Outcomes-based funding
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Part 1 of this article (published in the Spring 2014 edition) summarized the origin, evolution, and processes underlying outcomes-based funding (OBF) nationally and its emergence in California. Part 2 summarizes the current strategic context of OBF in California and within the California State University (CSU). Part 3 will look more closely at the factors that directly impact Cal State Fullerton (CSUF) and describe a way for the institution to move toward a local outcomes-based budget allocation model.

By José L. Cruz & Robert A. Koch

VICE PRESIDENT & PROVOST, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PROVOST

Academic Affairs

The Metrics.

California's FY2014-15 higher education budget affirms the state's intention to adopt an OBF model for higher education. The state is moving in this direction because "[enrollment-based funding] does not encourage institutions to focus on critical outcomes—affordability, timely completion rates, and quality programs—nor does it encourage institutions to better integrate their efforts to increase productivity given the state's investment." Furthermore, the budget states that future funding is contingent on "the UC Regents and the CSU Board of Trustees adopting three-year sustainability plans that set targets for key measures, within resource assumptions provided by the Department of Finance," and on the expectation that institutions will "implement reforms to improve student success and to realize institutional efficiencies."[1]

The Budget Act of 2014 was preceded in 2013 by amendments to the Education Code that require the CSU to report each March on performance and outcomes measures for the preceding year (see page 2, side bar). The sixteen metrics reported for selected student groups (freshman entrants, community college transfer students, graduate students and low income students) include enrollment percentages, persistence and degree-completion indicators, graduation rates and numbers, and data on expenditures per degree.[2]

The requirement to report on the above list of performance indicators and outcomes metrics sets the stage for the state's OBF plan.

The CSU Sustainability Plan.

In response to the Budget Act of 2014, on November 13, 2014, the CSU Board of Trustees approved a CSU Academic Sustainability Plan (Plan) for submission to the Department of Finance by the November 30, 2014 deadline.[3] According to Assembly Bill 94, which established some of the requirements found in the Act, the Plan (which was to cover the next three years) must include three components: a) establishment of annual goals for the sixteen metrics; b) annual projections for the number of resident and non-resident enrollments; and c) preparation of a balanced budget for each year.

The proposed goals and accompanying budgets were based on two different sets of assumptions: the Department of Finance (DoF) finance-based assumptions and the Chancellor's Office (CO) demand-based assumptions. According to the DoF assumptions, there would be a one percent (1%) annual enrollment growth between College Years 2015 and 2017, which would allow CSU to grow to 433,000 students in 2017; whereas the CO presumed an annual three percent (3%) increase during this same period, which would result in 460,000 students enrolled. The CO's higher enrollment projections reflect an aim to accommodate the backlog of students that resulted from cuts in enrollment during the recession and the current move by the California Community Colleges to increase enrollments and graduation rates.

In preparing the Plan, the Trustees considered the impact of several

additional factors: the Graduation and Student Success Initiatives, the Early Assessment and Early Start Programs, the increase in enrollments of students holding Associate Degrees for Transfer, and the progress in reducing the units to degree and time to degree. With these circumstances in mind, the Trustees offered two budgets to accompany the Plan—one based on the DoF assumptions and the other based on the CO assumptions.[4]

With respect to goals for the metrics, the document states, "This Plan follows a measured approach. It neither sells short the abilities of CSU students, faculty, staff, and administrators to exceed the status quo, nor does it create subjective goals that are far reaching but may have little to no chance of being achieved given modest budget increases and a short timeline to affect change. This measured approach demonstrates that, even with the prescribed additional resources of the State Budget and the short timeline for goal setting, the CSU is willing to strive for consistent improvements on these 16 performance measures."[5]

In a resolution dated November 5-6, 2014, the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) expressed concerns about these sixteen academic performance measures noting that it is unclear how they aggregate to provide "a unified overall measure of the *quality* of education provided by the CSU." The ASCSU recommended that the CSU establish a task force composed of faculty and administrators to review the mandates of the Budget Act and propose alternative measures as needed.[6]

The Chancellor's Task Force.

