Educational Effectiveness

2. 1 The Steady State University

Maintaining Educational Effectiveness in an Era of Slow Growth

Introduction

Over the decade since our last WASC Review, California State University, Long Beach has experienced significant changes in critical economic and demographic factors that directly affect our ability to offer a high quality educational program. From an economic standpoint, developments have been largely positive. A strong state economy has produced the revenues necessary to increase support for our campus. That support has come with increasing enrollments as the long-projected increase in prospective students has materialized. At the same time we have found ourselves in a position to initiate an increased level of faculty hiring after many years of very limited additions to our tenure track faculty. The campus has benefited a great deal from both of these developments as many of our educational programs have gained strength from more students and new faculty.

However, this situation is now changing. A slowdown in the growth of the state’s economy accompanied by a serious energy crisis has already begun to slow the rate of increase in our budget. Increasing energy costs will almost certainly exacerbate the reduction in the support available for instructional purposes. At the same time, we cannot expect budget increases to fund growing enrollment because we are very near our enrollment capacity as an institution. Even if we wished to take more students, we are simply unable to accommodate them. Moreover, faculty hiring has not been able to keep pace with the current enrollment growth because of increased retirements and faculty labor market conditions.

Faced with these challenges, the University began to examine its ability to engage in the kind of strategic planning necessary to cope with these emerging issues. The existing strategic planning process had hardly ever been used since its creation. The goals established by this process were very broad and the process itself was unrelated to the allocation of resources. There was little need to reevaluate these goals since they did capture the fundamental mission of the University, but they did little else. The result was a clear need to make planning operational. The movement toward this goal began with planning to deal with enrollment and faculty replacement. Subsequently, policy changes were made recently to facilitate more near term planning.

What follows is a review of our efforts to date in the areas referred to above.

A. Enrollment Management

1. Background

Enrollment at California State University, Long Beach is growing at a rate that cannot be sustained. In the Fall 2001 semester the campus added 2000 full-time equivalent students (FTES), compared to the previous fall. Enrollment has thus reached the master plan capacity of 25,000 FTES much sooner than expected. Since some growth will continue for several years, even if the number of new enrollments can be capped, there is a
real risk that we may exceed our physical plant capacity. We are also at the point where our ability to find the human resources to deal with the current enrollment is almost exhausted. We are already at a point where our ability to find the human resources to deal with our enrollment is almost exhausted. It is now quite difficult for departments to hire enough qualified faculty to teach General Education Foundation courses in English, Mathematics, Communication Studies, and other important Foundation course areas.

Increasing our capacity to serve students well will be very difficult. Our university has very little remaining undeveloped land even if it were fiscally possible to engage in a large scale building program. The California State University is attempting to increase the utilization of existing capacity by promoting the year round operation of more campuses in the system. YRO, as it is called, was very successfully implemented as a state-supported summer session on our campus in 2001. Overall, enrollment grew 25 percent, while enrollment of matriculated students soared by 40 percent. Nevertheless, our best estimates indicate that this is not likely to increase our enrollment by more than a thousand FTES over the next three years. In this case, it is not an issue of supply but of demand. Students have shown a reluctance to attend college on a year round basis because of the demands of work or family or simply leisure. We cannot compel them to attend.

Increasing the use of modern technology in the classroom may increase the quality of the learning experience for students but it does not ordinarily expand our capacity to handle enrollment. Neither will internet-based courses. In spite of the growing availability of such courses through our university and elsewhere, students want to come to campus. Moreover, such courses are heavily labor-intensive, often requiring as much or more time from faculty than other types of courses. In the near future, therefore, on-line courses are likely to be a useful supplement to our educational programs but they will not reduce student demand for seats in our classrooms enough to solve our problem, nor will this approach address the faculty shortage.

Throughout the Los Angeles basin, the supply of well-qualified instructors is not growing as rapidly as enrollment. Our university must compete for faculty services with numerous other public and private colleges and universities in the greater Los Angeles area. Part-time or adjunct faculty are in increasing demand just as the market for full-time faculty is becoming more competitive. We are not able to hire tenure track faculty rapidly enough to keep up with current and impending retirements. The result is a chronic shortage of instructors in traditional high enrollment areas (such as English composition, mathematics, speech communication, business, and economics) and a growing shortage in other areas as well. The departments offering basic skills and general education courses have developed strategies to meet the demand, including expanded and enriched teaching associate training programs, flexible hiring policies for lecturers, assurances of course availability in both semesters, and expanded work with high schools to minimize the number of remedial courses we need to offer. However, the campus has resisted hiring unqualified instructors for these courses, even when it means limiting the number of sections offered. Controlling the number of freshman the campus admits is an essential step to ensuring that all entering students are able to enroll in the courses they need, and that they are taught by qualified instructors.
2. Enrollment Management Plan

Because the growth in enrollment is precipitating or exacerbating other problems in the University, our first step was to develop a plan for managing our enrollment. The president, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, appointed an Enrollment Management Committee composed of knowledgeable representatives from each major division of the University, i.e., the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs - Instructional Programs, the Associate Vice President for Student Services, the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services, the Director of Strategic Planning, the Chair and the Secretary of the Academic Senate, and the Chair of the Staff Council. The Committee was assisted by the Director of Institutional Research and commissioned additional statistical research and analysis from a Professor of Psychology on our campus.

