

2000-2001  
FACULTY SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

**AGENDA**

Thursday, April 5, 2001  
Foothill Suite, University Union  
3:00 -5:00 p.m.

**OPEN FORUM**

*CFA- Livingston lecture  
workload survey  
4-26 mtg - regular is 3:30 -  
Res. & Creative Act Award - status?*

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

FS 01-19/ConC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--Senate

Academic Policies Committee

LISA ROBERTS, At-large, 2004 *Lib*  
TOM KRABACHER, At-large, 2004 *Geog*  
KAREN HOROBIN, At-large, 2004 *Teacher Ed*  
FRED MARSHALL, At-large, 2002

Committee on Diversity and Equity:

MAUREEN SMITH, At-large, 2003  
ANN MOYLAN, At-large, 2004

Curriculum Policies Committee:

BEN AMATA, Lib/SS, 2004  
TED LASCHER, At-large, 2004

Election Committee:

BETTE POLKINGHORN, At-large, 2002  
JOE KILPATRICK, At-large, 2002  
STEPHANIE WHITUS, At-large, 2002  
ALICIA SNEE, At-large, 2002  
SMILE DUBE, At-large, 2002  
ART JENSEN, At-large, 2002

Faculty Endowment Fund Committee:

SUZANNE LINDGREN, At-large, 2003  
ROBERTO QUINTANA, At-large, 2004  
SUE HEREDIA, At-large, 2004

Faculty Policies Committee:

LINDA GOFF, Lib/SS, 2004  
 SUE GOMEZ, At-large, 2004  
 PIA WONG, At-large, 2004

General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee:

CRISTY JENSEN, At-large, 2004  
 RICHARD KORNWEIBEL, At-large, 2004

Livingston Annual Faculty Lecture Committee:

DOUG RICE, At-large, 2003  
 ERNEST UWAZIE, At-large, 2003  
 GEETHA RAMACHANDRAN, At-large, 2003

FS 01-20/CPC, Ex. CURRICULUM REVIEW -- DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The Faculty Senate receives the commendations and recommendations (Attachment A) of the Curriculum Policies Committee on the program review of the Department of Criminal Justice and recommends that the Bachelor of Arts degree, the Master of Arts degree, and the Minor in Criminal Justice be approved for six years or until the next program review.

*Science*FS 01-21/CPC, Ex. PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of the following program change proposals:

B.S. Business Administration-Management Information Science Concentration:

Modifies the 24 unit option to provide students a stronger basis in Object Oriented systems and a greater opportunity to integrate some Computer Science courses into the concentration. No change in overall units requested.

M.S. Business Administration-Management Information Science Concentration:

Modifies the program to formally list elective options that have been routinely approved at the department level. The proposal also makes the program consistent with the new course numbering scheme for MIS undergraduate courses. No change in overall units requested.

B.S. Speech Pathology & Audiology:

- a) Deletes SPHP 149, Counseling Techniques for Speech Pathologists and Audiologists and adds SPHP 116, Speech and Hearing Sciences. SPHP 116 will be changed to a graduate level course (SPHP 219); the added course is similar to a course being deleted at the graduate level (SPHP 226) to better match appropriate course work with level of knowledge.
- b) Change SPHP 146 from Introduction to Clinic to Introduction to Clinical Methods, Ethical Practices and Legal Issues to consolidate information and prevent redundant presentation of information.

No change in overall units requested.

M.S. Speech Pathology & Audiology:

- a) Add SPHP 219, Counseling Techniques for Speech Pathologists and Audiologists (deleted from undergraduate program) and delete SPHP 226, Acoustic Phonetics (similar course added to undergraduate program) to better match appropriate course work with level of knowledge.
- b) Delete SPHP 211, Ethical and Legal Issues in Speech Pathology and Audiology (material to be offered in undergraduate course). One unit to be added to SPHP 221 [change from 3 to 4 units] for Speech Pathology Emphasis and to Audiology Emphasis in SPHP 224.
- c) Increase in total number of units from 46-50 units to 49-53 units.

Adapted PE Specialist Credential: Change total number of units in credential from 20 to 21 units to accommodate the increase in units for KIN 171 from 2 to 3 units (required course).

**REGULAR AGENDA**FS 01-26/Flr. MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes of March 15 (#9), 2001.

**SECOND READING**

[Action may be taken.]

FS 01-17/CPC, Ex. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS – SELF STUDY GUIDELINES  
(Amends *Blue Book*)

The Faculty Senate recommends approval of amendments to the *Blue Book*, Section X, Subsection F.II, as shown in March 15, 2001 Senate Agenda, Attachment D.

**FIRST READING**

[Discussion only—unless extended by majority vote; no action.]

FS 01-22/APC, Ex. ACADEMIC CALENDARS 2002-03 AND 2003-04

[Tom Krabacher]

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the proposed 2002-03 and 2003-04 academic calendars (college and academic years) (Attachment B).

FS 01-23/Ex. DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY

The Faculty Senate recommends adoption of the language for addition to General Guidelines (subsection 1.5) (Attachment C).

Want outcomes  
of 75 dist ed  
courses

correction  
of LT - BS vs BA

m/s/c

FS 01-24/Ex.            OUTSTANDING SERVICE AWARD

The Faculty Senate recommends establishing and Outstanding Service Award (Attachment D).

FS 01-25/Ex.            FACULTY MERIT SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PROGRAM POLICY  
(Amends AS 96-07)

The Faculty Senate recommends that the following amend current campus policy (AS 96-07) establishing the Faculty Endowment Fund Program and the procedures for its implementation be amended as follows:

Faculty Merit Scholarship Award Program

Program Description (replace first two sentences):

Each year a minimum of four Merit Scholarship Awards, equal to the cost of registration fees for one semester, shall be granted in the fall semester. At least three of the awards shall be made to undergraduate students and one award to a post baccalaureate student.

Undergraduate Scholarly and Creative Activity Award Program

Program Description (add to end of first paragraph):

Scholarly and Creative Activity Awards shall be awarded in the spring semester contingent upon the availability of funds.

Procedures, guidelines and criteria for allocation of funds:

1. Interest accrued in the prior year (July 1 through June 30) shall be used to fund the Merit Scholarship (MS) Awards and the Undergraduate Scholarly and Creative Activity (USCA) Awards in the following academic year.
2. Contributions accumulated in the prior year (July 1 through June 30) shall be set aside for use in funding the Merit Scholarship Awards and the Scholarly and Creative Activity Awards in the following academic year.
3. The Faculty Endowment Expenditure Fund (FEEF) will contain the total accrued interest and accumulated contributions from the prior year.
4. At the beginning of the fall semester, based upon the amount contained in the FEEF, the Faculty Endowment Committee will recommend the number of MS and USCA awards to be given.

If the funds are insufficient to make the minimum number of awards, the Committee's recommendation will be brought to the Executive Committee for approval.

If the funds are sufficient to make awards in excess of the minimum number of awards, the Committee may recommend that the remaining funds be deposited in the Faculty

Look at original

Get amendments from Susanne Lindgren

Endowment Fund or be used to grant additional awards. In either case, the Committee's recommendation will be brought to the Executive Committee for approval.

5. At the second meeting of the Faculty Senate in the fall semester, the Faculty Endowment Fund Committee will make a report to the Senate. The report should include Faculty Endowment Fund activity from the prior year; including contributions, interest earned on the endowment fund, audit information on the management and performance of the endowment fund, and disbursements in support of the awards made. In addition, the report should include information on the awards to be granted in the current year. The Committee should also report on the current year's plan for fundraising.

