlights the importance of the following:

- Improving integration of general education and major coursework;
- Working with high schools and community colleges to assure students are prepared for baccalaureate education;
- Using various methods of assessing student learning before, during, and at the end of the baccalaureate;
- Increasing the effective use of new teaching approaches and of technology;
- Engaging in continuous assessment of the knowledge and skills needed for graduation; and
- Supporting the commitment by our faculty to assuring the diversity of CSU degree programs²

In sum, the CSU Academic Senate applauds the vision of this plan and reaffirms its own commitments to that vision and especially to the plan's focus on significant student learning.

ACCESS

The CSU Academic Senate is especially appreciative of the plan's expressed strong linkage of the principles of access and quality. It is our firm conviction that access without quality is not access worth having. Ensuring the quality of our degrees and programs for our students is our primary concern. "The California State University owes to its students and the citizens of the state, the highest possible level of quality in the educational process."³ Further, we applaud the emphasis on providing instructional environments designed for maximizing learning and success for all students as early as possible in their educational experience. In an earlier response to this committee, the senate affirmed its position "that all students should be given the opportunity to be prepared for college-level work."⁴

In collaboration with the Chancellor's Office, and campus vice presidents for Academic Affairs, the CSU Senate has established a Task Force both to study and develop recommendations on "Facilitating Graduation." At the heart of our work is the recent study done by the U.S. Department of Education entitled: "*Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment.*"⁵ A primary conclusion of that study is that a high school curriculum infused with high academic intensity and quality is the most pronounced and positive factor influencing completion of a bachelor's degree for all students, taken as a whole, and even more so for African-American and Latin students.⁶ Further, we would like to add our voice to that of Professor Jeannie Oakes, Co-Chair of the

² *Baccalaureate Education in the California State University*, 2.

³ Ibid. 9.

⁴ Letter from Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley to the Honorable Dede Alpert, March 19, 2002. This was in response to the Student Learning Workgroup final report. See page 2.

⁵ *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment.* U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement, June 1999.

⁶ Ibid. vii.

Student Learning Workgroup, who affirms the importance of the “Opportunity to Learn Standards” advocated in the draft Master Plan.⁷

With these more general ideas stated, we turn now to specific recommendations contained within in the draft plan.

Recommendation 5.3 The State shall provide short-term grant funding to create additional professional development schools that operate in partnerships between institutions of postsecondary education and low-performing schools.

The CSU Academic Senate needs more clarification of this recommendation. The recommendation seems to look to the creation of “additional professional development schools” through “short-term grant funding.” The CSU and its twenty-three campuses have established many kinds of partnerships with schools in their communities. CSU faculty would welcome partnerships that promote mutual professional development among educators in our schools and universities, but there needs to be more definition within this recommendation regarding the “additional professional development schools” that are proposed. Perhaps the emphasis should be on “programs” rather than “schools.” Further, we strongly concur with the draft Master Plan’s affirmation that investment in human capital development will prove very fruitful for the advancement of a high quality education system in California.

Recommendation 9: The State should take action to increase the capability of California colleges and universities to attract, hire, and develop academically qualified teachers and faculty members who also have knowledge and understanding about teaching and learning.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly endorses this recommendation. In our 21st Century document⁸ we have demonstrated that faculty hiring in the CSU has reached crisis proportions. We assert that “Between Fall 2000 and 2010, enrollment growth and faculty retirements will require that the CSU hire a number of tenure/tenure track faculty equal to more than 80% of the current tenure/tenure track faculty.⁹” Further, “efforts to hire tenure/tenure/track faculty come at a time of increased competition from other institutions, a less competitive CSU salary structure than in the past, and housing costs that have skyrocketed, creating a severe crisis in affordable housing.¹⁰” If the CSU is going to maintain a quality faculty in sufficient numbers, significant resources and faculty support are clearly necessary. The senate is also addressing these issues by means of two task forces. The Task Force on Faculty Flow, a collaborative effort with the Chancellor’s Office, campus academic senates and Provosts for Academic Affairs, is addressing issues of recruitment, hiring and retention of faculty. The ACR 73 Task Force, a joint effort of the CSU Academic Senate, the Chancellor’s Office and the California Faculty Association, is addressing some similar issues, but its focus is on increasing the ratio of tenured/tenure track faculty to temporary faculty.

