Academic Senate CSU

Plenary Agenda
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday, January 17, 2008 – 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Friday, January 18, 2008 – 8:30 a.m. – noon

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements
6. Presentations/Introductions
7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
   7.4. Stephanie Brasley, Manager, Information Literacy Initiatives (Time certain 11:00 am, Thursday)
   7.5. Charles B. Reed, Chancellor; Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer (Time Certain (11:15 am, Friday)
   7.6. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
   7.7. John Travis, CFA
   7.8. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
   7.9. Roberto Torres, CSSA Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations
   8.1 Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats AS-2817-07/AA
   Second Reading
   8.2 Distinctive Universities: The Protection of the Autonomy of Individual Institutions as a Board Responsibility in the Governance of a Multiversity AS-2820-07/FGA/AA
   Second Reading
   8.3 Protecting Academic Freedom of CSU Area Studies Programs AS-2822-07/FA
   Second Reading
   8.4 Preparation of an annual report on the status of teacher education programs AS-2823-07/TEKR
   Second Reading
   8.5 Response to the Board of Trustees (BOT) September 2007 Agenda Item CSU Remediation Policies and Practices: Overview and Prospects AS-2824-07/TEKR
   Second Reading
   8.6 Graduate Business Fees AS-2825-07/EX
   Second Reading
   8.7 Role and Responsibilities of the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee AS-2826-07/TEKR
   Second Reading
9. Adjournment
Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) acknowledges the work of the CSU Taskforce on Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats and thanks the Taskforce members for their work; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU supports the advice of the Taskforce:

   a. To inform and enforce current policy regarding Incompletes.

   b. To limit course withdrawals to a maximum of 18 semester units (27 qtr.) for courses taken in the CSU.

   c. To record course withdrawals beyond the 18 unit maximum as grades of “F” or “WU”.

   d. To allow campuses to be more restrictive on course withdrawals than the maxima listed above.

   e. To limit repeats to a maximum of 24 semester units repeated (36 qtr.)

   f. To create a mechanism where courses could be repeated beyond this limit through Continuing Education or other full-cost mechanism.

   g. To limit repeats with no GPA consequences (aka Repeat-with-Forgiveness) to no more than 16 units (24 qtr.)

   h. To allow courses to be repeated (under state funding rates) only if the preceding grade was lower than a “B.”
i. To allow campuses to be more restrictive on course repeats than the maxima listed above.

;and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU does not support the Taskforce Recommendations which propose:

a. Counting the withdrawal from a full semester of coursework as 6 of the 18 withdrawal units. The ASCSU recommends that withdrawal from a full semester of coursework should not count at all toward the any limit on course withdrawals because current processes contain sufficient disincentives and protections against abuse and such mechanisms are valuable accommodations for students going through significant medical, emotional or other academic traumas.

b. Counting withdrawals prior to transfer as part of the allowed 18 withdrawal units. The workload to implement this recommendation is significant as are the consequences for students who have “violated” this requirement unknowingly. The number of students disqualified from university admission or graduation by this proposed requirement would far exceed those who might react to this disincentive to withdraw.

c. Counting repeats prior to transfer as part of the limit on repeated units. Once again, the workload to implement this recommendation is significant as are the consequences for students who have “violated” this requirement unknowingly. The number of students disqualified from university admission or graduation by this proposed requirement would far exceed those who might react to this disincentive toward “repeats.”; and be it further;

4. RESOLVED: That the CSU campuses work rapidly to implement electronic systems which give students and advisors timely, ongoing advice on progress toward a degree or
approaching curricular deadlines or limits which might threaten efficient completion of curricular requirements; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommends that a reasonable phase-in period or delay be specified for these important policy changes to take effect.

RATIONALE: Assuring the success of our students while conserving the limited resources which are provided to the CSU can create conflicts and policy dilemmas and the policy arenas of Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats are full of such tradeoffs. The DWIR Taskforce has proposed a series of recommendations which, in general, move toward the “conserve resources” side of this balance.

The Academic Affairs committee, as part of its deliberations, contacted faculty, students, and staff, especially those persons most directly involved in student advising, to get their reactions to the impact of the proposed changes. Their advice was nearly unanimous that limiting the number of full-semester withdrawals and pre-transfer course repeats or withdrawals would create an onerous workload on advising and articulation staff, produce irreversible “dead ends” for students, and block pathways to graduation. In summary, sufficient disincentives already exist for these actions and thus protect University resources.

Some of the groups and individuals that we consulted were opposed to any limit on repeating or withdrawing form courses but often did not address the fiscal and academic consequences of the current environment. They rightfully critique the Report’s lack of data to support its recommendations but with few exceptions (Thank you CSUC!) provided their own data to support their opinions.
We believe that the generous limits on repeats (almost one full year of normal college work) and withdrawals (roughly a semester and a half) provide a reasonable beginning limit on these activities. Requiring that students bear the full cost of repeated courses beyond the limit leaves open the door to student success while conserving limited University resources.
Date: December 16, 1974

To: Presidents

From: H. E. Brakebill
     Executive Vice Chancellor

Subject: Academic Renewal, Executive Order No. 213

Enclosed are five (5) copies of Executive Order No. 213 implementing academic renewal policies adopted by the Board of Trustees November 26, 1974. Both the Board and the Chancellor have indicated that this policy is to be implemented in a manner which does not erode academic standards and quality. Extreme care should be taken in establishing campus procedures to ensure that the intent of the program is upheld.

Careful record of actions taken under this Executive Order should be maintained since periodic reports will be required.
ACADEMIC RENEWAL
Executive Order No. 213

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Section 40402 of Article 5 of Subchapter 2, of Chapter I, of Part V of Title 5, of the California Administrative Code and is effective immediately.

I. Repetition of courses: In computing grade point averages required for graduation with a baccalaureate degree, units attempted, units passed (if any) and grade point (if any) for previous attempts shall be excluded when the following conditions are met:

1. The student formally requests permission to repeat the course(s).

2. The request is in compliance with such additional requirements and limitations as the campus may establish.

3. The request is approved by a campus official designated by the President.

In the case of a course completed at another institution, repetition may be accomplished by complying with the above requirements with regard to a course offered by the campus which is determined by the approving official to be essentially equivalent to that course.

III. Removal of previous term(s) work from degree consideration: Under certain circumstances, the campus may disregard up to two semesters or three quarters of previous undergraduate coursework taken at any college from all considerations associated with requirements for the baccalaureate degree. These circumstances are:

1. The student has requested the action formally and has presented evidence that work completed in the term(s) under consideration is (are) substandard and not representative of present scholastic ability and level of performance; and

2. The level of performance represented by the term(s) under consideration was due to extenuating circumstances; and
3. There is every evidence that the student would find it necessary to complete additional units and enroll for one or more additional terms in order to qualify for the baccalaureate if the request were not approved.

Final determination that one or more terms shall be disregarded in determination of eligibility for graduation shall be based upon a careful review of evidence by a committee appointed by the President which shall include the Vice President for Academic Affairs and consist of at least three members. In the case of the Consortium, the Committee shall include the State University Dean of Academic Affairs. Such final determination shall be made only when:

1. Five years have elapsed since the most recent work to be disregarded was completed; and

2. The student has completed at the campus since the most recent work to be disregarded was completed, 15 semester units (22 quarter units) with at least a 3.0 GPA, 30 semester units (45 quarter units) with at least a 2.5 GPA, or 45 semester units (67 quarter units) with at least a 2.0 GPA. Work completed at another institution cannot be used to satisfy this requirement.

When such action is taken, the student's permanent academic record shall be annotated so that it is readily evident to all users of the record, that no work taken during the disregarded term(s) even if satisfactory, may apply toward baccalaureate requirements. However, all work must remain legible on the record ensuring a true and complete academic history.

III. Admission from other colleges: In the cases of admission from other colleges where course repetition and removal of work from degree consideration has occurred, the following procedures shall be utilized:

1. Repeated courses: The policy of the college where the course was repeated shall be followed. If it is not possible to determine the nature of such policy, the policy of The California State University and Colleges shall be followed.

2. Removal of previous work from degree consideration: If another college has acted to remove previous work from degree consideration, such action shall be honored in terms of its policy. However, elimination of any work
in a term shall reduce by one term the one-year maximum on work which may be disregarded at the college to which the applicant seeks admission.

Dated: December 16, 1974

Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor

Executive Order No. 213
Academic Renewal
November 12, 2001

MEMORANDUM

To: CSU Presidents

From: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Subject: Grading Symbols, Assignment of Grades, and Grade Appeals – Executive Order No. 792

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 792 which updates policies related to grading symbols, assignment of grades, and grade appeals. This executive order supercedes Executive Order Numbers 268 and 320.

In accordance with the policy of The California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

CBR:ncs

Attachment

cc: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Academic Senate of the CSU
Executive Order No. 792

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

(562) 951-4700

Executive Order: 792

Title: Grading Symbols, Assignment of Grades, and Grade Appeals

Effective Date: September 1, 2002

Supersedes: Executive Order Nos. 268 and 320

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Sections 40104 and 40104.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and Chapter III, Sections 1 and 2 of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of The California State University and is effective with the Fall 2002 academic term (semester or quarter).

This executive order establishes administrative grading symbols, minimum standards governing the assignment of grades, and provisions for appeal to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of faculty and students are properly recognized and protected.

Administrative Grading Symbols

The administrative grading symbols AU, I, IC, RD, RP, W, and WU along with the definitions, rules, and procedures governing their application shall be utilized as circumstances require on all California State University campuses. Use of the symbols AU and RD are optional with each campus, except that where utilized, the definition and circumstances of application shall be as provided herein. No other grading symbols except the traditional grades of A, B, C, D, or F; or the non-traditional grades of A, B, C, NC; or CR-NC (where specifically authorized) shall be employed without the express prior approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer. To the extent permitted by Section 40104.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, each campus may use plus and minus designations in combination with traditional letter grades of A, B, C, and D.

1. AU (Audit). The following catalog statement reflects the minimum requirements for enrollment as an auditor. Authority to permit enrollment in this status rests with each campus. When audit status is permitted, students may not change from credit
to audit later than the census date. If enrollment as an auditor is permitted, the following statement together with any further campus requirements shall appear in the campus catalog:

Enrollment as an auditor is subject to permission of the instructor provided that enrollment in a course as an auditor shall be permitted only after students otherwise eligible to enroll on a credit basis have had an opportunity to do so. Auditors are subject to the same fee structure as credit students and regular class attendance is expected. Once enrolled as an auditor, a student may not change to credit status unless such a change is requested no later than the last day to add classes. A student who is enrolled for credit may not change to audit after the _____ week of instruction. (Insert appropriate number for campus.)

2. I (Incomplete Authorized). The “I” symbol shall be used only when the faculty member concludes that a clearly identifiable portion of course requirements cannot be met within the academic term for unforeseen reasons. An Incomplete shall not be assigned when it is necessary for the student to attend a major portion of the class when it is next offered. An Incomplete is also prohibited where the normal practice requires extension of course requirements beyond the close of a term, e.g., thesis or project type courses. In such cases, use of the “RP” symbol is required. The conditions for removal of the Incomplete shall be reduced to writing by the instructor and given to the student with a copy placed on file with the appropriate campus officer until the Incomplete is removed or the time limit for removal has passed.

An Incomplete shall be converted to the appropriate grade or symbol within one year following the end of the term during which it was assigned provided, however, an extension of the one-year time limit may be granted by petition for contingencies such as intervening military service and serious health or personal problems. Where campus policy requires assignment of final grades on the basis of numerous demonstrations of competency by the student, it may be appropriate for a faculty member to submit a letter grade to be assigned in the event the Incomplete is not made up within one year. If the Incomplete is not converted within the prescribed time limit, or any extension thereof, it shall be counted as a failing grade in calculating grade point average and progress points unless the faculty member has assigned a grade in accordance with campus policy.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol “I” (Incomplete Authorized) indicates that a portion of required course work has not been completed and evaluated in the prescribed time period due to unforeseen, but fully justified, reasons and that there is still a possibility of earning credit. It is the responsibility of the student to bring pertinent information to the
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attention of the instructor and to determine from the instructor the remaining course requirements which must be satisfied to remove the Incomplete. A final grade is assigned when the work agreed upon has been completed and evaluated.

An “I” must normally be made up within one calendar year immediately following the end of the term during which it was assigned.

This limitation prevails whether or not the student maintains continuous enrollment. Failure to complete the assigned work will result in an “I” being converted to an “IC” symbol, unless the faculty member assigns a specific letter grade at the time the Incomplete is assigned, which would replace the “I” in the student’s record at the end of the calendar year deadline.

3. IC (Incomplete Charged). The “IC” symbol may be used when a student who received an authorized incomplete “I” has not completed the required course work within the allowed time limit. The “IC” replaces the “I” and is counted as a failing grade for grade point average and progress point computation.

4. RD (Report Delayed). The “RD” symbol may be used where a delay in the reporting of a grade is due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. The symbol may be assigned by the registrar only and, if assigned, shall be replaced by a substantive grading symbol as soon as possible. An “RD” shall not be used in calculating grade point average or progress points. Although no catalog statement is required, whenever the symbol is employed an explanatory note shall be included in the transcript legend. The registrar shall notify both the instructor of record and the department chair within one week of the assignment of RD grades.

5. RP (Report in Progress). The “RP” symbol shall be used in connection with thesis, project, and similar courses in which assigned work frequently extends beyond a single academic term and may include enrollment in more than one term. The “RP” symbol shall be replaced with the appropriate final grade within one year of its assignment except for master’s thesis enrollment, in which case the time limit shall be established by the appropriate campus authority. The president or designee may authorize extension of established time limits.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The “RP” symbol is used in connection with courses that extend beyond one academic term. It indicates that work is in progress but that assignment of a final grade must await completion of additional work. Work is to be completed within one year except for graduate degree theses. (Insert campus statement describing the time limit for theses.)
6. W (Withdrawal). Withdrawal from a course (or courses) may be permitted, without restriction or penalty, during a time period established by the campus. However, this time period shall not extend beyond the census date. No symbol need be recorded in such instances. In connection with all other approved withdrawals, the "W" symbol shall be used.

Withdrawals after the census date and prior to the last twenty percent of instruction may be assigned only for serious and compelling reasons. Permission to withdraw during this time shall be granted only with the approval of the instructor and the department chair and/or dean as described by campus policy. All requests to withdraw under these circumstances and all approvals shall be documented as prescribed by the campus. The requests and approvals shall state the reasons for the withdrawal. Records of such approvals shall be maintained in accordance with the campus record retention policy.

Withdrawals shall not be permitted during the final twenty percent of instruction except in cases, such as accident or serious illness, where the cause of withdrawal is due to circumstances clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete is not practicable. Withdrawals of this sort may involve total withdrawal from the campus or may involve only one course, except that course grade and credit or an Incomplete may be assigned for courses in which sufficient work has been completed to permit an evaluation to be made. Requests for permission to withdraw under these circumstances shall be handled and filed as indicated in the preceding paragraph, except that such requests must also be approved by the academic administrator appointed by the president to act in such matters.

A "W" shall not be used in calculating grade point average or progress points.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol "W" indicates that the student was permitted to withdraw from the course after the ____ (day/week) of instruction with the approval of the instructor and appropriate campus officials. It carries no connotation of quality of student performance and is not used in calculating grade point average or progress points.