(AS 87-73: original policy establishing the Faculty Endowment Fund Program; and amendments: AS 90-67, AS 91-30, AS 95-43 and AS 96-07)

## INFORMATION

1. "Assessing State Accountability Goals" article (Attachment E).
2. Tentative S'2001 Senate Meetings—Thursdays, 3:00-5:00 p.m., in the Foothill Suite, University Union, unless otherwise noted:

<b>SPRING 2001</b>		May 3	<i>tentative</i>
April 12	<i>Spring Recess</i>	May 10 3:00-3:30 3:30-5:00	2001-02 Senate Elections 2000-01 Senate Meets
April 19	No Meeting	May 17	<i>tentative</i>
April 26 3:00-3:30 3:30-5:00	2001-02 Senate Nominations 2000-01 Senate Meets	May 24	<i>Tentative (Finals Week)</i>

2. Senate Home Page: <http://www.csus.edu/acse/> or CSUS Home Page *then* Administration and Policy *then* Administration *then* Faculty Senate

Calif  
6000  
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

MAR 17 2001

Faculty  
413

Senate Received

## Academic Program Review Report

for

## The Division of Criminal Justice

College of Health and Human Services  
California State University, Sacramento

Spring 2000

## Suggestions and Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** The Review Team recommends that the College of Health and Human Services consider modifying its organizational nomenclature to distinguish its academic units on the pragmatic basis of their relative size and productivity so that units terminologically distinguished as *divisions*, *departments*, and *programs* will constitute structurally and operationally different types of administrative entities; moreover, we recommend that within the context of this effort the Division of Criminal Justice *either* be elevated to the status of a school within the college or accorded the opportunity to explore alternatives to the conventional *department* model and adopt a governance structure that might better suit its needs.

**Recommendation 2:** The Review Team recommends that the Division of Criminal Justice explore organizational alternatives to the *department* model and consider developing a governance structure that might better suit its needs.

**Recommendation 3:** The Review Team recommends to the college and the university that funding formulas be modified as necessary to increase the level of budgetary support for the division over the next several years commensurate with efforts to improve and modernize its program. This should include, but not be limited to: supporting and, if necessary augmenting, the division's hiring plan; underwriting the creation of a more efficient management structure; supporting the establishment of a research and development arm of the division; and upgrading the division's equipment and technological resources as required.

**Recommendation 4:** The Review Team recommends that on an annual basis the division review and, if necessary, modify its hiring plan to assure that it is able to: a) implement needed changes to bring the curriculum into compliance with nationwide practice and to meet the student learning outcome goals identified in its assessment plan; b) expand the curriculum to cover new areas and foster the growth of research and development activities in the division; c) adjust to changes in faculty retirement plans; and d) make suitable progress in reducing the division's reliance upon part-time faculty.

**Recommendation 5:** The Review Team recommends that division office capabilities be reviewed periodically and that needed staff augmentations and equipment upgrades be given suitably high priority. Computer hardware upgrades should be a top priority.

**Recommendation 6:** The Review Team recommends that with oversight and assistance at the college level the division develop a formal plan to develop contract and research opportunities with state and federal agencies in the Sacramento area. To facilitate this, we recommend that the chair activate a task force of interested faculty to adopt or create an appropriate *institute* or *center* model; to identify a set of development and funding strategies; and to establish an implementation timetable.

**Recommendation 7:** The Review Team recommends that the division make it a top priority to revitalize its homepage and to begin using it to disseminate useful information to majors



and prospective majors. To facilitate this, the division should obtain funding and technical assistance from the College of Health and Human Services and University Computing and Communication Services sufficient to assure the creation of a first-rate web page that is sophisticated in design, yet user-friendly and easy to maintain.

**Recommendation 8:** The Review Team recommends that the division implement a mixed, multi-layered approach to undergraduate academic advising containing the following four components:

- *A Homepage Advising Link for Criminal Justice Majors* listing:
  - pertinent filing deadlines
  - suggested combinations of elective courses to fit student career goals
  - an FAQ (frequently asked questions) link
  - email hotlinks to the undergraduate advisor or list of faculty advisors
  - (consider) a ListProc link which would enable students to ask questions
- Distribution of printed packets containing the *Major Planning Worksheet*, along with a list of suggested combinations of elective courses to fit a selection of career goals.
- *Mandatory Targeted Advising* (in person) initiated by faculty advisors for students with grade deficiencies.
- Traditional drop-in advising

**Recommendation 9:** The Review team recommends that sufficient resources be obtained to upgrade and computerize the Criminal Justice Career Center, and that a campaign be mounted within the division to encourage majors to use the center early in their careers at CSUS.

**Recommendation 10:** The Review Team recommends that in continuing to develop and implement its assessment plan, the division place some priority on the question of whether the program assures that majors acquire the skills and abilities presently listed as program outcome goals and objectives, particularly the skills and abilities associated with conducting research, analyzing information, interpreting and using criminal justice and criminological data, and critically interpreting and comprehending research reports.

**Recommendation 11:** The Review Team recommends that an upper division course on research methodology be added to the core. The course should either include a significant unit on basic probability statistics or have a statistics prerequisite.

**Recommendation 12:** The Review Team recommends that the division consider adding an upper division course on law adjudication (i.e., a courts course) to the core.



**Recommendation 13:** The Review Team recommends that the division add to its ongoing program assessment activities the task of addressing problems of course overlap focusing especially on the following pairs of courses: CRJ 5/167; 161A/161B; 163/164.

**Recommendation 14:** The Review Team recommends that the division publish and make available to students suggested combinations of elective courses, as well as a list of particular minors, fitting various career goals.

**Recommendation 15:** The Review Team recommends that the division consider ways to assure that criminal justice majors exit the degree program with basic competencies in common types of computer applications in the field of criminal justice.

**Recommendation 16:** The review team recommends that the division consider restoring CRJ 168 to a place of prominence in the major, if not within the required core, then perhaps by flagging it as "highly recommended" for all majors.

**Recommendation 17:** The Review Team recommends that as the division progresses with the implementation and refinement of writing requirements in the upper division courses, it adopt a practical assessment rubric that can be used with some consistency across the curriculum. In conjunction with this, the faculty as a group might also consider whether in addition to the standard college essay and term paper there are other genres of professional writing (e.g., briefs, narrative reports) that majors should master, and, if so, into which courses they should be introduced.

**Recommendation 18:** In conjunction with the foregoing recommendation, we recommend that the division publish a division-wide style sheet containing the basic format, citation, and reference standards for writing in criminal justice courses. This style sheet should also be made available on the division's web page.

**Recommendation 19:** The Review Team recommends that the division empanel a committee to examine the disparity in grade distributions between part-time and full-time faculty.

**Recommendation 20:** The Review Team recommends that the division attend to the relatively high proportion of NC ("No Credit") grades awarded to students enrolled for internship credit (CRJ 195), and to reflect on potentially negative ramifications for the program.

**Recommendation 21:** The Review Team recommends that the division and the Graduate Committee deliberate on some of the questions raised by Dr. Gaines regarding the focus of the graduate program and consider narrowing the range of student and career needs the program currently endeavors to meet.

**Recommendation 22:** The Review Team recommends that the division establish a set of procedures to assure that upon admission to the graduate program each new student is paired with at least a temporary advisor whose responsibility it will be to assist the student in crafting

a tentative course of study, and that every graduate student be officially assigned to an advisor prior to the end of the first semester of enrollment.

**Recommendation 23:** The Review Team recommends that the division activate a *Homepage Advising Link for Criminal Justice Graduate Students*, similar to that recommended above for undergraduates; and that it also include an online rendition of the forthcoming graduate handbook.

### **Recommendations to the Faculty Senate**

The Review Team recommends that the Bachelor of Science degree program in Criminal Justice be approved until the next scheduled program review, contingent upon the Senate receiving a joint report from the College of Health and Human Services and the Division of Criminal Justice within two years of the approval of this document, reflecting satisfactory progress in implementing recommendations 1, 2, 3, 11 and 12

The Review Team recommends that the Master of Science degree program in Criminal Justice be approved until the next program review.

The Review Team recommends that the Minor in Criminal Justice be approved until the next program review.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

March 1, 2001

**MEMORANDUM**

California State University, Sacramento  
6000 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95819-6036

MAR 01 2001

TO: Tom Krabacher  
Chair, Academic Policies Committee  
Faculty Senate

Bob Buckley ✓  
Chair, Faculty Senate

Faculty 413 Senate Received

FROM: Donald S. Taylor  
Faculty Fellow  
for Academic Affairs

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Don Taylor".

SUBJECT: Review and Approval of the Proposed Academic Calendars for  
2002-2003 and 2003-2004 College and Academic Years

Enclosed are two copies of the Proposed Academic Calendars for the 2002-2003, and 2003-2004 Academic and College years for California State University, Sacramento. It is essential that the calendars, academic workdays, and pay period inclusive dates be reviewed for accuracy and that designated workdays be compatible with established norms and definitions (see attachment 1 and attachment 2). Please note that this time around we have built in aYRO element for summer 2002 and summer 2003. These workdays are not calculated as part of our academic year. Your completed review and recommendations should be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than Friday, April 6, 2001.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call me at extension 8-5925.

