

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting:** 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, March 14, 2000  
Fairmont Hotel

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Debra S. Farar  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Neel I. Murarka  
Dee Dee Myers  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Stanley T. Wang

#### **Closed Session**

Government Code Section 11126 [c][5]—Trustees Expected to Attend: Committee Members

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees, *Action*

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 1  
March 14-15 2000

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees**

**Presentation By**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

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

**Summary**

Recommendations from the Committee on Educational Policy, Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, will be addressed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c) (5) [closed session “to consider the conferring of honorary degrees”].

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting: 1:15 p.m., Tuesday, March 14, 2000**  
**San Jose State University**  
**Student Union Ballroom**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Debra S. Farar  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Neel I. Murarka  
Dee Dee Myers  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Stanley T. Wang

**Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of January 25 and 26, 2000

**Discussion Items**

2. Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access, *Action*
3. Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Fourth Annual Report, *Information*
4. Community Service: Responding to the Governor's Call, *Action*
5. Academic Planning and Program Review, *Action*

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

**Trustees of The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California**

**January 25-26, 2000**

**Members Present**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Debra S. Farar  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Stanley T. Wang

**Members Absent**

Dee Dee Myers

**Other Trustees Present**

Roberta Achtenberg  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Ali C. Razi  
Anthony M. Vitti

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

**Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees**

**Closed Session**

The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees and the Committee on Educational Policy met Tuesday, January 25, 2000, at 11:20 a.m. in closed session and acted on nominations for honorary degrees.

**Open Session**

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order on January 26, 2000, at 9:37 a.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of November 15 and 17, 1999, were approved as submitted and amended in the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph of page 5 to read, "Trustee Goldwhite stated that the accountability process demonstrated that a plan can be produced expeditiously and still give all CSU constituencies the opportunity for full participation in the process."

**Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories**

Chair Campbell stated that this item continues a series of presentations on notable accomplishments of CSU faculty in teaching, research, and scholarship. The Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML) is a collaboration that enables students from several different CSU institutions access to high quality instruction and the opportunity to participate in cutting edge research. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence commented that Moss Landing comprises the marine facilities and graduate program in marine science for a consortium of seven CSU campuses: Fresno, Hayward, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus.

President Caret, San Jose State, stated that the consortium demonstrates how research and teaching are blended in a partnership. He introduced a video, narrated by Dr. Kenneth Coale, acting director, MLML, which described the new facility under construction as well as the teaching and research contributions of the institution. President Caret introduced Dr. Coale, Dr. Gail Johnston, assistant director, and Ms. Lisa Utall, director of the Friends of MLML. The board applauded their work.

Trustee Pesqueira asked if students at MLML were able to utilize the California Maritime Academy vessel. Dr. Coale responded that although the primary purpose of the Maritime Academy vessel is to help prepare students for jobs in the maritime industry rather than to conduct research, MLML is in the process of developing a partnership with the Maritime Academy. Dr. Spence thanked President Caret, MLML staff, and faculty for their work.

**Progress Report on CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers**

Chair Campbell stated that in July 1998, the board adopted a commitment for CSU to prepare high quality teachers which included ten goals and specific timelines for reaching each goal. All the goals are to be reached by July 2000. Dr. Spence introduced President Maxson, CSU Long Beach, who gave a progress report on all ten goals in the four goal areas: access, curriculum, high standards, and collaboration with schools. President Maxson commented that not only have teacher credential recommendations increased by over 25 percent systemwide, but in every area major changes and improvements in teacher preparation have occurred. Dr. Spence congratulated the faculty, campus staff, and students for their role in the progress toward these goals. The next step is for the Presidents Commission on Teacher Education to oversee an external evaluation of the progress by seeking feedback from K-12 schools and community groups. The final report to the board is expected in January 2001.

Chair Campbell thanked Chancellor Reed for his leadership in making teaching preparation a high priority for CSU. Trustee Goldwhite, Dr. Maxson, and Dr. Spence recognized presidents, deans of education, faculty, and chancellor's staff for their contributions. He added that the progress to date is the work of the entire CSU, and that faculty and staff alike are aware of the importance of teacher preparation. Dr. Goldwhite pointed out that while it is important to increase the number of teacher credentials, it is also important to look at the support of the professional development of teachers in their first years of teaching. Dr. Goldwhite expressed concern about the high attrition rate of new teachers. Trustee Pesqueira added his congratulations to the faculty and staff for keeping the board informed of how CSU's commitment to teacher preparation is progressing and suggested regular reports as the program proceeds.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel inquired about a method for tracking teachers in the field during the first five years of teaching. President Maxson responded that there is a state funded program which provides ongoing assistance for the new teachers. In addition, all campuses have programs to keep in contact with new teachers who often remain in the immediate area, thereby simplifying the tracking process.

