CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
THIRTEENTH ANNUAL ACADEMIC RETREAT
OCTOBER 23, 1997

System Goals, Campus Impacts:
Cornerstones Understood and Examined

8:15 - 9:00	Continental Breakfast
9:00 - 9:20	***Welcome:*** Robert C. Maxson, President of the University David Hood, Chair, Academic Senate
9:20 - 9:40	***Keynote Address:*** Karl W. E. Anatol, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
9:40 - 10:40	***Discussion:*** Please read The Cornerstones Report. Refer to the list of Discussion Topics and select a topic. Be prepared to exchange ideas with other from across the campus. Baccalaureate Graduate Fee Differential Faculty Development Technology Private Funding Other
10:40 - 11:00	**BREAK**
11:00 - 12:15	***Demonstrations on Use of Technology in Instruction:*** <u>Earth Science Instruction at CSULB: Technology & the Quest for Learning Enhancements</u> -Beth Ambos, Biological Sciences To Be Announced -Dave Kumrow, Nursing To Be Announced -Julia Miller, Art <u>Teaching Philosophy of Art On-Line</u> -Julie Van Camp, Philosophy
12:15 - 1:30	**ITALIAN LUNCH BUFFET** Lunch table discussion: Let us dream. If we could shape our own destiny with fewer restraints, how would we change campus or system or state rules, policies, and procedures? How would these changes give us more flexibility? What could and should we do that we cannot do now?
1:30	***Sharing of Ideas***

<u>Acknowledgements:</u>
President's Office
University Relations and Development
University College and Extension Services
Academic Computing Services
Forty-Niner Shops, Inc.

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL ACADEMIC RETREAT

System Goals, Campus Impacts: Cornerstones Understood and Examined

DISCUSSION TOPICS

Please read *The Cornerstones Report*, select a topic, and be prepared to exchange ideas with others from across the campus, keeping in mind the fundamental questions:

> If we were to do this, how could we use it to contribute to better education of our students?
>
> If we were to do this, how could we use it to help us accommodate additional enrolment without substantial infusion of additional funding?

Baccalaureate:

p. 4, Principle I: "We will award the baccalaureate primarily on the basis of demonstrated learning. We will state explicitly what a graduate of the CSU is expected to know. We will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values."

Graduate Fee Differential:

p. 10, #8c: "the CSU shall initiate new fee structures for graduate, professional, and post-baccalaureate education, excepting programs in teacher education. These fees may be set flexibly, where differences are warranted by program costs on the one hand and earnings potential on the other."

Faculty Development:

p. 10, #8d: "...a "*faculty renewal and reinvestment* program, in which the CSU [uses savings from replacing retiring faculty with lower paid new hires] to expand programs for faculty professional development."

Technology:

p. 10,#8f: "The CSU should examine the prospects for increased productivity through the use of pedagogies that effectively employ technology (such as in well designed distance education)."

Private Funding:

p. 9, #7B: "The public tax base must be supplemented by private revenues in order to assure continued access and quality in the future. A policy framework that identifies how private revenues can be used to supplement public funding is needed to allow this to occur."

Other:

Topics you would like to discuss that are not covered elsewhere.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 17, 1997

TO: Participants, Thirteenth Annual Academic Retreat

FROM: David Hood, Chair
Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Retreat Information

The California State University, Long Beach Academic Senate will host its thirteenth Academic Retreat on Thursday, October 23, 1997. We are pleased that you will be able to join us. The theme this year is ***"System Goals, Campus Impacts: Cornerstones Understood and Examined."***

Please note that a Continental Breakfast will be served from **8:15 A.M. until 9:00 A.M.** The Retreat Program will begin at **9:00 A.M.** and will conclude following the luncheon discussion period at **approximately 2:00 P.M.** Your original invitation had indicated that the hours of the Retreat were from 8:30 A.M. until 4:00 P.M.

The Retreat will be held at the Long Beach Airport Marriott Hotel in Salons A, B, and C. The Hotel is located at 4700 Airport Plaza Drive, Long Beach (map enclosed).

The following are enclosed:

Map
Retreat Agenda and Schedule
Discussion Topics
The Cornerstones Report
San Jose State Sense of the Senate Resolution on Cornerstones
List of Invitees

Please do not hesitate to contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 5-4149 if you should have any questions. We look forward to seeing you on the 23rd.

DH:mm
Enclosures

1250 BELLFLOWER BOULEVARD · LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90840-2005 · 310/985-4149

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
THIRTEENTH ANNUAL ACADEMIC RETREAT
LIST OF INVITEES

49er Reporter,	Reporter, Daily 49er
Abels, Paul	Academic Senator, Social Work
Abrahamse, Dorothy	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Liberal Arts
Abramis, David	Academic Senator, Management/ Human Resources Mgmt
Adams , Gary	General Manager, 49er Shops
Albright, Len	Vice Chair, Graduate Council, Kinesiology & Physical Education
Alvarado, Karen	Director, Affirmative Action
Ambos, Beth	Academic Senator, Geological Sciences
Anand, Rajen	Academic Senator, Biological Sciences
Anatol, Karl	Provost & Senior VP for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs
Anderson, Kaye	Member, PEP Council, Teacher Education
Angell, Tom	Director, Staff Personnel
Armento, Greg	Secretary, Scholarly & Creative Activities Committee, University
Ashe, Pamela	Chair, Teacher Preparation Committee, Counseling &
Bader, Jeanne	Academic Senator, Family & Consumer Sciences
Behm, Robert	Academic Senator, Dean, University College & Extension
Berdan, Robert	Member, FAC, Educ. Psych., Admin. & Counseling
Bernard, Michael	Academic Senator, Educational Psychology, Administration, &
Beron, Toni	Director, Public Affairs
Bilici, Hamdi	President, California Faculty Association, Finance, Real Estate &
Birkemeier, Richard	Associate Dean, College Of The Arts
Birmele, Jutta	Academic Senator, Romance, German, Russian Languages And
Black, Jan	Secretary, Financial Affairs Council, Social Work
Bordeaux, Valerie	Director, University Outreach & School Relations
Bostic, Terie	Academic Senator, College Of Business Administration
Boylan, Bill	Secretary, Campus Climate Committee, Student Transition &
Brett, James	Director, University Research
Burgess, Ralph	President, Alumni Association
Burke, Albie	Academic Senator, History
Byron, Mary	Committee Chair, Staff Council, Student Health Center
Cantey, Richard	Academic Senator, Counseling & Psychological Services
Carver, Gloria	Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs
Caveness, Jeane	Senior Director, Student Life & Development
Cerillo, Augustus	Member, FAC, History
Cerny, Kay	Member, FAC, Physical Therapy
Chaderjian, Bruce	Academic Senator, Mathematics

Chaney, Tyson	Reporter, Union Newspaper
Charmack, Scott	Assoc. VP, Physical Planning & Facilities Mgmt
Clark, Pat	Member, FAC, Art
Coan, Donald	Director, Institutional Research
Cohn, Kathy	Associate Dean, College Of Education
Cohn, Nancy	Academic Senator, Enrollment Services
Coleman, Ian	Academic Senator, Treasurer, Associated Students, Inc.
Considine, James	,
Constas, Mike	Academic Senator, Accountancy
Contreras, Armando	Executive Assistant to the President, President's Office
Corey, Francoise	Academic Senator, New Media Center
Costa, Margaret	Academic Senator, Kinesiology & Physical Education
Councilman, Sam	Member, Academic Senate, Mathematics
Cox, Stafford	Vice Chair, Staff Council, Academic Computing
Crego, Marilyn	Associate Dean, University College & Extension Services
Crowther, Simeon	Academic Senator, Economics
Curtis, Ken	Member, PEP Council, History
Cynar, Sandra	Assessment Committee, Computer Engineering
D' Amicantonio, John	Chair, Student Affairs Committee, University Library &
Das, Mihir	Academic Senator, College Of Engineering
Daugherty, Emma	Chair, Educational Resources Committee, Journalism
Davis, Stephen	Secretary, Graduate Council, Philosophy
Decyk, Betsy	Academic Senator, Philosophy
Dinielli, Gene	Academic Senator, English
Dowell, David	Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts, College Of Liberal Arts
Ducharme, Cathy	Academic Senator, Teacher Education
Eliason, Lowell	Chair, GEGC, Physics & Astronomy
Ellstrand, Alan	Member, PEP Council, Management/ Hrm
Enders, Thomas	Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Services
Esfandiari, Ramin	Member, FAC, Mechanical Engineering
Fata, Frank	Associate Dean, College Of Liberal Arts
Feldman, Stephen	Academic Senator, V P, University Relations & Development
Ferris, Boak	Secretary, Grade Appeals Review Committee, English
Finot, Pat	Academic Senator, Dance
Fisher, Steven	Academic Senator, Accountancy
Franklin, Barbara	Monterey Conf. Participant, Kinesiology & Physical Education
Freeman, Davian	Academic Senator, Vice President, Associated Students, Inc.
Fung, Henry	Associate Dean, Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Gatain, Jennifer	Administrator, Associated Students, Inc.
George, Barbara	OPA Recipient, Finance, Real Estate, & Law

George, Simon	Academic Senator, Physics & Astronomy
Glezakos, Constantine	Academic Senator, Economics
Goitom, Tesfai	Vice Chair, Financial Affairs Council, Engineering Technology
Goldish, Dot	Academic Senator, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Greene, Gary	Chair, Grade Appeals Review Comm., Ed. Psych., Admin. &
Griffith, William	Academic Senator, V P, Administration & Finance
Gross, Mark	Academic Senator, Physics & Astronomy
Guthrie, Sharon	Academic Senator; Chair, COA, Kinesiology & Physical
Haglund, Elaine	Vice Chair, Faculty Personnel Policies Council, Educational
Hamano, Fumio	Academic Senator, Electrical Engineering
Hanley, Gerry	Director, Faculty Development
Hansen, Eric	Strategic Planning, Management/ Hrm
Harris, Douglas	Member, FAC, Student Services
Herman, Martin	Member, FAC, Music
Hill, Colleen	Academic Senator, Occupational Studies
Hlousek, Zvonimir	Academic Senator, Physics & Astronomy
Hobgood, Wade	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of The Arts
Hood, David	Academic Senator, History
Houck, Jean	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Education
Huckabay, Loucine	Academic Senator, Nursing
Huckaby, David	Member, PEP Council, Biological Sciences
Hunter , Hal	Member, FAC, Health Science
Jackson, Hazel	Member, PEP Council, Family & Consumer Sciences
Jensen, Marilyn	Academic Senator, Assoc. V P, Academic Affairs
Johnson, Carrie Jo	Member, FAC, Counseling & Psychological Services
Johnson, William	Academic Senator, Philosophy
Johnston, Michael	Academic Senator, Counseling & Psychological Services
Jones, Irene	Member, PEP Council, Romance, German, Russian Lang. Lit.
Jones, Kristi	Director, Liberal Studies
Kadowaki, Ted	Member, FAC, Student Services
Kapp, Gloria	Director, Admissions & Records
Keirn, Tim	First Year Experience, History
Kellogg, Bonnie	Secretary, Teacher Preparation Committee, Nursing
Khan, Mohammed	Associate Dean, College Of Business Administration
Kiefer, Christa	Committee Chair, Staff Council, Management & Budget
Klink, Eileen	Member, FAC, English
Kochan, Roman	Academic Senator, Director, University Library & Learning
Kvapil, Jay	Academic Senator, Art
Labrador, Elizabeth	Director of Operations, President's Office
Latter, Joseph	Assoc. VP, Financial Management