In a parallel response to the Budget Act of 2014, on 21 October 2014, the Chancellor formed and charged a Task Force on a Sustainable Financial Model for the California State University (Task Force).[7] By April, 2015, the Task Force is to propose "a sustainable plan for the future with respect to budget allocation, revenue generation, enrollment management, and institutional financial aid policies." This proposal must consider the mission of the CSU and the needs of its diverse student populations, allow different campuses to meet varying regional needs, identify opportunities to enhance revenues, consider how to adjust state university grants to manage student indebtedness appropriately, recommend policies and practices that stabilize budget allocations within the CSU, and create a phased implementation plan that does no harm. The task force includes representatives from the CO, and from campus presidents, provosts and vice presidents for academic affairs, vice presidents for administration and chief financial officers, a vice president for student affairs, chair of the academic senate, and a faculty and student trustee.

CSUF's Resolution on Equitable Funding.

In response to the current funding situation for CSUF and the lack of direct CSUF representation on the Task Force, the CSUF Academic Senate, on November 20, 2014, approved by acclamation a resolution on equitable funding for CSUF. The document notes that

Education Code, Section 89295

Commencing with the 2013-14 academic year, the California State University shall report, by March 15 of each year, on the following performance measures for the preceding academic year, to inform budget and policy decisions and promote the effective and efficient use of available resources:

(1) The number of California Community College transfer students enrolled and the percentage of California Community College transfer students as a proportion of the total number of undergraduate students enrolled.

(2) The number of new California Community College transfer students enrolled and the percentage of new California Community College transfer students as a proportion of the total number of new undergraduate students enrolled.

(3) The number of low-income students enrolled and the percentage of low-income students as a proportion of the total number of undergraduate students enrolled.

(4) The number of new low-income students enrolled and the percentage of low-income students as a proportion of the total number of new undergraduate students enrolled.

(5) The four-year graduation rate for students who entered the university four years prior and, separately, for low-income students in that cohort.

(6) The four-year and six-year graduation rates for students who entered the university six years prior and, separately, for low-income students in that cohort.

(7) The two-year transfer graduation rate for students who entered the university two years prior and, separately, for low-income students in that cohort.

(8) The two-year and three-year transfer graduation rates for students who entered the university three years prior and, separately, for low-income students in that cohort.

(9) The two-year, three-year, and four-year transfer graduation rates for students who entered the university four years prior and, separately, for low-income students in that cohort.

(10) The number of degree completions annually, in total and for the following categories: (A) Freshman entrants. (B) California Community College transfer students. (C) Graduate students. (D) Low-income students.

(11) The percentage of freshman entrants who have earned sufficient course credits by the end of their first year of enrollment to indicate that they will graduate within four years.

(12) The percentage of California Community College transfer students who have earned sufficient course credits by the end of their first year of enrollment to indicate that they will graduate within two years.

(13) For all students, the total amount of funds received from all sources identified in subdivision (c) of Section 89290 for the year, divided by the number of degrees awarded that same year.

(14) For undergraduate students, the total amount of funds received from all sources identified in subdivision (c) of Section 89290 for the year expended for undergraduate education, divided by the number of undergraduate degrees awarded that same year.

(15) The average number of California State University course credits and the total course credits, including credits accrued at other institutions, accumulated by all undergraduate students who graduated, and separately for freshman entrants and California Community College transfer students.

CSUF receives the lowest per-student allocations in the CSU and resolved that as a first step in the phased transitional implementation plan mentioned in the Chancellor's charge to the task force that "… the Task Force … include as a core value and operating principle for its deliberations [the resolution of] existing inequities in how state funds are invested on a per-FTE basis across the CSU…."[8]

The Road Ahead

While no firm long-term metrics for OBF budget allocations to California institutions of higher education have been set, the state has signaled some near-term expectations in the guidelines that accompany the RFP for Awards for Innovation in Higher Education. This award, the state's first competitive OBF-like opportunity, will reward higher education institutions based on the degree to which each has achieved one or more of three priorities: 1) significantly increased the number of bachelor's degrees awarded; 2) allowed students to complete bachelor's degrees within four years after beginning higher education; and 3) eased transfer through the state's education system by better recognizing learning that occurs across the state's education segments and elsewhere.[9] Although these priorities and the list of metrics are related, the lack of direct overlap suggests that institutions will be allowed and encouraged to develop their own strategies for producing the desired outcomes.