### **Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees**

Dr. Spence noted that both the Cornerstones implementation plan and the governor's call for the CSU to reconcile its 124-unit graduation requirement with UC's 120-unit requirement have prompted the CSU to reexamine the minimum number of units a student must take to earn a bachelor's degree. He added that consideration of the total units required for a degree has also stimulated interest among members of the statewide Academic Senate in discussion of the requirements for general education and majors. To allow time for further faculty discussion, the proposed Title 5 amendment will be brought back to the board for action at its May meeting.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:21 a.m.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 2  
March 14-15, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access**

Presentation By

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

Dr. Donald R. Gerth, President, CSU Sacramento  
Chair, CSU Admission Advisory Council and CSU Enrollment Management Work Group

#### **Summary**

Projections for growing demand for access to California higher education are coming true. In response to increasing enrollment pressures facing CSU campuses, the Committee on Educational Policy initiated a thorough review of CSU enrollment management policies to ensure they are able to guide CSU campuses as they cope with Tidal Wave II. At its November 15, 1999, meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy appointed an Enrollment Management Work Group to evaluate current CSU enrollment management policies and to make a recommendation to the Committee on Educational Policy at its March 2000 meeting to guide the chancellor and the campuses in responding to the challenges to access caused by increasing enrollment pressures. The work group was chaired by Donald R. Gerth, president, CSU Sacramento, and included four additional presidents, the chair of the Statewide Academic Senate, a second faculty representative, a provost, a campus enrollment management representative, and a student.

This item proposes enrollment management policy principles recommended by the Enrollment Management Work Group. If adopted by the Board of Trustees, the principles would be effective with students seeking admission to CSU beginning fall 2001.

#### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the proposed resolution adopting enrollment management principles.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2  
March 14-15, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access**

##### **Enrollment Pressures and Projected Capacities**

Several CSU campuses are approaching the point at which their current physical and operational capacity will not permit all eligible students to be admitted. On September 20, 1999, CPEC announced enrollment demand projections to 2010. Statewide enrollment demand between 1998 and 2010 is expected to increase by 714,753 students. It is estimated that CSU will enroll 130,000 of these students in the next ten years, an average of 13,000 each year for ten years. It is now clear that CSU is in a new time, a new situation not seen before.

When a program or campus receives more eligible applicants than can be enrolled, the program or campus is considered "impacted." Program impaction has enabled most CSU campuses to manage enrollment pressures. Now, some campuses are beginning to find that they have more qualified applicants than they have space for across the entire campus. San Luis Obispo, Chico, and San Diego State University have been designated as impacted and authorized to control their enrollment through the use of supplementary admission criteria. Long Beach and Fullerton are also experiencing increased enrollment pressures that may result soon in requests from these campuses to limit the number of students admitted. In addition, popular majors such as architecture, nursing, occupational therapy, and physical therapy are impacted at all campuses offering them. These are known as systemwide impacted programs, and are filled on the basis of applicants who apply during the first month of the filing period.

Within the directives of the Master Plan and state law, responsibility for the establishment of admission policy for the California State University rests with the Board of Trustees. The adequacy of CSU enrollment policies to respond to increasing pressures on access was first raised at the September 15, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy. This meeting was followed by two special working meetings of the Committee on Educational Policy on October 27, 1999, and November 15, 1999. In light of emerging concerns regarding significant projected enrollment growth, the board, through the Committee on Educational Policy, asked the chancellor and the executive vice chancellor to work with the presidents, academic senate, and the Admission Advisory Council to develop or clarify policy to address increasing enrollment pressures. An enrollment management work group composed of presidents, faculty, a provost, a campus enrollment management representative, and a student was appointed. The work group, chaired by Dr. Donald R. Gerth, president, CSU Sacramento, was asked to evaluate current enrollment management policies and to make recommendations to the Committee on Educational Policy at its March 2000 meeting. The members of this work group are listed in Attachment A.

This item proposes enrollment management policy principles recommended to the chancellor by the Enrollment Management Work Group. If adopted by the Board of Trustees, the principles would be effective with students seeking admission to CSU beginning fall 2001.

### **Key Policy Issue**

The Master Plan, state law, and trustee policies are clear about the relative priorities of categories of students admitted to CSU. Highest priority is accorded to upper division California Community College transfers. Once these students have completed the equivalent of the first two years of a bachelor's degree with at least a 2.0 GPA, they must have the opportunity to transfer to a CSU campus. Eligible first-time freshmen have second highest priority. California residents receive the highest priority in all admission categories; campuses are required to maintain a balanced program and diversity as admission priorities are implemented. The key policy question is the extent to which CSU campuses should provide access to fully eligible local applicants.