Lauda, Don	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Health & Human Services
Lee, Ron	Associate Vice President, Information Manangement
Li, San-pao	Academic Senator, Asian & Asian American Studies
Littlejohn, Alice	Chair, Graduate Council, University Library
Loeschen, Robert	Associate Dean, Natural Sciences & Mathematics
Lowentrout, Peter	Director, University 100
Luevano, Susan	Chair, Campus Climate Committee, University Library &
Luna, Margaret	Treasurer, Staff Council, Financial Management
Mack, Robyn	Director, Budget & Human Resources Management
Maestas, Gen	Member-at-Large, Staff Council, Facilities Management
Magaddino, Joseph	Chair, Financial Affairs Council, Economics
Mahoney, Mike	AVP for Information Technology, Academic Affairs
Mangir, Tulin	Academic Senator, Engineering Technology
Markman, Roberta	Director, University Honors Program
Martel, Diane	Member, PEP Council, Art
Maxson, Robert	President of the University, President's Office
Maxson, Sylvia	Member, FAC, Teacher Education
Mayfield, Darwin	Academic Senator, Emeritus & Retired Faculty Assoc.
Mc Cauley , Joan	Academic Senator, University Library
Mc Connell, Linda	Member, FAC, Business Administration
Mc Graa, Mary	Assistant to the Chair, Academic Senate
Merryfield, Margaret	Chair, PEP Council, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Meylor, Patricia	Member, FAC, Arts
Monat, Jon	Faculty Council Chair, CBA, Management/ Human Resouces
Moore Steward, Thelma	Member, PEP Council, Ed. Psy., Admin., & Counseling
Morley, Harvey	Member, PEP Council, Criminal Justice
Mulvaney, Susan	Director, Testing & Evaluation Services
Munitz, Barry	Chancellor, California State University
Myers, Bonnie	Academic Senator, Public Safety
Nagel, Glenn	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Natural Sciences &
Nieto, Consuelo	Chair, Univ. Org. & Services Comm., Teacher Education
Nishio, Alan	Associate VP, Student Services, Student Services
Nix- Baker, Leslie	Director, Employment Relations , Academic Affairs
Nuessle, Nita	Member, FAC, Health & Human Services
Nummedal, Susan	Chair, Faculty Personnel Policies Council, Psychology
Ohtmer, Ortwin	Academic Senator, Mechanical Engineering
Olson, Sharon	Director, University Academic Projects
Ortiz, Elizabeth	Academic Senator, Social Work
Parish, Cynthia	Academic Senator, University College & Extension Services
Parks, Barbara	Editor, Public Affairs & Publications

Pasion-gonzales, Lori	Academic Senator, Counseling & Psychological Services
Pawneshing, Sherry	Secretary, Staff Council, Facilities Management
Pellissier, Bron	Director, Learning Alliance
Pickard, Ken	Member, PEP Council, Information Systems
Polakoff, Keith	Academic Senator, Assoc. V P, Academic Affairs
Quan, Shirley	Administrative Coordinator, Academic Senate
Ramirez, Genevieve	Director, Learning Assistance Center
Reddy, Harnatha	Faculty Council Chair, COE, Electrical Engineering
Reichard, Gary	Academic Senator, Assoc. V P, Academic Affairs - Academic Assessment Committee, Occupational Studies
Resurreccion, Richard	Committee Chair, Staff Council, Facilities Management
Rhoades, Rodger	Member-at-Large, Staff Council, Facilities Management
Rice, Charleen	Immediate-Past Chair, Staff Council, Credential Processing
Riley, Carol	Academic Senator, Political Science
Riposa, Gerry	Committee Chair, Staff Council, Enrollment Services
Roa , Bernard	Vice President, Student Services
Robinson, Douglas	Academic Senator, President, Associated Students, Inc.
Rodriguez, Naomi	Academic Senator, Women's Studies
Rozee, Patricia	Chair, SCAC, Physical Therapy
Russo, Albert	Academic Senator, Anthropology
Ruyle, Eugene	Director, Academic Advising
Samuelson, Marilee	Director, Multicultural Center
Sauceda, James	Member, FAC, Education
Schilling, Ken	Academic Senator, Educ. Psych., Admin. & Counseling
Schmidt, George	Chair, Committee on Athletics (S98), Political Science
Schmidt, Paul	Member, FAC, Chemistry
Senozan, Nail	Academic Senator, Physics & Astronomy
Shen , K. Y.	Director, Sports, Athletics & Recreation
Shumard, Bill	Academic Senator, History
Sievers, Sharon	Associate Dean, College Of Health & Human Services
Sinclair, William	Member, PEP Council, University Library & Learning
Sluss, Sara	Academic Senator, Speech Communication
Smith, Craig	Secretary, Faculty Personnel Policies Council, University
Snider, Larry	Member, PEP Council, Geography
Splansky, Joel	Monterey Conf. Participant, Family & Consumer Sciences
Stanley, Sue	Member, PEP Council, Counseling & Psychological Services
Stevens, Tom	Member, PEP Council, Art
Stone, Craig	Member, FAC, University Library & Learning Resources
Sumpter, Linda	Member, FAC, Liberal Arts
Swan, Judy	OPA Recipient, Philosophy
Tang, Paul	

Taylor - Schmidt, Rosemary	Assistant Vice President, Student Services
Thibeault, Marie	Academic Senator, Art
Tiggs - Taylor, Linda	Associate Dean, College Of Engineering
Timboe, Rick	Assistant Vice President, Information Technology
Torabzadeh, Jalal	Member, PEP Council, Mechanical Engineering
Turban, Efraim	Member, FAC, Information Systems
Vail, Lee	Academic Senator, Art
Vander Heyden , Sandra	Director, Foundation
Viera, Maria	Academic Senator, Theatre Arts
Vogel, Ron	Academic Senator, Criminal Justice
Wakiji, Eileen	Member, PEP Council, University Library & Learning
Walter, Mike	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Business Administration
West, Richard	,
Wiley, Mark	Professor, English
Wiley, Terry	Academic Senator, Educ. Psych., Admin. & Counseling
William, Johnson	Member, Academic Senate, Philosophy
Williams , Richard	Academic Senator, Dean, College Of Engineering
Wright, Claudia	Assessment Committee, Ed. Psych., Admin. & Counseling
Wu, Henry	Member, FAC, Natural Sciences And Mathematics
Yur - Austin, Jasmine	Academic Senator, Finance, Real Estate, & Law
Zarn, Randy	Director, SOAR, Student Life & Development
Ziemer, William	Member, FAC, Mathematics

THE CORNERSTONES REPORT

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD
WILLIAM D. CAMPBELL
ROBERT L. CARET
HAL CHARNOFSKY
ARISTIDE COLLINS
GENE DINIELLI
MARTHA FALLGATTER
DONALD R. GERTH
BERNARD GOLDSTEIN
HAROLD GOLDWHITE
GARY HAMMERSTROM
JAMES M. HIGHSMITH
PETER S. HOFF
BARRY MUNITZ
JOAN OTOMO-CORGEL
RALPH PESQUIERA
NORMA S. REES
TED J. SAENGER
MARSHELLE THOBABEN
FRANK Y. WADA
STEPHEN L. WEBER
JOHN D. WELTY
BLENDA J. WILSON
BETH WOLF

DRAFT
AUGUST 1997

Preface: Cornerstones: A Commitment to the Future

We began the Cornerstones project with a sense of urgency and with a commitment to honor our best traditions of imagination and creativity in determining our future. The urgency is rooted in two fundamental developments which challenge all of higher education. First, we face a crisis of funding and resources, especially in light of the projected demand for university education in California. This crisis may be masked because it is developing slowly. Both university and state leaders may imagine ways of "managing" it without changing much. We believe this view is wrong. The sheer magnitude of the gap between likely resources and projected need is cause for alarm.

Second, we are called to examine our ways of providing education in light of California's continuing social, demographic, and economic transformation. A new economy is emerging out of California's recovery from recession, and a new social order is shaped by the diverse communities of our people. This is a remarkable opportunity for a healthy and energetic university to ask: How best do we educate our students for this new world?

Cornerstones began with four fundamental commitments:

1. We must continue to provide educational excellence in a teaching-centered, collegiate institution.

2. We must provide access for the growing and ever more diverse population of Californians seeking higher education in the face of limited public resources.

3. We must demonstrate our effectiveness to the people of California and to their elected leadership in crafting a new compact with the public we serve.

4. We must design a more responsive postbaccaluareate system to meet the demand in California for "liberally educated professionals."

In light of these commitments, the Cornerstones discussion -- involving our campuses as well as the broad-based Cornerstones' Task Forces -- identified four policy goals for the California State University. In support of these goals we identified ten guiding principles and a variety of specific recommendations which we believe should shape the policies of the university and influence the programs and strategies of our campuses.

Immediately elaborated are the four policy goals, the ten guiding principles, and the derivative recommendations. Following the body of the report is an Appendix which spells out in detail the challenges we face as a university.

The Cornerstones Framework: Policy Goals

The California State University seeks to ensure:

A. Educational Results

B. Access to Higher Education

C. Financial Stability

D. University Accountability

A. Ensuring Educational Results

The California State University has a rich and secure tradition of providing educational programs of great depth and value, and of regularly assessing and assuring the quality of those programs. There is a great diversity among our campuses, and a deep respect for the judgments of campus faculty empowered to define curricula in response to local purposes as well as national and international standards. There is a variety of ways students demonstrate their learning in the CSU, and faculty are involved in exploring both new methods of classroom work and a wide variety of alternatives.

Much of our intellectual strength in undergraduate education comes from a balance between the specific identities of individual programs and the broader goals of providing a comprehensive general education to undergraduates. In recognition of this balance, the CSU system Academic Senate, representing the community of campuses which defines the system, has undertaken a thorough review of the broad purposes and specific intellectual elements of the baccalaureate degree. At the same time, Cornerstones sought to clarify those educational results to which the community of campuses might commit itself for all CSU graduates.

The California State University seeks to ensure that each graduate of the university meets high expectations regarding what graduates should reasonably be expected to know and do. We expect to be held accountable to achieve these expectations. At the same time we commit ourselves to those things most difficult to "test": the search for reasoned judgment, rich imagination, personal integrity, and civic engagement.

While providing educational excellence, the California State University will respond to the needs of Californians, including both the young and the wide range of older and working adults returning to school. To this end, the CSU commits itself to innovation in the use of its facilities, the methods of teaching and learning, the development of academic schedules, the nature and duration of programs, the locations where education takes place, and the ease with which students can get services.

> Some of the changes proposed by Cornerstones are operational: one-stop student services, including admissions, records review, and financial aid, for both state-supported and fee-supported programs.
>
> Some of the changes are organizational: the expanded use of our campuses throughout the calendar year, more flexible course schedules and course meeting times, enhanced community college-CSU transfer programs, and better integration of continuing and extended learning programs into the academic planning of our campuses.
>
> Some of the changes are programmatic: developing more programs in areas of special relevance for California's economic and social future -- including traditional fields like nursing and teaching, and new areas like multimedia and biotechnology.

All of the proposals are rooted in a singular vision: that the university will strengthen its long tradition of strong intellectual work and responsive programming. This vision depends on the commitment and intelligence of the university's central asset: its faculty. To continue CSU's powerful faculty record of scholarship, public service, and creative activity will require nurturing and support. We are committed to a process of faculty support and renewal which will sustain the university in the decades ahead.

Principle 1: We will award the baccalaureate primarily on the basis of demonstrated learning. We will state explicitly what a graduate of the California State University is expected to know. We will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

1a. The commitment to require a comprehensive set of general educational "outcomes" that is sufficiently specific to support a public declaration of educational results, and sufficiently general to allow each campus to develop its own mission and each college and department to develop its own educational outcomes.

1b. The commitment to develop -- on each campus -- systems of learning assessment that enable students to demonstrate learning in both courses and programs. These assessment tools need to be developed with a broad consensus as to their proper use and will vary substantially among the disciplines.

1c. The commitment to devote sufficient resources to faculty development and the time required to develop appropriate assessment techniques, redesign programs, and to shape definitions of "credit."

