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This document summarizes the main trends in the college and central plans. COH perhaps said it best this year. While we must temper expectations for resources and rewards equal to accomplishments, we must not say what the hell, whatever comes first. Planning, in the short term, has cushioned us financially. In the long term, we must plan alternatives for the instability in the general fund. We can do so in the contexts of CSUN and CSU planning. AA goals (top) regroup CSUN’s five into three; and they address the priorities in the new CSU directive, Access to Excellence, as well as the older one, Cornerstones. There are three big differences, though. CSU reports still stress outputs, lack meaningful comparisons, and assume fiscal competency. We stress as well learning outcomes, make meaningful comparisons, and assume fiscal incompetence in the state.

ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

ACCESS/IMPACT: To the left, we see that CSUN has been averaging 3-4% growth. The result has been that a) we now exceed CSUN target, b) we steadily become more diverse, and c) international students’ higher fees compensate for the resident growth, above target, that the state does not fund. Despite the relative success of this approach, we must reduce 1,800 FTE in AY ’09-10. The theory is that the state then will fork over dollars for the 12,000 FTES CSU is over target. If we go down 1,400 in the AY (and 400 in summer), F9 would be between F6 and F7, recording a 5% decline. But, normal growth would have us at 29,300 in F9; thus, the reduction for impact is 7.65% for F9. There is cost, and there is gamble. Reducing FTES reduces fees, which in turn reduces FTEF, as here, directly to the right. At least 80 to 90 FTES are endangered. However, if the state restores full funding for the 12,000—despite the 42,000,000,000 dollar debit—CSU gains 100,000,000, roughly $300 per FTES. Roughly, $300 per FTES is
what we stand to lose by going down 1,800. We are trading in the gospel of works, praying for the reinstitution of grace.

To take the full 1,800 out of the pool of 4,100 enrolled FTF was not tolerable; to do so would reduce the freshmen class by nearly 40%. After broad discussion, we declared impaction:

- We divided the state into a local Tier 1 that includes LAUSD, North County, Ventura County, and the westernmost San Gabriel Valley and into a Tier 2, all other regions in CA. We expect most of 3,500-3,700 FTES from T1; they must be CSU-eligible. Tier 2 applicants will be admitted after T1 acceptances are projected. This approach mixes regionalism for T1 with slightly higher academic criteria for T2; thus, the approach amends access to accent excellence.
- We are turning away 200-350 FTES who have not taken the ELM or EPT by June. Research indicates that those who declare late persist poorly.
- We are reducing summer by about 400 FTE.
- We are stiffening the implementation of probation and appeals policies—500 to 600 FTE. Like the second bullet, this targets those who do not meet obligations and requirements.
- We are identifying the students with 140 cr, who have completed requirements, as well as those in search of a second BA. Hectoring and restricting them through advising, we anticipate 150-200 FTE. And we can restrict transfer admissions in spring.

So, we are turning many valves, in case several yield too much or too little. We are focusing on resident students who either under-perform or displace others; and we are introducing merit into out-of-region admissions, thereby shifting acceptance from geography to achievement. Of course, impacting universities, losing high school drop-outs, and wringing community colleges are poor answers to the questions, who will replace baby boomers in the knowledge economy, and when will society and education step up to the plate?

**ASSESSMENT:** The chart on the next page indicates that most departments are probing direct outcomes of learning with local instruments—essays with rubrics, pre- and post exams, oral presentations, projects, etc. Only a few cite accreditation as proof of assessment; it is not. Those who use surveys, interviews, peer evaluations, and self-reflection apparently know that these are indirect measures; thus, they tend to be linked with other method and criteria. Faculty on the assessment committee, faculty in several colleges, and central administrators report

- a pronounced move in COH, SBS, COBAE, and COSAM toward a core of common learning outcomes. Critical thinking, writing, working with others, behaving ethically, and undertaking/validating research are common. Using college rather than department SLOs increases the N for analysis and decreases the number of faculty working in isolated analysis. However, as the chart shows, we see not outcomes but process whereby assessment methods (columns) channel feedback (right).