California's journey to OBF is embryonic. We do not yet know how the state, system, and institutional policymakers will design future OBF opportunities, especially when it comes to linking outcome metrics with funding levels. Yet a case can be made that the move to OBF represents an opportunity more than a challenge for CSUF.

First, California's steady move to OBF and the corresponding financial incentives provided by the CSU, have coincided with CSUF's increased investment in student success and program quality via its five-year strategic plan.[10] Indeed, the goals that we have set not only align well with those set by the state, but are in some instances more aggressive.

Second, as one of the largest, most diverse comprehensive universities in the United States serving over 38,000 students (about 50% freshman and 50% transfer students) and awarding more than 10,000 degrees every year (more than half are first among their family to earn a degree), CSUF ranks first in California and sixth in the nation in awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanics thereby fulfilling an important part of the CSU mission to provide access to underserved minorities.

Third, CSUF has the potential to gain from OBF because under the existing enrollment-based funding model it ranks at the bottom among the 23 campuses in per-full-time equivalent students (FTES) funding allocations. As this fiscal condition is unlikely to change if student enrollment remains as the campus's sole source of state revenues, a well-positioned, high-performing CSUF stands to gain budget share in an OBF scenario.

Next Steps.

To take advantage of these opportunities we need to find ways to align our investments of money, time, talent, and energy with our goals.

One area that requires attention is the way that internal funding is allocated in our campus. Currently, most funding decisions are made solely on the basis of FTES reflecting the state model. But to succeed under OBF, we should be one step ahead of the conversation and work toward a phased approach that gradually reduces reliance on funding by FTES and incentivizes a focus on student success.

An academic affairs task force has been created and charged with developing a framework for a division-wide conversation on OBF and with sketching out a three-year approach for adopting an OBF budget allocation model for units within the division. The task force will consult with the Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee, Council of Deans, and the Academic Senate as the work moves forward. The task force's recommendations will be shared with the CSUF community at large in spring 2015.

Conclusion.

Admittedly, there is a lot of work to be done to connect where we are today with where we want to be in a few years. The Strategic Plan provides the foundation for change, and the commitment of our faculty, staff and students guarantee our success.

Endnotes.

1 California 2014-15 Higher Education Budget, http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2014-15/pdf/BudgetSummary/HigherEducation.pdf.

2 California Education Code, Section 89295. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=89001-90000&file=89295

3 CSU Academic Sustainability Plan as required by the Budget Act of 2014. Approved by the Board of Trustees November 13, 2014. REP/FIN 11-14-01. http://www.calstate.edu/budget/fybudget/legislative-reports/1415-CSU-Academic-Sustainability-Plan.pdf

4 Ibid, p. 8 and 9.

5 Ibid, p. 7 with details on pp. 11-22.

6 Response to AB 94: Goal Setting for Academic Performance Measures for Academic Sustainability Plan. AS-3194-14/AA/FGA. http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/documents/3194.pdf

7 ASCSU Chair's Report, Steven Filling, November 5, 2014, p. 3. http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/documents/November-2014-Chairs-Rept.pdf

8 ASD 14-167. A Resolution Concerning Systemwide Funding Formulas https://www.dropbox.com/sh/xox2ctgm4hlu1y5/AADiGlgOsRVPqDNXoSY3f-sI7a/11-20-14%20AS?dl=0

9 Awards for Innovation in Higher Education. http://www.dof.ca.gov/innovation-awards/

10 California State University, Fullerton Strategic Plan 2013-2018, http://planning.fullerton.edu/planning/_resources/pdf/CSUF-Strategic-Plan.pdf and http://www.fullerton.edu/analyticalstudies/student/graduationrates/freshman.asp

Campus Climate Survey

By Lori Gentles

VICE PRESIDENT
Human Resources, Diversity & Inclusion

The outstanding work of Cal State Fullerton's faculty and staff is responsible for our University's ability to advance its mission and progress toward its strategic goals. Through the University's Strategic Plan, we've made it clear that student success lies at the heart of everything we do — from keeping our grounds manicured to recruiting and retaining exceptional faculty and staff and everything in between. We have committed to ambitious goals and we are well on our way to achieving them.