1d. The commitment to develop systems of institutional accountability that demonstrate the university's delivery of the outcomes to which it is publicly committed.

While the specific parameters of the undergraduate curriculum are currently under review by the Academic Senate of the CSU, the following provide an outline of those forms of knowledge and ability expected from any graduate:

- substantive in-depth command over one or more fields of study
- the ability to integrate knowledge across discipline boundaries
- the ability to communicate effectively, through a variety of means
- the ability to read analytically and think critically at a high level
- the ability to write clearly
- the ability to locate, analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information
- the ability to make both qualitative and quantitative assessments
- the ability to participate effectively in a democratic society
- the ability to work effectively in group settings with people different from oneself
- the ability to speak, read, and write in a language other than English
- the ability to appreciate and value cultures other than one's own
- the ability to value one's own self and the communities of which one is a part, to make moral and ethical decisions, and to act in a socially responsible manner.

• arts
• global perspectives
• lack of interconnections between fields of study

Principle 2: Students and their teaching and learning experience are the center of the academic enterprise. We will shape the provision of our academic programs and support services to meet better the diverse needs of our students and our society.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

2a. The redesign of academic calendars to maximize the availability of courses in a significantly wider range of time and delivery models, both with regard to the weekly schedule of courses and the very concept of the academic "year."

2b. The redesign of current standards and processes of facilities utilization, so that the campuses can offer courses when appropriate throughout the year and throughout the hours of every day of every week, according to student demand. This, in turn, will require developing support for plant operation beyond the current schedules.

2c. The development of a technological infrastructure to support alternative "delivery" of pedagogical materials to a wide range of sites -- homes, community and business locations -- with proper academic supervision, and with attention to the challenge of maintaining a "collegiate experience."

2d. The development of adequate student services -- and all other elements of the academic infrastructure, including increased staffing -- to support students with non-traditional schedules, giving particular attention to the needs of older and working adults.

Principle 3: California State University students will be expected to be active partners in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

3a. The requirement that each student be responsible for creating an academic plan, one which will encourage students to take a more active role in their own learning, including self-paced and self-directed study.

3b. The commitment to facilitate practices of active learning (such as collaborative learning, problem solving, and the use of interactive technology), and to develop systemwide and campus arrangements needed for students to engage in a community service learning experience before graduation.

Principle 4: The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university.

The recommendations in support of this principle direct the university to the following:

4a. A commitment to a systemwide faculty renewal and reinvestment plan, including steps to define and address the faculty salary gap, investment in faculty renewal and development, improvement of the faculty role in shared governance, strengthening the diversity of the faculty, and strengthening the system of peer review for faculty, including faculty determination of improved measures for recognizing a wider range of engaged scholarship in addition to teaching, research, and creative activity. The Academic Senate, the California Faculty Association, and the CSU administration must be appropriately involved in developing this plan.

4b. A commitment to develop a broad systemwide policy guiding decisions on the replacement of retiring faculty, recognizing that not all campuses or programs experience faculty turnover at comparable rates.

4c. A commitment to work with graduate schools (especially at the University of California) to develop criteria that ensure prospective CSU faculty have sound training in teaching and learning, particularly in modes of active learning.

B. Ensuring Access to Higher Education

"Access" has long been a fundamental principle of California's Master Plan for Higher Education. The very structure of public higher education is predicated on the idea that every resident competent to benefit from instruction has some place to learn. Cornerstones reaffirms in the strongest possible terms the CSU role in meeting California's commitment to its students.

The CSU role has multiple dimensions, however, and Cornerstones seeks to affirm more than passive "availability" of a place for those eligible applicants who reach our campuses.

First, Cornerstones proposes strong outreach programs and retention efforts. Second, Cornerstones proposes a continuation of the current Trustee policy in support of K-12 efforts to prepare students better for college, and reaffirms CSU efforts to reach more students from underserved communities. Third, Cornerstones seeks to strengthen the CSU relationship with the California Community Colleges, which provide the majority of our undergraduates through transfer programs.

Fourth, Cornerstones reaffirms the commitment of the CSU to provide education beyond the baccalaureate, long a central element of our mission. This role has grown in importance, especially in light of the dramatic transformation of the California and global economy in which our graduates will work. Older industrial structures, modes of production, and long-established work relationships are rapidly eroding. Even during the current economic recovery, the uncertainty of working Californians regarding their future is rooted in a correct perception that work security will depend less on seniority than on adaptability, and adaptability will depend on the ability to learn new skills rapidly.

At the same time the need for highly skilled Californians has never been greater. In the fastest growing sectors of the economy there are local labor shortages, with many high-growth firms forced to recruit out of the state. The California State University is uniquely able to meet the needs of Californians for the applied and professional skills most in demand, and thus meet the needs of an expanding economy for talented employees. Many growth areas are in those fields long understood to be our special responsibility. To the degree Californians can fill the emerging jobs of a new economy, we serve the long-range health of our communities and state.

The commitment to serve California's growing need for career-transition education and lifelong learning defines a central element of the CSU mission. We propose a significant expansion of our continuing and extended learning programs, better integration of these programs into the overall academic planning of our campuses, and the provision of enhanced financial aid and support services to meet the needs of lifelong learners.

Finally, Cornerstones affirms our faculty's commitment to link the formality of access to the substantive success of students. This success is not measured in time-to-degree alone or in the skills and competencies we can formally assess. It is found in the habits of mind and spirit which sustain a hunger for lifelong learning among our graduates. With all our appropriate concern for

the economic value of a collegiate education, we reaffirm the older values of a liberal education: civility, reasoned judgment, sound personal values, and an ability to participate in a democratic society. These values frame our undergraduate work. They are no less critical in post-baccalaureate study.

Principle 5: We will meet the need for undergraduate education in California through increasing outreach efforts and transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and providing students a variety of pathways that may reduce the time needed to complete degrees.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

5a. A continuation of the current Trustee policy to strengthen the connection between the CSU and K-12, joined to a new commitment to strengthen significantly our relationship to the community colleges.

5b. A commitment to expand programs of mentoring, course and program articulation, and counseling and assessment.

5c. A commitment to continue and expand programs to reach traditionally underrepresented communities through increased efforts at outreach and retention.

5d. A commitment to review the current pathways to the degree(s), with a special focus on developing more joint degree programs, reviewing the preparation of students for the teaching credential, and eliminating unnecessary obstacles to the timely completion of degrees.

5e. While acknowledging that the "price" of instruction will go up, a continued commitment to maintain low student fees by any national standard, with sufficient financial aid to ensure that access for qualifying students is maintained.

Principle 6: Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

6a. The CSU will provide increased access to graduate and continuing education, especially in those programs central to the lifelong opportunity of our students, and to the continued health of California's communities and economy: These programs include traditional fields like teaching and nursing, and newer fields like biotechnology and multimedia. This recommendation suggests a significant expansion of programs in areas of high need, financed at least partly through program reductions in other areas.

6b. The expansion of opportunities in graduate education and continuing education will require a significant integration of programs in both the state-supported and fee-supported modes. The specifics of a more integrated program need to be developed, including the proper institutional and financial relationships, and piloted on at least three CSU campuses.

6c. The expansion of CSU post-baccalaureate programs will require a new system of financing these programs, including differences in professional fees when justified by costs and income potential.

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

6e. The expansion of opportunity in these areas will require new partnerships with community and business institutions to make education available off-site and to increase the immediacy of education that is applied and professional.

6f. The CSU should explore the feasibility of a "California State University Alumni Passport," which would offer continuing education courses at reduced fees, and other means of expanding access to lifelong learning for CSU graduates.

C. Ensuring Financial Stability

The goals of ensuring educational excellence and broad access to it are best met in an environment where resources are stable enough that campuses can make plans, determine priorities, and successfully implement them. Equally important, students should be able to plan confidently for the completion of their education in an environment in which both their fees and adequate aid are predictable. This requires a new financial policy framework for California higher education.

The California State University is committed to developing a long-term financing policy agreement between the state of California and the institutions of higher education. This new policy must be grounded in the long-term economic, educational, and social value to the state derived from higher education. California's annual state budget decisions must support the enduring policy commitments of the state's Master Plan for Higher Education. Above all, the State must align its resource allocation and reward policies with its highest priority social goals.

At the same time that the CSU leadership commits itself to develop a long-term policy agreement with the State, Cornerstones reaffirms the most central principle of any such policy: that the responsibility for maintaining excellence, diversity, and health of the CSU is shared by the state, the CSU system, our many campuses, the faculty, and students. At its heart this principle of shared responsibility expresses the very nature of a public university: that we are a precious public resource, supported generously not only because we offer opportunity to each individual student but because we are vital to the social, cultural, and economic health of the society at large.

Under these terms, the State of California will ensure adequate resources for new enrollment growth, with reasonable base budget adjustment beyond inflationary increases, the protection of access through significantly expanded student aid programs, and the resources needed to bring faculty salaries to parity with comparable universities.

At the same time, the CSU must adopt policies and procedures through which the system and the campuses increase our productivity in reaching, recruiting, supporting and teaching our students. The relentless search for more state funding must be matched by our own efforts to

produce excellence. "Financial stability" will only be achieved through a combination of increased revenues and increased productivity and savings.

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

The elements of this framework include:

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

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

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

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

7e. Because the individual economic benefits go up at higher levels of educational attainment, and also because of the traditionally higher costs of graduate education, the fees paid by students should increase as they move from undergraduate to graduate and professional education. Professional fees for post-baccalaureate education may reflect differences in program costs and income potential; such fees must be matched by adequate financial aid for eligible students.

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

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

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

Principle 8: The responsibility for maintaining educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty, and students.

The options presented in support of this principle fall into two categories, those providing revenues and those increasing savings through productivity.

Revenue Options

8a. The CSU must continue relentlessly to pursue state general funding to meet the core needs of the institution. Base funding for the institution must be provided for enrollment growth, quality, and capacity.

8b. Steps need to be taken to develop a stable long-term student fee and financial aid policy as part of a long-term funding compact with the State of California. Student fee increases should occur as part of a planned and managed financial compact among the institution, the State, and the students. Students should know when they first enroll in the CSU what their fees will be when they graduate. In keeping with current Trustee policy, one-third of all revenues from fee increases should be reserved for institutional financial aid.

8c. The CSU shall initiate new fee structures for graduate, professional, and post-baccalaureate education, excepting programs in teacher education. These fees may be set flexibly, where differences are warranted by program costs on the one hand and earnings potential on the other. Any increases in these fees must have offsetting financial aid for eligible students.

Productivity and Reinvestment Options

8d. Cornerstones proposes a *"faculty renewal and reinvestment"* program, in which the CSU projects potentially significant savings over the next decade. If retirements occur as planned, and faculty are rehired into tenure or tenure-track positions at more junior levels, greater productivity can be achieved through maintained investment in our faculty at reduced cost. Policies to guide how reinvestment and renewal occurs must be developed as part of the university's long-range institutional planning.

A central element of the renewal and reinvestment strategy is the commitment to use a substantial portion of the savings generated by the normal retirement of senior faculty and their replacement by junior faculty to expand programs for faculty professional development, recognizing that not all campuses experience faculty retirements at the same rate.

8e. Other options include reductions in remedial education costs, increased administrative efficiencies, and the improved time-to-degree afforded through better counseling and course scheduling.

8f. The CSU should examine the prospects for increased productivity through the use of pedagogues that effectively employ technology (such as in well designed distance education).

D. Ensuring University Accountability

The California State University has moved from a regulation-driven, heavily centralized and bureaucratized "system" to a community of distinct and diverse campuses. Each campus serves broad statewide purposes through a quite distinct mix of programs and fields of study. Each campus shares the fundamental commitment to teaching excellence, community service, and advanced scholarship, but does so with an attentive eye to distinct local and regional needs.