We have global indicators of relative outcomes, though. CSUN is one the top 25 public comprehensives in sending BA students to PhD programs in COSAM and SBS, according to NSF. Real strength is in biology, psychology and SBS generally for this result. CSUN accounting graduates as a cohort score
among the top three universities in CA on the CPA exam. CSUN graduates aggregate in the top quartile on the state’s teacher certification exams. Not strictly a sample, it is indicative of baccalaureate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTYA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB AE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O SYS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDO COE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S S E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCL L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y AST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S S C I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY CH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
competency for advanced work.

Other global assessments are more sobering. To the right we see that the average critical reading and math scores for students entering CSUN are below scores at MA universities. The left box displays scores on the **Collegiate Learning Assessment**, which purports to measure value-added by the senior year in making and criticizing arguments. Overall, we show the improvement that one would expect after college. But, remember our low beginnings. That means that modest improvement is not sufficient to propel students into advanced literacy and writing.

Indeed, assessment in the **OL** (right) indicates that freshmen can do 50% of the tasks associated with independent research and evaluation. After immersion, competency increases to 64% --and as others have shown, will not go much higher.

**NSSE** data, below, indicate that students at CSUN study longer as they mature, and read slightly more. Although they write longer papers, they submit fewer drafts. Projects under way to improve literacy include

- the writing project in **UGS**,
- the emphasis on reading in **Univ 100** and **Freshmen Experience**
- college convergence on critical reading and writing as generic SLOs.

Student’s responses suggest that we already develop both recognition and tolerance of divergence views. In that way, oral culture in campus and in classes effects considerable learning as an outcome, possibly beyond what students achieve in writing.

- **Work by IR**, which coincides with findings by **TNE**, suggests that earlier and more concerted focus on English and Math in feeder high schools is a difficult but probable effective remedy to students’ weaknesses. **MDECOE** is piloting an approach that, unlike **EAP**, brings faculty from like high schools together to exchange successful strategies. See the last section.
- **We expect both high performance and challenge in assessment next year:**
  - The **Learning Habits** project will continue to enrich, with qualitative detail, the NSSE.
  - Somehow we must institute a facsimile of **PACT**, at the least, in MDECOE;


● And we expect that the TNE/LAUSD link will provide with data for HLM/VAM.

**RESEARCH:** This section will end with a brief description of research under way. It begins with an effort to see how inputs convert to outputs and outcomes. We begin again with NSF. When you strip out system-wide, research university, and doctoral university data from the rankings, CSUN falls in the top tier—(10 to 25)—of schools with NSF funding, graduates students on grant support, and minority students in sciences, engineering, and social. However, comparisons in CSU are revealing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>G/C</th>
<th>FTES</th>
<th>RANK FTES</th>
<th>RANK G/C</th>
<th>RANK G/C FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>12,450,037</td>
<td>6,639</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>20,607,871</td>
<td>15,083</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>16,027,917</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>12,707,962</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>35,805,919</td>
<td>19,010</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>16,155,362</td>
<td>28,631</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>14,225,049</td>
<td>6,738</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>36,929,929</td>
<td>29,816</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>25,527,345</td>
<td>16,208</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>20,244,036</td>
<td>27,822</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>Chico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>14,960,190</td>
<td>17,924</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>16,683,144</td>
<td>23,786</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>East Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>30,455,127</td>
<td>13,858</td>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>109,719,393</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>56,736,054</td>
<td>24,170</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>22,026,202</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>5,978,251</td>
<td>7,221</td>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>25,651,446</td>
<td>7,384</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>5,340,043</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Some CSUs are missing from the '07 tally.) Nonetheless in overall comparisons, we are 4th in FTES, 10th in G/C, and 17th in G/C to FTES. Closer inspections show that engineering and health fields elsewhere out-pace CSUN, while COSAM and MDECOE lead here.

The chart below displays that the colleges spend a lot on assigned time. CSUN SFRs vary a lot, as do CSU’s. The relative closeness of a college to a CSU division’s SFR suggests the degree of flexibility the college has. Not visible here are the highly differentiated COA in the colleges/divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD CNT FULL T FAC</th>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>SSC</th>
<th>COBAE</th>
<th>HUM</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>SCI</th>
<th>HHD</th>
<th>AMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED TIME</td>
<td>210,312.0</td>
<td>834,624.0</td>
<td>1,032,350.0</td>
<td>1,136,016.0</td>
<td>563,567.0</td>
<td>1,019,765.0</td>
<td>658,260.0</td>
<td>375,414.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES/FTEF</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU FTES/FTEF</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIGNED TIME/ HC F T FAC</td>
<td>4,673.6</td>
<td>7,452.0</td>
<td>12,589.6</td>
<td>11,029.3</td>
<td>8,051.0</td>
<td>12,589.7</td>
<td>8,661.3</td>
<td>4,692.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the next page we can begin to see the impact of investing in research-related activities.

