

AGENDA

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Meeting: 3:25 p.m. Tuesday, November 18, 2008
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Jeffrey L. Bleich, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Kenneth Fong
Margaret Fortune
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman
Curtis Grima
William Hauck
Raymond W. Holdsworth
A. Robert Linscheid
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Craig R. Smith
Glen O. Toney
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 17, 2008

Discussion Items

1. Accountability Plan for *Access to Excellence, Action*

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

September 17, 2008

Members Present

Jeffrey L. Bleich, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Margaret Fortune
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman
William Hauck
Raymond W. Holdsworth
A. Robert Linscheid
Lou Monville
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Craig R. Smith
Glen O. Toney

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of May 13, 2008

Chair Bleich noted that the minutes of the May 13, 2008 Committee meeting was a consent item. He stated that unless there was an objection, the consent item would be considered approved.

Discussion Items

Litigation Report

Chair Bleich asked Christine Helwick, General Counsel, to present the item. Ms. Helwick stated that the semi-annual General Counsel's Report summarized all litigation activity in cases with institutional significance. Ms. Helwick introduced a PowerPoint report that displayed overall trends and progress in litigation and presented a broader

view of legal issues confronting the CSU in general. The first slide presented information on legal trends that arise from the written case summaries found in the agenda book, and give a bird's eye view of the nature of legal issues confronting the institution. The next slide, she reported, depicts the number of incoming "claims" handled in the General Counsel's Office over the last six months, and a comparison with previous reporting periods. A "claim", she explained, is defined as anything that takes more than two hours to manage and has the potential to become adverse. The contrast with the green bars, Ms. Helwick noted, indicates the difference between the number of incoming claims and the actual number of formally litigated cases that came in during the same reporting period. The gap between the gold and the green bars reflects some of the preventative work that is done by campus representatives and the CSU lawyers to contain litigation and prevent contentious situations from turning into formal lawsuits. Ms. Helwick reported that the following slide showed the volume of active cases throughout the CSU at different points in time. Currently, she noted, there are just 89 cases, where the CSU is being sued, and three where the CSU is prosecuting. In an institution the size of CSU, she noted, this is very good news. Ms. Helwick stated that the next slide denoted how cases fall in terms of classification. Currently employment cases are down a little, but as in past years, it still is the largest volume area and continues to constitute CSU's greatest exposure. She reported that the balance of other cases – Environmental, Construction, Personal Injury, Student, and the catch-all miscellaneous category of "Other" have remained pretty stable. Ms. Helwick reminded Trustees that the last time this report was given, Trustee Holdsworth asked for some additional information about CSU costs in defending these claims. The next slide presented, she explained, showed the total of annual expenditures, so it includes two reporting periods. She explained further that the slices of the pie generally follow the percentages of case volume presented in the earlier slide. The one surprise here, she noted, was the cost of defending environmental claims. Environmental cases take up just 4% of the case volume, and yet they consume a much larger piece of overall defense costs. Ms. Helwick surmised that was as a direct fall-out from the City of Marina decision, and as had been reported to the Board, the necessary early efforts to sort out and apply this new rule of law. Ms. Helwick continued that for the first time CSU must participate in the fair-share funding of the cost of off-campus local infrastructure improvements. Figuring out what is CSU's "fair-share," negotiating with the localities, and submitting the budget request to the Legislature was a new and time-consuming activity. It is hoped, she said, that as the process becomes more routine CSU will see defense costs in environmental cases go down. The final slide presents how cases are being resolved. As in past reports, CSU settled approximately half of the cases. Of the balance not settled, most are resolved with a ruling in the CSU's favor. Ms. Helwick reported that CSU has suffered a few losses in the last six months.

Chair Bleich adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accountability Plan for *Access to Excellence*

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Paul J. Zingg
President, California State University, Chico

Summary

At the May 2008 Board meeting, the Board of Trustees adopted *Access to Excellence* as the new strategic plan for the California State University. At the same time, the Board approved a second resolution calling for the development of indicators, metrics and timetables for achievement of identified strategic plan outcomes, and assessment of progress toward the achievement of outcomes in the context of such indicators, metrics and timetables. A third resolution stipulated that the Chancellor will report to the Board periodically, outlining major findings relative to strategic plan outcomes and progress made on the achievement of outcomes, as measured by those indicators and metrics.

This item presents, for Board of Trustees adoption, an Accountability Plan that has been developed by work teams of faculty and administrators, and approved by the Presidents' Advisory Group on behalf of the Executive Council. The Accountability Plan (Attachment A) includes three sections:

- I. System-level Actions Necessary to Achieve *Access to Excellence* Goals
- II. Indicators to Gauge System- and/or Institution-level Success in Achieving *Access to Excellence* Goals (with Metrics included as an appendix)
- III. Suggested Institution-level Actions to Achieve *Access to Excellence* Goals

Included in the resolution to adopt this Accountability Plan is the requirement that the Chancellor report progress toward achievement of the goals in *Access to Excellence*, as measured by the identified indicators and metrics. Section II of the Plan is proposed as the basis for such biennial reports.

Sections I and III of this Accountability Plan relate more to implementation of *Access to Excellence* than to accountability reporting *per se*. Section I lays out the actions that need to

occur at the system level in order to facilitate the work of the twenty-three CSU institutions to achieve the goals of this new strategic plan, while Section III describes the range of suggested indicators and metrics that individual CSU's may choose to monitor and report on their progress as they work to achieve these broad system goals in ways most consistent with their respective region-specific missions and priorities.

