

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 12, 1998
Auditorium

William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Roland E. Arnall
Harold Goldwhite
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
James H. Gray
William Hauck
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Alice S. Petrossian
Ali C. Razi
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti

Open Session

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 17, 1998

Discussion Items

1. Providing Services to Prospective Students Through the Internet, *Information*
2. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs, *Action*
3. Extended and Continuing Education in the CSU, *Information*

Closed Session

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

4. Review and Recommendations of Nominees for Honorary Degrees, *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**

March 17, 1998

Members Present

Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Martha C. Fallgatter, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Bernard Goldstein
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
James H. Gray
William Hauck
Eric C. Mitchell
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Alice S. Petrossian
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Michael D. Stennis

Members Absent

William D. Campbell, Chair
Roland E. Arnall
Anthony M. Vitti

Other Trustees Present

Jim Considine
Robert G. Foster
Maridel Moulton
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor's Office Staff

June M. Cooper, Senior Vice Chancellor and Interim Chief of Staff
Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

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 at 11:30 a.m. in closed session and acted on nominations.

Open Session

In the absence of Trustee Campbell, chair, Trustee Otomo-Corgel called the meeting to order at 1:46 p.m. and introduced the new executive vice chancellor, David Spence, and Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 27, 1998, were approved as submitted.

Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Second Annual Report

Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Lindahl began the second annual report to the board by outlining briefly the trustees' 1996 policy to reduce the need for remediation. The trustees' policy emphasizes collaboration between K-12 and postsecondary education to define more clearly the skills students need to 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. The trustees' commitment to a unified, collaborative approach to reduce the need for remediation has stimulated unprecedented cooperation among K-12 and postsecondary education with tremendous support from the governor and the legislature.

A systemwide Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee, chaired by CSU Stanislaus President Marvalene Hughes, was appointed by the chancellor and charged with overseeing implementation of the policy, encouraging the sharing of best practices among campuses, and continuing CSU's consultation with all constituencies. President Hughes described progress on those aspects of the trustees' remediation policy that CSU alone can address: communication of CSU's standards to students, families, counselors, and schools; campus activities to ensure that those who enter CSU unprepared are identified after admission and before enrollment so that they can be placed in appropriate remedial and/or developmental programs in the first term of enrollment; and campus success in ensuring that upper division transfer students complete at a minimum English composition and mathematics. President Hughes also described the significant progress made by campuses to administer the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) placement test to students as soon as possible after admission and before enrollment. President Hughes stated that the remaining tasks for the committee include assisting campuses in expanding partnerships between university faculty and high school teachers, following the work of the California Education Round Table task force to develop assessment methods to measure student mastery of content standards in English and mathematics, and developing policies to address the needs of students whose first language is other than English.

Dr. Lindahl then reiterated that it was expected that the number of students requiring placement in remedial and/or developmental programs would increase as more students needing remediation are identified. In the fall 1997, 47 percent of regularly admitted first-time freshmen were deemed in need of remediation in English, an increase of four percentage points over fall 1996. In mathematics,

54 percent needed remediation in fall 1997, an increase of one percentage point over the previous year. Dr. Lindahl stated that CSU campuses are succeeding in identifying all students who need to be assessed. With larger numbers of students taking the EPT and ELM and with those numbers including a higher proportion of poorly prepared students, he noted that CSU will continue to see an increase in the remediation rate for the next few years. Nevertheless, the goals that the trustees have set for 2001, 2004, and 2007 remain ambitious but achievable.

After the board adopted its policy on remediation in January 1996, seven strategies were devised for reaching the trustees' goals. Dr. Lindahl reported progress on several of those strategies. To improve student learning by improving teaching, the CSU is strengthening its teacher preparation programs. It has emphasized university-wide responsibility for developing teachers, earlier and more effective integration of subject matter and pedagogy, more university-school partnerships, and the development of common exit standards.

For many years, CSU annually has provided to each high school and community college that sends five or more students to the CSU system an Academic Performance Report (APR) tailored especially for that institution. These reports present in summary form information on the academic performance of students in their first year at CSU and allow schools to compare their graduates' performance with all students statewide who enter CSU. These reports are disseminated annually to over 1,000 public and private high schools and to over 100 community colleges. During the past year, extensive efforts were made to streamline and clarify the reports to ensure accurate interpretation and to improve their usefulness to high school and community college educators. A summary of student performance information by high school and community college has been placed on the World Wide Web to encourage further collaborative efforts by helping high schools and community colleges to use the APR more effectively. Campuses have identified three- and four-person English and mathematics project teams that include English and mathematics faculty members to work with local high school English and mathematics teachers to discuss CSU expectations for entering freshmen. These discussions serve as a vehicle to align curriculum, standards, and assessment.

Dr. Lindahl asked Presidents John Welty, CSU Fresno, and Bob Maxson, CSU Long Beach, to share additional, successful strategies their campuses have implemented that foster greater partnerships between CSU and local high schools. President John Welty described how CSU Fresno is working in the central valley to create a "seamless" web of services, articulation and transfer among institutions. President Maxson outlined how CSU Long Beach is developing projects involving CSU faculty, university students, and high school teachers and students.