Cornerstones affirms this movement towards decentralization and the differentiation of campus identities in a context of shared goals and broad commitments to the people of California. We do not pretend this balance between broad statewide commitments and local campus autonomy is easy or formulaic. It is created in a context of mutual accountability, increased clarity about goals, and better communication about results.

Cornerstones itself expresses the delicate complexity of drafting broad policy goals for a community of different campuses. We believe that the CSU can be more than the sum of its parts, that it can stand for more than the particular identities of its individual campuses, that it can make common commitments to California. At the same time, we believe in greater flexibility and autonomy in how campuses implement those commitments.

In the development of a comprehensive system of mutual accountability, the CSU should affirm two principles. First, we will account for our performance as a community in honoring the educational commitments we make to the people of California. We are confident in reporting to the people of the State our achievements.

Second, we will insist on the greatest possible autonomy for campuses to reach our statewide goals, and we will honor the quite diverse nature of our campuses and the students who attend them. Any system of annual reports, for example, should focus on the substantive educational value added for students of quite different backgrounds and appreciate the success of students who manage to acquire an education in the midst of raising families and working.

Principle 9: The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society, through regular assessment of the learning outcomes of its students and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.

The recommendations in support of this principle provide:

9a. The CSU will expand and/or develop mechanisms for assessing institutional performance in the areas of student achievement, student satisfaction, the quality of teaching and support services, the provision of service to the community and to the State's economy and society, alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and faculty and staff satisfaction.

9b. The CSU will develop a variety of annual reports, appropriately formatted to reach different audiences, which will serve to inform the public regarding our performance.

Principle 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identities, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.

The recommendations supporting this principle are:

10a. CSU campuses will have greater opportunity and incentive to create more flexible hiring, professional growth opportunities, and remuneration practices for faculty and staff, within the parameters of collective bargaining.

10b. CSU campuses will have greater options to develop community/industry partnerships and expand the use of off-campus facilities.

10c. The CSU will streamline the system process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. All of this will balance against greater system accountability for learning outcomes; thus, campuses will meet agreed upon performance standards while having greater flexibility regarding program design standards. The CSU shall pilot this process initially on three campuses.

10d. The CSU will work cooperatively with external agencies (WASC, CPEC, etc.), to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs, and develop appropriate accountability frameworks.

10e. The CSU will provide system funding for "start-up" and innovation programs, joined to significant reduction in program approval processes.

10f. The CSU will develop a comprehensive internal system of performance assessment and accountability -- focused on administrators, faculty, and staff -- as a companion piece to the generation of a student learning outcomes assessment system.

10g. The CSU system will review current Title V and university code requirements so as to eliminate regulatory constraints where possible.

Conclusion: Shared Responsibility

Cornerstones is animated by the conviction that a fundamentally healthy university is in the best possible position to examine itself, propose new directions, and shape a future which will better serve the people of California. The Cornerstones Policy Goals and Principles have one continuing theme: we all share responsibility for a great public resource. The California State University enjoys the strong support of the State, the loyalty of California's people, the professional commitments of a talented faculty and strong leadership, and the daily engagement of an intelligent and imaginative student body. Indeed, California's economic and social health is tied increasingly to CSU's expertise and performance.

Cornerstones depends on each member of the CSU community to play a role in determining the university's future. We will maintain both educational excellence and access through a program of shared responsibility. This shared responsibility will work only if the CSU, the students, and the State each does its part.

A. What the University faculty and administration will do to maintain their public responsibilities:

* Provide access to the growing population seeking higher education.
* Increase productivity as part of a long-term plan to maintain quality and access, through a variety of financing and accountability strategies, designed to share responsibility for the future among the members of the university community.
* Increase learning productivity through reduced time-to-degree, more efficient use of campuses, and greater student access to program services.
* Eliminate redundant and/or low enrollment programs serving little public interest through consolidation, cross-campus program sharing, or attrition.
* Reduce need for remediation.
* Reduce administrative costs.
* Reinvest significantly in faculty, through a faculty renewal and reinvestment program that protects the core resources and ensures additional resources for faculty development and learning.
* Increase investment in educational technology to enhance teaching and learning as well as prospects for distance education.
* Increase scheduling and programming flexibility, course availability, and continuing education opportunities.
* Focus on continuous quality improvement through a system of performance accountability that sharpens focus on goals and performance.
* Demonstrate public accountability for results through a series of "annual reports" and a streamlined regulatory system.

B. What the University will ask from students:

* Support for long-term stable financing of educational quality, including predictable fee increases, accompanied by adequate financial aid.
* Development of an individual learning plan for each student.
* More use of student counseling and advising services.
* Better pre-collegiate preparation.

C. What the University will ask from the State:

* Funding for enrollment growth.
* Reasonable and predictable base budget increases beyond inflation rates.
* Resources for faculty renewal and development.
* Funding for competitive increases in faculty and staff salaries.
* Reform of the capital outlay budget to remove distinctions between operating and capital funds for technology.
* Support for plant maintenance and improvement.
* Reform of state financial aid programs to provide increased funding for programs serving the financially disadvantaged, and for post-baccalaureate study.
* Support for a streamlined system of public accountability and reduced bureaucratic controls.
* Support for capital investment, both infrastructure and technology.

D. What the State of California will achieve within this framework:

* Protect future access to high quality, teaching-centered collegiate education.
* Maintain and strengthen the core faculty for the future.

* Clear standards of demonstrated learning.
* Protect comprehensive curricula.
* Maintain access through affordable fees and available aid.
* Flexible, student-centered learning environment.
* No traditional new campuses, but greater access through cross-campus consortia and distance education.
* Graduate education and continuing education programs attuned to changing professional and economic needs of Californians.
* Strengthened public communication about university performance.
* Greater public accountability for institutional effectiveness, including student learning outcomes, as well as contributions to the economy, the culture and civic life.

We began with four commitments and four policy goals in support of those commitments. The ten Cornerstones Principles and the specific recommendations that follow them should be the basis for the programs and projects of a university seeking to shape its future.

This framework provides both an internal guide and an external statement of our priorities. It proposes, finally, a partnership with California's people. This is a partnership rooted in the most fundamental fact about this great public resource: we are supported by a people who both need and respect us. This is support we earn the old-fashioned way: we work for it.

Cornerstones is a plan, then, about how we work in support of our students, our State, and a future we share. It calls for both continuity and creativity. We must continue doing what we do superbly well--in the classrooms and laboratories and libraries--and push ourselves beyond the most comfortable parts of our traditions. The best parts of those traditions are, after all, the moments of change and innovation and the unsettled search for new answers.

Appendix: The University in Context: the Economic, Demographic, Political, and Financing Challenges ahead.

The California State University is the nation's largest university system, with over 350,000 students at 22 campuses. It is a remarkable California treasure. Over many decades hundreds of thousands have earned CSU degrees, and contributed vitally to our society and economy.

This is the nation's premier teaching university, with a faculty whose intellectual and creative talents have always been brought directly into the classroom. The CSU is known best and appreciated most by the tens of thousands of Californians who have been our students, and then our loyal alumni, and by their employers. We are the gateway institutions for the great majority of students seeking a baccalaureate education in California, and for those who seek professional training as teachers, nurses, social workers, and engineers. We take special pride in our record of service to working families, immigrants, and minority communities--all who seek to enter the world of higher education.

We are a driving forceful engine for the California dream, and we are proud of it. Walk on any CSU campus and you will see the thousand faces of the new California: our students are young and old, they work and raise families, and they come from every ethnic, racial, and religious community. The health and vitality of our state's social future depends on these students' imagination and intelligence, and on our ability to provide them every opportunity for learning. There is a direct link between the particular intimacies of university work--the classroom magic, the quiet times of reflection, the serendipitous discovery of new things--and California's long-term social and economic health.

But, just as we affect the State's future, the dramatic transformation of the State's economy, society, and politics frames our own future.

The new economy: California's economy has undergone a profound transformation in the last two decades. The major economic growth areas which have emerged to bring the State out of its recent recession are high-tech and high-tech based, service related industries, that will best employ those who are well-educated and able to move easily among careers and employers. Californians who lack adequate education coupled with skills and competencies useful across career lines, especially those who have not received at least a college degree, will find less opportunity, less advancement, and less earning capacity.

The numbers are compelling. They are reflected in both national and international trends.

* In every industrialized nation, employment in those productive sectors demanding higher education has grown greatly -- between three times (in the United States) and 30 times (in Italy and France) the average of those demanding less education.

* The gap in annual wages between those with and without college degrees widens every year. Currently, those who have a college degree earn roughly twice what high school graduates earn. The annual wages of workers without college education have actually declined (when adjusted for inflation) over the last twenty-five years.

* Unemployment is dramatically higher for those without a college education. In the United States, even during the height of the recession, unemployment for those with a college degree did not exceed 3.5%, while it averaged over 8% for high school graduates and 13% for those lacking a high school diploma.

The new demography: In an economy in which the well-educated will thrive, and those lacking education will fare poorly, the California State University has a special responsibility. We have a long history of providing opportunity for those Californians who may be the first in their family to attend college. Especially through our partnership with California's community colleges, we provide education and access to the economy for millions of Californians. As the employment profile of the new economy continues to shift towards the service and value-added industries, the demand for collegiate education will soar.

The sheer magnitude of the numbers bears reminding. By the year 2005, CSU annual enrollment will grow by 69,000 full-time-equivalent students. We face an increase of 100,000 full-time-equivalent students by 2010. This will not happen all at once, of course, and each year may show dramatic variation according to changes in the economy and unemployment. Two out of every three new students will come through the community colleges, whose numbers may also increase as more students seek less expensive ways of going to college.

The aggregate numbers tell half of our funding dilemma, to which we turn in a moment. Far more interesting is the dramatic demographic transformation of the student body, which in the CSU's case increasingly reflects the racial and ethnic diversity of California. By 2005, close to half of the entering class of students will likely come from dual-language families. On almost all of our campuses there will be no single racial "majority" group, as the numbers of Latino and Asian students will increase significantly over the next decade.

This change ought to require only that which California has always offered its people: adequate resources to meet the demand for college education, and a commitment to excellence shared by both faculty and students. It is especially galling to minority communities to see dwindling resources emerge as a crisis precisely when minority students achieve majority standing. The CSU is deeply committed to active programs of recruitment and academic preparation for communities historically underrepresented in higher education, and believes that all our students deserve the highest quality service and instruction. The CSU will make every effort to secure adequate state resources for all Californians who desire a college education.

Within the university the questions of diversity are more complex and compelling than brute resources alone. How does the faculty, increasingly diverse itself, thoughtfully account for differences in learning styles and family demands among different students? What services make "access" an active rather than passive word, where the university actively seeks the best conditions for success of all its diverse students? What education is required for full participation in a diverse society committed to democratic values?

Many of these questions prompt further and appropriate concern for resources, as do other dimensions of the demographic change. More and more students will be working full-time and raising families. More and more students will be part-time, and more working Californians will seek short-term education for career or advancement purposes. And each new student will legitimately want attentive student service professionals and available faculty advisors.

The new politics: The political consensus about the role of higher education is more fragile now than at any time in the last three decades. This is a national issue, although the framework for the conversation and some of the specifics are unique to our State. What higher education is for, and who should have access to it, are being seriously debated in government and by the media. We are accused by many of having weak standards, being too expensive, and perpetuating our institutional interests rather than serving the educational needs of students or of society. This is a profound and serious political fact to which the CSU must pay attention. We operate within an external policy environment that often does not understand us or our values and goals.

The challenges facing public higher education in California are particularly sharp. The State fiscal situation and the public policy environment make it imperative that we attempt to shape the future rather than allow current trajectories to continue. Study after study done by us and others confirm the basic framework of demand growing faster than public resources. Absent some explicit interventions to reverse those trends, through effective justification for increased public revenues and sharper attention to internal resource management, the inevitable route is either the denial of access, or maintaining access at the expense of quality. Both are unacceptable.

