

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 3:30 p.m. Tuesday, March 16, 1999
Auditorium

William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Martha C. Fallgatter
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of January 27, 1999

Discussion Items

1. Cornerstones Implementation, *Action*
2. Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Third Annual Report, *Information*
3. Academic Planning and Program Review, *Action*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

January 26-27, 1999

Members Present

Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Bob Foster
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Members Absent

William D. Campbell, Chair
Martha C. Fallgatter

Other Trustees Present

Fredrick W. Pierce IV
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel

Presidential Liaisons

Marvalene Hughes, President, California State University, Stanislaus, *present*
Bob Suzuki, President, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, *present*
Blenda J. Wilson, President, California State University, Northridge, *present*

Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

Closed Session

The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees and the Committee on Educational Policy met Tuesday, January 26, 1999 at 11:30 a.m. in closed session and acted on nominations for honorary degrees.

Open Session

Vice Chair Otomo-Corgel called the meeting to order on January 27, 1999 at 8:42 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of November 11, 1998 were approved as submitted.

Community Service Learning in the CSU

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that community service-learning is a teaching approach linking academic study directly with community service. Dr. Spence pointed out that CSU has developed a national reputation in the field of service-learning and CSU administrators have taken on national leadership roles. Chancellor Reed and President Suzuki, Cal Poly Pomona, serve on the America Reads/American Counts Steering Committee, chaired by President Corrigan, San Francisco State University, President Wilson, CSU Northridge, is a member of the national Campus Compact Executive Committee, and President Corrigan is chair of California Campus Compact. Dr. Spence introduced President Corrigan, who has made university-community partnerships a hallmark of San Francisco State University.

President Corrigan affirmed that CSU is a national leader in the area of community service-learning. California Campus Compact, headquartered at San Francisco State, currently includes 53 colleges and universities, and almost every CSU campus is a member. In 1995 Dr. Thomas Ehrlich, a CSU Distinguished Scholar and faculty member at San Francisco State began working on a systemwide service-learning initiative. In 1997 faculty and administrators representing each CSU campus developed a strategic plan, and in 1998 a systemwide community service-learning office was established with Erika Freihage as the coordinator. A status report of service-learning has been developed and addresses campus progress toward achieving the following goals: (1) develop the necessary infrastructure to ensure service-learning's permanence, (2) build a strong base of faculty support, and (3) ensure that the campus service-learning programs meet both student and community needs.

As community service-learning matures in the CSU, students benefit academically and are personally stronger for their experience. President Corrigan stated that 98% of the students who were chosen to be tutors for the American Reads program, now want to become teachers. In addition, the CSU and each of its campuses enjoy stronger public support and understanding as a result of service-learning.

President Smith, CSU Monterey Bay, stated that at Monterey Bay service-learning is required for every major and for general education course completion. Dr. Smith also commented that as a result of service-learning, students are more active participants in the community, and feel significantly better prepared to make a career choice.

Trustee Goldwhite congratulated the Board, Chancellor Reed, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence, and the systemwide coordinator for their work. He pointed out that while a community service-learning strategic plan has been developed, it has not been adopted.

Trustee Mitchell stated that since almost half of the students are already involved with community service, students realize the importance of a planned service experience combined with academic learning.

Cornerstones Implementation

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence invited Statewide Academic Senate Chair, Gene Dinielli to participate in the presentation. Dr. Spence stated that the proposed implementation plan is a culmination of comments, suggestions, and recommendations from both systemwide and campus-based discussions. The responses recognize the Cornerstones activity already taking place on the campuses. The report will be further edited to include more information on time lines, schedules and accountability prior to the presentation for trustee action in March.

Dr. Spence noted that to move from the principles to action is difficult. CSU needs to reach consensus on the principles and recommendations to be addressed by all universities, agree on specific actions to be taken by the universities, the system, or both, identify what should be decided and accomplished by campus initiative and what should be addressed through systemwide coordination, and determine an accountability process. Dr. Spence commented that faculty, alumni, student, and university administrative responses were substantive and constructive.

Dr. Spence pointed out that the program requirements described in principle three are under review. A recommendation to revise Title 5 to reduce the length of the baccalaureate to 120 units will be made. A major point of Cornerstones, access to a baccalaureate degree of high quality, is contained in principle five. This principle spells out the critical importance of transfer student access to CSU. A major part of the implementation plan is campus outreach to public schools to assist students to prepare for CSU and the need for expanded campus action in this area. Dr. Spence stated that the accountability element of Cornerstones, defined in principle nine, is another major part of the report. It is important to have a process in place to let the State and public know how CSU is moving forward.

Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli commended Chancellor Reed and Executive Vice Chancellor Spence for working closely with the faculty on this important issue. Chair Dinielli acknowledged the willingness of the Presidents to work with faculty and include the input of students and alumni in the process. Vice Chair Otomo-Corgel also commended Chancellor Reed, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence, the Presidents, Senate, and CSSA for their valuable contributions as Cornerstones moves forward.

Trustee Mitchell thanked Executive Vice Chancellor Spence and Chair Dinielli for their work and called for greater emphasis on flexible class scheduling, accountability, and student services. Dr. Spence acknowledged that these concerns would be addressed. After thanking everyone who worked on the Cornerstones project, Trustee Pesqueira emphasized the importance of accountability and access, including the need for continued outreach programs and strong K-12 ties leading to improved college preparation. He advised CSU to move in a timely manner in implementation. Trustee Pierce commended Dr. Reed and Dr. Spence on their work, and stated the need to develop priorities across curricula and clarify the meaning of outcomes assessment. A student voiced her concern that the plan had moved away from a student-centered model.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Cornerstones Implementation

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

At the January 1999 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence presented a proposed plan for implementing the Cornerstones report endorsed as a planning framework by the Board of Trustees in January 1998. Dr. Spence acknowledged the extensive consultation involved in the process of developing the proposed implementation plan and recognized the valuable contributions of the California State Student Association, the Statewide Academic Senate, the Alumni Association, the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, and the Executive Council.

Revisions have been made to the draft of the implementation plan that was discussed at the January meeting based on comments made during the discussion and suggestions offered since then. The plan proposed for your adoption at the March meeting will be sent under separate cover for your study prior to the meeting. It will also include timelines for implementing the various steps proposed.

This Cornerstones implementation plan calls for the development of an accountability process for each university and the system. A first draft of this accountability process will be provided to the board along with the Cornerstones implementation plan. This draft accountability process is now under discussion throughout the CSU and will be brought to the trustees for discussion and action in May.

Recommendation

Adoption of the proposed resolution for approval of the Cornerstones implementation plan.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Cornerstones Implementation Plan

Overview

The Cornerstones planning process began in 1996 and yielded a set of general principles and supporting recommendations designed to guide CSU into the next century. In adopting the Cornerstones report in January 1998, the Trustees directed the Chancellor to pursue implementation of its recommendations.

Implementing a report as far-reaching as Cornerstones is challenging because, for implementation to occur, general principles and recommendations must be converted to specific, concrete actions. Doing so requires hard choices to be made about priorities, about what is most important to do now as opposed to later and about the procedures for moving from principle to action.

The need for a plan that is more exact about how Cornerstones should be implemented is based on the large scope of Cornerstones, its commitment to giving the campuses significant autonomy in how the recommendations are carried out, and the likelihood that many of the principles are subject to wide ranges of interpretation. To promote both clearer direction and accountability across the system, a plan is needed that is specific about what should be done and that assigns responsibility for action.

This plan includes those actions related to Cornerstones that all universities will be expected to address owing to their priority, importance, strategic value, or factors of timing and sequence of those actions. To varying extents, the plan spells out what is meant for an action to be addressed. For a great majority of the initiatives, individual campuses will have substantial flexibility in deciding how to implement an action; this is in keeping with Cornerstones Principle 10. A smaller number of actions call for a more common set of approaches to implementation across all campuses. This is especially applicable to many of initiatives in the access section (Principle 5). In many cases, campuses are already acting on some of the principles and need only to integrate those activities with the Cornerstones plan.