Development of the Accountability Plan

At the time *Access to Excellence* was proposed to the Board for adoption, a general process was suggested for developing the necessary indicators, metrics, and timetables. That process commenced immediately after the Board adopted the plan in May, beginning with identification by staff of existing sources and analyses from which appropriate indicators and metrics might be drawn for each of the eight "CSU commitment" areas in *Access to Excellence*. For each of the eight areas, a work team was established with a Chancellor's Office "lead," that included an Academic Senate CSU liaison (nominated by the Senate Executive Committee) and selected campus- and system-level administrators with expertise in the respective areas. Members of the work groups were encouraged to consult with their constituencies, as appropriate and feasible, as work proceeded throughout the summer.

At the Executive Council Retreat in June, Presidents approved this general process, and opted to take an active part in developing the Accountability Plan and bringing it forward to the Board. A Presidents' Advisory Group (PAG) was constituted to help to ensure that a strong and appropriate Accountability Plan emerged from the work groups. It was chaired by Paul Zingg, CSU Chico, and included King Alexander, CSU Long Beach; Mildred Garcia, CSU Dominguez Hills; Dianne Harrison, CSU Monterey Bay; Jolene Koester, CSU Northridge; Horace Mitchell, CSU Bakersfield; and Hamid Shirvani, CSU Stanislaus.

All work groups produced strong drafts by early August. When the work products of these groups were combined, the structure of the Accountability Plan emerged: a document that was informed by the advice from the work groups on roles and responsibilities of the system vis-à-vis the individual institutions, as well as their recommendations for indicators, metrics, and "actions necessary to implement" the new strategic plan. In consultation with the Presidents' Advisory Group, it was decided to organize the Accountability Plan into the three sections described above.

The rationale for this organizational approach is explained in the "Introduction" to the draft Accountability Plan:

The Access to Excellence strategic plan recognizes as a key CSU strategic advantage the distinctiveness of the twenty-three universities: "each have distinct strengths, serve distinct communities, and meet the broad missions of the institution in ways tailored to community needs." This Accountability Plan, too, values the distinct and diverse strengths of the individual institutions in the CSU. While Access to

Excellence includes clear system-level goals, for which the system will stand accountable, the individual universities have their own strategic plans, which—while aligned with the system strategic plan—will necessarily affect the patterns and details of regional implementation of Access to Excellence. Individual institutional priorities and goals are also influenced by regional needs and by outcomes from accreditation reviews. Accordingly, this Accountability Plan calls for only a limited number of mandated indicators, the data for most of which can be gathered and reported to the Board of Trustees by the Chancellor’s Office. In addition, recognizing the distinctive characteristics of the individual universities, while also holding each accountable for helping to achieve broad system-level goals, this Accountability Plan suggests a menu of possible indicators from which institutions may choose to demonstrate progress toward the broad system-level commitments (Section III).

It should be emphasized that, in keeping with this general approach, the “Institution-level Actions to Achieve Success” (Section III of the draft) are *suggested*, rather than required—thus permitting individual institutions to emphasize, and report on, those sorts of actions (and to select metrics to report success with those actions) that are most directly related to their respective priorities and commitments within the general framework of commitments laid out in *Access to Excellence*.

As for those “Indicators to Gauge System- and/or Institution-level Success” on which the Board will receive regular reports (Section II), core elements continue to come from currently reported *Cornerstones Accountability* indicators that remain valid in connection with *Access to Excellence*. In addition, indicators are proposed that are associated with CSU participation in the National Association of System Heads (NASH) “Access to Success” initiative, referenced in the *Access to Excellence* strategic plan, as is a limited number of new, additional indicators associated with commitments in *Access to Excellence* that were not directly included in *Cornerstones*. (See Attachment A of the attached Accountability Plan for the lists of proposed indicators in each of these categories.) Most of these indicators are now, or can be, gathered by the Chancellor’s Office. Specific metrics for all indicators will be included as Attachment B to the Accountability Plan.

Implementation of *Access to Excellence*

For the California State University is to succeed in achieving the ambitious goals laid out in *Access to Excellence*, strong commitment and purposeful action will be needed at both system and institution levels. While the new strategic plan necessarily includes a number of discrete goals and commitments, it is essentially a formalized statement of what the California State University *is* and what it commits to be in the future: an “engaged University.” In this context, the word *engagement* can be defined in various ways. The CSU is and aspires to be a University that:

- is *engaged* with society—helping both to define and to solve the problems that face our State, our nation, and our world;
- *engages* faculty and staff in support of student learning, and *engages* faculty in undertaking research that solves the problems of society; and
- *engages* students actively in their learning.

Most of the work outlined in *Access to Excellence* must necessarily be carried out by faculty, staff, administrators, and students at the twenty-three universities that comprise the CSU. At the same time, the Chancellor's Office, acting on behalf of the Board of Trustees, must provide the necessary support and facilitation to undergird such institution-level efforts. Section I of this Accountability Plan proposes, for each of the eight "commitment areas" of *Access to Excellence*, a list of system-level actions that will be necessary to assist the individual institutions to move successfully toward achieving the goals of the new strategic plan. These actions include, for example, strong public advocacy, development and maintenance of robust system-wide databases, building of system-level connections with relevant national, State, and regional organizations and partners, and facilitation of the sharing and dissemination of best practices in student learning, as well as research.

