Capacity for Sustaining Core Resources and Functions: Standard Three

Cal State Hayward sustains and supports its mission to provide an academically-rich, multicultural learning experience through its commitment to faculty, students, and staff. This chapter reflects on the university’s capacity to sustain this inclusive, learning-centered environment during difficult budget times as it discusses CSUH’s core resources: faculty, staff, information resources in the form of its library and instructional technology, and fiscal and physical resources.

Faculty (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

The Faculty COT, in response to standard three, inquired into three questions. To what extent: 1) does the current ratio of tenured/tenure-track faculty to lecturers affect student learning? 2) does the current diversity of our tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturers affect student learning? And 3) do the current systems for tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers’ workload, expectations, evaluation, and reward affect student learning? The Faculty COT used Chickering and Gamson’s Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education to envision the characteristics for a faculty learning community and to frame their responses to the three questions. These seven principles propose that student learning takes place in an environment that encourages student-faculty contact; encourages cooperation among students; encourages active learning; gives prompt feedback; emphasizes time on task; communicates high expectations; and respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

One goal for our university-wide WASC process is that “There is an ongoing dialogue about the quality of and community for learning among faculty, students, and staff.” The Faculty COT’s conversations revealed how much faculty want and need dialogues about teaching and learning within their own departments and across disciplines on campus. This recognition led to the following definition of a faculty learning community:

“A faculty learning community respects, encourages, and rewards the diverse intellectual talents of our faculty; provides regular opportunities for active learning among faculty; focuses on how faculty expertise can enhance student and faculty learning; supports pedagogical, scholarly, and creative collaboration among faculty; invites faculty to visit and contribute to one another’s classrooms; respects faculty diversity; and rewards diverse scholarship and creative activity that improve our understanding of teaching and learning.”

The ideas embodied in the Seven Principles and in the faculty learning community will be more widely discussed in the university and through faculty governance during the Educational Effectiveness phase.

Tenure/Tenure Track vs. Part-Time Faculty (CFR 3.2)

Adequate faculty resources are central to the educational mission of the university. Faculty staffing at CSUH, which is tied to state support and student enrollment, is declining due to several years of state budget cuts. Some programs (especially those in high demand) have
difficulty offering enough sections to serve the students. Over the past five years, the number of full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF), both tenure track and lecturers, declined from 522.6 in Fall 1999 to 509.7 in Fall 2003 (-2%). Tenure/tenure track faculty FTEF declined from 346.1 in Fall 1999 to 329.3 in Fall 2003 (-5%). Lecturer FTEF increased slightly from 176.5 in Fall 1999 to 180.4 in Fall 2003 (+2%). During this same period, the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) increased by 7%, which means that our student-faculty ratio (SFR) has been increasing.

In Fall 1997, the ratio of FTEF was 69% tenure track to 31% part-time lecturers. By Fall 2003, the university-wide ratio had declined to 65% tenure track to 35% part-time, which puts CSUH about in the middle of CSU institutions. In Fall 2001, the CSU System average was 64% tenure track to 36% part-time faculty. The growth in part-time lecturers is a serious concern. Tenured/tenure track faculty are considered better able to implement the seven principles than lecturers who are compensated only for classroom teaching and office hours. Further, lecturers are not expected to serve on department, college, or university committees, or to assist with meeting the ever-increasing demands for assessment and accountability. As a result, the Faculty COT concluded that tenure and tenure-track faculty might be overburdened with insufficient time and energy to carry out the many tasks they would like to perform to enhance student learning and campus climate.

The full-time to part-time issue has gained much attention in the state. In September 2001, the Legislature adopted a resolution (ACR 73), which urged the Board of Trustees to raise the percentage of tenure-track faculty to at least 75%. In July 2002, the CSU Chancellor’s Office developed a plan to achieve this goal. However, the Legislature has not appropriated funds for the plan.

Declining state support, and lack of additional funds to support the goals of ACR 73 have created a difficult situation for the university. CSUH is trying to achieve its goal of increasing enrollment to take advantage of enrollment growth dollars. The interim provost recognizes the need to rebuild the permanent faculty. As a result, the president recently authorized 30 tenure track searches for 2004/05, with the understanding that the current student faculty ratio (SFR) would not be reduced in the immediate future.

Diversity of Faculty (CFR 3.2)
The seventh of the Seven Principles states that good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning. This places the responsibility on faculty to be multi-culturally competent. Recent research further documents the benefits of a diverse faculty in particular to student learning.1 The thirty (30) new faculty recruitments will provide the university with an opportunity to impact the diversity of its faculty.