Recommendation 9.1-. The State shall expand programs to attract talented individuals, especially from underrepresented groups, into K-12 teaching and postsecondary faculty careers through forgivable loans and teaching fellowships.

⁷ Jeannie Oakes, “Can a Master Plan Save California’s Schools?”

⁸ *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*, Academic Senate of the California State University, September 7, 2001.

⁹ Ibid. 38.

¹⁰ Ibid. 38.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports this recommendation. CSU faculty members are strong advocates of our Forgivable Loan Program and have recommended and supported students from underrepresented groups to pursue doctoral programs. Some of our new and successful faculty members have been the beneficiaries of this program. Our faculty members have also strongly supported the Governor's Teaching Fellowships and the Sally Casanova Pre-Doctoral program.

Recommendation 9.2- California colleges and universities should strive to ensure that schools of education have the resources needed to produce a substantial proportion of the teachers and faculty needed to staff our pre-schools, schools, colleges, and universities over the next decade and beyond.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports this recommendation, but with the qualification concerning university-wide responsibility that follows. The CSU Academic Senate maintains a strong commitment to the CSU mission to provide quality teachers for K-12. This endeavor, however, is not just the task of our schools of education but is truly an all-university effort. Thus, our Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee is providing excellent leadership in ongoing efforts to ensure the solid infusion of the new standards into the education provided for future elementary school teachers. These standards demand a strong integration of content and pedagogy and thus faculty members in various disciplines are as crucially involved in this effort as are the faculty members in schools of education. Further, discipline faculty members play a key role in ensuring that secondary schools receive teachers with a high quality educational preparation for their single subject credentials. As for the preparation of faculty members for community colleges, a number of CSU campuses offer Masters Programs to prepare students for teaching in the community colleges and the senate supports the recent CSU-University of California agreement to increase the number of EdD programs. The CSU Academic Senate has also consistently supported other doctoral programs offered jointly by CSU campuses and other higher education institutions.

Recommendation 9.3- The State should increase doctoral and master's degree production in areas of high need, drawing upon the combined resources of the UC and CSU, as well as the independent sector of postsecondary education.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports this recommendation. The CSU currently awards some 56 percent of all post-baccalaureate degrees awarded by public institutions in California.¹¹ Last year, the CSU awarded 13,688 Masters Degrees, twice the number awarded by the UC (6,258). One of our campuses, San Diego, expects to graduate 405 doctoral students in 2002 and as many as 600 in 2005 all through joint-doctoral programs. The CSU Senate also supports the recent CSU-University of California agreement to increase the number of EdD programs. This effort, however, only addresses needs for a degree in education, e.g. educational leadership and special education.

The CSU could do more to meet the needs of California residents for post-baccalaureate education, including non-degree programs, the expansion of existing masters' degree programs, and the introduction of new, applied graduate degree programs at the master's degree and doctoral levels. Many CSU faculty members believe that, with appropriate funding, their departments could offer stand-alone doctoral programs to meet state needs, e.g. in preparing faculty to teach nursing or speech. These are areas of significant need where UC

¹¹ CPEC Reports. Performance indicators of California Higher Education 1999 (2.2000), Section V, Student Outcomes, Sections 5D-1, 5D-2, 5E-1, 5E-2, CSU Degrees, 1992-2-1997/8, and 5DEF, UC Degrees, 1992/3-1997-8.

does not offer programs. The CSU Academic Senate recently appointed a Task Force on Graduate and Post-baccalaureate Education to study the state's unmet needs for masters and doctoral graduates, the current CSU capability for meeting these needs (in terms of faculty specialization, support resources, and the like) and the financial aspects of expanding existing programs or developing new programs to meet state needs. A serious need for the CSU is a redefinition of a full-time graduate student for funding purposes from 15 student credit units per semester to 12, which is the standard throughout American higher education.¹² Funding and attention need to be given to graduate and post-baccalaureate education in the CSU. However, such attention should not adversely impact the primary mission of the CSU to provide a high quality undergraduate education. Rather adequate funding must be provided to both significant efforts.