### **Enrollment Management Work Group**

The work group on enrollment management held four meetings. Early in the work group's activities it was decided to give anyone interested in the group's assignment the opportunity to participate and share their views. This general invitation resulted in one entire meeting and half of a second meeting being devoted to presentations of interested parties and participating in discussions with them about CSU admission policies and practices. Those who accepted the invitation included community, public school, and community college leaders, parents, students, and representatives of the corporate and private sectors. Presidents of CSU campuses currently experiencing enrollment pressures or anticipating such situations were also invited to share their insights and concerns with the group.

Early in the work group's discussions members agreed that it is extremely important for CSU campuses to make every effort to avoid campuswide impaction. The first step is for each campus to use such approaches as flexible scheduling and year-round operations, distance learning and the use of technology, increased capacity of existing off-campus centers, establishment of new centers, and the use of facilities imaginatively to take full advantage of existing capacity. If these measures are inadequate to relieve enrollment pressure, campuses should use program impaction to control access to high-demand programs. The group concluded that only if all other efforts to control enrollment prove inadequate should campuswide impaction be considered.

Much of the group's attention was devoted to the question of the level of priority that should be accorded a fully eligible applicant by the CSU campuses in the student's region. After a great deal of discussion, it was decided to recommend that fully eligible "local" students be guaranteed admission to at least one local CSU campus, and that local students be defined as first-time freshmen and community college transfer students from high schools and community colleges that have

traditionally been served by a CSU campus in that region. The admission eligibility of such students would be based on established CSU system admission standards rather than higher supplementary admission criteria that are used to screen applicants for impacted programs.

Concurrent with the progress of the work group, parallel discussions of CSU admission policies were occurring in the Statewide Academic Senate, among the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, and in the Executive Council. The work group developed a series of principles that were largely consistent with points included in two resolutions adopted by the Statewide Academic Senate. The Senate resolutions and revisions emerging from Executive Council discussions were useful as the work group refined and finalized the principles included in the following resolution.

### **Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**WHEREAS**, California law acknowledges the responsibility of the State of California to provide the resources necessary for higher education to fulfill the requirements of the Master Plan for Higher Education; and

**WHEREAS**, Education Code Section 66202.5 states, “The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth ... to accommodate eligible California freshmen applicants and eligible California Community College transfer students...;”

now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the following principles are adopted by the Board of Trustees effective with students seeking admission to the CSU for fall 2001 to aid the chancellor and campuses in carrying out the mission of the CSU and to ensure that CSU campuses continue to comply with the provisions of the Master Plan for Education:

- CSU reaffirms its commitment to the Master Plan to accommodate within the CSU all fully eligible students in the upper one-third of recent California high school graduates and all fully eligible, upper division California community college transfer students.
- Appropriate to the mission of the CSU system and that of its member campuses, each CSU campus is expected to maintain a balanced student body and to provide broad-based access to the people of California.

- CSU outreach, admission, and retention policies shall continue to provide encouragement, support, and access to students traditionally underrepresented in California higher education toward the goal of enrolling a student population reflective of California's growing diversity.
- It is the intent of the CSU Board of Trustees that campuswide impaction be avoided. The trustees will seek the instructional and physical capacity resources necessary to serve all fully eligible students who desire a CSU education. The CSU system shall work with CSU campuses for which program impaction is inadequate to manage their enrollment pressures. A campus may be designated as impacted campuswide only if the campus can demonstrate that it has exhausted existing enrollment capacity by implementing such approaches as flexible scheduling and year-round operations, expanding distance learning and use of technology, increasing the capacity of existing off-campus centers, establishing new centers, and using facilities imaginatively, but not at the expense of regular campus maintenance and capital outlay needs.
- CSU-eligible students are guaranteed admission to at least one local CSU campus. Admission, however, does not include assurance of admission to a specific program.
- First-time freshmen and upper division transfer students shall be admitted to a local CSU campus on the basis of established CSU system admission policies, i.e., those standards defined in the first principle listed above.
- For purposes of admission, "local" first-time freshmen are defined as those students who graduate from a high school historically served by a CSU campus in that region, and local upper division transfer students are defined as those who transfer from a community college historically served by a CSU campus in that region.
- CSU campuses shall utilize program impaction where appropriate prior to requesting campuswide impaction.

6

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 2

March 14-15, 2000

- CSU campuses may pursue program impaction for those programs receiving more fully eligible applicants than can be accommodated. Campuswide impaction shall be authorized only when program impaction is inadequate to cope with an excess number of fully eligible applicants.
- Supplementary admission criteria will be used to screen applicants for impacted programs and shall be publicized widely. Supplementary admission criteria may be used in campuswide impaction situations provided that CSU-eligible students guaranteed regional access shall be admitted.
- The effects of these principles and other CSU admission policies and practices shall be monitored carefully to ensure that CSU continues to honor its Master Plan obligations in a clear and consistent way.

