Plenary Agenda
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday January 20, 2011 10:00 a.m. — 5:00 p.m.

Senate Social – Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee Hosting
5:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

Friday January 21, 2011 9:00 a.m. — 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to order

2. Roll call

3. Approval of agenda

4. Approval of November 4-5, 2010 Minutes

5. Announcements

6. Presentations/Introductions

7. Committee of the Whole – Senate Operations (Thursday, Time Certain 11:30 a.m.)

8. Reports:
   8.1. Chair
   8.2. Standing committees
   8.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
   8.4. Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources (Thursday Time Certain 1:00 p.m.)
   8.5. Allison Jones Senior Fellow for Postsecondary Engagement, Achieve (Thursday Time Certain, 10:30 a.m.)
   8.6. Ken O’Donnell, Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Policy “General Education, Transfer, and Student Success” (Thursday Time Certain 2:00 p.m.)
   8.7. CSU Trustee Linscheid (Friday, Time Certain 2:00 p.m.)
   8.8. Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
   8.9. John Travis, CFA
   8.10. Neil Sanchez, CSSA Liaison
   8.11. William R. Blischke, ERFA Liaison
9. Committee Recommendations

9.1. Commending the California State University for Hosting a National Teacher Education Summit

9.2. Recognition and Commendation for Efforts That Have Increased Rates of Proficiency in Reading and Writing for Entering Freshmen

9.3. Adequate Financial Support for the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)

9.4. Creation of a Task force for Developing System Policies for Online Degree Programs

9.5. Implications of the United States Supreme Court’s Decision in Garcetti v. Ceballos

9.6. Investing in Faculty Resources to Ensure Quality Education in the CSU

9.7. Sale, Distribution or Publishing of Class Materials for Commercial Use

9.8. Fiscal Concerns on Implementation of Early Start Programs

9.9. Call for Intersegmental Collaboration on the Implementation of AB 1295 (Fuller) – Postsecondary Education Nursing Degree Program

9.10. Assessment and Reporting of Results of Early Start Programs

9.11. Resolution Regarding Consultation about the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ (AASCU) Red Balloon Project

9.12. Commendation for Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Support

10. Adjournment
Commending the California State University for Hosting a National Teacher Education Summit

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) extend its appreciation to CSU Trustee Herbert L. Carter and the CSU for taking a proactive stance in support of teacher preparation by convening “A CSU Summit: Transformative Change in the Preparation of Teachers” on February 14, 2011 at the National Academy of Sciences in Irvine; and be it further,

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commend the summit’s recognition of exemplary CSU practices in teacher preparation that clearly warrant dissemination and scaling up in California and nationally; and be it further,

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge the wide participation of attendees, which include deans, faculty, and public education stakeholders; and be it further,

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse “A CSU Summit: Transformative Change in the Preparation of Teachers” and encourage the wide distribution of publications developed as a result of the conference; and be it further,

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

- CSU Board of Trustees
- CSU Chancellor
- CSU Executive Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- CSU Provosts
- CSU Academic Deans
- CSU Academic Senate Chairs
RATIONALE: The majority of the teachers in California received their professional preparation at one or more of the campuses of the California State University (CSU) system. Despite this long-standing dominant role in the education of K-12 teachers, the CSU is only recently being recognized as a strong policy leader, providing structural solutions to improve educational preparation and support. Twenty-two CSU campuses are preparing K-12 teachers in innovative ways, working in close partnership with local schools, focused on preparing outstanding new teachers who are effective with students of diverse backgrounds. Special attention is being given to the challenges of both urban and rural communities, and to preparing new teachers through experiential, engaged, and active learning. A CSU Summit: Transformative Change in the Preparation of Teachers promises to be consistent with these goals. CSU leaders should be commended for undertaking this initiative.
Recognization and Commendation for Efforts that have Increased Rates of Proficiency in Reading and Writing for Entering Freshmen