Recommendation 9.4- California colleges and universities should develop an infrastructure to support the ongoing professional development of faculty in order to improve the quality of teaching and promote student learning.

The CSU already has such a structure in place and thus the CSU Senate supports this recommendation. In 1994, the CSU Academic Senate, in collaboration, joint action and concurrence with the Chancellor's Office established a California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. It also encouraged the creation of similar institutes at each of the CSU campuses. The CSU institute and campus institutes provide focused support for newly appointed faculty members to ensure quality teaching and continual professional development as well as ongoing support for all faculty members throughout their professional careers. These programs pay significant attention to student learning outcomes and to various methods of assessment. There is also a strong emphasis on the scholarship of teaching and learning. In fact, the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning has an on-line journal devoted to expertise in teaching and learning.¹³ Finally, in hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion within the CSU a very strong emphasis is placed upon selection criteria that stress teaching effectiveness.

Recommendation 10.1 – Annually, the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California shall report to the Legislature the ratio of permanent/tenure-track to temporary faculty employed to their respective systems and how that ratio compares to system wide policy.

The Academic Senate, CSU, **supports this recommendation.** In fact, CSU is already addressing this recommendation. In response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73, the CSU, the CSU Academic Senate and the California Faculty Association have engaged in joint action to increase the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty to 75% of the total CSU faculty. Representatives of the three groups have had two successful meetings and have a third scheduled in early June. A plan to steadily increase the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty members in the CSU is expected to be completed by mid-August.

Recommendation 10.2- The California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California shall report to the Legislature the set of activities reserved for

¹² *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*, Academic Senate of the California State University, September 7, 2001, 16-17. Paragraph 3, pages 67 of the draft Master Plan document refers to the 12 unit recommendation.

¹³ See: www.exchangesjournal.org. For the activities of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning see: www.calstate.edu/itl.

permanent/tenure-track faculty and the rationale for why temporary faculty cannot be enlisted to assist in carrying out such activities.

The CSU Academic Senate requests **clarification** on the intent of this recommendation. The Senate is involved conjointly with the Chancellor's Office and the California State Faculty Association in a Task Force on Workload. A system wide survey of both tenured/tenure track faculty and temporary faculty has been undertaken to determine amounts of time faculty members dedicate to various activities including teaching and advising, research, and service activities including governance as well as to determine individual faculty member attitudes and opinions regarding the most effective use of their time. Further, a comparison national survey has been undertaken and the results will be available this August. Using these data and other material the Task Force will address a variety of recommendations about how the various activities critical to providing a quality educational experience for students might be best performed and by whom. Thus, I believe the CSU will have no difficulty in responding to this recommendation.

Recommendation 11.1- The governing boards of all three public sectors of postsecondary education should direct an examination of faculty promotion, tenure, and review policies and practices, and review them as needed, to ensure that teaching excellence is given significant weights in decisions that affect the compensation awarded to faculty.

The CSU Academic Senate has no doubt that CSU already meets the intent of this recommendation. Further, the senate would advise against making this a responsibility of governing boards. Faculty authority in setting criteria and standards for academic personnel decisions is the norm nationally and is protected by legislation in California. Further, both the CSU Academic Senate and campus senates regularly review the criteria for retention, tenure and promotion to assure their equitable application and clear interpretation. The CSU has three primary criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion: Teaching Effectiveness, Research, and Service. These three criteria are standard for all campuses in the CSU. All campuses consider highly effective teaching to be most significant criterion. Further, the CSU and its campuses have established various awards for and recognitions of exemplary teaching. Many campuses have outstanding teaching awards, both university-wide and school based, and the Wang Family Excellence award is a Trustee system wide award that recognizes exemplary teachers in four discipline areas every year.

