

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting:** 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 11, 1999  
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

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

#### Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1999

#### Discussion Items

1. CalStateTEACH, *Action*
2. Accountability Process, *Information*
3. Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers, *Action*
4. Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University, *Action*
5. Establishment of California State University, Channel Islands as a New University, *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 16, 1999**

**Members Present**

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

**Members Absent**

Bob Foster

**Other Trustees Present**

Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Stanley T. Wang

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

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

**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

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order on March 16, 1999, at 3:30 p.m. Chair Campbell introduced Delaine Eastin, superintendent of public instruction and director of education, and Speaker of the Assembly Antonio Villaraigosa.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of January 26-27, 1999, were approved as submitted.

### **Precollegiate Educational Policy Implementation: Third Annual Report**

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence introduced the third annual report stating that the trustee remediation policy goal to reduce the percentage of students needing remediation to 10 percent of incoming students by 2007 is moving forward. Moreover, principle five of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan also addresses this policy goal.

As shown by current statistical information from the campuses, the need for English and mathematics remediation still exists. Dr. Spence stated, however, that since CSU tests virtually every student prior to admission and before enrollment, CSU identifies all students who need remedial help and places them in appropriate courses. Chancellor Reed pointed out when every student is tested the extent of the problem is known and improvement can begin. Dr. Spence also noted the need for closer alignment between student high school grades and placement test scores. Additionally, transfer students are required to complete general education course work in English and mathematics before transferring to CSU.

As an important part of CSU's public school outreach to improve preparation of students, Dr. Spence stated that CSU has developed a series of initiatives designed to further prepare students for college. Pilot programs at several universities now provide early testing and tutoring to K-12 students. However, placement and diagnostic tests need to be made available to all ninth through eleventh grade students in order to assess preparation prior to CSU admission. Also, CSU campuses need to expand tutoring programs, to direct remedial programs to the high schools, and collaborate further with high schools needing the most assistance.

Dr. Spence noted the Board of Trustees' expectation that students needing help should complete remedial work by the end of their first year of enrollment. Chair Campbell stated that Executive Vice Chancellor Spence and Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli will work together to initiate a process that will achieve closer alignment between the many standards and expectations and CSU's process of assessing English and mathematics competency.

Superintendent Eastin thanked the trustees for engaging in close collaboration between K-12 and higher education, and acknowledged the supportive role of Chancellor Reed and previous Chancellor Munitz. She expressed hope for continued united work on an accountability plan and stated the need to set standards and align assessments with those standards. Superintendent Eastin asked the trustees to continue their support of K-18 partnerships, praising CSU as the best system to lead outreach efforts between higher education and K-12. She also pointed out that due to an aging teaching population and the class-size reduction mandate, 300,000 new teachers, as well as administrators, will be needed over the next ten years. In closing, Superintendent Eastin stressed the need to work with UC to create additional joint doctorate degree programs to serve educators who wish to advance in their profession.

CSSA Chair Mette Adams voiced her concern about the one-year expectation to complete remediation classes or be disenrolled. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence responded that a committee, comprised of presidents, vice presidents of academic affairs, faculty and students, examined the current policy and agreed unanimously to support its current form. However, each campus president may grant individual exemptions on a case-by-case basis. Trustee Pesqueira supported current policy and stressed that CSU should continue working with K-12 and community colleges to prepare students prior to enrollment.

Trustee Mitchell asked how many campuses have summer remediation programs. In reply, it was noted that all campuses either have or will have summer programs this year.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked if a student would be able to pass the EPT/ELM placement exam after a year-long remediation class. Dr. Spence responded that remediation is course-based; that is, if the course is passed, it is presumed that the student would have achieved the level of competency desired.

President Suzuki, Cal Poly Pomona, noted that it might be difficult to apply the one-year policy to ESL students. Chair Campbell stated that a president can opt to grant an exception. Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli added that the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates developed competency statements in science, mathematics, and English, and concluded that the requirements should be the same for ESL students.

Dr. Spence announced that in addition to the annual report in March, an interim report will be presented in November focusing on the effectiveness of CSU remedial programs and the appropriateness of CSU's diagnostic/placement tests.

### **Cornerstones Implementation**

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that changes were made in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan since January to further recognize student and other input. Dr. Spence apologized for not recognizing the contributions of the California Faculty Association at the January board meeting.

Trustee Pierce thanked Dr. Spence for his efforts in developing the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. Trustee Pierce encouraged integrating learning outcomes and core competencies into every college course. Trustee Goldwhite added his thanks to Dr. Spence and Chancellor Reed for their efforts, and commented that he regarded the development of Cornerstones as an exemplary demonstration of collegiality. CSSA Chair Mette Adams thanked Trustee Otomo-Corgel and Dr. Spence for the last-minute revision to further enhance student presence in the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. Senate Chair Dinielli applauded Dr. Spence for elevating academics to the level it deserves. Trustee Otomo-Corgel suggested an amendment to add several references to students in the overview section of the plan, and a motion to approve the change was adopted. Trustee Pesqueira stated that Cornerstones is gaining nationwide attention. Chair Campbell added that the accountability section will be reviewed at the May board meeting. Superintendent Eastin expressed her thanks for the report.

4  
Ed. Pol.

The resolution was moved and seconded. The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (REP 03-99-01).

### **Academic Planning and Program Review**

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence 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. Dr. Spence described the criteria for and the three alternative paths (traditional, fast track, and pilot) to program approval. The campuses were seeking permission to plan a total of 16 new programs.