Goal 3 of our strategic plan states that Cal State Fullerton aims to become a model of faculty and staff inclusivity, diversity and engagement in order to better serve our diverse student population. To achieve this goal, our strategic plan identifies a series of objectives and strategies that need to be operationalized. The first objective calls us to "assess the campus climate and utilize results to identify and implement retention and engagement strategies." Simply stated, a "campus climate survey" is a way to take the temperature, if you will, of how closely our values are aligned with how we treat and work with one another.

It's been now a little over a year since President García established a Diversity Action Plan Taskforce (DAPT) and charged it with examining the attitudes, behaviors and practices of employees at Cal State Fullerton via a campus climate survey. I had the privilege of chairing the DAPT and working with its distinguished members: José Cruz, Provost; Harry Norman, Dean, College of Extended Education;

Emily Bonney, Associate Professor, Liberal Studies; Dave Bowman, Interim Dean, College of Natural Science and Mathematics; Melba Castro, Director of Educational Partnerships; Phenicia McCullough, Associate Director, Talent Acquisition; Joe Ferrer, Sr. Director, Support Services; Carlos Navarro, Student; Davida Hopkins-Parham, Director of Special Projects; Ed Sullivan, Associate VP Institutional Research and Analytical Studies and Valerie Orleans, Editorial Director.

The DAPT carried out its responsibilities over a period of eight months. The taskforce dedicated a significant portion of its meeting time to conferring and working with Sue Rankin, of Rankin & Associates Consulting, to generate the campus climate survey instrument. These discussions included extended conversations about the types of questions that would be appropriate for our campus population. Focus groups from all campus constituencies participated in sessions that helped to shape the proposed framework for the survey.

The DAPT also developed a comprehensive communications plan to encourage participation in the survey by the entire campus community. Comprising 76 questions, the climate survey sought to find out how staff and faculty are thinking about the campus climate and what they're actually experiencing in their departments and on the campus. The survey was launched on March 12, 2014 and remained open until April 17,

2014. The DAPT's communications effort was hugely effective, as 37 percent of the campus responded, submitting 1,574 surveys.

This fall, the consultant completed the analysis of the data and provided the final report which was shared with the campus community on October 23rd. The results tell our story – what our faculty and staff are thinking and experiencing on campus. Readers who haven't yet had the opportunity to do so are strongly encouraged to review the survey results posted at http://campusclimatesurvey.fullerton.edu/ to learn what respondents expressed about our campus climate. The findings are revealing, addressing respondents' levels of comfort with the atmosphere in which they work, specifically their perceptions of exclusionary conduct, employment practices and accessibility and their experiences, if any, of sexual harassment.

While the data supports the notion that CSUF is a fairly healthy workplace, there are aspects of our campus climate that need improvement. The good news is that 71 percent of respondents report being comfortable or very comfortable with the climate at CSUF, while 70 percent report being comfortable or very comfortable with their departments/work units. Most impressive is that 86 percent of the faculty respondents report being comfortable or very comfortable with the climate in their classes. These findings confirm that most community members are pleased with the climate. But they also signal that almost a third of our

fellow staff and faculty are not having a similar experience.

In relation to work-life issues, 73 percent of staff respondents report that they feel valued for the work that they do. Other, more probing questions solicited the levels of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct that respondents experience. 27 percent of the respondents reported such conduct, exposing clear distinctions based upon identity. The following impressions are instructive:

> a higher percentage of women attributed this conduct to their gender identity than men

> a higher percentage of respondents of color reported experiencing this conduct based upon their racial identity than did 'non-people of color' respondents

> a higher percentage of LGBQ respondents reported experiencing this conduct based upon their sexual identity than did heterosexual respondents

Although CSUF's climate survey results are similar to those from other universities of its size and kind, the above findings indicate that there is work to be done. Just because we are not the only university where faculty or staff feel discomfort does not mean we have to settle for those circumstances.