Attachments:

- c. Bernice Bass de Martínez
- Elizabeth Moulds
- Nancy Shulock
- Cecilia Gray
- Elsa Favila
- Sheila Orman

6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95819-6016 • (916) 278-6331 • (916) 278-7648 FAX

## ACADEMIC CALENDAR NORMS AND DEFINITIONS

To provide for the orderly development of campus academic calendars that are both responsive to local needs and basically consistent throughout the system, the Chancellor's Executive Council has adopted a number of "norms" and definitions. These are to be used in developing all academic calendars. The basic principle governing academic calendars throughout the system is that differences from campus to campus should be rationally based. They should not simply be chance occurrences.

### NORMS:

**Typical Year** - The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year to year and from campus to campus, a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible.

**Minimum Work Days** - There shall be a minimum of 170 academic work days in the academic year.

**Maximum Work Days** - The work year of an academic year employee shall not exceed 180 work days, pursuant to the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (Provision 20.4).

### DEFINITIONS:

**Instructional Day** - Any Monday through Friday during regular academic terms when class meetings are scheduled on a regular and extensive basis for the purpose of instruction.

**Examination Day** - Any day that is set aside for the exclusive purpose of administering final examinations for the term. When comparing campus calendars, institutions which integrate all or part of examination activity with regular instruction will be presumed to have four examination days per term. 8 DAYS MAXIMUM MAY BE SCHEDULED.

**Registration Day** - Any day during the academic year during which faculty members are on duty for the purpose of advising, orientation, course enrollment, and similar activities. For purposes of counting work days, registration days which are also instruction or examination days will not be included a second time.

**"Other Day"** - Any day during the academic year when faculty members are on duty for such purposes as faculty and departmental conferences, committee meetings, faculty development activities, etc..

**Grades Due Days** - Any day(s) prior to or at the close of the term that is designated specifically for the purpose of turning in final grades. This day must be included when computing total academic work days. Campuses that schedule grades due over several dates may count up to two days per semester or one day per quarter as academic work days. One day is preferred.

**Evaluation Day** - Days that are set aside for the reading of examinations and papers and for submission of final grades. A maximum of one day per term may be scheduled.

**Commencement** - Any day set aside for graduation ceremonies. Commencement is counted as an academic work day only if faculty participation is expected and normal, and if the day is not otherwise credited as an academic day. Campuses with school commencements extending over several days may count only one day in computing total academic work days.

**Academic Work Days** - The total of all of the above that occur between the beginning and ending dates of the academic year.

**Academic Holiday** - Any day (Monday through Friday) occurring between the beginning and ending of the academic year that is so designated by the President. Except by special arrangement, faculty members are not expected to be on duty during academic holidays.

**Faculty Vacation** - The period from the end of one academic year to the beginning of the next, when all continuing academic year faculty members are on vacation status, except for those scheduled to teach in summer term or for those on duty by other special arrangement. For faculty members taking a quarter off in exchange for summer quarter teaching, the period extends from the end of the quarter preceding the quarter taken off to the beginning of the quarter succeeding the quarter taken off.

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges** - For accreditation purposes, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges defines a semester as 17 full weeks with at least 15 full weeks of academic class work or its equivalent in effort; a quarter is approximately 11 weeks, with 10 full weeks of academic class work. In addition, the Secretary of Education has defined "instructional time" as a period that includes examination periods and preparation for examinations. Therefore, campuses that use CSU minima for instructional days and examinations will be in compliance with Federal Title IV financial aid regulations.

**DRAFT 2002/2003 ACADEMIC CALENDAR Revised 3/1/01**

Summer, 2002

Apr. 8, 2002 (M) Summer 2002 Class Schedules Available in Bookstore and on CSUS Web

May 13-31, 2002 (M-F) CASPER (Registration for Summer Semester)

May 31, 2002 (F) College Year (YRO) and Summer Semester Begins

May 31, 2002 (F) University-wide and/or College Meetings

June 3, 2002 (M) Instruction Begins for First 6-week Session (Session A) and Full Summer Session (Session C)

June 3-14, 2002 (M-F) CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)

July 4, 2002 (R) Independence Day (Holiday) (❖)

July 14, 2002 (U) Instruction Ends for Session A

July 15, 2002 (M) Instruction Begins for Second 6-week Session (Session B)

July 15, 2002 (M) Evaluation Day for Session A

July 17, 2002 (W) Grades Due for Session A

Aug. 25, 2002 (U) Last Day of Instruction for Session B and Session C

Aug. 26, 2002 (M) Evaluation Day for Session B and Session C

Aug. 27, 2002 (T) Grades Due for Session B and Session C

Aug. 27, 2002 (T) Summer Semester Ends

63 Days of Instruction; 66 Faculty Workdays - (Not included in Academic Year Instructional and Faculty work days)

❖ Campus Closed

Certain collective bargaining agreements covering CSU employees are currently scheduled to expire prior to the last day indicated on this calendar. For employees in these bargaining units, any holiday(s) or winter break listed subsequent to the expiration date of the current agreements(s) are tentative and subject to negotiations with the appropriate exclusive representative.

Fall, 2002

Apr. 8, 2002 (M) Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 Class Schedules Available in Bookstore and on CSUS Web

July 10-31, 2002 (W-W) CASPER

Aug. 26-28, 2002 (M-W) CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)

Aug. 28, 2002 (W) Academic Year Begins - Unit 3 & 4 (Faculty-Academic Professionals)

Aug. 28-30, 2002 (W-F) University-wide and/or College Meetings

Sept. 2, 2002 (M) Labor Day (Holiday)❖

Sept. 3, 2002 (T) Instruction Begins

Sept. 3-13, 2002 (T-F) CASPER Plus (Schedule Adjustment)

Sept. 9, 2002 (M) \*Admission Day (Holiday Observed on 11/29/2002) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Oct. 14, 2002 (M) \*\*Columbus Day and Indigenous People's Day (Holiday Observed on 12/26/2002) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Nov. 11, 2002 (M) \*\*\*Veteran's Day (Holiday Observed on 12/27/2002) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Nov. 28, 2002 (R) Thanksgiving Day (Holiday)❖

Nov. 29, 2002 (F) \*Holiday (Admission Day Observed)❖

Nov. 30-Dec.1, 2002 (S-U) Campus Closed❖

Dec. 13, 2002 (F) Last Day of Instruction

Dec. 14-20, 2002 (S-F) Final Examinations (Sat., Sun: Other Work Day)

Dec. 20-21, 2002 (F-S) Commencement (Sat.: Other Work Day)

Dec. 23, 2002- Jan. 24, 2003 (M-F) Winter Recess (Students)

Dec. 23, 2002 (M) Evaluation Day

Dec. 25, 2002 (W) Christmas (Holiday)❖

Dec. 26, 2002 (R) \*\*Holiday (Columbus Day and Indigenous People's Day Observed)❖

Dec. 27, 2002 (F) \*\*\*Holiday (Veteran's Day Observed)❖

Dec. 30, 2002 (M) +Holiday (Lincoln's Birthday Observed)❖

Dec. 31, 2002 (T) ++Holiday (Washington's Birthday Observed)❖

Jan 1, 2003 (W) New Year's Day (Holiday)❖

Jan. 2-3, 2003 (R-F) Fall Term Grades Due

Jan. 3, 2003 (F) Last Day of Fall Semester

Jan. 6-21, 2003 (M-T) Winter Recess (Faculty)