**CSU ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP**

**1999-2000**

Dr. Donald R. Gerth, Chair  
President  
CSU Sacramento

Ms. Lorraine Newlon  
Director of Articulation, Admissions, and Records  
CSU Northridge

Dr. Robert L. Caret  
President  
San José State University

Dr. James M. Rosser  
President  
CSU Los Angeles

Mr. Charles Collom  
President, Associated Students Inc.  
CSU Bakersfield

Dr. Paul J. Zingg  
Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs  
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

Mr. Gene L. Dinielli  
Chair  
Academic Senate CSU

Dr. Alexander Gonzalez  
President  
CSU San Marcos

Dr. David S. Spence, ex officio  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
Chief Academic Officer  
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Robert C. Maxson  
President  
CSU Long Beach

Dr. Charles W. Lindahl, ex officio  
Associate Vice Chancellor  
Academic Affairs  
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. David O. McNeil  
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee  
Academic Senate CSU

Mr. Allison G. Jones, staff  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Office of the Chancellor

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 3  
March 14-15, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Fourth Annual Report**

##### **Presentation By**

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

Herbert L. Carter  
Special Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor

##### **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. That policy called for annual reports to the trustees on implementation of the policy. Since the most important information, the percentage of incoming freshmen needing assistance in English and mathematics, is not available when the agenda is published, the written agenda item has focused on campus and system efforts to deal with this issue.

This year's agenda item summarizes special services that CSU campuses have established to serve first-time freshmen. Many of the services are offered throughout the system, and other programs are unique to the campus. All programs reflect the campus's commitment to ensure first-time freshmen are prepared for academic studies and are comfortable and confident in their new surroundings.

The latest information on English and mathematics preparation of new CSU students entering CSU in fall 1999 will be presented at the meeting.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3  
March 14-15, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Fourth Annual Report**

At its 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. 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.

Executive Order 665 was issued by the chancellor to implement the provisions of the trustee remedial education policy adopted in January 1996. This executive order requires campuses to assess student proficiency in English and mathematics after admission and prior to enrollment, to ensure that students needing remediation receive it beginning with the first term of enrollment, to establish and enforce limits on remedial activity and advise students who are not making adequate progress in developing foundational skills to consider enrolling in other educational institutions as appropriate, and to permit students to continue for a second year of remedial education on a case-by-case basis.

As reported to the trustees at its March 1999 meeting, 99 percent of all regularly admitted first-time freshmen enrolling in fall 1998 were assessed in English and mathematics after admission and before enrollment. Of these freshmen, 47 percent required remediation in English and 54 percent required remediation in mathematics.

In a special report to the board in November 1999, it was reported that all campuses have implemented procedures to improve the effectiveness of remedial education so that more first-time freshmen enrolling at CSU in fall 1998 completed their required remediation prior to fall 1999. For students who were unable to demonstrate proficiency in English and/or mathematics at the end of the first academic year or summer, campuses developed and implemented effective criteria and processes to determine whether students could re-enroll for a second year of remediation. These measures were so successful that 94 percent of students continuing in fall 1999 were proficient in English and mathematics. Campuses are continuing to do exemplary work in this area. The latest information on English and mathematics preparation of new CSU students entering CSU in fall 1999 will be presented at the meeting.

The 1999-2000 state budget provides \$9 million to CSU to work collaboratively with selected California high schools that send the most students to CSU who need remediation in English or mathematics, or both. A total of \$5 million was appropriated to establish CSU-High School Faculty-to-Faculty Alliances and \$4 million for learning assistance programs. Campuses are using these funds to expand the number of trained CSU student tutors who will work with high school students to strengthen their basic English and mathematics proficiency skills, to provide in-service training for high school teachers to clarify and align CSU and school standards, to develop more effective English and mathematics teaching methods,

and to administer and interpret English and mathematics diagnostic tests. If high school students are informed as early as possible about their progress in preparing for college, the more time they will have to acquire the needed competencies while still enrolled in high school.

In support of these faculty-to-faculty alliances and learning assistance programs, each CSU campus has dedicated English and mathematics faculty members to work with the high school chairs of the English and mathematics departments, deans of curriculum, and principals as well as trained student tutors to work with high school students to achieve the following outcomes:

- To increase the basic English and mathematics proficiency skills of high school juniors and seniors;
- To increase the number of graduating high school seniors who are able to pass the English and mathematics sections of the high school exit examination under development;
- To increase the high school college participation rate;
- To reduce the number of first-time regularly admitted students entering CSU who require remediation; and
- To increase the academic performance of first-time entering freshmen during their first year of enrollment at a CSU campus.

The CSU goal to reduce the need for remediation extends beyond just providing high school students help to acquire basic English and mathematics skills necessary to move into college-level work and first-time CSU freshmen additional opportunities to strengthen their English and mathematics skills. First-time freshman students are at greatest risk of dropping out of college due to being unprepared for college life and the demands of university studies. CSU campuses have developed services and special programs to improve the retention of first-time freshmen until completion of their baccalaureate degree. The following summarizes campus efforts to meet these needs.