In addition to this statement, the campus catalog shall include a description of the procedures to be followed in withdrawing from a class or from the campus. Such procedures shall be consistent with all applicable provisions of this executive order.

7. WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized). The symbol "WU" shall be used where a student, who is enrolled on the census date, does not officially withdraw from a course but fails to complete it. Its most common use is in those instances where a student has not completed sufficient course assignments or participated in sufficient course activity to make it possible, in the opinion of the instructor, to report satisfactory or
unsatisfactory completion of the class by use of the letter grade (A - F). The instructor shall report the last known date of attendance by the student. The symbol “WU” shall be identified as a failing grade in the transcript legend and shall be counted as units attempted but not passed in computing the grade point average. In courses which are graded Credit/No Credit or in cases where the student has elected Credit/No Credit evaluation, use of the symbol “WU” is inappropriate and “NC” shall be used instead. The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol “WU” indicates that an enrolled student did not withdraw from the course and also failed to complete course requirements. It is used when, in the opinion of the instructor, completed assignments or course activities or both were insufficient to make normal evaluation of academic performance possible. For purposes of grade point average and progress point computation this symbol is equivalent to an “F.”

If local campus policy prescribes other instances where this symbol may be used, the foregoing statement shall be extended to cover such instances.

Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals

The following principles support the minimum standards governing the assignment of grades and provisions for appeals:

1. Faculty have the sole right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades. (Administrative grading symbols may be assigned only in accordance with the provisions of this executive order.)

2. There is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. It is the responsibility of anyone appealing an assigned grade to demonstrate otherwise.

3. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as instructor or clerical error, prejudice or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

4. Students who believe that an appropriate grade has not been assigned should first seek to resolve the matter informally with the instructor of record. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, the student may present his/her case to the appropriate campus entity, have it reviewed and, where justified, receive a grade correction.

5. If the instructor of record does not assign a grade, or if he/she does not change an assigned grade when the necessity to do so has been established by appropriate campus procedures, it is the responsibility of other qualified faculty to do so.
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6. “Qualified faculty” means one or more persons with academic training comparable to the instructor of record who are presently on the faculty at that campus.

7. Each campus faculty senate has authority and responsibility for providing policy and procedures for the proper implementation of the foregoing principles.

8. Each campus president is responsible for ensuring that the policies and procedures developed by the faculty senate are in conformance with the principles and provisions of this executive order and for ensuring that such established policies and procedures are carried out.

Each campus shall implement policy and procedures covering the assignment of grades and grade appeals which include at least the following provisions:

1. The time and manner of reporting course grades including provisions for assuring that such grades have been assigned by the instructor of record.

2. Circumstances under which the instructor of record may change a grade once assigned, and procedures for making such changes.

3. A means for preliminary review of potential appeals that may resolve differences before initiation of formal proceedings.

4. Grounds for which a grade appeal is permitted.

5. One or more committees for hearing grade appeals which shall provide safeguards to assure due process for both student and instructor. Such committees shall include student membership. Student members shall not participate in assignment of grades.

6. Procedures whereby grades are assigned by other qualified faculty in circumstances where the instructor of record does not do so, including those instances where a grade change is recommended by a grade appeals committee and the instructor of record does not carry out that recommendation.

7. Specification of time limits for completion of various steps in the appeal process and of the time period during which an appeal may be brought.

8. Description of the extent of the authority of appeal committee(s), including provisions which clearly limit grade changes to instances where there is a finding that the grade was improperly assigned.

9. Limitation of committee authority to actions which are consistent with other campus and system policy.

10. A statement that there is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. Thus, the burden of proof rests with the individual who is appealing.
11. Procedures for dealing with allegations of improper procedure.

12. Assignment of authority to revise policies and procedures for grade appeals to the campus faculty senate. The campus president is responsible for ensuring that such revisions conform to the principles and provisions of this executive order.

13. Provision for annual reporting to the campus president and campus faculty senate on the number and disposition of cases heard.

These policies and related procedures shall be published in a manner that ensures that all faculty and students have an opportunity to be aware of them (in class schedules, faculty manuals, student handbooks, etc.). While it is not necessary that policy and procedures be published in their entirety in generally circulated documents, such publications shall ensure that the students are aware that policy and procedures exist and where they may be obtained.

\[Signature\]
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: November 12, 2001
Distinctive Universities: The Autonomy of Individual Institutions in a Multi Institutional system

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, California State University, (ASCSU) reaffirm its recognition of and acknowledgement that the California State University (CSU) comprises twenty three separate campuses each with a distinct mission appropriate to its own unique environment; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU continue ever mindful of this reality in its deliberations and actions, reserving to the local senates the faculty role in shared governance whenever possible; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) and the Chancellor to honor the distinctiveness of our campuses and to support institutional autonomy to the fullest extent possible consistent with the mission of the CSU; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the BOT to include explicit language in our new strategic plan “Access to Excellence”¹ addressing institutional autonomy that is at least as comprehensive and forceful as that in Principle 10 in the implementation plan for our predecessor strategic plan “Cornerstones”²; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the BOT to use to lead The American Council on Education (ACE) and The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

² [http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html](http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html)
The implementation plan for Principle 10 is reproduced in its entirety as Attachment A to this resolution.
(AGB) in endorsing the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) 1978 note 3 to the 1966 joint (AAUP, ACE, and AGB) policy “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” 3; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU forward this resolution to the BOT, the Chancellor, and the academic senates of the CSU’s constituent campuses.

RATIONALE: The CSU BOT is currently engaged, with appropriate consultation, in generating a strategic plan for the upcoming decade: “Access to Excellence”. However, the CSU consists of twenty three distinct campuses. The system is an extraordinary array that comprises large universities and small, old and new, urban and rural, two polytechnic universities and the Maritime Academy. By not acknowledging this distinctiveness but acting as if the CSU were one university with 23 campuses, the system does a disservice to a major source of excellence and dilutes the potential effectiveness of the planning process.

Our predecessor strategic plan, “Cornerstones”, included “PRINCIPLE 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.” Commitment to this principle must be ongoing; it specifies goals and behaviors of an enduring nature. An unambiguous restatement in “Access to Excellence” is highly desirable.

With regard to public policy and legislative intent, there can be no doubt that the 1960 Donahoe Act 4 (Master Plan for Higher Education) established the Board of Trustees as the

Governing Board of what is now The California State University [“Universities” in the sense of this resolution]. However, legislative understanding and concerns are not static. Please see Attachment A for an interesting excerpt from the 1973 “Report of The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education”⁵ for strong legislative challenge to the excessive centralization of administration in both the University of California and California State University systems.

The 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” was “jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Note 3 of that document states

“The traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. [Emphases added] The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such

⁵ http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/JtCmte0973.pdf
guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.]

The California State University through its BOT is a full member of both ACE and AGB. Inasmuch as most of the members of ACE and AGB are boards of single-campus institutions, one may speculate that members of both the ACE and AGB await the initiation by one or more major “supra-campus” boards in enacting organizational endorsement of this proposition. This presents the opportunity for the CSU BOT not only to reinforce the institutional aspiration articulated in domain 6 of the CSU’s strategic planning guidelines and in Principle 10 of “Cornerstones” but to do so as a clear leader among American multi-institutional governing boards.

No moment could be more propitious than this for the ASCSU to adopt this resolution reinforcing and advancing shared governance and collegiality in the CSU. No time could be better than this, when our BOT is in the process of adopting our new strategic plan, for it to proclaim its endorsement of this important 20th and 21st century principle of shared governance—that of appropriate institutional autonomy for the universities that the CSU comprises. Furthermore, this is an appropriate time for our BOT to once again assume a principled leadership position among America’s supra-institutional governing bodies in leading administrators and governing boards in endorsing an important principle already endorsed nationally by faculty. Let us take advantage of this opportunity to strengthen the CSU and to exercise a national leadership role.
PRINCIPLE 10

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

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

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

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

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

The recommendations supporting this principle are:

10a. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will streamline the process governing program development and
program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility. All of this will balance against greater campus and system accountability for outcomes. (*Continuing activity implementing July 1998 Board policy*)

10b. **System and Campus Priority** The CSU system and each university will work cooperatively with external agencies [Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), etc.], to facilitate appropriate approvals of new and experimental programs and to develop appropriate accountability frameworks. (*Continuing activity*)

10c. **System Priority** The CSU system will review current Title 5 and university code requirements to reduce or eliminate regulatory constraints where possible and will authorize appropriate experiments, to promote ways to increase the effectiveness of teaching, learning, and the general CSU mission. (*Title 5 review by fall, 2000; continuing commitment to encourage experimentation*)
An excerpt from:

Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education

California Legislature

Assemblymen

John Vasconcellos (Chairman)
Willie Brown
Raymond Gonzales*
Jerry Lewis
Ken Meade
John Stull**

Senators

Howard Way (Vice Chairman)
Alfred Alquist
Dennis Carpenter
Mervyn Dymally
Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Susan Powell, Assistant Consultant
Nancy Wood, Secretary

September 1973

Permission is granted to reproduce this report. Single copies are available upon request. Comments and requests should be addressed to the Joint Committee, Assembly P.O. Box 83, State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814.

*Member of the Committee since March, 1973.
**Member of the Committee from March, 1971 to March, 1973.
Multicampus Systems

A major but largely unrecognized trend of the last decade has been the concentration of large numbers of campuses under central administrative offices. In California, under the Master Plan, the two statewide four-year systems have grown enormously.

The multicampus systems have contributed to the orderly growth of public higher education—particularly in the areas of planning, resource allocation and achieving economies of scale. However, they have also added considerable bureaucratic apparatus to higher education. Despite significant efforts to decentralize, there is still a preponderance of administrative centralization.

There is currently no evidence available on the optimum size of multicampus systems. Unfortunately, neither statewide segment has addressed this subject in an analytical way. The Joint Committee recognizes this as an extremely complex problem with many variables. Policy-makers in higher education and state government must learn about the impact of size in order to make rational decisions about such issues as governance, administration and structure. We can no longer afford an uncritical attitude towards growth, expansion and size of campuses and systems. We urge the appropriate agencies to make such an analysis.

Decentralization of Governance

We believe the University of California, the California State University and Colleges and the large multicampus community college districts should undertake controlled experiments in decentralization of governance.

One approach, suggested in our Draft Report, would be the creation of local boards with final authority over such matters as campus architecture (design only), buildings and grounds and personnel. The local board’s concurrence might also be
required in the appointment of a campus chief executive. In addition, the local board could serve as a liaison between campus and community and as guardian of the unique character of each campus. It would be important that local boards’ authority be delegated by the governing boards and not taken from administrative powers now held by campus chief executives.

We are dismayed by the reaction of the segments to this suggestion. They have indicated an unwillingness to even experiment with decentralization. We are reluctant at this time to mandate decentralization. However, this may be the only alternative in the future.

The University of California expressed some degree of willingness to experiment with local advisory boards. Similar boards already exist at the California State University and Colleges. However, boards which are only advisory cannot effectively serve as more than public relations and fund-raising bodies. Such boards have sometimes been effective in accomplishing limited objectives, but they have not served to place important decisions closer to the persons affected by them.

There are many ways local boards could be selected. However, we believe they should combine representation from the campus, the local community, and the state at large (for campuses which serve the entire state).

In summary, local boards could free the energies of segmental boards from parochial matters and enable them to focus more intensively on issues of systemwide policy. Boards with enormous responsibilities too frequently bog down with matters better decided locally.
Protecting Academic Freedom for California State University (CSU) Area Studies Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly support the academic freedom of its faculty in proposing, developing, and implementing area studies programs without any outside pressure and interference; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU object to and deplore recent actions and attempts by political organizations and /or citizens’ groups to impose their political agenda on our universities and to change the academic content of our area studies programs; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm that decisions affecting the curriculum and the selection of the faculty for an academic program are under the purview of campus faculty, subject to the approval of academic administrators.

RATIONALE: Historically outside political organizations and citizens’ groups have attempted to question the appropriateness of certain disciplines and /or area studies programs. Most recently the Middle Eastern Studies Project at the CSU Fresno, has come under attack based on unsubstantiated accusations against the faculty teaching in that area. By singling out individual faculty, these outside entities have tried to create an atmosphere of intimidation on campus. Political attacks on faculty have a chilling effect on freedom of teaching, inquiry and advancement of knowledge in area studies and other disciplines. These attacks could create a hostile environment for both faculty and students, and seriously damage the free flow of research and discussion on our campuses.
Annual Report on Efficacy of California State University (CSU) Teacher Education and K-12 Collaborations

1. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommends that the Office of the Chancellor, in consultation with the Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR) Committee prepare an annual report that will document the scope and status of teacher preparation programs of the CSU and campus-based K-12 collaborations, and be it further

2. RESOLVED: The ASCSU recommends that the Office of the Chancellor, in consultation with TEKR, develop the specifications of this Annual Report and ensure that assessments of teacher education programs and K-12 collaborations are formative, as opposed to summative, in nature, and that recommendations for improvement be based upon evidence of need, and be it further

3. RESOLVED: The ASCSU recommends to the Office of the Chancellor that elements of this Annual Report include but not be limited to:
   a. Analyses of emerging and ongoing issues related to quality in teacher preparation;
   b. Analysis of the efficacy of preparation single subject and multi-subject teachers in California public schools with respect to hiring, retention, diversity, early classroom instructor success, supervision, credential program selection, continuing education, teacher placement demographics by state and region;
   c. Analyses of the efficacy of the Early Assessment Programs in English and mathematics;
   d. Analysis of the efficacy of the Mathematics and Science Teaching Initiative,
4. RESOLVED: The ASCSU recommends that the Annual Report on Efficacy of CSU Teacher Education and K-12 Collaborations be distributed to all relevant stakeholders within the CSU, including but not limited to:

a. CSU faculty associated with teacher preparation on CSU campuses
b. Chairs of Departments of Teacher Education on CSU campuses
c. Deans and Associate Deans in the Colleges of Education on CSU campuses
d. Chair of the ASCSU; the Chair of the Senate's Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee; CSU campus Senate Chairs
e. Provosts on CSU campuses,

5. RESOLVED: The ASCSU recommends that all campus constituencies utilize this annual report to affect ongoing teacher preparation program improvement.

RATIONALE: Improvement of teacher preparation programs in the CSU depends critically on accurate data and data analysis from a broad spectrum of program elements as well as strong commitment to excellence by all stakeholders in the process. This report will enable TEKR and the Academic Senate of the California State University to become a more effective voice of CSU faculty on matters of policy related to teacher preparation and K-12 relations, and to become a well informed, enthusiastic, collaborative partner in the support of teacher education and K-12 relations.
Response to a Board of Trustees (BOT) September 2007 Agenda Item - CSU Remediation Policies and Practices: Overview and Prospects

1. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University recommends the Chancellor’s Office develop and implement an ongoing process for updating and documenting remediation efforts at each of the CSU campuses and the collaborative work being done between campus and local high schools, and for assessing the results of these collaborative efforts and making adjustments and recommendations for improvement as needed, and be it further.

2. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University recommends that the Chancellor’s Office provide for a comprehensive annual report in which findings and recommendations inform decisions about the levels of K-12 and CSU funding necessary to adequately address the continuing needs for remediation, and be it further.

3. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University recommends that the Chancellor’s Office provide for a process for regularly bringing together developmental math and English representatives – both faculty and staff – from the campuses to collaborate and to provide the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Trustees with an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of remediation efforts across the system, and be it further.

4. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University concurs with the endorsement by the Board of Trustees of a new set of guiding principles, but strongly recommends that these principles be used as guidelines for remedial practices and not prescribe programs or practices.
RATIONALE: As indicated in the resolution, the Academic Senate approves of the eight principles to be considered by the Board of Trustees, albeit with some conditions. The eight Principles are listed below. Conditions are noted for Principles three, six, seven and eight.

a. Maintain current commitment to working with California public schools to improve the college-readiness of first-time Freshmen

b. Recognize that there are multiple levels of readiness

c. Strengthen “early start” programs.

   Condition. Principle statements should not recommend a “practice” but should guide the work that develops the practices. Public school and university faculty and staff should have the flexibility to develop plans and programs that produce results given the constraints that are unique to their situation. One specific approach may be successful in one situation and not in another.

d. Continue to expect completion of remediation before the start of the second year

e. Reconsider the redirection to community college of students who don’t complete remediation after one year

   Condition. While this principle is laudable it conflicts with principle number 4.

f. Wherever possible, offer degree credit-bearing work based on outcomes achieved.

   Condition. This must require that degree credit be based on specific college course outcomes and not the supplemental work associated with the course.

g. Use technology-assisted approaches where promising and feasible.
Condition. The appropriate translation of promising and feasible is that the approach might produce the desired results, but regardless we can implement the approach. We need to determine effectiveness before investing in any one approach. Technology, although feasible, may not be the best solution. Decisions about pedagogy and approach should be informed by results, not the promise of results.

h. Review and validate the various CSU assessments for placement in English and mathematics

Condition. Both ELM and EPT have been and continue to be validated professionally. In addition, both exams have widespread professional support from the English Council and Math Council. All changes are reviewed and validated by the appropriate Councils before implementation.

As indicated in the resolution, those faculty and staff engaged in remediation efforts on each of the campus (collaboration with the high schools, working directly or indirectly with the EAP as well involved in campus-based remediation efforts) possess valuable experience that should inform policy decisions. For example, when asked to recommend improvements (independent of whether their recommendations would be feasible or within the purview of the CSU to implement), a number of these faculty and staff recommended the following:

a. Require college bound high school students fulfilling the a-g requirements to participate in the EAP test in their junior year.

b. Recommend that funding be identified and provided to engage a team of math faculty to develop a 12th grade course that would provide for the remediation of those students that failed the EAP version of the California Standards Test (CST). This objective would be
to develop an applied problem oriented algebra course, including both curriculum and appropriate instructional methodology. In addition, this effort should include the development of training materials for those high school math teachers that would be teaching the course.

The approach and intent would be similar to that used by the English council in developing ERWC, work which spanned a two year period of time and included field testing and.

c. Require provision for an additional CSU preparatory math course to be available for 12th grade students that fail the EAP version of the California Standards Test (CST).

The typical secondary school student fulfills the math requirement by taking Algebra I in the 8th grade, Geometry in 9th grade, and Algebra II in 11th grade.

d. Recommend collaboration between K-12 and the CSU to use diagnostic information to intervene in the early grades (the intent being to identify remediation needs at an earlier level).

e. In order to encourage and promote EAP participation, recommend the development of information materials and identification of venues for informing patents, counselors and school boards about EAP. In addition, consider the creation of workshops for HS teachers and principals, which would explain in detail the purpose and intent of EAP and the conditions necessary for its successful implementation.

f. Recommend involvement of principals and high school counselors to work with those students identified by EAP testing to need remediation to enroll in appropriate classes in their senior year.
g. Recommend that the high school’s EAP information plan include effectively communication to parents (using “back to school nights” or similar parent participation events) about the purpose and intent of EAP testing and the importance of those students identified as needing remediation to enroll in appropriate courses during their senior year.

h. Recommend the CSU request state funding to allow campuses to establish early start remediation programs (such as summer bridge programs).

i. Recommend the CSU establish a system of periodic meetings to bring together Directors of developmental programs from the CSU campuses (e.g. learning skills, developmental math, and et al.) to assess progress and develop or adapt remediation programs, as needed.

j. Recommend the CSU establish a system of periodic meetings to bring together ESL/Bilingual teachers to address the unique needs of those non-native speaking students identified through EAP as needing remediation. This group might be included with the group of Directors referenced in recommendation #8.
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California State University Remediation Policies and Practices: Overview and Prospects
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Summary

This item reviews the history of remediation policy in the California State University and, drawing from a survey of CSU campuses undertaken in summer 2007, appraises current promising practices designed to bring entering first-time freshmen to college-level proficiency. Eight principles are offered at the end of the review for the Board’s consideration.

Three of the principles call for system choices or actions.

Principle one states that the 1996 Board of Trustees policy goal, that 90% of incoming first-time freshmen should be fully proficient, is consistent with the existing CSU strategic plan. However, as that plan is reviewed and updated, the quantified student proficiency goal should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.

Principle four stipulates that the CSU should continue to expect freshmen to attain proficiency within one year, especially as students are directed to an energetic early start in the initial summer, as called for in principle three.

Principle eight calls for a review and validation study of the EPT, ELM, and other related instruments (such as EAP, SAT, and ACT), and the results used to inform campus experimentation with directed self-placement and other innovative remediation placement practice.

Five of the principles ask or encourage campus actions.

Principle two tasks campuses to assess the effectiveness of their approaches to meet students’ varying developmental needs, and to continue to identify—and share—practices that are found to be particularly effective.

Principle three encourages all campuses to establish or expand “early start” programs, including strong financial support to include both improved financial aid opportunities and
opportunities for summer employment, for students with both significant and moderate remedial needs.

Principle five asks campuses to explore alternatives to redirection to Community Colleges, while maintaining the basic principle that students must achieve proficiency before enrolling in their second year in the CSU.

Principle six encourages campuses to develop, for students who begin their mathematics or English study at a demonstrated “nearly proficient” level, courses that offer baccalaureate credit while requiring enrolled students meet specific proficiency objectives along with goals for general education.

Principle seven encourages all campuses to develop and use technology-assisted, Internet-based learning programs for remedial English and mathematics. Consortial efforts that involve several campuses in the development of these programs are encouraged.

**Brief History and Introduction**

Remedial and developmental programs in the basic skills areas of reading, writing, and mathematics have been the focus of discussion by the Board of Trustees since the mid-1970s, when an Advisory Committee on Writing appointed by Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke recommended a diagnostic examination in writing for regularly admitted first-time freshmen, as well as a requirement that students demonstrate proficiency in writing as a condition of graduation. The result of these recommendations, which were endorsed by the CSU Academic Senate and approved by the trustees in May 1976, was the entry-level diagnostic test now known as the English Placement Test (EPT). The EPT has been administered to entering undergraduates since September 1977.

In the early 1980s, the CSU introduced two major curricular changes that made the undergraduate curriculum more rigorous and raised expectations for preparation by entering students: the General Education-Breadth curriculum, including the requirement that students be assessed for basic skills on entry (Title 5, Section 40402.1); and the requirement that students complete college preparatory courses in English (four years) and mathematics (two years) to be eligible for admission. Responding to these changes in admission and requirements, the chairs of CSU departments of mathematics urged that a systemwide instrument be developed as a companion to EPT to assess basic skills in mathematics (quantitative reasoning). The Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination was subsequently developed and was first administered to students in May 1983. In 1992, the exam was upgraded to test for all three years of high school mathematics preparation currently required for admission.

In January 1996, the trustees adopted a policy to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. Students were classified as needing remediation if they did not
score a 550 on the SAT in mathematics and in English. That SAT score requirement gave the California State University the nation’s highest proficiency expectation, when compared to other American regional comprehensive universities. Trustees then set a goal that, by fall 2007, 90 percent of regularly admitted first-time freshmen at CSU would be prepared at the time of matriculation to enroll in baccalaureate-level English and mathematics courses. Fall 1998 was the baseline year for assessing progress; intermediate benchmarks were set for fall 2001 and fall 2004.

In 1997, the trustees reaffirmed their commitment to determining competency in English and mathematics for entering students and to providing them with opportunities to develop necessary foundational skills. Executive Order 665, which is still in effect:

- Requires all non-exempt students to take the EPT and ELM examinations after admission and before enrollment at a CSU campus;
- Requires all campuses to place students who do not demonstrate the requisite competence in appropriate developmental/remedial education activities during their first term of enrollment and each subsequent term until such time as they demonstrate competence; and
- Requires all campuses to establish and enforce limits on developmental/remedial activity and to advise students who are not making adequate progress in developing their foundational skills to enroll in other educational institutions as appropriate.

As is now known, the CSU’s remediation efforts—both on its campuses and in its partnerships with public schools—have not resulted in the level of college preparedness that trustees set in 1996 as goals for 2007. In fall 2001, 54 percent of entering freshmen were proficient (ready for baccalaureate-level work) in both English and mathematics. In fall 2004, 53 percent of entering freshmen were proficient in English and 63 percent were proficient in mathematics. Chancellor’s Office staff project that in fall 2007, 57 percent of entering freshmen will be proficient in English and 66 percent will be proficient in mathematics—a slight increase from years past, but still well below the 90 percent goal. These figures are reflective of national trends. About 40 percent of all college students in the United States take at least one remedial course (Adelman, 2004). The estimated cost of remedial education to taxpayers is about $1 billion a year (Breneman & Haarlow, 1998; see The Center for Student Success, 2007).

The persistently large numbers of students who enter four-year universities unable to do college-level work have been the subject of numerous, often contentious state and national policy debates. Critics of developmental education at the college level emphasize the cost of remediation and argue that universities should not be in the business of teaching skills that students should have learned when they were younger. Others counter that, in our increasingly knowledge-based, globally-connected economy, it has never been more crucial to have a workforce with some education beyond high school. In other words, there are sound social and economic reasons why it is appropriate for universities to provide at least some remedial education (Phipps, 1998). A report by the Institute for Higher Education Policy went so far as to
suggest that “remediation is a core function of higher education” and always has been. “What we now call remedial education has not been caused by current admissions standards, the availability of federal financial aid, or any of a number of other concerns that have been raised in the recent policy discussions,” wrote the author of the report (Phipps, 1998, vi). He contended that as an ever-growing proportion of the population sought higher education, universities would continue to play an important role in helping underprepared students gain proficiency.

In what follows, a review is provided of the various, often innovative ways that the CSU has sought to prepare students for college-level work and, more broadly, for entry into the social and economic mainstream of California. The first part of the review offers an overview of the collaborative partnerships the CSU has formed with the public schools in an effort to provide students with the basic skills in English and mathematics they need prior to matriculating at CSU institutions. The second part of the review highlights the results of a survey that appraised campus efforts to bring students to proficiency after they have arrived at the CSU. The review concludes with eight “guiding principles” for the Board’s consideration that emerged from the scan of existing programs and practices and survey results.

Collaborative Partnerships: The CSU-K-12 Connection

To be admitted to the CSU, freshman applicants need to have earned a high school diploma or equivalent, completed a college preparatory curriculum, and have grade-point averages (GPAs) and standardized test scores that place them in the top one-third of their graduating class. Currently that means coming from a pool of high school graduates who:

- Completed 4 years of English instruction with a C or better;
- Completed 3 years of mathematics instruction with a C or better; and
- Earned a 3.0 grade point average.

CSU Board of Trustees policy states that students admitted to the CSU are classified as English or mathematics proficient if they score:

- 550 or above on the mathematics section of the SATI-Reasoning Test; or
- 550 or above on the verbal section of the SATI-Reasoning Test.

Until the Early Assessment Program (EAP) was initiated, CSU placement standards were not fully aligned with the state board standards in English and mathematics that govern the K-12 public schools. This lack of alignment underscored the need for CSU to work closely with the State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to align CSU placement standards with those promulgated by the state board.

Early Assessment Program components included the assessments of English and mathematics proficiency of public high school 11th graders – the exams; the EAP professional development programs for high school teachers; the CSU Math Success and English Success websites for students; and refined CSU preservice programs offered to aspiring middle and high school
teachers. These innovations have been the focus of reporting at several previous trustee meetings. A short recap may be useful.

The EAP Exams. Continued low proficiency rates for first-time freshmen entering the CSU strongly suggested that incoming students needed to be assessed earlier than immediately prior to matriculation in order to determine whether they were on track to be ready for college-level English and mathematics, and to give them a chance to become ready if they were not. The Early Assessment Program (EAP)—a collaborative effort by the CSU, the California Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction—was developed to perform this function. The EAP provides students, their families, and high schools with the opportunity to assess 11th grade student readiness for college-level English and mathematics--i.e. skills that students who choose either to enter college or to enter the workforce directly out of high school will need in order to be successful. It does this through the use of augmented English and mathematics California Standards Tests (CST) that incorporate questions reflecting CSU placement standards. The public response to these exams, which are voluntary for 11th grade students, has been overwhelming, with increasing numbers of students taking them each year.

The EAP’s Professional Development Programs. In addition to the exams for 11th grade students, the EAP offers several professional development opportunities to high school teachers. The Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation (RIAP) program is intended to help teachers to implement standards-based approaches to improve students’ academic literacy in all subjects. More than 2,500 teachers have participated in RIAP since its inception in 2001-02. An independent evaluation of the program found that in schools with sizable participation in RIAP, there was an increase on the statewide 11th grade California Standards Test (CST) in English-Language-Arts. The gains among these students between the years 2003 and 2006 were almost four times as large as the statewide gain (14 points vs. 3.6 points) and more than twice as large as found in control schools (14 points vs. 6.7 points) for the same period.

Another EAP-related innovation, the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC), is designed to prepare students to meet the expectations of college and university faculty in English and is aligned with the California English-Language Arts Content Standards for grades 11-12. CSU English faculty, K-12 English teachers, and curriculum specialists developed a full-year college preparatory English course for high school juniors and seniors. Course assignments, organized into 14 modules and based mainly on non-fiction texts, emphasize the in-depth study of expository, analytical, and argumentative reading and writing. To promote wide-scale adoption of the Expository Reading and Writing Course, the CSU and County Offices of Education collaborate to provide professional development for English teachers at a variety of locations across the state. Since the introduction of the ERWC in 2004, more than 2,200 teachers have participated in these workshops and piloted the ERWC modules. An independent evaluation of the ERWC has found that, in schools in which five or more English teachers
participated in ERWC workshops, the percentage of students who score as proficient in English improved substantially.

In addition, a committee of secondary mathematics educators and CSU mathematics professors created a professional development program for mathematics teachers who teach Algebra II and higher. The program, which includes two full days of professional development, began in 2005-2006 and has served 1,300 teachers to date. Workshops provide an introduction to the EAP and specific approaches for improving the college readiness of high school students in mathematics.

The EAP and CSU Preservice Programs. The integration of the EAP into preservice teacher preparation began in 2005-06 and continued in 2006-07 through workshops offered to CSU faculty who teach methods courses in mathematics and English. The aim of the workshops was to inform the faculty of the EAP’s professional development opportunities for individuals who teach these subjects in high school and to consider ways in which the information might be provided to candidates prior to earning their Single Subject credentials. Many CSU faculty who provide professional development programs to teachers at the high school level have established innovative practices for infusing that material into their preservice coursework.