To this end, President García has established a Climate Survey Evaluation Team that will review the data and begin to shape the university's diversity action plan. The committee includes the following members of our campus community: Todd Frandsen, Director, Annual Campaigns; Emeka Emeruwa, Info Tech Consultant; Joy Hoffman, Director, Diversity Initiatives & Resource Center; Alexandro Gradilla, Associate Professor and Dept. Chair Chicana/o Studies; Janice Myck-Wayne, Associate Professor, Special Education; Matthew Jarvis, Associate Professor, Politics, Administration & Justice; Mary Ann Villarreal, Director, Strategic Initiatives / University Projects; Robert (Bob) Koch, Special Assistant to the Provost; Jessie Jones, Interim Dean, HHD; Laura Gil-Trejo, Director, Social Science Research Center; Jeffrey Cook, Associate VP, University Advancement - Strategic Communications; Shari McMahan, Deputy Provost; James Hershey, Senior Research Associate; Perrin Reid, Associate VP, HRDI, and Ramon Knox, Chief of Operations, HRDI.

The climate survey results provide the context within which the newly constituted Climate Survey Evaluation Team begins its work. The members look forward to developing a diversity action plan tailored to the specific interests and needs of our community. That's the key – to produce a plan that resonates with all of us.

As of this writing, the Climate Survey Evaluation Team has had its fourth two hour meeting and, at this juncture, anticipates a weekly meeting schedule through the spring. The team is currently devising a framework for the diversity action plan. Once the team has defined the primary themes, it will determine the components and strategies by which a diverse and inclusive community can be strengthened and sustained. The community should keep an eye on the team's progress through the spring semester. It will be fascinating to see what emerges.

Creating and sustaining a welcoming, diverse and inclusive community require strategic, intentional and ongoing effort. As we strive to become a model comprehensive university, our academic excellence must be joined by other important elements. Among them is a true collaborative community that values each of its members and seeks to facilitate our collective success.

The Success of High Impact Practices in Human Services Advising

By Lorraine Klein Thornburg, M.S., L.P.C.C.

ADVISOR & LECTURER, Department of Human Services

As California State University, Fullerton continues to implement and strengthen high impact practices, there is one that I believe is a cornerstone to ensuring retention, student success, and graduation: academic advising.

Several years ago I began creating an advising program for the Human Services Department that included the following components:

Presentation of the Human Services program is made in each of the HUSR 380 classes, including the major & fieldwork requirements, GE requirements, number of units needed to graduate, GPA requirements, how to read the TDA, minor information, scholarship information, etc.

Next, Holistic — one-on-one advising that includes building rapport with the students. Gaining an understanding of the various components of his or her life, such as family responsibilities/stressors, workload, extracurricular activities, future academic plans including career, grad school or credential aspirations is key to building a plan that ensures student success. This, coupled with accurate advising, is the strongest component contributing to the success of our advising program. A review of each student's TDA and general education is integrated into his or her plan, as well as the current number of units needed to complete the degree.

Finally, an academic plan, a Personalized Human Services Study Plan, is created that takes the above components into consideration. The plan covers the remainder of their time at CSUF. On one sheet they are able to see what they need to take each semester including major, minor, GE, elective and any pre-requisites for credential or master degree programs.

Our comprehensive advising plan also includes Live Grad Checks, done once students have registered for their final semester, to be certain any classes or units they need for successful completion of their degree are in progress. Live Grad Checks make sure that students have the opportunity to add anything they may be missing by the first two weeks of their final semester of school.

I have one part-time graduate student, Ramona Perez, a first-generation, Spanish-speaking advisor, who is trained in our philosophy of advising: being sensitive to students' personal as well as academic needs.

During registration I also monitor each section of classes that we've identified as potential bottleneck courses, capping each one at a number that gives me the flexibility to permit each student into any Human Services class they need, and thus ensure that they will graduate on time, while monitoring enrollment numbers to be sure we meet, but do not exceed, our target FTES each semester.