Supported in this way, the twenty-three CSU's will then each themselves be accountable for carrying out the aspirations outlined in *Access to Excellence*. Consistent with the culture of the CSU, there should be recognition of the uniqueness of individual institutions, and room for flexibility in the way they each implement the broader purposes of the strategic plan. Yet, while regional differences, specific commitments in institution-level plans, and institutional commitments to external accrediting bodies such as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) may produce local variations in emphasis and action, each institution must also adopt indicators and metrics by which it may be accountable for progress under *Access to Excellence*. Accordingly, Section III of this Accountability Plan proposes a wide variety of such indicators, with suggested metrics, from which institutions may choose—and to which they may wish to add.

Taken together, the three sections of this Accountability Plan provide a roadmap for the system and its individual universities to move purposefully toward fulfillment of the CSU's commitments in *Access to Excellence*, and to be accountable to the Board of Trustees and the broader public for progress in that regard in the years ahead.

The following resolution is proposed for Board consideration:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Accountability Plan for *Access to Excellence* be adopted; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees expects that each campus, and the University as a whole, will institute programs and take other actions that, while taking fully into account variation in regional missions and distinctive campus characteristics, cumulate to a vigorous implementation of the strategic goals set forth in *Access to Excellence*; and be it finally

RESOLVED, that beginning in the 2010-11 fiscal/college year the Chancellor biennially provide the Board of Trustees an accountability report that is responsive to these Board expectations.

***ACCESS TO EXCELLENCE* ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**

The *Access to Excellence* strategic plan recognizes as a key CSU strategic advantage the distinctiveness of the twenty-three universities: “each have distinct strengths, serve distinct communities, and meet the broad missions of the institution in ways tailored to community needs.” This Accountability Plan, too, values the distinct and diverse strengths of the individual institutions in the CSU. While *Access to Excellence* includes clear system-level goals, for which the system will stand accountable, the individual universities have their own strategic plans, which—while aligned with the system strategic plan—will necessarily affect the patterns and details of regional implementation of *Access to Excellence*. Individual institutional priorities and goals are also influenced by regional needs and by outcomes from accreditation reviews. Accordingly, this Accountability Plan calls for only a limited number of *mandated* indicators, the data for most of which can be gathered and reported to the Board of Trustees by the Chancellor’s Office. In addition, recognizing the distinctive characteristics of the individual universities, while also holding each accountable for helping to achieve broad system-level goals, this Accountability Plan suggests a menu of possible indicators from which institutions may choose to demonstrate progress toward the broad system-level commitments (Section III).

SECTION I.

SYSTEM-LEVEL ACTIONS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE *ACCESS TO EXCELLENCE* GOALS

Commitment 1. Reduce Existing Achievement Gaps

- Participate in the National Association of System Heads (NASHE) “Access to Success” and Lumina Foundation-supported Opportunity Grant initiatives to: improve academic preparation of students in K-12; analyze the adaptability, scalability, and implementation requirements of the most promising practices to improve retention and success rates; review and improve financial aid policies and procedures, as appropriate; etc.
- Improve feedback to and communication with K-12 and community colleges (review and redesign, as appropriate, Internet-based Academic Performance Reports data)
- Implement strategies for improving student attainment of proficiency in English and mathematics, as approved by Board of Trustees in January 2008 (i.e., continue to engaged with K-12, via Early Assessment Program; engage CSU campuses in implementing recommended effective practices to guide and support first-time freshmen in attaining proficiency; facilitate collaboration among CSU faculty in piloting programs such as “early start” programs, alternatives to redirection to Community College such as by hosting Community College instruction at CSU campuses, credit-bearing courses based on college-level course outcomes for “near-proficient” students, and technology-assisted, internet-based learning programs for remedial English and mathematics.

- Develop a central data tool for use by CSU institutions in identifying factors/obstacles and points in the educational pipeline that contribute to gaps in retention, graduation, and degree production
-

Commitment 2. Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence

- Support CSU institutions by means of analytical work to identify compensation gaps, monitor retention and turnover among faculty, monitor progress toward increasing the proportion of tenure-track faculty, and monitor demographic trends among faculty
- Develop a faculty database to support recruitment and retention, including information about growth areas, anticipated retirements, and net need for faculty at the system and institution levels
- Develop and disseminate consistent guidelines for faculty hiring processes
- Work collaboratively with the California Faculty Association to ensure that bargaining agreements support the recruitment and retention of a talented and diverse faculty in support of CSU mission
- Sponsor system-wide opportunities for professional development and dissemination of research, such as the annual community engagement research conference
- Undertake a study to identify best practices in workload reallocation

Commitment 3. Plan for Staff and Administrative Succession and Professional Growth

- Support CSU institutions by means of analytical work to identify compensation gaps where they exist, monitor retention and turnover among staff and administrators, and monitor demographic trends among staff and administrators
- Review policies and practices to ensure that risk and compliance issues are well managed, and that the system is able to meet its obligations in key areas, such as implementation of the new state payroll system
- Undertake a benchmark compensation study for the Management Personnel Plan (MPP) employment category, using external comparators
- Identify and disseminate strategies for developing leadership at institution level, including identifying individuals with potential talent for management, providing professional development programs for staff, and providing pathways for staff and faculty to develop administrative skills
- Develop orientation and continuing education programs for managers to provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to meet the needs of the CSU