Dr. Lindahl concluded the second annual report indicating that the ambitious trustee policy and goals can be met by continuing to work closely with K-12. Considerable progress has been made in strengthening teacher preparation, setting clear standards, aligning curriculum, standards, and assessment, communicating standards and expectations, informing high schools and community colleges about student performance, developing early intervention programs, using CSU students to tutor and mentor K-12 students in basic skills, and assessing students after admission to CSU and placing those requiring remediation in appropriate remedial and/or developmental programs in the first term of enrollment. CSU is progressing in these areas through collective, persistent, and intersegmental action. Next year's third annual report may be the most important of all, as most freshmen (more than 90 percent) will be tested, indicating the full scope of the challenge.

During the discussion that followed the formal presentation, Superintendent Eastin acknowledged President Hughes and the presidents for their work. About 200,000 new teachers are needed to respond to the growth in the student population and class size reduction initiatives. Superintendent Eastin stressed that science and mathematics standards need to be strengthened with CSU's help.

Trustee Pesqueira complimented the board, presidents, and academic affairs for their work. He noted a tendency of students to avoid enrollment in mathematics and science classes. He suggested CSU offer incentives to the students to enroll in these subjects.

Trustee Goldstein added that the science issue is a critical one, and the Commission on Science Standards is evaluating this discipline.

Trustee Petrossian commended the efforts of those who have worked on the precollegiate implementation committee. Trustee Petrossian also asked how long CSU has shared the academic performance tests with the high schools. Dr. Lindahl responded that the reports have been shared for about 15 years and are mailed to each principal with a copy of the transmittal letter to the superintendent and chair of the school board. Placing their reports on the Web will provide access to anyone with an interest in how well students are prepared for university study. Trustee Petrossian suggested the superintendents and board chairs should also receive a copy of the report.

Chancellor Reed stated he will be meeting with the superintendents of the L.A. Basin in the near future and will be advising the group of CSU's admission expectations. Chancellor Reed commended the board and Superintendent Eastin for building a relationship between K-12 and higher education. He emphasized that in order to improve the public school system, teachers must be better prepared. Convincing 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students to take algebra will help promote success in college and the workforce.

CSU Senate Chair James Highsmith commented that the recently published *Statement on Competency in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students* had been distributed. He also offered the help of the Academic Senate in pursuing the board's remediation policy.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Lindahl presented the annual report on academic planning and program review in the CSU. He noted that academic planning at each university involves both the planning and development of new degree programs and the regular review of existing programs which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation. The two-step process for instituting new programs includes trustee approval of a campus request for permission to plan a new program; when the campus is ready to implement it, a detailed proposal is reviewed by the Chancellor's Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The chancellor's approval is required for implementation.

Dr. Lindahl reviewed the criteria for evaluating campus requests to project new programs: the unmet needs that the proposed programs would fill, whether there are better ways of meeting needs, whether enrollment expectations are consistent with experience at other campuses, and how the new program would impact existing programs. The campuses were seeking permission to plan eighteen new programs. Most of the projected programs would draw on existing faculty resources and facilities, reconfiguring existing courses into programs responsive to local needs and preferences.

In July 1997 the board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established two-step process, campuses have two new alternative processes for establishing programs: the “fast track” and the pilot program. The new alternative processes are congruent with the Cornerstones recommendations for streamlining the program development and approval process. Dr. Lindahl also noted newly projected programs that were responsive to the Cornerstones recommendation encouraging program consolidation and cross-campus sharing, as well as the eight reported program discontinuations, which were in harmony with the Cornerstones recommendation to eliminate redundant and/or low enrollment programs. Dr. Lindahl then introduced Dr. Robert Caret, president of San Jose State University.

President Caret reported that two years ago, the university began a comprehensive review of its program structure, including the entire array of existing degree programs, options, concentrations, emphases and minors. The intent was to enhance, modify, consolidate, or discontinue academic programs as necessary.

Provost Linda Bain and Academic Senate Chair Kenneth Peter gave a comprehensive report of the process San Jose State University used in its program review. The program review involved students and members of the faculty, administration, and staff in collegial partnership. Two hundred eighty-four programs were reviewed and as a result, 10 were identified for enhancement, 120 were to be maintained, 14 were to be maintained with conditions, 22 were to be maintained on probationary status, 98 were consolidated into 21 programs, 3 were to be reduced, and 17 are in the process of termination.

Trustee Pesqueira commended San Jose State University for its work and pointed out how valuable the review process is, as campuses generally tend to add more and more programs. He called for all campuses to conduct careful, systematic reviews of all degree programs. Trustee Mitchell also commended San Jose State for its work.

Chancellor Reed announced that the program review process would be discussed during the next Executive Council meeting. He observed that the CSU needs to reevaluate degree requirements, including the number of units required to earn a bachelor’s degree.