We have seen a generation of state legislative leadership leave because of term limits, and the arrival of new leadership that is energetic and capable, but that has not absorbed the educational policy lessons in California of the last half century. Many of our legislators are new, they are impatient because they need to make their mark in a short period of time, and they want solutions. We know what questions they will ask: how will we meet our mission to provide access and affordability; how will we ensure quality through maximum attention to the teaching and learning process; and what is the evidence for our results?

Within the CSU, we need to engage a new process if we are to find solutions to our challenges and preserve the most important ingredients of shared governance. We must maintain our momentum of moving toward a decentralized system, with greater support for individual campuses to serve different communities with different needs. At the same time, we must maintain our capacity to serve the needs of the State as a system.

There are transformative educational needs facing the institution, which must be addressed whatever the levels of State funding. To do this, the institution must pay much greater attention than before to achieving change through reinvestment and renewal of our core resources. The strategies of reinvestment and renewal are particularly important as they affect the most valuable resource of the University, its teaching faculty, many of whom will retire in the next decade. The protection and regeneration of that faculty must be a priority in the years ahead. Achieving this in an environment of greater decentralization and shared governance is a challenge, but one we believe is achievable.

The finance crisis: Over the past twenty years, through a series of constitutional initiatives that have limited legislative control over spending, California has evolved a state budget structure with a permanent imbalance between general fund revenue availability and structural demands for new program spending. Higher education spending -- specifically spending for the University of California, the California State University and student aid -- has become a "leftover," drawn from a general revenue base increasingly restricted by constitutional and statutory provisions. These provisions limit the Legislature and Governor's ability to decide where scarce resources can be spent.

The net result is that elected officials have incrementally lost both the resources and the decision capacity to govern, with particularly bad effect on higher education The percentage of state spending on higher education has dropped enormously: from $12.01 for each $1000 of personal income in 1975, to $7.22 in 1996. While the end of the current recession has meant more state funding for higher education over the past two years, the long-term outlook is that higher education expenditures as a percentage of the total state spending will decline.

The "Gap": We fully intend to do everything possible to increase state funding for the CSU, and we do not believe the people of California will abandon support for the CSU if our case is made persuasively. Through intensive public advocacy on behalf of the institution, and appealing to the current broad-based bipartisan support for higher education, we believe that the

CSU can maintain and increase State support. Indeed, during this decade's worst economic environment in California's history, the respect and relative-support for our university has grown meaningfully. Yet we do not imagine that even the most effective efforts will result in sufficient funding for all of our legitimate needs. Developing a sense of the range of most likely resource needs, and identifying steps to meet them, is one of the goals for this process. The starting place for this aspect of our work has been an assessment of the size of the resource/quality/funding "gap" that CSU and the State must fill if the institution is to meet future enrollment demand without a loss of quality.

CSU anticipates four types of resource "gaps" between legitimate need and probable future revenues: the operating "growth" gap, resulting from insufficient revenues to meet the enrollments of the next decade; the "quality" gap, accumulating from current unmet needs such as the eroding CSU faculty salary base, as well as for new investments for priorities such as faculty renewal and new technology; the "capital" gap, for resources for physical plant needs both for deferred maintenance and repair on the existing plant and for new space to accommodate the new enrollments; and the "access/aid" gap, resulting from unfunded financial need for CSU students. The details of these estimates are provided in the report of Task Force II, and are just briefly reiterated here:

The "growth" gap: Under the most optimistic scenario of possible future state appropriation growth (between 5.0% and 6.5% annually through 2005), the CSU will have a $58 million "deficit" in 2005 if enrollment demands are met. Under a pessimistic scenario, with appropriations growing at 4.5% through 2005 and then dropping to 3.5% thereafter, the "deficit" is $240 million in 2005, and grows to $520 million in 2010. The mid-range estimate is for a deficit of $240 million in 2005, growing to $365 in 2010.

The "quality" gap: CSU has unfunded needs which constitute a serious gap between resources needed to sustain quality even without new enrollment related funding needs. We estimate these deficits now would cost nearly $900 million to close, largely for faculty salaries, new technology, equipment replacement, libraries, and maintenance. The institution estimates a need for $450 million for intra-campus technology infrastructure for all CSU campuses; this does not include the cost of training in new technology to enable faculty and staff to make the best use of the new technology. An additional $115 million is needed to replace obsolete instructional equipment, particularly vital to maintain the quality of the teaching laboratories. There is a deficit of $53 million in library acquisitions; another $51 million in funding for mandatory price increases; and $13 million in maintenance and utilities costs for new space.

The "capital" gap: CSU has new capital needs both to accommodate enrollment growth, and for deferred maintenance, renovation and remodeling. Accommodating the enrollment growth will require additional space to accommodate the roughly 26% overall increase in students. If all available existing physical plant space on all the CSU campuses were used to maximum capacity (and making this estimate requires aggregating space availability, meaning a leap in imagination to use space without regard to where it is), CSU would still be short of space needed to accommodate 25,000 students in 2005, and 58,000 in 2010.

Financial aid/access gap: Student aid remains a critical element in the CSU efforts to provide access to California's students. In 1996-97, close to 45% of CSU students had financial "need" as measured by the standard methods for determining need. Because of the growing inability of the financial aid system to fund all need, we estimate a financial aid "gap" for our current students of $312 million. The number of needy students is projected to increase gradually over the next decade, to 59% of total enrollments in 2005 and 68% in 2010. These estimates assume no increases in tuition beyond annual inflationary adjustments. Even at that level of tuition growth, we project the need for aid to grow to $774 million in 2005, and to top

$1 billion in 2010. Cornerstones will affirm that all fee increases must be matched by adequate financial aid for needy students.

The historic level of public resources committed to higher education is absolutely unmatched by any other state in this nation. Yet the current reality of public finance in California is that public resources are no longer available to fund all of higher education's legitimate priorities at the same levels as in the past. No State financial policy framework for higher education has been developed in this new environment, and the institutions and the State are left with no analytical basis for determining where increasingly scarce general fund resources should be invested to meet public priorities. Three years ago a preliminary compact between CSU, UC and the State began to mould a long term stable planning context. What is needed is a new State policy framework for higher education finance that is animated by the goals of the Master Plan, and which can be used as a policy guide to determine what resources can be found to meet our priorities. That policy framework should shape a series of new compacts with the State, Compact II and beyond.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD • CHICO • DOMINGUEZ HILLS • FRESNO • FULLERTON • HAYWARD • HUMBOLDT • LONG BEACH • LOS ANGELES • MARITIME ACADEMY • MONTEREY BAY
NORTHRIDGE • POMONA • SACRAMENTO • SAN BERNARDINO • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SAN JOSE • SAN LUIS OBISPO • SAN MARCOS • SONOMA • STANISLAUS

BARRY MUNITZ
CHANCELLOR

June 14, 1996

To: Members, Cornerstones

From: Barry Munitz, Chancellor

Re: **Our Goals and Purposes**

In anticipation of our meeting on June 24 and 25, I am writing to offer my own view on our purposes in convening the Cornerstones group. I want to elaborate our collective "charge," and indicate the particular importance of the four topical areas in which we will work.

First, my deep appreciation for your willingness to participate in what promises to be a thoroughly engaging and obviously time-consuming process. I cannot imagine a more important task than to clarify the paths we must take if we are to honor the fundamental commitments of the CSU.

As I suggested in my remarks to the Trustees in May, I was initially attracted to this planning initiative because it offered an opportunity to engage diverse members of our extended CSU family in developing concrete action plans with which we might address the most serious structural and institutional dilemmas we face. I was especially drawn to a process which could bring together representatives of the Trustees and the faculty to work together in developing action proposals for the system.

At the same time, I became interested in how we might engage the broader CSU family - including both on and off-campus communities - in discussing candidly the options we have in addressing our basic dilemmas. I am aware that most planning efforts remain private, in effect, and so I was most concerned that the Comerstones project be open to a broader discussion.

So the Cornerstones project has these two dimensions: the serious work of a relatively small group of men and women, and then later the broader involvement of wider constituencies as we refine and develop our proposals.

What do we hope to accomplish? And why now?

It is my hope that the Cornerstone group can bring back to the system actual policy and action proposals in each of the topical areas we have announced for the initiative. I am not imagining a year of vague talk, but the hard work of developing strategic initiatives in each area.

This initiative and opportunity comes at a particularly auspicious time for the CSU, a moment where we have some breathing room in which we can plan ahead, and- ironically - virtually no latitude to avoid the fundamental contradictions we face.

400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4275 Telefax: (310) 985-2808 Telephone: (310) 985-2800

What do I mean? First, we are now in the second year of a four-year pact with the current administration in Sacramento, to stabilize our funding and minimize the disruptions caused by either fee increases or dramatic general fund decreases. We are in a momentary lull in what we anticipate as the first push of Tidal Wave II. We enjoy strong support in Sacramento and across the state. Our internal house is in order, our faculty contract is in place, we have strong leadership at both the campus and system level.

So, we are at a moment when we can really focus on the future and not be overwhelmed by the immediacy of crisis after costs. But, taking a breath does not mean we can relax, or that the fundamental predicament we face is going away. Indeed, I am more struck than ever I have been by the enormity of what we face. We face a crisis created both because of inadequate resources in the face of our exploding growth, as well as the need to reframe what we do and how we do it to meet the needs of the future.

The question is: how can we continue to serve the people we are sworn to serve without the level of resources we have long enjoyed from the state? No momentary respite - or four-year deal - gets us out of the challenge of the next decade: tens of thousands of students heading our way, and less resources available to serve them.

This is, in many ways the defining issue for this institution, and you have heard me speak of it in many venues. The full dimensions of the "Gap" between expected expenditures and expected revenues are explored most coherently in the enclosed analysis prepared by Executive Vice Chancellor Broad for our meeting on the 24th. The particulars do matter, as small changes in the numbers can affect our real options; but the fundamental issue dwarfs the particulars under any reasonable scenario, the state will not fully fund our expected enrollment demand.

At the most extreme case, all the available discretionary state resources will move from higher education to corrections towards the end of the next decade. Even discounting from the most extreme model, we will find ourselves trapped nonetheless between the rock of increased demand and the hard place of scarce state resources.

Many of you have heard me make this argument. What's the point for us today? The point is this: I want to have it both ways, and a couple of new ways to boot. Put simply: I want us to find concrete ways to meet our obligations to the next generation of students without fantasizing a solution to the fiscal crisis. I want us to acknowledge the limits on what the state will likely give us - and still plan to expand our services and even define new roles in the face of California's changing economy and society.

Why put the challenge this way, and how does this lead me to the topics with which I believe our new planning initiative must deal?

I have been here now five years. I have seen the depth of commitment and seriousness with which our faculty and staff meet the needs of the students they teach and the communities they come from. There are certain things which I believe are non-negotiable in the CSU. First, it is non-negotiable to offer the finest quality undergraduate and graduate education our faculty can organize and deliver. Second, it is non-negotiable that we meet the demand for higher education in Califomia. This faculty and this administration does not want to turn away qualified men and women who seek an education which will empower them to be productive citizens.

Third, it is non-negotiable that we see ourselves as answerable to the people, as accountable for our performance. We will put our graduates up against any; we are proud of a history of institutional integrity, of the prudent use of scarce - really scarce - state resources, and we are proud of the many ways we serve our communities.

Fourth, there is a non-negotiable commitment to being fully responsive to the changing needs of the state. At campus after campus there are faculty seeking ways of meeting an entirely new set of educational demands beyond undergraduate education. I'm not talking obliquely about some new doctorate here, but of the need for entirely new forms of continuing and professional education beyond the baccalaureate, delivered in new ways in untraditional forms according to new kinds of schedules.