These results, detailed in following reports, can be summarized briefly.

The primary engine of our enrollment growth is the freshmen class whose numbers have risen steadily in recent years. In addition, virtually all of these entering freshmen are full-time students. As a result, our mean student credit unit per student has risen steadily, from 10.24 in 1976-77 to 11.50 in 2000-2001, as seen in Table 1. Thus, the increase in student numbers at this level is increasing the demand for classes more than a similar “headcount” increase would have in earlier years. Finally, we are retaining over 80% of these students into the sophomore year and retention rates are rising for the third year as well. If left uncontrolled, this growth will make it more difficult to fulfill the mandate of the California Master Plan for Higher Education that upper-division transfer students from California community colleges have the highest priority in CSU admissions.

Figure 1: Unit Load

Therefore, the goal of the Enrollment Management Plan is to control the size of the entering freshman class, the most powerful method we have to affect overall enrollment growth. Under current California State University Trustee Policy, there are very few ways to control enrollment. Recent concerns about the management of this problem on other CSU campuses have led the Trustees to tighten their policy in this regard and to add stipulations about the need for state university campuses to accommodate local students. In addition, the Chancellor and the Trustees require that campuses exhaust other alternatives before moving to the most effective tool, i.e., increased or “supplemental” entrance requirements—what the CSU calls “impaction.” Such supplemental requirements, which
the campus describes as “competitive admissions,” will be implemented for the Fall 2002 applicant pool.

After extensive study and discussion, the Enrollment Management Committee determined that “impaction” of the freshmen class would be the best solution to our enrollment challenge. However, if the campus were to develop supplementary criteria for admission, what effect would those criteria have on our current mix of students? There was and remains a strong feeling in the University among both faculty and administrators that the diversity of our campus community is one of its greatest strengths. We wanted to tailor the supplemental criteria for admission to make sure that they did not unfairly discriminate against low-income students, first-generation college students, or students from high schools that already have lower-than-average rates of college attendance.

The Plan, endorsed by the President’s Cabinet, the Academic Senate, and the Senior Management Council (Council of Deans and senior Academic Affairs staff), is detailed in the referenced letter of President Maxson to Chancellor Reed of April 3, 2001 as well as Executive Vice Chancellor Spence’s response. We believe that the implementation of this plan will enable us to control our enrollment growth and that it will do so without changing the diversity of the institution significantly. However, the effects of the Enrollment Management Plan on this variable will be closely monitored. We are certainly prepared to alter our approach if the results of implementation reveal such a need.

3. Recommendations

• Assess the impact of the Enrollment Management Plan on the demographic, social, and academic characteristics of the entering Freshman class.

B. Planning Activities and Program Review

Once the current rate of growth tapers off, what must the campus do to make sure that it is still able to offer new programs and services when students need them?

1. Current Issues

The ability to offer new services and programs in a non-growth environment is a multidimensional challenge that the University is approaching through a broad strategic planning process that has several distinct components. Overall enrollment will have to be gradually stabilized to yield a condition closely approximating steady state. And, since the CSU system bases funding primarily on enrollment, the campus will also have to adjust its allocation processes to a steady-state budget.

Because our overall budget is enrollment driven, the State of California funds us for the students that we enroll. As enrollment increases, additional dollars come to the campus which pay for new faculty and staff hiring as well as additional operating expenses associated with enrollment growth and new program development. Once these funds become committed to the permanent operating budgets of various units in the University, reallocating them to other uses amounts to cutting the budget of those units. We have avoided this problem by using the monies that come with additional enrollment to support new initiatives or unfunded external mandates. They are our primary source of budget flexibility.
However, once we stop growing, this flexible money will disappear and we will be facing a “steady state” budget. Such a situation is very likely to require the reallocation of resources previously thought to be permanently assigned to the operating divisions. In the past, such reallocations have usually only occurred during periods of budget reduction and fiscal stringency associated with declining enrollments or economic recession. In the near future they will have to be negotiated while enrollments are at capacity and overall state funding remains constant.