Commitment 4. Improve Public Accountability for Learning Results

- Coordinate data collection, posting, and rollout of Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) *College Portrait* (including CSU's *Contributions to the Public Good*) and university-specific information
- Review and consider expanding the VSA-required graduating senior *sample* survey item to a graduating senior *census* survey regarding plans after graduation
- Review *The Impact of the California State University* information posted on the CSU website, similar individual university websites, and the CSU's *Contributions to the Public Good* page of the *College Portrait* (page 4) to improve communication tools geared towards employers
- Facilitate sharing of institutional best practices in employer-university partnerships and in inter-university post-baccalaureate partnerships
- Facilitate sharing of institutional best practices with using VSA to communicate more effectively with prospects, students, and their families
- Coordinate review of learning results from the two-year experiment with CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment), from engagement surveys, from the FIPSE-sponsored projects and field tests (*Degrees of Preparation* survey, portfolio rubrics, and alignment of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)/Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)/Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) instruments), from the CSU/ETS ICT literacy assessment, and other VSA-supported activities, to develop recommendations for improvement

Commitment 5. Expand Student Outreach

- Continue coordination with the California Department of Education to expand the Early Assessment Program (EAP)
- Continue to collaborate and partner on the expansion of use of the EAP in all high schools, including enrollment of students in appropriate 12th-grade programs designed to increase proficiency
- Continue to support and expand such programs as: College Making It Happen, CSU Mentor, Early Assessment Program, Economic Opportunity Program (EOP) Outreach, Foster Youth outreach, GEAR UP, "How to Get to College" poster, MESA, Parent Institute for Quality Education, *Super Sunday* targeted outreach efforts, Upward Bound, partnerships with K-12 intervention programs such as Aim High, Troops to College, and other informational and academic outreach programs targeted to K-12 students

Commitment 6. Enhance Student Opportunities for “Active” Learning

- Develop diverse pathways for students to obtain credit toward degree or program requirements for “active” learning (such as community engagement, service learning, internships, and undergraduate research); in particular, facilitate inter-institution transfer of course and degree credit for “active” learning
- Develop effective incentive plans for faculty and staff to provide more “active” learning experiences for students
- Facilitate sharing and dissemination of information on best practices to enhance and expand student opportunities for “active” learning, and minimize barriers to such learning
- Increase funded (graduate and undergraduate) student research and internship opportunities
- Provide professional development programs that assist faculty and staff in integrating “active” learning enhancements into degree programs and extracurricular activities; identify faculty leaders in “active” learning strategies who can serve as resources
- Implement a comprehensive communications program to “brand” the CSU as a highly successful institution that engages students in active, collaborative, and experiential learning; where teaching, scholarship, and service are interdependent, valued, and rewarded; and where CSU contributions to the economy and success of the state are recognized
- Significantly increase the number of multi-university proposals generated, in order to take advantage of regional and/or statewide faculty interest groups that may be more competitive in sponsored program competitions directed toward “active” learning
- Conduct periodic environmental scans to assess institution-level applied research infrastructure
- Work to align system-wide policies for use of space to better accommodate and support “active” student learning
- Leverage the specialized legal and business expertise of the CSU to develop intellectual property and technology transfer capabilities

Commitment 7. Enhance Opportunities for Global Awareness

- Encourage and promote an emphasis on globalization through the curriculum, development of partnerships with international universities, and study abroad experiences
- Provide institutional support for information clearinghouse on ways and means to globalize programs, and on international learning opportunities (study abroad of various durations and with various learning goals)
- Support and facilitate the achievement of global awareness on the part of students and faculty in all levels of university programs: undergraduate, graduate, and other post-baccalaureate education

- Provide a clear policy framework for international programs and study abroad
- Develop a policy framework to facilitate international partnerships

Commitment 8. Act on the CSU's Responsibility to Meet Post-baccalaureate Needs, including Those of Working Professionals

- Advocate the strengths of the CSU and its institutions to outside agencies and industry groups; increase marketing and promotion of CSU graduate education (e.g., use of CSU Graduate Education website at <http://www.calstate.edu/gradprograms/message.shtml> and *Mastering Your Future* brochure)
- Attract and secure grant funding for partner support of graduate education and research
- Facilitate and support the development of multi-campus partnerships for delivering high-cost, necessary, but relatively low-enrollment post-baccalaureate programs
- Facilitate and support the development of innovative programs leading to the applied doctorate in key professional areas where need exists in the State
- Strengthen information networks in support of improved graduate and post-baccalaureate planning and implementation, e.g., by receiving and disseminating institution-level information on the priorities of regional graduate-program advisory boards and providing access to national and state labor statistics to identify workforce trends
- Coordinate system-wide project for improving policy, infrastructure, and funding that will facilitate innovative programs in graduate and post-baccalaureate education for traditional students and working adults
- Develop and institute policy that supports the development of new degree programs, degree program modifications, and certificate programs that respond to areas of high workforce demand, with minimal Chancellor's Office delay
- Provide educational programs and re-training opportunities related to workforce needs, including those programs that shrink the "skills deficit" and those that assist working adults who wish to remain longer in the workforce
- Coordinate development of a strategic plan for expanding high-quality post-baccalaureate, multi-mode programs through extended education and graduate studies
- Create an online repository for information on developing and offering graduate and post-baccalaureate instruction through extended education, special sessions, and distance technology
- Investigate and develop policy to allow a blending of state-support and self-support components in graduate programs to minimize student fees so as to provide and promote access to high-demand programs

SECTION II.

INDICATORS TO GAUGE SYSTEM- AND/OR INSTITUTION-LEVEL SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING ACCESS TO EXCELLENCE GOALS

(See Attachment B for metrics)

Existing Cornerstones Accountability Indicators to be Continued

- Providing every eligible applicant with admission to at least one CSU institution
- Improvement of progress rate to degree
- Improvement of persistence and graduation rates at the institution of origin (and anywhere in the CSU)
- Increase in non-traditional instruction (instruction via evenings, Fridays, weekends, summers, distance learning, off-site, and total and percentage in non-traditional instruction)

NASH “Access to Success” Initiative Indicators to be Included

- Reduction of the gap in first-year retention for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students
- Reduction of the gap in graduation rates for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students
- Reduction of the gap in baccalaureate awards to undergraduate enrollment for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students
- Reduction of the gap in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students
- NOTE: For indicators related to reducing “access” gaps in numbers of first-time freshmen from K-12 and transfer students from community colleges, “**Partnership Access Indicators**” are recommended. See **Appendix 1**.