The resolution was moved and seconded. The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (REP 03-99-03).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 1  
May 11-12, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **CalStateTEACH**

##### **Presentation By**

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Peter P. Smith, President  
California State University, Monterey Bay

John D. Welty, President  
California State University, Fresno

##### **Summary**

CalStateTEACH is a new alternative program leading to the Multiple Subject (elementary) with Cross Cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) teaching credential. Available to individuals residing and teaching in any geographic location in California, CalStateTEACH is designed specifically to serve teachers who hold an emergency permit and teach full-time in an elementary school. It is also expected to attract prospective teachers unable to access campus programs due to personal circumstances or because they live beyond commuting distance to a university campus. It is a personalized program of independent learning in which beginning teachers work in small groups, guided and supported by a California State University faculty member whose primary responsibility is to serve each Intern Teacher as an adviser, coach, and evaluator. The curriculum has been specially constructed to integrate the theory and practice of teaching with the daily experiences of teachers in the classroom. The program is designed primarily for emergency permit teachers, who, for reasons of geography or personal circumstances, need a flexible form of learning allowing part-time, home-based study and using a rich mix of print, Internet, video, and audio materials.

##### **Recommendation**

Adoption of the proposed resolutions adding Section 40100.3 to Title 5 and setting fees.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1  
May 11-12, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### CalStateTEACH

##### **The Challenge: Fully Prepared Classroom Teachers**

When California schools opened in fall 1998, classrooms were staffed by over 30,000 teachers working without the qualifications necessary to be fully credentialed instructors. Providing opportunities for these individuals to become fully qualified—as well as training many of the estimated 250,000–300,000 additional teachers that will be needed by 2008—is the mission of the California State University. Yet the burgeoning demand for fully credentialed school personnel is overwhelming the resources of our campus teacher preparation programs. Even with CSU teacher preparation programs gearing up to accommodate significantly increased enrollments, the state university will be hard pressed to meet California's need for well-prepared teachers. To fulfill its mission to prepare teachers for K-12 classrooms, CSU has looked to other possible models, in addition to the traditional on-campus programs that have served the state so well.

##### **CalStateTEACH: Alternative Pathway to the Teaching Credential**

With \$5 million in special funding obtained from the California legislature by Chancellor Reed, and with the advice and guidance of Sir John Daniel and British Open University (OU) representatives, the CSU has developed a unique program to meet the state's need for fully credentialed teachers. Through observation and study of the OU, the CSU identified a model that provides the convenience and flexibility of distance learning with the high-quality curriculum and rigorous mentoring characteristic of on-campus instruction, and used this model to develop an entirely new program, CalStateTEACH.

CalStateTEACH is a multiple subject intern program that has been designed initially for fully employed elementary teachers holding emergency permits or waivers. The program may also attract prospective teachers unable to access campus programs due to personal circumstances, unworkable commuting distances, or those who have completed a baccalaureate and desire a nontraditional route to a credential. This approach considers the working teacher's classroom experience central to the learning process and is designed to integrate that experience with academic knowledge toward the attainment of the program outcomes. It is a systemwide program with a common curriculum and an elaborate support system operated by CSU regional centers established specifically for this project. When students matriculate into CalStateTEACH, they will become Intern Teachers who are guided and advised by CSU Learning Support Faculty (LSF) associated with the regional centers. Additionally, each Intern Teacher will be mentored by Adjunct Site Faculty (ASF) in the school district where the Intern Teacher is employed.

This new program is available to students residing and teaching in any geographical location in California. There are no regular university classes to attend, although there are five Saturday seminars over the course of the 18-month program. Participants can study at the place and time of their choice while adhering to a common schedule for submitting assignments and fulfilling other academic requirements. They will begin the program whenever their respective cohorts begin and will be required to maintain the pace of their cohorts. That means they will be expected to submit written

assignments at set times and participate in the four stages for established periods. This is an open, independent learning experience, but not a fully self-paced program. After the Intern Teachers successfully complete the year-and-a-half program, they will have earned a preliminary Multiple Subject credential and 38 semester units of credit.

### **Organization of the Program**

CalStateTEACH is unique in that it is a systemwide program that draws upon and combines some of the system's best resources and is heavily dependent on CSU campuses for support in several important ways. First, the curriculum was developed by 28 CSU faculty members widely regarded for their expertise in their respective fields. Second, CSU faculty members serve as the Academic Directors of all the regional centers and many of the Learning Support Faculty are expected to be CSU faculty members. Third, selected CSU campuses are operating the regional centers and serving as lead or "home" campuses for purposes of providing financial aid, monitoring academic records, and recommending those who fulfill program requirements to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) for a credential.

The five regional centers, chosen primarily on the basis of the geographic location of the emergency permit teacher population, are operated by the following campuses and campus consortiums to serve specified geographic areas.

- Bay Area/Sacramento/Northwest California: Hayward (lead campus), Chico, Humboldt, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, and Sonoma
- Central and Northeast California: Fresno and Monterey Bay (lead campuses), Bakersfield, San Luis Obispo, and Stanislaus
- Los Angeles North and West: Los Angeles (lead campus), Channel Islands, Dominguez Hills, and Northridge
- Los Angeles South and East: Pomona (lead campus) and Long Beach
- Southern California: Fullerton (lead campus), San Bernardino, and San Marcos

Additional centers may be added as needed. Each regional center will be staffed by a faculty member serving as Regional Center Academic Director and several Learning Support Faculty members. The centers will be developed and operated by CSU campuses in the respective regions but not necessarily located on CSU campuses.