### **Enriched Freshman Year Experience Programs**

The California State University provides access to the upper one-third of recent California high school graduates. When CSU admits these students, it is recognizing that they have the necessary qualifications for academic success. They have earned in high school the equivalent of a 3.0 grade point average and have completed CSU's required 15 college preparatory courses. Thus, the admission of students carries with it a responsibility to ensure that all students are successful in completing the requirements necessary to earn a baccalaureate degree. To fulfill this obligation, CSU campuses offer an array of services that support the acquisition of academic, personal, and social skills critical to success.

In fall 1999 descriptions of campus programs dedicated to the retention of first-time freshman students were collected and analyzed. The campus responses demonstrate CSU's commitment to ensure first-time freshman students are offered special services that enhance their educational experience and increase the retention and graduation rate of the most at-risk group of students. All campuses offer special services and programs to first-time freshman students that reflect a true commitment to and thoughtful analysis of the needs of their unique student population.

## **Systemwide Programs**

The following programs are offered by most or all of the campuses.

### ***Outreach Activities***

All campuses provide a comprehensive program of outreach services designed to inform students and their families about admission requirements, financial aid, and educational opportunities available at CSU campuses. The activities provided to high school and community college students include presentations at school sites, participation in college and parents' nights, and development of outreach brochures, videos, posters, and other materials. These programs offer special outreach events involving admission staff, financial aid staff, and faculty representatives from academic departments. Campus web sites are developed to provide information to prospective and current students. Outreach staff members also provide academic and career advice and conduct analyses of student transcripts. Outreach services represent the campus to prospective students, their families, and the community. Many campuses have partnerships with local feeder schools to provide more intense outreach and preadmission services.

### ***Educational Opportunity Programs***

The Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP) are designed to improve access and retention of low-income and educationally disadvantaged students. The programs provide admission, academic, and financial assistance to EOP-eligible undergraduate students. Orientation sessions are provided to help students learn about campus services and programs. EOP students receive extensive counseling, tutoring, advising, and mentoring services throughout their CSU attendance. Grants are awarded to EOP students eligible for financial aid. Most students enter EOP programs as first-time freshmen.

### ***Summer Bridge Programs***

Summer bridge programs are highly successful efforts to increase the retention and graduation of "high-risk" students who are disadvantaged educationally and economically by providing an intensive program during the summer prior to matriculation. Summer bridge programs are four- to six-week residential programs allowing students to experience campus living prior to matriculation, thus improving students' comfort level with university life and expectations. This program facilitates the transition of selected students into the CSU by providing advising and mentoring services and strengthening their basic writing, reading, and mathematics skills. "High risk" disadvantaged students are defined as those who score in the lower quartile of the EPT and ELM exams or whose transcripts indicate that their academic preparation needs strengthening.

### ***Financial Aid***

The availability of financial aid continues to play a critical part in the ability of students to enter a college of choice and succeed in their university studies. Each year, more CSU students depend on grants, loans, and scholarships, or a combination of these types of financial aid to finance their educational experience than in previous years.

In 1997-98 (the most recent year for which data are available), 59.3 percent of the first-time freshman population received some type of financial aid. Of the number of students who received financial aid, 61.4 percent received either scholarships or grants, 55 percent of the students received loans, and 8.8 percent were work-study recipients. These figures show that first-time freshman students rely on a variety of aid types to finance their educational expenses, with a great reliance on loans.

### **Campus-Initiated Programs**

In addition to these systemwide programs funded by the state, campuses have initiated programs to improve the retention of first-time freshman students by responding to their unique needs. Some programs are funded by external sources such as federal grants while other programs are funded by the campus.

Campus programs fall into several categories.

#### ***Orientation Programs***

All campuses offer orientation programs to first-time freshman students to familiarize these students with the campus and its academic policies and procedures, to provide early advising ensuring students take appropriate English and math courses commensurate with their skill levels, and, in many instances, to provide priority registration privileges. Most campuses encourage but do not require first-time freshmen to attend orientation programs.

#### ***Freshman Seminar***

Nearly all campuses offer a freshman seminar. Students often earn 1-3 units of baccalaureate credit for the courses. Some credits satisfy general education requirements and others apply as elective credit. The courses are designed to assist first-time freshman students to transition successfully between high school and college by orienting students to activities related to study skill development, time management, test-taking strategies, value formation, critical thinking, and writing skills. At some campuses, this course also includes instruction on how to use the computer to access information. The courses are challenging, multi-dimensional, and develop student skills across many domains. These small groups of students also serve as a place of initial social interaction and as a support group for students encountering difficulties.