Controlling enrollment growth is the critical first step in maintaining our educational effectiveness. It will enable us to schedule classes, plan curriculum, and hire faculty in a more stable environment. This will enable the students we do enroll to get the classes they need and to make timely progress toward their degree objectives. It will also minimize the need to reallocate our internal resources precipitously in order to cope with sudden overenrollment.

However, we will still be faced with the need to reallocate internal resources because zero enrollment growth will result in zero increases to our budget based on enrollment growth. Consequently, we will need to engage in internal reallocations if we are to support new initiatives or shifts in student demands for particular courses of study. External funding from non-state sources may mitigate some of this, but such funding has not played a very significant role in our budget previously. Valuable startup funding has been received for our programs in Italian, Japanese, and Chinese, and to enhance various programs, but not to support basic instruction.

2. Current University Planning Activities

Program Review: CSULB has a well-developed system of program review that has often been used in the past to make decisions about expansion, reduction and discontinuance of academic programs. For the past several years, each program has undergone external and internal review approximately every seven years. Departments completed a self-study, following a form developed from the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ Handbook of Program Review (1992), adopted in 1995. The review process has usually included external evaluation by one or two consultants, followed by separate internal reviews of the graduate and undergraduate programs by subcommittees of the Graduate Council and the Planning and Educational Policies Council, respectively. Review committees were composed of members of the councils. Programs which underwent accreditation also completed a self-study and participate in the program review process, although in such cases separate external consultants are rarely hired.

However, our program review process has not kept pace with the evolution of two related parallel developments within the University, i.e., academic planning and current approaches to the assessment of educational effectiveness. In the former case, although program reviews have generally called for reporting on program elements related to our overall strategic goals, these goals were so global and fundamental (e.g., “educational quality”) that they had little to do with specific objectives for programs. The introduction of Mid Range planning that concentrates on near-term objectives of a more specific nature (e.g., enrollment management in an era of rapid expansion) provides an opportunity for program review to deal with more current planning issues of greater relevance to program development. Now faculty hiring and curriculum development can be directly related to the actual plans that the University is making for the immediate (two to three year) future.
In the case of assessment, our program review procedures need to be strengthened to improve conformity with what departments are being required to do by our current assessment policy. In addition, we will be acting soon to revise some of the “productivity measures” that have been a part of program review in the past. Now the CSU system’s interest in “accountability” is creating the need for additional measures of overall program effectiveness that may require additional data from individual departments. All of these potential requirements for measures of effectiveness will require alterations in our current program review process.

Faculty governance responded to the need to integrate the program review process more effectively into university planning by creating a new Program Review and Academic Planning Council. This Council is charged with improving the existing process to integrate departmental learning goals, assessment plans and student outcomes with faculty planning with faculty needs and programmatic planning.

The Resource Planning Process (RPP): The all-university “budget committee” for our campus is called the “Resource Planning Process Committee” or “RPP” for short. It is a joint administrative and faculty committee whose responsibility it is to recommend to the President which of the budget requests of the four operating divisions of the University should be granted and in what amount. In addition, the RPP makes recommendations to the President from time to time regarding all-university budget policies or fiscal issues that need more study or further action of some kind.

Despite its name, the RPP has little opportunity to plan. The Committee’s primary focus is the analysis of the University’s financial position at the beginning of each budget cycle and the subsequent evaluation of the requests for support from those resources. Although it maintains a good institutional memory for prior budgetary allocations and seeks to create continuity in it’s governing values and processes, the RPP does not actually plan ahead. Recognizing that fact, the RPP recommended the formation of a group to develop what it calls “mid-range” goals for the campus. The purpose of this group would be to define and articulate the most pressing university challenges over the coming two to three years. These Mid-Range Goals could then be used to help guide the resource allocation process operated by the RPP. The President accepted this recommendation and the Mid-Range Planning Committee was established in Fall 2000.

Mid-Range Planning: The Mid-Range Planning Committee is composed of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Vice President for Student Services, the Vice President for University Relations, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Chair of the Staff Council, and the Director of Strategic Planning. The latter facilitates the discussions of the Committee and prepares its written materials. The most recent set of Mid-Range Goals gives a clear picture of the group’s work. As drafts of the Mid-Range Goals are formulated, the Vice Presidents consult with their respective divisions to get reaction and further input. At the end of this process it is the Mid-Range Planning Group that establishes the Mid-Range Goals.

Within the context of the University’s Strategic Goals, the Mid-Range Goals have sought to focus attention on the most pressing near-term challenges. Thus the issues of enrollment management, faculty hiring/tenure density, and the implications of a steady state budget appear in the list of Mid-Range Goals. The Mid-Range Planning Group does not propose specific solutions nor does it deter-
mine budget allocations. However, it does establish an agenda for the institution and that will become more obvious as the process develops over the next few years. Mid-range goal setting will allow the University to take its first step toward resolving the competing demands for resources in a steady state.