The chancellor appointed an advisory board, co-chaired by President Peter Smith of CSU Monterey Bay and President John Welty of CSU Fresno, which is responsible for ensuring achievement of program objectives and recommending policy to the chancellor.

In addition to its systemwide approach, there are several other distinctive features to this program: the innovative curriculum, the rich learning support for participants, and the use of technology to facilitate learning and to provide faster and more efficient communication for working teachers.

**Curriculum**

The curriculum of CalStateTEACH provides a different pathway to the teaching credential. In recognition of the special needs of Intern Teachers, it is structured differently from traditional programs.

The Intern Teacher in an elementary classroom must assume all the responsibilities of a full-time teacher from the beginning of their employment, teaching all subjects, managing the classroom, assessment of students, and maintaining relationships with staff and parents. Therefore, it is difficult to decide which “course” this candidate would need to take first.

CalStateTEACH’s curriculum was designed with precisely this candidate in mind—the working Intern Teacher. Rather than course by course, the activities and experiences build along themes in teaching and learning. The kinds of assignments given are integrating with, rather than simply adding to, the Intern Teacher’s work with children. In this fashion, the Intern Teacher learns a little about every area at the beginning—“survival” skills and strategies. Those initial understandings are built on and extended until the entire program is completed, giving the Intern the same level and complexity of skill and understanding as a traditional candidate, only having built them in a different fashion. In the end, all graduates of CalStateTEACH will have achieved the same goals and outcomes as traditional programs are designed to promote. The curriculum was designed around the six domains of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and prepares teachers to work with the California K-12 curriculum frameworks and subject matter standards.

To build a program in this fashion, special curriculum materials had to be devised. Twenty-eight faculty members known for expertise in their respective fields worked in small teams to create new curricular materials to develop a distinctive California Multiple Subject credential program. Additionally, over 30 faculty members from throughout the CSU served as reviewers of the curriculum, as did faculty from all CSU teacher preparation programs. The Statewide Academic Senate played an important role in the identification of these faculty experts and assumed the primary responsibility for review of the curriculum.

**Learning Support Faculty**

While the CalStateTEACH program employs a number of innovations, at its heart is the relationship between the Learning Support Faculty (LSF) and the Intern Teacher. Each Intern Teacher in the program will be assigned to a CSU faculty member who will serve as the LSF. The Learning Support Faculty member acts as teacher, adviser, coach, assessor, and guide—working with the Intern Teacher throughout the 18-month program. Intern Teachers in the program will have access to their LSF in person at the school of employment or the regional center, via email, and by telephone. The LSF reads and responds to all written work submitted by the Intern Teacher, facilitates on-line classroom discussion groups, and regularly observes K-6 classroom teaching.

It is expected that some of the LSFs will be individuals who are current faculty members within the CSU, and that others will be especially hired for this role from other areas (such as recently retired elementary school teachers). Current CSU faculty members who are hired as LSFs will simply be on “loan” to the CalStateTEACH program, with their campus receiving full reimbursement.

Additionally, the CalStateTEACH Intern Teacher will be supported at the school site by an Adjunct Site Faculty (ASF) member, a teaching employee of the participating school district. This daily on-site mentoring and support is another critical component in the Intern Teacher's professional development.

### **Use of Technology**

To deliver its curriculum, CalStateTEACH will use a rich combination of print, audio, video, and web-supported media. Computer conferencing and email will serve as the primary method of one-to-one and group communication as well as the preferred vehicle for submitting assignments. Because technology is important to the Intern Teacher's success as a learner in the program, technology has been integrated into the curriculum through close work between the curriculum teams, project instructional designers, and technology support personnel.

Additionally, the program's curriculum is designed to meet the state's standards for the knowledge and skills elementary teachers need to employ technology appropriately in their teaching. Therefore, technology is also part of the curriculum content.

CalStateTEACH has been designed to be "user friendly." Although the program makes use of the computer and Internet, the software is easy to use. Intern Teachers will need only to have a general understanding of personal computer use, word processing, and the Internet. The project will provide its own "help desk," accessible by telephone, which will assist students with the software required in the program and will help solve basic computing problems.

### **Ensuring High Quality**

High standards for teacher preparation are always a top priority for the California State University. This program will meet the same accreditation and review standards as all other programs in California. CalStateTEACH is actively pursuing accreditation by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), which has been encouraging about this innovative approach to addressing the teacher shortage in the state. CSU is also working with WASC to ensure full compliance with regional accreditation requirements. Finally, since half of the CSU teacher education programs are also accredited by the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), discussions have been held with officers of NCATE to determine whether or not the NCATE standards, which assume a traditional campus structure, would accommodate a program such as CalStateTEACH. But perhaps the clearest and most enduring testament to the quality of the new CalStateTEACH program is its development through a synergy of some of the most skilled teacher preparation faculty in the California State University.