That said, it is important to know where Human Services stands in terms of statistics. Based on the Department of Institutional Research & Analytical Studies, the statistics are as follows:

2006 COHORT

$68^{\%}$ of Human Services transfer students graduated in 4 years

2010 COHORT

$82^{\%}$ of Human Services transfer students graduated in 4 years

122	**female students**	**$82^{\%}$**
21	male students	$81^{\%}$
85	**underrepresented students**	**$86^{\%}$**
42	non-underrepresented students	$71^{\%}$
104	**first-generation college students**	**$84^{\%}$**
28	students with college-grad parents	$71^{\%}$

The total enrollment of Human Services major in Fall 2010 consisted of 51% Hispanic students. That number has risen to nearly 62% this Fall. The Human Services majors rank 2nd in number of Hispanic students out of all majors on campus. Overall, Human Services ranks 5th in the number of all minority students on campus.

It may be a little early to conclude that Human Services doesn't need to worry about an achievement gap but currently, according to Department of Institutional Research & Analytical Studies, "the gap looks to be closed and even reversed in Human Services."

We have done this by utilizing the high impact practices of relational advising, in addition to being comprehensive and accurate, ensuring retention, student success, and high graduation rates in a major that has a majority of underrepresented students.

An interview with
J o s é L . C r u z

By Emily Bonney

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, Liberal Studies

Good morning Provost Cruz. I don't have prepared questions because we had agreed this would be an informal conversation so we'll just work our way through the list of topics we have agreed on. So first is the Academic Master Plan. What is that and why are we doing this?

An Academic Master Plan is a document that informs decisions related to an institution's ability to advance its mission within a particular strategic context. An AMP allows a University to reflect on the questions of what, who, when, where, how, and how many as it relates to academic programs, research, students and faculty. For example, it concerns what we teach, who we teach, how many students we teach and where and how we do it – online, hybrid, in the classroom. It's also about who teaches and what the balance should be between tenured and tenure track faculty and adjuncts. Given the backdrop of changes in the way that California funds higher education, the Planning, Resource and Budget Committee recommended that the University develop an AMP. During her fall convocation speech, President García announced that the development of an AMP was indeed a high priority and asked that I work with the members of PAB to develop a framework for the corresponding campus-wide conversation with the expectation that we would complete the plan within two years.

So where are we in this process?

To get the process started, Peter Nwosu, AVP of Academic Programs, developed a draft "framework for developing an academic master plan." The Council of Deans, with input from Sean Walker, Chair of the Academic Senate, and Harpreet Bath, President of ASI, has made several revisions to the draft. The document articulates what an AMP is, what it isn't, how it will help us with the enrollment challenges we

face, and describes how the work of developing the AMP will be organized. At this time, we envision the work to be structured similar to the way we structured the development of the WASC Interim Report – a steering committee with various subcommittees with broad representation from campus constituencies and deliberative and governing bodies. We expect to share the revised framework with the broader campus community for comments by the end of the fall semester.

If you were going to point people for examples of Academic Master Plans where would they look?

Two that come to mind and that have been examined by the COD are those of CSU East Bay and Tennessee State University, but our discussions so far suggest our final plan won't look like those. The structure, format and content of an AMP must correspond to the way an institution plans on using the document to guide its work. In our case, we want the document to inform the decisions we need to make regarding the way we manage our enrollments in an era when the state is signaling that it will not encourage or fund enrollment growth. Indeed, given this scenario, in addition to the AMP, President García has asked that I work with Danny Kim, Vice President of Administration and Finance, to develop some zero-enrollment growth scenarios, and that I work with Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Vice President of Student Affairs, to explore the development of an enrollment management function for our campus. Both of these conversations will be extended to the rest of the campus community via the PRBC and other venues.

It sounds as though there are a lot of moving parts.

Higher education institutions have always embraced change, but the

change we are expected to enact right now is different because, in an effort to drive us to accelerate their efforts, states across the nation have enacted major shifts in the way they fund their public universities. This is true here in California where the state has asked the three segments of higher education to produce "academic sustainability plans" that describe how the universities will improve certain performance metrics in exchange for the funding they will receive from the state.