Additional Indicators to Achieve Access to Excellence Goals

- Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students engage in real-world workplace experiences to provide students with the kinds of exposure and skills that employers value

- Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students gain and improve global understanding and foreign language skills so they can compete in the global economy and participate in a global society
- Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students provide service to the community
- Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students engage in activities as engaged citizens
- Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students exhibit information competence
- Increase in numbers of CSU baccalaureates who transition to post-baccalaureate and graduate programs, especially in high-demand areas
- Increase in numbers of CSU baccalaureates who transition into high-demand areas in workforce
- Increase in number and proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty
- Increase in diversity of employees (faculty, staff, administration)

SECTION III.

SUGGESTED INSTITUTION-LEVEL ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE ACCESS TO EXCELLENCE GOALS

Commitment 1. Reduce Existing Achievement Gaps

- Establish “reduce-the-gap” targets (for system, as well as individual universities)
- Improve feedback to and communication with K-12 and community colleges, using Academic Performance Reports at <http://www.asd.calstate.edu/performance/index.shtml>
- Participate in system-wide efforts to identify effective practices in improving first-time freshman attainment of proficiency in English and mathematics, including piloting of such practices
- Review system-level data tool to identify factors/obstacles and points in the educational pipeline that contribute to gaps in retention, graduation, and degree production; utilize findings to inform changes to program and/or policy

Commitment 2. Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence

- Develop and carry out effective recruitments, adhering to system-wide recruitment guidelines
- Maintain fully-functioning faculty professional development offices
- Establish, review, and implement policies for evaluation, retention, tenure, and promotion that are well-aligned with *Access to Excellence* commitments

- Provide support for faculty at all career stages to achieve excellence in both pedagogy and scholarship
- Conduct institutional research on effective pedagogy
- Create effective practices for student engagement
- Develop ways to improve educational outcomes
- Review and implement, as appropriate, identified best practices in workload allocation
- Address faculty workload in graduate programs, including responsibilities for research, scholarship, and supervising culminating experiences

Commitment 3. Plan for Staff and Administrative Succession and Professional Growth

- Identify high-risk positions, including taking steps to retain individuals and/or plan for succession, as appropriate
- Review and implement, as appropriate, identified strategies for developing leadership, including identifying individuals with potential talent for management
- Provide professional development programs for staff, and provide pathways for staff and faculty to develop administrative skills
- Create programs that support employees' safety as well as physical and mental well-being

Commitment 4. Improve Public Accountability for Learning Results

- Post and maintain Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) *College Portrait*, including current institution-specific information
- Ensure that deans' advisory councils include employer representatives from regional high-demand areas and post-baccalaureate institutional representatives to gain their advice about the strengths and weaknesses of graduates (particularly skill and content areas for improvement) and anticipated needs
- Survey employers of graduates as to student preparation and gaps in preparation
- Use survey results and data-gathering from the deans' advisory councils, strengthen partnerships addressing identified targets
- Share, institution-wide, input offered by advisory boards regarding emerging and ongoing regional needs and priorities, to inform decisions about the planning and assessment of baccalaureate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate programs

Commitment 5. Expand Student Outreach

- Continue to reach out to new populations of students through such programs as: College Making it Happen, the *CSU Mentor* admissions portal, Early Assessment Program, EOP

Outreach, Foster Youth outreach, GEAR UP, “How to Get to College” poster, Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA), Parent Institute for Quality Education, Super Sundays, Upward Bound, partnerships with K-12 interventions programs such as Aim High, Troops to College, and other informational and academic outreach programs targeted to K-12 students

Commitment 6. Enhance Student Opportunities for “Active” Learning

- Conduct self-studies to understand what “active” learning practices are already in place, what the benefits of these practices are with respect to student success, what practices might be nurtured and developed, and what barriers exist to expanding “active” learning at the institution level (examine the use of independent study, research methods, and internship coursework as part of degree preparation)
- Minimize barriers to “active” learning and create curricular frameworks and course designs that support enhanced “active” learning opportunities
- Identify the core functions and resources that are needed to promote and expand “active” learning, particularly internships, community engagement, service learning, and graduate and undergraduate research, followed by implementation in the context of individual institutional infrastructure and culture
- Identify and provide appropriate incentives for faculty to promote more opportunities for student “active” learning
- Engage with surrounding communities, to identify community stakeholders and community needs to match with student “active” learning opportunities
- Engage in extramural fund generation in support of “active” learning, including outreach to business and industry
- Maximize use of existing resources for “active” learning, including physical plant space
- Augment, as needed and possible, support for applied research infrastructure, including space, staffing, and intellectual property and technology transfer
- Develop institution-level communications plan to promote, publicize, and advocate for the institution as highly successful in engaging students in active, collaborative, and experiential learning; where teaching, scholarship, and service are interdependent, valued, and rewarded; and which are of fundamental value to the communities and the region’s economy
- Augment existing incentive systems for faculty and staff to engage in writing proposals for external support for “active” learning