The resolution was moved and reworded. The committee recommended adoption of the prepared resolution (REP 03-98-03).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 1
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Providing Services to Prospective Students Through the Internet

Presentation By

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Allen Firstenberg, President and CEO
XAP Corporation

Summary

CSU constantly looks for ways to improve services to prospective and entering students. Toward that goal, CSU has developed and implemented a systemwide electronic outreach, admission, and financial aid system to simplify the process of exploring higher education opportunities, gaining admission, and qualifying for financial aid. This item describes CSU's program to use the Internet to provide ready access to a wide array of up-to-date campus information, to submit applications for admission, and to determine eligibility for financial aid.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Providing Services to Prospective Students Through the Internet

Background

Between April 1995 and September 1996, CSU explored aggressively ways to provide an enhanced level of outreach, admission, and financial aid services to students and prospective students through the expanded use of technology. Rather than a centralized process or a common location where processing would occur, it was determined that an electronic environment provided the highest level of service to students by reducing the need for students or staff to handle paper. A committee comprised of campus and system representatives was convened to coordinate, guide, and expedite the development of a CSU-specific systemwide electronic outreach, admission, and financial aid system known as CSUMentor™.

This new approach is an electronic student information system that simplifies the college exploration, admission, and financial aid process for prospective students, improving CSU's ability to respond quickly to applicants. A key component of the system is the electronic redirection process. This process will electronically redirect an admission application to an alternate CSU campus when applicants cannot be accommodated at their first-choice CSU campus without requiring the student to complete another CSU admission application, to supply another complement of transcripts and test scores, or to pay an additional admission application fee.

After consultation with the Commission on Institutional Management and Infrastructure Technology (CIMIT), the Admission Advisory Council, Financial Aid Advisory Council, admission and records, outreach, and financial aid deans and directors and with endorsement by the Executive Council, Technology Steering Committee, executive vice chancellor, and chancellor, CSU awarded a three-year contract to XAP Corporation to develop, implement, and operate CSU's electronic outreach, admission, and financial aid services project.

XAP demonstrated through a competitive process its ability to deliver information management systems to higher education institutions and how these services could be provided directly to students via the Internet. Its proposal captured the essence of CSU's vision for a student-centered rather than a school-based information system. Its products, services, and intellectual property will allow CSU to provide outreach, admission, and financial aid services to students and prospective students and their families through the use of technology.

The president and chief executive officer of XAP, Allen Firstenberg, has achieved considerable success in technical innovation and program management. Prior to founding XAP, Mr. Firstenberg was director of Rockwell International's Science Center, in charge of research and development in information sciences, including software development, control systems, signal processing, artificial intelligence, and computer science. Before joining Rockwell in 1978, Mr. Firstenberg was the program manager of Voyager '77's imaging system. A three-year contract with XAP was signed on August 29, 1996. CSU has amended the contract with XAP to provide five one-year extensions to enable XAP to continue to maintain and operate CSUMentor.

After over one year of consultation with high school students, their families, counselors, and campuses, CSUMentor was unveiled formally on November 1, 1997, at the permanent Web site <<http://www.csumentor.edu>>. The new system represents a collaborative effort by all constituent users: students, families, counselors, and CSU campuses.

CSU Student Services Vision

CSU's goal is to provide students as many points of entry into the outreach, admission, and financial aid process as possible, from paper options to electronic and high touch approaches. Using computers located in homes, high schools, community colleges, workplaces, and public libraries throughout the state, students are able to browse through general information about CSU, view multimedia campus presentations, send and receive electronic responses to specific questions, and apply for admission and financial aid. Through a California Education Round Table initiative, CSU is working with other postsecondary education segments to develop an electronic capability of transmitting academic transcripts and test scores via the Internet.

The CSU vision of offering outreach, admission, and financial aid services in a more student friendly manner is an attempt to balance technology with personal contact. It is not intended to replace face-to-face, personal interaction. The electronic outreach, admission, and financial aid services project provides an array of components that campuses may tailor to reflect the unique campus program offerings.

Planning Process

Based upon extensive consultation and research throughout the development of the new approach, two core concepts were identified that established the system as unique. Because of the limited number of high school and community college counselors throughout California, the system needed to be Internet-based and operational 24 hours every day as well as self-sufficient and simple to operate by students and their families without the assistance of a high school or community college counselor. Therefore, the system was designed as a student-centered, interactive, on-line system rather than a counselor-oriented system. CSUMentor is unique because information about CSU is available directly to students and their families through the Internet regardless of when or where they need it.

Project Development

Allison Jones, senior director, academic affairs, access and retention, and Russell Utterberg, senior director, strategic projects, information resources and technology, were the project co-directors. They worked with a design team that included over eighty campus representatives from admission and records, outreach, financial aid, and information systems.