Evaluation questions assessing the impacts on the secondary English and mathematics teachers prepared by the CSU will be integrated into the annual Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation beginning in 2007-08. In addition, EAP strategies will be incorporated into the preservice preparation of educational administrators. Twenty CSU campuses offer education leadership programs at the preservice level, preparing close to 60 percent of the new administrators in California. Similarly, lessons learned from EAP will be integrated into the curricula of the CSU’s emerging Ed.D. programs.

CSU Math and English Success Websites. The Math and English Success Websites (see www.csumathsuccess.org and www.csuenglishsuccess.org) provide high school students, parents, teachers, and counselors with resources for helping students become ready for college-level work in mathematics and English. These websites encourage students to take ownership of their path to college by providing them with personalized, authoritative advice about the CSU English and mathematics placement requirements and how to meet them; testimonial videos which show the importance of taking proactive steps to prepare for the CSU in the most efficient and expeditious manner; and online learning resources which provide free 24/7 access to high quality tutorials which are aligned to the CSU mathematics and English placement content.

To date, the CSU Math and English Success Websites have registered over 200,000 cumulative visits. Math Success attracts roughly 7,000 visits and English Success attracts roughly 4,000 visits per month. Among the most popular resources on the Success websites are the learning materials, which offer assessment-driven analysis of student preparation in mathematics and English. These resources include:
ALEKS - an intelligent tutor that uses adaptive questioning to determine quickly and accurately exactly which ELM concepts a student knows and doesn't know. ALEKS’ adaptive questioning approach is based on knowledge space theory, which stresses repetition of a series of like problems until mastery is achieved. The CSU ALEKS ELM Prep tutorial is currently being used by six CSU developmental mathematics programs and 18 high school mathematics classes. Between August 2005-July 2007, more than 15,000 enrolled CSU students and potential CSU students signed up for the online prep course. A detailed description of ALEKS ELM programs is provided below.

Online EPT Practice Tests - four online multiple choice tests with questions taken from retired English placement tests. Students receive a score report with an itemized list of their performance in eight categories along with feedback about why their answers were correct or incorrect.

Calibrated Peer Review – an online essay writing tool that uses retired essay prompts and an automated rubric grading system to prepare high school students for the EPT. Approximately 60 high school English teachers have signed up for this service through the English Success Website, and over 2,000 students have participated.

Contextual Issues and Concerns: Proficiency Standards and Demographic Shifts

As outlined above, the CSU’s partnership with California public schools has had promising results. However, as proficiency figures demonstrate, the number of admissible students who are unprepared for college-level work remains high.

Some critics suggest that the CSU’s proficiency standards should be changed. Such a suggestion disregards the fact that CSU proficiency standards at entry align with California’s English and mathematics standards for high school students. Students who demonstrate college-level readiness at the end of the 11th grade on the EAP English test tend to be those who are advanced in their performance on the CST English. In mathematics, those whom the CSU says will be ready one year from now—even if they take no higher level mathematics in their senior year—also tend to be those who post “advanced” scores on the CST Algebra II or Summative High School Mathematics examinations. Moreover, a recent study by the National Center for Education Statistics (2007) suggested that California standards are much better aligned with the expectations of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) than are the standards set by many other states.

This reaffirmation of CSU and California public school standards is occurring against the backdrop of dramatic demographic change. English language learners comprise nearly 40 percent of all K-12 students in California (California Community Colleges Center for Student Success, 2007). More than 166,000 children for whom English is a second language are currently in the second grade. These children, and others like them, are now being referred to as
“Generation 1.5.” They share a common experience, having been educated in California or other U.S. public schools, but having grown up in homes where the language spoken is not English (Ching, 2005). Dr. Robby Ching, chair of the Learning Skills Center at CSU Sacramento, describes the academic challenges that these children will likely face:

By fourth grade when reading and writing demands are dramatically ratcheted up, many will begin struggling to keep up with the academic demands as they are simultaneously developing their language skills … Without English language support at home, they don’t have adequate literacy in English, and they usually have not had an opportunity to learn to read and write in their first language so those resources are not there to fall back upon either. Instead they have oral fluency, often in a non-standard variety of English used in their community, and a certain amount of cultural knowledge (5).

Noting that “students who are still learning English in grades 4, 5, 6 risk falling behind in academic proficiency and failing to master the skills needed for success in middle and high school,” Ching writes, “It’s not surprising that they enroll in the university still having gaps in those areas” (5). By all accounts, filling in those gaps is crucial to California’s social and economic health. According to a report issued in May 2007 by the Public Policy Institute of California, the state needs to produce 2.9 million college graduates between now and 2025 to meet future demands for highly skilled workers (Taiz, 2007). Anne Driscoll (2007) of the University of California says that, if California is to develop the diverse and educated workforce it needs, policies and interventions must be identified to increase the chances of academic success for Latino and African American high school students in particular.

With this history and context as points of departure, a survey was conducted in June 2007 in an effort to discover how CSU campuses—continuing to face high numbers of incoming students needing remediation—were preparing these students for college-level work. Of particular interest was how, if at all, developmental/remedial education at CSU was impacted by a burgeoning group of language minority students.

Survey of CSU Campuses on Practices and Concerns Regarding Developmental and Remedial Education

In June 2007, campuses were surveyed in an effort to discover how students are being prepared to achieve full college-level proficiency in English and in mathematics after matriculating to CSU. From this survey we are able to provide a snapshot of several important, innovative, and promising approaches to remediation that campuses have taken, as well as contextual richness and concerns.

Background and Context: Students and Their Readiness
Students at Various Stages of Readiness. Students arrive at CSU fully compliant with CSU admissions criteria, yet at various stages of readiness for college-level work. At most campuses, scores on the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam determine which composition and mathematics courses they will take. Typically, cut-off scores are used to place students in three general categories of courses—courses for those with minimal remedial needs, who are very nearly proficient; those with moderate remedial needs; and those with significant remedial needs, who are a substantial distance away from full proficiency. The more significant the remedial need, the more basic the course content and the more intensive the remediation efforts in the courses in which the student is placed. The range in the readiness of students for college-level work spawns experimentation with various approaches to remediation. The quest is to take students to proficiency efficiently and effectively.

Non-English and Non-Standard English Backgrounds. Perhaps not surprisingly, language acquisition—characterized by students who are working on learning English or Standard English—was consistently mentioned by survey respondents as the single largest factor influencing student performance in reading and writing courses. Respondents had in mind students whose households spoke a language from Europe or Latin America, for example, such as Spanish; or a language from eastern Asia, such as Chinese. They also had in mind students whose households or communities speak informal or “street” English in strong preference to standard English. Either background makes the college environment a challenge. “Many years of research in language acquisition show that learning a second language is a slow process, one that may take many years,” wrote a respondent from CSU Chico, who added that a year of developmental/remedial activity for such students simply might not be enough. Language acquisition was also mentioned as a factor affecting student performance in mathematics courses.

Other Barriers. Campuses identified several other barriers to readiness including:
- **Commitment:** “students don’t take their studies seriously enough;”
- **Test experience:** “students do not have enough experience taking timed pressured tests;”
- **Stigma:** “students have a negative attitude towards the classes because of the ‘developmental’ designation;”
- **Familial obligations:** “geographical distance from home coupled with cultural displacement, especially for urban students from cultures that prioritize familial obligation;”
- **Lack of prior instruction:** “insufficient preparation in high school;” and
- **Misplaced pride:** “an unwillingness to take the time to seek help.”

Early Starts

Survey results point to the potential value of an “early start” on remediation, in the summer prior to a first-time freshman’s initial fall term. Summer Bridge and other early start programs provide students—especially those who have significant remedial needs, many of whom are the first in their families to attend college—with time to learn the ropes of college and to make the kinds of progress necessary to reach college-readiness in English and mathematics by the end of
the freshman year. The greatest barriers to offering adequately long and sufficiently intensive summer opportunities are: (1) students’ interest in summer employment to cover their contributions to financial aid and to help support their families and (2) the lack of adequate federal and state financial aid for summer.

In summer 2006, eight campuses provided a total of 544 incoming students with remedial opportunities in English, and 14 campuses provided a total of 1,348 incoming students with opportunities to pursue basic proficiency in mathematics. By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, five of the campuses that offered summer remedial opportunities in English had successfully prepared more than 90 percent of their students for baccalaureate-level work (including, of course, those who achieved proficiency during the academic year). During that same period, seven of the campuses that offered summer opportunities in mathematics had successfully remediated at least 90 percent of their students.

Students who seek an early start on remediation have several different types of opportunities in addition to Summer Bridge. CSU San Marcos runs a six-week Summer Academy for all incoming first-year students who failed the EPT and/or the ELM. CSU Fullerton, Cal Poly Pomona, and San Diego State offer all incoming freshmen with remedial needs in English a chance to begin their developmental classes in the summer, and CSU Los Angeles offers composition classes to students with moderate or minimal remedial needs. An early start seems an obvious strong practice. Assuring early start programs raises consideration of budget strategies: we discuss dedicated funds sources below, in the recommendations section.

For students with remedial needs in mathematics, campuses offer intensive instruction that varies in length from 10 days to six weeks. For students who barely failed the ELM, CSU Fullerton provides an online course (described below). CSU Bakersfield offers students in the same category an opportunity to participate in a 10 day, three-hour a day “early start” program. Similar students at CSU Long Beach are invited to take a four-week “last chance” mathematics workshop. The Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies at CSU San Bernardino runs an Intensive Mathematics Program each summer that consists of two 10-day sessions in which students are given a crash course in elementary and/or intermediate algebra. Those who pass the intermediate algebra portion are deemed remediated and may enroll in GE mathematics courses in the fall. Those who pass only the beginning algebra portion are allowed to register for intermediate algebra in the fall. CSU San Bernardino reports that the program has been highly successful, with a passage rate of about 90-95 percent for students in the intermediate portion of the program and about 95-98 percent for participants in the beginning algebra portion.

A few campuses provide opportunities in the summer following their initial academic year for students who did not complete remediation across their initial college year. These campuses include CSU Northridge and San Diego State in English, and CSU Chico, CSU Northridge, San Diego State, and San Jose State in mathematics.
Developmental/Remedial Education Approaches in English

Directed Self-Placement in English. Two campuses have eschewed the use of EPT scores to place students in first-year writing courses, arguing that single timed tests are unreliable predictors of a student’s ability to succeed in college-level work. CSU Channel Islands and CSU Fresno have adopted instead “directed self placement” (DSP) programs, which allow students with remedial needs in English to choose, with guidance, which composition courses to take. Students at CSU Channel Islands have two choices—they can take two 3-unit classes that “stretch” over two semesters with the same instructor and classmates, or they can take a one semester, 3-unit course. The “stretch” option is the more basic of the two and emphasizes the development of writing strategies. The one-semester option is designed for students who are ready for college writing and emphasizes research writing. In addition to offering a one-semester, 3-unit “accelerated” option and a two-semester, 6-unit “stretch” option, CSU Fresno has a 9-unit option that provides students who are multilingual speakers with an extra semester to work on their English before taking composition classes. CSU Fresno, which only recently implemented the DSP, reports that initial evaluations of the program have been positive. CSU Channel Islands, which implemented the DSP the first year the campus offered courses, has systematically evaluated the program and consistently found promising results. “For four years, we’ve demonstrated that students make appropriate choices about which writing courses to take, and that mainstreaming all students in baccalaureate writing classes works,” wrote a survey respondent at that campus.

Credit-Bearing English Course Placement. Other CSU campus efforts have focused on students who are nearly proficient at entry. CSU Channel Islands, CSU Fullerton, Humboldt State, CSU Northridge, CSU San Bernardino, and San Francisco State simply place such students in credit-bearing baccalaureate-level courses. This approach has been spurred within the CSU by the results of a five-year study conducted by researchers at San Francisco State University, which showed that placement in explicitly labeled developmental courses often discourages at-risk students and decreases the likelihood of their staying in college and graduating. They found that, in contrast, placing students in intensive, credit-bearing baccalaureate-level courses accelerated their sense of competence and eventual success. CSU Channel Islands, Humboldt State, and CSU San Bernardino have reported similar findings. The survey respondent at Humboldt State summarized this dynamic, writing that integrated courses encourage students to perceive themselves more as “‘real’ students instead of ‘dummy’ students in ‘bonehead’ English.” Because these courses do not carry the stigma of remediation, the argument is, students feel as though they belong in college and, therefore, are more likely to persist in their pursuit of the baccalaureate degree.

Campuses continue to try to identify ever more effective ways to meet the multiple remediation needs of students. For example, CSU Dominguez Hills will be piloting three new approaches to developmental English fall 2007. One will place students with minimal remedial needs in a 4-unit GE English course with supplemental instruction; another will place students with moderate
remedial needs in a combined one-year “stretch” course with the same instructor and students; and the third will place students who continue to have significant remedial needs after one semester in an intensive 5-unit course in spring. Also effective this fall, Sonoma State University will no longer require two semesters of remediation for students with moderate to significant remedial needs. Instead, these students will be placed in one 4-unit course and will be additionally required to take 1 unit of tutoring through the campus Writing Center. According to the survey respondent for Sonoma State University, the campus hopes this approach will result in a high percentage of students completing their remedial work in one semester as opposed to the previously standard two semesters.

**Community College Remedial Instruction on CSU Campuses.** Although redirecting CSU students to community colleges has produced disheartening results, community colleges nevertheless can—and should—take an active role in the remediation of these otherwise admissible students. San Diego State’s arrangement with San Diego Community College is a promising example. For the past five years, community college instructors have taught the vast majority of San Diego State’s remedial courses in English and mathematics on the university’s main campus. With this arrangement, students are able to continue their remedial education while maintaining their “identify” as San Diego State students. Such an arrangement helps these students to remain engaged, not only physically but psychologically, with the university in particular and in their education more generally.

**Standard English Learner Approaches.** Meeting the basic skill needs of students whose primary language is not standard English is a special concern, and indeed an increasing concern as such students increasingly find their way to CSU. As noted, several campuses noted explicitly in the survey that these students face unique learning challenges, in both English and mathematics. In response to this challenge, CSU Fullerton, CSPU Pomona, CSU Sacramento, and San Francisco State have designed developmental reading and writing courses that have an explicit multilingual component in addition to offering courses intended primarily for native speakers. Placement in these courses is determined in a variety of ways—San Francisco State, for example, looks at student scores on the ESL Placement Test, and CSPU Pomona relies on a personal interview and diagnostic essay in addition to EPT scores. CSU Northridge’s remedial course offerings reflect an acknowledgment that culture, in addition to language, can shape a student’s learning. That campus offers developmental reading and writing courses in three departments other than English: Asian American Studies, Chicana/o Studies, and Pan African Studies.

**Developmental/Remedial Education Approaches in Mathematics**

**Varied Sequential Remedial Mathematics Approaches.** There is enormous range in the readiness of students for college-level mathematics. Some students are ready for standard term-length or year-long courses. Yet other students have been so underexposed to college-level mathematics expectations that a variety of approaches have been put forward as CSU campuses seek effective pathways to mathematics proficiency. Both CSU Stanislaus and CSU Long Beach have
reconceptualized their intermediate algebra courses so that they are aligned with different types of academic majors—for example, in fall 2007, CSU Long Beach will offer basic intermediate algebra to students pursuing non-technical majors, and enhanced intermediate algebra to students who plan to major in business, science, engineering, or education. The mathematics chair at CSU Long Beach said the department moved to offer the two separate tracks in recognition of the different skill sets that are required of the different majors.

