SS-F99-5

At its meeting of November 1, 1999, the SJSU Academic Senate passed the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by David McNeil for the Executive Committee.

SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION
ON THE CSU DRAFT ACCOUNTABILITY RESPONSE

WHEREAS: President Robert L. Caret and Gene L. Dinielli, Chair, Statewide Academic Senate have requested the San José State University Academic Senate to provide feedback regarding the Draft Accountability Process proposed by Executive Vice Chancellor Spence (August 16, 1999); and

WHEREAS: Opinions have been solicited from all senators and responses incorporated into the attached response; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the SJSU Academic Senate approves and adopts the attached response.

RESOLVED: SJSU Academic Senate forward this response to President Caret for attachment to the campus response to the Academic Senate CSU and Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence.

<h1 align="center">San José State University Academic Senate</h1>

<h1 align="center">Response to Draft Accountability Process</h1>

The draft accountability process proposes to establish specific areas of performance review and indicators for accountability at both the system and campus levels within the CSU. While this process can have a positive impact on campus' abilities to demonstrate achievement of their academic missions, the process should preserve the autonomy of the individual campuses. In addition, this document needs system indicators that demonstrate explicitly what the central administration is doing to support the academic mission. System performance should be measured in the context of how central administration's activities result in direct improvements in teaching and learning.

Our campus already routinely reports the institutional performance areas and indicators for items 2-9 to the System. We are concerned that we will be asked to report them again, in another format for this project, thus doubling out current workload. In addition, the system needs to assure campuses that the new CMS (PeopleSoft) software will simplify the collection of the necessary data.

The proposed items 1 and 10-12 are new, cannot be equally applied among the campuses, and will require considerable campus variation in order to devise appropriate campus accountability measures. However, the information provided in the various indicators is only relevant and valid when viewed in the aggregate, and the level of aggregation can only be at the system level.

The SJSU Academic Senate applauds the System for including accountability measures for the System, Chancellor's office, and Board of Trustees in this most recent draft. The entire system will be strengthened and improved by having the accountability of the central units defined and measured. However, this draft is incomplete without concrete indicators for the System, Chancellor's Office and Board of Trustees. Reciprocal accountability flowing from the System office to the campuses is an important step forward in improving the relationship between the System and the campuses in the spirit of Cornerstones Principle 10.

<h3 align="center">SYSTEM, CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE, BOARD OF TRUSTEES
ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY</h3>

Indicators need to be added in all the performance areas for the System, Chancellor's Office, and Board of Trustees. A model indicator for the item listed under the second performance indicator: "Maintaining appropriate balance between system commonality and campus autonomy" is provided below. Under performance area 2: "Desired distribution of decision-making between the system and campuses" we suggest the following indicator:

Indicator: For the system, produce and deliver to the statewide senate and statewide presidents committee an annual report describing system achievements on the system performance indicators in this document.

<h3 align="center">CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY</h3>

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
We suggest that you insert the words "the students" before the first indented item to read:
- identification of the expected learning outcomes "for students" in the program (students learn, the program doesn't)

In bullet 3 we suggest changing the word "change" to "strategies" (change implies a need to change-strategies means the status quo is an option. Thus it would read:

- a report of "strategies" in pedagogy, curriculum…

In the second indicator change the last line to: "strategically to attain teaching, learning, and program goals. (allows status quo to be an option)
Thus it would now read:
      Indicator: (after three years) For each university, a report of campus academic program reviews that summarizes assessment results and describes how these results have been used "strategically to attain teaching, learning, and program goals."

2: Access
There is a need for the system to clarify in the document what "eligible" means because it means different things at different campuses and will affect how the indicator information is compiled. It may be clearer to state: The CSU will admit all eligible (by individual campus standards) undergraduate students…

3: Progression to degree
In the stem for performance area #3 consider replacing the language "clear paths" with: "The CSU will facilitate progress to the…" There is a need to define what progress means. Is this straight return rate? This needs to be clarified.

On the second indicator, there is a need for clarification. Does this refer to all units at all institutions or just units completed at CSU? If the information this is trying to gather is the total number of units taken at all institutions, we think the comparison is inaccurate and not valid as we have no influence on how many units a transfer student takes at other institutions prior to entering CSU. Students may enter any college level institution uncertain of their choice of major and spend a year "shopping for a major."

4. Graduation
In the stem we suggest replacing the word "allow" students with "assist" students.
In the indicator, we suggest adding in the final parenthesis, "and average unit load."
Thus, the Indicator would now read: For each university, student graduation rates, disaggregated by major subpopulations (first-time freshmen, lower-division transfer students, and upper division transfer students) and by key student characteristics (such as "age", full-and part-time attendance and average unit load).

6. Relations with K-12
This is the item that we find most troubling. There is a serious disconnect in logic which would suggest holding the individual CSU campuses accountable for K-12 education outcomes over which they have no direct influence. Instead, we believe that it would be appropriate to hold the CSU campuses accountable for the number and quality of outreach efforts to K-12 education.

7. Remediation

Need to take into consideration:
- Percentage of remediation success should be calculated on a base of remedial students completing first year (retention losses should not compromise rate of remediation)
- Freshman vs. transfer populations
- Data on primary language spoken (English or other)

- English or math only vs. English plus math remedial students
- Data should include information on how this affects minorities

8: Facilities utilization
We suggest revising the stem statement as follows: "In order to fully utilize campus resources, the CSU will increase utilization of facilities in "off-peak" times (including state support and continuing education) to provide flexibility for students and facilitate student progress to the degree." This change puts the focus clearly on the intended outcome: "to facilitate student learning and progress," and does not tie it to a building issue. In addition, reconsider revising the indicator so that it encompasses courses offered utilizing flexible and innovative scheduling. Notwithstanding the statements above, year-round–operations or other facilities utilization efforts need to be implemented on a campus-by-campus, program-by-program basis; otherwise, for some campuses without a major enrollment problem this could lead to more costly operation. Also, other older campuses have facilities in need of upkeep and repair; there needs to be down-time for this to take place. Collect baseline data on programs that are now on a year-round schedules such as teacher education, business and mathematics and the computer science department.

Three-Year Performance Areas and Indicators

Consider for these items and the proceeding ones, a reporting structure that meets CSU, WASC, and current program review requirements so that campuses do not waste time and resources preparing three different reports for three different agencies.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document.