Simultaneously, XAP conducted focus group meetings with high school students to determine what students wanted to know prior to applying for admission. Meetings were held at a rural campus, a low-income inner-city school, and an urban school. These focus group discussions revealed that regardless of the student's family income, high school students generally had access to and were comfortable with computers.

What the New System Provides to Students

The home page of CSUMentor provides access to several components or “modules” for students and their families, counselors, or anyone interested in learning more about CSU outreach, admission, and financial aid opportunities:

Preadmission Information

Students have the opportunity to peruse general preadmission, admission, and financial aid information. Links to campus Web sites allow students to move from the CSUMentor Web site to campus Web sites to obtain additional campus-specific information. The system provides interactive, virtual, multimedia tours for each of the twenty-two campuses. Campus tours are updated annually by each CSU campus with current information and data. Some campuses have included multimedia presentations that include video motion clips.

Comparison of CSU Campuses

Students can request a comparison of information by campus. The student can request and review comparisons by setting (urban, rural, suburban), geography (southern California, central California, northern California), number of students enrolled, average class size, percentage of freshmen living on campus, and percentage of students receiving financial aid.

Student-Matching Assistant

Students can enter their preferences to determine which CSU campus(es) meet their matching criteria, e.g., students can request the names of all campuses that offer a specific undergraduate major or graduate degree program that are in urban areas in southern California. Students can enter preferences by geography, location, setting, academic programs/majors, enrollment, average class size, percentage of students receiving financial aid, percentage of students living on campus, sports, and cost per year. Based upon preferences entered by the student, the student-matching assistant will provide the student with the names of CSU campuses that meet all of the student’s undergraduate or graduate preferences.

Student Planner

The student planner is the module that sets CSUMentor apart from any other product. The centerpiece of the student planner module is the electronic student academic portfolio or profile created by students at their option while enrolled in K–14 and maintained by students through high school graduation or time of transfer from a community college. The electronic academic portfolio will contain documentation of the students’ academic achievements as they proceed through school. In addition to course titles, grades, and units, this repository will include SAT/ACT test scores, Advanced Placement scores, scores on Golden State Exams, academic awards and achievements, extracurricular activities, and family financial information for students planning to apply for student financial aid.

Students will enter personal, demographic, and academic information that is maintained on XAP’s server, rather than CSU’s database. Students are given a user identification and password that allows them to access their academic portfolio for viewing and updating. The password is confidential; only the student and XAP have access to the password. Students who forget their password may call XAP using a toll-free number to obtain their password.

Students need to be aware of CSU admission requirements while enrolled in middle school. Students need to know which high school courses meet CSU admission requirements and if their academic portfolio makes them eligible for CSU admission. Occasional meetings with middle and high school academic counselors are frequently insufficient to ensure that all students have the information and lead time necessary to complete all required courses.

The high school courses that can be used to meet CSU's fifteen units of college preparatory courses required for admission are specific to each California public and private high school since a course that meets CSU's requirements may carry a different title at each high school. Students complete an electronic worksheet that checks courses they have taken or plan to take against an approved list of high school courses that meet CSU course requirements. Based upon courses the student has completed, CSUMentor will provide a list of courses the student still needs to complete to satisfy CSU admission requirements.

The student planner ensures that students are provided information when needed rather than waiting for an appointment to meet with a high school counselor. By providing 24-hour access, seven days a week, students and families can plan a course of study at a convenient time to their household schedule. High school counselors can advise students more effectively when students have first accessed CSU information through the Internet.

A student planner to meet the unique needs of transfer students will be implemented for the 1999-2000 academic year. This component will guide transfer students in the lower-division general education courses they should take at a community college to satisfy CSU admission requirements.

Financial Aid Information

Students can access information about financial aid opportunities and eligibility. An on-line, Preliminary Aid Information System (PAIS) provides the student with an estimated family contribution, State University Grant eligibility, Pell grant eligibility, and federal student loan eligibility. Links to several important Web sites including scholarship search and FAFSA-on-the-Web (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) are provided.

Admission Application

Students are able to apply electronically through the new system. Data will transfer automatically to the CSU application for students who established an academic portfolio. Both undergraduate and graduate admission computerized applications are available on-line.

Students can apply to multiple campuses by completing only one set of information that is entered into the electronic admission application. Once the student submits the application, it is electronically transferred to campus "mailboxes" where the student has applied. Campus staff members pick up their mail at regular intervals to transfer the data to the campus' student information system for processing.

6

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 1

May 12-13, 1998

Applications to Non-CSU Campuses

Because the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) recently signed a contract to use a program following CSU's format, XAP will be able to use common admission data elements to complete admission applications upon the request of a student who applies both to CSU and to a California independent college. Eventually it is expected that students also will be able to access all University of California and California Community Colleges electronically.

Electronic Mail

CSUMentor offers free e-mail accounts to all students. E-mail permits private electronic communications between high school students and CSU campuses. Students may select the campus and department to which they wish to send mail. The new system stores ten different departmental e-mail addresses per campus.