The plan indicates for each action where responsibility will reside. Again, in recognition of the Cornerstones commitment to campus autonomy and flexibility, many actions call for responsibility at the campus level, especially for those actions concerning the curriculum, teaching-learning process, and faculty activity. Other initiatives recognize a shared responsibility for implementation among the campuses and the system-level offices of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Such system responsibility may include the functions of policy-making, coordinating common approaches to campus implementation, facilitating communication among campuses, seeking support for various initiatives, and helping to avoid duplicative efforts.

No clearer statements exist for giving meaning and direction to our discussion of how CSU should move into the next century than Cornerstones, adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1998, and the Baccalaureate Study, approved by the Statewide Academic Senate in November 1997.

Each, in its own way, invites serious attention to that which all our efforts are directed: teaching and learning. Each, in its own way, asks us to forget about impediments and to recreate and shape the CSU for the demands of the 21st century. Each, in its own way, calls for the full participation of the whole CSU community, to accomplish the tasks before us. And, each, in its own way, is prelude to the particular work we propose the system and the campuses to undertake. It is daunting, to say the least, but it must be undertaken.

No statement about the hopes and directions embodied in Cornerstones and its implementation can be made without constant attention to the students of CSU; in fact, underlying every principle and recommendation is the given that the end to which all the Cornerstones activities are directed is the development of the educated and productive citizen. To achieve that end, CSU needs the collaboration and support of its current students and CSU alumni/ae to fulfill our vision for CSU in the 21st century.

We have asked the faculty to combine their current efforts in order to generate creative, integrative, and collaborative ways in which the system, under the principle of joint investment but tolerance of variability, can move forward in concrete ways to implement Cornerstones. We have proposed that the faculty and staff, students and alumni/ae, deal with such issues as learning outcomes and their assessment; program requirements; public school outreach; faculty development and support; baccalaureate education; graduate and post-baccalaureate education; accountability; institutional autonomy and system governance. The ultimate goal of all of these initiatives is to ensure a productive teaching and learning environment of high quality, strengthen student development, and expand access to CSU's services.

Campuses, in short, are asked to reexamine what universities have been dealing with for centuries: in the face of growing numbers of calls for change, what is it about the university that ought to change, and what ought not to change? We know the faculty are up to the tasks we place before them, as we direct new attention to best fulfilling our mission, without any loss of quality and within the contexts of the new demographics and the new economics. Campuses are appropriate sites for these deliberations where the faculty, who are the main repository of institutional values, have been, along with campus administration and students, wrestling with these issues and proposing changes.

A system like ours honors the various campuses for their multiplicity of functions and differentiation through centers of excellence. It also recognizes that some major concerns are "borderless," meaning we share common educational goals; we want the best education made available to our students based on shared and relevant goals; we jointly want to demonstrate accountability for achieving these goals; we want to achieve cooperation with all campus partners; and we jointly want to explain our mission in a way that is articulated clearly, well integrated, fair, consistent, and understandable.

By any account this discussion has taken place within a short time line; however, the discussions and debates have been responsive and rich, a sign of a vital university system. The campuses and other stakeholders have responded in most thoughtful, constructive ways; the campus discussions

4
Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item 1
March 16-17, 1999

and those of the statewide Academic Senate became timely occasions for focusing time-honored beliefs about the academy in relation to the initiatives embodied in Cornerstones and to the public policy concerns of the 21st Century.

The California State Student Association constructively and importantly brought the student perspective to the refinement of the implementation plan. The CSU Alumni Association made timely, critical, and important improvements to the Plan.

All the responses recognize and note the preponderance of evidence showing ongoing Cornerstones activity already anticipated and taking place on the campuses. The campuses have taken upon themselves to attempt, within the context of competing demands for resources, to implement whatever Cornerstones initiatives that might be amenable to their individual cultures. This climate of activity, these many attempts to make CSU the University of the 21st Century, must be sustained and supported. Support will be given to efforts that foster faculty development; develop appropriate and meaningful reward structures; effect changes in workload which accurately reflect different modes of teaching and learning; and ensure accountability by collecting evidence of results of experiments on the use of new modes of teaching and learning.

The implementation discussion has brought a growing clarity of focus on such matters as the changing roles of faculty, students, the campuses, and central administration. Cornerstones and the beginning of organized implementation have been occasions, as they were designed to be, to rediscover the ends to which we are all directed — to develop the educated and productive citizen in the context of California and the 21st Century.

The benefits of this exercise have been: 1) the remarkably thoughtful and insightful responses which have come from the campuses and their faculty and students, 2) the unmistakable evidence of the ongoing attempts of campuses to translate Cornerstones into practice, and 3) the admirable commitment to CSU and its mission which has resurfaced as a result of this discussion.

The following Cornerstones Implementation Plan is proposed for trustee consideration and approval. Following the implementation plan are the Academic Senate Resolution Response to the Draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan, the *Overview of CSSA's Response to the Draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan*, and the *Alumni Council Response to the Draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan*.

CONERSTONES IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

PRINCIPLE 1

California State University's highest obligation is to prepare students who will live most of their lives in the 21st Century. While there is much we do not know about the next millennium, we do know it will provide our graduates with significant new challenges and opportunities. During their working years, most will change not just jobs, but professions several times, requiring uncommon adaptability to changing circumstances. They will need extraordinary skills to understand the

exponential increase of information over their lifetimes. They will need the ability to cross cultural boundaries with sensitivity, facility, and understanding, as well as the ability to function effectively in a global context. They will need to confront the opportunity and the risks associated with expanding technological capacity, and to balance its potential effects with strong ethical principle. They will face conflicts and issues in their community, state, nation, and the world that are more complex than any presented this century and requiring solutions that can only be achieved through interdisciplinary perspective and collaborative problem-solving.

CSU's academic programs have always sought to offer students a sound foundation for personal and civic success; however, we can and should raise the bar. To ensure that our students are well prepared, we must focus our efforts collectively on helping them develop their intellectual skills to the highest possible level, for they must not only master content, they must also develop the ability to analyze, evaluate, and apply their knowledge to deal with the complex challenges ahead. And most importantly, we must provide our students with the foundations they need for self-reliant lifelong learning.

The following Cornerstones principle asks each campus faculty to work collaboratively to explicate publicly the knowledge, skills, and values they believe students will need; to accept responsibility for assessing students for demonstration of those outcomes; and to use the results of that assessment for the improvement of academic programs. The goal is not to create separate or parallel outcomes or assessments to those established by faculty in courses and programs, but for faculty to declare the highest intellectual outcomes they expect of students and intentionally to infuse the development of these outcomes into the institution's teaching and learning process.

Universities should have the authority and responsibility to develop their own learning outcomes in general education and major programs as well as procedures for assessment. Many also believe that previous work on general education outcomes found in the Statewide Academic Senate's Baccalaureate Study, and existing Title 5 policy, can be valuable as a base from which to proceed. To the extent that faculty from various universities find it helpful, such system-level activities as those being sponsored through the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) will be expanded. The ITL will continue to support faculty across the system as they discuss general education outcomes and assessment. The Institute also will organize systemwide groups of faculty by disciplines to enable discussions of outcomes and assessment by program major. These disciplinary faculty groups can also lead consideration of such other Cornerstones issues as length of degree, lower-division major preparation (see Principle 2), course alignment, articulation, transfer, and unit requirements for the major.