#### ***Learning Communities***

Several campuses have created innovative “learning communities” or groups of first-time freshman students to promote academic success, student retention, social interaction, and student satisfaction. Student participation is optional except at some campuses that establish communities for students admitted to special programs or for students who lack knowledge in basic skills.

The unique structures of the learning communities reflect campus responses to meet the needs of their student populations. Some learning communities bring together students with similar majors to study and receive advising and mentoring. Other learning communities provide more inclusive services by having a cohort of students live together in dormitories, take courses together, study together, and receive mentoring and advising together. Some campuses have developed special courses that integrate general education and developmental courses.

The major goals of learning communities are designed . . .

- To enhance first-year academic life through integrated academic and social activities;
- To provide opportunities for collaborative learning and the formation of study groups;
- To create a sense of community and belonging;
- To increase opportunities to share and discuss ideas; and
- To improve student retention through the first-year experience.

Learning communities require extensive planning and support by campus staff members and faculty. Concomitantly, the programs help first-time freshman students develop the skills necessary for academic and personal success at a four-year university.

### ***Advising Programs***

All campuses provide academic advising to students both for general education coursework and for major preparation.

Nearly all campuses have programs developed for first-time freshman students that incorporate academic advising with other support services. Early advising ensures first-time freshmen take the necessary developmental and baccalaureate coursework in a timely and efficient manner.

Campuses have developed special advising programs for select first-time freshman students. EOP has always incorporated an extensive advising component as do most other retention programs.

Some campuses have established mandatory advising programs for students who are on academic probation. These intervention programs ensure students are provided appropriate services to improve their academic standing. Data have shown that these services and programs are effective in improving the grade point average and retention of students at greatest risk of failing.

### ***Honors Programs***

Most campuses offer honors programs to exceptional first-time freshman students to enable them to develop leadership and intellectual skills and to cultivate habits of critical thinking, independent analysis, and collaboration. Honors programs seek to challenge students academically while also providing them the resources to grow socially, culturally, and professionally. Honors programs may offer scholarships and specialized courses to eligible participants.

### ***Mentor Programs***

Mentoring has long been viewed as an effective way to ensure students become more connected to the university and receive early intervention if academic problems arise. Campuses have been offering both student and faculty mentoring for several years, often in combination with other support services. Faculty or students in the same major may provide mentoring.

Many campuses offer exemplary mentoring programs. One campus has launched an ambitious advising and mentoring program for all incoming first-time freshman students. At this campus, a team is established consisting of a faculty member, a student services professional, and a student peer mentor. One of the most important roles of this program is providing accurate advising to first-time freshman students regarding appropriate coursework and educational and career planning. The program assures that new students have at least two faculty/staff members who will guide them through their academic careers and help make their university experience a satisfying one.

### ***Special Services to Unique Populations***

Many campuses have designed special programs for special populations, combining orientation, learning communities, advising, mentoring, and specialized courses.

Several campuses have developed programs for students admitted to various science majors, ensuring these students receive appropriate and early support services. Some of the programs focus on strengthening certain basic skills, such as math, while others provide a plethora of services to increase the participation of underrepresented students in these majors.

All campuses provide support services to students with disabilities. Support groups are often formed to familiarize these students with the demands of the university.

Several campuses have developed special programs for first-time freshman student-athletes, ensuring this cohort is able to compete successfully both athletically and academically at the university. Athlete programs usually combine orientation, mentoring, advising, and tutoring services. These programs help first-time freshman students understand and meet the academic demands of the university.

One campus has designed a fast track, intensive undergraduate program for freshmen who enter the university wishing to become elementary school teachers. The program allows students to complete all requirements for a multiple subject credential with a CLAD emphasis in four years and two summer sessions instead of the usual five or more years. Program participants are provided learning communities, elementary classroom experiences beginning in the freshman year, and “themed” semesters that help students make correlations across course content.

### ***Other Programs to Develop Specific Skills***

Campuses have established programs to increase the number of first-time freshman students who come to the university prepared for college studies. One campus developed an innovative pre-college enrichment program to help participants improve their ability to read and understand college-level textbooks through the integration of content and learning skills with a consistent focus on comprehension. This program helps students with low scores on the verbal section of the SAT to use the summer before matriculation to raise their reading skills to the college level. The same campus also provides institutes and labs to improve writing skills of first-time freshman students.

8

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

March 14-15, 2000

Several campuses have focused on increasing math skills of first-time freshman students. These innovative programs are varied and multifaceted as campuses address the needs of their unique populations. Some campuses have developed integrated developmental courses with varied teaching strategies to help the participants succeed in the programs. All campuses with summer bridge programs incorporate improving math skills with other learning skills.

### **Summary**

The campuses are providing programs for first-time freshman students of unusual breadth and depth. The energy, enthusiasm, and campuswide commitment to ensure these students are served is recognized and appreciated. Campuses that have designed and conducted successful programs generally affirm research findings that actively engaging students at the beginning of their studies improves retention, student satisfaction, and ultimate progress toward the degree.