Customer Service Support

CSUMentor customer support handles all incoming inquiries through a three-level system of communication and is available to student users and CSU staff members:

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Students are able to review answers to select questions organized by topic. These questions and answers are designed to answer the most commonly asked questions.

Electronic Mail Support

Electronic mail (e-mail) provides students with a simple, time-efficient and effective method to communicate with customer support personnel. This capability allows the user to send e-mail directly to XAP customer support personnel or to individual campus representatives. XAP directed e-mail is answered within 24 hours, except on holidays and weekends.

Customer Support Toll-Free Hotline

A customer support hotline staffed by knowledgeable XAP personnel is available to students Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. This system has far out-performed system specifications that limit the average hold time to less than 30 seconds, not exceeding 60 seconds.

Electronic Admission Application Fee Payment

Students applying for admission through CSUMentor have three options to pay the admission application processing fee: by providing information on-line that allows an immediate determination of whether the student qualifies for an admission application fee waiver, by mailing a check to the campus, or by paying electronically by credit card. The use of secure credit card payments electronically is a new option at all CSU campuses.

Response to the New System

The response to CSUMentor has exceeded expectations. Students report that the information presented is useful in planning for college, that the electronic application is easy to complete, and

that they appreciate the availability of 24-hour accessibility. High school counselors have welcomed the extensive information provided about each campus and the development of the student planner. Campuses report that the Internet program supplements their outreach efforts by providing information to students who may not have discussed postsecondary opportunities with counselors.

Based on the first five months of operation, the following projection is made:

	Actual Use As of 3/31/98	Projected Use By 10/31/98
Number of pages viewed	2,139,700	4,490,000
Visits by prospective students/counselors	255,500	541,000
Academic Portfolios established	26,200	56,000
On-line Admission Applications	9,500	19,000

The high utilization is the result of an extensive public information program that included presentations at CSU's fall 1997 high school and community college conferences, information for counselors to distribute to their students, posters highlighting the Internet location, mousepads with CSUMentor's Web site address, joint press releases with XAP, newspaper articles, and radio and television public service announcements.

Summary

CSUMentor represents only the first of several phases of CSU's student services vision. While first addressing student and campus outreach, admission, and financial aid student services, the new system will be expanded to support campus registration, enrollment, and placement services. This is a dynamic project that will be responsive to new technological advances as well as to changing student and campus needs.

The success of this new approach is due to the commitment of CSU campuses, high schools, community colleges, student users, and XAP. This broad-based system and statewide support has created the first-year success. The long-term success depends upon continued efforts to improve the provision of information to prospective students and their families. It is a commitment that CSU must make as it enters the 21st century.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 2
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs

Presentation By

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Summary

Revision of the sections of Title 5 on teacher preparation programs is an element of the CSU's preliminary plan for restructuring teacher education, in accordance with the recommendations of the CSU Presidents Group on Teacher Preparation and K-18 Education.

Current minimum scholarship standards for admission to CSU teacher education programs are based on grade point averages by campus and discipline division of the applicant's academic major. They are designed to identify students who are in the upper half of a group of comparable students in academic achievement, but the standards are specified in greater detail than is required by state policy. The intent of the recommended revision is to maintain high scholarship standards while reducing the unintended consequences of the specificity of existing regulations. As California moves to open several alternative pathways of academic preparation for teaching credentials—and schools in need of teachers increasingly rely on people who have yet to earn any teaching credential—it seems inappropriate to maintain regulations that give campuses little flexibility in responding to local and state needs, circumstances, and opportunities.

The proposed standards have been discussed with the CSU Deans of Education, the CSU Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate CSU and the Executive Council and have the support of these groups. They were presented to the board for information in January 1998.

Recommendation

Approval of the resolution amending Title 5.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs

Background

Nationwide in the 1980s, there was concern that the teaching profession was drawing from the academically weaker segments of the college and university student population. It appeared that with the significant expansion of career opportunities for all students in the 1960s and 1970s, talented students—especially women and ethnic minority students—who might have sought to become teachers in earlier decades were pursuing a wider range of career options. In the CSU, studies suggested that most students entering teacher preparation programs were among the top half of the students in their majors, but this phenomenon was neither guaranteed by systemwide policy nor widely recognized. With the encouragement of many interested parties within and outside of the CSU, the trustees adopted Article 9 of Subchapter 3, Chapter 1, Division 5, Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*. These regulations were designed to ensure that candidates entering teaching credential programs are of high quality. The vast majority of students to be admitted to teacher preparation programs were to be in the top half of the students in their discipline, as measured by grade point average (GPA).

The California Commission on Teaching Credentialing (CCTC) incorporated a roughly parallel criterion into its standards for teacher preparation programs:

As a group, candidates admitted into the program each year have attained the median or higher in an appropriate comparison population on one or more indicators of academic achievement selected by the institution.