### **Resolutions**

Formal trustee action expressly granting the chancellor authority to establish and operate CalStateTEACH is appropriate in view of the importance of the systemwide program in helping meet the need for more well-qualified teachers. It is also appropriate for the trustees to reaffirm the need for CSU to take extraordinary measures to respond to the need for 250,000–300,000 more California teachers during the next 10 years. Therefore, the following resolutions are recommended for adoption:

## **Title 5 Authorization**

**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 2 of Subchapter 2 of Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations by adding Section 40100.3 as follows:

### **§ 40100.3 Authorization to Establish Teacher Education Programs**

The Chancellor may establish and operate teacher education programs leading toward fulfillment of requirements for one or more public school service credentials. When the programs are approved by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing, the campuses participating in the programs are authorized to recommend individuals who have completed requirements to the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing. Students admitted to these programs and recommended for credentials shall have met relevant portions of Article 9 (commencing with section 41100) of Subchapter 3, Requirements for Admission to Teacher Basic Credential Programs and Student Teaching and Recommendation for Teaching Credential. The Chancellor shall consult with the Statewide Academic Senate during the establishment and operation of these programs.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66600 and 89030, Education Code.

and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees has determined that the adoption of this 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.

### **Fee Setting**

The fees proposed for CalStateTEACH students are the standard systemwide mandatory fees (Application Fee, State University Fee) plus an Instructional Materials Fee which includes the cost of all textbooks, audio and video tapes, and other required materials. In the resolution that follows a new CalStateTEACH Instructional Materials Fee is set and the State University Fee, set by separate board action on a systemwide basis, is included because of the need for its assessment on a “per stage” basis rather than on the usual academic term basis. Students who are not residents of California for fee purposes will be required to pay nonresident tuition. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that effective with fall 1999 the following fees are approved for each of the four stages of the CalStateTEACH program:

<b>State University Fee</b>	\$792
<b>Instructional Materials Fee</b>	\$350
<b>Total Fees (per stage)</b>	\$1,142

and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor shall have authority to adjust the CalStateTEACH Instructional Materials Fee as necessary to meet the costs of the program.

## **BRIEF**

**Information**

Agenda Item 2  
May 11-12, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Accountability Process**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

Prior to the March meeting, members of the Committee on Educational Policy received copies of a proposed accountability process. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence explained that the proposed process was a major step toward Cornerstones implementation because greater accountability is a major theme throughout the Cornerstones report. The draft document distributed at that time appears in the following pages.

Discussions and development of a Compact II agreement have been proceeding concurrently with development of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan. The new compact drafts have greatly expanded the emphasis on accountability. Intensive meetings in recent weeks have yielded major progress on the entire compact and much greater substance and detail in the accountability portion of the compact. It now appears that there will be considerable similarity between the accountability section of Compact II and CSU's proposed accountability process.

At the March meeting, Dr. Spence said that the proposed accountability process would be the subject of discussion throughout the CSU during the weeks prior to the May trustees' meeting. The comments and revisions emanating from the discussions held so far will be shared. In addition, the latest version of the accountability section of Compact II will be presented and discussed. Copies of that document will be sent to trustees as soon as they are available.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2  
May 11-12, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### Accountability Process

##### Proposed Accountability Process—DRAFT

*“The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society, through regular assessment of the learning outcomes of its students and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.” (Principle #9, Cornerstones Implementation Plan, adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees, January, 1998.)*

The recommendations in support of this principle provide:

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

#### Background

The CSU has an extensive system of assessment already in place, and continues to be fully accountable as a public institution for the quality and integrity of the learning experience. Our primary motivation for strengthening accountability is the desire to know more about the extent to which the CSU is doing what it professes to do.

Evaluating the contributions of an institution by how much and how well its students are learning and how their educational experience is affecting their values and attitudes is fundamental to the mission of the University. This process also responds to the interests of state government and the public at large. Elected officials, trustees, faculty, and administrators who must make academic decisions want and need clear, comprehensible evidence of institutional effectiveness upon which to base those decisions.

The implementation plan consists of the underlying principles, a description of the institutional outcomes for which the campuses will be accountable to the system, and institutional accountability indicators.

#### Principles

1. Efforts to enhance the accountability of both the system and its campuses must encourage campus improvement and innovation in achieving its mission by using accountability indicators. This responsibility falls upon administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

2. Although some accountability indicators should apply to all California State University campuses, each campus also should be able to choose indicators that reflect its unique mission. Campus-based indicators are to be devised through the regular processes of campus governance.
3. The implementation plan must take into account the varied backgrounds, experiences, and abilities that students at each campus bring to their educational pursuits and recognize each campus's contributions. This "value added" philosophy will recognize institutions that accept the challenge of educating the full range of students eligible for the CSU.
4. The implementation plan must include campus processes that challenge CSU institutions to continually improve. Each campus will evaluate and report its progress toward its educational objectives over time. Whenever appropriate, accountability information should be presented in a multiyear format, both to attain a fuller picture of performance and to discern progress over several years. Due to the differences between campuses relating to mission, goals, and environment, comparisons between campuses will not be attempted.
5. The implementation plan should minimize the set of accountability indicators to those viewed as most important by the CSU and its stakeholders.
6. The CSU will consult widely in the development and refinement of accountability indicators and reports.
7. The CSU should constantly evaluate institutional outcomes to determine appropriateness and accountability indicators to determine usefulness and value.
8. To the extent possible, the CSU will rely upon existing data, data systems, and processes in developing indicators and reports.