PRINCIPLE 1: The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning as determined by our faculty. The CSU will state explicitly what a graduate of the California State University is expected to know, and will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 1a. **Campus Priority** Each university will have a faculty-determined, comprehensive set of general education outcomes that are sufficiently specific to support a public declaration of educational results, and sufficiently general to allow each college and department to develop its own educational outcomes. *(By fall, 2002)*
- 1b. **Campus Priority** Each university faculty will have systems of learning assessment that enable students to demonstrate learning in both courses and programs. These assessment tools will be developed with a broad consensus as to their proper use and will vary substantially among the disciplines. *(By fall, 2002)*
- 1c. **Campus Priority** Each university will periodically collect, analyze, and evaluate evidence of the extent to which its students are achieving the learning outcomes to which it is publicly committed. *(Beginning fall, 2002 or sooner)*
- 1d. **Campus Priority** Each university will use the assessment results in their process for review and improvement of programs. *(Beginning fall, 2002 or sooner)*
- 1e. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will devote sufficient resources to faculty development and the resources and time required to develop appropriate assessment techniques to redesign programs, and to shape definitions of credit, including responding to individual university requests for exceptions, on a pilot-basis, to certain system requirements. *(Continuing funding and program priority)*

PRINCIPLE 2

Quality depends, in part, on the responsiveness of CSU's degree programs and services to student needs. Every member of the university community — faculty, staff, administration, and students themselves — has a responsibility to help students succeed. This responsibility extends beyond making sure that academic requirements are clear and that basic services are accessible. In line with CSU's distinctive commitment to teaching and learning, this responsibility has meant actively reaching out to students, understanding their individual learning and personal needs, and providing academic and support services that help each student meet these requirements.

As the needs and diversity of California's population change, universities must ensure that the kind of programs and their requirements reflect those changes while always maintaining quality. CSU's students, alumni/ae, and California's employees are valuable sources of advice regarding needs and performance.

These changing needs of students also will require universities to ensure that support services respond to the needs of a wider range of students. The needs, priorities, and satisfaction levels of students should regularly be assessed and used to assure that programs and services are responsive.

The later recommendations on graduate, post-baccalaureate, and continuing education also speak to the principle of responsiveness to students.

PRINCIPLE 2: Students are the focus of the academic enterprise. Each campus will shape the provision of its academic programs and support services to meet better the diverse needs of its students and society.

The specific recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 2a. **Campus Priority** In accord with Board of Trustee program review policy, each university shall make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures. These campus criteria and procedures will be designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to, among others, societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities. The views of students, alumni/ae, and employers should regularly be sought concerning what programs are needed and the extent to which existing programs are yielding important student outcomes. *(Policies and practices amended by fall, 2000)*
- 2b. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will ensure that all students are able to complete baccalaureate degree program requirements within a reasonable length of time. Recognizing that on some campuses there is a large population of students who must support themselves while attending the university, no time-to-degree limit will be imposed. The Board of Trustees will reduce the Title 5 baccalaureate degree unit requirement from 124 to 120 units. Each campus will re-examine the unit requirements for graduation and provide a monitoring system to ensure that acceptable justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the normative minimum of 120 units. *(Policy amended by January, 2000; campus requirements amended by fall, 2001)*
- 2c. **Campus Priority** Each university will ensure effective services for all students, including those with non-traditional schedules, such as older and working students. These academic and student development services should be evaluated regularly to ensure effectiveness. *(Continuing commitment)*
- 2d. **Campus Priority** Each university will design its academic calendars and class schedules to maximize the availability of courses in a significantly wider range of times and modes, both with regard to the weekly schedule of courses and the fuller use of the calendar year. *(Continuing commitment)*
- 2e. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will redesign current standards and processes for facilities utilization, so that the universities can offer courses when appropriate throughout the year and throughout the hours of every day of every week, to enhance student-faculty contact, advising, and instruction. *(Continuing commitment)*

PRINCIPLE 3

Teaching and learning are central to the CSU mission. Building on this critical strength and orientation, the quality of teaching and learning can be taken to an even higher level by enriching the interaction among faculty and students. Commitment to this principle will help to secure CSU's unique reputation for high-quality teaching and learning.

The search for ways to enhance the learning relationships among faculty and students may lead to the greater use of the external community as environments in which students learn both from faculty and practitioners, and are able to relate or apply their learning in an experiential manner. This search also may find faculty capturing increasingly the benefits of students learning from each other. Technology is providing yet another way to strengthen interaction between faculty and students. It also should be noted that these efforts to add even more quality to the CSU teaching and learning experience will require more faculty time and support with associated workload and funding implications.

The system should create and support an environment within which faculty can develop and test new ways to augment their current strong commitment to teaching and learning. Because they carry out this most central process of the university, faculty should determine what methods are used and ensure that quality is always maintained or increased.

PRINCIPLE 3: Students will be expected to be active partners with faculty in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 3a. **Campus Priority** Each university will require that all students work with faculty and staff in planning their academic careers to include taking a more active role in their own learning and the development and improvement of academic programs and services. (*Continuing commitment*)
- 3b. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each campus will facilitate such practices of active learning as collaborative learning, internships, problem solving, and the use of interactive technology. (*Continuing activity*)
- 3c. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each campus will provide opportunities and arrangements for students to engage in community-service learning experiences. (*Continuing activity*)
- 3d. **Campus Priority** Each campus will expand student involvement in scholarship, research, and creative activity under faculty guidance, because these activities are central to the teaching and learning mission of a comprehensive university. (*Continuing activity*)

PRINCIPLE 4

Faculty are central to carrying out CSU's teaching and learning-centered mission. For CSU to strengthen already strong performance of this mission, it will look to its faculty, individually and collectively, within the universities and through its representative systemwide bodies: the Academic Senate and the California Faculty Association.

Cornerstones asks faculty to take additional steps to bring the effectiveness of teaching and learning to a new level, a level which few other systems will approach. In doing so, we should recognize that CSU faculty are teachers, and scholars, meaning that CSU faculty work with knowledge at its highest levels. Such scholarship, including research and creative activity, is essential to conveying knowledge at the highest levels of effectiveness. To do so, faculty must be able to develop continuously not only new knowledge, but also to develop various ways to transmit it. So, as we ask faculty to take CSU's mission to an even higher level, we must recognize the critical role of scholarship in doing so and find ways to lend greater support to scholarship.

CSU faculty are unique in American public higher education for translating into practice the dual emphases on teaching and the scholarship related to teaching. As California's population is changing, so are the needs and challenges for teaching and learning. It is crucial that faculty be supported in their efforts in order to meet the more diverse and challenging needs of the future.

PRINCIPLE 4: The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university. Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity are essential components of that mission.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 4a. ***System Priority*** The CSU system will provide faculty with a fair and reasonable incentive and reward system, including closing the faculty salary gap. (*Continuing funding priority*)
- 4b. ***Campus Priority*** Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity will be broadly defined and recognized as appropriate to each campus. (*Continuing activity*)
- 4c. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will support research, scholarly, and creative activities for the faculty as a central element of a rich learning environment for our students. (*Continuing activity*)
- 4d. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will provide a more coordinated and substantive faculty development effort. These efforts will be supported by seeking new resources and by recognition of faculty time needed for these purposes. The Academic Senate, the California Faculty Association, and the CSU administration should be appropriately involved in developing this effort. (*Continuing funding and program priority*)

- 4e. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will seek resources for instructionally-related technology support. (*Continuing funding priority*)

PRINCIPLE 5

Providing access to the baccalaureate degree of high quality is the most important role of CSU. The vast majority of students seeking the social and economic benefits of a baccalaureate education look to CSU. In light of the size and diversity of California's population, no other system of public higher education faces such a challenge, particularly given CSU's commitment to providing access while adhering to high standards. These access challenges only will increase as CSU seeks to raise standards and at the same time assist a wider range of people to complete successfully a high-quality degree.

Strengthening access to the degree will require CSU to address many current barriers to successful access including making CSU programs more available to students who have time, schedule, place, or financial barriers to academic programs. Given that a great majority of community college students seek to complete the baccalaureate degree at CSU, it is critical the transfer process be as effective as possible. And perhaps most important, access to a CSU degree depends on all students coming to CSU fully prepared to begin a high-level of study, which for too many students is not now the case. Addressing this problem will require a comprehensive, systemwide series of joint CSU-public school efforts to reach students while still in school to convey CSU standards for beginning college-level study and to help them to meet these standards.