Subsequently, the CCTC put into effect a standard that is more specific than the one above but still more general than the criterion that the CSU adopted in Title 5. The current CCTC standard includes the following language:

In each credential preparation program, qualified candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures that utilize multiple measures.... Each candidate admitted to basic teaching credential programs (including emphasis credentials) has attained an undergraduate grade point average (GPA) that is above the median GPA for a comparable population of students at the institution.

Problem

In the 1990s, education in California is undergoing reform from elementary school through higher education. Teacher education programs within the CSU are actively seeking wider partnerships with public schools in a more focused way in order to increase the number of qualified candidates seeking credentials and to provide alternative routes for candidates preparing for the credential.

Title 5 and the chancellor's Executive Order No. 547 are very specific about how the candidate's grade point average is to be calculated, depending on how many units the candidate has earned in

the CSU, and how to compute the discipline median grade point average against which the candidate's GPA is to be compared. This specificity has led to some anomalous shifts in admission criteria from one three-year period to the next (in part because some of the medians are based on comparatively small numbers of students).

The distinction among disciplines has proven to be problematic as well, in part because some disciplines include a wider variety of majors than others. The problem is particularly acute for students who are seeking multiple subject credentials to teach at the elementary level. While most students who enter the CSU as undergraduates intending to teach in elementary schools major in liberal studies, many students who become interested in elementary-school teaching have majored in other subjects. Though they, like liberal studies students, may have met the standards of a multiple-subjects waiver program or have otherwise acquired the subject-matter skills and knowledge expected of multiple-subject credential candidates, they and liberal studies majors may be evaluated on strikingly different GPA criteria. Different grading practices at different colleges and universities further complicate the situation for students who have attended more than one institution of higher education.

The CSU cannot afford to place artificial and possibly inequitable barriers to participation in teacher education programs by candidates who have the ability to become good teachers of children in the public schools if given the opportunity to prove themselves. California is in dire need of teachers and is turning to the CSU to provide a high number of well-qualified credential candidates to take positions in the urban and rural areas of the state. The Class Size Reduction Act, the growing number of children of "Baby Boom" parents entering school, an impending large retirement cohort, and the increasing diversity of the K-12 population all contribute to the acute need for teachers.

Discussion

The proposed revisions retain the CSU's commitment to ensuring the quality of teaching credential candidates but provide greater flexibility to the campuses in crafting an operational definition of the scholarship standard that better reflects campus circumstances and curricular organization than the definition currently imposed. They also take into account the possibility of sharp year-to-year changes in the number of students seeking entry to the program and adjust the provisions for exceptional admissions appropriately. Furthermore, they permit a campus to establish benchmarks during the program, as well as at the beginning and end, that students may be obliged to meet. This change is consistent with increasing CSU and Commission on Teacher Credentialing interest in five-year integrated teacher preparation programs that combine methodology, content, and early clinical experiences. In the future, the teacher education program may not be so sharply distinguished from undergraduate, subject-matter-centered education. Admission to the teacher education program might occur at any of several points in a student's university career, not necessarily at the beginning of the "fifth year." Formal admission might even be granted in stages. Even now, there are more possible points of entry into teacher preparation than existed when this Title 5 article was adopted, and more flexible language is better suited to the greater variety of programs authorized. In particular, because student teaching as conceived in the 1980s is no longer the only major form of clinical experience, the elimination of Section 41102 is recommended. The provision for benchmarks in Section 41101 would allow campuses, if they find it appropriate, to continue to impose criteria like those now embodied in Section 41102.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the legislature are in the process of responding to the direction of SB 1422 (Bergeson, 1992) and will shortly produce a new credentialing structure. Reports already issued encourage making available a still greater variety of avenues for teacher credential applicants to pursue. Among the avenues available to candidates, internships may ultimately transform the ways teacher education departments within the system prepare and train teachers. The SB 1422 Advisory Panel for the Review of Teaching Credential Requirements also focused on the assistance that teachers need in the critical induction years and the beginning skills that are necessary for reading instruction, classroom management, and application of methodology. This increased programmatic flexibility and expectation for more extended professional development of teachers are not compatible with regulations that assume a single model of teacher education, a standard point of entry, and greater focus on specific entry criteria than on progress in the program and achievement of well-defined standards at the time of credential recommendation.

Proposed Resolution

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Article 9 of Subchapter 3 of Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

§ 41100. Admission to Teacher Education Basic Credential Program.

To be admitted to a teacher education basic credential program, a candidate for admission shall be evaluated by the campus as provided in subsection (a) and shall be determined to have satisfied all entrance requirements of the campus as provided in subsection (b).

(a) Evaluation Procedure. When a candidate requests admission to a teacher education basic credential program, the campus shall evaluate the candidate and review the candidate's record in accordance with the review and evaluation procedures established at the campus. ~~The teacher education Faculty shall be involved in conduct~~ this review and evaluation. The decision of the campus resulting from this evaluation shall be final.