Recommendation 12.5- The California Community Colleges, CSU, and UC should collaborate to strengthen the programs in community colleges that prepare students to transfer to CSU and UC and to assure that those courses are acceptable for all campuses of the CSU and UC.

The CSU Academic Senate supports this recommendation and notes that such collaboration is already taking place. The CSU Academic Senate believes that high quality and well-articulated general education requirements and agreements about courses that satisfy lower-division requirements for the majors must be in place between community colleges and all public universities in order to allow successful transfer to CSU and UC. The senate played a key role in achieving agreement on the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and we participate as leaders in the continual review process of the courses that satisfy the intentions of this curricular agreement as well as the GE Breadth program. Further, we are now engaged in Core Lower Division Major Projects that seek consensus among CSU programs on transfer lower division major requirements. Such agreements have been achieved in several disciplines such as sociology, communication studies, management information systems, history, and nursing. Work proceeds in

psychology, criminal justice, nutrition and food services, computer science, and kinesiology, and other projects will be initiated soon. In addition, we are full partners in the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project sponsored by the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS). The two major objectives of this project are: (1) to clarify the essential competencies and knowledge components needed for quality preparation in a major, including those provided in a lower division curriculum; and (2) the establishment of a system of state and regional intersegmental faculty dialogues, by disciplines and among related disciplines, to address curricular issues related to articulation and transfer. A number of our faculty members serve as Lead Faculty as well as participants in this effort. This project includes the faculty leadership of the Community College, the CSU and the UC. Finally, the CSU Academic Senate is involved in efforts to complete a 4CSU agreement that will provide benefits to community college students similar to those envisioned in the UC/CCC Dual Admissions Agreement.

Recommendation 12.6- The community colleges should enhance their career and technical programs that lead to occupational certificates and occupational associate degrees; all postsecondary educational institutions should offer industry skills certificates that prepare students to enter the job market with a set of competencies that they will need to succeed; and CSU and UC should enhance the quality of professional programs that prepare students to enter professional careers with a set of competencies they will need to succeed.

The CSU Academic Senate would appreciate clarification on the intended outcome for CSU of this recommendation. All professional programs in the CSU have to meet the high standards of their accrediting agencies. Included in these standards are student learning outcome and competency assessment requirements that seek to assure both quality and student success in the profession. Further, a series of focus groups convened earlier this year by the Public Affairs division of the CSU strongly endorsed the excellent preparation of CSU students for the workplace.

Recommendation 13.1 – The California State University and the University of California should continue collaborating with K-12 schools to increase the rigor of all academic courses to achieve the goal of reducing demand for remedial instruction among freshmen students and eliminating the current practice of providing additional weight to honors and AP courses in admissions decisions.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly endorses collaborative efforts to increase the rigor of the K-12 curriculum. We refer the committee again to the U.S. Department of Education study, *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment*.¹⁴ This report presents the following relevant findings:

- The impact of high school curricula of high academic intensity and quality on success in completing a baccalaureate degree is far more pronounced for African-American and Latino students than for any other pre-college indicator of academic resources. (pp.16-18)
- Of all pre-college curricula, the highest level of mathematics one has studied in secondary school is the best predictor of completing a bachelor's degree. Finishing a course beyond the level of Algebra 2 (trigonometry or pre-calculus) more than doubles the odds that a student who enters postsecondary education will complete the bachelor's degree. (pp. 24-25)

¹⁴ Op. Cit. *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment*. 16-2.-

- Academic Resources (the composite of high school curriculum, test scores, and class rank) produces a much steeper curve toward bachelor's degree completion than socioeconomic status. Students from the *lowest* SES quintiles who are also in the *highest* academic resources quintile earn bachelor's degrees at a higher rate than a majority of students from the top SES quintile. (pp. 24-25)
- Taking Advanced Placement course is more strongly correlated with bachelor's degree completion than it is with college access.