PRINCIPLE 5: The California State University will meet the need for undergraduate education in California through increasing outreach efforts and transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and providing students a variety of pathways that may reduce the time needed to complete degrees.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 5a. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will continue the current Trustee policy to strengthen the connection between the CSU and K-12, and our collaborative relationship with the California Community Colleges. (*Continuing activity*)
- 5b. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will devote greater attention to the articulation of required lower-division, major courses and/or competencies, both within the CSU and between the CSU and community colleges. Both systems will help define the nature of any problems and, if warranted, ask faculty disciplinary groups across the CSU to seek common requirements. (*By winter, 2001 or sooner*)
- 5c. ***Campus Priority*** Each university will continue and expand programs to reach traditionally underserved communities through increased efforts at outreach and retention. (*Continuing activity*)

- 5d. **System Priority** The CSU system will revisit the competencies needed to begin college-level work and how best to assess them. This review will focus on the relationship of CSU's general education expectations to the skills and knowledge students should bring to college. (*By January, 2000*)
- 5e. **System Priority** The CSU system will intensify its support for early diagnostic testing of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade high school students in English and math to determine progress being made in meeting CSU expectations. (*Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority*)
- 5f. **System Priority** The CSU system will make standardized, nationally normed, placement tests available to K-12 students in English and mathematics during their junior year. Students who pass would be granted appropriate CSU placement. (*Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority*)
- 5g. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will strengthen alliances with the public schools. These alliances will focus on developing a clear understanding of what the CSU math and English placement standards are and how best to achieve them. Special funding will support these efforts. (*Beginning fall, 1999; continuing funding priority*)
- 5h. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will expand the number of well-trained CSU students helping K-12 students achieve stronger English and math skills. (*Continuing commitment*)
- 5i. **System Priority** The CSU will seek more effective methods and structures by which remedial education will be provided, including extended learning and expansion of partnerships with community colleges, public schools, and other institutions. (*Continuing commitment*)

PRINCIPLE 6

Graduate education and continuing education are not only critical elements in CSU's mission but should be expanded and strengthened. Increasingly, economic success will hinge on more education beyond the baccalaureate, both at the Master's degree level and in other forms of continuing and certificated learning.

Additionally, CSU faculty-scholars need the interaction with students in graduate programs in which higher level teaching, learning, scholarship, and research combine to produce new knowledge and its effective transmission; moreover, CSU should seek to widen avenues for its faculty to lend its considerable talents to meeting needs for doctoral-level programs and research.

The particular strengths and roles of continuing education programs in CSU should be recognized. These self-support programs for many years have been effective examples of how to make both credit and non-credit education more accessible to thousands of people and of how to combine private and public support of higher education.

PRINCIPLE 6: Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.

The recommendations in support of this principle are:

- 6a. **Campus Priority** The CSU system will provide increased access to graduate education and continuing education in programs central to the mission of the university, to lifelong opportunities for our students, and to the continued health of California's community and economy. These programs include the liberal arts and sciences that define a university, teaching, nursing, and such newer fields as biotechnology. This recommendation suggests a significant expansion of professional and other programs in areas of high need, financed at least partly through program reductions in other areas. New systems of financing these programs will be explored. (*Continuing activity*)
- 6b. **System and Campus Priority** In support of the CSU mission and recognizing its proven capacities to be creative, flexible, and innovative, continuing education is able to undertake key roles in such areas as assessing needs, testing new technologies, promoting collaboration among universities, starting new programs, and responding to emerging, transient, or cyclical needs. (*Continuing activity*)
- 6c. **System and Campus Priority** The expansion of opportunities in these areas will require a significant integration of programs in both the state-supported and fee-supported modes; the specifics of a more integrated program need to be developed, including the proper institutional and financial relationships. (*Continuing exploration*)
- 6d. **System Priority** The expansion of opportunity in these areas requires significant increases in financial aid for graduate, credential, and continuing education students. This initiative will require both institutional aid and a commitment to amend state and federal aid policies. (*Continuing commitment*)
- 6e. **Campus Priority** Universities will build new partnerships with community and business institutions to make education available beyond the campus, and to increase the immediacy of education that is applied and professional. (*Continuing activity*)
- 6f. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU and its universities will increase investment in their graduate and post-graduate educational programs while maintaining the CSU's commitment to undergraduate education. Consideration will be given to the following possibilities for increased support.
 1. Seek State recognition of the higher cost of graduate (relative to undergraduate) education and the alignment of funding accordingly (without reducing support of undergraduate education). (*Continuing funding priority*)

2. Establishment of differential fees for undergraduate and graduate students to reflect the higher costs associated with graduate education, in parallel with increased financial aid for graduate students. (*Continuing assessment*)
 3. Allowing campuses and programs to charge differential fees in accordance with costs, competition in the marketplace, and demand, subject to adequate financial aid to assure access. (*Continuing assesment*)
- 6g. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU's role in doctoral and professional education will be increased through relationships with the University of California and other public and private higher education institutions. (*Continuing commitment*)

PRINCIPLES 7 AND 8

Securing the resources needed to support CSU's agenda for achieving even higher levels of quality and access is a responsibility to be shared by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campuses, faculty, students, alumni/ae, the California Faculty Association, private enterprise, and the State of California.

As the Board and Chancellor seek these resources for the whole system, the campus administrations, faculty, students, staff, and alumni/ae are asked to continue their effective past and current efforts, which have resulted in CSU's high quality and access. These efforts include substantial progress campuses have made in acting on many elements of the Cornerstones agenda. One purpose of this implementation plan is to establish for all campuses across the system a set of action priorities, which guide the allocation of time, effort, and resources. That many campuses have already institutionalized many of the Cornerstones initiatives speaks well of a shared sense of priorities.

Described below is a series of funding-related initiatives which CSU will seek. It is important to note that securing such support will in part depend upon the commitment of the campuses and Chancellor to a specific agenda and to a process that will provide evidence to funders that progress is being made on critical priorities. Seeking and securing more resources, in short, must go forward with commitment, action and accountability.

PRINCIPLE 7: The State of California must develop a new policy framework for higher education finance to assure that the goals of the Master Plan are met. This framework should be the basis for the subsequent development of periodic "compacts" between the State and the institutions of higher education.

and

PRINCIPLE 8: The responsibility for enhancing educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty and staff, alumni/ae and students.

CSU will pursue the following financing initiatives:

8a. *Development of future budget compacts with the State.*

The California State University is supported primarily by the State's general fund. The University is subject to the variability of the State's overall revenue and the uncertainty of the legislative budget process. Since 1995, the University has had a "compact" with the state that gives multi-year stability to the revenue expectations for the University. This multi-year expectation allows the University to plan for strategic investments in instruction and such instructional support, as technology, that requires implementation over several years. Other areas of need, like compensation increases and maintenance of plant, can be balanced over several years, allowing the University to make better judgments about the amount to spend on competing high priorities within limited resources. (*Under negotiation*)

8b. *Continued commitment to closing the faculty salary gap.*

Competitive salaries for all employees of the university are essential. CSU recruits and retains its faculty in competition with all universities. As enrollment increases and as faculty retire, a significant number of faculty will need to be hired. CSU determines the appropriate salary range by using a CPEC-approved comparison salary methodology. In each budget year a majority portion of CSU's budget increase is allocated for keeping salaries competitive, as measured by the comparison faculty salary survey. CSU is committed to closing the faculty salary gap. (*Continuing funding priority*)