Technology and Computer-Aided Instruction in Mathematics. New technology and computer-aided instruction are playing an increasingly important role in preparing students for college-level mathematics. CSU Fullerton offers a summer, online short course for students with a “barely failing” score on the ELM. Most students have been able at the end of the course to show readiness for baccalaureate-level mathematics. The logic is apparent, and attractive. Many of these students were proficient at one juncture (while still in high school), but discontinued mathematics courses or courses that use mathematics skills, and forgot some of the material. In one intensive week, these students can once again achieve and demonstrate proficiency in mathematics.

Campuses that supplement traditional lecture with new technology report similarly impressive results. Pass rates in the traditional lecture courses at CSU Los Angeles have improved since the introduction of an online homework package. CSU San Bernardino—noting the learning benefits and cost-effectiveness of new technology—reports plans to start using a similar program. CSU Channel Islands has a computerized algebra problem-solving lab that requires students to perform tasks of progressive complexity and difficulty, and CSU Fresno, CSU Sacramento, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo report successful use of ALEKS, a web-based mathematics and learning system that is also available to students while they are still in high school via CSU’s Early Assessment Program. ALEKS uses adaptive questioning to quickly and accurately determine exactly which ELM concepts a student knows and doesn't know. Fresno and Sacramento use ALEKS in their six-week Summer Bridge programs, which are designed to prepare selected first-time freshmen and Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) admits for the challenges of a four-year university. Both campuses report having achieved impressive results with ALEKS; approximately 80 percent of the students who enroll in these summer programs successfully complete the ELM requirement before fall classes begin. CSU Bakersfield also uses ALEKS in its four-week intensive summer program targeting incoming freshmen who did not pass the ELM.

Looking to the Future

Most survey respondents expressed cautious optimism about the future of developmental/remedial education in the CSU. In large part, this optimism appeared rooted in a determination to persist in identifying effective ways to prepare incoming freshmen for baccalaureate-level work. Ongoing assessment of student learning that results from different approaches can be particularly helpful. Many respondents mentioned how failed approaches at
remediating students that were reconfigured and tried anew often produced better results. Several respondents described how the effort to identify effective approaches resulted in reaching out to colleagues across their campuses and across the CSU.

Such observations reflect a laudable determination to continue the mission of the California State University to serve with high quality the top third of graduates from California public high schools. Plainly, such commitment needs to be joined with sharp and insightful assessment of approaches, on which strong and successful practices can be built, and weaker and less-successful practices discarded.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The California State University has taken innovative steps to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. At the system level, the CSU’s work with California public schools in particular, with its focus on curriculum alignment and intervention efforts, has been hailed as a national model. Requests from other states for further information about the CSU’s Early Assessment Program (EAP) have been frequent.

As prior reports to trustees have made clear, however, efforts to improve the readiness of the state’s young people for college and the workforce have produced only modest improvements. These trends underscore the importance of continuing to collaborate with public schools so that more young people will arrive at the CSU ready to do college-level work. They also point to the critical role that CSU campuses continue to play in bringing these fully-admissible students to a level of baccalaureate proficiency. This latter concern—how to best prepare students for college-level work in English and mathematics after they have matriculated at the CSU—was the central focus of the survey administered to the campuses in June 2007. Examples drawn from the survey were discussed in the previous section of this report. More broadly, the results of this survey, in combination with prior reviews of existing programs and practices, suggest that the Board of Trustees may wish to affirm the following guiding principles for programs aimed at bringing admitted CSU students to baccalaureate proficiency:

1. **Maintain current commitment to working with California public schools to improve the college-readiness of first-time Freshmen**

   In considering the CSU’s commitment to bringing to proficiency those first-time freshmen who have not yet demonstrated baccalaureate-level readiness in English and/or mathematics, it is important to recognize that, except for a very small number of permitted exceptions, students who are admitted as first-time freshmen are fully admissible based on their record of high school performance. They have met the formal requirements of admission to the CSU, both in terms of coursework completed and academic performance. These students are exactly the population that CSU serves as its central mission.
We should also bear in mind that the CSU’s commitment of resources to partner with California’s public high schools in both curriculum alignment and intervention efforts is likely ultimately to reduce the number of admissible students who have not yet achieved proficiency. A goal to maximize the proficiency upon entry of students entering the CSU as first time freshmen is worthy and appropriate, and should continue as a viable policy of the Board of Trustees. However, in the face of undeniable realities, the 90% quantification set by the Board in 1996 should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.

Principle #1. The current goal is consistent with the existing CSU strategic plan. However, as that plan is reviewed and updated, the quantified student proficiency goal should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.

2. Recognize that there are multiple levels of readiness

CSU freshmen who need remediation demonstrate varying levels of competence. Campuses meet the needs of these students in multiple, often innovative ways. Most campuses assign remedial students to pre-baccalaureate courses based on their scores on the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam. Cut-off scores vary from campus to campus but reflect the same general principle: the lower the exam scores, the more basic the course content and the more intensive the needed remediation efforts. Some campuses place students who very nearly pass the basic skills tests into baccalaureate-level courses, frequently with supplemental assistance. Channel Islands’ and Fresno’s “directed self placement” systems seem especially promising, in allowing remedial students, with guidance, to place themselves in the first-year writing classes they deem most appropriate to their experience and/or confidence as writers.

There is broad recognition that students whose families are native born, but for whom standard academic English is effectively a second language, face unique challenges in acquiring the basic skills to do college-level work. This includes students whose cultures and communities teach and reinforce “street English” in preference to more standard usages. Several campuses have designed developmental reading and writing courses that more effectively address these students’ needs. This would seem to be a much-needed focus for the future. It is also very much worth saying that campuses should be commended for identifying multiple ways to meet students’ varying developmental needs.

Principle #2. Campuses should be tasked to assess the effectiveness of their approaches to meeting students’ varying developmental needs, and to continue to identify—and share—practices that are found to be particularly effective.

3. Strengthen “early start” programs
Survey results point to the potential value of an “early start” on remediation via a summer experience prior to the initial freshman fall term, especially for first-generation college-goers and students with remedial needs that may require more than an academic year of coursework to overcome. At the same time, it is optimal for students with less significant remedial need to enter their initial fall term without the stigma and need to cover high school material again. Long, intensive summer programs can require foregoing some summer employment earnings, and the inadequacy of federal and state financial aid is an important barrier. The CSU should engage federal and state policy makers to overcome these problems. Campuses should seek to provide employment to such students and should aggressively seek local and regional businesses and industries to assist with providing jobs to students needing summer employment. As a supplement, system and institutional fundraising could help to support some targeted students. In addition, for quarter campuses, mid-August to mid-September intensive early start programs might avoid the summer employment and financial issues by adding a nontraditional front-end to the traditional fall quarter. With creativity and early notification to incoming freshmen, semester campuses also may be able to craft a nontraditional early start to their fall semester. This may well entail innovations in budget practices, including the provision of dedicated funds for early start programs.

Principle #3. All campuses are encouraged to establish or expand “early start” programs, including strong financial support to include both improved financial aid opportunities and opportunities for summer employment, for students with both significant and moderate remedial needs.

4. Continue to expect completion of remediation before the start of the second year

Campus remediation efforts have yielded remarkably positive results, all considered. As has been reported to the Board in recent years, the overwhelming majority of CSU freshmen needing remediation attain proficiency in English and mathematics by the end of their first year of study. Most encouragingly, these students are just as likely as students who were fully proficient at entry to earn a bachelor’s degree. These results provide strong evidence that the CSU is effective both at remediating students within one year and laying the foundation for their future academic success. All in all, the current policy goal, that students be prepared for baccalaureate-level English and mathematics by the start of their second year, is sensible and facilitates academic success.

Principle #4. The CSU should continue to expect freshmen to attain proficiency within one year, especially as students are directed to an energetic early start in the initial summer.

5. Reconsider the redirection to community college of students who don’t complete remediation after one year
Under current policy, students who do not attain proficiency within the first year are disenrolled and redirected to community colleges to complete their remediation. The alarming results of this policy, however, stand in sharp contrast to the encouraging results of remediation efforts sited at CSU campuses. Data from the past five years show a steady decline in the number of disenrolled CSU students who in fact enter community college to complete their remedial education. Many drop out of higher education altogether rather than take up remedial studies at a community college. Further, those who do enter a community college are simply not returning to the CSU to complete their baccalaureate degrees.

One alternative is for campuses to consider adding additional early warnings in their tracking of remedial students. Students trying but making inadequate progress in their fall term might be directed to more intensive coursework in the winter and spring terms. Students who will clearly fail to complete their remediation by the end of the spring semester could be offered an extra nontraditional month of intensive instruction before the summer begins to complete remediation. With creativity and early warning to students at quarter campuses, a similar end-of-spring boot camp to complete remediation before July may be an alternative that would still allow students two months of summer employment.

Still, community colleges may have a strong role to play in the remediation of students who need this additional time. One promising approach is from San Diego State University, where community colleges offer remedial instruction, but on the university’s main campus. This could be an approach especially worth considering for instruction in the summer immediately following a student’s initial academic year. And finally, campuses continue to have the authority to permit students who have made progress to proficiency and are very nearly fully college-ready to continue enrollment in a second year under the terms of a performance “contract” with the university. Continued experimentation with such contracts – on an exceptions basis - coupled with energetic assessments seem in order, while we continue the policy of expecting full proficiency before a student can begin a second year of study in the CSU.

In summary, current data strongly suggest that redirecting students who fail to achieve full proficiency across their initial freshman college year from the CSU to Community Colleges has been counterproductive.

**Principle #5. Campuses should explore alternatives to redirection to Community Colleges, while maintaining the basic principle that students must achieve proficiency before enrolling in their second year in the CSU.**

**6. Wherever possible, offer degree credit-bearing work based on outcomes achieved**

A more integrative approach to remediation, characterized by the embedding of developmental education into the regular academic curriculum, has gained currency. Consistent with this integrated approach, some CSU campuses are moving away from placing students in pre-
curricular (i.e., non-credit bearing) “remedial” courses in reading and writing, and assigning them instead to innovative baccalaureate-level courses. Some campuses have demonstrated that those showing near-proficiency can be placed directly into the college-level English course, coupled with extra monitoring of adequate progress. Students with more substantial remedial needs have been offered credit-bearing work but within a more intensive experience that both remediates and carries the student through general education proficiency. At the same time, university credit for clearly pre-baccalaureate work is inappropriate, a point that all engaged in the remedial enterprise must continue to bear clearly in mind. Whether in an initial summer or across an initial academic year, this approach can serve two interrelated and equally important objectives: to take away some of the stigma of remediation and, because students will more likely feel that they belong in college, to facilitate their persistence toward graduation.

Principle #6. Campuses should be encouraged to develop, for students who begin their mathematics or English study at a demonstrated “nearly proficient” level, courses that offer baccalaureate credit while requiring enrolled students to meet specific proficiency objectives along with goals for general education.

7. Use technology-assisted approaches where promising and feasible.

Several campuses have turned to new technology and computer-aided instruction in remedial education, especially in mathematics. CSU Fullerton’s online short course for students with a high but (barely) failing score on the ELM has been very successful in getting these students prepared fully for baccalaureate-level mathematics. ALEKS, the web-based mathematics assessment and learning system, has been used extensively and effectively at CSU Fresno and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. CSU Los Angeles reports that pass rates in remedial mathematics have improved with the use of an online homework package.

These initiatives are congruent with CSU’s Transforming Course Design (TCD) initiative, in which campuses are encouraged to improve student learning via Internet-based learning while simultaneously addressing the issue of instructional costs. Internet-based instruction may increase students’ access to learning, and can easily provide individually-tailored programs. It further provides faculty with critical information on the performance and time spent on study for each student. The CSU has made funding available to support pilot projects that seek to accomplish these goals, and anticipates ramping up the TCD approach very substantially in the next three years.

Principle #7. All campuses are encouraged to develop and use technology-assisted, Internet-based learning programs for remedial English and mathematics. Consortial efforts that involve several campuses in the development of these programs are encouraged.

8. Review and validate the various CSU assessments for placement in English and mathematics
The CSU is planning a regular review and validation of the English Placement Test (EPT), the Entry-Level Mathematics (ELM) examination, in conjunction with validation studies of the Early Assessments of Readiness for College-Level English and Mathematics (EAP English and EAP Mathematics) and cut-scores on the SAT/ACT, two other methods for establishing exemption from the need to take the EPT and ELM. In light of the campus experiments with direct self-placement and placement in credit-bearing courses, the standard validation and extended research may provide more refined considerations regarding the ranges of student readiness and the interpretations we draw from them.

*Principle #8. A review and validation study of the EPT, ELM, and other related instruments (such as EAP, SAT, and ACT) should be undertaken, and the results used to inform campus experimentation with directed self-placement and other innovative remediation placement practice.*
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Summary

This item reviews the history of remediation policy in the California State University and, drawing from a survey of CSU campuses undertaken in summer 2007, appraises current promising practices designed to bring entering first-time freshmen to college-level proficiency. Eight principles are offered at the end of the review for the Board’s consideration.

Three of the principles call for system choices or actions.

Principle one states that the 1996 Board of Trustees policy goal, that 90% of incoming first-time freshmen should be fully proficient, is consistent with the existing CSU strategic plan. However, as that plan is reviewed and updated, the quantified student proficiency goal should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.

Principle four stipulates that the CSU should continue to expect freshmen to attain proficiency within one year, especially as students are directed to an energetic early start in the initial summer, as called for in principle three.

Principle eight calls for a review and validation study of the EPT, ELM, and other related instruments (such as EAP, SAT, and ACT), and the results used to inform campus experimentation with directed self-placement and other innovative remediation placement practice.

Five of the principles ask or encourage campus actions.

Principle two tasks campuses to assess the effectiveness of their approaches to meet students’ varying developmental needs, and to continue to identify—and share—practices that are found to be particularly effective.

Principle three encourages all campuses to establish or expand “early start” programs, including strong financial support to include both improved financial aid opportunities and
opportunities for summer employment, for students with both significant and moderate remedial needs.

Principle five asks campuses to explore alternatives to redirection to Community Colleges, while maintaining the basic principle that students must achieve proficiency before enrolling in their second year in the CSU.

Principle six encourages campuses to develop, for students who begin their mathematics or English study at a demonstrated “nearly proficient” level, courses that offer baccalaureate credit while requiring enrolled students meet specific proficiency objectives along with goals for general education.

Principle seven encourages all campuses to develop and use technology-assisted, Internet-based learning programs for remedial English and mathematics. Consortial efforts that involve several campuses in the development of these programs are encouraged.

**Brief History and Introduction**

Remedial and developmental programs in the basic skills areas of reading, writing, and mathematics have been the focus of discussion by the Board of Trustees since the mid-1970s, when an Advisory Committee on Writing appointed by Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke recommended a diagnostic examination in writing for regularly admitted first-time freshmen, as well as a requirement that students demonstrate proficiency in writing as a condition of graduation. The result of these recommendations, which were endorsed by the CSU Academic Senate and approved by the trustees in May 1976, was the entry-level diagnostic test now known as the English Placement Test (EPT). The EPT has been administered to entering undergraduates since September 1977.