● We have over 1,000 students working on grants or research-motivated community and campus projects. The literature points to the value for retention.
According to comparisons with NSOPF data for like institutions, CSUN faculty publish and present at or above rates on peer campuses. Advancement dollars brought in per FTES exceed the national average for comprehensive universities. Overall, with TExL direct returns and IDC accounted for, we are to the good by $2,000,000.

Still, we need to refine how we collect data on student effects, impacts on curriculum and culture, and influences on the local community. And we need to examine why research seems not to emerge publicly in all the units, though we tried for broad definitions.

LEARNING-CENTERED AND ONGOING PROGRAMS: As the assessment chart and the WASC work indicate, to the degree that we are able to fiscally, many programs have undertaken the principles of learning-centeredness:

- We have at least 1,000 students in research and community service, examples of active learning. However, we need to specify assessments to learn about worthiness.
- Significant seat-time experiments are under way in Math and English to shorten the time for remediation and basic skills completion. Because of success, pilots will expand next year.
- Across the states, learning technology and digital communications have caught on. 80% of public universities offer some DE programs; on average they offer 6. 44% have virtual courses outside designated DE programs, with 49% having such courses in hybrid form. Alas, as here 97% of the work is developed on campus. High percents of students report using technology to communicate and access course materials. CSUN statistics are similar. With IT, we maintain a small faculty development center to advance web work in media, LMS, and hybrid formats. Exigency requires us though to align with utilities like Merlot in order to virtualize labs.
- One can see the effect on the way the OL is used. Physical checkouts, including inter-library loan, amount to 500,000 transactions, with a gate of 1,500,000. Meanwhile virtual retrievals from
electronic collections total 1,200,000 with 12,000,000 entries to the OL web. Thus, we must balance the physical and virtual libraries, managing expenses to sort need. And increasingly, as the OL has, we require robust orientations for both faculty and staff, as well as students, to virtual resources. The OL assessment plan is a paragon of how to snag and respond to these needs and data. We need, though, to plan for, capture, and tag data on-campus learning objects. Scattered across servers, they are barely searchable, with no common nomenclature.

- Ingenuity in TExL and regressive behavior about fees in the general fund position TExL as our technology agent for academic change. TExL has a dynamic plan to grow and now is partnering with the colleges and the OL in on-line and off-site advanced degree programs in fields as diverse as COH, Public Policy, Librarianship, and K-16 systemization in the middle east. But it faces challenges. See the next two charts. Since the phase-out of summer, TExL lost a revenue source that required little investment.

Since the change, expenses have exceeded revenue; TExL invested in programs that could run in the black, eventually. But generous MOUs with the colleges, as well as charges by CSU, complicate the effort to re-balance. Even were CSU to be less charge-happy, there still would be a need to adjust the investment/return ratio with the colleges. Otherwise, TExL loses the ability to gain reserves against which it can run risks. And ultimately we jeopardize the $1,000,000 to 2,000,000 in extra pay that TExL generates.

We believe, however, that current recalculations of internal MOUs will secure matters, even as nearby counties reduce their investment in the professional development of their staff. The last two displays put the finances in different contexts. The first shows how funding sources have adjusted to the loss of stability in summer and long-term contracts. TExL is in the brave new world of competitive credit programming for a changing workforce. The final display shows, according to CSU accounts TExL’s relative position in revenue, ’06-07. Given the distance from LB and the lower profiles of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>04/05</th>
<th>05/06</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>07/08</th>
<th>08/09 (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest and Miscellaneous</td>
<td>133,915</td>
<td>125,183</td>
<td>131,434</td>
<td>(168,166)</td>
<td>54,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Credit Extension</td>
<td>1,218,678</td>
<td>1,307,817</td>
<td>1,440,835</td>
<td>863,450</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Session</td>
<td>742,335</td>
<td>714,034</td>
<td>740,953</td>
<td>850,724</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Programs</td>
<td>1,935,136</td>
<td>1,709,920</td>
<td>1,743,991</td>
<td>2,207,501</td>
<td>1,627,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>1,794,842</td>
<td>1,656,115</td>
<td>1,621,005</td>
<td>1,424,964</td>
<td>1,684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive English (IEP)</td>
<td>2,546,078</td>
<td>3,286,448</td>
<td>3,966,886</td>
<td>4,711,404</td>
<td>6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit (Degree/Certificate)</td>
<td>5,646,394</td>
<td>3,542,267</td>
<td>469,747</td>
<td>470,858</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>15,726,997</td>
<td>13,837,898</td>
<td>12,147,915</td>
<td>12,746,156</td>
<td>14,686,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LA and DH, there should be room to grow.