### **Institutional Outcomes**

The implementation plan addresses eleven fundamental institutional outcomes based in the mission of the California State University system and its campuses:

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
2. Access to CSU
3. Articulation and transfer
4. Graduation
5. Teacher education
6. Relations with K-12

4  
Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 2  
May 11-12, 1999

7. Remediation
8. Facilities utilization
9. Quality of post-baccalaureate programs
10. Contributions to community and society
11. Institutional effectiveness

Each campus will report to the system annually on its attainment of the first eight of these outcomes using the system-defined indicators described below and one of the final three outcomes using the system-defined reports description below. All three of these latter outcomes must be addressed in a three-year period. In addition, each campus may select additional institutional outcomes and indicators/reports based upon its unique mission, goals, or environment.

An overview of the accountability indicators and reports follows:

### **System-Defined Institutional Accountability Indicators—Campus to Chancellor and Board of Trustees**

1. *Quality of baccalaureate degree programs*

In its 1997 report entitled “Baccalaureate Education in the California State University,” the CSU Academic Senate stated,

*The three broad areas of educational achievement expected of CSU graduating students are: (1) acquiring a sophisticated knowledge base, (2) acquiring the skills needed to use knowledge and to learn new knowledge so as to renew their knowledge base, and (3) participating in a mix of collegiate experiences and social processes that contribute to values for successful living.*

In outcomes-based education, CSU campuses focus on two areas: (a) General Education and (b) the major. In each area, the faculty of each institution should incorporate in its academic program review process each of the following:

- identification of the expected learning outcomes for the program;
- description of the means by which the faculty will assess students’ achievement of the expected outcomes; and,
- a report of changes in pedagogy, curriculum, academic support, and other measures taken to enhance students’ achievement.

Outcomes-based education is important to assure that students move beyond simple comprehension of knowledge toward the development of their abilities to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and apply that knowledge. Therefore, processes to assess student learning outcomes cannot be reduced to simple quantitative measures.

Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the university, program, and discipline-specific levels. After an initial three-year period, the accountability indicators will include (a) use of the developed assessment processes; and (b) evidence of curricular improvements based on assessment results.

**Indicator:** (*first three years*) Documentation of the development of a process for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving key outcomes.

**Indicator:** (*after three years*) Documentation of the inclusion of assessment results in campus academic program reviews and the use of these results to improve teaching, learning, and programs.

2. *Access*

The CSU will admit all eligible undergraduate students.

**Indicator:** The percentage of eligible undergraduate applicants, including transfers, who are admitted to the university.

3. *Articulation and transfer*

The CSU will remove all barriers to transfer within the CSU and between the CSU and the community colleges.

**Indicator:** The number of units required of transfer students to graduate as compared to the number of units required of native students to graduate.

4. *Graduation*

The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements and effective advising, will allow students to achieve their stated goals for graduation.

**Indicator:** Actual graduation rates, adjusted for student characteristics and full-time/part-time status.

5. *Teacher education*

The CSU will adjust its capacity to prepare credentialed teachers consistent with the needs of K-12 education.

**Indicator:** Number of credentials issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to campus-prepared candidates.

6. *Relations with K-12*

In an effort to increase the level of preparation of entering students, the CSU will be responsive to the needs of K-12 education.

**Indicator:** The percentage of regularly eligible students who are fully prepared in mathematics and English composition.

7. *Remediation*

The CSU will successfully remediate within one year, entering students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English composition.

**Indicator:** The percentage of students requiring remediation who complete remediation within one year.

8. *Facilities utilization*

In order to reduce the needs for the construction of new buildings, the CSU will increase utilization of facilities in "off-peak" times (including state support and continuing education).

**Indicator:** The percentage of course enrollments occurring during evenings, weekends, summers and other "off-peak" times.

9. *Quality of post-baccalaureate programs*

The CSU will continue its commitment to provide education beyond the baccalaureate as an essential component of its mission.

**Indicator:** Periodic (three-year) reports that describe how the campus is meeting the needs of post-baccalaureate education including lifelong learning, graduate degree programs, and professional certification. These reports could include quantitative and qualitative data related to (for example):

- graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates,
- graduates engaged community college teaching, and
- the range of continuing education programs offered.

#### *10. Contributions to community and society*

The CSU will contribute to its community and society through the economic impact of its graduates, the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, and the public service provided by faculty, students, and staff.

**Indicator:** Periodic (three-year) reports describing the various contributions of the campus to its community and society. These reports could include quantitative and qualitative data related to (for example):

- students earning credit for service-related internship courses, service learning courses, fieldwork courses, and tutorial programs,
- faculty engaged in academically-related community service,
- graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates,
- graduates enrolling in post-baccalaureate programs,
- graduates engaged in teaching, government, or public-service careers,
- grant and contract awards to faculty and staff, and
- the economic impact of the campus upon its community and region.

#### *11. Institutional effectiveness*

The primary mission of the CSU is teaching and learning. Administrative functions and the campus environment should support this mission through responsiveness to the needs of students and faculty, and through increasing efficiencies.

**Indicator:** Periodic (three-year) reports describing the achievements of the campus in improving its institutional effectiveness. These reports could include quantitative and qualitative data related to (for example):

- effective strategic planning,
- a collegial environment,
- student participation in shared governance,
- regular surveying of student needs and support services, and
- organizational units using benchmarking, satisfaction surveys, or other evaluative measures to assess performance.

**Campus-Defined Institutional Accountability Indicators—Campus to Chancellor and Board of Trustees**

A campus may choose to provide indicators in addition to the system-defined indicators for the outcomes described above. These indicators may be used in cases where the campus believes that the system-defined indicators do not fully describe their circumstances. The following are examples of indicators that a campus may choose to report. They are by no means exclusive, since campuses may develop their own indicators.