The CSU Academic Senate finds the results of this study compelling and is seeking to address the issues it raises in its Task Force on "Facilitating Graduation." We also believe that degree completion is the more significant measure of success for the students and citizens of California.

Achievement of Students

As stated above, student achievement in various forms, including the completion of a degree program is a significant and firm goal for faculty in the CSU.

Recommendation 21.2- The State should encourage schools and postsecondary institutions to develop end-of-course assessments that can serve the dual purposes of measuring what a student has mastered as each grade level and of the student's readiness to successfully undertake learning at the next grade level.

Recommendation 21.3- Schools, colleges, and universities should use authentic assessments that measure students' school accomplishments, including work samples and portfolio entries, in relevant academic subjects that would allow the student to move through a variety of coordinated delivery systems, regardless of the provider.

These recommendations seem to assert that student outcomes assessment should become a standard practice in California's educational institutions. The CSU Academic Senate believes that student outcomes assessment is a standard practice in the CSU. As part of the regular program review process in the CSU, all programs must establish goals and objectives for their programs and must have established measures of assessments of the achievement of these student learning outcomes. Further, individual programs must report the results of these assessment processes. For example, a number of Liberal Studies programs in the CSU require students to have graduation portfolios that document their progress and achievements as they progress through the program. These portfolios have proven very valuable as these students move on to seek employment in the school system. Further, the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning as well as campus institutes offer numerous programs to assist the academic programs in student learning outcomes assessment. Most of the campuses in the CSU have web pages devoted to Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. The CSU maintains a web page specifically devoted to Student Learning Outcomes. This web page has links to all the campus assessment sites as well as other national assessment sites. It also has information on various discipline-based discussions, funded projects in disciplines on assessment (including one on engineering), and on the 2002 GE Embedded Assessment Conference.¹⁵ The CSU Academic Senate's position on student outcomes assessment is this

¹⁵ See: <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/SLOA>

process should be faculty initiated and reviewed and that numerous forms of assessment should be explored and utilized. Only in this manner can assessment address the various competencies, skills, and knowledge components of the multitude of academic programs offered by a quality university.

Recommendation 23: Membership of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) should be augmented with faculty from California's K-12 schools. The resulting new K-12/postsecondary intersegmental faculty body should be charged with reviewing and recommending change, if needed, in the alignment and coordination of curricula, assessment, admissions, and placement.

The CSU Academic Senate appreciates the insight that K-12 teachers need to be involved in inter-segmental alignment and co-ordination activities, but we have some serious concerns about this recommendation as it stands. The first difficulty for implementation of this recommendation concerns the way in which K-12 faculty might become involved. ICAS is a voluntary organization made up of the elected leaders of the system wide academic senates for each segment. Teachers in the K-12 segment do not have a parallel structure to that of the three higher education segments. The essential component is an academic senate body, i.e., a body of elected faculty members that recommend policy dealing with curriculum and other academic matters. It is these faculty bodies in each higher education segment that have primary authority on curricula, admissions, and placement. These are the bodies of expertise that make these decisions relevant to the specific missions of each segment. With no such statewide elected body of K-12 faculty, it is difficult to see how the participating K-12 faculty would be chosen and how they could be seen as speaking for the state's K-12 faculty in the same way that the members of ICAS do.

Further, there already exists an intersegmental body that can address the needed collaboration and understanding between K-12 and the higher education segments. This body is the Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC), composed of leaders of the five educational segments and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. In addition, the ICC has five representative operating committees: Transfer and Articulation; Curriculum and Assessment; Outreach and Student Preparation; Improvement of Teaching; and Technology. The intended goals of this recommendation might be better achieved by reexamining the membership, task and work of the ICC and its committees.