72 Days of Instruction; 86 Faculty Work Days - Units 3 & 4

\*, \*\* \*\*\*, +, ++ Holiday Observance Rescheduled; ❖Campus Closed

Spring, 2003

Apr. 8, 2002 (M) Spring 2003 Class Schedule Changes available on Web only

- Nov. 25-Dec. 18, 2002 (M-W) CASPER
- Jan. 21-23, 2003 (T-R) CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)
- Jan. 20, 2003 (M) Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (Holiday)❖
- Jan. 22, 2003 (W) Spring Semester Begins
- Jan. 22-24, 2003 (W-F) University-wide and/or College Meetings
- Jan. 27, 2003 (M) Instruction Begins
- Jan. 27-Feb. 7, 2003 (M-F) CASPER Plus (Schedule Adjustment)
- Feb. 12, 2003 (W) ++Lincoln's Birthday (Holiday Observed on 12/30/2002) (Campus Open, Classes Held)
- Feb. 17, 2003 (M) ++Washington's Birthday (Holiday Observed on 12/31/2002) (Campus Open, Classes Held)
- Mar. 31, 2003 (M) Cesar Chavez Birthday (Holiday)❖
- Apr. 14-20, 2003 (M-U) Spring Recess
- May 16, 2003 (F) Last Day of Instruction
- May 17-23, 2003 (S-F) Final Examinations
- May 23-24, 2003 (F-S) Commencement
- May 26, 2003 (M) Memorial Day Observance (Holiday)❖
- May 27, 2003 (T) Evaluation Day
- May 28-May 29, 200 (W-R) Spring Term Grades Due
- May 29, 2003 (R) Last Day of College Year (YRO & Academic Year)

24 Days of Instruction; 88 Faculty Workdays - Units 3 & 4

Total Academic Year = 146 Days of Instruction; 174 Faculty Workdays  
\*, \*\*, \*\*\*, +, ++ Holiday Observance Rescheduled; ❖Campus Closed



**DRAFT 2003/2004 ACADEMIC CALENDAR Revised 3/1/01**

Summer, 2003

Apr. 7, 2003 (M) Summer 2003 Class Schedules Available in Bookstore and on CSUS Web

May 12-30, 2003 (M-F) CASPER (Registration for Summer Semester)

May 30, 2003 (F) College Year (YRO) and Summer Semester Begins

May 30, 2003 (F) University-wide and/or College Meetings

June 2, 2003 (M) Instruction Begins for First 6-week Session (Session A) and Full Summer Session (Session C)

June 2-13, 2003 (M-F) CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)

July 4, 2003 (F) Independence Day (Holiday) ♦

July 13, 2003 (U) Instruction Ends for Session A

July 14, 2003 (M) Instruction Begins for Second 6-week Session (Session B)

July 14, 2003 (M) Evaluation Day for Session A

July 16, 2003 (W) Grades Due for Session A

Aug. 24, 2003 (U) Last Day of Instruction for Session B and Session C

Aug. 25, 2003 (M) Evaluation Day for Session B and Session C

Aug. 26, 2003 (T) Grades Due for Session B and Session C

Aug. 26, 2003 (T) Summer Semester Ends

† Days of Instruction; †† Faculty Workdays - (Not included in Academic Year Instructional and Faculty Workdays)

Campus Closed

††††† Certain collective bargaining agreements covering CSU employees are currently scheduled to expire prior to the last day indicated on this calendar. For employees in these bargaining units, any holiday(s) or winter break listed subsequent to the expiration date of the current agreements(s) are tentative and subject to negotiations with the appropriate exclusive representative.

Fall, 2003

Apr. 7, 2003 (M) Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 Class Schedules Available in Bookstore and on CSUS Web

July 7-29, 2003 (M-T) CASPER

Aug. 25-27, 2003 (M-W) CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)

Aug. 27, 2003 (W) Academic Year Begins - Unit 3 & 4 (Faculty - Academic Professionals)

Aug. 27-29, 2003 (T-F) University-wide and/or College Meetings

Sept. 1, 2003 (M) Labor Day (Holiday) ♦

Sept. 2, 2003 (T) Instruction Begins

Sept. 2-12, 2003 (T-F) CASPER Plus (Schedule Adjustment)

Sept. 9, 2003 (T) \* Admission Day (Holiday Observed on 11/28/2003) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Oct. 13, 2003 (M) \*\* Columbus Day and Indigenous People's Day (Holiday Observed on 12/26/2003) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Nov. 11, 2003 (T) \*\*\* Veteran's Day (Holiday Observed on 12/29/2003) (Campus Open, Classes Held)

Nov. 27, 2003 (R) Thanksgiving Day (Holiday) ♦

Nov. 28, 2003 (F) \* Holiday (Admission Day Observed) ♦

Nov. 29-30, 2003 (S-U) Campus Closed ♦

Dec. 12, 2003 (F) Last Day of Instruction

Dec. 13-19, 2003 (S-F) Final Examinations (Sat., Sun: Other Work Day)

Dec. 19-20, 2003 (F-S) Commencement (Sat.: Other Work Day)

Dec. 22, 2003- Jan. 23, 2004 (M-F) Winter Recess (Students)

Dec. 22, 2003 (M) Evaluation Day

Dec. 25, 2003 (R) Christmas (Holiday) ♦

Dec. 26, 2003 (F) \*\* Holiday (Columbus Day and Indigenous People's Day Observed) ♦

Dec. 29, 2003 (M) \*\*\* Holiday (Veteran's Day Observed) ♦

Dec. 30, 2003 (T) + Holiday (Lincoln's Birthday Observed) ♦

Dec. 31, 2003 (W) ++ Holiday (Washington's Birthday Observed) ♦

Jan. 1, 2004 (R) New Year's Day (Holiday) ♦

Jan. 2, 2004 (F) Fall Term Grades Due

Jan. 2, 2004 (F) Last Day of Fall Semester

Jan. 5-20, 2004 (M-T) Winter Recess (Faculty)

72 Days of Instruction; †† Faculty Workdays - Units 3 & 4  
 \*, \*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, +, ++ Holiday Observance Rescheduled; ♦ Campus Closed

Spring, 2004

Apr. 7, 2003 (M)	Spring 2004 Class Schedule Changes available on Web Only
Nov. 24-Dec. 18, 2003 (M-R)	CASPER
Jan. 19, 2004 (M)	Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (Holiday)❖
Jan. 20-22, 2004 (T-R)	CASPER Plus (Late Registration or Schedule Adjustment)
Jan. 21, 2004 (W)	Spring Semester Begins
Jan. 21-23, 2004 (W-F)	University-wide and/or College Meetings
Jan. 26, 2004 (M)	Instruction Begins
Jan. 26-Feb. 6, 2004 (M-F)	CASPER Plus (Schedule Adjustment)
Feb. 12, 2004 (R)	+Lincoln's Birthday (Holiday Observed on 12/30/2003) (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Feb. 16, 2004 (M)	++Washington's Birthday (Holiday Observed on 12/31/2003) (Campus Open, Classes Held)
Feb. 31, 2004 (W)	Cesar Chavez Birthday (Holiday)❖
Mar. 5-11, 2004 (M-U)	Spring Recess
May 14, 2004 (F)	Last Day of Instruction
May 15-21, 2004 (S-F)	Final Examinations
May 21-22, 2004 (F-S)	Commencement
May 24, 2004 (M)	Evaluation Day
May 25-May 26, 2004 (T-W)	Spring Term Grades Due
May 26, 2003 (W)	Last Day of College Year (YRO) and Academic Year

! Days of Instruction; 88 Faculty Workdays - Units 3 & 4

Total Academic Year = 146 Days of Instruction; 173 Faculty Workdays

\*\* , \*\*\* , + , ++ Holiday Observance Rescheduled; ❖ Campus Closed

March 26, 2001

TO Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM Tom Krabacher, Chair  
Academic Policies Committee

SUBJ Letter of Transmittal: Academic Calendars, 2002-2003 and 2003-2004

BACKGROUND: It is the designated responsibility (as identified in HEERA) of the CSU faculty, acting through their academic and faculty senates, to recommend for approval the CSU academic calendars. Donald Taylor, representing Academic Affairs, presented the proposed academic calendars for AY 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 to the Academic Policies Committee at its 3/16/01 meeting. Discussion occurred regarding various features of the calendar, most notably those proposed to accommodate the adoption of YRO scheduling. Faculty should particularly note the introduction of two new calendar terms: (1) the traditional *Academic Year*, which begins at the onset of Fall Semester and ends with the last day of the following Spring Semester, and (2) the newly-proposed *College Year*, a YRO-related designation that begins with the onset of Summer Semester and ends on the last day of the following Spring Semester.