It was probably inevitable that activities initiated to address student proficiency in English and mathematics are usually viewed negatively by the students who are required to participate in them. With some reorganizing and reorientation, it should be possible to shift these efforts to strengthen English and mathematics competencies from a narrow, negative remedial focus to a more positive, comprehensive support model designed to help the maximum number of students achieve academic success. If designed and implemented in an integrated manner on each campus, these activities and retention programs will result in greater student satisfaction with their educational process, retention, and graduation.

Campuses are encouraged to continue their efforts to seek ways to expand those aspects of these highly successful programs that can be offered to all incoming first-time freshman students.

ATTACHMENT A  
Ed. Pol. — Item 3  
March 14-15, 2000

SEE PRINTED AGENDA

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 4  
March 14-15, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Community Service: Responding to the Governor's Call**

##### **Presentation By**

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

Robert A. Corrigan, President  
San Francisco State University, and Chair  
CSU Advisory Group on Community Service

Gene Dinielli, Chair  
Academic Senate CSU

Stephanie Rahlfs, Chair  
California State Student Association

##### **Summary**

Community service, service learning, and community-based activity are longstanding traditions in the mission and purpose of the California State University. Faculty, students and administrators in the CSU have been partnering with, and participating in, their local communities to meet their educational objectives since the first CSU campus was founded in 1857. It is widely recognized that CSU's connections to the community enhance student learning, advance faculty research, and support university programs while contributing to the well being of California residents. The 1999 Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) indicates that more than 135,000 CSU students perform a total of 33.6 million hours of community service annually. The service hours provide the equivalent minimum wage value of approximately \$193.2 million.

On July 15, 1999, Governor Gray Davis called on the three public systems of higher education in California to work toward the development of a community service requirement for graduation. The governor stated that the primary purpose of his initiative would be to strengthen an ethic of service among graduates of California universities. Since that time, the Academic Senate CSU, campus faculty senates, students, community partners, community service and service-learning coordinators, and the CSU Advisory Group on Community Service actively have participated in dialogue about ways to strengthen an ethic of service on CSU campuses, building on the service initiatives that have taken place for decades. A report on these activities and conversations will be presented and a resolution will be proposed for trustee action.

##### **Recommendation**

Adoption of the proposed resolution.

## ITEM

2

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 4

March 14-15, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Community Service: Responding to the Governor's Call**

Community service, service learning, and community-based activity are longstanding traditions in the mission and purpose of the California State University. Faculty, students and administrators in the CSU have been partnering with, and participating in, their local communities to meet their educational objectives since the first CSU campus was founded in 1857. It is widely recognized that CSU's connections to the community enhance student learning, advance faculty research, and support university programs while contributing to the well being of California residents.

Over the last several decades in particular, CSU institutions have expanded community service activities on their campuses through volunteer centers, student organization activities, residence life programming, Associated Student initiatives, Human Corps, the Educational Participation in Communities program (EPIC), Upward Bound, America Reads and America Counts, and outreach centers. The 1999 Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) indicates that more than 135,000 CSU students perform a total of 33.6 million hours of community service annually. The service hours provide the equivalent minimum wage value of approximately \$193.2 million.

Responding to a growing body of research on teaching and learning, CSU institutions began to integrate service activities into their academic curriculum. Because community service learning has been widely recognized as an effective pedagogical and learning approach for students, CSU has emerged as one of the leading public higher education systems in the nation offering community service-learning courses for its students. Community service-learning courses promote student learning through active participation in meaningful and planned service experiences in the community that are directly related to course content. The commitment to this educational approach is substantial throughout the CSU system. Each campus has identified a community service-learning leader, and the chancellor established the position of a coordinator of community service learning in 1998 to coordinate the efforts to expand community service-learning opportunities in the CSU. CSU Monterey Bay was founded with community service learning at its core. These commitments are guided and supported by the Community Service-Learning Strategic Plan, developed in 1997, which has as its primary goal that of providing opportunities for each CSU student to engage in community service and community service-learning experiences.

In the fall of 1999, Chancellor Reed appointed a CSU Advisory Group on Community Service to recommend ways to strengthen CSU initiatives related to community service and to provide a strategic vision of community engagement for the university system. CSU's commitment to community service and community service learning reflects a dynamic nationwide movement in higher education. National and state leaders have voiced strong support for the integration of community service experiences in higher education. This is clearly evident in California under the administration of Governor Gray Davis.

In April 1999, Governor Gray Davis called for a community service requirement for all students enrolled in California's public institutions of higher education. This was formalized in a letter to each of the leaders of the public segments on July 15, 1999, calling on the three public systems of higher education in California to work toward the development of a community service requirement for graduation. The Governor stated that the primary purposes of his initiative would be to enable students to give back to their communities, to experience the satisfaction of contributing to those in need, and to strengthen an ethic of service among graduates of California universities. Governor Davis requested faculty members from the University of California, California Community Colleges, and the CSU to work through the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates to address this issue.