- Generally, other new programming must be restrained, given the budget. The EDD has launched well, and hires continue. We are participating in the CSU nursing build-out, too. However, as the fate of the MBA fee and Audiology and Physical Therapy indicates, we are stymied by the unwillingness of the state and system to charge differential fees for high-cost programs, and by the opposition of UC and privates to CSU entering their world of degrees beyond the MA, even if we limit to applied programs.
- To this end, a planning group from MDECOE, HHD, SBS, and academic resources has made head way in plotting a clinical front, client support system, and org chart for health and wellness programs. This is key to efforts to be regionally relevant in ways that capitalize on faculty expertise, likely developments in preventative health care, and regional need.
- Finally, we secured dollars from the CQF to add peer advisors and instructional support for high DUF courses. The CQF process requires close assessment. So, with one hand we try to keep students in school; in the other hand, we hold the cudgel of impaction and pummel 1,400 or so FTES out the door. Oh, tempores, oh, mores.

**STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

Academic Affairs at CSUN has a rich array of activities for students. We will get to the data soon, but we have these advantages:

- A large number of identity based programs and languages that are hubs for student;
- Perhaps the most cohesive EOP program in the CSU, partly decentralized in the colleges. Usually, retention and graduation rates compare well with demographic peer campuses;
- An organized administration within UGS that has cleared up policy confusions across colleges and has help to make SOLAR legible. Additionally, the unit has worked virtual advising, as well as just-in-time advising, to deal with the influx of FTES last year.
- COBAE, which has had decent retention but, according to group confession, inconsistent advising, has received an endowment for a career advising center; and it has made its advising center more user friendly by opening up space.
- COH runs an extremely effective peer mentoring program that benefits senior mentors and freshmen.
- COSAM has worked with health to develop an advising/mentoring program for students interested in medical careers.
- CECS has developed ACCESS to interest high school students in its fields. Recently, it redesigned a major lab to promote project work.
While MCCAMC is busy with performances and capstones in the arts, HHD uses the extensive Brown Center as a teaching lab, while COSAM does many field trips, and SBS clubs have won awards and attract students.

Yet the effort, which has included an Honors program, University 100, and academic orientations, apparently has hit a wall, reached intermittently since ’03. First to second year retention is at 76% to 77% as the high. 2004 witnessed high retention to the third AY term, but/because the freshmen class was small. 2007 suffered; the class topped 41%. Virtualization has made advising easier to get and understand. However, the severe increase in the proportion of part-time faculty has made the TT/FTES 34:1. That probably is over the top. Six and seven year graduation rates have improved steadily, but are still well below 50%.

On average CSUN students spend 10-11 AY terms on campus just for baccalaureate classes. However 70% of our students require remediation for at least another term. Transfers, more often than not, wandered in the CCC, adding a year. So 11+.5+1=6.5 years, if one continues at an even pace, never steeping in academic hot water.

Clearly, remediation accounts for delay. But there is more going on, and it is predictable, really. The chart below plots 3rd term retention (y) by SAT math, bottom quartile (x). CSUN is the red dot. Note that it is above the trend line. The data imply that the test score weighs on retention. However, three schools do better. Before investigating their strategies, we should profile their students. The chart in blue factors the test score with the 6th year graduation rate. Again CSUN is the red dot; this time, the nearest out-performer has a score 10 points higher. In both graphs peers are public MAs > 10,000 FTES, with .45 correlation for the third term, .63 for the 6th yr. The orange display—CSUN on the trend line—illustrates that as the percent of people on Pell increases, the percent not finishing year 6 increases.