8c. *Study of faculty workload issues.*

The system should respond to faculty concerns about heavy teaching and other responsibilities with a nationally-based comparative study. This review should document how CSU faculty workload compares to other universities with similar missions. To the extent that faculty utilize instructional technology and develop new ways of providing instruction without traditional fixed time classroom sessions, current methods may be no longer sufficient as ways of measuring both faculty and student workload. (*By June, 2000*)

8d. *Seeking funding to support the integrated technology plan initiatives.*

The CSU has determined that substantial investment in information technology is required to provide students with an educational experience that is appropriate for today's society. The investment in campus networks is a new demand on University resources. There is no doubt that this investment is essential. Today's networks provide access to the data and information of the world. They are an essential part of an educational experience in the 21st century. Also, the University needs to replace and update its current administrative systems for improved fiscal controls and improved student service. (*Continuing funding priority*)

8e. ***Seeking special state funding for faculty development and direct instructional support.***

Instructional support, particularly for information technology equipment and instructional equipment replacement, are among the budget priorities considered by the Board of Trustees each year. A specific budget request will be developed that addresses faculty development required to meet the increased expectations of outcomes assessment and new methods of instruction as outlined in this Cornerstones Implementation Plan. *(Continuing funding priority)*

8f. ***Seeking sharper focus of instructionally-related technology support.***

Over several years, there have grown many different initiatives and consultative structures that encourage new uses of technology, particularly information technology, in instructional support. These consultative structures will be examined to coordinate and focus the University's efforts in using technology to assist instruction. *(By January, 2000)*

8g. ***Seeking special funding for specific systemwide public school outreach efforts.***

California has a diverse population. Students eligible for the CSU have come from schools with varying levels of preparation for CSU level work. CSU takes the responsibility to help students in high schools understand the preparation required to perform successfully at the collegiate level. The outreach efforts outlined in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan will be fully developed and the legislature and the Governor will be asked to provide special funds to implement new and coordinated outreach programs to help students prepare for and succeed in university study. *(Continuing funding priority)*

8h. ***Campus reinvestment of productivity.***

The CSU has a program of making continuous productivity improvements. These improvements may result in savings or may result in improved services at the same cost. It is critical that these productivity savings be reinvested at the campuses where they are generated and not be used by the state to diminish the state's obligation to support CSU's instructional program. *(Continuing activity)*

8i. ***Seeking categorical funding for applied research.***

Applied research is a critical part of the CSU's mission to the people of California. In the last decade, the state has not provided any new support for this part of the University's activities. Investment by the state in applied research, often matched by industry, helps invigorate the state's economy, and assists in preparing students to address problems facing California's society. *(Continuing funding priority)*

8j. *Seeking funding for joint doctoral programs based on need.*

There are doctoral programs that CSU is in the best position to provide. Current policy and budget practices work against forming programs that could meet these needs. Fee and funding strategies for high demand doctoral programs should be explored with the state. (*Policy under development*)

8k. *Advancement and fundraising*

The Cornerstones priorities, once imbedded in campus academic plans, will provide development directors and other advancement professionals an opportunity to assist with a number of academic and program priorities. The university advancement officer functions best when the university has an academic plan to assist advancement to order its fund-raising, marketing, alumni/ae, and community relations efforts. External fund-raising is becoming extremely important in maintaining CSU's margin of excellence. (*Continuing activity*)

PRINCIPLE 9

The Cornerstones process is about charting directions for CSU to carry out its mission for quality and access in ways that will meet the demands of the next decade. Cornerstones is also about a commitment to accountability, to assuring the public that, in exchange for its support, it can expect certain results. We trust that making a case based on clear evidence of CSU's value and commitment to continuous improvement will lead to even greater public support.

The nature, formats, and kind of information included need to be defined carefully with full participation by all parties—individual campuses, Trustees, Chancellor, faculty, students, alumni/ae, and the general public. Great sensitivity must be given to differences in institutional missions, identities, and cultures and to the appropriate level and detail of reports, particularly respecting the nature and process for sharing information about student achievement.

This accountability process is critical and should address at least two reporting relationships: that of each individual campus to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor and that of the overall CSU system to the general public and its governing bodies. The focus of campus accountability to the Board should reside at the highest institutional levels; the Chancellor and Board of Trustees should report for the system as a whole.

PRINCIPLE 9: The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society through regular assessment of student achievement and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.

The recommendation in support of this principle provides:

9. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU will expand and/or develop mechanisms for evaluating institutional performance, and develop annual reports appropriately formatted to reach different audiences, describing institutional performance in the areas of student achievement, student satisfaction, the quality of teaching and support services, administrative effectiveness, the provision of service to the community and to the state's economy and society, alumni/ae satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and student, faculty, and staff satisfaction. (*By May, 1999*)

PRINCIPLE 10

Cornerstones will be successfully implemented to the extent that its initiatives are institutionalized by the campuses, particularly through their strategic planning and consequent actions. Virtually all actions that affect quality and access reside with the campuses, where CSU's mission is carried out. While all of the recommendations in this implementation plan are expected to be addressed by each university, it is expected that for a vast majority of them, campuses will have substantial flexibility in how they are implemented. This is especially true for initiatives concerning the teaching and learning process, like learning outcomes and assessment, faculty-student interaction, and academic programs.

Some initiatives suggest consideration of such new methods, as the use of technology- enhanced instruction for augmenting the classroom experience or for extending instruction to place- or time-bound students. Determinations as to their use on an experimental or permanent basis should reside with the faculty, who are in the best position to determine if the primary criterion of quality will be at least maintained, if not increased, by the use of such new methods.

It also is important in calling for faculty to consider other approaches that the system support the necessary experimentation. Support includes not only providing readily accessible information technology resources and infrastructure, but also creating an environment that recognizes the faculty time needed to develop and test new procedures and the fact that some experiments conclude with negative findings, which also have value.

Finally, as individual campuses continue to address the recommendations, the system commits to remove barriers to their effective implementation, including relaxation on a pilot basis of such policies as those in Title 5.

PRINCIPLE 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.

The recommendations supporting this principle are:

- 10a. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will streamline the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. All of this will balance against greater campus and system accountability for outcomes. *(Continuing activity implementing July 1998 Board policy)*
- 10b. ***System and Campus Priority*** The CSU system and each university will work cooperatively with external agencies [Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), etc.], to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs and to develop appropriate accountability frameworks. *(Continuing activity)*
- 10c. ***System Priority*** The CSU system will review current Title 5 and university code requirements to reduce or eliminate regulatory constraints where possible and will authorize appropriate experiments, to promote ways to increase the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and the general CSU mission. *(Title 5 review by fall, 2000; continuing commitment to encourage experimentation)*

Proposed Resolution

The following resolution is recommended for adoption.

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees of the California State University endorsed in January 1998 the Cornerstones report as a planning framework and directed the chancellor to actively pursue the recommendations in the report; and,

WHEREAS, the chancellor and executive vice chancellor have conducted a thorough, participative, systemwide process to develop the Cornerstones Implementation Plan, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University that the Cornerstones Implementation Plan, included in Agenda Item 1 of the March 16, 1999, meeting of the trustees' Committee on Educational Policy, be approved; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board directs the chancellor and the presidents to assign high priority to carrying out the Cornerstones Implementation Plan; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board expresses appreciation for the valuable contributions of the Alumni Council, the California State Student Association, and the Statewide Academic Senate during development of the implementation plan.

The following documents are included to provide examples of the valuable contributions made during development of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan and to establish the context for the systemwide discussions. The final version of the plan incorporates many of the comments and recommendations prompted by the several drafts of the plan.

- Academic Senate Resolution “Response to the Draft Cornerstones Implementation Plan”
- Overview of CSSA’s Response
- Alumni Council Response

Following these reports is Attachment A which is a proposed accountability process that is being circulated to campuses and constituent groups for comment and revision prior to discussion with trustees.

