POLICY ON INTERSEGMENTAL COOPERATION BETWEEN
SFSU AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Academic Senate Policy F91-172

At its meeting of November 26, 1991, the Academic Senate approved the following policy:

**Background:** During the Fall 1990 semester, due to financial cuts which resulted in the elimination of almost 200 sections of courses from the normal course offerings on this campus, and due to a unique opportunity presented to SFSU from Skyline Community College, this campus was able to offer 23 sections of Segment courses to our students on our campus through inviting Skyline Community College to staff and fund those courses. At the conclusion of the Fall 1990 semester the Vice President for Academic Affairs convened the Ad Hoc Committee on Skyline College Courses to evaluate the program and make recommendations to the Academic Senate concerning future intersegmental cooperation. Their report was submitted to the Academic Senate at the end of the Spring 1991 semester. The Academic Senate voted to refer the Committee report to the Academic Policy Committee and directed the APC to make a report and submit policy recommendations back to the Academic Senate before the conclusion of the Fall 1991 semester. Any continuation of similar programs with any other Community College program was also directed to be delayed until after final action by the Academic Senate based on the investigation and report of the Academic Policy Committee.

**Procedures of the APC:** The Academic Policy Committee took up the Ad Hoc Committee on Skyline College Courses report as its first order of business in the Fall 1991 semester. Several meetings were held with a variety of interested parties throughout the campus. Erwin Seibel, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Al Willard, Director of Academic Services and Gary Hammerstrom, Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, all members of the Ad Hoc Committee conferred with APC. Additionally, APC conferred with Nancy McDermid, Dean, School of Humanities, Jim Kelley, Dean, School of Science, Phil McGee, Dean, School of Ethnic Studies, Steve Arkin, Chair, Department of English, Susan Shimanoff, Chair, Department of Philosophy, Catherine Lucas, University Composition Coordinator, and Rosemary Patton, Associate University Compositions Coordinator.

**Observations:** Dean Erwin Seibel reported to the Committee that an informal telephone survey of other CSU campuses revealed a variety of similar
cooperative programs with local community colleges at five other campuses. All five reported that the emphasis was on remedial programs in Math (CSU Chico, Dominguez Hills, San Jose State), all through informal arrangements from Department to Department with the blessing and cooperation of the Administration at each campus. CSU Pomona had tried such a program, had discontinued it and was now reconsidering such an arrangement. The fifth campus contacted was U.C. San Diego which also reported a remedial Math program with a local community college.

Dr. Shimanoff also reported to the committee that the Speech Department at CSU Chico had attempted a similar program with Oral Communication courses, however the department had abandoned the program in favor of more resources given to the department for Chico faculty to offer more sections.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Skyline College Courses issued seven "Conclusions/Issues/Recommendations for Future Intersegmental Cooperation." The APC Committee finds the first four to be factual conclusions reached through a survey of students enrolled in the Skyline courses during the Fall 1990 semester. The final three items were of particular interest to APC and bear repeating here:

5. "Opposition to the offering of these courses on the SFSU Campus was raised by the School of Humanities. Their points regarding the lack of adequate consultation, the potential impact upon the mix of lower division, upper division and graduate students at SFSU, and the impact of such decisions upon collateral programs (such as graduate training in basic subjects) are valid and require more serious evaluation and discussion than can be provided by this ad hoc committee. Some members of the School of Humanities Council urged that such an arrangement not be agreed to again."

**APC Addendum:** Representatives from the School of Humanities remain unanimous in concerns about the repetition of intersegmental cooperation between SFSU and local community colleges. In addition to the issues addressed above, concerns were also expressed about the impact of such a program on the University's philosophy toward the commitment made to students accepted for admission to the University. The Master Plan mandates that CSU provides "comprehensive education" for all students and that we fail in that mission if students accepted to our campus are then redirected into Community College courses. Representatives form both the School of Humanities and form the School of Ethnic Studies also expressed apprehensions about the commitment of SFSU to remedial students and remedial programs and expressed fears that a shift in resources to incorporate community
college courses would also signal a shift in priority away from lower division
and remedial students.

"If such cooperative arrangements are considered in the
future, they should be undertaken only with broad consultation between
the administration, the Schools and departments, and the Academic Senates
of the segments involved. Adequate time should be provided to allow careful
consideration of the issues raised in item 5 above. In addition, consultation
should also take place with all the unions involved, both at SFSU and
the Community College, other CSU campus, UC campus, or private university
involved regarding the alignment of salaries and benefits, work assignment
and other issues that may require negotiation. CFA regards intersegmental
cooperation as positive so long as it is accompanied by an adequate
consultation
process."

**APC Addendum:** We cannot stress strong enough the need for the
consultations called for in the above statement among all parties involved in
such arrangements. Additionally, it was believed that academic departments must
also be consulted and have the strongest voice possible in dealing with logistical
problems such as classroom space, office space, copying services, textbook orders,
access to computer laboratories, etc.

"The academic planning process at SFSU should take cognizance
of the consultation requirements articulated in item 6 above. While recognizing
that the decision to offer the Skyline courses during the Fall 1990 semester
was made under the press of time and unusual circumstances by reasonable
and attentive people, who were genuinely concerned about assisting
students,
it is our belief that future decisions on intersegmental cooperation need
to garner as wide a support of the SFSU faculty as possible."

**APC Addendum:** We, again, strongly agree with that statement.

In order to achieve adequate consultation and wide support of faculty for such
arrangements, it is the belief of this committee that any such intersegmental
agreements must be initiated and controlled by each interested academic department.

**Policy Recommendations:**
Any intersegmental cooperation between academic units at SFSU and local community colleges to offer courses on this campus must be initiated at the SFSU Department/Program level. Academic departments/programs also hold sole responsibility for the evaluation of such programs and for recommending continuation or discontinuation of such arrangements.

1. Academic departments/programs will present their proposal to their school dean, who is then responsible for working with the Vice President of Academic Affairs (or designee) to facilitate institutional arrangements, consultation and cooperation between affected unions representing each respective faculty unit, and other related issues as articulated in items 5 and 6 of the above report.

2. School deans are also responsible to work with the VPAA (or designee) to 1) identify other schools, departments or programs which would be affected by such an intersegmental cooperation, as well as appropriate all-university committees and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and to 2) involve such affected parties in a process of broad consultation and cooperation.

3. Upon completion of the consultative process, the VPAA (or designee) will be responsible for drafting a final proposal which must be approved by the initiating academic department/program prior to its implementation.

**APPROVED BY PRESIDENT CORRIGAN ON FEBRUARY 13, 1992**