NSSE data allow us to probe campus climate for students to see whether anything beyond math is running them off. Although focus groups bad-mouth advising and sometimes staff for unfriendliness, we now have sufficient NSSE and CIRP data to put that to rest, as the top graph on the next page shows. A difference-maker between CSUN and non-CSU peers is, as we know, more participation in on campus but out.
of class activities. When we break data into undergraduate colleges, we can see a few things that inspire inference but there I nothing clinching. Two colleges are lauded especially for advising. Perhaps because of size and the largely non-interactive format of its classes, students feel less passionate about COBAE than peers in other colleges do about their experience.

So, we look now to those peer school in the scatter plots that out-did us. Grand Valley State is much whiter with comparatively less Pell. Brooklyn and Baruch are smaller but demographic matches. However, since they dumped remediation, their Math and English entry scores shot up. Nonetheless, Brooklyn has been active in FIPSE and First Year. We need to review their work. Finally, there is Fresno, a close match in nearly every way. There, where the dust flies, the heat rises, and the athletic coaches whine, might be an answer that can help us make modest jumps in retention and graduation, given the bounds that the correlations and scatter plots suggest.

**SHARE VALUES**

**COLLABORATION:** As the attached chart suggests, decision-making is shared widely. X indicates participation in the decision while red signifies a lead role. It is striking that there are no isolated red Xs; and one also can see how many oars are in the water per topic. Also, notable is how widely the red Xs are distributed. The process requires time for consultation. But, as this fall, it has accommodated discussions and decisions on LMS, email, and impaction. The chart focuses mainly on current cross-divisional topics, not ones peculiar to AA. It is fair to say that we have moved largely, though not entirely, out of silos.
**TECHNOLOGY:** When you look at national benchmarks in IT/AA, we look like other MA universities with a few key distinctions. 85% of peers have academic computing and instructional technology, as well as other areas, report to a central IT. We share reporting. The central plus decentralized AA IT dollars per FTES hits the peer average for whole campuses. The ratio will increase when we get data from other units. That is why, for example, we must tease out the duplicative and least effective ways that we provide training through centers, grants, disciplinary specialists, college help, etc. It is why we must control LMS proliferation, SMART room costs, etc.

Without evidence of effectiveness, the principles are want equals get, get entails integrate and update, they suck up dollars.

Now, look in AA, at admittedly older data. Total technology costs amount to 7-8% of the divisional budget. Increased cost is not in hardware; it is in distributed labs, physical modifications, and software, as well as personnel. While costs in red should be throttled, the entailed costs in green are the real concern. Within AA and CSUN, we need cost effective help and R/D:

- OL and IT should apply to CQF to develop help sites.

We also have cost and complexity problem in handling data, especially accountability. Accreditation agencies argue that their disciplines need unique ways of collecting and modeling data. CHEA and other regulators must step in to simplify. As alluded to under Research, we need strategies on collecting, storage, client access, security, refreshing data, and retrieval. Otherwise, we will be awash in small Ns, monitored by a big staff.

In sum, we face these issues and tasks:

- We need to insist on standardization in SMART classrooms, using a model that utilizes the benefits of central, virtual capacity; or if not that, minimizing the capacity of pc’s that we buy.
- We cannot afford software upgrades of over 100k each year, unless we can demonstrate offsets.
- As an example, the delta of 2M amounts to 40 positions.
- We must cue into the future of dbs at CSUN.
- We must do this within the following plan:
  - rolling out an amendable LMS
  - using technology mainly to contract seat time, utilize lecture halls more efficiently
- Capitalize on dispersed expertise in the colleges, OL, and TExL, as well as IT and SA to control R/D and implementations. Merge AA IT and TExL IT to leverage TExL’s experience in program improvement.
- Tether impulse buying, such as it is.
- Look to various fees to offset costs.
- This spring, get a handle on AA dbs and plans for new ones.