Recommendation 24.1- The governing boards of the University of California, California State University, and California Community College systems should establish an intersegmental group of faculty to devise system-wide articulation agreements that would enable students to transfer units between and among public colleges and universities in California.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports successful articulation and transfer efforts, but we have serious concerns about this approach to the issue. Articulation agreements that work most effectively are those that involve the participation and agreement of the faculty members of the various academic programs within the three systems. Such agreements involve true collaboration and understanding between and among the faculties of the institutions who will teach and/or evaluate the academic content and competencies represented in these agreements. Further, system-wide articulation for general education already exists in the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, a curriculum that is accepted by all three segments, and in the GE Breadth program for students transferring to CSU. Faculty members from all three segments participate in a regular review process of the courses that satisfy this curriculum. CSU faculty members also are participating in efforts to articulate

requirements for undergraduate major courses that will expedite the timely completion of baccalaureate programs.

Recommendation 24.2- The University of California, California State University, and the California Community College systems should establish an intersegmental group that includes faculty and students to consider what steps need to be taken to establish a transfer Associate's degree, within the existing Associate degree unit requirements, the attainment of which will guarantee admission, and course transferability, to any CSU or UC campus for students successfully completing the transfer degree program.

The CSU Academic Senate appreciates the intent of this recommendation but cannot support it in its present form.

First, we are not certain that it is possible to guarantee admission to any CSU or UC campus due to a variety of factors including impaction of programs and campuses. Second, we do not believe it is necessary to create a new intersegmental body since there are groups that are already addressing related issues. For example, the CSU Academic Senate has initiated a collaborative effort with the Community College Academic Senate to establish a Task Force on Transfer. This group could be expanded to include UC representation as well as representation of students from each of the three segments. The charge to the Task Force could include study of the establishment of a transfer Associate's degree. Some careful study is needed here to determine what experiences from other states may be relevant and to examine possible models for such a degree program. Responsibility for funding and oversight of this Task Force could be given to ICAS. In addition, there are the UC and CSU agreements that address dual admissions and transfer.

Recommendation 26: The State should support ongoing professional development of all staff in technology applications to ensure they have the skills to help students develop the technology skills and knowledge needed for lifelong achievement and success.

The CSU Academic Senate supports this recommendation and recommends that professional development for faculty also be considered for support. The CSU Academic Senate is committed to ensuring that CSU students develop the technology skills and knowledge needed for lifelong achievement and success. In 1993 the Senate urged the developers of a system wide telecommunications plan to address thoroughly the needs for student learning and for proven pedagogy.¹⁶ In 1994 a Task Force was appointed to address the use of "Technology for Teaching and Learning."¹⁷ In 1995, the CSU Academic Senate resolved to "recognize and affirm the importance of faculty using and, where possible, teaching their students with and about proven as well as emerging technologies that may satisfy both the students' need for a thorough contemporary education and their need for lifelong learning strategies."¹⁸ In 1996, the senate endorsed the position paper of the Task Force on Technology, *Statement of Principles on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning.*¹⁹ This followed in 1996 with a series of

¹⁶ AS-2187-93/AA/FA/CSIP, November 4-5, 1993: "Response to the Draft Telecommunications Plan, "Leveraging the Future."

¹⁷ AS-2204-94/Floor, March 10-11 1994: "Establishment of a Task Force on the Use of Technology in Teaching and Learning."

¹⁸ AS-2248-95/AA, January 19-20,199: "Emerging Technologies and Pedagogy in the California State University,"

¹⁹ AS-2295-95/TTF, September 7-8 1995: "Statement of Principles on Faculty Professional Development in the Use of Technology for Teaching and Learning."

recommendations and enunciated principles for Technology Mediated Instruction.²⁰ Meanwhile, members of the CSU Academic Senate participated in the work of the CSU Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) that promoted professional development for faculty engaged in technology mediated instruction and projects that enhance student technology skills and learning.