The Academic Policies Committee sends the proposed calendars forward to the Executive Committee and full senate with its recommendation for approval.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR: The proposed calendar is in line with previous academic calendars adopted at CSUS. The Committee viewed the changes proposed to accommodate YRO as both reasonable and non-controversial.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST: There were none.

## **DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY** California State University, Sacramento

This policy shall apply to all matriculated courses and programs offered through distance education by California State University, Sacramento (CSUS).

For purposes of this policy, **Distance Education** is defined as a formal educational process in which the majority (50 percent or more) of instruction takes place when the professor and students are not in the same place at the same time. Instead, the interaction between professor and students is mediated using audio, video and/or computer technologies.

Three methods are utilized to deliver distance education courses to CSUS students. These include video-based, web-based and mixed media (video and web) delivery. Cable television, two-way compressed video, microwave, satellite, videotape, CD-ROM and video streaming are video-based methods of delivery. Web-based courses include Web courses and Web-enhanced courses. Web courses deliver instruction on the Internet with students in the traditional classroom only for orientation and/or testing. Web-enhanced courses deliver at least 50 percent or more of the instruction on the Internet.

### **1 GENERAL GUIDELINES**

- 1.1 The faculty are responsible for deciding which courses and/or programs will be offered in a distance education format.
- 1.2 The faculty have the collective responsibility to ensure both the rigor and integrity of all courses offered as well as the quality of instruction.
- 1.3 Prior approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs is required for any individual, department or program to contract with any private or public entity to design, transport, and/or produce content for distance education courses or programs on behalf of CSUS.
- 1.4 Prior approval by the relevant department or program is required for the University to contract with any private or public entity to design, transport, and/or produce content for distance education courses or programs.
- 1.5 For programs in which required courses have been traditionally provided in a non-distance education mode of delivery, a change in any of these required courses to a distance education mode of delivery shall also provide students in the program a pathway to completing the major through non-distance education courses.

### **2 PROGRAM APPROVAL GUIDELINES**

- 2.1 A **New Program Proposal** in which a student can complete the program with 50 percent or more of the program being provided through distance education courses must include the information indicated in subsection 2.3.

2.2 A **Program Change Proposal** must be prepared and the University's current "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" (as specified in the *Bluebook*) followed for any program where additions or changes of any courses in the program can result in a student completing the program with 50 percent or more of the program being provided through distance education courses.

2.3 Program Proposals should include the following information:

2.3.1 The role of full-time faculty in developing and implementing the proposed distance education degree program.

2.3.2 Student learning outcomes for the program and the plan for assessing these outcomes.

Note: An existing program adapted for distance education must be equivalent to the program offered on campus. The proposal must demonstrate how course objectives for all distance education classes will be met as effectively as on-campus course sections.

2.3.3 The means for ensuring the academic integrity of student work.

2.3.4 The means for providing the methodologies/strategies for providing interaction between faculty and students as well as interaction between students.

2.3.5 The means for providing the required academic support services and resources (including library, general advising, financial aid, counseling, social support services, etc.).

2.3.6 A faculty development plan for providing pedagogical and technical training to teach through video-based and/or Web-based technologies.

2.3.7 The means whereby faculty and students will access needed technical support.

Note: New distance education programs or existing programs converted to distance education must be reviewed and granted approval by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) prior to implementation. The guidelines for preparing such a proposal are consistent with the guidelines contained in this policy. Academic Affairs will assist departments in the preparation and submittal of such proposals.

### 3 COURSE APPROVAL GUIDELINES

3.1 A **New Course Proposal** in which a majority (50 percent or more) of instruction takes place when the professor and students are not in the same place at the same time must include the information indicated in subsection 2.3. ~~2.3.~~ 3.4.

3.2 A **Course Change Proposal** must be prepared and the University's current "Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs" (as specified in the *Bluebook*) followed for any existing course modified for distance education - where the majority (50 percent or more) of instruction occurs without face-to-face interaction between professor and students.

3.3 Approval of **transfer credit** for distance education courses taken at other institutions is the responsibility of the appropriate department or program. Such courses will be reviewed and evaluated as to both curriculum content and the Course Approval Guidelines specified in this policy.

**3.4 Course Proposals should include the following:**

3.4.1 Student learning outcomes for the course and the plan for assessing these outcomes.

Note. An existing course adapted for distance education must be equivalent to the same course taught on campus. The proposal must demonstrate how course objectives for distance education sections will be met as effectively as the on-campus course.

3.4.2 The means for ensuring the academic integrity of student work.

3.4.3 The methodologies/strategies for providing interaction between faculty and students as well as interaction between students. This would include the types and forms of interaction expected.

3.4.4 The means for providing the required academic support services and resources (including library, general advising, advising in the major, financial aid, counseling, social support services, etc.).

3.4.5 The skill level and technology experience as well as the hardware and software a student will need to take the course.

**4. EVALUATION AND APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES ESTABLISHED PRIOR TO THE APPROVAL OF THIS POLICY**

The Program Review process will be used to review and evaluate courses established prior to implementation of this policy. The Course and Program Approval Guidelines specified in this policy will be used to verify compliance.

**5 INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT**

**5.1 Basic Student Support Services.** All regularly matriculated CSUS students receiving instruction through distance education shall be provided access to the basic student support services offered on this campus. These shall include admission, course registration services, academic advising and orientation, textbook purchasing, financial aid, career development and other special program accommodations as applicable (for example, EOP, Veteran, and Re-entry students).

**5.2 Library Support.** The Library shall provide <sup>insert "equivalent"</sup> support for distance education courses and programs. Effective and appropriate library services for distance education may differ from those services offered on campus but they should be designed to meet a wide range of informational and bibliographic needs. The requirements of academic programs should guide the Library in its response. Elements of library support available to students taking distance education courses may include courier and electronic document delivery, electronic journals,



full-text databases, end-user searching, reference assistance and instruction, network access, reciprocal borrowing and interlibrary loan services, cooperative arrangements with other libraries for collection access, cooperative development of databases, and other strategies that emphasize access to resources.

**5.3 Technology Support.** In order to facilitate instruction that is appropriate for selected technologies, professional support in the use of the technology is necessary. Such support shall include:

- Training in the use of distance education tools, applications, and transport systems.
- Development and production of online and mediated materials
- Ongoing consultation with Computing, Communications and Media Services (CCMS) and / or College Instructional Technology (IT) staff

**5.4 Pedagogy Support.** In order to facilitate instruction that is pedagogically effective, faculty members teaching distance education courses shall have access to pedagogy support from faculty and staff involved in distance education. Such support shall include:

- Instructional design
- Effective pedagogical uses of specific technology
- Assessment strategies
- Ongoing consultation with Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) faculty and/or CCMS staff

**5.5 Faculty Support.** The University shall provide appropriate faculty support services specifically related to distance education. It is easy to underestimate the effort and skill required of faculty to convert from a conventional classroom format to a distance education format. It is even easier to underestimate the effort and skill required of faculty to change from professor-centered classroom activities to the genuinely learner-centered activities made possible by technology.

Consequently, workload calculations for distance education courses should reflect the additional effort and skill required of faculty. The workload calculations should be uniform and consistent with guidelines currently used to determine assigned time for excess enrollment, for differences in course classification, and for faculty to make use of support available for both technology and pedagogy.

## **6 COPYRIGHT, PATENT AND OWNERSHIP POLICY:**

Ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, tele-courses, or other media products shall be agreed upon by the faculty and the University in accordance with the University's Copyright and Patent Policy and guidelines (UMC02750).



## **RECOGNITION OF OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTION**

(modeled after the Recognition of Outstanding Teaching Policy, AS 92-46 – May 14, 1992)

### **The Award:**

Each spring semester, one faculty member from each College may receive an award for outstanding contributions to the institution. Recognition of the award will include:

Placement of the name of the recipient of the award on a perpetual plaque that will be on display at the office of the dean of the College and on a perpetual plaque recognizing all recipients in a central location, accessible to the public.

Recognition of the recipient(s) at the President's Concert, spring commencement ceremonies of the College, and/or other appropriate public event or ceremony.

Recognition of the recipient(s) at a gathering where the recipient(s) is invited to address the faculty.

### **Eligibility:**

All full-time faculty are eligible to be nominated for the award.