Commitment 7. Enhance Opportunities for Global Awareness

- Include goals for global awareness in institution's strategic plan and program quality review policies, including: program performance review criteria; co-curricular planning; General Education planning and assessment; and technology planning
- Ensure international engagement for all undergraduates (specifically including those who do not study abroad), including engagement via low-cost means such as telephone and Internet
- Internationalize graduate education by, for example, admitting international students, hiring international faculty, drawing graduate student research attention to topics that adopt perspective from more than one country, and offering programs that address international issues
- Bring global perspective-building opportunities to California resident students by integrating international students into university academic and co-curricular life
- Support international development of faculty
- Provide institutional support for information clearinghouse

Commitment 8. Act on the CSU's Responsibility to Meet Post-baccalaureate Needs, Including Those of Working Professionals

- Explore possibilities for joint graduate/post-baccalaureate programs with other institutions to maximize local resources and reach greater student audiences
- Develop and implement new degree and certificate programs that answer particularly urgent workforce needs (such as in nursing, STEM fields, educational leadership, audiology, and physical therapy, for example); work with statewide workforce planners and initiatives
- Make appropriate use of "fast-track" and "pilot program" policies in order to respond to regional workforce demands in timely fashion
- Add graduate degree programs that incorporate both state-support and self-support components to minimize student fees while still providing high-demand and costly programs
- Support international research partnerships and implement programs that feature articulation of coursework from international institutions
- Seek professional accreditation for graduate programs that are subject to accreditation
- Execute a strategic plan for expanding graduate and post-baccalaureate education and for ensuring high quality of those programs that are offered through extended education

Appendix 1.
Partnership Access Indicators

Increasing the numbers of first-time freshmen and undergraduate transfers to meet the State's need for Californians with baccalaureates *and* reducing the access gaps for underrepresented and low-income students cannot be accomplished without partnerships among CSU system and institutions, school and community college communities, business and industry, and government. Federal, state, and institutional financial aid, and especially extra-governmental financial aid that serve students who are otherwise ineligible for grants like Pell's, CalGrants, and State University Grants are essential for students in need. All students deserve rigorous academic preparation in K-12 and community colleges. In addition, *Super Saturday* and *Super Sunday* targeted outreach via faith congregations showcase the roles that churches and community organizations can play in spreading the word that college is affordable, college is worth the investment, and college is for every young person who is willing to study and learn in ways that complement the outreach of CSU, California Community Colleges, and high school college counselors, advisers, and staff. Extraordinary partnerships are essential for the educational pipeline to flow as it should.

As such, CSU Accountability Indicators under Access to Excellence are prefaced with California Partnership Access Indicators to highlight the educational pipeline between high school and postsecondary education in California. All of proposed indicators already are produced by the California Department of Education, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the California State University.

Increase in the numbers of new undergraduate students to the CSU

- # of California public high graduates (spring 2009, state and regions)
- # and % of California public high school (PHS) graduates who completed college A-G (spring 2009, state and regions)
- # of California Community College first-time freshmen (fall 2009) and % of California PHS graduates (state and regions)
- # of California State University first-time freshmen (fall 2009) and % of California PHS graduates (state and regions)
- # of University of California first-time freshmen (fall 2009) and % of California PHS graduates (state and regions)
- # of California public postsecondary first-time freshmen (fall 2009) and cumulative % of California PHS graduates (state and regions)

There are many federal and state accountability indicators on access and diversity that provide comparability for the CSU system and its individual universities, but none quite captures the *full extent* that the CSU admits and enrolls new undergraduates. As such, it frequently is missed, ignored, or forgotten that the majority of CSU baccalaureate degree recipients are awarded to undergraduate transfers, not to native students (those who started as CSU first-time freshmen). The approach taken with the indicator coins a simple way to highlight the extent to which the CSU *actually* enrolls new undergraduates during the year. This parsimonious approach uses National Association of System Heads (NASHE)/Education Trust definitions for underrepresented (URM) students and low income students¹ and African American/ Black, Hispanic/ Latino(a), and American Indian/ Alaskan Natives.

Reduction of the gap in access to the CSU for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female new undergraduates

System partnership indicators

- # CSU new undergraduates (2009-10)

Underrepresented

- # and % of underrepresented California PHS graduates (spring 2009)
- # and % of underrepresented CSU new undergraduates (2009-10)
- % of underrepresented CSU new undergraduates/ % of URM California PHS graduates – parity equals 1, 1.0 minus the indicator is the access gap

Low-Income

- # and % of estimate low-income California PHS graduates (spring 2009)
- # and % of Pell CSU new undergraduates (2009-10)
- % of Pell CSU new undergraduates/ % of estimated low-income California PHS graduates – parity equals 1, 1.0 minus the indicator is the access gap

Gender

¹ URM are African Americans/ Blacks, Latino(a)s, and American Indians/ Native Americans; Education Trust provides the estimate on percentage of state high school graduates who are low-income.