In 1999 through collaboration and joint action between the Chancellor's Office and the CSU Academic Senate, the Academic Technology Advisory Committee was formed. This committee includes representation from the faculty, students, provosts for academic affairs, vice presidents for student affairs, the Council of Library Directors, the Commission on Extended University, the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning as well as the Council for Campus Professional Development Institutes, and members from the technology staff of the Chancellor's Office. Included among the tasks of this committee are the charges to assure excellence and effectiveness in teaching and learning, improve student access in information resources, and to enhance the learning environment for faculty and students within and outside of the classroom. In April, 2002 this committee and the Chancellor's Office sponsored an Academic Technology Planning Conference. Each CSU campus sent teams of faculty, provosts of academic affairs, students, technology experts, librarians, student affairs personnel and others to this conference. Over three hundred were in attendance. The goals of the conference were:

- To develop a shared vision of where academic technology will be in three to five years,
- To promote the development or refinement of campus strategic plans for academic technology that will assure that the technology employed is essential to providing a high quality teaching and learning environment.
- To share promising academic technology practices within the CSU.
- To develop an understanding of which organizational practices and structures on campus, and within the system, can best support the use of technology to support learning.

In addition to these efforts to ensure that CSU students have the technology skills and knowledge they need, the CSU Senate, in 1998, adopted a position paper on "Information Competence," that urged the system and campuses to develop a program in information competence to "ensure that all CSU graduates are able to locate, retrieve, organize, critically evaluate, analyze, synthesize, and communicate information in a cohesive and logical manner." It further urged that information competence be an integral part of the total curriculum and that outcomes in this area be assessed.²¹ This goal is rapidly being achieved on all CSU campuses, in part through grants administered by the Information Competence Work Group. This group is a system wide task force focused especially on library resources and on bringing disciplinary faculty into closer working relations with the library faculty who are pioneers in information competence. Further, the Chancellor's Office, the CSU Institute of Teaching and Learning, and campus teaching institutes have sponsored programs and workshops to assist faculty and programs in integrating information competence into the curriculum. For further information on these efforts, you may consult the Information Competency web site.²²

²⁰ AS-2322-96/AA/TEKR, March 7-8 1996: "Recommendations Regarding Technology Mediated Instruction in the CSU."

²¹ AS-2409-98/AA, March 5-6, 1998: "Information Competence: A University-Wide Responsibility."

²² www.calstate.edu/lis/infocom.shtml.

Finally, an outstanding project for technology in teaching and learning is the MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching) project. The project involves collaboration between the CSU, CCC, several Canadian universities, the Council for Independent Colleges, the Florida Board of Regents and Florida Community College System, the Boards of Regents of Iowa, Louisiana, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Tennessee, the SUNY system, Troy State University, the University of Hawaii, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, University System of Georgia, University of Wisconsin system, Virginia Community College System, and the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications. Composed of discipline communities in Biology, Business, Chemistry, Foreign Languages, Health Sciences, Information Technology, Mathematics, Music, Physics, Psychology and Teacher Education, Merlot is a continually growing collection of online learning materials and support resources that help faculty enhance their teaching and to foster student learning.²³

Accountability for Learner Outcomes and Institutional Performance

Recommendation 30.1- The State's accountability framework for postsecondary education should be improved by the modification and expansion of the 'partnership' budget approach, currently applied to UC and CSU, to include all postsecondary education, clarify the link between performance and funding, and adopt realistic alternatives for revenue downturns.

The CSU Academic Senate supports this recommendation.

The CSU Academic Senate participated extensively in the CSU Cornerstones project that forms the basis for the present accountability system utilized in the CSU. This also forms the foundation for the accountability measures that are a key component of the present 'partnership' document with the governor. The senate urges that campus senates and faculty members be significantly involved in a process of clarification of the links between performance and funding as well as in seeking realistic alternative measures in the face of revenue downturns.

As indicated in responses above, the CSU as a system and the senates and faculty members of various campuses are heavily involved in, and committed to, student learning outcomes, assessment and various forms of accountability measures.

Affordability of a Higher Education System

Recommendation 48- The State should adopt policies to provide more stability for finance and dampen the 'boom and bust' swings of state appropriations for postsecondary education.

The Academic Senate CSU strongly supports this recommendation. We believe that state government should provide funding for 'core budget items,' such as adequate enrollment support, appropriate compensation increases, and funding for key instructional support items such as libraries and instructional equipment, including that needed for technology mediated instruction. This predictability and stability in funding is absolutely crucial if CSU is to meet its commitment to provide accessible, high quality education to the citizens of California.