- Data from students (e.g., SNAPS) or alumni/ae on satisfaction and perceived value of CSU education in the academic program review process.
- Data from students on satisfaction with access to learning opportunities, the quality of academic advising, and access to faculty beyond the classroom.
- Employer feedback on the preparation of graduates' skills, knowledge, and ability to continue learning.
- Student persistence rates.
- Number of students admitted to basic credential programs.
- Number of students pursuing multiple subject waiver programs.
- The percentage of students earning credit for internship courses, service learning courses, fieldwork courses, and tutoring programs.
- The percentage of faculty engaged in academically-related community service.
- Number of CSU graduates qualifying for professional licenses and certificates.
- A campus report on the scholarly and creative contributions of faculty.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 3  
May 11-12, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers**

##### **Presentation By**

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

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Financial Officer

##### **Summary**

At the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities meeting in March 1999, an agenda item was presented which provided background information on off-campus centers and summarized existing policies which guide the establishment of new off-campus centers and the approval of permanent off-campus centers. The Ad Hoc Committee asked staff to return to the May 1999 meeting with a proposed resolution affirming existing policy and introducing additional criteria recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Pending positive action by the Ad Hoc Committee at its meeting on May 11, 1999, the Committee on Educational Policy will be presented with an updated policy on the establishment of new off-campus centers and approval of permanent off-campus centers. This updated policy both affirms existing trustees' policy and adds new criteria addressing distance learning technology and documentation of need.

##### **Recommended Action**

Adoption of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3  
May 11-12, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Updated Policy and Criteria Regarding Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers and Approval of Permanent Off-Campus Centers**

##### **Background**

In March 1999, the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities discussed background information on off-campus centers and the existing policies that guide establishment of new off-campus centers and permanent center facilities. The members of the committee asked staff to prepare a resolution that would affirm existing policy while recommending new criteria to address some issues not covered in the original policy. Out of this discussion and after further review, staff developed a recommendation that affirms existing policy and proposes a two-step process for establishment of new off-campus centers, what CPEC refers to as “outreach operations,” and approval of permanent off-campus centers, with the addition of new criteria.

##### **Policy and Criteria for the Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers**

The basis for off-campus education programs is to provide regular academic degree programs in geographic areas not adequately served by existing CSU campuses. The area should demonstrate a population base or growth with demand for such programs that cannot be met by the regional four-year campus or other public or private higher education institutions in the area. The centers should not compete with existing community colleges, other local institutions, or with the four-year “home” campus. They are limited in enrollment to CSU eligible students, with all fees and academic requirements consistent with CSU policy for matriculated students. Off-campus centers are an integral part of the “home” campus academic program, offering upper division and graduate courses allowing students to complete specific degree programs.

The 1985 statutes authorizing the trustees to pursue planning for three new centers included language regarding development of criteria for approval of state-funded centers, as follows:

“The Trustees shall develop explicit criteria for the approval of any proposals for the state-funded purchase or construction of off-campus centers of postsecondary education, and shall submit the criteria to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) for its review. No later than July 1, 1986, the Trustees shall submit the criteria to the legislature, and the commission shall submit to the legislature its recommendations concerning the criteria.”

In January 1986, the board adopted criteria for new centers to be applied to the three new legislatively proposed centers, as well as other future proposals. The following criteria from those adopted in January 1986 will apply to the establishment of new off-campus centers:

1. no negative impact on established higher education institutions in region
2. alternative instructional delivery insufficient to meet regional demand
3. enrollment of at least 200 FTE, with anticipated growth to 500 FTE over 5-10 years
4. at least three academic degree programs offered with full upper division program
5. staffing with regular CSU faculty at ratio similar to on-campus staffing
6. academic resources sufficient for continuity without impacting “home” campus programs

In addition, the following new requirements are proposed for the establishment of new off-campus centers.

#### *Distance Learning*

Given sufficient enrollments, distance learning technology can deliver educational programs from an existing university campus (or multiple campuses) to remote sites at lower costs than traditional delivery methods. As campuses identify educational needs that they are not currently serving, the possibility of serving those needs through distance learning systems must be considered as an alternative to establishment of a new off-campus center. The effectiveness of distance learning technology in any particular case will depend on its ability to deliver the specific types of instructional content that are needed. To ensure that distance learning technology is considered, staff recommends adding the following additional requirement to the trustees' previously approved list:

7. For the establishment of new off-campus centers serving up to 500 FTE, it must be demonstrated that the projected center enrollment cannot be accommodated through distance learning technologies or other alternative instruction delivery methods that meet pedagogical requirements for effective instruction.

#### *Reporting Requirement and Delegation of Authority to Chancellor*

To address documenting the need for new off-campus centers that have enrollments of up to 500 FTE, staff recommends introducing the following additional requirement to the trustees' previously approved list:

8. In the proposal for a new off-campus center, the "home" campus shall show how the proposal meets trustee policy requirements and affirm that the proposed center does not require additional support costs above the campus's allocated enrollment budget. Based on this report, the chancellor is delegated the authority to approve the establishment of a new off-campus center, not to exceed 500 FTE, without Board of Trustees' approval.

Consistent with existing CPEC Guidelines, the establishment of a new off-campus center does not require CPEC review.

#### **Policy and Criteria for the Board Approval of Permanent Off-campus Centers**

Existing CPEC policy requires review by CPEC of the proposed establishment of off-campus centers with enrollment in excess of 500 FTE. Therefore, prior board approval and designation as a permanent off-campus center is required in such cases.