I am certain there are other elements of our institutional character which many would regard as equally fundamental, but I want to start with these four. I want to challenge this system to use the next year to discuss and debate and then prepare to move to decisions about how we are going to meet the challenges which are implicit in these four areas.

Let me be much more specific. I have asked the Cornerstones planning group to form four planning task forces, each centered on one essential element of our collective future. I am asking those task forces to take one year, and at the end of that year bring back concrete proposals for action in each of four areas.

I have alluded to the four areas. Again, let me be quite specific.

First, we have an obligation to assure the people of California that we will provide the finest and most relevant education for all Californians who come to us. We affirm our commitment - indeed our identity - as a primarily teaching and learning-centered institution, and we seek the clearest possible public statement of what we want our students to learn and know in the face of the changing century.

This system has just spent months debating issues of student preparation, and has affirmed in the strongest possible way our commitment to be a partner with the public schools in ensuring the best preparation for those who come to us. Now we need to define clearly what the public can expect from our graduates, and how we define the meaning of our degrees as we enter the next century.

It is important to clarify our expectations for a baccalaureate degree from the CSU. We need to look seriously at the issue of educational outcomes, as this could be an important part of assessing real productivity and the efficient use of our resources. These are topics long under scrutiny in the CSU - among the faculty, the leadership of the Academic Senate and the chancellor's office of Academic Affairs division. Indeed, the Senate is currently reviewing the baccalaureate degree; I anticipate great reciprocity between their effort and the Cornerstones initiative.

In the end, I am asking the first of our four task forces to return in one year with proposals regarding what outcomes we expect when we educate. What knowledge and values will we most value; what range of and habits of mind will we build into our new programs and reinforce our traditional strengths? I am not asking some super committee to design the general education program; indeed, one of our values is the diversity between our campuses in the ways they craft their different programs and curricula. But we must have learning goals for our CSU students. What are they? No less important, how will we know whether those goals are met?

Second, and more practically difficult than stating what we want our students to know: how will we meet the enrollment challenge of the next decade? I hold it to be non-negotiable that we meet the enrollment demands of the future. Iam asking for the planning initiative to bring back in one year a concrete plan, with options and alternatives, for how we will meet that demand. I expect that funding for higher education will remain a state priority, and you know we will be as tireless and insistent as we have always been that we get our share. But I am not romantic about our prospects. We must work as partners with the State to prepare a realistic plan for financing the CSU in the next decade. That plan has to have four elements: a) what we believe we need - and can realistically expect from the State of California; b) the role that we believe student tuition revenue must play; c) our goals and plans for student financial aid; d) specific plans for what we must be able to achieve through productivity increases and cost containment.

Third, we have to address the means and methods by which we will hold ourselves accountable. How do we balance "system" accountability and campus autonomy? We must continue to be accountable to the State of California for meeting our public purposes as a system, and also be as unbureaucratic and decentralized within that system as possible. We must address our internal regulatory procedures, to get rid of those that no longer meet our purposes and which may actually get in the way of changing how we do our work. This should help us become more efficient at what we do, and allow us to save money now spent on excessive bureaucracy. We must find ways of enhancing and encouraging maximum campus innovation and distinctiveness, including more program innovation and privatization within and among the campuses, while continuing to meet our commitment to the State of California as a system. Along with a re-evaluation of our internal procedures for doing business, we must re-evaluate the basis on which we should be held accountable to the State of California, including expanded use of performance-based measures of accountability.

Fourth, we have to re-think what CSU does with post-baccalaureate education. I am convinced that the state's long-term economic future will depend in part on our capacity to provide sophisticated, innovative educational programs to professionals who already have their baccalaureate education and who need new education to keep up with the rapid pace of change in the world. These aren't conventional academic graduate programs, and the usual vocabulary of masters, or "professional," or "doctoral" may not work for us here. Technological change, changes in the structure of government, changes in the economy, new partners overseas - California needs to have citizens who stay smart about the world, and who are well educated to participate effectively in it. We need to think about what education is needed, and about how we can provide it in the most efficient and cost effective way possible.

The Cornerstones planning group has prepared the accompanying materials which detail the organization through which we propose to address these four topical areas. Much of our work on the 24th and 25th will be the elaborating of how we go about our work, and redefining the very questions with which we begin.

We are blessed in this effort with fine leadership. I do not believe we could have begun this initiative without the help and guidance of my friend Tom Ehrlich, and once again we are calling on Chuck Lindahl to lend his considerable talent to organizing one more system initiative. We are in good hands, and I look forward to beginning.

San José State
UNIVERSITY

SS-F97-4

A campus of The California State University

Office of the Academic Senate • One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0024 • 408-924-2440 • Fax: 408-924-2410

At its meeting on October 6, 1997, the Academic Senate approved the following Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution presented by Senator Carmen Sigler for the Executive Committee.

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION

ON THE "CORNERSTONES" PROJECT

Whereas, San Jose State University has been asked to provide feedback regarding the "Cornerstones" Project; and

Whereas, San Jose State University has devoted detailed and serious discussion to the "Cornerstones" project: through the participation of an expert delegation to the Monterey Conference on Cornerstones, through discussions within the President's Roundtable, through meetings and retreats in each of the University's colleges, and finally through a retreat of the Academic Senate of SJSU; and

Whereas, The Academic Senate has fully reviewed and considered the most recent draft of the "Cornerstones" report, dated August 1997, and prepared its response accordingly; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of SJSU thank the Trustees and the Cornerstones team for providing an opportunity for substantial campus consultation on this project; be it further

Resolved, That Cornerstones is to be commended for raising our awareness of the possible threat of insufficient public resources to support increasing enrollments in future years; be it further

Resolved, That there are a number of educational reforms suggested in Cornerstones that are worthy of further study and possible implementation; be it further

Resolved, That the Cornerstones report skews its emphasis toward the impending problems of access when it ought to devote greater attention to the full purpose and nature of higher education in the CSU, and especially the existing problems of maintaining quality in all of our undertakings; be it further

Resolved, That the Cornerstones report underestimates the extent to which faculty and administration have already undertaken many of the suggested reforms; be it further

Resolved, That Cornerstones fails to adequately address the contradiction between the requirements of the expensive educational reforms that it advocates and its stated need to extract significant productivity and savings from the system; be it further

Resolved, That Cornerstones is a systemwide effort that would be better redirected to a campus by campus level; we therefore enthusiastically endorse Cornerstones Principle 10, that "campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identities, and programs, with institutional flexibility..." and believe we should start with each campus laying its own "Cornerstones;" be it further

Resolved, That Cornerstones inexplicably ignores the need to better support scholarly research as a means to maintain and improve the quality of education delivered by our teacher-scholars; be it further

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of SJSU endorse the attached report "Response to Cornerstones;" be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to the AS CSU and to all those working on the Cornerstones initiative.

Response to Cornerstones
Academic Senate of San Jose State University
October 6, 1997

Based upon campus input and a Retreat of the Academic Senate held September 12, 1997

SJSU Background:

The Academic Senate of San Jose State University is pleased to respond to the invitation to provide feedback on the August "Cornerstones" draft report. SJSU has positioned itself to offer a thoughtful critique of this system-wide effort by participating fully in Cornerstones at every available opportunity. SJSU sent a full delegation to the Monterey Conference on Cornerstones. Our delegation was chosen through a competitive application process which revealed much greater interest than could be accommodated. SJSU also held a Presidential Roundtable discussion on Cornerstones on May 1, which included a wide cross section of representatives from the entire University community. Individual colleges have studied the proposals, held retreats and forums, and communicated their views to their Academic Senators. Following these college meetings, the full Academic Senate held an all-day retreat on September 12, 1997, to specifically respond to the August draft of Cornerstones. This report is the culmination of all of these activities.

Overall Assessment:

In general, we believe that the Cornerstones effort should be commended for raising our awareness of certain important issues, and are especially heartened by the degree of consultation and collegiality shown by the expansion of the Monterey Conference and the extension of time lines to allow for detailed campus consultation. There are also a number of specific proposals and ideas which we found thought-provoking and which may well prove, upon further study, to be useful educational reforms.

However, the latest draft of Cornerstones continues to suffer from several fundamental problems that prevent us from positively endorsing this document. While we understand that this document is, among other things, an effort to deal realistically with the Legislature, the private sector, and the state as a whole, we feel strongly that the assumptions and language of such a fundamental document should better reflect the values of academia. Many criticisms raised at our retreat were connected to the underlying way ***Cornerstones regards education as a commodity rather than as an intellectual experience.*** For example, this is reflected in the notion that education is an "outcome" (1d) rather than a process, that it is something that can be "explicitly" defined (1), that the language of the corporation and/or the assembly line can be usefully applied to the labor-intensive craftsmanship of higher education (e.g., the nature of the discussion of productivity.) At the same time, missing from any Cornerstones principle are the core values that might explain why higher education in the United States has become the envy of the entire world, and is thus, in the international context, comparatively more successful as an institution than even American corporate enterprise. In short, the language of Cornerstones reflects a fundamental shift in values away from the academic, which we believe is unjustified and ultimately counterproductive.

We continue to be concerned that Cornerstones underestimates the extent to which campuses in the CSU are already undertaking many of the suggested reforms. These oversights give the report a somewhat punitive tone--as if it were a lecture on how faculty in particular are to change--rather than a tone of positive support for those efforts that are already underway. The report's lack of awareness of campus initiatives is no doubt due to the centralized perspective of the report--no individual or group of individuals could possibly know of all the initiatives taking place at campus levels to achieve much of what

Cornerstones proposes. Many of the individual principles could be strengthened simply by indicating that they are as much an endorsement of existing initiatives and efforts as they are mandates for new efforts.

A very serious overall problem with the report continues to be the massive contradiction between the need for new resources to implement worthwhile educational reforms, and the presumption that there are significant productivity gains and savings to be extracted from the system. We are pleased that the defeatist presumption (from earlier versions) that additional public funds will not be forthcoming has been corrected through the addition of principle 8a. But the bulk of the discussion continues to be on strategies to produce greater productivity, not on strategies to communicate our desperate financial plight to the public. While we must do the best job we can with whatever resources the public is willing to provide, it may be more realistic to admit that no amount of reform can create miracles, and that the expected increasing demand for higher education, upon which the future of the California economy rests, cannot be adequately funded except by a shift in public priorities. Cornerstones might well succeed in improving the quality of education we provide. With a few specific exceptions, however, it will not enable us to handle significantly more students without the depreciation of educational quality. Cornerstones could therefore create the false hope that we can handle the coming demographic bulge on our own, and thus weaken the CSU in its efforts to persuade the public to adequately support us.

We find that Cornerstones is a system-wide effort when only campus-specific efforts will be truly realistic and effective. The 10th Principle that there should be greater institutional flexibility at the campus level is paradoxically at odds with most of the rest of Cornerstones. Cornerstones is prefaced with a system-wide crisis in impending enrollments, but this crisis does not apply equally to all campuses. Even beyond the statement of the problem, the statement of possible solutions is even less universally applicable across all campuses. Cornerstones can either say nothing of substance or it can raise substantive reforms that will be inappropriate for some campuses. Our view is that earlier drafts of Cornerstones erred more on the side of inappropriately universal solutions, and in an effort to correct this problem the latest draft now is less substantive. A better strategy would be to insist that each campus produce its own solutions of substance.

At our retreat strong concern was expressed about the lack of specific referencing information in the text of the August draft, which limits our ability to critique the document and its assumptions. In the effort to shorten the document from earlier drafts it was rendered less intelligible to those who have not followed its evolution.