In the early 1980s, the CSU introduced two major curricular changes that made the undergraduate curriculum more rigorous and raised expectations for preparation by entering students: the General Education-Breadth curriculum, including the requirement that students be assessed for basic skills on entry (Title 5, Section 40402.1); and the requirement that students complete college preparatory courses in English (four years) and mathematics (two years) to be eligible for admission. Responding to these changes in admission and requirements, the chairs of CSU departments of mathematics urged that a systemwide instrument be developed as a companion to EPT to assess basic skills in mathematics (quantitative reasoning). The Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination was subsequently developed and was first administered to students in May 1983. In 1992, the exam was upgraded to test for all three years of high school mathematics preparation currently required for admission.
In January 1996, the trustees adopted a policy to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. Students were classified as needing remediation if they did not score a 550 on the SAT in mathematics and in English. That SAT score requirement gave the California State University the nation’s highest proficiency expectation, when compared to other American regional comprehensive universities. Trustees then set a goal that, by fall 2007, 90 percent of regularly admitted first-time freshmen at CSU would be prepared at the time of matriculation to enroll in baccalaureate-level English and mathematics courses. Fall 1998 was the baseline year for assessing progress; intermediate benchmarks were set for fall 2001 and fall 2004.

In 1997, the trustees reaffirmed their commitment to determining competency in English and mathematics for entering students and to providing them with opportunities to develop necessary foundational skills. Executive Order 665, which is still in effect:

- Requires all non-exempt students to take the EPT and ELM examinations after admission and before enrollment at a CSU campus;
- Requires all campuses to place students who do not demonstrate the requisite competence in appropriate developmental/remedial education activities during their first term of enrollment and each subsequent term until such time as they demonstrate competence; and
- Requires all campuses to establish and enforce limits on developmental/remedial activity and to advise students who are not making adequate progress in developing their foundational skills to enroll in other educational institutions as appropriate.

As is now known, the CSU’s remediation efforts—both on its campuses and in its partnerships with public schools—have not resulted in the level of college preparedness that trustees set in 1996 as goals for 2007. In fall 2001, 54 percent of entering freshmen were proficient (ready for baccalaureate-level work) in both English and mathematics. In fall 2004, 53 percent of entering freshmen were proficient in English and 63 percent were proficient in mathematics. Chancellor’s Office staff project that in fall 2007, 57 percent of entering freshmen will be proficient in English and 66 percent will be proficient in mathematics—a slight increase from years past, but still well below the 90 percent goal. These figures are reflective of national trends. About 40 percent of all college students in the United States take at least one remedial course (Adelman, 2004). The estimated cost of remedial education to taxpayers is about $1 billion a year (Breneman & Haarlow, 1998; see The Center for Student Success, 2007).

The persistently large numbers of students who enter four-year universities unable to do college-level work have been the subject of numerous, often contentious state and national policy debates. Critics of developmental education at the college level emphasize the cost of remediation and argue that universities should not be in the business of teaching skills that students should have learned when they were younger. Others counter that, in our increasingly knowledge-based, globally-connected economy, it has never been more crucial to have a
workforce with some education beyond high school. In other words, there are sound social and economic reasons why it is appropriate for universities to provide at least some remedial education (Phipps, 1998). A report by the Institute for Higher Education Policy went so far as to suggest that “remediation is a core function of higher education” and always has been. “What we now call remedial education has not been caused by current admissions standards, the availability of federal financial aid, or any of a number of other concerns that have been raised in the recent policy discussions,” wrote the author of the report (Phipps, 1998, vi). He contended that as an ever-growing proportion of the population sought higher education, universities would continue to play an important role in helping underprepared students gain proficiency.

In what follows, a review is provided of the various, often innovative ways that the CSU has sought to prepare students for college-level work and, more broadly, for entry into the social and economic mainstream of California. The first part of the review offers an overview of the collaborative partnerships the CSU has formed with the public schools in an effort to provide students with the basic skills in English and mathematics they need prior to matriculating at CSU institutions. The second part of the review highlights the results of a survey that appraised campus efforts to bring students to proficiency after they have arrived at the CSU. The review concludes with eight “guiding principles” for the Board’s consideration that emerged from the scan of existing programs and practices and survey results.

**Collaborative Partnerships: The CSU-K-12 Connection**

To be admitted to the CSU, freshman applicants need to have earned a high school diploma or equivalent, completed a college preparatory curriculum, and have grade-point averages (GPAs) and standardized test scores that place them in the top one-third of their graduating class. Currently that means coming from a pool of high school graduates who:

- Completed 4 years of English instruction with a C or better;
- Completed 3 years of mathematics instruction with a C or better; and
- Earned a 3.0 grade point average.

CSU Board of Trustees policy states that students admitted to the CSU are classified as English or mathematics proficient if they score:

- 550 or above on the mathematics section of the SATI-Reasoning Test; or
- 550 or above on the verbal section of the SATI-Reasoning Test.

Until the Early Assessment Program (EAP) was initiated, CSU placement standards were not fully aligned with the state board standards in English and mathematics that govern the K-12 public schools. This lack of alignment underscored the need for CSU to work closely with the State Board of Education and the California Department of Education to align CSU placement standards with those promulgated by the state board.
Early Assessment Program components included the assessments of English and mathematics proficiency of public high school 11th graders – the exams; the EAP professional development programs for high school teachers; the CSU Math Success and English Success websites for students; and refined CSU preservice programs offered to aspiring middle and high school teachers. These innovations have been the focus of reporting at several previous trustee meetings. A short recap may be useful.

The EAP Exams. Continued low proficiency rates for first-time freshmen entering the CSU strongly suggested that incoming students needed to be assessed earlier than immediately prior to matriculation in order to determine whether they were on track to be ready for college-level English and mathematics, and to give them a chance to become ready if they were not. The Early Assessment Program (EAP)—a collaborative effort by the CSU, the California Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction—was developed to perform this function. The EAP provides students, their families, and high schools with the opportunity to assess 11th grade student readiness for college-level English and mathematics-- i.e. skills that students who choose either to enter college or to enter the workforce directly out of high school will need in order to be successful. It does this through the use of augmented English and mathematics California Standards Tests (CST) that incorporate questions reflecting CSU placement standards. The public response to these exams, which are voluntary for 11th grade students, has been overwhelming, with increasing numbers of students taking them each year.

The EAP’s Professional Development Programs. In addition to the exams for 11th grade students, the EAP offers several professional development opportunities to high school teachers. The Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation (RIAP) program is intended to help teachers to implement standards-based approaches to improve students’ academic literacy in all subjects. More than 2,500 teachers have participated in RIAP since its inception in 2001-02. An independent evaluation of the program found that in schools with sizable participation in RIAP, there was an increase on the statewide 11th grade California Standards Test (CST) in English-Language-Arts. The gains among these students between the years 2003 and 2006 were almost four times as large as the statewide gain (14 points vs. 3.6 points) and more than twice as large as found in control schools (14 points vs. 6.7 points) for the same period.

Another EAP-related innovation, the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC), is designed to prepare students to meet the expectations of college and university faculty in English and is aligned with the California English-Language Arts Content Standards for grades 11-12. CSU English faculty, K-12 English teachers, and curriculum specialists developed a full-year college preparatory English course for high school juniors and seniors. Course assignments, organized into 14 modules and based mainly on non-fiction texts, emphasize the in-depth study of expository, analytical, and argumentative reading and writing. To promote wide-scale adoption of the Expository Reading and Writing Course, the CSU and County Offices of
Education collaborate to provide professional development for English teachers at a variety of locations across the state. Since the introduction of the ERWC in 2004, more than 2,200 teachers have participated in these workshops and piloted the ERWC modules. An independent evaluation of the ERWC has found that, in schools in which five or more English teachers participated in ERWC workshops, the percentage of students who score as proficient in English improved substantially.

In addition, a committee of secondary mathematics educators and CSU mathematics professors created a professional development program for mathematics teachers who teach Algebra II and higher. The program, which includes two full days of professional development, began in 2005-2006 and has served 1,300 teachers to date. Workshops provide an introduction to the EAP and specific approaches for improving the college readiness of high school students in mathematics.

The EAP and CSU Preservice Programs. The integration of the EAP into preservice teacher preparation began in 2005-06 and continued in 2006-07 through workshops offered to CSU faculty who teach methods courses in mathematics and English. The aim of the workshops was to inform the faculty of the EAP’s professional development opportunities for individuals who teach these subjects in high school and to consider ways in which the information might be provided to candidates prior to earning their Single Subject credentials. Many CSU faculty who provide professional development programs to teachers at the high school level have established innovative practices for infusing that material into their preservice coursework.

Evaluation questions assessing the impacts on the secondary English and mathematics teachers prepared by the CSU will be integrated into the annual Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation beginning in 2007-08. In addition, EAP strategies will be incorporated into the preservice preparation of educational administrators. Twenty CSU campuses offer education leadership programs at the preservice level, preparing close to 60 percent of the new administrators in California. Similarly, lessons learned from EAP will be integrated into the curricula of the CSU’s emerging Ed.D. programs.

CSU Math and English Success Websites. The Math and English Success Websites (see www.csumathsuccess.org and www.csuenglishsuccess.org) provide high school students, parents, teachers, and counselors with resources for helping students become ready for college-level work in mathematics and English. These websites encourage students to take ownership of their path to college by providing them with personalized, authoritative advice about the CSU English and mathematics placement requirements and how to meet them; testimonial videos which show the importance of taking proactive steps to prepare for the CSU in the most efficient and expeditious manner; and online learning resources which provide free 24/7 access to high quality tutorials which are aligned to the CSU mathematics and English placement content.

To date, the CSU Math and English Success Websites have registered over 200,000 cumulative visits. Math Success attracts roughly 7,000 visits and English Success attracts roughly 4,000
visits per month. Among the most popular resources on the Success websites are the learning materials, which offer assessment-driven analysis of student preparation in mathematics and English. These resources include:

**ALEKS** - *an intelligent tutor that uses adaptive questioning to determine quickly and accurately exactly which ELM concepts a student knows and doesn't know.* ALEKS’ adaptive questioning approach is based on knowledge space theory, which stresses repetition of a series of like problems until mastery is achieved. The CSU ALEKS ELM Prep tutorial is currently being used by six CSU developmental mathematics programs and 18 high school mathematics classes. Between August 2005-July 2007, more than 15,000 enrolled CSU students and potential CSU students signed up for the online prep course. A detailed description of ALEKS ELM programs is provided below.

**Online EPT Practice Tests** - *four online multiple choice tests with questions taken from retired English placement tests.* Students receive a score report with an itemized list of their performance in eight categories along with feedback about why their answers were correct or incorrect.

**Calibrated Peer Review** – *an online essay writing tool that uses retired essay prompts and an automated rubric grading system to prepare high school students for the EPT.* Approximately 60 high school English teachers have signed up for this service through the English Success Website, and over 2,000 students have participated.

**Contextual Issues and Concerns: Proficiency Standards and Demographic Shifts**

As outlined above, the CSU’s partnership with California public schools has had promising results. However, as proficiency figures demonstrate, the number of admissible students who are unprepared for college-level work remains high.

Some critics suggest that the CSU’s proficiency standards should be changed. Such a suggestion disregards the fact that CSU proficiency standards at entry align with California’s English and mathematics standards for high school students. Students who demonstrate college-level readiness at the end of the 11th grade on the EAP English test tend to be those who are advanced in their performance on the CST English. In mathematics, those whom the CSU says will be ready one year from now—even if they take no higher level mathematics in their senior year—also tend to be those who post “advanced” scores on the CST Algebra II or Summative High School Mathematics examinations. Moreover, a recent study by the National Center for Education Statistics (2007) suggested that California standards are much better aligned with the expectations of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) than are the standards set by many other states.
This reaffirmation of CSU and California public school standards is occurring against the backdrop of dramatic demographic change. English language learners comprise nearly 40 percent of all K-12 students in California (California Community Colleges Center for Student Success, 2007). More than 166,000 children for whom English is a second language are currently in the second grade. These children, and others like them, are now being referred to as “Generation 1.5.” They share a common experience, having been educated in California or other U.S. public schools, but having grown up in homes where the language spoken is not English (Ching, 2005). Dr. Robby Ching, chair of the Learning Skills Center at CSU Sacramento, describes the academic challenges that these children will likely face:

By fourth grade when reading and writing demands are dramatically ratcheted up, many will begin struggling to keep up with the academic demands as they are simultaneously developing their language skills ... Without English language support at home, they don’t have adequate literacy in English, and they usually have not had an opportunity to learn to read and write in their first language so those resources are not there to fall back upon either. Instead they have oral fluency, often in a non-standard variety of English used in their community, and a certain amount of cultural knowledge (5).

Noting that “students who are still learning English in grades 4, 5, 6 risk falling behind in academic proficiency and failing to master the skills needed for success in middle and high school,” Ching writes, “It’s not surprising that they enroll in the university still having gaps in those areas” (5). By all accounts, filling in those gaps is crucial to California’s social and economic health. According to a report issued in May 2007 by the Public Policy Institute of California, the state needs to produce 2.9 million college graduates between now and 2025 to meet future demands for highly skilled workers (Taiz, 2007). Anne Driscoll (2007) of the University of California says that, if California is to develop the diverse and educated workforce it needs, policies and interventions must be identified to increase the chances of academic success for Latino and African American high school students in particular.

With this history and context as points of departure, a survey was conducted in June 2007 in an effort to discover how CSU campuses—continuing to face high numbers of incoming students needing remediation—were preparing these students for college-level work. Of particular interest was how, if at all, developmental/remedial education at CSU was impacted by a burgeoning group of language minority students.

Survey of CSU Campuses on Practices and Concerns Regarding Developmental and Remedial Education

In June 2007, campuses were surveyed in an effort to discover how students are being prepared to achieve full college-level proficiency in English and in mathematics after matriculating to CSU. From this survey we are able to provide a snapshot of several important, innovative, and
promising approaches to remediation that campuses have taken, as well as contextual richness and concerns.

**Background and Context: Students and Their Readiness**

*Students at Various Stages of Readiness.* Students arrive at CSU fully compliant with CSU admissions criteria, yet at various stages of readiness for college-level work. At most campuses, scores on the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam determine which composition and mathematics courses they will take. Typically, cut-off scores are used to place students in three general categories of courses—courses for those with minimal remedial needs, who are very nearly proficient; those with moderate remedial needs; and those with significant remedial needs, who are a substantial distance away from full proficiency. The more significant the remedial need, the more basic the course content and the more intensive the remediation efforts in the courses in which the student is placed. The range in the readiness of students for college-level work spawns experimentation with various approaches to remediation. The quest is to take students to proficiency efficiently and effectively.