A previously established off-campus center will have been supported through normal campus resources. Facilities may have been leased or donated. A permanent off-campus center may continue to function in leased or donated facilities but will also qualify for owned facilities. Thus, it is expected that budget support requirements may impact systemwide resources including capital outlay. Thus, the needs for expansion of the off-campus center beyond 500 FTE must be consistent with the necessary reallocation of systemwide resources to support this expansion.

4

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

May 11-12, 1999

In addition to the satisfaction of all criteria for the establishment of new off-campus centers cited in the prior section, the following criteria for Board of Trustees' approval adopted in January 1986 will apply.

9. existing center operated 3 years prior to consideration for permanent status
10. needs commensurate with anticipated costs
11. recognized General Fund budget support
12. campuses other than "home" may offer degree programs at center
13. strong community support

### **Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board approves the updated policy on the establishment of new off-campus centers and approval of permanent off-campus centers, as described in Agenda Item 3 of the May 11-12, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 4  
May 11-12, 1999

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University**

**Presentation By**

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

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Financial Officer

**Summary**

This item presents a recommended policy for converting an existing off-campus center to a university. Pending positive action by the Ad Hoc Committee at its meeting on May 11, 1999, the committee may be presented with policies and criteria for consideration.

**Recommended Action**

Adoption of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4  
May 11-12, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Policies and Criteria for Converting an Existing Off-Campus Center to a University**

##### **Background**

At the meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities in March 1999, the members of the Ad Hoc Committee discussed an agenda item summarizing current policies and criteria used when converting an existing off-campus center to full university status. The committee found that these policies are essentially the same as the existing policies for the establishment of a new university. After review and discussion, the Ad Hoc Committee concluded that the existing criteria for establishing a new university are appropriate for converting a permanent off-campus center to a university. If the Ad Hoc Committee affirms this position, the Committee on Educational Policy will consider this recommendation.

This item includes the proposed resolution plus the CSU's existing criteria for establishing a new university. It also includes the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) criteria for reviewing new campus proposals.

##### **Conversion of an Off-Campus Center to a University**

Staff recommends that existing trustee policy for the establishment of a new university campus be applied in the case where an off-campus center is being converted to a university. Site selection for a permanent off-campus center may include consideration of factors that might make the site potentially viable as a future CSU university campus, i.e., acreage, regional educational needs, availability of transportation, utilities and public services, regional population growth patterns, and proximity of other higher education institutions. However, existence of a permanent off-campus center is not, by itself, justification for establishment of a new CSU campus.

##### **Existing CPEC Policies for Reviewing New Campus Proposals**

- Enrollment projections for 10, 15, and 20 years must support the proposal.
- Alternatives, such as establishment of an off-campus center or expansion and increased utilization of existing campuses must be considered.
- Projected statewide enrollment demand should exceed the planned system capacity, or compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.
- Programs must be justified, and access for economically, educationally, and socially disadvantaged population must be demonstrated.

##### **Existing CSU Criteria for Establishing New Campuses**

- a. Carefully delineated and justified primary service area; this includes growth of student demand and ability of existing and future planned institutions to serve demand.
- b. Proposed new campus should not jeopardize operations of existing institutions in the proposed service area.
- c. Community interest and support.

- d. Accepted community plan for orderly development of adjacent, surrounding land.
- e. Proximity to existing and future housing, shopping, employment, cultural and recreational facilities.
- f. Accessibility to transit.
- g. Adequate shape and size to accommodate projected enrollment.
- h. Availability of utilities.
- i. Freedom from noise and nuisances
- j. Desirable natural features, including “beauty, spirit and feeling.”

It is staff’s judgment that the above criteria, specifically related to the establishment of a new university, are applicable as written to the conversion of an existing, permanent off-campus center to a university.

**Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board approves the use of the existing policy and criteria for establishment of new campuses, as described in Agenda Item 4 of the May 11-12, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, to determine when an off-campus center should be converted to a university.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 5  
May 11-12, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Establishment of California State University, Channel Islands as a New University**

##### **Presentation By**

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

Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Financial Officer

##### **Summary**

The trustees have previously delegated authority to the chancellor to accept conveyance of the former site of the Camarillo State Hospital and Development Center to the California State University to be used as the site for California State University, Channel Islands and the California State University, Northridge off-campus center. Under this authorization, actions have begun to make effective reuse of the site a reality. However, additional trustee action is required to establish the new campus. The trustees are being asked to officially authorize the establishment of California State University, Channel Islands subject to specific conditions (e.g., budgetary and CPEC approval) having been met.

##### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 5  
May 11-12, 1999

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### Establishment of California State University, Channel Islands as a New University

##### Background

Attempts to establish a CSU campus in the Ventura County area have a long history. It has only been with the acquisition of the Channel Islands facility that strong community support has come together.

The governor's task force on the future best use of the Camarillo facility commissioned a study that found that:

- Both individuals and employers in the Ventura area have unmet higher education needs;
- Individuals most in need of additional access to higher education are those unable to leave the area;
- Economics and family responsibilities will require many students to seek higher education in settings close to their home.