Finally, we are surprised by the lack of attention to scholarly research in Cornerstones. While the primary mission of the CSU is teaching, and we have no desire to change that mission, scholarly research is important for a wide variety of reasons. For example, it is an important tool in keeping our faculty current, vital, and active--and thereby improving the quality of our teaching and the range of opportunities we can provide our students. The omission of a plan to protect or improve scholarship in the CSU seems to us to indicate that Cornerstones is not serious about balancing the twin goals of access and quality, but is willing to relinquish quality in a pinch. Scholarship, understood broadly in its various forms (discovery, application, interpretation, pedagogy, etc.), is a necessary component of quality teaching, and therefore vital to our mission. It must be supported and nurtured, along with other elements of the CSU mission.

Response to "Achieving Educational Results":

Cornerstones makes some assumptions about active and passive learning which we find questionable. For example, our retreat agreed that the first principle ("We will award the baccalaureate primarily on the basis of demonstrated learning....") may betray a misunderstanding of the present system. In our view, the baccalaureate degree ***is currently*** awarded on the basis of demonstrated learning. We find a similar problem with the third principle ("...students will be expected to be active partners in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum...."), which incorrectly assumes that students are currently not active learners,

and that the traditional classroom experience is by definition passive. This is not the case. Students who earn credit units in university courses are not mere passive time servers. They must read, take notes, reflect, discuss, pass exams, write essays, and complete projects. In all these ways, they demonstrate learning; and we believe the well-designed university course remains the best way to convey, and to measure, that learning. Assessment tools like portfolios, that might measure a student's progress over several semesters, are promising. But such tools are cumbersome and very expensive and, in any event, are promising as ***additional*** assessment devices, not as replacements for a course of study.

We remain concerned about earlier drafts of Cornerstones that explicitly advocated the awarding of credit for experiences outside the University, and caution that principles 1c and 2c should not be used to support such a proposal. No one objects to giving credit to students who demonstrate the ***same*** mastery of a ***subject*** --for many requirements we have long had in place procedures for challenge exams by which such mastery can be demonstrated. But we are hard pressed to think of many instances where "experiential" knowledge would be equivalent to the university study of a subject, and we could think of none where mere "experience" would itself constitute a demonstration of mastery in lieu of any kind of examination.

Cornerstone's efforts to think creatively about differing ways to award "credit" and differing ways to measure it than "units" run into the problem of establishing a common currency. Despite its several shortcomings, the current system of credit units has one supreme advantage: it gives students unparalleled freedom in developing their academic careers across university boundaries. By utilizing a common currency that is widely recognized by other universities as well as by graduate and professional programs, our students are assured that they will be given the credit they deserve for their academic achievements as they move beyond their starting campus. Without this common currency students would likely face barriers in transferring ***out*** as undergraduates, applying to graduate and professional programs, in transferring ***in*** from universities that remain on the old standard, etc. Even if the technical difficulties could be overcome, other institutions might believe that our "currency" had been devalued.

We have mixed views with regard to the specific competencies listed on page four of the August draft. Everyone was willing to endorse the first seven, which are quite general and traditional academic competencies. Among the remaining five, some participants felt that we should not require all graduates to show an ability to speak, read, and write a language other than English, noting that this was not a necessary skill in all fields and adding that it was in any event a skill best acquired before college, or even before high school. Other participants thought it an important requirement for the college-educated person, regardless of that person's special field, and they argued that the existence of a university requirement could only increase the study of languages at early levels of education. A similar division appeared over the remaining items: participating in democratic society, valuing other peoples and cultures, acting in an ethical, moral, and socially responsible manner. While all discussants agreed these were highly desirable traits, and traits which a good university education will serve to strengthen, some thought it would be unwise to label them as things we could claim directly to teach or accurately measure. Others, citing the "decline of civic culture," argued that these should be included as specific goals.

As for items that should be added to the list, it was reported that the Humanities and Arts Chairs had entered a strong plea that creative arts be included, noting that teaching the creative arts is part of the charge to the CSU. And in a similar vein, there was much agreement among the participants that our General Education program should be structured to provide each student "a broad and challenging liberal arts" education requiring "engagement with great ideas, great literature, and great art."

When seeking changes in the baccalaureate our participants agreed that the present baccalaureate with its balance between broad, general education and in-depth study of a major field represents the ideal of a university education. We were particularly apprehensive about creating a "lesser" vocational, technical, or short-cut degree that might seem initially attractive to unsophisticated students who will later discover they had been short-changed. More to the point, lesser degrees will be necessarily less able to provide students with those forms of knowledge and ability expected from any graduate which make up

that impressive list on page 4 of the Cornerstones report. It is one of the several inconsistencies and contradictions within the Cornerstones report that such ambitious goals for learning should be coupled with proposals to shorten the time for learning.

With regard to principle 2, which calls for the revision of academic calendars and greater flexibility in facilities utilization to accommodate students, we agree that every effort should be made to provide courses, when appropriate, at hours convenient to students. We suspect what is really meant, though, is providing courses at all hours, convenient or not, to meet the anticipated demand without building more buildings or more campuses. Either way, participants saw no serious objections to expanded evening, weekend, or summer offerings. (We assume that the document assumes state-supported summer sessions.) Full-scale summer sessions, however, will pose tricky questions about faculty workload: e.g. will faculty teach summer instead of, or in addition to, fall and spring? Will advising and committee work be spread equally through all three sessions? How will the personnel committee operations and the personnel decisions calendar adjust to three semesters or four quarters? How will collegial governance (i.e., academic senates and their committees) adjust to the new system?

Principle 2 also suffers from a fundamental confusion about productivity. It suggests reforms that are directed to maximize the utilization of our physical resources but may actually utilize our human resources less efficiently. Our expert schedulers can attest that--even at this commuter campus--there is a law of diminishing returns for classes scheduled in "off-peak" hours. Depending upon the discipline, night classes, weekend classes, summer classes, intersession classes, and even late afternoon classes have significant but limited demand. It is simply not the case that students would flock to these time slots if only faculty would be willing to teach at "inconvenient" hours. Many departments prove that just the opposite is the case--they offer classes at off hours out of a sense of obligation to meet the needs of non-traditional students, but find that these classes are seldom full and thus constitute a net drain on their productivity. While we might attract more students to the CSU by offering more classes in "off-peak" hours, we could do so only by hiring more faculty and allowing them to teach smaller classes. The inefficiencies of this utilization of faculty might well offset any gains created by extending the use of the physical plant.

There was general agreement that service learning should be ***encouraged*** and that it is best assessed when conducted as an integral part of a course of study. In short, we do not envision extra units for community service but rather requirements for service ***learning*** as part of a number of courses where students will be asked to reflect upon and evaluate what they have learned from their "service" and to relate that learning to the subject matter of the course. Participants were apprehensive that units granted simply for performing services outside the context of a course of study would be difficult to assess, difficult to administer, and subject to abuse. Even assuming carefully controlled conditions and clearly stated aims, many participants were reluctant to go beyond encouraging service learning. Pointing out that many of our students are older, have families and jobs, and come from disadvantaged backgrounds, and citing as well questions about possible legal liabilities and administrative costs, these participants would not want to ***require*** every student to enroll in a course with a service learning component.

Participants were uncertain about the intent of "academic plans" (principle 3a.) Of course students should take an active role in their own learning -- they won't learn very much if they don't. If the intent is that students seek competent advice, select a major, and proceed to complete their required units in the most efficient manner, the participants felt, on the whole, that would be a good thing. If the intent is that all students try to invent a special, individual major, participants felt that, on the whole, they should not. A student may decide if he or she wishes to major in, say, physics. But it is the responsibility of the physics faculty to decide what courses a physics major must take. Our answer, then, is that students should be responsible for seeking competent academic advice early and often, and the university should be responsible for providing it.

Part of principle 3a refers to self-paced and self-directed instruction. Since the reforms of the 1960s we have allowed and routinely practiced similar instruction through directed reading and

independent study courses. Our experiences indicate that such instruction can be highly valuable in certain situations, but that it is invariably more time consuming for faculty to direct. Furthermore, there is a considerable body of scholarly literature on PSI/SPI (Self Paced Instruction) beginning in the 1960s which generally concludes that these methods slow time to completion for most students, and most particularly for students with demography similar to that found in the CSU (first generation to attend college, working numerous hours outside of school, etc.) By all means, let us use these methods where appropriate, but by no means should it be suggested that such methods are currently unavailable or that they will speed time to degree.

Response to "Ensuring Access to Higher Education":

For many years, California higher education regarded the twin goals of "access" and "quality" with equal regard. While Cornerstones mentions the "quality gap" in its appendix (p. 18), it appears to skew most of its discussion toward an anticipated crisis in access. We believe that the CSU already lacks sufficient support to provide quality education to its existing students, and our current crisis in quality deserves as much attention as the anticipated crisis in access. Faculty are paid less than they should be, libraries are sinking below mediocrity, the physical plant is decaying, student support services are inadequate, there are too few academic support staff, and technology is only now emerging from XT/AT levels. While Cornerstones has done us all a service by pointing out the problems that will be associated with an increasing number of students, it may be missing the point: "Ensuring access to higher education" assumes that anyone will desire the quality of education we will be able to provide. If present trends continue, we will solve our "access" problem by making the CSU an undesirable place to attempt to seek education.

Staying within the rubric of the Cornerstones Principle 5, however, we are concerned that the goals of increased outreach and increased retention of students may come into conflict – to the extent that the university is successful in its attempt to enroll students from disadvantaged backgrounds, it may enroll students who are less prepared to succeed in college, thus reducing retention and graduation rates. The group felt that a regional effort, bringing together SJSU, local high schools and community colleges, would be more productive than something mandated by the CSU. While the general goal of access is laudable, we would emphasize that each campus should retain maximum autonomy in interpreting and achieving these goals.

It is revealing that at our retreat, almost every group managed to find a way of working the issue of remedial education into their assignments. It may also be revealing that our several groups reached fundamentally different conclusions on the subject. One point upon which nearly all agreed: remedial education should not be the ***primary*** duty of the CSU system. The best solution, of course, would be to reduce the need for remediation by adequately supporting the K-14 sector. Unfortunately, we see no evidence that our state leaders are making a serious effort to improve public education in California. Even the governor's program to decrease class size in grades K-3 is poorly thought out. As a result, students in the future will probably enter SJSU even less prepared than they are now, and the need for remedial education will go up rather than down.

We are also concerned that the term "remediation" is imprecise and prone to misunderstanding. Just what is remedial and what is not? Our efforts to assist the physically disabled or the learning disabled are considered remediation efforts by some. Are these efforts to be reduced so that we can achieve greater "productivity," as per principle 8e? We doubt that this was the intent of Cornerstones. But what percentage of students in conventional remediation classes are learning disabled? Is the point of Cornerstones that there are "good" and "bad" versions of remediation, that students who have learning disabilities should be given remedial help, but those who simply had lousy academic preparation are less deserving of help? We suspect that such distinctions are artificial and insupportable, but they point out the difficulties in coming to grips with this nomenclature.

If the need for remediation stays constant or increases, how should the CSU respond? Cornerstones optimistically mentions (in principle 8e) the reduction of remediation as a means to greater productivity. Some of our faculty pointed out that the reduction of remediation could actually lower productivity, if this means that unprepared students will simply be left to flounder in mainstream classes. They will be apt to fail while consuming important resources, and faculty who have no expertise in remediation will struggle to cope with them. As "unproductive" as remediation seems, in some circumstances the lack of it can be even more "unproductive."

A different solution to remediation, and possibly to the entire dilemma of access, is simply to raise entrance barriers and thereby decrease the numbers of students admitted to the CSU. Cornerstones, of course, flatly rejects this option (p. 17). Some of our faculty are willing to embrace this solution, particularly since they perceive the quality of their academic programs to be closely related to the quality of their students. Others stand philosophically opposed to this remedy on the grounds that it would betray our egalitarian mission to provide opportunity for a broad cross section of California students. However, even those philosophically in support of broad access can see the political necessity of drawing a line beyond which further declines in quality will not be tolerated. Such a line shifts the decision over how elitist our institution will be to the legislature, which must decide how many additional students they are willing to support.