### **Nomination:**

Any member of the University community may nominate an eligible faculty member for the award. To accomplish this, a letter of nomination must be sent to the dean of the nominee's College. Upon receipt of a letter of nomination, the dean shall forward a copy of the nomination letter to the nominee, along with this policy statement.

### **Application:**

The faculty member who is nominated is responsible for providing evidence of outstanding contribution to the institution. The submission shall be made to the College dean.

### **Selection:**

The selection of faculty members to be recognized in a College will be made by a committee of faculty members in each College known as the College's Outstanding Service Recognition Committee. Each committee will consist of five members, appointed to staggered three-year terms by the faculty governance council of each College. The decisions of the committee shall be forwarded to the Chair of the Faculty Senate of CSUS for conveyance to the President. The President and the Faculty Senate

Chair shall make a joint announcement to the University community of the awards, as decided by the College committees.

**Criteria** (reference: UARTP Policy 5.03 H):

The decisions of the Outstanding Service Recognition Committee will be based upon the following criteria:

1. Contributions to the faculty member's Department such as membership on Departmental committees, chair of a Departmental committee, special assignments, curriculum development, and student advising.
2. Contributions to the faculty member's College such as membership on a College committee, chair of a College committee, special assignments, curriculum development, and student advising.
3. Contributions to the University such as membership on a Senate and/or University committee, chair of a Senate and/or University committee, special assignments, curriculum development, and student advising.

The quality of the evidence, not the quantity of evidence, shall be used by the committee in reaching a decision.

**Schedule:**

Early in each fall semester the Chair of the Faculty Senate shall announce the schedule for the program, including:

1. Deadline for nominations
2. Deadline for applications
3. Deadline for decisions by the College committees
4. Date of announcement of recipients in the spring semester

Announcement of recipients shall be made prior to the deadline for publication of the spring commencement program.

# Assessing State Accountability Systems

BY JANE V. WELLMAN

*Why is it important that the public know more about higher education performance? The value higher education adds? The return on investment? Some say the reasons it is important are as simple as one, two, three. 1) The public increasingly insists on accountability for state government. 2) Competition for funding forces colleges and universities to show their efficiency and effectiveness. 3) Higher education must demonstrate its value to students, to business and industry, and to the public to gain the support it needs.*

—Southern Regional Education Board  
“Linking Higher Education Performance Indicators to Goals”  
Atlanta, GA, February 2000

**P**ropelled by the momentum of the K-12 standards movement, pressures to increase productivity, and competitive models developed by nontraditional providers of postsecondary education, statewide accountability systems have come to higher education. There are many variations on the model, but most systems are designed to provide an empirical accounting of institutional performance, for three purposes: to motivate internal improvement, to encourage institutions to address state goals, and to deregulate higher education by strengthening consumer information about institutional performance. Many, but not all, of the systems link performance with allocation of resources through the state budget.

*Jane V. Wellman is senior associate at The Institute For Higher Education Policy in Washington, DC. This article is part of The Institute's "New Millennium Project," a multi-year policy research effort supported by a grant from The Ford Foundation. Forthcoming work will focus on state financial aid policy and state responses to the federal tuition tax credits.*

## In the age of consumerism and public transparency, accountability is necessary for preserving the compact between higher education and society

There is no serious dispute that higher education must improve its capacity to demonstrate how it serves social expectations. Higher education serves broad social purposes, it is heavily subsidized with public funds (either through direct appropriations or the privilege of tax-exempt status, or both), and it is increasingly the gateway to social opportunity and economic productivity in the larger society. The academy cannot survive if it is perceived as serving institutional rather than social purposes. In the age of consumerism and public transparency, accountability is necessary for preserving the compact between higher education and society.

Yet a look at statewide accountability models being developed raises questions about the gap between promises and performance in these systems. While some are designed to stimulate institutional improvement or movement toward a few clearly specified state goals, many are collections of data that are unrelated to any clear purposes. Ironically, by generating unfocused and disconnected information about institutions, they may invite greater governmental intervention into the management of higher education rather than its deregulation.

### WHAT ARE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS?

The term "accountability" is used to mean so many things that a word is in order about the meaning of "state accountability systems" as described in this article. Accountability systems are state-level indicators of institutional performance, designed to reach public audiences, using quantitative and qualitative measures that allow comparisons among institutions. These systems—variously called report cards, performance indicators, benchmarks, or accountability measures—are geared to legislative or gubernatorial audiences rather than individual governing boards. Affecting public institutions for the most part, state accountability systems differ from accreditation reviews in that the latter are private reports that avoid comparisons among institutions.

Unlike the new national report card described in the article on *Measuring Up 2000* in this issue, statewide accountability systems focus on the performance not of states but of institutions within them. Finally, accountability reports can be distinguished from the many activities within institutions designed to improve quality through reforms in teaching and learning. To be sure, improvement in performance is a central dimension of one form of accountability. But evidence of performance must be translated into readily understood public measures before it can be included in an accountability system.

Accountability systems are rapidly becoming standard features of the higher education landscape: A 1997 survey by the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) found that 37 of the 50 states reported some kind of accountability or performance reporting, with another five indicating plans to establish systems in the future. Most report only on public in-

stitutions, but a few include information about the private sector as well. Interest in accountability remains high on the agendas of the state-based national education organizations, such as the Education Commission of the States (ECS), the National Governors' Association (NGA), and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO).

To some extent, accountability systems are not new in higher education—performance indicators and annual reports of one kind or another have long been part of state budget decision processes. Earlier incarnations of performance reporting that look something like accountability reports are program-planning-budgeting systems (PPBS), performance budgeting, zero-based budgeting, and various manifestations of MBO or management-by-objectives.

These early techniques were the subject of a blistering critique by Aaron Wildavsky in his 1974 treatise, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*. Wildavsky's central point was that decisions about distribution of resources are driven by politics and, to a much lesser degree, by policy—not by a disinterested desire to understand the relative efficiency of resource use. The PPBS often accompanied enrollment-based funding formulae in the 1970s and into the early 1980s. In the late 1980s and 1990s these techniques in turn were discarded because of the recession that forced traditional budgetary formulae to be rewritten. Once again, systems designed to promote change and provide performance incentives, such as block budgets and Total Quality Management (TQM), began to predominate.

Critics of management fads in higher education correctly note the pattern of reforms that spread like viruses from one state to the next. Faculty in particular are skeptical if not dismissive of these techniques, viewing them as efforts by the educational bureaucracy to promote itself. Others who are less cynical nonetheless express some fatigue about the rhetoric of accountability and the successive waves of reform initiatives in public institutions that are never fully implemented or evaluated.

To be sure, there is some trendiness in the accountability drive in higher education. However, these systems aren't just passing fads but serious attempts on the part of state decision makers to organize information about performance and resource use in their colleges and universities. Contrary to the views of some faculty, they also aren't the wholesale invention of an educational bureaucracy intent on perpetuating its influence. Instead, an external economic and political climate is forcing fundamental structural changes in the relationship between higher education and government. Even if the vocabulary of the moment changes, these pressures to be accountable will persist.

### THE CONTEXT OF K-12 REFORM

The standards movement in elementary and secondary education has fueled interest in accountability systems for high



education. There are legitimate differences between K-12 and higher education, of course, but underlying those differences is a common political and policy agenda, created by many of the same people using the same vocabulary. It is therefore instructive to view the development of accountability systems in higher education in the context of K-12 standards-based reform.

The fundamental assumption of K-12 reform is that all students can achieve at high levels. Rigorous academic standards for student learning are enforced and measured through on-site student-learning assessments, which become a primary vehicle for holding students, teachers, institutions, and policymakers accountable for performance. Comprehensive standards-based reform links subject-specific content standards with benchmarks for performance. These are in turn joined at the state level to teacher licensure and continuing education requirements, and to governance structures that clearly demarcate roles and responsibilities between individual schools, local districts, and the state. In a performance-based accountability system, the state role shifts from enforcing regulations to measuring results and providing incentives for change; individual schools may achieve those results by whatever works most effectively at the local level. The essence of local control is thereby preserved while state-level accountability is promoted.