**REVENUES:** Much of this has been covered in previous sections. We will go over the short term and then the long term. The short term leaves us with the need to meet the CSUN share of 97+66m cut over two years. Calculated must be the contract hits, if ever implement of 11-13m. Then there are the truly unknown things—whether GF cuts will be steeper, whether we will need to absorb, and how much, finishing costs of the COSAM building—13.1m with group 2 equipment—and closing and starting the VPAC. The numbers are staggering; and although we have large divisional reserve, it is not that large! The chart to the left reduces the problem to the fathomable. The left is an approximate model for this year. The right adjusts—reducing Adv pay-out, counting on a 10% growth in TExL usable revenues, figuring a 10% fee increase across resident and non-resident students, including the GF cuts referred to before. Then we arrive at the total per FTES. The CQF helps a lot. The chart leaves out many of the other red marks, including costs like promotions that we annually swallow. So, though we are decently prepared, we are guarding against more silliness:

- We are reimbursing MPP expenses at the *per diem* rate. We are cutting professional development, equipment, etc., by at least 10% over spring, while aiming for 25% next AY. We will proceed with excessive caution when hiring. We will discuss in March how to view faculty hires to be on board in ’10-11. Decisions necessarily will be contingent on the state budget.
- Academic Resources will work with Administration and Finance to insure that we have adequate plans to backfill, where appropriate, GF with trust balances and endowed funds that are not upside down.
- The colleges, as requested, have submitted reports that show available funds, in a normal world, through the end of AY. AA will work with AR on a division summit on the budget by early March, when we might have a better idea of what is ahead.
- All this accelerates the need for the deans to work with Adv and TExL on new funding. We have worked, through PC, to right TExL budgeting, so that partner stake risk with greater equity. We expect 10% growth next year. Expansion into markets in SA and the ME, however, might be set back by the economy.
- For their contribution to planning the deans and Adv should submit clear metrics that show meet to ask ratios, ask to gift ratios, as well as data on number of prospect, number of vetted prospects. Especially helpful would be their summary, too, of the climate for giving.
ALIGNING STRUCTURE WITH REALITY, BASED ON EVIDENCE: This is a big issue across higher education. It plays out this way in AA at CSUN:

- Over thirty years, the proportion of part-time faculty has doubled, the proportion of junior faculty has increased, Al Gore invented the internet, and accountability became the vogue, while shared governance became de rigueur. As a result, mid-career faculty find themselves working as chairs or running accountability studies. That is shared practice. Shared values, however, demand quietly that traditional research and teaching always come first, that research cannot really be done about the campus, lest it be institutional reporting—a grave misunderstanding of that! We must structure the conception and presentation of chair and major committee work, etc., so that the academic value becomes clear. We need to do a better job (as we have with teacher prep, health and well being, the environment, and student success) to align requirements for research and service with university interests; and we must credit those activities. The CSUN blue book allows for such work for credit, under an extended definition of peer review. Culture frustrates it. So we need to change the culture.
  - We have made this a theme, pressing department for statements of equivalencies. We will tally and assess practices as we move through 4-6 yr evaluation this AY.

- Implicit in this is that we can’t have a cookie cutter workload policy. We need peer designed and changeable guidelines that allow faculty to meet the goal in FTES in the way that they see fit—assessment will confirm learning. Numbers of classes and class size can vary; central AA monitors mainly FTES. The extent to which a) some classes can run larger, b) majors shed courses, and c) the elective cycle put down favorite pets, is the extent to which schedule can become more flexible, and the mode of delivery become even more differentiated. COBAE and SBS are charging ahead, COH is picking up the pace.
  - This summer, we will extract data on course load per FTES, for a comparison with national data.

- Recasting how we credit and reconstruct workload might relieve internal pressures; it also might help us improve the functionality of centers. Although not a drain on resources, they clutter the mental landscape and give a false sense of what CSUN is about.
  - We need a consistent template for tallying what they do: clients, students, research, service activities, etc. And if they are to continue, we also need evidence of how they intersect with workload and effect.
  - GRIP will be commissioned to create and implement this before the review next summer/fall.

- Several centers, like the centers in HHD and MDECOE are very effective. In fact, these centers are likely to coalesce into a pattern of institutes that will do applied research/service, in part, through faculty clinical practice. Interest also has converged on well being and the environment because of the exorbitant costs of health care. Preemption and prevention are necessary. Many
faculties are helping with this new conception. How do we fuse faculty research with public mission; how do we get colleges and departments to share clinical and business practices, consider clients holistically, and provide for “application” of knowledge? Planning proceeds, but we are several years removed from a launch.