(b) Evaluation Standards. Requirements for admission to a teacher education basic credential program shall be prescribed by the campus and shall include the following:

(1) Scholarship. ~~The candidate shall have earned at the college level an average of grade points in the upper half of undergraduate students in the candidate's discipline division on the campus. If the candidate has attempted at least 30 semester or 45 quarter units at the campus, the grade point average shall be based on cumulative work attempted at the campus. In the absence of 30 semester or 45 quarter units of work at the campus, the grade point average shall be based on cumulative work attempted at all colleges and universities attended. The Chancellor or designee shall determine the median grade point average for all discipline divisions on the campuses based on data provided by the campuses. "Discipline division" as used herein shall mean those discipline groupings~~

developed by the National Center for Educational Statistics and published in *A Taxonomy of Instructional Programs in Higher Education* (United States Government Printing Office, 1970). have attained a grade point average that is greater than the median undergraduate grade point average of students pursuing comparable undergraduate curricula. The campus shall establish procedures for determining whether a candidate meets that criterion.

(2) Prerequisite Courses and Field Experience. The candidate shall have successfully completed ~~a~~ at least one documented supervised ~~early~~ field experience and other prerequisite courses and experiences prescribed by the campus.

(3) Professional Aptitude. The candidate shall demonstrate suitable aptitude for teaching in public schools in accordance with standards and procedures determined by the campus. These procedures ~~shall~~ may include interviews, letters of recommendation, and a statement of professional goals or philosophy written by the candidate.

(4) Physical Fitness. The candidate shall satisfy the standards of physical fitness required by the ~~State credentialing agency.~~ Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

(5) Fundamental Skills. The candidate shall demonstrate proficiency in fundamental skills. Fundamental skills shall include written and spoken English, reading, and mathematics. The campus shall determine the essential level of proficiency and the means by which the fundamental skills shall be demonstrated. The campus may use such means as observation and examinations.

(6) Personality and Character. The candidate shall demonstrate personality and character traits ~~which~~ that satisfy the standards of the teaching profession. The assessment of the candidate shall be made by the teacher education faculty of the campus, who may also consider information from public school personnel ~~as well as~~ and others. Tests, observations, and interviews may be employed by the campus for this assessment.

(7) Exceptions. The campus may admit a candidate to a teacher education program as an exception when the candidate has not met one or more of the requirements if the candidate possesses compensating strengths in other required areas. A campus may grant exceptions ~~which~~ that are conditioned on satisfaction of requirements within a specified time period. The campus shall limit the number of exceptional admissions to teacher education programs in the current year to a number no greater than 15 percent of those regularly admitted to the campus teacher education program in the current or previous year.

Authority cited: Education Code § 89030

Reference cited: Education Code § 89030

§ 41101. Continuation in Teacher Education Basic Credential Program.

Once admitted to a teacher education basic credential program of a campus, a student shall continue to satisfy the requirements for admission in Section 41100 and those prescribed by the campus. Should the campus determine that a student no longer satisfies these requirements or that a student who was admitted as an exception has failed to satisfy a condition of admission, the campus may, after notifying and counseling with the student, discontinue the student's participation in the teacher education program.

A campus may establish additional criteria of satisfactory progress through the teacher education program. Should the campus determine that a student has not made satisfactory progress, the campus may, after notifying and counseling the student, discontinue the student's participation in the teacher education program.

Authority cited: Education Code § 89030

Reference cited: Education Code § 89030

~~§ 41102. Admission to Student Teaching.~~

~~To be admitted to the student teaching experience, a candidate shall have satisfied the following requirements:~~

~~(a) The candidate shall have achieved a minimum grade point average of 3.0 on a four-point scale in all classes attempted in professional education courses after entering into the teacher education basic credential program.~~

~~(b) The candidate shall have successfully completed all student teaching entrance requirements imposed by the Education Code and by the campus, including certification of subject matter competence by the appropriate subject matter examination, major department, or program.~~

~~(c) A candidate admitted as an exception shall have satisfied any conditions of the exception prior to admission to the student teaching experience.~~

~~Authority cited: Education Code § 89030~~

~~Reference cited: Education Code § 89030~~

§ 41103. 41102. Recommendation for Teaching Credential.

To be eligible for recommendation by the campus for a basic teaching credential, the candidate shall have satisfied the following requirements:

(a) The candidate shall have achieved a minimum grade point average of 3.0 on a four-point scale in all classes attempted in professional education courses after entering the program.

(b) The candidate shall have met campus standards for completion of a supervised student teaching experience, including a ~~student~~ teaching experience in a multicultural setting.

(c) The candidate shall have successfully completed all credential requirements of the Education Code and ~~Part VIII~~ Division 8 of Title 5 of the California ~~Administrative Code of Regulations~~.

(d) The candidate shall have satisfied all competence standards of the campus in the following categories: fundamental skills, the appropriate subject matter, instructional procedures, classroom management, and professional attitudes.

Authority cited: Education Code § 89030

Reference cited: Education Code § 89030

§ ~~41104~~. 41103. Office of the Chancellor.

The Chancellor shall provide guidance to the campuses of ~~The~~ the California State University concerning the requirements of this Article 9 and may provide administrative direction in the implementation of the provisions of this article in ~~The~~ the California State University.