For now, however, both of these philosophical standpoints are rendered moot by our budgeting process. Campus budgets, college budgets, and department budgets are all based upon the numbers of students that they serve. If entrance barriers are to be employed, there would have to be a radical restructuring of the budgeting process from top to bottom, or else those departments, colleges, and campuses that currently serve the less academically prepared students would be subjected to crippling cuts. The very high rate of failure throughout the CSU for students taking the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry Level Mathematics Test (ELM) heighten our concern about the poor level of preparation these students have attained prior to the beginning of their collegiate years, but they also make us worry that entrance barriers could cause massive and undeserved budget cuts. The cruel irony is that these cuts would fall most heavily on those campuses and programs that have done the best jobs of student outreach.

We are also concerned that Cornerstones fails to define "access" broadly enough. One important meaning of the term should be making a campus a place that is more conducive to learning and that treats students and faculty with respect--what SJSU has termed the "campus climate." Campus climate, or the perceived "accessibility" of the university, suffers when students come into contact with a decaying infrastructure; they find it difficult to learn when they cannot find parking, when their classrooms are too hot/cold, when their desks are falling apart, when the library is rarely open, when there are no quiet places to study or hold intellectual conversations with their classmates, etc. Campus climate also suffers when there are insufficient funds to provide sufficient numbers of staff in academic support and student services, leading to long lines for students and burnout for staff. SJSU has attempted to address these issues with a major campus climate program, two diversity initiatives by our Senate, and the creation of a student resource center. Nonetheless, in order to make substantial progress throughout the system, new and unprecedented levels of investment in faculty and staff development, student services, and infrastructure will all be necessary.

We take issue with principle 6a--that the university should focus more on those programs which are of "high need" to the state of California. We are worried that "high need," particularly as it is described in the principle, is defined solely in economic terms. California has other extremely high needs which principle 6a overlooks. Its population exhibits great ignorance of the creative arts, shows some of the lowest levels of participatory citizenship of any industrialized democracy, contains pockets of serious poverty, etc. As a public university concerned with the public good, these needs should have an equal or higher claim to our resources than emerging trends in the private sector. Furthermore, this principle's charge to internally reallocate resources fails to credit us for having done just that on our own initiative--SJSU is now completing a major academic priorities effort (described elsewhere).

The Cornerstones mandates to increase mentoring, counseling, assessment (5a) as well as innovation in the classroom, use of technology, etc. will all demand huge amounts of faculty development. Students are coming to SJSU with more problems (problems at home or work, medical problems, mental problems, etc.) than they once did, and this problem will increase as "access" increases. Ph.D. programs do not generally prepare faculty to handle these things, so to the extent faculty engage in these activities, the CSU must be prepared to make a substantial investment in educating them. Furthermore, the RTP process should change to give faculty credit for the time-consuming new responsibilities that they might be forced to assume in the push to "increase access".

Response to "Ensuring Financial Stability":

We emphatically agree with principle 8a, "The CSU must continue relentlessly to pursue state general funding to meet the core needs of the institution...." Beside this goal all others pale in comparison. We certainly should undertake any and all reforms that extend our existing resources without diminishing the quality of the education we provide, but a realist must admit that such reforms will provide only a tiny fraction of what will be needed for the expected demographic bulge. As a public university expected to meet a dramatic surge in public demand, any solution to our shortfall in resources must involve a public answer. The public must be prepared to allocate more resources, or it must be prepared to suffer economically when access to the CSU dramatically diminishes.

Taken in this context, the extensive debates over internal reforms which will at best produce minor improvements to our "financial stability" appear trivial. Their one useful function might be to prove to the public that we have indeed considered every alternative in the effort to stretch our resources, and thus we are deserving of adequate public support. Unfortunately, we conclude that while there appear to be a variety of good ideas in Cornerstones, they are unlikely to increase productivity, if by increased productivity we mean the ability to educate more students at the same level of quality. In most cases reforms that seem to have been initially included because of their ostensible ability to increase productivity may actually ***increase*** costs. These reforms, such as the incorporation of contemporary technologies into our modes of instruction, may be worthwhile, but they are not magic bullets.

For example, we do not share the optimism of principle 8f that technology can be used to significantly increase productivity in the classroom, and believe that such a claim misunderstands technology's function and may actually set back its incorporation into instruction. Well designed distance learning and technologically mediated instruction (TMI) should actually increase faculty/student interaction. This may increase course quality, but it also creates greater faculty workload, as the best practitioners of TMI attest. To use TMI to increase the faculty/student ratio and thus increase "productivity" would sacrifice course quality, and would therefore be prohibited at SJSU (S97-6). Technology--whether it be the technology of books, of chalk, of CD-ROM, or of two-way compressed video--can facilitate but never replace the time faculty must spend giving individualized attention to their students.

While technology offers few prospects for greater productivity in instruction, we are more optimistic about its prospects in administration and advising (8e). For example, the hardware and software to support a sophisticated degree audit system could dramatically improve advising. Both transfer students and ongoing students could accurately know which requirements in their program remain to be filled and which courses could fill those requirements. Currently, many students make mistakes in determining how to fulfill requirements. Preventing these mistakes could often shorten time to graduation.

The differential fee system is one that philosophically divides us, although our Academic Senate is on record as opposing graduate fee differentials (SS-S95-1). We considered whether we have a greater obligation in the CSU towards undergraduate rather than graduate programs; whether it was really true that graduates can afford to pay more than undergraduates; whether under a system of higher graduate fees there should be lower fees or forgivable loans to encourage students to enter into graduate fields in the public interest but not particularly lucrative (e.g., social work, teaching). In general, we did agree that ***if***

graduate fee differentials were created precautions should be taken to prevent graduate programs from becoming financially inaccessible to our working class students. What those measure might be we debated.

A major conceptual point that was raised was the uncertainty principle: namely, in a cost analysis, if one increases the uncertainty of a specific event, then there is a corresponding decrease in productivity. For example, if 30 different GE courses exist to fulfill a given requirement, and if they are not coordinated with each other or with other requirements, "productivity" declines. We would anticipate that self-paced instruction (principle 3a), the fulfillment of requirements through individualized "learning outcomes assessment," and credit by examination for experiential learning all would greatly increase uncertainty in the ability of the institution to predict enrollment patterns and in the lives of our students, and could well contribute to a slowdown in the time to degree.

We agree that savings that accrue from the expected replacement of large numbers of retiring faculty should be retained to augment faculty development, but wish to point out that faculty development should be an ongoing investment that is not dependent upon the vagaries of mass retirements. Given the expected boon, however, we were divided as to how best to distribute the savings: on a campus or a system-wide basis. There is considerable appeal to retaining these funds on the campus which generates them--this assures that the resources are immediately available to help cushion the blow when a campus loses its most experienced faculty. On the other hand, various campuses are considerably ahead of the rest of the system in retirements, and it would be unfair if, merely on account of their earlier bulge of retirements, they receive few benefits. In fact, through the "golden handshakes" of several years back these campuses were denuded of senior faculty and then made to pay for a large chunk of the handshake with their meager discretionary funds To now tell these same campuses that the next retirement bulge will actually ***generate*** funds but they will not share in these revenues would be quite inequitable.

Fundraising from private sources must be carefully handled to avoid creating inequities between campuses and between academic units. We all understand the great benefits to supplementing our state support with private donations. However, the system should take account of the differences between the various regions served by different campuses. It may well be that some campuses can be expected to raise more private donations and others less. In no case, however, should we tolerate the development of "rich" and "poor" campuses on the basis of who has the more lucrative fundraising territory. The same should be true within campuses. Inflexible fundraising quotas, for example, are generally inappropriate because certain disciplines have extensive access to private money and others do not. Finally, the system should make a special effort to distinguish between kinds of money raised. Funds that are raised to directly support the academic mission of the university are rare and extremely valuable--such funds should be valued far more highly than funds that are raised for embellishments, athletics, etc.

Response to "Ensuring University Accountability":

We are very concerned that Cornerstones seems to disregard the very extensive system of accountability that is already in place. Students are assessed and held accountable for their work hundreds of times over the course of their academic careers. Faculty undergo RTP reviews by multiple levels of administrators and multiple levels of peer review--a system that is certainly far more elaborate, detailed, and extensive than any in the private sector. Tenured faculty undergo periodic post-tenure reviews. All faculty are regularly evaluated for their teaching effectiveness. Curricula are constantly reviewed, departments and programs are accredited, budgets are scrutinized at multiple levels. At San Jose State University we just completed the most exhaustive review of our academic programs in our history--reducing our total number of programs from 280 to about 180. This task consumed thousands of person-hours at the department, college, and university levels, and involved the collaboration of the entire University community.

With so much assessment and review already in place, we are distressed that Principle 9 "The California State University will account for its performance...through regular assessment of the learning

outcomes of its students and through periodic reports to the public" seems to assume that we are not currently conducting assessment nor accounting for our performance. While there may well be improvements to be made in the our assessment techniques, and while we may need to do a better job informing the public of the results of our assessment, we do not believe the problem demands ***more*** assessment. In fact, there may well be an inverse relationship between the amount of assessment and the productivity of faculty. Faculty already spend enormous periods of time complying with the wide variety of mandates for assessment, and this necessarily detracts from the time they have available to teach, advise, conduct research, and participate in service activities.

Principle 9 appears to us to confuse "accountability" and the need for better reporting and public relations. Ample evidence already exists that enables us to ***account*** for our performance. We would agree, however, that this evidence has been poorly ***presented*** to the public. The CSU needs to do a better job of explaining the link between our system and the quality of life in California as a whole, both in terms of our huge impact upon the economy of California as well as upon culture, the arts, public service, etc. While we are eager and willing to help improve our public image, this is one of the rare instances where system administration needs to take the lead. In fact, it seems to us that this is the major reason for having a system administration, and its previous lack of success in telling our story and acquiring resources is a primary reason that many faculty view it with suspicion and distrust. One way to reduce the tension would be to incorporate into Cornerstones a detailed and coherent strategy for marketing our existing strengths and achievements. Such a strategy warrants as much energy and detail as has been devoted to any of the four "cornerstones."

New system-wide accountability schemes could negatively distort campus behavior. For example, a system-wide accountability program focused on "learning outcomes" rather than simply on "learning" will reward those campuses that admit students with high levels of achievement and penalize campuses that practice extensive outreach to disadvantaged groups. Because the starting level of its students differs from other campuses, an "outreach" oriented campus may do a superior job of education but still produce graduates with a lower absolute level of achievement than an "advantaged" campus that deals only with students who are well prepared for college. The hunt for good publicity, contributions, and state funds might well hang in the balance, and it would not be long before campuses began to compete for ways to jettison those students who depress the measures of "learning outcomes."

If the system mandates new kinds of "learning outcomes assessments," then it must be prepared to provide sufficient resources to implement these assessments in a responsible manner. Unfortunately, to implement such assessments in any manner other than by standardized tests would be prohibitively expensive. But standardized tests are defective on two counts: first, they are not suitable for measuring many kinds of learning, and second, they often distort and narrow learning by encouraging teachers to "teach to the test."

Far superior to system-wide accountability comparisons would be campus-based measurements. When a campus is competing with itself it has incentives to be honest and to critically view its own shortcomings. When a campus is competing with other campuses it has incentives to present itself in the best possible light, and efforts will be made to manipulate and distort data and/or practices to fit the measurement device. For this reason campuses should develop their own systems of accountability that are not geared to comparison with other campuses. One suggestion that was made at our retreat is to institute mandatory exit interviews for all students, faculty, and staff who depart the university for any reason, positive (graduate, retire) or negative (drop out, transfer, accept a higher paying position, etc.). Such a practice, while costly, would help us pinpoint our strengths and weaknesses by utilizing the evaluations of our strongest and most knowledgeable critics.