- # and % of male/female CSU new undergraduates (2009-10)

Individual university partnership indicators

- # of underrepresented CSU new undergraduates (2009-10, individual universities) and % of system underrepresented new undergraduates
- # of Pell grant-recipient CSU new undergraduates (2009-10, individual universities) and % of system Pell new undergraduates
- # and % of female CSU new undergraduates (2009-10)

Improvement in college readiness of CSU first-time freshmen

- # of California public high school juniors (spring 2008, state and regions)
- # and % of California public high school juniors who took the EAP (spring 2008, state and regions)
- # and % of high school juniors not demonstrating proficiency on the EAP who took opportunities to achieve proficiency in senior year (including targeted 12th-grade courses, online self-instructional programs, etc.)
- # and percentage of CSU first-time freshmen college ready in English and in mathematics (fall 2008, state and regions)

Metrics for System- and Institution-level Indicators

Continuing Cornerstones Accountability Indicators

- **Providing every eligible applicant with admission to at least one CSU institution**
 - For impacted institutions or institutional programs, eligible applicants not admitted – for first-time freshmen and upper-division CCC transfers;
 - For impacted institutions or institutional programs, eligible applicants not admitted to first choice, but admitted to another CSU institution – for first-time freshmen and upper-division transfers

- **Improvement in progress to degree**
 - # of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen needing remediation in mathematics and % of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen remediated in mathematics within one year (system and individual universities)
 - # of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen needing remediation in English and % of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen remediated in mathematics within one year (system and individual universities)
 - First-year retention of first-time freshmen (expanding to all for consistency with NASH, system and individual universities)
 - First-year retention of undergraduate transfers (expanding to all for consistency with NASH, system and individual universities)
 - The average number of upper-division units completed at graduation by students who entered the CSU as upper-division CCC transfer students (system and individual universities)
 - The average number of upper-division units completed at graduation by students who entered the CSU as native first-time freshmen (system and individual universities)

- **Improvement in persistence and graduation rates at the institution of origin (and anywhere in the CSU)**
 - Graduation rate of first-time freshmen at the CSU institution of origin (expand to all for consistency with NASH, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)
 - Graduation rate of undergraduate transfers at the CSU institution of origin (expand to all for consistency with NASH, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)
 - Graduation rate of first-time freshmen anywhere in the CSU (expand to all for consistency with NASH, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)

- Graduation rate of undergraduate anywhere in the CSU (expand to all for consistency with NASH, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)
- **Improvement of persistence and graduation rates via the CSU anywhere**
 - Graduation rate of first-time freshmen anywhere in the United States (expand to all for consistency with NASH, expand Clearinghouse use at the institution of origin, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)
 - Graduation rate of undergraduate anywhere in the United States (expand to all for consistency with NASH, expand Clearinghouse use at the institution of origin, use persistence and graduation to estimate final graduation, system and individual universities)
- **Increase in non-traditional instruction (instruction offered via evenings, Fridays, weekends, summers, distance-learning, and off-site)**
 - For main campuses, # of course FTES in evenings, Fridays, weekends, summers, distance learning, off-site, and total and % in non-traditional instruction.
 - For state-supported, CPEC-approved off-campus centers, # of course FTES in evenings, Fridays, weekends, summers, distance learning, off-site, and total and % in non-traditional instruction.

NASH “Access to Success” Initiative Indicators

- **Reduction of the gap in first-year retention for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students** (indicators for system and individual universities)
 - First-year retention rate for underrepresented new undergraduates
 - First-year retention rate for white new undergraduates
 - First-year retention rate for Pell first new undergraduates
 - First-year retention rate for non-Pell new undergraduates
 - First-year retention rate for female new undergraduates
 - First-year retention rate for male new undergraduates
- **Reduction of the gap in graduation rates for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students** (indicator for system and individual universities; graduation rate at institution of origin, CSU final graduation)

- Graduation rate for underrepresented new undergraduates
 - Graduation rate for white new undergraduates
 - Graduation rate for Pell new undergraduates
 - Graduation rate for non-Pell new undergraduates
 - Graduation rate for female new undergraduates
 - Graduation rate for male new undergraduates
-
- **Reduction of the gap in baccalaureate awards to undergraduate enrollment for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students** (indicator for system and individual universities)
 - # of underrepresented undergraduates
 - # of underrepresented baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of underrepresented baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
 - # of white undergraduates
 - # of white baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of white baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
 - # of Pell undergraduates
 - # of Pell baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of Pell baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
 - # of non-Pell undergraduates
 - # of non-Pell baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of non-Pell baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
 - # of female undergraduates
 - # of female baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of female baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
 - # of male undergraduates
 - # of male baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of male baccalaureate awards to undergraduates
-
- **Reduction of the gap in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors for underrepresented, low-income, and male/female students** (indicator for system and individual universities)
 - # of underrepresented STEM undergraduate majors
 - # of underrepresented STEM baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of underrepresented STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors
 - # of white STEM undergraduate majors
 - # of white STEM baccalaureate awards
 - Ratio of white STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors
 - # of Pell STEM undergraduate majors
 - # of Pell STEM baccalaureate awards

- Ratio of Pell STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors
- # of non-Pell STEM undergraduate majors
- # of non-Pell STEM baccalaureate awards
- Ratio of non-Pell STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors
- # of female STEM undergraduate majors
- # of female STEM baccalaureate awards
- Ratio of female STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors
- # of male STEM undergraduate majors
- # of male STEM baccalaureate awards
- Ratio of male STEM baccalaureate awards to undergraduate majors

Additional Indicators

- **Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students engage in real-world workplace experiences to provide students with the kinds of exposure and skills that employers value**
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who have had workplace experiences with careers and the estimated number of hours spent in these activities [e.g., internships and other field experiences in law offices, hospitals, engineering firms] (institution, system)
- **Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students gain and improve global understanding and foreign language skills so they can compete in the global economy and participate in a global society**
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who have gained and improved global understanding
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who achieve defined levels of “foreign” language proficiency (institution, system)
 - Percentages and numbers of students studying in environments that engender interactions with cultures tied closely to non-U.S. locations (including but not limited to students who travel to study in non-American locations)- by duration, destination, major, demographic characteristics
 - Numbers of degree-seeking and non-degree-seeking students who are citizens of other countries
- **Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students provide service to the community**
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who have had volunteered in their communities and the estimated number of hours (institution, system)