It seems there's a contradiction between the missions of providing access and developing a sustainable model that limits enrollments.

The "access" element of our mission is important to us and continues to be important for the State. But through AB94, the State has signaled that it is equally, if not more, interested in the success rates of the students we extend access to, the time it takes them to complete a degree, and the affordability of their experience. Indeed, the governor has been more willing to invest in programs and initiatives that promise higher success rates than to invest in additional enrollments. Hence, because we value access, we must think long and hard about how we manage our enrollments. For example, do we encourage our students to take a higher number of units each semester? Do we grow resident enrollments through prudent management of our non-resident students? These are but a few of the questions we need to address.

You said there also were ongoing conversations regarding the contingent faculty.

Yes, while this topic will be covered as part of the Academic Master Plan conversation, per the recommendation of the PRBC, I have engaged the Council of Deans and the Division of Human Resources, Diversity and Inclusion on some preliminary discussions regarding how we could improve the professional experience of our part-time lecturers. At this time we are still in the "discovery phase," exploring best practices across our colleges and across the nation. It is important to note that our lecturers teach more than 50% of our FTEs and deserve all the support we can provide them to succeed in the classroom and in their careers.

That sounds as though it involves the FDC.

The FDC is an important professional development vehicle for all faculty — particularly as we look to expanding High Impact Practices on campus and strengthening the quality of our online offerings. Recognizing this, we are considering bringing back the TLAC program; exploring ways to strengthen the center's linkages to other campus service providers like FAR, OASIS, ATC, and RCATT (including co-location for one-stop shopping for some of these); and perhaps delivering more training online. There is a lot to be gained through better programs, coordination, and delivery. Given the challenges ahead, we need to set a good foundation.

Seems like there is a lot on the line.

During the recession years institutions across the nation managed their budgets by increasing tuition, reducing the proportion of tenure-track faculty, increasing class sizes and deferring the maintenance of their

buildings. Now, as we are asked to develop "sustainable" models, the consequences of those decisions are in front of us. We have scale on our side, and there are ways in which we can organize the work so it has a broader impact. We need to invest our resources in strategic places to advance our mission well.

Irvine fits in here somewhere too doesn't it?

Yes. Over the summer we had a re-envisioning Irvine committee that reviewed the results of focus groups led during the spring by a team of external consultants and the recommendations made by various campus committees that at one point or another had explored how to best leverage our branch campus. Because we have had such a long-standing conversation about the branch campus, I asked the committee to look at everything that had been said and done and, given our current and prospective strategic context, present some recommendations for moving the campus forward. And I asked them to do all of this in 45 days or less. Their recommendations now have been shared with the campus community for feedback before the end of the fall semester. In short, the committee has recommended a five-year plan that will increase the number of complete degrees that are offered at the branch campus in concert with local community college partners. For example, when all is said and done, students could be dually admitted to an academic program at Irvine Valley College and at the CSUF Irvine campus. Meanwhile we need to be more strategic about the courses we offer in South County.

So what is the vision for the campus?

We will focus on upper division courses and try to provide complete programs with a preference for programs that leverage the location and the needs of the south county and that also make a smooth transition from the community colleges to those programs.

Maybe we should finish with a few words about the library?

In addition to the temporary changes that have been enacted in response to earthquake damage and the recently unveiled book de-selection process, we have engaged — with the help of the chancellor's office — a specialized architectural firm to help us visualize our own Library of the Future. Based on the information gathered through several focus groups with campus constituencies, the architects are developing recommendations on how the library space could be programmed to better serve our students, faculty and staff. The recommendations will be shared with the campus community for feedback during the spring 2015 semester. It is important to note that in addition to the funding we expect to receive to address earthquake damage, there is the possibility that the University will be able to take advantage of the recent capital financing authority that the State granted to the CSU.

Thanks for taking the time to have this conversation.

Thank you for the opportunity to update the campus community through the Senate Forum. We are making progress in many areas and this is in large part due to our faculty's level of engagement. The State may expect more from us, but not as much as we expect of ourselves.