*Non-English and Non-Standard English Backgrounds.* Perhaps not surprisingly, language acquisition—characterized by students who are working on learning English or Standard English—was consistently mentioned by survey respondents as the single largest factor influencing student performance in reading and writing courses. Respondents had in mind students whose households spoke a language from Europe or Latin America, for example, such as Spanish; or a language from eastern Asia, such as Chinese. They also had in mind students whose households or communities speak informal or “street” English in strong preference to standard English. Either background makes the college environment a challenge. “Many years of research in language acquisition show that learning a second language is a slow process, one that may take many years,” wrote a respondent from CSU Chico, who added that a year of developmental/remedial activity for such students simply might not be enough. Language acquisition was also mentioned as a factor affecting student performance in mathematics courses.

*Other Barriers.* Campuses identified several other barriers to readiness including:

- **Commitment:** “students don’t take their studies seriously enough;”
- **Test experience:** “students do not have enough experience taking timed pressured tests;”
- **Stigma:** “students have a negative attitude towards the classes because of the ‘developmental’ designation;”
- **Familial obligations:** “geographical distance from home coupled with cultural displacement, especially for urban students from cultures that prioritize familial obligation;”
- **Lack of prior instruction:** “insufficient preparation in high school;” and
- **Misplaced pride:** “an unwillingness to take the time to seek help.”

**Early Starts**
Survey results point to the potential value of an “early start” on remediation, in the summer prior to a first-time freshman’s initial fall term. Summer Bridge and other early start programs provide students—especially those who have significant remedial needs, many of whom are the first in their families to attend college—with time to learn the ropes of college and to make the kinds of progress necessary to reach college-readiness in English and mathematics by the end of the freshman year. The greatest barriers to offering adequately long and sufficiently intensive summer opportunities are: (1) students’ interest in summer employment to cover their contributions to financial aid and to help support their families and (2) the lack of adequate federal and state financial aid for summer.

In summer 2006, eight campuses provided a total of 544 incoming students with remedial opportunities in English, and 14 campuses provided a total of 1,348 incoming students with opportunities to pursue basic proficiency in mathematics. By the end of the 2006-07 academic year, five of the campuses that offered summer remedial opportunities in English had successfully prepared more than 90 percent of their students for baccalaureate-level work (including, of course, those who achieved proficiency during the academic year). During that same period, seven of the campuses that offered summer opportunities in mathematics had successfully remediated at least 90 percent of their students.

Students who seek an early start on remediation have several different types of opportunities in addition to Summer Bridge. CSU San Marcos runs a six-week Summer Academy for all incoming first-year students who failed the EPT and/or the ELM. CSU Fullerton, Cal Poly Pomona, and San Diego State offer all incoming freshmen with remedial needs in English a chance to begin their developmental classes in the summer, and CSU Los Angeles offers composition classes to students with moderate or minimal remedial needs. An early start seems an obvious strong practice. Assuring early start programs raises consideration of budget strategies: we discuss dedicated funds sources below, in the recommendations section.

For students with remedial needs in mathematics, campuses offer intensive instruction that varies in length from 10 days to six weeks. For students who barely failed the ELM, CSU Fullerton provides an online course (described below). CSU Bakersfield offers students in the same category an opportunity to participate in a 10 day, three-hour a day “early start” program. Similar students at CSU Long Beach are invited to take a four-week “last chance” mathematics workshop. The Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies at CSU San Bernardino runs an Intensive Mathematics Program each summer that consists of two 10-day sessions in which students are given a crash course in elementary and/or intermediate algebra. Those who pass the intermediate algebra portion are deemed remediated and may enroll in GE mathematics courses in the fall. Those who pass only the beginning algebra portion are allowed to register for intermediate algebra in the fall. CSU San Bernardino reports that the program has been highly
successful, with a passage rate of about 90-95 percent for students in the intermediate portion of the program and about 95-98 percent for participants in the beginning algebra portion.

A few campuses provide opportunities in the summer following their initial academic year for students who did not complete remediation across their initial college year. These campuses include CSU Northridge and San Diego State in English, and CSU Chico, CSU Northridge, San Diego State, and San Jose State in mathematics.

**Developmental/Remedial Education Approaches in English**

*Directed Self-Placement in English.* Two campuses have eschewed the use of EPT scores to place students in first-year writing courses, arguing that single timed tests are unreliable predictors of a student’s ability to succeed in college-level work. CSU Channel Islands and CSU Fresno have adopted instead “directed self placement” (DSP) programs, which allow students with remedial needs in English to choose, with guidance, which composition courses to take. Students at CSU Channel Islands have two choices—they can take two 3-unit classes that “stretch” over two semesters with the same instructor and classmates, or they can take a one-semester, 3-unit course. The “stretch” option is the more basic of the two and emphasizes the development of writing strategies. The one-semester option is designed for students who are ready for college writing and emphasizes research writing. In addition to offering a one-semester, 3-unit “accelerated” option and a two-semester, 6-unit “stretch” option, CSU Fresno has a 9-unit option that provides students who are multilingual speakers with an extra semester to work on their English before taking composition classes. CSU Fresno, which only recently implemented the DSP, reports that initial evaluations of the program have been positive. CSU Channel Islands, which implemented the DSP the first year the campus offered courses, has systematically evaluated the program and consistently found promising results. “For four years, we’ve demonstrated that students make appropriate choices about which writing courses to take, and that mainstreaming all students in baccalaureate writing classes works,” wrote a survey respondent at that campus.

*Credit-Bearing English Course Placement.* Other CSU campus efforts have focused on students who are nearly proficient at entry. CSU Channel Islands, CSU Fullerton, Humboldt State, CSU Northridge, CSU San Bernardino, and San Francisco State simply place such students in credit-bearing baccalaureate-level courses. This approach has been spurred within the CSU by the results of a five-year study conducted by researchers at San Francisco State University, which showed that placement in explicitly labeled developmental courses often discourages at-risk students and decreases the likelihood of their staying in college and graduating. They found that, in contrast, placing students in intensive, credit-bearing baccalaureate-level courses accelerated their sense of competence and eventual success. CSU Channel Islands, Humboldt State, and CSU San Bernardino have reported similar findings. The survey respondent at Humboldt State summarized this dynamic, writing that integrated courses encourage students to perceive
themselves more as “‘real’ students instead of ‘dummy’ students in ‘bonehead’ English.” Because these courses do not carry the stigma of remediation, the argument is, students feel as though they belong in college and, therefore, are more likely to persist in their pursuit of the baccalaureate degree.

Campuses continue to try to identify ever more effective ways to meet the multiple remediation needs of students. For example, CSU Dominguez Hills will be piloting three new approaches to developmental English fall 2007. One will place students with minimal remedial needs in a 4-unit GE English course with supplemental instruction; another will place students with moderate remedial needs in a combined one-year “stretch” course with the same instructor and students; and the third will place students who continue to have significant remedial needs after one semester in an intensive 5-unit course in spring. Also effective this fall, Sonoma State University will no longer require two semesters of remediation for students with moderate to significant remedial needs. Instead, these students will be placed in one 4-unit course and will be additionally required to take 1 unit of tutoring through the campus Writing Center. According to the survey respondent for Sonoma State University, the campus hopes this approach will result in a high percentage of students completing their remedial work in one semester as opposed to the previously standard two semesters.

Community College Remedial Instruction on CSU Campuses. Although redirecting CSU students to community colleges has produced disheartening results, community colleges nevertheless can—and should—take an active role in the remediation of these otherwise admissible students. San Diego State’s arrangement with San Diego Community College is a promising example. For the past five years, community college instructors have taught the vast majority of San Diego State’s remedial courses in English and mathematics on the university’s main campus. With this arrangement, students are able to continue their remedial education while maintaining their “identify” as San Diego State students. Such an arrangement helps these students to remain engaged, not only physically but psychologically, with the university in particular and in their education more generally.

Standard English Learner Approaches. Meeting the basic skill needs of students whose primary language is not standard English is a special concern, and indeed an increasing concern as such students increasingly find their way to CSU. As noted, several campuses noted explicitly in the survey that these students face unique learning challenges, in both English and mathematics. In response to this challenge, CSU Fullerton, CSPU Pomona, CSU Sacramento, and San Francisco State have designed developmental reading and writing courses that have an explicit multilingual component in addition to offering courses intended primarily for native speakers. Placement in these courses is determined in a variety of ways—San Francisco State, for example, looks at student scores on the ESL Placement Test, and CSPU Pomona relies on a personal interview and diagnostic essay in addition to EPT scores. CSU Northridge’s remedial course offerings reflect an acknowledgment that culture, in addition to language, can shape a student’s learning.
campus offers developmental reading and writing courses in three departments other than English: Asian American Studies, Chicana/o Studies, and Pan African Studies.

Developmental/Remedial Education Approaches in Mathematics

*Varied Sequential Remedial Mathematics Approaches.* There is enormous range in the readiness of students for college-level mathematics. Some students are ready for standard term-length or year-long courses. Yet other students have been so underexposed to college-level mathematics expectations that a variety of approaches have been put forward as CSU campuses seek effective pathways to mathematics proficiency. Both CSU Stanislaus and CSU Long Beach have reconceptualized their intermediate algebra courses so that they are aligned with different types of academic majors—for example, in fall 2007, CSU Long Beach will offer basic intermediate algebra to students pursuing non-technical majors, and enhanced intermediate algebra to students who plan to major in business, science, engineering, or education. The mathematics chair at CSU Long Beach said the department moved to offer the two separate tracks in recognition of the different skill sets that are required of the different majors.

*Technology and Computer-Aided Instruction in Mathematics.* New technology and computer-aided instruction are playing an increasingly important role in preparing students for college-level mathematics. CSU Fullerton offers a summer, online short course for students with a “barely failing” score on the ELM. Most students have been able at the end of the course to show readiness for baccalaureate-level mathematics. The logic is apparent, and attractive. Many of these students were proficient at one juncture (while still in high school), but discontinued mathematics courses or courses that use mathematics skills, and forgot some of the material. In one intensive week, these students can once again achieve and demonstrate proficiency in mathematics.

Campuses that supplement traditional lecture with new technology report similarly impressive results. Pass rates in the traditional lecture courses at CSU Los Angeles have improved since the introduction of an online homework package. CSU San Bernardino—noting the learning benefits and cost-effectiveness of new technology—reports plans to start using a similar program. CSU Channel Islands has a computerized algebra problem-solving lab that requires students to perform tasks of progressive complexity and difficulty, and CSU Fresno, CSU Sacramento, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo report successful use of ALEKS, a web-based mathematics and learning system that is also available to students while they are still in high school via CSU’s Early Assessment Program. ALEKS uses adaptive questioning to quickly and accurately determine exactly which ELM concepts a student knows and doesn't know. Fresno and Sacramento use ALEKS in their six-week Summer Bridge programs, which are designed to prepare selected first-time freshmen and Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) admits for the challenges of a four-year university. Both campuses report having achieved impressive results with ALEKS; approximately 80 percent of the students who enroll in these summer programs
successfully complete the ELM requirement before fall classes begin. CSU Bakersfield also uses ALEKS in its four-week intensive summer program targeting incoming freshmen who did not pass the ELM.

**Looking to the Future**

Most survey respondents expressed cautious optimism about the future of developmental/remedial education in the CSU. In large part, this optimism appeared rooted in a determination to persist in identifying effective ways to prepare incoming freshmen for baccalaureate-level work. Ongoing assessment of student learning that results from different approaches can be particularly helpful. Many respondents mentioned how failed approaches at remediating students that were reconfigured and tried anew often produced better results. Several respondents described how the effort to identify effective approaches resulted in reaching out to colleagues across their campuses and across the CSU.

Such observations reflect a laudable determination to continue the mission of the California State University to serve with high quality the top third of graduates from California public high schools. Plainly, such commitment needs to be joined with sharp and insightful assessment of approaches, on which strong and successful practices can be built, and weaker and less-successful practices discarded.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The California State University has taken innovative steps to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. At the system level, the CSU’s work with California public schools in particular, with its focus on curriculum alignment and intervention efforts, has been hailed as a national model. Requests from other states for further information about the CSU’s Early Assessment Program (EAP) have been frequent.

As prior reports to trustees have made clear, however, efforts to improve the readiness of the state’s young people for college and the workforce have produced only modest improvements. These trends underscore the importance of continuing to collaborate with public schools so that more young people will arrive at the CSU ready to do college-level work. They also point to the critical role that CSU campuses continue to play in bringing these fully-admissible students to a level of baccalaureate proficiency. This latter concern—how to best prepare students for college-level work in English and mathematics after they have matriculated at the CSU—was the central focus of the survey administered to the campuses in June 2007. Examples drawn from the survey were discussed in the previous section of this report. More broadly, the results of this survey, in combination with prior reviews of existing programs and practices, suggest that the Board of Trustees may wish to affirm the following guiding principles for programs aimed at bringing admitted CSU students to baccalaureate proficiency:
1. **Maintain current commitment to working with California public schools to improve the college-readiness of first-time Freshmen**

In considering the CSU’s commitment to bringing to proficiency those first-time freshmen who have not yet demonstrated baccalaureate-level readiness in English and/or mathematics, it is important to recognize that, except for a very small number of permitted exceptions, students who are admitted as first-time freshmen are fully admissible based on their record of high school performance. They have met the formal requirements of admission to the CSU, both in terms of coursework completed and academic performance. These students are exactly the population that CSU serves as its central mission.

We should also bear in mind that the CSU’s commitment of resources to partner with California’s public high schools in both curriculum alignment and intervention efforts is likely ultimately to reduce the number of admissible students who have not yet achieved proficiency. A goal to maximize the proficiency upon entry of students entering the CSU as first time freshmen is worthy and appropriate, and should continue as a viable policy of the Board of Trustees. However, in the face of undeniable realities, the 90% quantification set by the Board in 1996 should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.

*Principle #1. The current goal is consistent with the existing CSU strategic plan. However, as that plan is reviewed and updated, the quantified student proficiency goal should be reassessed, and revised as appropriate.*

2. **Recognize that there are multiple levels of readiness**

CSU freshmen who need remediation demonstrate varying levels of competence. Campuses meet the needs of these students in multiple, often innovative ways. Most campuses assign remedial students to pre-baccalaureate courses based on their scores on the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) exam. Cut-off scores vary from campus to campus but reflect the same general principle: the lower the exam scores, the more basic the course content and the more intensive the needed remediation efforts. Some campuses place students who very nearly pass the basic skills tests into baccalaureate-level courses, frequently with supplemental assistance. Channel Islands’ and Fresno’s “directed self placement” systems seem especially promising, in allowing remedial students, with guidance, to place themselves in the first-year writing classes they deem most appropriate to their experience and/or confidence as writers.

There is broad recognition that students whose families are native born, but for whom standard academic English is effectively a second language, face unique challenges in acquiring the basic skills to do college-level work. This includes students whose cultures and communities teach
and reinforce “street English” in preference to more standard usages. Several campuses have designed developmental reading and writing courses that more effectively address these students’ needs. This would seem to be a much-needed focus for the future. It is also very much worth saying that campuses should be commended for identifying multiple ways to meet students’ varying developmental needs.

Principle #2. Campuses should be tasked to assess the effectiveness of their approaches to meeting students’ varying developmental needs, and to continue to identify—and share—practices that are found to be particularly effective.