Recruitment, Workload, Expectations, Evaluation, and Reward (CFR 3.3)
Recruitment: From Fall 2001, through Fall 2003, the recruiting success rate for CSUH was 72.2%, which was slightly higher than the CSU System rate of 70.2%. [Faculty Recruitment Data] Primarily a teaching institution, CSUH uses recruitment, incentive, and evaluation processes to focus on instructional competency. Most candidates invited for an on-campus interview for faculty positions are required to give a lecture (often in front of a
class) as part of their interview process. The Faculty COT, comprised of members with extensive experience on search committees and newer faculty who were recently applicants, noted that search committees have little or no guidance about how to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of applicants. The committees look closely at candidate materials that document their teaching ability, usually syllabi, assignments, and teaching evaluations. Workshops held by the Provost’s Office for Departmental Search Committees (CFR 3.3.) emphasize the recruitment of a diverse pool. The Faculty, Student Services, Instructional Technology, and Campus Climate COTs all recommend that criteria for hiring include evidence of the seven principles.

Promotion, Tenure, and Retention: The issue of retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty is the locus of much faculty anxiety. Although CSUH tenures over 90% of its probationary faculty, the felt anxieties reflect two converging sources of faculty stress: alignment of the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure with CSUH priorities, and the heavy teaching requirements in the CSU system. A number of COTs (Mission, Faculty, GE, Student Services, Campus Climate, and Community Connections) devoted significant discussion to the CSUH Promotion, Tenure, and Retention (PTR) document. Two all-COT meetings focused on which criteria are given primacy, what counts as evidence for performance, and what activities are secondary for PTR though required of faculty.

As background, the CSUH Academic Senate’s promotion, tenure, and retention document describes the criteria for evaluation of full-time faculty [PTR Document]. The PTR document puts the highest emphasis on teaching effectiveness and presents a wide variety of ways to document scholarly activity, the second criterion. University service and community involvement are the other two criteria for faculty evaluation. PTR committees examine peer reviews and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction. CSUH has recruitment criteria and evaluation processes for part-time faculty. [Recruitment Processes: Part-time Faculty] All full-time faculty must have students evaluate at least two courses per year.

A typical CSU workload consists of 12 weighted teaching units (WTUs) or 3 courses per quarter. Faculty salaries are based on 15 WTUs per quarter leaving three WTUs for scholarly and creative activities, committee assignments, and community involvement. Faculty concern that their heavy teaching load limits their ability to conduct research, to interact with students, or to serve their communities is widespread across the CSU. A 2001 system-wide survey on workload found that faculty reported working an average of 50 hours per week while expressing a desire for fewer administrative and teaching responsibilities and more time for scholarly and creative activities. Thirty-nine percent of CSUH’s 50 respondents reported they had received some assigned time (release from teaching) for scholarly or administrative work. This strategy to balance teaching with scholarship, advising, and service, however, has declined in use due to the budget crisis and a desire to put more tenure-track faculty in the classroom.

The all-COT discussions about promotion, tenure, and retention produced no significant disagreement with the criteria listed in the PTR document. However, discussants argued passionately for explicit ways to honor the work required of faculty but perhaps minimally
rewarded in the PTR process, for example, student advising and community service. They expressed distress that review committees look to student evaluations as the primary indicator of effective teaching and a desire that they balance student evaluations with evidence of sound pedagogy, e.g., strong syllabi and assignments, and high and fair standards for achievement, peer evaluations. The participants called for the document to align more effectively with CSUH’s new mission, vision, and values and developed five major recommendations for revisions in the PTR document: 1) reward faculty engagement with the Seven Principles; 2) recognize faculty for integrating technology and online instruction; 3) count community service as service to the university; 4) reward faculty who teach in freshman learning communities and other general education courses; and 5) discuss the value the scholarship of teaching as both research and creative activity. Some faculty, who reviewed a draft of this report, saw no need for such an examination. However, the recommendation remains that CSUH open a research inquiry into the PTR process in collaboration with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) of the Academic Senate. Any subsequent recommendations will go before faculty governance.

Support For Faculty Development (CFR 2.8, 2.9, 3.4)
The Office of Faculty Development and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching (FCET) is a central location for organizing and coordinating faculty activities related to improved teaching methodology, and for university-wide discussion of student learning. FCET services are directed toward creating a faculty learning community where regular opportunities for active learning are provided to faculty, methods for enhancing student learning are discussed and analyzed by diverse groups of faculty, new and untenured faculty are provided with effective mentoring, and the scholarship of learning is supported.

FCET maintains a weekly workshop program for faculty during the academic year, featuring both technological and pedagogical learning opportunities. Programs emphasize increasing student engagement, assessing student outcomes, using classroom technology, and designing interdisciplinary courses. [FCET Schedule]

The FCET has taken the lead in attempts to organize an effective faculty learning community. In response to faculty feedback, Center personnel consistently update their offerings and develop new programs to meet changing faculty needs. In addition, each college has its own methods for renewing teaching and scholarship. These efforts to improve teaching effectiveness are welcome and reasonably effective, and we want to maximize their full potential. While the offerings are attractive, attendance is less than desired. The Faculty COT reported that faculty attribute lack of attendance to increased workload and decreased numbers of tenure-track faculty.

The Office of Faculty Research and Sponsored Programs supports faculty to find research opportunities and to develop and submit research proposals. CSUH received $9.1 million in 2002/03 in external funds for research, up from $8.3 million received in 1998/99. Over the past five years, 484 faculty research proposals have been submitted to external sources and 379 (78.3%) have been funded. Faculty research and creative activity at CSUH is also supported through Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) grants and college initiatives. CSUH received $78,502 from the CSU Chancellor’s Office in 2004/05 to
support research, scholarship, and creative activity. Despite the budget crisis, this allocation was not cut from the 2003/04 figure. Colleges also support research, scholarship, and creative activity through assigned time and other means, which releases faculty from teaching responsibilities.

**Staff (CFR 3.1, 3.3)**

Staff play a critical role in the attainment of the university’s mission. Many of the issues for faculty, such as adequacy of numbers, policies, and development, are also applicable to staff. The beginning of the 2004/05 academic year was difficult for staff due to the state budget cut. Thirteen (13) staff employees were laid off. While this number was down from the 63 originally proposed, many staff were reassigned or chose to leave under the threat of layoffs. However, before the staff layoffs, the number of FTE staff actually grew from 762.3 in Fall 1999 to 783.6 in Fall 2003. Executive/Managerial staff declined from 54.2 in Fall 1999 to 51.7 in Fall 2003. The biggest growth in staff was in the Professional category, which grew from 246.8 in Fall 1999 to 295.3 in Fall 2003.

Although the combination of layoffs, reduction in temporary positions, reassignments, retirements, and resignations have resulted in service reductions across the university, every effort has been made to lessen the impact on students and on instruction. One example is the Learning Commons, a joint Library-Media and Technology Services effort that will open in the library building in Winter 2005 to give students access to an initial seventy-five (75) computer workstations and service from both library and instructional technology staff. Regardless, faculty and staff concerns regarding the sustainability of basic infrastructure needs and the potential for future budget reductions have had a negative impact on morale.

Staff recruitment, evaluation, workload, and incentives must follow the guidelines and regulations of the CSU System and the provisions in the collective bargaining agreements with the eight unions that represent CSUH employees in eleven (11) bargaining units, [Collective Bargaining Agreements]. The human resource policies, the position classification system, and the salary schedules of the CSU System are on the CSU website [CSU Human Resource Policies]. The Human Resources department at CSUH provides directions and a checklist of actions that must accompany hiring requests. The university’s Equal Employment Opportunity Officer must approve all staff appointments.

**Information Resources (CFR 3.6, 3.7)**

Information resources and the related infrastructure are well used at CSUH; however, the teaching and learning process pressures the university to offer ever-increasing levels of high quality information resources and attendant services. This has resulted in such initiatives as the implementation of Blackboard and the Learning Commons. As a result, the maintenance, funding, and expansion of information resources are a constant struggle and keeping up with demand is a continuous challenge.

**Library (CFR 3.6)**

The library reviewed its mission as part of its planning process and chose to retain its existing statement, which reflects core library values – commitment to collections and service, information access, information competency, and a physical place that fosters...
learning and collaboration. The library then identified action items related to its mission and goals [CSUH Library Mission Statement] and is now in the implementation phase.

In addition to local collections and services, the library web page is a gateway to electronic information and services [CSUH Library Services]. Despite the decrease in funds for materials ($1.36M in 2001/2002; $984,000 in 2004/2005), the library finds creative ways to provide information resources. CSU consortial and centrally-funded electronic licensing agreements are considered a “best practice” model for libraries. Resource sharing is enhanced through LINK+, a multi-library consortium that allows users to request materials directly from member libraries, and interlibrary loan. Library services supplement traditional in-person and telephone service with e-mail and web-chat, which are growing in popularity. For a few hours of CSUH librarian participation in the 24/7™ service, faculty, students, and staff can access web-chat help round the clock seven days a week from librarians nation-wide. If the budget decline continues, however, it will be increasingly difficult for the library to provide the desired level of resources and services needed for teaching and research.