The following will be handed out at the meeting:

- Academic Senate Resolution
- Overview of CSSA's Response
 - Alumni Council Response
 - Attachment A

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2
March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Third Annual Report

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

The CSU Board of Trustees adopted in January 1996 a policy designed to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. Trustee policy calls for annual reports to the Board of Trustees until its remediation policy goals are met. Prior agenda items focused on systemwide and intersegmental activities to implement the elements of the Trustee policy. Campuses are continuing and expanding these activities aggressively. This agenda item includes information about the major education reform initiatives and effectiveness of CSU remediation efforts. As with past reports, the latest information on English and mathematics preparation of new CSU students will be presented at the meeting.

ITEM

Agenda Item 2
March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Third Annual Report

Background

At their January 24, 1996 meeting, the Trustees of the California State University adopted an ambitious plan to work with the public schools to strengthen the preparation of their graduates. Capping two years of research, deliberation, and public comment about the increasing number of students requiring remedial instruction, the Trustees approved a strategy designed to reduce the number of freshmen who need remediation in English and/or mathematics by ten percentage points by fall 2001, and to reduce gradually the need for remediation to not more than ten percent of regularly admitted new freshmen by 2007. The policy does not call for the elimination of remedial and developmental studies but seeks to reduce substantially the number of students requiring remediation while continuing to provide for the special needs of transfer, re-entry, and ESL students.

CSU must stay the course in order to achieve its goal by 2,007 by continuing to pursue the following components of the trustee policy:

- ***Strengthen teacher preparation*** to ensure teachers can teach reading and basic skills;
- ***Set clear standards and assess performance*** against those standards at regular intervals to ensure students will meet both high school graduation standards and university admission requirements;
- ***Communicate standards and expectations*** to ensure that students, their families, and schools can plan effectively to meet university competence standards;
- ***Inform high schools and community colleges about student performance*** after the student's first-year of attendance at CSU.
- ***Develop early intervention programs*** for those students who need assistance meeting high school graduation standards by effective use of college student tutors, mediated, self-paced instruction (technology), and other learning strategies;
- ***Tutor and mentor K-12 students using CSU students***, especially those CSU students who are considering teaching as a career;
- ***Provide early assessment*** after university admission and before first enrollment and ensure that students who need remedial or developmental activity receive it during the first term of enrollment.

As described in the prior two annual reports to the Board, the success of implementing the Trustee policy is contingent on how well the CSU works with K-12 and other higher education segments to define standards for graduation from high school and to help students meet them before leaving high school. This multi-pronged effort emphasizes collaboration between the public schools and postsecondary education to define more clearly the skills students must bring from high school to ensure readiness for college. New early assessment and intervention programs will help determine

the skill levels of high school students so that those who need remedial and developmental work can receive it while still enrolled in high school. In fall 1998, the chancellor called upon district school superintendents to require algebra I, geometry, and algebra II for high school graduation and to teach reading through the 12th grade rather than stopping this activity in about the 5th and 6th grades.

These collaborative efforts have yielded significant progress towards achieving the Trustees' policy goals:

- Nearly all first-time freshmen regularly admitted to CSU who cannot demonstrate proficiency on the basis of the SAT, ACT, and achievement tests, are taking the EPT and/or ELM prior to fall enrollment.
- Virtually all students who require remediation are being placed in appropriate remedial programs and activities during the first term of enrollment.
- Almost all transfer students have completed their general education requirements in English composition and mathematics before entering CSU.
- Teacher preparation programs are being strengthened significantly.
- Annual feedback to high schools and community colleges about the level of preparation of their students and performance at CSU has resulted in the development of consortia composed of CSU and high school English and mathematics faculty in nearly every CSU campus service area.
- Curriculum, standards, and assessment are aligned more closely with CSU expectations.
- Communicating CSU collegiate skill standards has prompted and supported the development of teacher education councils composed of superintendents, associate superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, and teachers from area school districts, in addition to faculty and administrators, to discuss topics related to K-16 education including CSU entrance standards and the school district's high school graduation standards. CSU faculty are working closely with K-12 teachers in summer and academic year weekend workshops to improve their English and mathematics teaching skills.
- The number of CSU students tutoring K-12 students is at its highest level ever. Over 2,500 CSU students serve as mentor/tutors, serving over 64,000 K-12 students in over 800 K-12 schools. The Legislature and Governor permanently augmented the CSU Precollegiate Academic Development Program (PAD) for the third year by \$1 million in recognition of its effectiveness in helping K-12 students to strengthen their English and mathematics skills. This results in a total budget of \$4.5 million for 1998-99.

Cornerstones Initiatives

In the aggregate, CSU campuses are engaging in virtually every means of communicating standards and expectations, informing high school about student performance of their graduates, developing early intervention programs, tutoring and mentoring K-12 students, and provide early assessment opportunities for high school students. There are certain activities, however, that have proven to be particularly effective which need to be implemented by all CSU campuses. Many of these activities are identified in Cornerstones which is a systemwide plan that will require the participation of all CSU campuses. The *Cornerstones Implementation Plan* presented to the Trustees includes under Principle 5 the following actions which campuses will be called upon to implement:

- Strengthen the connection between the CSU and K-12 and our collaborative relationship with the California Community Colleges;
- Expand programs to reach traditionally underserved communities through increased efforts at outreach and retention;
- Revisit the competencies needed to begin college-level work and how best to assess them;
- Intensify support for early diagnostic testing of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade high school students in English and math to determine progress being made in meeting CSU expectations, including focus on the Math Diagnostic Placement Test (MDPT) and the CSU on-line writing assessment project;
- Make placement tests available to K-12 students in English and math during their junior year, certifying CSU placement for those who demonstrate proficiency;
- Strengthen alliances with the public schools to focus on developing a clear understanding of what the CSU math and English placement standards are and how best to achieve them;
- Expand the number of well-trained CSU students helping K-12 students achieve stronger English and math skills; and
- Seek more effective methods and structures by which remedial education will be provided, including extended learning and expansion of partnerships with community colleges, public schools, and other institutions.

Together, these steps will help strengthen the preparation of entering students and reduce the need for remediation. Working with K-12, CSU has provided leadership to help ensure that students come from high schools well prepared to make the most of their college opportunity. CSU expects the next generation of college students to enter the CSU with significantly enhanced skills and the ability to enter directly into their studies and achieve unprecedented success.

Education Reform Initiatives

Beginning with Governor Wilson's pumping millions of dollars into class-size reduction and continuing with Governor Davis identifying improvement of public schools his key issue, improvement of the public schools has become the dominant public policy issue in California. Massive resources are being dedicated to the improvement of school buildings, quality of teaching, and student acquisition of the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed. California invests nearly \$43 billion from all fund sources in K-12 education. However, the governor calls for California to do even more, reporting in his budget summary that the most recent scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) revealed that fifty-six percent of California students scored below basic competency compared to forty-one percent nationally. The first year results from the Standardized Testing and Reporting System (STAR) showed California with a national percentile ranking of California schools as 39 for reading and 44 for math. The scores for third grade reading indicate that sixty-two percent of California third graders are below the national median. By ninth grade, sixty-six percent are below the national median reading score.

To improve the skills of K-12 students, the Governor's Budget for 1999-2000 provides \$444 million for a package of initiatives entitled *Raising Expectations, Achievement, and Development (READ) in Schools*. The READ initiative has a single objective: to improve significantly student academic achievement by setting high expectations and rewarding excellent results. Many of these initiatives will be proposed through special session legislation. The new funding will be focused in three major areas:

- Improving reading skills (\$186 million);
- Enhancing professional quality (\$51 million); and
- Increasing school accountability (\$200 million).