In recognition of the need to provide for broad consultation in the planning process and to increase the role of program review in future planning, the University has made important changes this year.

An extensively revised Policy on Strategic Planning has been adopted which integrates Mid-Range Planning into annual planning processes, sets specific dates for the preparation of Divisional plans, and provides for their integration with the Mid-Range planning process. As already noted, faculty governance has been restructured to create a new Council on Program Review and Academic Planning. This is the first addition of a new Council to the governance structure in several decades.

3. Recommendations

- Revise the program review instructions to departments in order to make the preparation of the departmental program review a more valuable exercise and integrate program review and assessment with departmental planning.
- Establish a clear line of accountability for the program review process itself (e.g., the roles of department chair, dean, Program Review and Academic Planning Council, and Office of the Provost).

4. Conclusions

In the past three years we have made significant improvements in our ability to deal with enrollment changes and in our understanding of the implications of controlling enrollment. After extensive consultation within the University community we have developed new plans and structures to deal with the “steady state” situation described above. The next step is to implement these plans and processes and assess their efficacy.

C. Faculty of the Future

With the university recovering from the destructive budget reductions of the early 1990s and able now to add substantial numbers of new faculty, what is the proper balance between full-time and part-time faculty? Within a few years, the university is likely to reach the end of the current bulge in retirements as it ceases to receive growth dollars for new faculty hiring. How should the campus plan effective hiring decisions that will determine programs for the next decade?

1. Background

The university is faced with an urgent need to plan for the faculty of the future. Rapid growth in the past few years, especially at the lower division level, has coincided with an increasing number of retirements. In the past two years (2000-2001 and 2001-2002), the university has hired over 150 new tenure-track faculty members. Over a third of the current tenure/tenure-track faculty has been hired in the last decade. The current demography of the university indicates that retirements will continue in significant numbers over the next five years, and that their impact will be felt unevenly throughout the university. Table 1 illustrates the numbers and percentage of faculty who will be at retire-
ment age in the next few years in each college, as of Fall 2000.

CSULB’s demographics, like those on many other campuses across the country, reflect extensive hiring in most colleges in the 1960s and early 70s, and little hiring in subsequent years until the 1990s when positions were again available. One concern for the future, certainly, is to maintain some demographic balance so that the university will have a healthy mix of ages and experience on its faculty in most departments. A related issue is the need to maintain and develop strong faculty leadership as the faculty who have guided the university’s development and led its strong governance system retire. Table 2 demonstrates the demographics of younger faculty by college in Fall 2000. Despite considerable variation among colleges, it is clear that some areas will continue to have significant retirements for the next ten years. It is also clear that parts of the campus (for example the College of Engineering and the College of the Arts) now lack the junior faculty who are most likely to have recent training and provide good role models for students. Recent hiring in other areas, however, has created more balanced faculty demographics for the long-term future of the university.

Retirements and expansion in the university have brought it to its lowest overall tenure density in years. In 1999-2000, the tenure density of the campus was 63.3%, following a rapid decline in the previous three years. In 2000-2001, the university’s overall tenure density was 60 percent, a significant decline since 1995. In a relatively short period, the university has gone from a situation in which many departments were over-tenured to a shortage of tenured faculty. We would like to return at least to the 75-percent tenure density of five years ago.

Table 3 demonstrates changes in university demographics in the past six years, emphasizing the extent to which enrollment (and faculty) growth and a relatively constant number of tenure-track faculty have been responsible for the decline in tenure density.

The change in actual numbers of courses taught by permanent–as opposed to temporary–faculty is magnified by the growth in faculty activity outside the classroom. External funding that takes faculty out of the classroom for research and training has grown significantly. As the university responds to needs for advising, mentoring, and service learning for its students, and as it expands its role in the schools and the community, faculty workload is less likely to consist exclusively of classroom teaching. As a result, the proportion of courses taught by part-time faculty, especially at the lower division level, is significantly higher than the official tenure density numbers indicate. Although proportions vary across colleges, for the University as a whole in 2000-2001 temporary faculty taught approximately 50 percent of all sections.

2. Issues

As we plan for continued hiring within the approaching constraints, we are aware of the importance of all-campus planning. Traditionally, departments have defined their

1 The pattern is especially true for the Liberal Arts. The massive hiring of the 1960s was due to enrollment growth. In the 1970s, a shift in student population from arts and science majors into business and engineering and a change in the Teacher Education Law, which required that teachers complete a diversified major (LiberalStudies) rather than majoring in a subject, such as English or History, created a drop in enrollments in departments that had previously hired many faculty. Hiring patterns have varied in other colleges; Engineering enrollments, for example, have fluctuated sharply in response to changes in the job market. University caution in tenure track hiring resulted in vacancies in some areas that went unfilled for many years.
need for tenure-track faculty internally, in connection with developments in the discipline, most often with curriculum for the major as a paramount consideration. The campus realizes that these considerations are no longer adequate. Disciplines will continue to change within themselves, sometimes in radical fashion (as, for example, in recent revolutions in biology, geography and computer science). Student and faculty interests are increasingly interdisciplinary, and they converge across department and even college.