- **Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students engage in activities as informed citizens**
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who voted, who were otherwise politically engaged (institution, system)
- **Increase from entry to graduation in the extent to which CSU students exhibit information competence**
 - Percentages and numbers (survey estimate) of entering freshmen and graduating seniors who meet CSU information competence standards (institution, system)
- **Increase in number of CSU baccalaureates who transition to post-baccalaureate and graduate programs, especially programs in high-demand areas.**
 - Number of graduating seniors transitioning to post-baccalaureate and graduate programs (institution, system)
 - Number and percentage of graduating seniors transitioning to post-baccalaureate and graduate programs in high-demand areas (institution, system)
- **Increase in number of CSU baccalaureates who transition into high-demand areas**
 - Number of graduating seniors transitioning to the workplace (institution, system)
 - Number and percentage of graduating seniors transitioning to the workplace in high-demand areas (institution, system)
- **Increase in the proportion of tenured and probationary faculty.**
 - Number of total FTEF (institution, system)
 - Number of tenured/probationary FTEF and their % of total FTEF (institution, system)
- **Increase in the diversity of employees**
 - % of full-time faculty by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)
 - % of full-time managers by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)
 - % of full-time professionals by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)
 - % of full-time secretarial staff by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)
 - % of full-time technical staff by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)
 - % of full-time technical staff by gender and ethnicity (institution, system)

Additional Suggested Indicators to Assess Institution-level Progress

Commitment 2. Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence

- Analysis of recruitment pools, success of searches, and faculty hired

- Measures of faculty satisfaction, compared to sources such as the COACHE survey of probationary faculty, as well as turnover at the institution

Commitment 3. Plan for Staff and Administrative Succession and Professional Growth

- Measures of customer satisfaction (supporting evidence of a highly competent workforce), evidence of participation in/ assessments of professional development programs
- Analysis of recruitment pools and search success, as well as the employee profile at the institution

Commitment 5. Expand Student Outreach

- Number and % of FTF *applicants* who completed a-g in current and prior year, by ethnicity and gender (same for transfer applicants)
- Number and % of *admitted* first-time freshmen who completed a-g in current and prior year, by ethnicity and gender (same for transfer students)
- Number and % of *enrolled* first-time freshmen who completed a-g in current and prior year, by ethnicity and gender (same for transfer students)
- Number and % of students applying for and receiving financial aid

Commitment 6. Enhance Student Opportunities for “Active” Learning

- % of students responding affirmatively to selected “active” learning measures on survey instruments such as the AASCU *Degrees of Preparation* survey and/or the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Degree programs including “active” learning opportunities, as evidenced by syllabi and program review documents
- Institution funds provided in support of faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities that include support for undergraduate and graduate student researchers
- Funds from grants, gifts, and contracts that include support for student “active” learning

Commitment 7. Enhance Opportunities for Global Awareness

- Number and % of students with a major or course of study that is explicitly international in focus
- Number and % of students with a major or course of study including non-U.S. themes
- Number and % of students engaged in credit-bearing experiences abroad
- Number and % of students enrolled in languages other than English

- Number of languages available for study through the intermediate level
- % of students responding affirmatively to selected “global learning” learning measures on the AASCU *Degrees of Preparation* survey
- Number of degree-seeking students who are citizens of other countries
- Number of faculty who engage non-American scholars for professional purposes (e.g., shared research, scholarly meetings)
- Number of faculty whose research and scholarship is sited abroad
- Number of faculty who lead short-term study abroad activities (for matriculated and non-matriculated students)
- Number of faculty who take full-time, semester or year-long positions abroad
- Number of faculty who have revised courses to include international themes
- Number of faculty who travel for professional purposes outside the United States
- Number of visiting faculty from outside the United States
- Stated goals for internationalization in institution’s strategic plan, program review criteria, co-curricular planning, and/or RTP documents
- Performance goals for senior managers that include encouragement of international engagement and the adoption of global perspectives in learning environments
- Institutional Agreements and level of activity during the review period; number of formal international partners/ foreign universities
- Extent to which citizens of other countries are made available to U.S. citizen students (in programs with cultural understanding objectives embedded—both in student life programs and curricula)

Commitment 8. Act on the CSU’s Responsibility to Meet Post-baccalaureate Needs, Including Those of Working Professionals

- Partnerships and advisory bodies, as appropriate for various academic programs, to evaluate regional needs for specific graduate and post-baccalaureate programs
- Evidence of integration of advisory board input into planning and assessment of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs
- Number of scholarships, stipends, internships, and/or other program funding provided by external partners
- Partnerships between existing institutional research centers, whose collaboration supports faculty and student research and may support the development of degree programs
- Graduate and post-baccalaureate programs offered jointly with other institutions that maximize local resources and reach greater student audiences

- New degree and certificate programs implemented to answer particularly urgent workforce needs (including use of “fast track” and/or “pilot program” policies to implement such programs in timely fashion)
- Status of campus strategic plan for expanding graduate and post-baccalaureate education offered through extended education
- Success in supporting international research partnerships and/or implementing graduate programs that feature articulation of coursework from international institutions
- Professional accreditation for graduate programs that are subject to accreditation
- State certification and state licensure pass rates in fields that are subject to same
- WASC approval of new graduate and/or post-baccalaureate programs requiring substantive change review
- Resources committed to graduate and post-baccalaureate program development
- Resources committed for faculty research, scholarship, and creative work, including for broad dissemination, professional presentation and publication of such work