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize and commend the efforts of California State University faculty and administration for their work and leadership in improving the reading and writing proficiency rates of graduating seniors in the public high schools of California; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize and commend Dr. John Edlund, professor of English and the founding director of the university writing center at Cal Poly Pomona, for his leadership in the development and adoption of the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) currently used in many of the public high schools of California, and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize and commend Nancy Brynelson, Co-Director of the CSU Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR), for her leadership in facilitating the collaboration and training that has brought CSU faculty and their high school colleagues together to work towards improving reading and writing proficiency to high school seniors in the public high schools of California; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize and commend the efforts of the many CSU faculty that continue to work with their high school colleagues as increasing numbers of high school seniors achieve college-ready proficiency in reading and writing; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU expect that partnering and continued collaboration between the CSU and high school faculty and administration will similarly achieve college-ready proficiency rates in both mathematics and reading/writing that fulfills the goals specified in EO 665.

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

- Chancellor’s Office Liaisons
- Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs
- Eric Forbes, Director of Enrollment Management Services
- California Department of Education
- California Board of Education
- CPEC
- CCTC
- CSU Deans of Education
- English Council

RATIONALE: The CSU Expository Reading and Writing Task Force developed both curriculum and professional development materials for the expository reading and writing course (ERWC) now offered to high school students in their junior or senior year. The course was designed to prepare students for college-level English and is aligned with the California English-Language Arts Content Standards. The course assignments emphasize the in-depth study of expository, analytical, and argumentative reading and writing.
This course not only satisfies the 4th year high school "a-g" English requirement, but also will address critical reading and writing problems identified by the CSU English Placement Test Development Committee. The ERWC helps students meet the standards of the English Placement Test (EPT), the expectations of college and university faculty, and the requirements of the California English-Language Arts Content Standards.

The Center for the Advancement of Reading (CAR), part of the CSU Office of the Chancellor, oversees the professional development opportunities for high school English teachers in collaboration with the Curriculum and Steering Committee of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association. Approximately 5,000 English teachers have attended workshops and piloted course modules in their classroom. Of the 1,243 high schools in California, 367 have adopted the ERWC as a 12th grade course with an additional 750 high schools currently offering the course.
#3 Agenda Item

Adequate Financial Support for the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)

1. Resolved: That the ASCSU recognize that it has endured major budget cuts in recent years; and be it further

2. Resolved: That the ASCSU strongly urge the Chancellor to provide adequate funding for the full and effective operation of the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further

3. Resolved: That the ASCSU direct the Executive Committee to prepare a budget trend analysis for delivery to the ASCSU and Chancellor for the years 2000-2010, that demonstrates the decline in financial support for systemwide shared governance in the past ten years; and be it further

4. Resolved: That the ASCSU direct the Executive Committee to request a formal meeting with the Chancellor to discuss the analysis, and the continued viability of the ASCSU, given the severity of budget cuts suffered over the last decade; and be it further

5. Resolved: That the ASCSU request that its members forward a copy of the Executive Committee’s report to their campus Senates, and ask their Senates to endorse this resolution or develop one of their own in support of the ASCSU’s request to the Chancellor for adequate funding; and be it further
6. Resolved: That the ASCSU direct the Executive Committee to develop and present to the ASCSU a prioritized list of administrative initiatives that involve ASCSU participation, so that the ASCSU, given declining resources, may assess which initiatives warrant its continued commitment; and be it further

7. Resolved: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: Over the last ten years, the ASCSU has made a concerted effort to demonstrate its willingness to adapt to reduced state support for the CSU by altering the size of the Senate, moving to virtual or teleconference interim meetings when appropriate, encouraging individual members to participate virtually or by teleconference in systemwide committee and taskforce meetings when possible, accepting cuts in staffing levels and adhering closely to all CSU travel policies. However, the severity of budget cuts has reached the point where the continued viability of the ASCSU is called into question. To address the situation, this resolution directs the Executive Committee to take specific steps to encourage the Chancellor to consider restoring ASCSU funding to appropriate levels, calls upon the Chancellor to provide such support and encourages campus senates to support the ASCSU request to the Chancellor to for adequate funding. It also provides a mechanism for the Senate to decide which administrative initiatives warrant continued commitment in a substantial decline in available resources.
Creation of a Taskforce for Developing System Policies for Online Degree Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urges the Chancellor to convene a taskforce to study and recommend guidelines for online degree programs proposed by CSU campuses; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the taskforce should include representatives from CSU Academic Affairs staff, and campuses; including Provosts, Academic Technology experts, students, and ASCSU Senators; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That CSU Trustees be invited to serve on this Taskforce; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the taskforce be charged with studying policies regarding online degree programs at other multi-campus educational systems and formulating policy recommendations to the Office of the Chancellor for evaluating and sustaining such programs in the CSU, and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to

- the Board of Trustees,
- the Office of the Chancellor,
- the Chancellor,
- campus Presidents,
- campus Senate Chairs,
- campus Senate Executive Committees,
• Provosts,
• California Faculty Association,

RATIONALE: It is expected that the number of online degree programs being offered by the CSU will be increasing over the next several years. Much work has been done by the system on issues related to online learning, (e.g. a taskforce dealing with learning management systems; a recently constituted taskforce looking at expansion of course and programs to better serve underserved areas and people through distance learning, increasing the number of graduates in Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics [STEM] fields, and providing additional opportunities for working professionals; and a planning document dealing with online program planning). Recently, the Legislative Analyst’s Office released the report The Master Plan at 50: Using Distance Education to Increase College Access and Efficiency (see http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2010/edu/distance_ed/distance_ed_102510.pdf). This report highlights issues relative to distance learning and calls on the State’s public systems of higher education to look into ways that distance education can be used to better serve California’s students.

To date, there does not seem to have been an effort to develop criteria that can be used at the system level for deciding when a new online program should be approved. Given the limitation of resources being faced by the CSU and the fact that online programs are not geographically constrained, it does seem worthwhile that a taskforce look into this issue.
Implications of the United States Supreme Court’s Decision in Garcetti v. Ceballos

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) express its concern that lower courts may use the United States Supreme Court's 2006 decision in Garcetti v. Ceballos, 126 S. Ct. 1951 (2006) (http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/05pdf/04-473.pdf) to restrict academic freedom; in Garcetti v. Ceballos the Supreme Court held that when public employees speak “pursuant to their official duties, the employees are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline,” as comprehensively examined in the 2009 report of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), "Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom after Garcetti v. Ceballos;" (http://www aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/postgarcettireport.htm) and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage all CSU faculty and campus senates to learn about the implications of this decision and subsequent lower court rulings that have applied the decision to public colleges and universities; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge campus senates to provide and/or enforce policies that (a) expressly protect faculty participation in institutional governance as a dimension of academic freedom, and (b) clarify that faculty speech including but not limited to classroom teaching and research and extramural utterances merits both constitutional and institutional
protection, but (c) need not and probably should not expressly use the language of “matters of public concern” lest general First Amendment standards that apply to public employee speech inappropriately be applied to speech that should be protected by academic freedom; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU and campus administrators to reaffirm their commitment to the protection of academic freedom and acknowledge that as an educational institution based on shared governance, academic freedom extends to faculty statements on university operations and the administration; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, and campus Provosts.

RATIONALE: In 2006, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the case of Garcetti v. Ceballos that public employees are not protected by the First Amendment when they speak about matters of public concern as part of their official duties. Although the Court indicated in its decision that it might not apply to the academic environment, lower courts have increasingly employed this ruling as a rationale for limiting faculty speech with respect to university affairs.

Among the most recent of such rulings, in May 2010 a U.S. District Court rejected claims by a University of South Alabama faculty member that the First Amendment protected her complaints about a lack of diversity in hiring decisions. In March of 2010, a separate U.S. District Court held that two professors of nursing at Medgar Evers College in New York were not protected by the First Amendment when they complained about the management of
their academic department to the College’s union representative, a grievance officer, and administrators. For more background on the application of Garcetti v. Ceballos to higher education see "Evaporating First Amendment?"


In an extensive report on the implications of Garcetti v. Ceballos, the AAUP urged faculty, academic senates, faculty unions, and university administrations to respond to the courts' use of this ruling to limit academic freedom. This important report is available at [http://www(aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/postgarcettireport.htm](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/A/postgarcettireport.htm). Earlier this year the AAUP reached agreement with the University of Delaware on a collective bargaining agreement that, among other things, addressed the report's concerns. The relevant portion of this agreement reads:

In the furtherance of the purpose of this Agreement, the parties agree to adhere to the following Statement on Academic Freedom.

Academic freedom is the freedom to teach, both in and outside the classroom, to conduct research and other scholarly or creative activities, and to publish or otherwise disseminate the results. Academic freedom also encompasses the freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. Faculty have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any social, political, economic, or
other interest. The freedoms enumerated in this policy apply without institutional discipline or restraint save for statements or actions that demonstrate disciplinary incompetence or that violate the University’s Professional Ethics Statement or the University’s standards pertaining to disruptive behavior. Alterations to these statements made subsequent to the signing of this Agreement do not affect the freedoms enumerated in this Article unless ratified by the UD-AAUP. Academic responsibility implies the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that, when one is speaking as a citizen on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.

It is understood that this Agreement in no way diminishes the responsibility of faculty, of department chairpersons, and of deans, directors and other appropriate administrative officials for the exercise of academic judgment.
Investing in Faculty Resources to Ensure Quality Education in the CSU

1. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU call on the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to take concrete steps to comply with ACR 73; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to make recruitment and retention of the faculty workforce a priority as the CSU recovers from the exigencies of California's dire budget situation regardless of the status of specific budget line item requests; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU strongly urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to continue to advocate aggressively with the Department of Finance, the Legislature and the Governor's Office, as they did in the 2009-2010 budget request, for the additional funding necessary to implement fully the goals jointly agreed upon by the ASCSU, the California Faculty Association, and the Office of the Chancellor in *A Plan to Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the California State University*; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to issue annual reports on their progress toward restoring and building the faculty workforce; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Office of the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, campus Presidents, campus Senate chairs, the California Faculty Association, and the Legislative Leadership.

RATIONALE: The plethora of initiatives to improve student retention, improve graduation rates, increase learning effectiveness, and "re-imagine the university" highlight the urgent need for qualified, full-time, permanent faculty who provide the baseline quality education which our students deserve. All of those initiatives depend heavily upon an energetic and engaged faculty. As noted in the 2009-2010 CSU Budget Request.

There is growing alarm that recent hiring trends in higher education, necessitated by recovery from prior-year budget deficiencies, competitive salary lags, increasing student demand, and limited enrollment growth funding support, upset an appropriate balance between tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturer faculty. The trend is important because tenured and tenure-track faculty bear the primary responsibility for student advising, program development and revision, and participation in shared governance. When the proportion of tenure/tenure-track faculty declines within the CSU, the quality of these efforts also wanes.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges [WASC], as the accreditation agency for CSU campuses, is an important voice in setting standards and policy for our campuses. WASC standards and Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) echo the Budget Request's
assertion that sufficient instructional staffing is crucial to developing and maintaining instructional effectiveness:

3.3 Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.

GUIDELINE: The institution has an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty with appropriate backgrounds, by discipline and degree levels. The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review and faculty development.

Finally, CSU's strategic plan, Access to Excellence, acknowledges the necessity of ensuring that the CSU, "anticipate what the people of the state will need from the CSU in the next decade, and generally indicates how best to position the institution to meet those needs." The strategic plan identifies three priorities, one of which is to sustain institutional excellence through investments in faculty and staff, innovation in teaching, and increased involvement of undergraduates in research and in their communities. In pursuit of that priority the Board has committed the CSU to:

Plan for faculty turnover and invest in faculty experience. The CSU will develop a comprehensive plan for reinvestment in its faculty to meet its goals of reducing
compensation gaps and increasing the number of tenure-track faculty. In addition, the CSU commits to a comprehensive faculty planning effort, to include turnover planning, attention to recruitment and retention practices, and consideration of faculty development and evaluation strategies to support excellence in both pedagogy and scholarship.

Clearly the CSU is cognizant of the need for an "appropriately balanced" faculty to enable our provision of high quality education for our students. Equally clearly, we recognize that the budget challenges California and the CSU have faced over the past several years have constrained our ability to successfully meet that need. However, groups as diverse as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the CSU Board of Trustees, the Legislature of California and WASC have highlighted the reality that we must seek out, recruit and retain a larger number of tenured/tenure-track faculty so that we can make progress on the goals we have set for ourselves. It is critical that we take steps toward meeting the ACR 73 mandate, toward rebuilding the ranks of a faculty that are deeply committed to student success and who can become the vanguard of our "re-imagined" universities.
Sale, Distribution or Publishing of Class Materials for Commercial Use

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) affirm California Education Code (CEC) Section 66450; and Section 41301, Subsection (b) (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=66001-67000&file=66450-66452) of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, both of which prohibit the sale, distribution or publishing of class materials for commercial purpose, said Sections serving as important safeguards of faculty intellectual property rights; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU thank the Chancellor’s Office for its strong and immediate response to the recent launching of the NoteUtopia website, which included an advisory e-mail to approximately 30,000 students as well as a letter to the website founder informing them of the CEC and Title 5 violations; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU affirm its commitment to working closely with the Chancellor’s Office, whenever possible, to ensure adherence to the provisions of the CEC and Title 5, both as they relate to issues of faculty intellectual property rights, as well as other matters that affect the integrity of California’s educational mission; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, Chancellor’s Office of General Counsel, the founder of NoteUtopia.com, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.
RATIONALE: CEC Section 66450 prohibits any business or person from selling or otherwise distributing or publishing class notes for a commercial purpose. In addition, Section 41301, Subsection (b)(14) of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, which is the Student Conduct Code that governs all students at the 23 CSU campuses, prohibits the “unauthorized recording, dissemination, or publication of academic presentations (including handwritten notes) for a commercial purpose.” The most recent actions of the Chancellor’s Office in response to NoteUtopia represent an important safeguarding of faculty intellectual property rights in particular, as well as the broader issues addressed by the CEC and Title 5.
Fiscal Concerns on Implementation of Early Start Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the efforts of the CSU Board of Trustees to ensure student success; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Administration to ensure that implementation of Early Start programs does not result in qualified students being denied access to the CSU due to program funding issues or financial concerns; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU Administration to also consider the fiscal impact to campuses; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU is concerned that implementation problems with Early Start programs may hamper student access and enrollment at CSU campuses. Fiscal concerns include student affordability and the need for financial assistance, the necessity of students to work in the summer to support themselves and their families, program funding, and inter campus transfer of funds, all of which leads to the urgent need to take steps to alleviate those problems.
Call for Intersegmental Collaboration on the Implementation of AB 1295 (Fuller) – Postsecondary Education Nursing Degree Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) call for intersegmental collaboration on the implementation of AB 1295 (Fuller) – Postsecondary Education Nursing Degree Programs; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the California Community Colleges (CCC) to advise students to complete either CSU GE Breadth or IGETC for lower division CCC nursing general education requirements; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, campus Senate Chairs, Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, California Community Colleges’ Board of Governors, and Assemblymember Fuller.