3. **Strengthen “early start” programs**

Survey results point to the potential value of an “early start” on remediation via a summer experience prior to the initial freshman fall term, especially for first-generation college-goers and students with remedial needs that may require more than an academic year of coursework to overcome. At the same time, it is optimal for students with less significant remedial need to enter their initial fall term without the stigma and need to cover high school material again. Long, intensive summer programs can require foregoing some summer employment earnings, and the inadequacy of federal and state financial aid is an important barrier. The CSU should engage federal and state policy makers to overcome these problems. Campuses should seek to provide employment to such students and should aggressively seek local and regional businesses and industries to assist with providing jobs to students needing summer employment. As a supplement, system and institutional fundraising could help to support some targeted students. In addition, for quarter campuses, mid-August to mid-September intensive early start programs might avoid the summer employment and financial issues by adding a nontraditional front-end to the traditional fall quarter. With creativity and early notification to incoming freshmen, semester campuses also may be able to craft a nontraditional early start to their fall semester. This may well entail innovations in budget practices, including the provision of dedicated funds for early start programs.

Principle #3. All campuses are encouraged to establish or expand “early start” programs, including strong financial support to include both improved financial aid opportunities and opportunities for summer employment, for students with both significant and moderate remedial needs.

4. **Continue to expect completion of remediation before the start of the second year**

Campus remediation efforts have yielded remarkably positive results, all considered. As has been reported to the Board in recent years, the overwhelming majority of CSU freshmen needing remediation attain proficiency in English and mathematics by the end of their first year of study.
Most encouragingly, these students are just as likely as students who were fully proficient at entry to earn a bachelor’s degree. These results provide strong evidence that the CSU is effective both at remediating students within one year and laying the foundation for their future academic success. All in all, the current policy goal, that students be prepared for baccalaureate-level English and mathematics by the start of their second year, is sensible and facilitates academic success.

 Principle #4. The CSU should continue to expect freshmen to attain proficiency within one year, especially as students are directed to an energetic early start in the initial summer.

5. Reconsider the redirection to community college of students who don’t complete remediation after one year

Under current policy, students who do not attain proficiency within the first year are disenrolled and redirected to community colleges to complete their remediation. The alarming results of this policy, however, stand in sharp contrast to the encouraging results of remediation efforts sited at CSU campuses. Data from the past five years show a steady decline in the number of disenrolled CSU students who in fact enter community college to complete their remedial education. Many drop out of higher education altogether rather than take up remedial studies at a community college. Further, those who do enter a community college are simply not returning to the CSU to complete their baccalaureate degrees.

One alternative is for campuses to consider adding additional early warnings in their tracking of remedial students. Students trying but making inadequate progress in their fall term might be directed to more intensive coursework in the winter and spring terms. Students who will clearly fail to complete their remediation by the end of the spring semester could be offered an extra nontraditional month of intensive instruction before the summer begins to complete remediation. With creativity and early warning to students at quarter campuses, a similar end-of-spring boot camp to complete remediation before July may be an alternative that would still allow students two months of summer employment.

Still, community colleges may have a strong role to play in the remediation of students who need this additional time. One promising approach is from San Diego State University, where community colleges offer remedial instruction, but on the university’s main campus. This could be an approach especially worth considering for instruction in the summer immediately following a student’s initial academic year. And finally, campuses continue to have the authority to permit students who have made progress to proficiency and are very nearly fully college-ready to continue enrollment in a second year under the terms of a performance “contract” with the university. Continued experimentation with such contracts – on an exceptions basis - coupled with energetic assessments seem in order, while we continue the policy of expecting full proficiency before a student can begin a second year of study in the CSU.
In summary, current data strongly suggest that redirecting students who fail to achieve full proficiency across their initial freshman college year from the CSU to Community Colleges has been counterproductive.

Principle #5. Campuses should explore alternatives to redirection to Community Colleges, while maintaining the basic principle that students must achieve proficiency before enrolling in their second year in the CSU.

6. Wherever possible, offer degree credit-bearing work based on outcomes achieved

A more integrative approach to remediation, characterized by the embedding of developmental education into the regular academic curriculum, has gained currency. Consistent with this integrated approach, some CSU campuses are moving away from placing students in pre-curricular (i.e., non-credit bearing) “remedial” courses in reading and writing, and assigning them instead to innovative baccalaureate-level courses. Some campuses have demonstrated that those showing near-proficiency can be placed directly into the college-level English course, coupled with extra monitoring of adequate progress. Students with more substantial remedial needs have been offered credit-bearing work but within a more intensive experience that both remediates and carries the student through general education proficiency. At the same time, university credit for clearly pre-baccalaureate work is inappropriate, a point that all engaged in the remedial enterprise must continue to bear clearly in mind. Whether in an initial summer or across an initial academic year, this approach can serve two interrelated and equally important objectives: to take away some of the stigma of remediation and, because students will more likely feel that they belong in college, to facilitate their persistence toward graduation.

Principle #6. Campuses should be encouraged to develop, for students who begin their mathematics or English study at a demonstrated “nearly proficient” level, courses that offer baccalaureate credit while requiring enrolled students to meet specific proficiency objectives along with goals for general education.

7. Use technology-assisted approaches where promising and feasible.

Several campuses have turned to new technology and computer-aided instruction in remedial education, especially in mathematics. CSU Fullerton’s online short course for students with a high but (barely) failing score on the ELM has been very successful in getting these students prepared fully for baccalaureate-level mathematics. ALEKS, the web-based mathematics assessment and learning system, has been used extensively and effectively at CSU Fresno and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. CSU Los Angeles reports that pass rates in remedial mathematics have improved with the use of an online homework package.
These initiatives are congruent with CSU’s Transforming Course Design (TCD) initiative, in which campuses are encouraged to improve student learning via Internet-based learning while simultaneously addressing the issue of instructional costs. Internet-based instruction may increase students’ access to learning, and can easily provide individually-tailored programs. It further provides faculty with critical information on the performance and time spent on study for each student. The CSU has made funding available to support pilot projects that seek to accomplish these goals, and anticipates ramping up the TCD approach very substantially in the next three years.

Principle #7. All campuses are encouraged to develop and use technology-assisted, Internet-based learning programs for remedial English and mathematics. Consortial efforts that involve several campuses in the development of these programs are encouraged.

8. Review and validate the various CSU assessments for placement in English and mathematics

The CSU is planning a regular review and validation of the English Placement Test (EPT), the Entry-Level Mathematics (ELM) examination, in conjunction with validation studies of the Early Assessments of Readiness for College-Level English and Mathematics (EAP English and EAP Mathematics) and cut-scores on the SAT/ACT, two other methods for establishing exemption from the need to take the EPT and ELM. In light of the campus experiments with direct self-placement and placement in credit-bearing courses, the standard validation and extended research may provide more refined considerations regarding the ranges of student readiness and the interpretations we draw from them.

Principle #8. A review and validation study of the EPT, ELM, and other related instruments (such as EAP, SAT, and ACT) should be undertaken, and the results used to inform campus experimentation with directed self-placement and other innovative remediation placement practice.
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Graduate Business Fee

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), while recognizing the need to adequately fund high cost and high demand graduate programs, recommend that the Board of Trustees (BOT) reject the proposal to implement a $210/unit supplementary fee on students enrolled in graduate business programs as presented to the BOT in September 2007; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse the following principles:

   a. The CSU must make every effort to meet its financial needs without increasing costs for students and potential students.

   b. Proposals to determine student fees on the basis of the discipline program in which the students are enrolled, or on the basis of the potential economic benefit accruing to students in a given program, must be carefully considered for their impact on both affected students and on all other programs in the CSU.

   c. Proposals to determine student fees on the basis of discipline must take into account the diversity of CSU’s constituent universities and the differing situations of degree programs

; and be it further
3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU acknowledge the serious financial challenges faced by American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) -accredited business degree programs in the CSU in meeting the requirements for accreditation; and be it further

4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recognizes the market-based constraints faced by such programs seeking to hire and retain high-quality faculty; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s Office to work with the Executive Committee of the ASCSU as well as faculty in Business and other disciplines to craft an approach to meeting these challenges – and similar challenges facing the CSU in other disciplines. This approach should not unduly burden students, does not create unwarranted inequalities among programs, does not move significantly in the direction of “privatizing” CSU programs, and is situated within the broader context of a clearly defined policy governing differentiation of fees by discipline.

RATIONALE: The proposal to introduce a special fee for students in graduate business programs, as presented in the BOT agenda in September, has divided faculty. Most faculty, especially in Business, recognize that the demands of the AACSB accreditation process have created serious difficulties and financial problems for colleges and schools of business in the CSU and for the universities of which they are a part. However, most faculty, including many faculty in Business, are also concerned that resolving these problems in the manner foreseen in the September 2007 BOT agenda raises serious problems. First, as the draft of the “Access to Excellence” strategic plan stresses, the CSU cannot address its fiscal challenges through “privatization.” Student fees have nearly doubled in the past six years and it is likely that fees will rise again next year. An additional increase of about $10,000 in
the cost of a graduate business degree could, in this context, have a potentially serious impact on how higher education in general is funded. Second, any proposal to implement fees differentiated by discipline would be precedent-setting and have broad implications for the mission of the CSU. This would be the first time that the CSU enacted a fee based largely on the personal benefit accruing to the individual student rather than on the societal benefit provided by an educated populace. Third, many faculty are concerned that consultation regarding the graduate business fee took place, before the September board meeting, almost exclusively among business faculty, deans of colleges and schools of business, and the executive leadership of the CSU, with little to no involvement of faculty in other disciplines, the ASCSU, and campus senates. Finally, many faculty are concerned that other high-cost programs will also turn to discipline-based fees to address fiscal problems that are fundamentally systemic. This could create an unfortunate multi-tiered system of more and less affluent programs and undermine the solidarity of faculty and students to the detriment of all.

At the same time, however, programs outside colleges and schools of business are currently in effect subsidizing business programs. This is also the situation of other high-cost degree programs. To maintain accreditation and hire faculty, colleges and schools of business must now rely on the general university budget, thereby leaving fewer resources for other programs. The AACSB has specific and stringent standards for the quantity and quality of academically and professionally qualified faculty. Some CSU colleges and schools of business are under pressure to meet these standards, which require greater research and lower workloads than most CSUs can afford. Maintaining AACSB accreditation is widely
recognized by many faculty and students in business disciplines as critical to preserving the appeal and quality of their programs.

Enrollments in graduate business programs in the CSU have declined by roughly 20% in recent years. In addition, only limited numbers of students from underserved populations – especially African-American and Hispanic students – are enrolled in such programs. It is not clear what impact such a fee increase might have on these enrollments. Nor has it been entirely clear how the $210 fee level was determined and the extent to which alternative proposals have been considered.

It is possible for the CSU to address the challenges posed by inadequate funding – for both business programs and the CSU in general – on the basis of clear criteria for the implementation of discipline-based fees and in a manner that places minimal burdens on students and does not adversely impact other programs or the ability of the CSU to provide broadly accessible and affordable high-quality degree programs for all segments of California’s population.
Role and Responsibilities of the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee

1. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommends that the proposed CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee (AS-2793-07) assume the responsibility to ensure independence and autonomy of each Ed.D Doctorate program, and be it further

2. RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommends that the proposed CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee (AS-2793-07) assume the responsibility for implementing the recommendations intended to promote and establish the CSU as a center of “High Quality Ed.D programs in Educational Leadership” as specified in AS-2792-07.

RATIONALE: The consultation and collaboration recommended in AS-2792-07 is an appropriate and fundamental responsibility that can be provided by the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee.
High Quality Ed.D. Programs in Educational Leadership

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that the offices of the CSU Chancellor, the ASCSU, and the Ed.D. program faculty collaboratively provide leadership to assure that all of our new Doctorate in Educational Leadership programs:

- Respond to the unprecedented opportunities and challenges facing the public schools and community colleges;
- Prepare graduates who will provide effective leadership in the rapidly changing reform environment characterized by intense accountability amidst widespread skepticism about school and college effectiveness;
- Restore California’s public schools and community colleges to positions of national prominence where excellence in student achievement results from the vision of educational leaders prepared by the CSU;
- Become national models in professional doctoral level education through student and faculty formulation of solutions to seemingly intractable student achievement problems, and the implementation of new curricula for the preparation of courageous, inspiring, and successful public school and community college leaders for the 21st century; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that the offices of the CSU Chancellor, the ASCSU, and the Ed.D. program faculty consider the following activities:

- Sponsorship of a series of system-wide colloquia on the most promising research and practices in educational leadership,
- Establishment of organized research units that advance scholarship and inquiry in educational leadership,
- Sponsorship of conferences or similar events for the dissemination of research findings and validated practices to demonstrate that the faculty and our future graduates have contributed significantly to improving student achievement in our public schools and community colleges.

RATIONALE: California State Senate Bill 724 (SB 724) was passed by both the Assembly and the Senate and signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger for the express purpose of meeting the state-wide demand for excellent educational leaders who can improve the academic performance of students in our K-12 schools and colleges. Our state legislators included a provision in the legislation requiring the CSU to demonstrate the effectiveness of the new programs in terms of student achievement gains by 2011. To meet this challenge, the new Ed.D.
programs will need to effect new synergies in teaching and leadership, theory and application, and scholarship and practice. A coordinated system-wide effort is needed to ensure the highest quality and effectiveness of all our new Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership.

Approved Unanimously – May 10-11, 2007
Establish a CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) call for the establishment of a CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee that will serve as the primary recommending policy and procedures body for education doctorate programs within the CSU and asks the Executive Committee to initiate discussions with the Executive Vice Chancellor for the purpose of establishing the Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly recommend that the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee replicate the model for shared CSU governance which has been successfully utilized for the General Education Program, i.e. the General Education Advisory Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly recommend membership of the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee be collaboratively developed between the Executive Committee and Chancellor’s Office with initial membership to include Senate appointments (including the Chairs of the committee on Teacher Education & K-12 Relations and Academic Affairs Committee, Chancellor’s Office designees, representatives of campus Ed.D. programs, and doctoral candidates, and adjunct faculty members representing the K-12 and community college communities, and it is understood that faculty will serve a predominant role in the membership of this committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the charge to the Committee include review and recommendation of: changes to Title 5; implementation guidelines in the areas of curriculum, faculty roles and responsibilities; development of resource/budget guidelines and research and faculty development support; and oversight of the legislatively mandated evaluation of the Ed.D. program; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the current Ed.D. Faculty Consultation Group be renamed the EdD Proposal Review Group and continue to serve as a proposal review and feedback body with the faculty membership recommended to the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee by the Executive Committee of the Senate.

RATIONALE: A systemwide advisory committee on the Ed.D. modeled after the General Education Advisory Committee is proposed to serve as the policy recommending body for the Doctorate in Education programs moving through the development, review and approval process. During the period after the passage of SB 724, two Senate groups have worked on an ad hoc basis to develop, along with the Academic Affairs Division of the Chancellor’s Office, initial policy direction, Title 5 changes, guidance to campuses regarding
academic and curricular policies, and the structure of the proposal development and review process. During campus discussions, issues of resource allocation and workload have surfaced which need to be incorporated into the broader curricular and programmatic policy decisions. As we anticipate the initial start up this fall of Ed.D. programs on several campuses and the continued development of proposals from second and third wave campuses, there is a need for a more formal structure for guiding future decisions. The GEAC model distinguishes between the policy body with broad faculty, community and administrative representation (though faculty dominant) and a course (proposal) review committee.

Approved Unanimously – May 10-11-2007