- The deans of MDECOE and HHD will present PC with a progress report by the end of the academic year. During and/or after this review, we will decide on the next steps towards rationalizing business practices and making clinical practice financially supportable.
- Alongside this, we need the equivalent of a COBAE impact report that charts the private and public sectors, with number of clients. We really do not have a clear image of whom we serve, who the lead contacts are in the community. This spring, money allowing, we will commission a unit either in COBAE, SBS, or TExL to do such a review.

- Such a review can also let us see more clearly where and how we can be strategic as we flesh out “regionally relevant” in a fashion that supports the centers/institutes and returns funds to the core. When we identify these sectors and relevant centers and institutes, we provide clarity, too, for the organization fund-raising personnel in AA. We have set precedent for sharing them across units so that we maximize affinities, balance prospects, and make economies. Already, the dean of TExL captured much of this in talks with the deans.

- This is part of the long-range strategy to diversify funding, a challenge in a master-planned system like CSU that suffers the market but builds no buffers. Our total budget plans, as we have said before, need to reflect the reduction in the general fund that has trended for three decades. The world we build toward is on the right. (The percents are illustrative.)
There is one way, close to home, that we can make money. Consider these facts. With a 65% graduation rate, LAUSD’s students make $100,000,000 less per year than if they finished. Factor across the state; one totals at least $200,000,000 annually. Add the social costs.....we could near $500,000,000. At CSUN this plays out in a less dramatic way, through remediation. That cost for 66% of 3,900 freshmen each taking several remedial courses can mount to $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. Now, we know that thirty-four feeder high schools yield nearly 40% of our freshmen. So, this spring we should commission TNE to work with deans’ council on a plan gradually to reduce the need for remediation of students from these schools. The plan should have these elements:

- Identification of those elements in literacy and numeracy in these schools that need work.
- Alignment of interventions in K8 feeder schools that affect performance in these HS.
- Work with sites on appropriate CST, graduation, and attendance goals.
- Recommendations for key places in the CSUN undergraduate to post-baccalaureate elementary education program the need reform in order to improve instruction in math and English.
- Recommendations about how to use campus PD funds toward the goal of reducing cost and need in this area. Sufficient evidence mechanisms are in place.

As all this implies, we have exciting projects ahead because we are thinking how to align mission, service, work, and resources. So, as we take on, for example sustainability, we must look for ways to trim waste and consumption within Academic Affairs——paper, power . . .
AGENDA

ACCESS/IMPACTION

- We divided the state into a local Tier 1 and into a Tier 2.
- We are turning away 200-350 FTES who have not taken the ELM or EPT by June. We are reducing summer by about 400 FTE.
- We are stiffening probation and appeals.
- We are identifying the students with 140 cr.

ASSESSMENT:

- Continue a pronounced move in toward a core of common learning outcomes. Critical thinking, writing, working with others, behaving ethically, and undertaking/validating research are common.
- As a result, continue the writing project in UGS,
- the emphasis on reading in Univ 100 and Freshmen Experience.
- Insure that the TNE/LAUSD link will provide data for HLM/VAM
- Continue Learning Habits.

RESEARCH

- Expand G/ in CECS AND HHD
- Gather clearer data on students and their link to research.
- Maintain current levels of publication; tighten but continue support.
- CECS will implement Digital M, concentrate R/D funding on jr. faculty.

ONGOING PROGRAMS

- Assume no centrally funded programs/positions.
- Enact TExL growth and budget balancing
- Build out EDD.
- Have TExL, OL, and AA IT converge on web indexing, tagging, and archiving.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

- Determine the sources of the retention delta with peers like Fresno.
- Set targets for calibrating college practices to converge on COH numbers.
- Research whether internships, campus work, etc., improve retention.
- Track the effect of the size of FTF.

SHARED VALUES

TECHNOLOGY

- Insist on standardization in SMART classrooms.
- Limit Db instances, set target for SW expenses.
• Roll out an amendable LMS; clarify DE programs from hybrid maximization of lecture halls.
• Mainstream pilots in Math and Eng.
• Using common data, project a technology/FTES ratio for AA.
• Use CQF to generate Help standards.