CSU Channel Islands will be able to address these until now unmet community educational needs. Toward that end, a number of significant actions establishing California State University, Channel Islands have been taken over the past two years:

November 1996	A gubernatorial task force recommends CSU's reuse of the Camarillo State Hospital site.
October 1997	Senate Bill 623 (O'Connell) authorizes transfer of the hospital site to the CSU.
September 1998	The Channel Islands Site Authority Act is enacted (SB 1923, O'Connell, Johnston, Polanco). The Site Authority's purpose is to develop the site and it is given the requisite fiscal and bonding authority to do so.
September 1998	The trustees approve a resolution to convey the hospital site to the CSU.
September 1998	The Environmental Impact Report for the site, which includes public private development of some of the land, is approved by the trustees.
August 1999	CSUN's off-campus center is slated to move classes to the Channel Islands site.

In addition to these steps, in 1998/99 the state invested \$5.2 million General Fund money to support the operation of the off-campus center. Also, \$11.3 million in capital funding was provided to renovate the first 100,000 square feet of space.

### **Development of the Site and the Off-Campus Center**

The creation of California State University, Channel Islands will go through a process where the existing California State University, Northridge off-campus center will first be transferred to the site of the new campus. The students associated with the off-campus center will serve as a core group for generating the student body for the new campus.

The general site development strategy endorsed by the trustees was one that would have little impact on the CSU capital development budget, and thus capital development on the other campuses, as possible. This is to be accomplished by developing for-rent and for-sale housing on some of the land on the site. Based on current market conditions, the for-rent and for-sale housing should generate sufficient revenues to be the primary support for all the physical development needs for a campus serving up to 11,750 FTE over the next 25 years.

The Channel Islands Site Authority has met and has conducted preliminary negotiations with a developer for the housing. Remodeling of the buildings necessary to accommodate the CSUN off-campus students in August is proceeding on schedule.

### **Need for Four Critical Actions**

An important phase in fully implementing the new campus has now been reached requiring the completion of four critical actions. All four of these critical action items must be completed if the campus is to be successfully launched.

The first critical action involves obtaining approval for the new campus by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, which is required by law to approve all new campuses. The second critical action involves a review by the chancellor to ensure that the campus satisfies all of the trustee-approved criteria for the establishment of a new campus. The third critical action is the legislative and gubernatorial approval of two budget requests, spanning two fiscal years, amounting to about \$13 million in state funding to provide operations support revenue for the campus. This funding provides the resources necessary to make the new campus a viable entity from a fiscal perspective. It supplements the capital development money that the for-rent, for-sale housing will generate. The fourth critical action is the selection and hiring of appropriate senior academic staff. This staff must initiate the campus's academic planning process and develop a curriculum for the new campus.

**Timeline for Future Action**

Some key milestones for the development of the new campus are:

August 1999	Students at CSUN off-campus center are transferred to the new site.
2000/2001	\$13 million support budget appropriation over two fiscal years.
June 2000	Estimated time to obtain CPEC approval.
August 2000	Year-long process for hiring key academic personnel begins.
September 2000	Full financial and academic responsibility for the current off-campus center is transferred from CSUN.
August 2002	CSUCI officially opens its doors and its first group of incoming students begins school.

These times are, of course, estimates and may be changed.

**Proposed Resolution**

A prerequisite for the above actions is the establishment of the California State University, Channel Island campus by the trustees. Establishing the campus essentially brings it into existence as an entity and thus allows the additional steps necessary to actually develop the campus subject to the four conditions being met. This action goes beyond the previous trustee action of authorizing the conveyance of the site to actually creating the campus. However, because establishment of the campus would essentially be in name only unless the above action items are completed, it is necessary to make the establishment of the campus contingent on completion of all of the critical action. The proposed resolution therefore explicitly requires that the above critical actions be taken before actual establishment of the campus can proceed.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that this board directs that a new campus, to be named California State University, Channel Islands, be established as a comprehensive university in the California State University system subject to the following conditions having been met:

1. The establishment of California State University, Channel Islands is recommended by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

2. The chancellor is assured that all relevant trustee policy requirements have been met.
3. The 2000/01 budget request for \$10 million and the 2001/02 budget request for \$3 million (for a combined permanent cost of \$13 million) are approved.
4. Senior academic staff are selected and hired.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**HANDOUT**  
Agenda Item 3  
MAY 11-12, 1999

### **Policy and Criteria for Establishment of New Off-Campus Centers**

#### **As Revised by Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities on May 11, 1999**

1. enhance higher education in region with no negative impact on established higher education institutions in region
2. alternative instructional delivery insufficient to meet regional demand
3. enrollment of at least 200 FTE, with anticipated growth to 500 FTE over 5-10 years
4. at least three academic degree programs offered with full upper division program
5. staffing with regular CSU faculty at ratio similar to on-campus staffing
6. academic resources sufficient for continuity without impacting "home" campus programs.
7. For the establishment of new off-campus centers serving up to 500 FTE, it must be demonstrated that the projected center enrollment cannot be accommodated through distance learning technologies or other alternative instruction delivery methods that meet pedagogical requirements for effective instruction.
8. In the proposal for a new off-campus center, the "home" campus shall show how the proposal meets trustee policy requirements and affirm that the proposed center does not require additional support costs above the campus's allocated enrollment budget. Based on this report, the chancellor is delegated the authority to approve the establishment of a new off-campus center, not to exceed 500 FTE ~~without Board of Trustees' approval.~~ The chancellor shall report to the Board all such approvals.

The following resolution, as revised, is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the board approves the updated policy on the establishment of new off-campus centers and approval of permanent off-campus centers, as described and revised in Agenda Item 3 of the May 11-12, 1999, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy.