

California State University, Bakersfield**Working Draft Proposal:*****Academic Realignment for the Future***

For a number of years, CSUB has been operating in a changing, and overall challenging environment, and that situation will likely continue into the foreseeable future. Chronic shortfalls in the state budget and changing CSU funding formulas, changes in public expectations about how universities should operate, in enrollment patterns and indeed in our own students' expectations and needs, and in the needs of the communities that we serve are not temporary or discrete problems; rather, they combine to describe the environment in which we function today and into the future.

We recognize that the economic and social context within CSUB, and in the communities that we serve, and on which we depend, have changed. Embedded within these shifts are new sets of opportunities, possibilities, problems, and complications. Imagining those possibilities and constructively addressing those problems require innovative ways of thinking and responding, and the willingness to structure and align our university in ways that support those efforts. It is with this in mind that this proposal is advanced for reorganizing the relationships between our schools and academic programs.

A major theme emanating from our university-wide strategic planning process is "alignment" of structures, programs, policies and operations. This proposal is aimed at improving the alignment between our mission and vision for community engagement and our academic programs. Having said that we cannot realistically address the challenge we face here without an overarching set of principles or parameters to undergird our task ahead. Key among these parameters is our need to:

1. Align with the University Mission – i.e., the proposed organizational structure of Academic Affairs and its constituent units should optimize its alignment with the mission statement of the university.
2. Support academic quality – i.e. strategies must be employed that will stave off the erosion of academic quality due to declining resources. We must demonstrate a shared approach to meeting our challenges and direct support to areas that will enable faculty to continue their commitment to academic quality for our students and our community.
3. Engender a collaborative campus culture – i.e., the proposed organizational structure promotes collaboration and cross disciplinary education in related areas, positions faculty to carry out their mission most effectively and to demonstrate an absence of program silos.
4. Further the sharing of our mission programmatically – i.e., the proposed organizational structure allows for clustering of programs sharing a like-minded vision and mission, programmatic objectives, targeted areas of service, and disciplinary synergies; the structure should effect a culture of evidence supportive of common institutional and academic goals.

5. Buttress cooperative programming – i.e., programs would be leveraged to buttress each other not only in the same cognate field but across the school and the structural divides that mitigate against inter, intra, and trans-disciplinary efforts.
6. Heighten our community engagement – i.e., the proposed organizational structure in part, or as a whole operationalizes with purpose, transparency, and full intent, the university's commitment to community service and the needs of our constituents. The focus would be seen by the community to meet, the human capacity needs of the region in such areas as education, justice, child, adolescent, and family development, mental health, the aged, minorities and other disenfranchised groups – as well as other community needs.
7. Seek economy of scales – i.e., an organizational structure that best utilizes economy of scales to remain effective and efficient in the delivery of relevant programs, while not eroding the resources of other academic units. We seek a more equitable distribution of departments and programs among the schools with a diverse resource base that will better equip us to meet the budgetary challenges.

CSUB has at present four schools. The primary mission of one such school, the School of Education, is professional preparation for the private and public non-profit education sector. Concomitantly, and despite efforts to the contrary, the School of Education continues to face challenges in meeting its charge – and for good reasons. Chief among them are the continual erosion of CSU budgets, reduction in student enrollments, the non-replacement of faculty due to attrition and retirements, and the Kern County School District's own credentialing capabilities.

Recent declines in enrollment in the School of Education (see Appendix A) have been triggered by changes in the credentialing regulations (e.g., CSET requirements), competition from other area education programs (e.g. University of Phoenix, Capella University, National University, Point Loma Nazarene University, Fresno Pacific University, and the University of LaVerne), and the declining numbers of individuals entering the teaching profession. The prospect of future enrollments remains unclear. Moreover, the steepest declines have been in credential programs that anchor the central core and mission of the school.

This decrease brings with it a reduction in funds available to the school as currently configured; thereby eroding even further the faculty's operational capacity to serve the Kern County region while maintaining the requirements associated with accreditation. And yet we must remain resolutely committed to the purpose and aim that the School of Education serves. We must identify ways to not only assure that the programs within the School of Education retain their ability to adapt to the changing nature of teacher preparation, but that we create opportunities for stronger linkages and partnerships with other academic programs and with the community that contribute to the preparation of human service professionals. At the same time, these academic partnerships must result "in the whole being stronger than the sum of its parts."

Deans and faculty in the School of Education have worked diligently to improve enrollments and sustain thriving programs, however the enrollments in the post-baccalaureate programs have not improved appreciably. This fact, together with the profound environmental changes affecting the University as a whole, suggest that now is the time to begin to rethink the characteristics of the organizational structures which frame and support those efforts. This proposal outlines a planned reorganization intended to support the mission of teacher preparation and, at the same time, foster and advance other academic programs that are guided by similar missions and serve similar segments of the community.

Such a structure is not new to the CSU system. There already exist across our campuses different school or college configurations which house education programs. As result of the uncertain budgetary outlook for the CSU and the changing enrollment patterns in schools of education, this past January, CSU Dominguez Hills announced the merger of the College of Education with the College of Health and Human Services into a College of Professional Studies. Last month it was announced that the College of Education was being transformed into a School of Education and merged with the College of Science and Mathematics at Cal Poly, SLO. At CSUB, we do not believe that there are too many schools, rather we want to assure that all of our schools are organized with a common mission, maintain high ideals of academic quality, meet the needs of students, and contribute to the advancement of the university.

The Recommendation

It is worth noting that today's youth cannot be compartmentalized into silos consisting of school, home, and social needs. Using the parameters outlined above, the following recommendations are made to respond to the challenges we face as a university, and to promote even greater opportunities for engagement with our community. This proposal emerged as a more comprehensive alternative school structure (see the Addendum for further discussion):

1. The formation of a *School of Human Services and Education* to house within it the departments of:
 - a. Advanced Education Studies
 - b. Counseling (includes integrating with Counseling program in HSS)
 - c. Criminal Justice
 - d. Physical Education and Kinesiology (PEAK)
 - e. Social Work
 - f. Special Education
 - g. Teacher Credential and Liberal Studies (teacher track only)
2. Reassign, where feasible, the subject matter faculty (with their salaries) in the present School of Education to their respective discipline departments in the appropriate schools; and thereby afford the discipline departments to become more synergistically involved with teacher preparation.
3. Maintain the Liberal Studies (general track i.e., non-teacher preparation) program within the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

This reorganization creates a different kind of school. The departments of Social Work and Criminal Justice each bring unique strengths and expertise as they prepare individuals for a variety of human

service-related fields. It provides an opportunity for the “founding faculty” of this new school to promote “seamless” models of community service delivery and orient students towards more integrated “one-stop” approaches in partnership with schools. For example, many school districts include mental health and gang prevention units as part of their organizational structure.

At the same time, rather than limiting its focus to K-12 education, the new school’s mission can address human services in a more holistic way by including other related programs. This remains the purview of the faculty to create new models of para-professional and professional preparation. This new alignment will also move us toward a more even distribution of academic programs, majors, and FTES enrollment across our four schools (see Appendix B).

A Look at the Broader Context

Further impetus for considering these changes now, rather than a year from now, is the need to define the new structure prior to conducting a national search for a dean since all departments within a school must participate in the process. It is anticipated that a search would be initiated in Fall 2009. This proposed reorganization achieves several things. It:

1. Creates synergies and opportunities for interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary collaboration and grant developments, focused on preparing professionals for the private and public not-for profit sectors
2. Increases the involvement of subject matter disciplines in teacher preparation
3. Improves the resource base of the new school, while not detrimentally affecting the other schools
4. Broadens the University’s mission to include other human service-related programs into a single clearly defined unit designed to serve with purpose and intent the strategic needs of our community
5. Provides greater diversification of academic programs within the new school
6. Strengthens the capacity for the education programs to build stronger linkages within the K-12 community, and
7. Identifies a locus of activity for addressing broader human service needs and concerns within our region.

Our elementary and secondary school systems as well as the human service sector are expected to be significantly impacted by the proposed state budget cuts. The stressors and conditions associated with these dire times will require that we prepare professionals in all areas of the human enterprise from education, to social services, to justice, and other sectors to seek optimal solutions within a constrained fiscal environment.

As a state university, we have an obligation to our constituents. Our institutional commitment remains to serve CSUB’s diverse region, with a continued emphasis on children and youth, and families. Accordingly, the departments within the proposed new school can address the concerns of children, adolescents, adults, and families from a broader and more responsive perspective than is possible with a focus solely on teacher preparation.

Proposed Next Steps

The Administration believes it was essential that the faculty and staff in the relevant departments be informed directly about this proposal before a wider circulation. Thus, the President and/or the Provost held separate meetings with the faculty and staff in the School of Education, and the departments of Social Work, Liberal Studies, Criminal Justice, and Psychology. It was then announced at the Academic Senate Meeting that a proposal would be circulating campus-wide seeking faculty and staff input, questions, comments, and other proposed configurations of the school, using the guidelines outlined in this document.

This proposal for academic realignment will be distributed electronically to the faculty and staff no later than March 9th. Faculty and staff are invited to send their ideas, suggestions, reactions, and questions electronically to a special email address: provost@csub.edu by April 17th. In addition, there is a First Class bulletin board site - "realignment" - for comments and suggestions. As needed, the Provost will also be available to meet with groups.

The President and Provost will consider all ideas for realignment, suggestions, feedback, and answer questions. Consultation with the Academic Senate and the Senate Executive Committee will be conducted no later than May 15th. The President will make his final decision by June 1, 2009. (If a proposal for realignment is approved, 2009-10 will be a planning and transition year for the proposed school.)

Appendix A-1

Note: Each CSU campus is assigned an enrollment target by the Chancellor's Office. This target is distributed among the four schools. Each year, any additional resources is dependent upon the campus' achieved target. Beginning 2006-07, campuses under or over target (+/- 2%) must return funds to the CSU.

Summary by College Year by School: Difference in FTES Target and Actual and Percent Achieved

	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07*		2007-08	
	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)
H&SS	68.4	2.2%	31.8	1.0%	33.0	1.0%	65.1	2.0%	-77.7	-2.2%	-47.9	-1.4%
NS&M	-59.9	-4.6%	-61.1	-4.5%	-97.4	-7.2%	-12.8	-0.9%	25.9	1.9%	-15.2	-1.1%
B&PA	-56.2	-9.9%	-40.9	-7.0%	30.7	5.2%	61.6	10.0%	65.1	9.5%	-16.6	-1.9%
SoE	-9.9	-0.7%	-46.7	-3.1%	-294.6	-19.5%	-324.0	-21.7%	-1.3	-0.1%	-10.7	-0.9%
No School	30.9	41.4%	0.1	0.1%	-4.3	-5.5%	4.0	5.2%	-1.3	-1.5%	-2.9	-2.9%
Total	-26.8	-0.4%	-116.7	-1.7%	-332.6	-4.9%	-206.2	-3.1%	10.8	0.2%	-93.4	-1.3%

*2006-07 was the first year of rebenchmarking; because of the continual decline in enrollment, the School of Education's target was reduced in 2006-07 and distributed to other schools.

Appendix A-2

Summary Annual Change in College Year FTES, by School and Year (not in relation to target)

	02/03 to 03/04		03/04 to 04/05		04/05 to 05/06		05/06 to 06/07, unrebenched		05/06 to 06/07, rebenched		06/07 to 07/08	
	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)	# over (under)	% over (under)
H&SS	54.2	1.7%	33.8	1.0%	-20.8	-0.6%	73.8	2.3%	123.0	3.8%	-62.2	-1.8%
NS&M	36.6	2.9%	-22.7	-1.8%	73.8	5.8%	31.4	2.3%	33.5	2.5%	23.6	1.7%
B&PA	31.8	6.2%	77.4	14.2%	53.2	8.5%	57.1	8.4%	77.4	11.4%	88.2	11.7%
SoE	5.1	0.4%	-232.9	-16.1%	-41.4	-3.4%	-47.7	-4.1%	25.9	2.2%	19.3	1.6%
No School	-28.7	-27.2%	-3.5	-4.6%	7.7	10.4%	5.1	6.3%	5.1	6.3%	11.0	12.8%
Total	99.1	1.5%	-147.9	-2.2%	72.5	1.1%	119.8	1.8%	264.9	4.0%	79.9	1.2%

Appendix A-3

Actual FTES Targets, by Year and School

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07*	2007-08
H&SS	3,144.0	3,234.7	3,267.4	3,214.4	3,480.3	3,388.3
NS&M	1,310.0	1,347.8	1,361.4	1,350.6	1,345.3	1,410.1
B&PA	569.9	586.3	592.2	614.5	688.3	858.3
SoE	1,451.5	1,493.4	1,508.4	1,496.5	1,199.6	1,228.3
No School	74.7	76.8	77.6	77.0	87.4	100.0
Total	6,550.0	6,739.0	6,807.0	6,753.0	6,801.0	6,985.0

*2006-07 was the first year of rebenching; because of the continual decline in enrollment, the School of Education's target was reduced in 2006-07 and distributed to other schools. Since 2002-03 to 2007-08 the target has declined approximately 15%.

Appendix A-4

FTES Achieved by Year and School

						Rebenched	
	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07*	2007-08
H&SS	3,212.4	3,266.6	3,300.3	3,279.6	3,353.4	3,402.6	3,340.4
NS&M	1,250.1	1,286.7	1,264.0	1,337.8	1,369.2	1,371.3	1,394.9
B&PA	513.6	545.4	622.9	676.1	733.2	753.4	841.7
SoE	1,441.6	1,446.7	1,213.8	1,172.4	1,124.7	1,198.4	1,217.6
No School	105.6	76.9	73.3	81.0	86.1	86.1	97.1
Total	6,523.2	6,622.3	6,474.4	6,546.8	6,666.6	6,811.7	6,891.6

*2006-07 was the first year of rebenching.

APPENDIX B

Current & Proposed Reorganized -Degree Programs-Departments/FTES/Majors of Schools

The following provides a breakdown of the resulting number of departments, FTES and majors:

School	Current			Proposed Reorganization		
	Degree Prog./ Depts.(1)	FTES	Majors (2)	Degree Prog./ Depts.(1)	FTES	Majors(2)
• NSM (unchanged)	7	1385	1250	7	1385	1,250
• Current SOE • Reorganized -HSE (new programs: Criminal Justice, Social Work, Liberal Studies Teacher Track)	6	1200	1399	9	1535	2483
• HSS (reassign Social Work, Liberal Studies (teacher preparation track)(3) & Criminal Justice)(Liberal Studies General Track remains in HSS)	16	3,337	3,327	14	2,801	1,957
• BPA (unchanged)	6	841	1221	6	841	1221

Table based on 2007/08 data rebenchd numbers

(1)Sociology & Anthropology; Philosophy & Religious Studies; Accounting & Finance; Management & Marketing counted as separate degree programs although share single department.

(2) # Majors excludes undeclared.

Secondary Education FTES (201) and Majors (286) will be distributed across the corresponding subject disciplines.

HSE also includes: Educational Administration, Bilingual/Multicultural Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood Education, and Reading/Literacy. Note: It is uncommon for an advanced credential students not to be simultaneously enrolled in the corresponding MA program.

(3) Liberal Studies FTES will remain in the current departments; the Liberal Studies General Track will also remain in HSS.

ADDENDUM

Over the past several years, ideas and questions have emerged from faculty and administrators about reconfiguring our schools. Suggestions have ranged from merging two schools into one, resulting in three schools to establishing a fifth school. While such ideas are worth considering, it is necessary that any such changes be guided by a set of principles that will yield long-term benefit for CSUB and our students. Shared emphases, common academic goals, and economies of scale are among the principles that should shape our thinking, as is the fit between any new configuration and CSUB's mission. Certainly, we also need to consider the budgetary implications of such changes. Thus, the establishment of a fifth school at this point in time, and given our budget climate would not be prudent since it suggests the need for a new administrative and support infrastructure. At the same time, to have the budget alone be the guiding factor would not necessarily yield an alignment among disciplines and programs, or provide the inherent opportunities that can come from proximity.

In considering the principles of academic realignment outlined in this document, there were several variations of the proposal presented, including such ideas as a) joining only Liberal Studies with the SOE since this is the undergraduate "pipeline" to teacher credentialing and the state requirements have become even more "prescriptive," b) connecting Liberal Studies and Social Work with the SOE (since social workers often practice in K-12 schools, addressing the mental health, family, and environmental factors that affect learning), or c) merging the School of Education with another school (e.g. the School of Humanities and Social Sciences) and then reorganizing into two schools (this could enrich those in teacher preparation by connecting them to the cognate areas). In pondering which ideas to present to the faculty in the relevant school and programs, to the Senate, as well as campus-wide, the desire was to consider the best option that advances institutional alignment and community engagement as outlined in our mission and strategic planning documents. Not only do we want to enhance the programs in the current School of Education, to strengthen the resource base for schools, but to also promote and support new opportunities for those programs that would be reassigned.