The level of consensus about the K-12 standards and assessment movement that has been achieved in the last 15 years is truly remarkable, particularly in light of the strong tradition of local control in this country. This reflects the hard work done in the 1980s following the publication of the *Nation at Risk* report, which coalesced in 1989 when President George Bush convened the first National Education Summit of federal leaders and state governors, who gathered to address what was seen as a national crisis in educational achievement. The agenda has been extended since, through continued work of the National Governors' Association and that of many other national groups inside education and the philanthropic and business communities. These organizations are all hard at work on a common reform agenda, pursued through accountability reports, benchmarking projects, reviews of standards, and assessments.

With all this activity, education is still perceived as lagging behind other efficiency and reform movements that have swept across government, where performance reporting, workload accounting, and productivity review clearly are the order of the day. At the federal level the reinventing government (REGO) initiative has helped to replace regulatory controls with the use of benchmarks—what in REGO parlance is called “steering instead of rowing”—to propel change. At the state level, offices of legislative auditors-general nationwide have shifted from accounting-based review to performance auditing. Benchmarking and best practice efforts figure prominently on the agendas of these auditors as they work with agencies of state government, from highway departments to welfare and health-care organizations.

### THE PRESSURE OF SCARCE RESOURCES

An additional reason for the drive toward educational accountability systems beyond K-12 lies in the long-term trajectory of increasing demand for higher education, juxtaposed with a stable or even declining state resource

## RESOURCES ON K-12 STANDARDS-BASED REFORM

- National Governor's Association, [nga.org](http://nga.org)
- Education Trust, [edtrust.org](http://edtrust.org)
- Achieve (a cooperative effort of governors and business leaders), [achieve.org](http://achieve.org)
- National Alliance for Business, [nab.org](http://nab.org)

base. Unlike K-12 education, with its tradition of local control, states have always been the primary funding and policy centers for higher education in this country, particularly for public institutions but also for independent colleges and universities. State legislatures and governors have long played a critical role in higher education policy, through the power of the budget and their influence on the agendas and membership of public governing boards.

Meanwhile, it is a widely held belief that state funds for higher education will not grow enough to accommodate future demand if resources are used in the same way as they have been thus far. The gaps between future demand and current resources are particularly dramatic in the Sunbelt states and the West, where the number of students still in elementary school is expected to push enrollments up by 20 percent or more in the next decade. As a result, state decision-makers are keenly interested in promoting efficiency and productivity in higher education. Skeptical of traditional methods of supporting institutions that equate quality with inputs rather than outcomes, they are looking for ways to maintain or increase instructional capacity while holding the line on new money.

But policymakers are offering institutions a *quid pro quo* for evidence of effectiveness: colleges and universities are promised more latitude to achieve results by whatever means are appropriate, and regulatory controls that required top-down approvals are being removed if they prove to be obstacles to change. As two examples, old policies on program review and approval are being disbanded in favor of greater flexibility to adapt to new markets; and state controls on purchasing and contracting are being amended or removed to allow institutions to use new partners (including for-profit entities) to provide educational services.

### THE POSSIBILITIES OF DISTANCE LEARNING AND COMPETITION FROM NEW PROVIDERS

Another ingredient in the political mix that influences state accountability agendas is higher education funders' hope that distance learning will provide a vehicle for achieving long-term efficiencies in the delivery of postsecondary instruction. The reasoning goes that by eliminating the physical plant and high fixed costs of campuses, higher education can be delivered at significantly lower unit costs. Policymakers also believe that the newly fledged nontraditional institutions will stimulate such efficiencies through the competition and models they provide. Governors have been leaders in promoting distance learning in higher education, particularly in the West, as witnessed by the Western Governors' University. Accountability systems that assure student performance are essential to the future capacity of distance learning not just to deliver technical and continuing education, but to substitute for traditional classroom-based education.

## South Carolina is attempting to base *all* state higher education funding on performance indicators and is experimenting with a system that connects approximately 50 indicators with resources.

*Accountability and improved performance are closely linked. Today's knowledge-based, global economy and society hold extremely high expectations for colleges and universities and their graduates. The challenges at hand demand open communication, the broad involvement of stakeholders, pertinent information about performance, and a commitment to improvement.*

—New Jersey Commission on Higher Education  
“Accountability in Higher Education: The  
Fourth Annual Systemwide Report”  
January 2000

### A LOOK AT STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MODELS

There are several different types of accountability systems being tried out at the state level: general performance reports, statewide goals assessments, and performance funding. The distinctions between these types aren't all that clear in practice—many states start with general report cards, which over time get focused on a few clear goals, and subsequently performance on these measures is tied to resources. The process for developing accountability measures follows a common pattern from state to state: First, the governor or legislature mandates the coordination of an accountability or performance reporting system, and statewide governing and coordinating boards are responsible for developing the measures by working with the state's colleges and universities. Most of the systems are in various stages of experimentation and design, with measures being newly developed and others discarded from year to year.

**Performance reports**—These document activity on a wide range of measures. Many are called report cards, although relatively few include grades or rankings as part of the report. Most states using this approach try to use benchmarks to compare performance from other states if the data are available, or they look to changes in performance over time to give context to the information; progress is not measured against strategic goals or performance standards. Working with an accountability model enacted in 1991, California is an example of a state that falls into the report card category. The California law established an advisory committee to recommend performance indicators to the legislature. This committee recommended, and the legislature approved, annual indicators in five areas: the population context, fiscal context, student preparation, student access, and student outcomes. The performance indicators for student-learning outcomes measure retention, persistence, and graduation; no measures of student learning achievement or even goals for learning are mentioned.

Data for between five and 10 indicators in each category are collected and presented in summary reports attached to

detailed spreadsheets. Now in its sixth year, the report includes measures for over 75 separate indicators. California reports performance for public institutions at the system level only; the University of California, the California State University System, and the community colleges cannot be compared. Individual campus reports are not displayed, and there is no information about private institutions.

**Assessment of statewide goals**—Several states are using accountability reports to document institutional progress towards a few strategic state goals. Texas, New Jersey, and Tennessee are all examples of what could be called goal-oriented accountability systems. The New Jersey system began as a broad-based report of performance indicators and has moved toward a goal-oriented system as a result of initiatives from former Governor Christine Whitman. National benchmarks include graduation rates, transfer and articulation success, efficiency and effectiveness, and diversification of revenues. New Jersey reports on performance in private-sector as well as public institutions, aggregated into three clusters for reporting purposes: proprietary schools, theological institutions, and “public-mission independent institutions.”

Texas and Tennessee have both tied state goals to the regional initiatives the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) suggested in its “Challenge 2000” agenda. The SREB goals for higher education are—

- 1) Four of every five students entering college will be ready to begin college-level work.
- 2) Significant gains will be achieved in the mathematics, sciences, and communications competencies of vocational education students.
- 3) The percentage of adults who have attended college or earned two-year, four-year, and graduate degrees will be at the national level or higher.
- 4) The quality and effectiveness of all colleges and universities will be regularly assessed, with emphasis on the performance of undergraduate students.
- 5) All institutions that prepare teachers will have effective teacher-education programs that place primary emphasis on the knowledge and performance of graduates.
- 6) Salaries for teachers will be competitive in the marketplace, will reach important benchmarks, and will be linked to performance measures and standards.
- 7) States will maintain or increase the proportion of state tax dollars for schools and colleges while emphasizing funding aimed at raising quality and productivity.

**Performance funding**—Tennessee has also connected its goal-oriented performance reporting with an incentive funding process, the longest-lived such experiment among the states. The Tennessee goals are 1) enrollment and persistence, 2) remediation, 3) quality and performance, 4) teacher education, 5) research and service, and 6) student assistance. The measures of quality and performance are ACT test

scores, pass rates on licensure examinations, accreditation recognition for creditable programs, and library purchases. Institutions can earn a supplement of up to 5 percent of their instructional funding to reward performance on these and other indicators. In its 10th annual report on state progress toward meeting its goals, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission notes that there has been steady, regular improvement toward meeting all of the goals first established in 1989. Whether the performance funding has been the essential contributor to the momentum or these goals would have been met without the incentives is not clear. The Tennessee legislature has recently directed that a comprehensive review of performance funding take place in 2000-2001, which may answer that question.

A growing number of other states are connecting performance reporting to budgeting. The 1998 SHEEO study found eight states that claimed such connections at the time: Tennessee, Colorado, Missouri, Florida, Arkansas, Ohio, South Carolina, and Virginia. Arkansas has discontinued its funding incentive program since then; South Carolina's system is back on the drawing boards; and several other states—including New York, Kansas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin—seem to be moving toward connecting performance reporting with budgeting.