Table 1: Faculty by age and retirement status, Fall 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Tenured /Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>56+</th>
<th>%56+</th>
<th>FERP²</th>
<th>PRTB³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Arts</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Faculty by Age, Fall 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>&lt;36</th>
<th>%&lt;36</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>%36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>%46-55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Faculty Demographics, 1995-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Utilization</th>
<th>Tenure track Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure Density</th>
<th>New Appointments</th>
<th>Retirements, Resignations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1246.00</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>60.0 %</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1145.79</td>
<td>725.6</td>
<td>63.3 %</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1072.39</td>
<td>701.9</td>
<td>65.4 %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1020.01</td>
<td>714.0</td>
<td>70.0 %</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>986.52</td>
<td>725.6</td>
<td>73.5 %</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>965.80</td>
<td>728.8</td>
<td>75.5 %</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²Faculty Early Retirement Program.
³Permanent Reduction in Time Base.
boundaries. Interdisciplinarity is reflected in curriculum, such as the new BA and BS in Environmental Science and Policy, the BA in Chinese Studies, and the MA in Global Logistics, as well as in numerous research and teaching collaborations across the university, and in increasing requirements within majors for service courses in other disciplines. The campus also recognizes the need for a hiring philosophy that will balance our need for cutting-edge faculty for upper division and graduate programs and the need to staff general education and lower division courses, as noted in Section 2.2, pp. 89-90. CSULB must preserve the flexibility to respond to new community demands, such as the shortage of well-prepared teachers or the need for computer scientists. Such needs may be cyclical, but require the knowledge and commitment provided by permanent faculty. Like other universities, it must also meet the increasingly competitive job market in fields where there are few candidates, or where there are lucrative incentives for employment outside academia (as in Business, Design and Computer Science). We have recently initiated planning processes to address these questions.

3. Current Efforts

Planning for the faculty of the future takes place in several bodies in the university, and is informed by data we have begun to utilize. Systematic collaborative planning for faculty hiring and roles began in the Division of Academic Affairs in 1998, as part of a multi-year comprehensive planning process. In October 1998, the Senior Management Council identified “Planning the Faculty of the Future” as a new priority, stating that

High priority will be given in 1998-9 to setting in motion an ongoing, collegial planning process for determining the shape of CSULB’s “faculty of the future.” The goal of this process is to ensure that institutional growth and change are based on vision, rather than on a mentality of “replacement.”

In 1999-2000, a subcommittee developed an “Overview of Planning the Faculty and Academic Programs of the Future” that was used as a framework for college and department planning for tenure-track hiring. The plan, as initiated in 2000, involves several steps.

Demographic data for each college and department are assembled each year and reviewed by individual departments, deans and a subcommittee of the Senior Management Council. Each college asks its departments to make a 3-5 year plan as they consider their hiring needs, and to initiate collaborative discussions among themselves about college programmatic priorities, new initiatives and broader responsibilities such as general education and teacher training. Departments have developed thoughtful visions for their future (Please see examples from Biological Sciences and Political Science). Program review results, too, are an increasingly important consideration in hiring decisions (see above, p. 55-56). College plans and hiring requests are read and discussed collaboratively by all participants in the Senior Management Council before decisions are made by the Provost. The goal of these discussions has been to encourage long-range faculty planning at the department, college and divisional level.

This process encourages us to consider how faculty needs across departments may be coordinated and how interdisciplinary expertise and interests can be best addressed. In the past few years, for example, we have created a Liberal Studies faculty across several colleges through collaborative planning and a series of joint appointments. Initiatives like a new major in Environmental Science and Policy and a growing Latin American Studies program involve at least two colleges, and have involved hiring new faculty in several
departments to strengthen the planned programs.

The new process for faculty planning has proven a very valuable incentive for thoughtful and collaborative academic planning. As the university reaches steady state and the opportunities to hire new tenure-track faculty become more competitive, the process will become more important. To date, faculty planning has made use of faculty demographic data, but a more comprehensive set of data should be developed and distributed annually to departments and colleges as they initiate their planning. One goal of the plan has been to integrate the program review process, discussed below, more closely with faculty planning. This will require integration of the multi-year review cycle with the annual planning cycle described in this section.