Since that time, the Academic Senate CSU, campus faculty senates, students, community partners, community service and service-learning coordinators, and the CSU Advisory Group on Community Service actively have participated in dialogue about ways to advance and strengthen an ethic of service on CSU campuses, building on the service initiatives that have taken place for decades. The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) passed a resolution that included a series of questions regarding community service to help focus campus reexamination of this issue. As the ASCSU requested, campus senates responded to the questions.

Campuses approached this charge in a thoughtful and inclusive manner, often inviting community partners, students, faculty, administrators and staff into the conversations. The California State Student Association (CSSA) discussed the matter extensively at several monthly meetings and has developed a formal position on the issue. Community service and service-learning coordinators attending the annual CSU colloquium on community service learning in October 1999 discussed thoroughly the governor's call for service. Finally, as the CSU Advisory Group on Community Service has worked to meet its charge to strengthen CSU community-based initiatives, it has developed an informed perspective from which to respond to Governor Davis's call to service.

### **Resolution**

The following resolution is proposed for adoption:

**WHEREAS**, The California State University has a tradition of such community-based activities as service learning and community service; and,

**WHEREAS**, Governor Davis has called on the CSU to establish a community service requirement for CSU students; and,

**WHEREAS**, the CSU endorses Governor Davis's interest in strengthening an ethic of service as an important part of undergraduate education; and

**WHEREAS**, CSU Monterey Bay already has a service-learning requirement for graduation and a number of individual academic departments and programs throughout the CSU currently require community service or service learning; and

4

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 4

March 14-15, 2000

**WHEREAS**, The Academic Senate CSU, the California State Student Association, and the CSU Advisory Group on Community Service have carefully studied the place of community service and service learning in the undergraduate education experience; now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, By the Trustees of The California State University, that the chancellor require each CSU president to ensure that all students have opportunities to participate in community service, service learning (deemed academically appropriate by faculty), or both; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees, through the chancellor, endorse campus efforts to make service an expectation, condition, or requirement for the undergraduate education experience; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor report to the Board of Trustees, on an annual basis, CSU's increasing efforts to provide those opportunities to all students.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 5  
March 14-15, 2000

### **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 2000-01 through 2004-05 (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 third year that the planning approval process adopted by the board in July 1997 is in effect; programs that are taking advantage of the alternatives to the traditional process are noted. Summaries of academic program review activities for each campus appear in Attachment B. In 1998-99, several campuses received visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); summaries of the teams' reports are 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 5  
March 14-15, 2000

### 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 Reports (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 date. 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; campuses request occasionally that projected programs be removed from their academic plans.

This year, twenty-two new programs have been proposed for addition to campus academic plans. Seven of those represent conversions to full degree programs of well-established options or concentrations. Six are interdisciplinary fields that students in considerable numbers have been exploring in individualized majors. Three are master's degree programs especially designed to serve teachers. Almost all the newly requested programs can be initiated in existing facilities. The programs for which "planning authorization" is requested are listed below.

Bakersfield	MA, Interdisciplinary Studies MA, Spanish
Chico	BA, Criminal Justice BS, Computer Graphics MFA, Art MS, Mathematics Education
Fullerton	BA, Public Administration BA, Television and Film
Long Beach	BA, Environmental Science and Policy BS, Environmental Science and Policy BS, Manufacturing Engineering Technology MA, Religious Studies
Pomona	MA, History
San Diego	BS, Hospitality and Tourism Management
San Francisco	BS, Apparel and Interior Design BS, Atmospheric and Oceanic Studies
San Luis Obispo	MS, Accounting MS, Forestry Sciences MS, Industrial Engineering Master of Public Policy
Sonoma	MS, Computer and Engineering Sciences
Stanislaus	MA, Criminal Justice

## **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; three of those have already been through campus, system, and California Postsecondary Education Commission proposal review processes and received endorsement at every level.

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. Three new pilot programs have been established: a BA degree program with a major in Urban Learning at CSU Los Angeles and an MS degree program in Regulatory Affairs at San Diego State University, each of which may be offered from fall 1999 to fall 2004, and an MS degree program in Geology at CSU Sacramento, which may be offered from fall 2000 to fall 2005.

The 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 by 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. No existing projections were subject to automatic removal from the academic plans this year.

### **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.

Fresno	BS, Physical Therapy
Sacramento	BS, Physical Therapy

San Francisco      MA, Science  
                             MS, Accountancy  
                             MA, Health Science

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.

**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. Summaries of the results and recommendations resulting from visits by teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges during 1998-99 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 5 of the March 14-15, 2000, 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.