Improving Reading Skills (\$186 million)

\$75 million will be allocated to improving the reading skills of ten percent of the students in grades K-4 who have the least reading skills. \$25 million will be used to create or augment elementary school classroom libraries with an extensive selection of good books that students may read during classroom reading periods or checked out and used at home. The Office of the Secretary for Education will develop and conduct a public campaign to encourage parents, students, and community members to make reading an integral part of the students daily life. \$2 million will be used to provide \$5,000 each to 400 elementary and middle schools whose students meet specified reading targets by reading books designated in the Superintendent of Public Instruction's California Reading lists. The State Department of Education will identify and disseminate exemplary instructional models for use in teaching reading to secondary school students. The primary language of nearly one quarter of the students in California schools is a language other than English. Therefore \$74 million will be used to identify and implement successful strategies to teach English language learners. \$1 million will be used to publish and distribute pre-kindergarten reading and development guidelines and to train child care providers on the use of these guidelines.

Enhancing Professional Quality (\$51 million)

Recognizing the importance of classroom teachers to ensuring student acquisition of basic skills, the Governor's Budget includes \$51 million to improve professional quality. CSU will be a full partner with UC in using \$12 million to establish development institutes for up to 6,000 beginning teachers of reading. These institutes will help teachers with training on effective research-supported strategies for teaching beginning reading skills and the use of classroom assessments in reading. Under the Teacher Peer Review and Assistance Program, \$16.8 million will be merged with the existing Mentor Teacher Program resulting in total program funding of \$100 million. Teachers will receive assistance for and evaluation of their teaching skills in a peer review system. Selected teachers will receive training in peer review techniques in order to help other teacher improve or update their teaching techniques. Biennial teacher evaluations will be modified to include appropriate student testing results as a method to measure how well state academic standards are taught.

Increasing School Accountability (\$200 million)

The Governor's Budget asserts that "the ability to measure student, teacher, and administrator performance is essential to improving the overall performance of California's schools." Therefore, the budget includes over \$200 million to promote school performance and accountability. The development of academic content standards with the development of statewide student assessment measures provides the foundation upon which to develop an accountability system that identifies under-achieving and high-achieving schools.

The State Department of Education will use \$2 million to develop statewide high school exit exams in reading, writing, and mathematics that all students will be required to pass as a condition of high school graduation beginning in 2003. Special legislative session bill SB 2 (O'Connell) outlines the provisions for the high school exit examination. CSU has offered two proposed amendments to this bill that would require the participation of faculty from each public higher education in the review and exit examination development process and that would fund early warning English and mathematics diagnostic instruments available to all high school mathematics and English teachers so that teachers, students, and their families can assess the extent to which each student has progressed in becoming prepared to take and pass the high school exit examination. Specifically, CSU is recommending that the legislature provide full state support to enable all California high school students to take the Mathematics Diagnostic Test Program (MDTP) and either the CSU or UC on-line writing diagnostic assessment.

\$42 million will be requested to fund a comprehensive school accountability proposal that will hold all schools accountable for educating the students they serve. The State Board of Education will develop an academic performance index to be used to measure student academic progress in selected schools. Schools that improve student performance by meeting or exceeding goals established by the State Board of Education will be rewarded under this program from a fund totaling \$150 million.

Community colleges will receive \$10.6 million to prepare and publish annually a report card on the academic preparedness of new community college students to help individual high schools identify strengths and weaknesses that need improvement. This report will be similar to the CSU Academic Performance Report which CSU has provided annually to each high school and community college

that sends five or more students to the CSU system. These reports present in summary form information on the academic performance of students in their first year at CSU. For freshmen, this information includes grade point averages, mean SAT and ACT scores, persistence from first to second year, and performance on the EPT and ELM.

In addition to these education initiatives, the Governor's budget calls for intersegmental cooperation and outreach to ensure increased participation by students from educationally and economically disadvantaged backgrounds through partnerships with K-12 and increased regional collaboration to share library, computer, and other education resources. Universities must make a greater contribution towards improving the performance of the K-12 systems, recognizing that university students of the 21st century are enrolled in K-12 today. Excellence at the postsecondary level requires excellence at the elementary and secondary levels. Therefore, the Governor's Budget calls for CSU, UC and K-12 to assume greater responsibility for helping to develop a single, coordinated and integrated educational system by recognizing the statewide K-12 academic standards, especially the new high school graduation exam, in college admission policies, re-examining how outreach is structured and conducted to ensure that students are better prepared for higher education, forming collaboratives not only with other higher education systems and K-12 but also with community and businesses to help focus all regional efforts on the goals of improving K-12 education, and researching instructional strategies that can assist under-performing schools and students.

Each of these efforts will help improve the academic preparation of K-12 students, thus reducing the need for remediation.

Implementation of Testing and Prompt Remediation Policies

Nearly all first-time freshmen regularly admitted to CSU who cannot demonstrate proficiency on the basis of the SAT, ACT, and achievement tests, are taking the EPT and/or ELM prior to fall enrollment. Students who require remediation are being placed in appropriate remedial programs and activities during the first term of enrollment.

For those who require placement in appropriate remediation programs and activities, CSU campuses are thoughtfully considering the degree and scope of remediation they require. To achieve this, campuses are placing students on the basis of the student's score on the EPT and/or ELM, determining whether students need one or multiple terms of remediation during the first academic year. At all needing remediation receive it beginning with the first term of enrollment. On some CSU campuses, remedial English and mathematics courses are offered during the summer for entering freshmen who do not achieve qualifying scores on the EPT and/or the ELM. Special admit students are expected on some campuses to take the EPT and the ELM as part of their participation in orientation and summer bridge programs. Reading and writing programs are being developed and expanded in tutorial formats.

Computer-assisted instructional aides are being employed in the areas of mathematics, reading, writing, study skills, and general test preparation to minimize the number of remedial courses students have to take. At some CSU campuses, faculty are teaching remedial mathematics by using

software that permits students to proceed at their own pace. Using this self-paced computer program, faculty can increase the number of students taught in each section, and students have access to instruction that is learner-centered (interactive, adaptive to individual learning pace and style, diagnostic and tutorial). Evaluation at one campus indicates that students using the computer technology have as high a success rate in completing remedial courses and that they fare as well in subsequent college-level mathematics courses as do students who were exempt from remedial courses.

CSU campuses have instituted a variety of strategies to ensure that students who require remediation are placed in appropriate programs during the first term of enrollment and continue to remain active participants in the remediation classes until the students can demonstrate proficiency. The following are representative examples of approaches used by campuses:

- Outreach activities include more information about the trustees' remediation policy.
- Orientation activities emphasize the requirement that all first-year students complete remediation in their first year.
- All faculty who teach remedial courses and the academic advisors of first-year students participate in special training programs that emphasize areas such as pedagogy, course attendance, and referrals for academic support.
- All academic advisors prepare a first-year enrollment plan for their advisees based on the level of remediation required.
- All faculty who teach remedial courses place a statement in their syllabi that students must complete remediation during the first year of attendance.
- Electronic early alert systems have been created to link faculty with the student's academic advisor to prevent students from withdrawing from remedial classes or from failing to complete assignments.
- Campuses have established remediation committees to strengthen and monitor compliance with trustee remediation policies.
- Students who require a second term of remediation are flagged to ensure that they enroll in appropriate remediation classes in the spring term.
- Some campuses are exploring contracting with local community colleges to provide remedial instruction on the CSU campus to entering students.
- Student information systems are being reprogrammed to track students who are required to enroll in remedial classes.

Early Indicators of Student Preparation Levels

All high school students in California should have the opportunity to see if they are on track for skills expected to ensure that they will master the competencies in English and mathematics expected of high school graduates and college/university freshmen. The earlier students, teachers, and parents are of deficiencies, the more time students have to acquire the needed competencies.

CSU recognizes the need for students to be tested as early as the 10th grade and prior to CSU enrollment. While the California Education Round Table task forces complete the development of content standards and assessment measures, the CSU supports, as an interim step, a number of projects that expand the use of diagnostic instruments at the high school level that will lead to a reduction in the need for remedial education. The Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP), developed jointly by CSU and UC faculty members, offers tests to students from pre-algebra level to calculus. Annually, MDTP tests are administered to over 350,000 students enrolled in 9th through 12th grades in over 900 California high schools. In addition, over 225,000 California Community College students take the MDTP.