REVENUE

• We are reimbursing MPP expenses at the per diem rate. We are cutting professional development, equipment, etc., by at least 10% over spring, while aiming for 25% next AY. We will proceed with excessive caution when hiring.
• Insure that we have adequate plans to backfill, where appropriate, GF with trust balances and endowed funds that are not upside down.
• AA will work with AR on a division summit on the budget by early March, when we might have a better idea of what is ahead.
• All this accelerates the need for the deans to work with Adv and TExL on new funding. We expect 10% growth next year.
• D and Adv should submit clear metrics that show meet to ask ratios, ask to gift ratios, as well as data on number of prospect, number of vetted prospects.

ALIGNMENT OF CULTURE WITH REALITY

• With PPR, structure chair and major committee work, etc., so that the academic value becomes clear.
• Align requirements for research and service with university interests in regional improvement; and we must credit those activities. The CSUN blue book allows for such work for credit, under an extended definition of peer review
• Free up workload policy. We need peer designed and changeable guidelines that allow faculty to meet the goal in FTES in the way that they see fit—assessment will confirm learning.
• Create a more detailed template for tallying what Centers do: clients, students, research, service activities, etc.
• The deans of MDECOE and HHD will present PC with a progress report by the end of the academic year and HWB project.
• Plan for equalization on GF and SUG over 10 years.
• Commission TNE to work with deans’ council on a plan gradually to reduce the need for remediation from feeder schools.
# INDEX

## A

- AA IT DOLLARS 12
- ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE 1, 2
- ACCESS 1, 2, 9, 17
- ACCESS TO EXCELLENCE 2
- ACCESS/IMPACTION 2, 17
- ADVANCEMENT 7
- ALIGNING STRUCTURE WITH REALITY, BASED ON EVIDENCE 14
- ASSESSMENT 3, 17

## B

- BARUCH 11
- BLUE BOOK 14, 18
- BROOKLYN 11
- BUSINESS PRACTICES 15

## C

- CECS 9, 17
- CENTERS 12, 14, 15
- CHEA 12
- CIRP 10
- CLIENTS 14, 15, 18
- CLINICAL 9, 14, 15
- COBAE 3, 9, 11, 14, 15
- COH 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 17
- COLLABORATION 11
- COLLEGIATE LEARNING ASSESSMENT 5
- CORNERSTONES 2
- COSAM 3, 6, 9, 10, 13
- CUT OVER TWO YEARS 13

## D

- DE 7, 17

## E

- EDD 9, 17
- ENDOWED 13, 18
- ENVIRONMENT 14
- EOP 9
- EQUIVALENCIES 14
- TEXL 7, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18

## F

- FACULTY HIRES 13
- FEEDER HIGH SCHOOLS 5, 16
- FRESNO 11, 17

## G

- GRADUATION 9, 10, 11, 16
- GRIP 14
- GROUP 2 EQUIPMENT 13

## H

- HEALTH CARE 9, 14
- HHD 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18
- HIGH DUF 9
- HYBRID 7, 17

## I

- IT 7, 12, 13, 17

## L

- LAUSD 3, 6, 16, 17
- LEARNING HABITS 5, 17
- LEARNING-CENTERED AND ONGOING PROGRAMS 7
- LMS 7, 11, 12, 17

## M

- MA UNIVERSITIES 5, 12
- MCCAMC 10
- MDECOE 5, 6, 9, 14, 15, 18
- MISSION 15, 16
- MPP EXPENSES 13, 18

## N

- NSOPF 7
- NSSE 5, 10

## O

- OL 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17
- OUTCOME 5
- OUTCOMES 2, 3, 6, 17

## P

- PART-TIME FACULTY 10, 14
- PC 13, 15, 18
- PEER REVIEW 14, 18
- PELL 10, 11
- PREVENTION 14

## R

- RANKINGS 6
- REMEDIATION 7, 10, 11, 16, 18
- RESEARCH 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 17, 18
- RETENTION 6, 9, 10, 11, 17
- REVENUES 13

## S

- SBS 3, 9, 10, 14, 15
- SERVICE 7, 14, 16, 18
- SFR 6
- SHARED VALUES 1, 11
- SLOS 3, 5
- SMART 12, 17
- STUDENT ENGAGEMENT 9, 17
- SUSTAINABILITY 16

## T

- TECHNOLOGY 7, 8, 12, 18
- TNE 5, 6, 16, 17, 18
- TRUST 13, 18

## U

- UGS 5, 9, 17
- UNIVERSITY 100 10

## V

- VPAC 13

## W

- WASC 7
- WELL BEING 14
- WORKLOAD 14, 18