

TO: Linda Holt Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Support Task Force
DATE: September 28th, 2005

Task Force Charge: To determine what type of support structure is needed to engage academic departments in meaningful assessment strategies for the PEP process as well as other program planning and development efforts. The task force should meet to discuss what types of support are necessary across the different types of academic units and assign cash value to this support. This information should be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Senate within six weeks of the first task force meeting.

Make-up of Task Force:

Gabriela Sonntag, Chair of Program Assessment Committee
Regina Eisenbach, CoBA
Linda Shaw, Sociology
Denise Garcia, Biological Sciences
Bettina Huber, Director of Analytic Studies
Marie Thomas, WASC Educational Effectiveness Committee.

The Taskforce met on two occasions and exchanged ideas via email. Faculty input was invited via the discussion board on the Academic Senate website. Additionally Bettina Huber conducted a survey of practice on other CSU campuses relating to funding for program reviews and assessment.

As the campus moves forward with the WASC review and in consideration of the CSU Accountability Reporting process, including the review of educational effectiveness indicators, we foresee heightened focus on the program review process and especially on the assessment of student learning. The campus must acknowledge the serious investments that these entail and provide sufficient resources to faculty in the programs under review, as it is the faculty that takes on the greatest share of the task.

The CSU survey shows that funding is generally available for external reviewers (12 campuses routinely fund it; another 4 sometimes provide funding). Program reviews, per se, are not generally funded although 4 campuses do receive some funds (partial funding for attendance at assessment conferences, reimbursements for one-time expenses such as software purchases, small stipends for summer work).

We urge the university to set aside **funding for assessment** giving a priority to those departments undergoing program review. The survey of sister campuses found that 18 of them provide at least some funding for assessment.

- a. Funds (\$10,000 per program) to support the initial development of assessment plans. The department will submit a proposal that explains how the monies will be used: course releases, departmental retreats, attendance at conferences, etc. Flexibility is important to allow for variations in need.
- b. Additional funding in future years (\$2000) to support the implementation of specific assessment projects. Examples may include a survey development and implementation, alternative assessment tools, exit interviews, etc.
- c. Several campuses have used lottery funds to underwrite assessment initiatives.

Creating a faculty learning community on assessment is an innovative idea seen on other CSU campuses. The programs undergoing review can work together, attend assessment conferences, and provide support. The faculty member would receive a small stipend to participate.

**Faculty Participation in the Development of
Professional Responsibility Guidelines**

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM express its grave concern regarding the development of a General Fund Assigned Time for Instructional Faculty at Cal State San Marcos without consultation with the CSUSM Academic Senate or the Faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM advise the President to reject this policy/guidelines on the basis of the lack of consultation as was present in all preceding drafts of this policy/guidelines developed over the past three years; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM recommend that any professional responsibility (assigned time) policy/guidelines be developed by a committee of the Academic Senate of CSUSM and submitted to the President and other interested parties for review, recommendations, and approval as required by the CBA and Educational Codes; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of CSUSM create a task force or refer to a standing committee the responsibility of drafting a Professional Responsibility policy/guidelines for review by Faculty, Provost, President, CFA, and other interested parties and forwarded to the Senate for review and approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM adhere to the standard policy for Senate actions of forwarding the actions to the President for approval or return to the Senate with objections.

RATIONALE: Approximately four years ago representatives of CoBA faculty met with the Provost to collaborate on the development of an assigned time policy for CoBA. After several meetings and drafts, the Provost announced that he would like to expand the effort to the development of a policy for the entire campus. An expanded Task Force was appointed which included representation from the CSUSM Administration, the CSUSM Academic Senate, and the CFA. Over three years of countless meetings and drafts resulted in several versions being sent by the CSUSM administration to the Chancellor's Office for review. Each version was returned with required modifications which were unacceptable to the faculty members of the Task Force. However, in all instances, the Task Force continued to meet and attempted to develop a policy which would be acceptable to the faculty, administration, and Chancellor's Office.

On September 9, 2005, a Memorandum was sent to tenure-line instructional faculty by the Provost and College Deans stating, "We are writing as a group to announce the introduction of guidelines to formalize the awarding and reporting of assigned time to tenure-line faculty to fully account for the annual workload..." This unilateral announcement without consultation with the faculty is totally inconsistent with the process utilized in all prior efforts to collaboratively develop an assigned time policy. (Faculty members of the original Task Force preferred to refer to it as professional responsibilities of tenure-line faculty.) This resolution expresses the Senate's concern for the unilateral reversal in the assigned time policy development process and the rejection of shared governance principles in this situation.