Because of the university’s recognition of the need for information competency across the curriculum, library faculty members teach Introduction to Information Literacy, a two-unit required course that is thematically linked to the General Education Core curriculum. This endeavor is part of the CSU-wide mandate that the library be responsible for information competency, a mandate that this university has embraced and which is one of its strengths.

Staffing is key to helping students to be information competent. Data on the Institutional Portfolio confirms the library’s serious understaffing as compared to its benchmarks, namely the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Standards for Libraries in Higher Education [ACRL Standards] and six peer institutions selected from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Academic Library Statistics Program website [NCES Comparisons] for their comparable student population size and total expenditures.

**Instructional Technology (CFR 3.7)**

The Instructional Technology (IT) COT researched ways to evaluate the effectiveness of educational technologies. The committee benchmarks technological infrastructure, budget, and coordination easily, but finds it difficult to assess the effectiveness of technology in affecting learning outcomes. Current studies show that, in addition to the motivation and preparedness of the student, the quality of instructional design and the talent of the faculty are key elements in affecting learning outcomes regardless of whether technology is involved in the delivery. It is also difficult to separate out the effect of today’s multi-technology environment in the assessment of technology’s impact on the teaching and learning experience. Still, CSUH wants to learn how to identify appropriate technologies to support student-centered learning and hopes to understand the relationship between in-class and online activities. 5

The IT COT is aligning its new mission with the Seven Principles and other criteria. 6 The team believes that CSUH should provide access to appropriate and current instructional technology; professional development and training to ensure the technological competency
and currency of faculty; and educational technology supported by professional development and on-going technical assistance.

CSUH is using instructional technology to develop web services and applications to create a cyber-infrastructure to sustain scalable information resources and educational services and to foster a learning community that uses technology to create a sense of community. There is also significant classroom instructional support. The Blackboard (Bb) system is populated automatically with all sections of all courses each quarter. In the beginning of Fall 2004, 11,338 of the 12,722 enrolled students activated and used their Bb accounts. A pilot ePortfolio system is underway in the GE program and a pilot Content Management file sharing system is underway for the same students and all faculty. Selected other highlights include: over 70 smart classrooms; video equipment in every classroom and lab; and the new Learning Commons. Prior to this new facility, there were no open access computer labs available that were not also used for scheduled classes. The library also supplies approximately 100 wireless laptops for student use in the library.

Although CSUH instructional technology budgets have remained relatively flat over the past decade, the university compared favorably with instructional technology spending in the CSU until recent budget cuts (an additional 15% in 2004/05), but less favorably with national averages. Due to the recent state budget crisis, however, several technology-related initiatives were cut and will not be restored in 2004/05. IT staffing across the university is down by 17%. All technology plans are discussed in the University Instructional Technology (UIT) committee, which includes faculty and administrative representation. Colleges have Technology Coordinators, who meet regularly with central university IT staff. Two of the four colleges also have active technology advisory committees. A CSU system-funded multi-million dollar computing infrastructure upgrade is scheduled to be completed in 2004/05.

**FISCAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES (CFR 3.5)**

CSUH has experienced a decline in state support. There is hope that funding stability and adequacy of dollars will return, but the political process that funds the CSU is never certain. It is against this backdrop of fiscal challenge that Hayward is confronting the capacity to sustain its fiscal and physical infrastructure.

The ability of the University to provide a safe, secure learning environment for its students is more in jeopardy today than at any other time in the last thirty years. The deferred maintenance requirements of the physical structures and the underground infrastructure of Hayward’s utilities systems have been steadily increasing. The staff needed to address this area have also been steadily decreasing. The gross square footage of the physical structures of the university continues to grow without the concomitant funding needed to sustain it. All of this is brought about because budget cuts have been disproportionately sustained in the physical facilities and administrative portions of its operating budget. It should also be recognized that these same type of cuts (though to a lesser degree) occurred in the early 1990s and the deficit created by them has never been corrected and continues to grow.
In these difficult budget times, the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, is of particular importance, regularly advising the president on budgetary matters. The Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA), a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, was formed within the last year to assist in helping faculty to understand and to provide input on budgetary issues. COBRA makes recommendations regarding: budgetary processes, priorities, and policies that help the university to achieve its long-term academic goals in the light of changing conditions; principles and procedures governing the development, improvement, and use of university financial resources; principles and procedures governing the development, improvement, and use of university facilities; and the allocation of instructionally related resources.

In 2004, President Rees charged a new committee with improving the operational management of budgets at the university. The Committee on Reporting, Utilization, and Monitoring of Budget Systems (CRUMBS) is comprised of personnel with budgetary and financial oversight responsibility for substantial areas of fiscal operation, such as a college or a major administrative department.