Tenure Density: This report has identified the rapid decline in tenure density and the proportion of courses taught by non-permanent faculty as an emerging issue of serious concern for the university. In the current year, the campus has begun to evaluate the appropriate ratio of permanent and part-time faculty for its needs. We recognize that certain courses, such as English composition and elementary mathematics, are likely always to be staffed with a high proportion of lecturers (See Section 2.2, pages 85-89). Other programs draw very effectively on professional practitioners and artists for specialized instruction, and the campus makes effective use of Teaching Assistants in programs like elementary foreign language courses and science labs. The availability of highly qualified temporary faculty varies widely across the university, but in the last few years hiring has become more competitive in many key curricular areas.

It is essential that we ensure, over time, that all students continue to have opportunities to work with permanent faculty throughout their education on our campus. It is equally important that as senior faculty retire, a new generation of faculty be able to take on essential leadership roles. Consequently, university planning and resource bodies have begun to look very carefully at the need to replenish and increase the permanent faculty base of the university while maintaining needed flexibility for changing instructional needs. Such studies should look very carefully at the contributions of lecturers and the differing roles they play in the curriculum of various programs, as well as at the continuing availability of lecturers and the support needed to ensure the quality of their contributions to the campus.

As we enter into an era of steady-state resources, fiscal considerations must be an important element of our planning. Annual budget planning in the Division of Academic Affairs is integrated with the Multi-Year plan, to identify priorities and resources needed for future years. The university has recently ended annualization (the process by which the campus’ budget office adjusts the dollar allocations to individual units each June 30 to reflect the salaries actually being paid on that date). This means that each college must now rely on the resources within its own budget to hire new faculty. The cost of replacing faculty has thus become even more challenging. In particular, planning in Academic Affairs has emphasized the assistance needed for each new faculty person in the form of research and teaching support, start-up equipment needs and technology. We are beginning to understand better the differing needs of various disciplines, which include competitive salaries, time for research, or laboratory space and equipment. Clearly, resources are needed to support these efforts.

Division plans are presented to the all-campus Resource Planning Process, in which representatives of each division and faculty governance bodies participate in making annual budgetary decisions and identifying issues for the future. This group has given its highest priority to the needs of the instructional program and the quality of the faculty who provide it. Current “researchable
questions” for this body include an analysis of the costs of improving our tenure density. We believe that it is essential for CSULB to maintain the distinctive hallmark of our system, the ability of all students to study with talented teacher-scholars who are permanent members of the faculty.

4. Recommendations:

- Develop a common data set, to include at least tenure density, age distributions, student enrollment trends, and balance of temporary and permanent faculty, for annual distribution to departments and colleges, to serve as a basis for faculty planning.
- Integrate program review with the annual faculty planning process.
- Develop a long-term plan to achieve and maintain an appropriate balance between permanent and temporary faculty, and update annually for planning purposes.
- Develop a strategy to meet the costs of improving tenure density in an era of steady-state resources.

D. Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

How should the campus support the efforts of its faculty in teaching, research and service so as to maximize their effectiveness, maintain their morale, and assure their retention and promotion?

1. Background:

CSULB has a strong consensus about the mission of its faculty. We remain a campus committed to teaching at the undergraduate and master’s level, and our top priority is to provide excellent student learning experiences. For more than 20 years the campus has had a major commitment to the importance of faculty research and creative activity, expressed through long-standing university support and the faculty tenure and promotion review process. We are equally proud of the climate of respect for service that has made faculty governance and program development so effective. It is important to emphasize that as the campus looks to the needs for faculty support in the future, it must do so for faculty at all stages of their careers and with concern for lecturers as well as permanent faculty.

2. Current Efforts

This review finds the campus in the midst of a generational shift, but like other institutions, we are also undergoing profound changes in the nature and expectations of faculty work. CSULB faculty embrace new teaching methodologies, from technology supported classes to service learning and standards-based instruction, in large numbers. They are increasingly likely to participate in school and community partnerships, international teaching and exchanges, or in intensive student mentoring. All of these require support. The following are evidence of the university’s commitment to provide support for both research and teaching for faculty.

- The Faculty Development Center, staffed by a Director and faculty associates, runs extensive programs for new faculty, lecturers, and summer and winter institutes on General Education. It also provides workshops on syllabus development, proposal writing and file preparation for faculty evaluation processes. The director and other associates consult with faculty individually on teaching and learning issues.
- The Academic Computing Center offers a full series of faculty computer workshops, online courses, software develop-
ment grants and individual consultation and assistance for faculty.

- In the past year, BeachBoard (formerly Blackboard) has provided an instructional technology suite for a growing number of course sections, beginning with 20 in Fall 1999, and expanding to 547 in Fall 2001.

- The Center for Community Service Learning provided support in Spring 2001 for 49 courses with service learning components, including several multi-section classes.

