CSCU Transform 2020 Initiatives   CSU Faculty Leadership Group
DRAFT 12/17/14

	Initiative Name	Category
1.01	Establish/grow early college programs at CC's	1
1.02	Cross campus registration and admissions	5
1.03	Go Back to Get Ahead	4
1.04	Veterans recruitment	*then 4
1.05	Recruit non-resident students	*then 2
1.06	Improve opportunities for study abroad	*then 2
1.07	Graduate student recruitment	*then 2
1.08	Academic advising	2
1.09	First year student experience	2
1.10	Academic Program Optimization	6
1.11	K-12 alignment PA 12-40	5
1.12	Academic Centers of Excellence	2
1.13	Strengthen liberal arts core	7
1.14	Faculty skill and development	2
1.15	Research for graduate students	2
1.16	Seamless system wide transfer	5
1.17	Philanthropic campaign to transfer from CC to CSU	7
1.18	Build state of the art classrooms	7
1.19	Blended learning and online course delivery	7
1.20	Study skills for online/distant learning	7
1.21	Evening and after hours support	* then 2
1.22	Invest in co-curricular student experience & res. life	* then 2
1.23	Enhanced career services	2
2.01	Labor needs & workforce programs	**7**
2.02	Career-related programs (e.g., P-Tech)	**1**
2.03	Collaboration with business community	* then 2
2.04	Career pathway alignment – CT Tech.	1
3.01	System-wide policy transparency	7
3.02	Shared metrics	7
4.00	Revenue Management	7
5.01	Organizational effectiveness & efficiency	2
6.01	IT systems assessment	7
6.02	IT organizational structure	7
7.01	Facilities master plan	3
7.02	Code compliance/infrastructure improvement	3

Categories:

1. **Does not belong to CSU**: Does not involve, or is not appropriate for, CSU institutions; may be appropriate for Community Colleges
2. **Belongs to individual campuses of CSU**: Actions/outcomes should be chosen and implemented by shared governance on individual CSU campuses based on local culture, needs, and circumstances. System Office supports with funding when necessary.
3. **Belongs to CSU System**: Should be coordinated on behalf of four CSU institutions by CSUS standing or ad hoc committees.
4. **Belongs to the BOR**: Should be coordinated by BOR/System Office on behalf of 17 constituent institutions; does not exclude individual institutions from continuing/initiating campus-based activities in same area.
5. **Belongs to Faculty Governance on the individual campuses of CSU**: Any involvement of CSU institutions should be determined and designed by faculty from those institutions and approved by established faculty governance processes. Any inter-campus cooperation should be coordinated by faculty members from those campuses chosen by faculty governance.
6. **Rejected**: Not appropriate, necessary, or useful for CSCU institutions.
7. **Cannot support in current form**: Too vague, inappropriate, counterproductive or otherwise problematic for CSU faculty to support as written; requires significant rethinking with direct input from CSU faculty leadership on behalf of faculty at large.

* Several initiatives call for research into current practice and best practice at CSCU institutions and elsewhere as the basis for new policies or actions. An asterisk marking such initiatives indicates that CSU faculty approve conducting that research; faculty support of any subsequent policies or actions requires that the results of that research be evaluated by CSU faculty. Category numbers following asterisks indicate that once the research is done, the determination of any actions or policies is to be the province of the institution or group designated by that number.

Notes on initiatives in categories 6 and 7

1.10 Academic Program Optimization: CSU faculty believe this initiative is contrary to principles of academic self-governance as well as to the missions of all the CSCU institutions to provide educational access to their communities. In addition, the CSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement has in place a mechanism for determining the necessity and viability of academic programs; no other such mechanisms or procedures have any place at the CSUs.

1.13 Strengthen Liberal Arts Core: As written, this initiative proposes not the strengthening but the assessing and standardizing of the liberal arts core on our campuses. Assessment of the liberal arts core should be—and already is—the province of the faculty-governed Transfer and Articulation Program (TAP), and standardization of liberal arts education is entirely inappropriate. Faculty believe that the best way to strengthen the liberal arts core at CSCU institutions is to hire more full-time, tenure-track faculty to teach core liberal arts courses and disciplines, demonstrating CSCU's commitment to the liberal arts core and differentiating us from other institutions that rely heavily on adjunct faculty to teach these courses. CSU faculty propose that this initiative be reframed as a request for funds to hire more faculty in the liberal arts, and thus to directly support academic excellence.

1.17 Philanthropic Campaign to Transfer from CC to CSU: As written, this initiative disincentivizes and penalizes students who wish to earn their entire degree at one of the CSU schools. Financially differentiating CSU's rising juniors from CC transfer students will demoralize the former and will negatively impact freshman and sophomore enrollment at the CSU institutions. The impact of this initiative must be much more carefully explored before CSU faculty can support it, or any version of Transform of which it is a part.

1.18, 1.19, 1.20: Online Learning Initiatives: Despite repeated concerns about student learning and requests for consultation expressed by CSU faculty, these three inextricably connected initiatives continue to proceed without

alteration, consultation, or abatement while our concerns are papered over with verbal assurances that are contradicted by the content and direction of the initiatives as written. The issues surrounding online education go to the heart of our concerns about Transform and must be substantively addressed before CSU faculty can support the initiatives or any version of Transform that includes them.

2.01 Labor Needs and Workforce Programs: The aims of this initiative require discussion and clarification, especially regarding their relationship to CSU's core mission to provide all our students with a broad liberal arts-based education.

3.01 System-wide Policy Transparency: CSU faculty are always in favor of transparency, but the aims, scope, and content of this initiative are, in its current form, too vague and unclear for faculty to support it.

3.02 Shared Metrics: A number of the metrics included in this initiative in its current form are problematic, and despite assurances, faculty have been allowed no substantive input through established faculty governance procedures. Moreover, the use or function of the metrics, particularly with regard to funding, is troublingly unclear. Faculty cannot support this initiative until these concerns are heard and addressed through the appropriate channels.

4.00 Revenue Management: In the initiative as written, two issues are not clear: (1) the role of the individual campuses, including faculty input, and (2) the rationale for combining the biennium budget and the Office of Sponsored Programs.

6.01 and 6.02: IT Initiatives: The extensive list of projects in these initiatives was created without input from faculty, who best understand our students' needs, and has been proceeding towards implementation without faculty being informed, much less consulted. To proceed further without consulting faculty—the projects' end users and/or those who know its end users (our students) best—is ill advised. Moreover, the projects represent a substantial financial investment, which may conflict with other more pressing or important financial needs.

Finally, a common thread in many concerns above is the lack of appropriate and substantive communication and consultation with faculty. In addition to working with representative faculty leadership as called for above to determine if and how these initiatives can be salvaged and put on proper footing to go forward, the faculty recommend that this unfortunate situation be prevented from recurring by placing at least one CSU faculty member *chosen by the CSU faculty* on every initiative group so that CSU faculty can be kept informed and have direct input. If the CCs wish to have the same representation, they should be allowed to have it. In some cases, more than one faculty member may be appropriate, and in other cases as noted above, entire initiatives should be turned over to the faculty.