RATIONALE: AB 1295 added Section 89267.5 to the California Education Code related to nursing degree programs. Section 2 of this legislation (see attachment to this report) mandated that the CSU Chancellor implement articulated nursing degree transfer pathways between the CCC and the CSU prior to the start of the 2012-2013 Academic Year. The legislation additionally required that CSU campuses shall not require ADN to BSN students to complete any duplicative courses either required by the California Board of Registered Nursing (BRN) for nursing licensure, or the CCC associate degree in nursing and that CSU
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The campuses shall not require ADN to BSN students who have taken prerequisite courses at CCC to earn the associate degree in nursing to take the same courses at the CSU.

The AB1295 Implementation Workgroup was established in the Fall, 2009 to address issues related to implementation of the law by 2012-2013. Comprised of members including nursing leaders, nursing directors, and nursing faculty members from both the CCC and the CSU as well as members of the CSU and CCC Chancellor's Office staff, the workgroup has been meeting regularly since 2009. The AB1205 Implementation Workgroup examined challenges in the development of streamlined transfer pathways including standardization of nursing pre-requisite courses, nursing pre-licensure curricula (as mandated by the California Board of Registered Nursing), collaborative working relationships between CSU and the CCC nursing programs, and seamless transfer of lower division general education courses from the CCC to the CSU. The need for the CCC streamlined lower division general education requirements was identified in early workgroup discussions. CSU nursing directors and faculty noted problems associated with the transfer of lower division general education courses from the CCC. Individual community college general education requirements were noted to result in either students requesting transfer to the CSU with many more units than those necessary for transfer or for many students, the need to complete additional lower division general education courses required for CSU nursing baccalaureate programs.

In summary, the AB1295 Workgroup has identified challenges in the development of the seamless transfer pathways mandated in AB1295. Nursing directors and nursing faculty in both the CSU and the CCC continue efforts to standardize all nursing pre-requisite courses, ensure that students transferring from associate degree programs are not completing duplicative pre-licensure nursing courses, and support nursing program collaboratives. The
development of effective articulated nursing degree transfer pathways is made difficult by a lack of CCC systemwide general education requirements. Changes made to ensure that all CCC associate degree nursing programs utilize CSU GE-B or IGETC requirements would serve to facilitate the development of such articulated transfer pathways.
Assembly Bill No. 1295

CHAPTER 283

An act to add Section 89267.5 to the Education Code, relating to nursing degree programs.

[Approved by Governor October 11, 2009. Filed with Secretary of State October 11, 2009.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1295, Fuller. Postsecondary education: nursing degree programs.

Existing law establishes the University of California, the California State University (CSU), and the California Community Colleges as the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. Under existing law, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges is required to encourage community college districts to, and the Chancellor of the California State University is required to, standardize all nursing education program prerequisites on a statewide basis and negotiate and implement articulation agreements among the campuses and districts of these 2 segments.

Existing law expresses the intent of the Legislature to encourage CSU to establish partnerships or collaborations with community colleges to facilitate the education of students in bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) or entry-level master’s nursing programs.

This bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University to implement articulated nursing degree transfer pathways between the California Community Colleges and CSU prior to the commencement of the 2012–13 academic year. The bill would require the articulated nursing degree transfer pathways to meet prescribed requirements.

The bill would authorize the Chancellor of the California State University and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to appoint representatives from their respective institutions to work collaboratively to provide advice and assistance relating to prescribed topics concerning the articulated nursing degree transfer pathways.

The bill would require the Legislative Analyst’s Office, by March 15, 2011, to prepare and submit to the Legislature and Governor a report on the status of plans to implement the articulated nursing degree transfer pathways.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
(a) Access to a quality nursing education through California’s public postsecondary institutions is provided through 74 California Community Colleges and 22 California State University (CSU) campuses.
(b) The California Board of Registered Nursing is responsible for approving the comprehensive and quality nursing curriculum provided through the California Community Colleges and CSU and for licensing registered nurses who pass a standardized licensing exam.