Authority cited: Education Code § 89030

Reference cited: Education Code § 89030

And, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees has determined that the adoption of the proposed revision will not impose a cost or savings on any state agency; will not impose a cost or savings on any local agency or school district that is required to be reimbursed under Section 17561 of the Government Code; will not result in any cost or savings in federal funding to the state; and will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees delegates to the chancellor of the California State University authority to further adopt, amend, or repeal this revision if the further adoption, amendment, or repeal is required and is nonsubstantial or solely grammatical in nature, or sufficiently related to the original text that the public was adequately placed on notice that the change could result from the originally proposed regulatory action.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Extended and Continuing Education in the CSU

Presentation By

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Robert Detweiler, President
CSU Dominguez Hills, and Chair,
Commission on the Extended University

Summary

Established by legislation and trustee policy, extended university programs have provided campuses with the freedom and flexibility to respond to the needs of business, industry, education, and government. Extended university offices have been pioneers in the development and use of distance learning technologies. CSU faculty participating in extended university programs have created a number of experimental courses and degrees that have later been incorporated into regular academic operations. Extended university programs enrolled a record 416,925 students during the 1996-97 year. A report on these activities will be presented.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Extended and Continuing Education in the CSU

Extended and continuing education courses and programs serve the needs of working professionals including teachers, nontraditional learners, and students enrolled in campus programs. Campus extended and continuing education units vary in their organization and program structure, being heavily influenced by the campus's curricula, traditions, resource commitments, and local geography and socioeconomics. For the last three years, extended university courses and programs have been carried to all 58 counties in California and 314 separate communities. Extended university units offer a wide variety of graduate and undergraduate degree programs, 340 certificate programs, and hundreds of professional development activities. Extended university courses and programs are, by state law, "self-supporting," indicating that the student pays the full cost of instruction.

As the CSU approaches the twenty-first century, new methods and capacities for assisting with the state's social, educational, and economic transformation have come to the forefront. The California State University has completed the comprehensive Cornerstones planning process, and a series of new plans and agendas have been outlined to assist the system in meeting the needs of its citizens. A number of the fundamental Cornerstones recommendations deal with the role of the extended university.

Serving as one of several outreach arms of the CSU, extended university programs have shown encouraging growth over the last decade. Registrations in extended university courses and programs increased from 304,773 during 1995-96 to 416,925 during the past year. Certificate and teacher credential programs increased significantly as well. The CSU now offers 340 certificates and teacher credential programs through extended university operations. Innovation and professional applicability have been especially apparent in non credit and certificate programs. For example, CSU Fullerton began a new "Applications of Forensic Science to Civil and Criminal Investigation" program during the past year. This program, taught by Dr. Henry Lee, an internationally known forensic scientist, featured eighteen other forensic specialists. The program was designed to educate law enforcement officials, attorneys, and other professionals about the practices and limitations of modern forensic science.

During 1996-97, CSU campuses offered 36 baccalaureate and graduate degree programs through the extended university. These are designed to meet the needs of the adult population. For example, San Jose State offers its MBA program on-site at local businesses and industries. In operation for over a decade, the program has provided instruction to hundreds of students in their work setting every year. It is conducted in eight-week modules and taught by the graduate faculty of the College of Business.

Contract courses and programs are tailor made to meet specific needs of business and industry, public and private education, and other groups. CSU Chico's Satellite Education Network, for example, delivers the campus computer science programs to more than 20 high-tech corporate partners across the nation.

Newer CSU campuses have contributed to the growing inventory of extended university programs and courses. The California Maritime Academy, for example, has developed a 40-hour Advanced Marine Fire Fighting program that meets new U.S. Coast Guard requirements.

Campus extended university units have been pioneers in the development and use of the distance learning technologies. For several years televised instruction has been the most common use of technology for extended university instructional efforts. Within the last two years, campus extended education units have become heavily involved in computer-based (on-line) programming. Last year, nearly 200 students from California, the nation, and the world enrolled in a new Master of Science in Quality Assurance on-line program offered by CSU Dominguez Hills. Using funds from the Commission on the Extended University, CSU Northridge is preparing to offer a special on-line component of its master's degree in speech pathology.

The coming century will almost certainly present global challenges and opportunities for California residents. Campus extended university offices have initiated a number of new programs that may serve as pathfinders for additional systemwide efforts. CSU Hayward, for example, has conducted a successful MBA degree in Moscow for the last four years. Students are expected to meet the admission and graduation requirements of CSUH, including proficiency in English. Eighty students have already graduated from this program, and eighty more students are expected to graduate by the end of 1998. Additionally, San Diego State's renowned International Training Center regularly broadcasts instruction in many different languages throughout the world.

Extended university offerings effectively complement on-campus programs to enable the California State University to respond fully to the state's broad range of educational needs.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Closed Session

Review and Recommendations of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

Presentation By

Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

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”}.