The information from these tests is provided both to the student and to the teacher to help strengthen curriculum and preparation to enable students to know what they must do to prepare for baccalaureate level study. Unfortunately, the demand for this test exceeds the MDTP test supply and budgetary support necessary to administer and score these tests. Additional funds have been requested in the intersegmental budget process to make the MDTP available to all students enrolled in 9th through 12th grades.

While the MDTP is an effective series of mathematics diagnostic assessment instruments, there is not a similar instrument available to measure student preparation in English. Therefore, CSU is developing in collaboration with ETS an on-line diagnostic writing service to assist high school students strengthen reading and writing skills. The service will provide students an opportunity to write a response to a previously administered but retired essay question from CSU's. Responses will be evaluated by trained faculty readers, and students will receive an overall evaluation of their essay accompanied by diagnostic statements designed to help them and their teachers improve their reading and writing skills while the student is still enrolled in high school.

Summary

While these systemwide and campus efforts are effective for the majority of students requiring remediation, it will be several years yet before CSU sees the outcome of its efforts to work with students who are enrolled in elementary and middle schools. Many of the early intervention programs are designed for students who need assistance in elementary and middle schools. As mentioned in the introduction to this agenda item, the success of implementing the Trustee policy is contingent on how well the CSU works with K-12 and other higher education segments to define standards for graduation from high school and to help students meet them before leaving high school.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3
March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Planning and Program Review

Presentation by

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

This annual report on academic planning and program review is in accord with Board of Trustees policy established in 1963. While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs, which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation.

The five-year curricular plans for each campus have been updated to cover the years 1999-2000 through 2003-04 (a few campuses have curriculum development processes that require longer planning time frames). These campus academic plans are in Attachment A to this agenda item. This is the second year that the planning approval process adopted by the Board in July 1997 is in effect; programs that are taking advantage of the new alternatives to the traditional process are noted. Summaries of academic program review activities for each campus appear in Attachment B. In 1997-98, one campus received a comprehensive visit by a team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); a summary of the team's report is included as Attachment C. The attachments have been distributed separately.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plans and specify the conditions under which projected programs may be implemented.

Recommended Action

Adoption of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3

March 16-17, 1999

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Planning and Program Review

This item summarizes the California State University academic planning process over the past year and submits the campus academic plans for the next five years (up to ten years for campuses that require a longer planning time frame). While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs. This sometimes leads to program consolidation and discontinuation. Program consolidation and discontinuation is likely to be an increasingly active concern of the campuses over the next several years as a result of Cornerstones recommendations, opportunities for increased collaboration through technology, and a more concerted effort by the campuses to focus their program offerings in accord with their missions.

Five academic planning topics (and a proposed resolution) are addressed in this item:

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)
2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs
3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)
4. Program Discontinuations
5. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the existing degree programs offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. They are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus.

The academic plans are reviewed annually by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy which has been developed over the last three decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of these proposed programs on the academic master plan. Consequently, the "proposed" columns of the academic plans in Attachment A represent only "planning authorization." If and when a campus decides to pursue implementation of a new program (other than a pilot program), a detailed degree proposal must be submitted to the chancellor before the planned implementation dates. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the concurrence of the California Postsecondary Education Commission must also be sought before a degree program can be established. Not all projected programs are eventually implemented; this year, campuses requested that several projected programs be removed from their academic plans.

This year, sixteen new programs have been proposed for addition to campus academic plans. Four of those represent conversions to full degree programs of options within a long-established accredited Engineering degree program (every other general Engineering program of long standing in the CSU has already undergone a similar transformation). Two others are alternative baccalaureate programs in disciplines for which a baccalaureate program already exists on the campus. All but one of the remaining programs would be interdisciplinary, drawing on considerable faculty, curriculum, and physical resources that already exist on the campuses. No new facilities are required for any of the newly requested programs. The programs for which “planning authorization” is requested are listed below.

Chico	BA, Jewish Studies (in collaboration with other CSU campuses)
Dominguez Hills	BA, Digital Media Arts
Fullerton	BA, Women’s Studies
Hayward	MS, Health Care Administration
Northridge	BA, Science
	BS, Civil Engineering
	BS, Computer Engineering
	BS, Electrical Engineering
	BS, Manufacturing Systems Engineering
	BS, Mechanical Engineering
San Francisco	MA, Human Sexuality Studies
San José	MFA, Creative Writing
San Luis Obispo	BA, Physics
	BS, Earth Sciences
Sonoma	BA, Women’s and Gender Studies
Stanislaus	BM, Music

2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs

In July 1997, the Board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established process described above, campuses have two new alternative processes for establishing programs: the “fast track” and the pilot program. The fast track combines the program projection and program implementation phases of the traditional process for proposed programs that meet certain criteria. Five of the newly projected programs on the updated academic plans are on the fast track, and four will probably be implemented in 1999-2000. The pilot program process allows campuses, under certain conditions, to implement a limited number of programs without prior review and approval by the Chancellor or the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A pilot program may admit students for no more than five years, unless converted to regular-program status; conversion requires a thorough program evaluation, review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and approval by the Board and the Chancellor. Two pilot programs have been established: a BA degree program with a major in Travel and Tourism at CSU Dominguez Hills (which may be offered from fall 1998 to fall 2003) and an MS degree program in Computing and Technology in Education (which may be offered from summer 1998 to summer 2003).

The new alternative processes are congruent with the Cornerstones recommendations, which have called for “streamlin[ing] the process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. ... This will balance against greater ... accountability for outcomes....”

The revised procedures also specify that projected programs be removed from campus academic plans if an implementation proposal is not developed within five years or the date originally projected for implementation (whichever is later), unless a new justification is submitted. This provision does not apply to “foundation” liberal arts and science programs. The request for proposed updates to the academic plans listed four projections that would automatically be removed from the academic plans. Campuses have requested that three be retained.

3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)

In 1971, the Board of Trustees adopted policy requiring that each campus review every academic program on a regular basis. Since that time, summaries of campus program reviews have been provided annually to the board. The summaries appear as Attachment B to this item.

In the early 1990s, several campuses were unable to use external reviewers in the program review process because of budget difficulties. Campuses are again employing external reviewers on a regular basis, some from other CSU campuses and some from outside the system. A few campuses have recently revised their program review processes, often better to coordinate reviews with campus strategic planning initiatives. In general, the campus review processes are as rigorous in determining areas for improvement as in recognizing program strengths.

4. Program Discontinuations

Campuses have informed the chancellor of the discontinuation of the following degree major programs since the last report on academic planning and program review. For some of the programs listed below, part or all of the instruction associated with the discontinued program has been subsumed within other degree programs.

Long Beach	BA, Biology
Los Angeles	BA, Earth Sciences
Pomona	BA, Earth Science
Sacramento	MS, Biomedical Engineering
San Francisco	BA, Creative Arts
San José	BA, Industrial Arts
	MA, Industrial Studies

The Cornerstones plan encourages each university to “make special efforts to ensure that programs and courses are strengthened, added, retained, and eliminated according to explicit criteria and procedures.... [that are] designed to ensure that programs are continually responsive to ... societal needs and the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, changes in disciplines, and campus priorities.” We note that there has already been substantial consolidation of options or concentrations within existing degree programs on some campuses, and that activity is likely to increase.

5. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)

The Board of Trustees adopted a resolution in January 1991 that requires information on recent campus accreditation visits to be included in the annual agenda item on academic planning and program review. A summary of the results and recommendations resulting from the visit by a team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to Humboldt State University during 1997-98 can be found in Attachment C.

Proposed Resolution

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans in Attachment A. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 16-17, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and be it further

RESOLVED, That those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the programs will be available; and be it further

RESOLVED, That degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.