²³ See: www.merlot.org and e-mail info@merlot.org.

Recommendation 48.2- The State should analyze the appropriateness of maintaining a 'marginal cost' approach for funding all additional enrollments in colleges and universities.

The Academic Senate CSU strongly supports the need to review the adequacy of the marginal cost funding formula. An analysis of marginal cost funding is part of our 21st Century document and our conclusion is that the factors in the calculation need to be re-examined because this funding no longer reflects the real costs to serve students. The faculty salary rate used in the methodology dates back to a budgeted position used by the CSU prior to 1993/94 for new faculty positions, but one no longer relevant given major changes since then. This step on the salary schedule (Faculty Salary Step III, currently \$44,800) is supposed to reflect the average cost for hiring a new faculty member. However, the average amount paid to new hires in the CSU (on average, \$52,000 in 2002) is significantly higher than the cost represented in the marginal cost funding formula.²⁴ In addition, the Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) used in the formula is too high, reflecting the crisis of the early 1990's rather than the reality of either the previous decade or good educational practice.

Recommendation 48.3- The State should earmark a percentage of its annual investment in state-supported research by public postsecondary education institutions for applied research in areas of public priority as identified by the Legislature.

The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports this recommendation. As a public institution, we are dedicated to serve our communities as well as interests of the state. Further, many CSU faculty members are engaged in applied research that directly benefits the communities served by their universities. Much of this research involves students thus fostering research skills that will provide future benefit to the state. CSU faculty members very much consider themselves as members of a university community in close partnership with its surrounding community and its members and not as members of an 'ivory tower' institution.

Recommendation 49: The Legislature and Governor should reform the State's approach to student charges in the public segments and maintain the Cal Grant need-based financial aid entitlement.

Recommendation 49.1- The State should adopt a student fee policy aimed at stabilizing student fees and should resist the pressure to buy out student fee increases or reduce students fees at the CCC, CSU and UC during good economic times.

Recommendation 49.2- The State should continue to emphasize financial need in the award of state-supported grants and should continue to fund the Cal Grant 'entitlement' as defined in SB1644 (statutes of 2000).

The CSU Academic Senate supports all three of these recommendations. Each public higher education institution suffers from current unmet needs and will be unable to accommodate the demands of Tidal Wave II unless the long term decline of state appropriations support is reversed. With so many existing constraints on the state budget, the only realistic solution to meeting these needs may well be to seek allow these institutions new sources of revenue. We believe that students and their families will recognize this reality and will appreciate a policy that allows for long term planning and stability in fees. Further, the Academic Senate believes the proceeds from fees should remain with institutions of higher education to directly benefit the students who pay those fees. The senate also strongly

²⁴ *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California, the Academic Senate of the California State University, September 7, 2001.*

supports the continual funding of the Cal Grant entitlement and the recommendation of the Finance and Facilities working group that all increases in state assistance given to students should be limited to those with financial need.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we wish to stress two points.

First, we welcome many of the new initiatives you suggest, but urge that our primary mission of providing a highly quality education for the citizens of California be adequately financed.

Second, we wish to address two separate but related issues on funding this mission:

The California State University is actively engaged in planning for a future that includes large numbers of new students seeking admission to our institutions. And, yet the funding we receive varies with the State's economy. Just as California citizens deserve some predictability about the fees they will pay for their university education, so do state-supported institutions deserve some predictability about the support they will receive. 'Boom-or-Bust' funding is deleterious to the institutions and unfair to our students. A separate funding issue is the marginal cost formula. Developed during the early 1990's when funding for our institutions had reached a low point, the marginal cost formula has retarded the growth of our universities.

The CSU Academic Senate is very appreciative of the opportunity to provide observations and commentary on the draft Master Plan for Education. Be assured that we will work in appropriate ways to support this highly significant effort for the benefit of the citizens of California and for their educational system.