- Standards-based instruction has been introduced in the core courses in the new Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP). Since these classes are generally also in the General Education program, they have an extensive potential impact on faculty.

- More and more faculty are involved in externally supported grants and training activities that support both research and teaching. In 2000-2001, the campus was awarded $39,199,161 in external grants, an increase of almost $29 million in the decade since 1989-90.

- Research and Professional Development Support: The campus has made an important investment in faculty support in recent years. Internal grant support for research has been increased at the university level.

Table 4: Numbers of Faculty Receiving Research Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SCAC Assigned Time</th>
<th>Summer Stipend</th>
<th>Mini-Grant</th>
<th>Conference Grants ($ awarded)</th>
<th>Career Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding for professional travel has grown, as have support for teaching innovations, assessment, and community service learning projects. Campus allocations, described here, represent a relatively small percentage of total support from colleges and departments.
### Table 5: Faculty Travel Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>FY 00/01</th>
<th>FY 99-00</th>
<th>FY 98/99</th>
<th>Three-year Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Innovations</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$17,078.00</td>
<td>$10,844.00</td>
<td>$5,200.00</td>
<td>$33,122.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>$6,150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$6,289.00</td>
<td>$26,289.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Career Enhancement Pro-</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gram*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Travel</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY Totals</td>
<td>$183,878.00</td>
<td>$179,494.00</td>
<td>$115,289.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Faculty Career Enhancement Program OE Awards for FY 1999-2000 transferred $32,200 to colleges; travel breakdown not known.

New Faculty: In 2000-2001, the university made it a high priority to support new faculty in their transition into roles as scholar-teachers by committing funding for a reduced teaching load, previously available only to first-year appointees, through both semesters of their second year. It also expanded its financial support for the funding of startup equipment. For 2000-2001, the campus budget included $300,000 for second-year assigned time and $300,000 for startup equipment. In both of these categories colleges had to add substantial funds of their own to offset the full cost involved. For 2001-2002 the RPP Task Force recommended, and the President approved, $600,000 and $400,000 respectively, for these efforts. The increased funds for second-year assigned time will eliminate the need for a college match. Renewal of the commitment of second-year assigned time for the faculty who will join the campus in the 2001-2002 academic year has also been discussed positively in the Resource Planning Process, but it is uncertain whether these types of support can be sustained at the same level once the University’s enrollment levels off. This question is important to more than the new faculty, because the ability to fund second-year assigned time centrally makes it possible for the colleges to shift some existing resources to newly tenured faculty and to give support to a larger number of senior researchers. These are essential investments if we are to keep the faculty we have hired and maintain the morale and productivity of more senior faculty.

### 3. Challenges

Our campus has long valued research, but we face additional challenges with the appointment of a large number of new faculty in the past few years who bring fresh energy and a strong commitment to their professional development in their fields. They join a faculty with a notable number of productive senior scholars and artists. Their work is regularly reported to the campus in the Academic Affairs publication called Showcase. The generational change also brings a potential crisis in service, as senior faculty who have been responsible for departmental leadership retire, and faculty still in junior ranks are asked to take on major responsibilities in faculty governance and program development. The traditional model of faculty work that envisioned a fairly uniform twelve-unit in-class teaching load each semester no longer describes what our faculty are asked to do, nor is it any longer required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement itself.
As we attempt to develop a model for faculty support for the future, our questions reflect the variety and complexity of faculty needs. What is our definition of appropriate faculty workload? What support is needed for new faculty in their probationary years? How can we ensure that Associate Professors do not have to sacrifice their scholarship as they take on added service responsibilities? Do we adequately recognize and reward different kinds of faculty careers? How can we improve the evaluation and recognition of faculty no longer in the retention and promotion system? Does the campus recognize the extensive time commitment needed for faculty to incorporate new technology, service learning or different learning models in their curriculum? Is there a need to reconceptualize the way in which different faculty tasks are credited? How much can we change faculty workloads while meeting enrollment needs and ensuring the high quality of student learning experiences? How can we ensure that adequate resources are available to support faculty scholarship and creative activity at current levels, as we attempt to meet the costs of faculty hiring?

Preparing a new generation of faculty leaders is a particularly important challenge for the campus. The university depends on its strong and effective faculty governance system at the department and campus level, and has been fortunate in the collaborative faculty-administrative leadership that characterizes CSULB. As many of the faculty leaders who have shaped campus governance retire, the campus must attract talented faculty to governance roles from department chair to leadership on key councils and committees. To do so, we must offer adequate rewards and professional satisfaction for such service, and must consider means of exposing junior faculty to potential leadership opportunities.