Our primary institutional purpose is to provide bachelor’s and master’s education to our students. In line with this objective, 82.2% of the university’s budget in 2004/05 is allocated to the Academic Affairs unit. Of this amount, approximately 65% is spent directly on instruction. Faced with a budget cut of nearly 8% for 2004/05, the faculty budget committee, COBRA, and university administration agreed that protecting instruction was the first priority, with the knowledge that there would be grave consequences to the rest of the university, including reduced services in the library, technology, physical plant, and all other areas. Thus, non-college units experienced higher percentages of budget cuts than did college units (approximately 15% compared to 8%). Even with the protection of instruction to the extent possible, the Division of Academic Affairs had to reduce its operating budget in 2004-05 by over $5M, which has meant fewer classes and larger class sizes. Instructors have taken on more students, more advising, and more university service. The only adequate solution to these problems is sufficient funding to the CSU.

CSUH is subject to regular annual financial audits by independent, external auditors for the main campus and its four officially recognized auxiliaries. The university undergoes regular internal financial compliance audits by the Office of the Auditor for the Board of Trustees of the CSU as well as special subject area compliance audits. Audited financial statements and CSU internal audit reports are available for the community to review. (CFR 3.5) As a CSU institution, Cal State Hayward is not allowed to have deficits. CSUH budgeting practices include maintaining reserves at modest levels for contingency funding.

**SUMMARY ~ SUSTAINABILITY IN DIFFICULT TIMES**

Given three years of serious budget cuts, the university community is concerned with protecting and sustaining the infrastructure that supports teaching and learning. The cuts have had a long-term effect. Administration and faculty have worked together to mitigate the impact of these cuts on instruction and on students; however, the university is teaching more students with fewer faculty, a trend that everyone recognizes cannot continue forever. Thus, discussions are underway to rebuild the faculty and other key service areas once the
budget improves and/or the university receives enrollment growth dollars. Improvement of the tenure/tenure track vs. lecturer ratio is a high priority, as is replacing staff lost to layoffs in certain divisions of the university. Several faculty committees, notably COBRA, enable faculty to gain greater knowledge of and voice in the university’s budgeting process.

Dealing effectively with the university’s budget challenges will require the talent and cooperation of the entire university community. Fortunately, the university not only has that talent, but also a renewed sense of energy and commitment as evidenced by the new mission, vision, and values statements and the work of the COTs and their deep reflection on how to foster and support student learning and strengthen the students’ multicultural educational experience in times of fiscal constraint.

---

1 See, for example, “The Dynamics of Race in Higher Education: An Examination of the Evidence” or the American Council on Education’s Study “On the Importance of Diversity on Higher Education.”

2 Faculty reviewed for retention, tenure, or promotion submit a dossier that documents their achievements in all areas. PT&R decisions result from departmental PTR Committee, Department Chair, College PTR Committee, College Dean, and university PTR Committee recommendations with the president making the final decision. The university PTR policies must be in alignment with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the Chancellor’s Office. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the Board of Trustees of the CSU governs the use of student evaluations of instruction [Collective Bargaining Agreements].

3 The State-wide Academic Senate of the CSU conducted the survey. Fifty-one professors from CSUH participated in the survey. Across the system, 52.4% of the faculty reported receiving assigned time. [CSU Faculty Workload Survey]

4 For example, the College of Education and Allied Studies faculty meets regularly to discuss research as well as teaching and learning. Issues such as diversity among the faculty are also discussed and debated in this forum. In the College of Science, faculty are encouraged to become involved in programs that foster student learning, often through participation in research activities. Examples are the federally funded Research Initiative for Student Education (RISE) Program and the Schering-Plough Foundation Student Laboratory Assistantship Program. In the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, the English department has established a learning community for lecturers with an active listserv for discussions of writing instruction and weekly workshops that discuss strategies to enhance student learning.

5 Russell, T. (1999) extensive literature review demonstrates the predominance of “no signifiance” in studies that have tried to evaluate the effectiveness of technology separate from instruction. However Twigg and others have shown that technology can make a significant difference when the course or program has been re-designed using best pedagogical practices.
6 These include: flexibility of learning anytime and any place; increased opportunities for individualization, group activities, cooperative activities, and varied learning techniques; the opportunity for students to work on problem solving with group members to achieve shared goals and develop understanding and skills with leadership, interdependence, individual and group responsibilities, and group processes; and the opportunity to use technology as an integral component of the regular program so that students will be prepared for opportunities and problems they will meet in their respective communities.