South Carolina is attempting to base *all* state higher education funding on performance indicators and is experimenting with a system that connects approximately 50 indicators with resources. Similarly, Florida plans to put the entire community college system on performance funding, and it is using performance measures to identify resource priorities in the public four-year institutions as well. Incentive funding for its community college system is based on five measures, and for the four-year public institutions, on 19. The Florida measures give some idea of how complex it is to link performance measures with budgeting. Some of the measures are readily available, but others will require significant new data collection and research on graduates after they leave the institution, faculty publications records, and perceptions of customer satisfaction with public service projects.

Colorado presents another emerging example of performance funding. There, only 10 performance indicators are used: baccalaureate graduation rates; faculty teaching workload; freshman retention; achievement tests on licensure, professional, and graduate-school examinations; institutional support spending per student; availability of general education lower-division courses required of all freshmen; support for and success of minority students; credits required for the degree; and additional optional measures to be selected by each institution.

Unlike the Florida system, the Colorado measures are all based on data that are already available, even if some of the measures haven't previously been reported to the state. Benchmarking is a major feature of the Colorado system, which sets norms based on national data or measures from comparison groups. Institutions are expected to reach certain thresholds against these national benchmarks and are awarded points based on whether they meet their expected goals. Performance exceeding the benchmark receives bonus funding. The Colorado system is just now under way, so it has not yet established a track record.

## FLORIDA'S PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Florida measures for performance budgeting for the four-year public institutions are

- Six-year graduation rate for First-Time-In-College (FTIC) students
- Six-year retention rate for FTIC students
- Four-year graduation rate for associate of arts (AA) transfer students
- Four-year retention rate for AA transfer students
- Percentage of students graduating with total accumulated credit hours that are less than or equal to 115 percent of the degree requirement
- Pass rate on licensure/certification exams for the first sitting
- Percentage of graduates remaining in Florida
- Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percentage employed at \$25,000 or more one year following graduation
- Of those graduates remaining in Florida, the percentage employed at \$25,000 or more five years following graduation
- Percentage of undergraduate students enrolled in graduate school upon completion of the baccalaureate degree
- Number of degrees granted by level
- Percentage of classes taught by state-funded ranked faculty members
- Percentage of Florida applicants meeting Board of Regents admission standards admitted as FTIC students
- Percentage of alternative admits who are out-of-state students
- Externally generated research and training grant funds per state-funded ranked faculty full-time equivalent
- Ratio of externally generated research and training grant funds to state research funds
- Average number of articles in refereed journals per ranked faculty member
- For the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, the percentage of public service projects where the beneficiary is satisfied or highly satisfied with the extension assistance
- The number and percentage of Florida public schools assisted

## POTENTIAL DISCONNECTS

There is a good deal of activity and effort going into statewide accountability systems. They promise to increase public support for higher education by helping institutions improve their performance and meet state goals, and help reduce bureaucracy and decentralize decision-making by replacing control of processes with response to results. These promises may be kept in a few states, where the accountability reports are designed to support institutional improvement efforts and are organized around clear state goals. Yet many systems seem to have allowed clarity about purpose, audience, and design to be obscured by a mind-numbing volume of data. Unfortunately, the technical capacity to generate and display data seems to be outstripping the ability of educators and policymakers to agree on broad goals or standards to measure the performance of higher education. And the amount of detailed information creates another potential problem, which is to invite greater state involvement in the direct management of higher education.



## RESOURCES

- Allen, Richard, and Ellen Earle Chaffee, "Management Fads in Higher Education," Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1981.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission, "Performance Indicators of California Higher Education," Sacramento, CA: The Commission, 1998; available online at: [cpec.ca.gov](http://cpec.ca.gov).
- Carnevale, Antony, Neal C. Johnson and Anne Ruffner Edwards, "Performance-Based Appropriations: Fad or Wave of the Future?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 10, 1998.
- Christal, Melodie, "State Survey on Performance Measures: 1996-1997," Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers, April 1998.
- Colorado Commission on Higher Education, "Ten Performance Indicators, Base Points, and Bonus Points for Use in the Performance Funding Process for FY 2001-2001," November 29, 2000; Denver, CO: The Commission, available online at: [state.co.us/cche/qi/newprocess.html](http://state.co.us/cche/qi/newprocess.html).
- Hovey, Harold A., "State Spending for Higher Education in the Next Decade: The Battle to Sustain Current Support," San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, July 1999.
- Mitchell, Ruth, "Front-End Alignment: Using Standards to Steer Educational Change," Washington, DC: The Education Trust, 1996.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative For School Reform*, Washington, DC: April 1983.
- New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, "Accountability in Higher Education: The Fourth Annual Systemwide Report," New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, January 2000, available online at: [state.nj.us/highereducation/reports.htm](http://state.nj.us/highereducation/reports.htm).
- Ruppert, Sandra S., (Editor), "Charting Higher Education Accountability: A Sourcebook on State-Level Performance Indicators," Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1998.
- Southern Regional Education Board, "Linking Higher Education Performance Indicators to Goals," Atlanta, GA, February 2000.
- State of Florida Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability, "Florida Government Accountability Report, 2000; available online at: [oppaga.state.fl.us/budget/pb2.html](http://oppaga.state.fl.us/budget/pb2.html).
- Tennessee Higher Education Commission, "Performance Funding," Nashville, TN: The Commission, available online at: [state.tn.us](http://state.tn.us).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Status of Higher Education in Tennessee," February 15, 2000.
- Wildavsky, Aaron, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1974.

Presenting detailed information about performance indicators not clearly connected to improvement or compelling state purposes provides governors and legislatures with more information than they can absorb about decisions that are someone else's to make. It can also divert their attention from the basic policy decisions that *are* theirs to make, which is how to use scarce state subsidies to meet the goals of higher education: student access and equity, student learning appropriate to the standards of the institutions, institutional service to society, and research and economic development.

The drive for accountability and performance in higher education isn't likely to go away soon. States that have yet to measure performance are apt to do so, and the accountability systems that are already in place will likely be revised, torn down, and rebuilt. The complexity of the systems described here are testimony to the fact that they are hard to design: The process is a political negotiation requiring consensus about technical measures among parties who may not agree with one another on the purpose of the measurements. Small wonder then that the systems lose their focus. But systems that are poorly designed can defeat rather than support the laudable goals of accountability by being simultaneously opaque and bureaucratic.

It behooves leaders in higher education and state policy to step back from the rush of accountability system development to think about how form should follow function in these systems. The temptation to use statewide accountability reports to accomplish multiple purposes, from providing broad-based consumer information about higher education to establishing the grounds on which to base budget decisions, should be resisted if possible. In designing an accountability system for statewide use, the few purposes it will serve should be clearly articulated, and the general rule that less is more should be followed. On the other hand, information about the contributions

of independent colleges should be included (as they have been in *Measuring Up 2000*), because those institutions play a central role in meeting state policy goals for higher education. Including private colleges in accountability reports will also help discipline policymakers from using accountability models as a way to intrude into the micro-management of institutions.

By far the most important nut to crack in crafting accountability models is agreement about statewide goals and standards for student learning and ways of measuring it that are appropriate in a postsecondary context. To be sure, there are many other important facets of institutional performance beyond student learning, and learning standards capture only a relatively narrow measure of effectiveness. Still, demand for accountability in higher education is driven by the simple and powerful need for public clarity about institutional performance in teaching and learning. The momentum from the K-12 model is strong, and by comparison many of the accountability systems in higher education seem designed to evade rather than to inform.

The K-12 paradigm is not politically or substantively workable in our highly eclectic system of higher education. Government does not have the same role in establishing academic standards in higher education as it does in K-12, and for government to move into a standard-setting mode in higher education would standardize a system that functions best because of its diversity. But that does not mean that higher education cannot be accountable. Without some basic agreement on goals and standards, accountability systems won't measure performance, improve education, or deregulate institutions. Instead, they will either be irrelevant collections of data, or, at their worst, can become instruments for perpetuating bureaucracy and extending political control into higher education. Higher education, and its audiences, surely can do better than this. □