We ask these questions in the context not only of the need to make choices as we enter steady state, but in an employment market that makes it dramatically more difficult to hire and retain faculty. In some fields, salaries have escalated so dramatically that new faculty must be paid at the level of senior faculty in other fields, diminishing substantially the potential savings from retirements. In other fields, the costs of providing the equipment and space necessary for a new faculty member may exceed $100,000 for a single position. In most areas, the university cannot expect to hire and retain new faculty with a 12-unit classroom teaching load. We have already lost a few junior faculty to other universities due to workload factors. Thus, we face the dilemma of providing the resources needed to hire and keep essential faculty without sacrificing the student learning experience in other parts of our instructional program. As we approach steady state and face the possibility of increasing fiscal stringency, the choice of where to invest scarce discretionary resources becomes critical.

As growth funds end, it is essential that we conduct a broad analysis of faculty workload and student instructional needs. We know what average faculty workloads are, but have not evaluated how they vary across campus, or at different stages of a career. Existing funding, available from many discrete sources, could possibly be coordinated, streamlined, and committed for longer periods of time. We need to consider whether existing class sizes and formats provide the optimum balance for faculty and students, and whether there are creative changes that would provide some of the needed support for faculty. We also need to look more carefully at support and recognition for service. Faculty as well as students benefit enormously from programs that allow more mentoring and facilitate working together on research projects (cases in point are Partners for Success and the McNair program). Essential functions such as advising, however, are often overwhelming and unrecognized. We do know that one size does not fit all for faculty at any stage of their careers. The Academic Senate’s newly created Program Review and Academic Planning...
Council might undertake the needed study jointly with the Faculty Personnel Policies council.

4. Retention, Tenure and Promotion

The campus has taken important steps to recognize and support varied faculty aspirations and contributions. The retention, tenure and promotion process was revised to broaden the definitions of scholarship, teaching and service. The campus Policy on Retention, Tenure and Promotion in effect since 1997 suggests different expectations for each stage of the career, and it places the determination of specific criteria for teaching, scholarship and service at the department and college level. Each college has an approved document specifying its criteria and process, and every department must have an approved document which specifies, at a minimum, discipline standards for scholarly and creative activity. Faculty members present their candidacy for tenure and promotion through a narrative that describes their development and plans in each area of review. Inclusion of course materials and samples of student work helps to link the faculty review process with student learning goals. The new process was partially designed to make it easier to evaluate and credit such types of faculty work as pedagogical scholarship, the design of instructional technology, work with local schools, and service learning and internships. Our first five years of experience with the new process will be reviewed during 2001-2002 with the intent of both evaluating how well it has lived up to its expectations and reducing the paperwork requirements for candidates and review committees.

Lecturers: The campus must also address the needs of the lecturers who will always be a significant part of our instructional program. The Faculty Development Center has an ongoing mission to provide support and information for lecturers, and they provide a significant proportion of the attendance at General Education Institutes and other programs. Some campus and college professional support programs are open to lecturers. However, the integration of lecturers into department programs remains a challenge. As noted in Section 2.2 pp. 85-89, in some departments, there is a course coordinator for multiple section courses who provides the syllabus and “ground rules” for the course and gives advice and assistance to inexperienced faculty members. Lecturers in other departments have people to advise them about policies and procedures. In some cases, however, there are lecturers, especially where there is heavy dependence on lecturers for night classes, who have little contact with the department and may not know university policies and procedures. At the other extreme, many departments have long-term lecturers who take on important responsibilities, but have no job permanence. The campus has made an attempt to open professional development and support opportunities to such people, but these efforts may not be consistent across campus. Special attention needs to be paid to the integration and professional development of lecturers in important curricular areas staffed largely by lecturers.

5. Recommendations

- Analyze current faculty workloads, including the number of preparations, student loads, and nature of assignments other than teaching for permanent and temporary faculty across colleges and departments. This analysis should be used in making budget decisions for faculty support for professional development, and setting priorities for future funding for faculty.

- Forecast equipment, facilities needs, and office space requirements for faculty likely to be hired in the next decade.

- Review existing RTP policies to ensure that they recognize the varieties of teaching, scholarly/creative activity and
service activities expected of our faculty and the differential experiences at different career stages.

- Find ways to encourage development of faculty leadership skills.

6. Conclusions

Although we face significant challenges in terms of identifying the resources necessary to replenish the faculty and provide the continuing support that faculty need, there are reasons for optimism. Faculty effectiveness and morale depend on many intangibles as much as they do on the formal support issues described here. CSULB is fortunate to have many of the elements that contribute to strong faculty morale. Faculty find our students rewarding to teach and appreciate their diverse backgrounds. The positive atmosphere created by the President and other administrators, and the absence of conflict between faculty and administration, are very important reasons that our campus is considered a good place to be.