(c) In order for California to meet the demand for an increasingly skilled and educated nursing workforce and to address the critical shortage of nurses throughout the state, it is an economic benefit to the state and students to streamline the community college and the CSU transfer pathway for nursing.

(d) It is estimated that only 20 percent of community college associate degree nurses continue on to obtain a bachelor’s degree.

(e) The lack of a common nursing transfer pathway may result in students being required to take duplicative and unnecessary coursework that prolongs the time required to obtain a degree and increases the cost of education to both the student and state. These unnecessary barriers act as a disincentive for students who wish to continue their postsecondary education to earn the bachelor of science in nursing.

(f) California’s workforce needs increasingly educated nurses to fill public health nursing positions, to proceed toward completion of a master’s degree in nursing, and to fill nursing faculty positions at both the California Community College and CSU level.

(g) A streamlined nursing degree transfer pathway between California Community Colleges and CSU will result in a cost savings to both the student and California, make it less burdensome for community college nursing students to further their education, and reduce the time to degree.

SEC. 2. Section 89267.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

89267.5. (a) As used in this section, “ADN-to-BSN student” means a person who meets all of the following qualifications:

1. The person has earned an associate degree in nursing from a California Community College from a program approved by the Board of Registered Nursing.
2. The person is licensed to work in California as a registered nurse.
3. The person is applying to the California State University to earn a bachelor of science in nursing.

(b) Prior to the commencement of the 2012–13 academic year, the Chancellor of the California State University shall implement articulated nursing degree transfer pathways between the California Community Colleges and the California State University. The articulated nursing degree transfer pathways shall, at a minimum, comply with both of the following requirements:

1. A campus of the California State University shall not require an ADN-to-BSN student to complete any duplicative courses for which the content is already required by the Board of Registered Nursing for licensure or that the student has already satisfied by earning the associate degree in nursing and becoming licensed as a registered nurse.
2. A campus of the California State University shall not require an ADN-to-BSN student, who has taken a prerequisite course at a California community college to earn the associate degree in nursing, to take the same
prerequisite course or same content from that prerequisite course at the university for the bachelor of science in nursing degree.

(c) The Chancellor of the California State University and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges may appoint representatives from their respective institutions to work collaboratively to provide advice and assistance on either or both of the following:

(1) Implementation of the articulated nursing pathways.

(2) Identification of additional components to be included that are consistent with providing ADN-to-BSN students with a streamlined nursing degree transfer pathway consistent with the finding in subdivision (g) of Section 1 of the act that adds this section.

(d) By March 15, 2011, the Legislative Analyst’s Office shall prepare and submit to the Legislature and the Governor a report on the status of plans to implement articulated nursing degree transfer pathways between the California Community Colleges and the California State University. This report may be part of its annual budget report to the Legislature.
Assessment and Reporting of Results of Early Start Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that the Office of Chancellor develop a comprehensive assessment plan to ascertain the degree to which the goals specified in Executive Order 1048 have been met; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that data collected be used to determine for students requiring remediation in writing and/or mathematics whether early start programs achieve significant differences in reducing both the time-to-degree and its associated costs, and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the report include 1) a summary of campus level processes established to allow students to appeal for exceptions to the mandate to begin early start remediation in the summer before they begin matriculation at their destination campus and 2) calculations of the numbers of appeals and the percentage granted; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that benchmarks be established for early start programs against which success can be assessed and appropriate cost/benefit analysis used to ascertain the effectiveness of these programs; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that an annual assessment report be developed which would document the assessments made along with findings and recommendations.

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

- Chancellor Reed, California State University
- CSU Board of Trustees
- Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim Smith
- Educational Policies Committee of the CSU Board of Trustees
- Campus Senates
- Campus Provosts
- Math Council
- English Council

RATIONALE: On May 12-13, 2009, the CSU Board of Trustees passed a resolution requiring the development of “policies required to achieve a full-scale implementation of pre-matriculation programs throughout the CSU, including a timeline for implementation.” The proposal and timeline were presented to the Board of Trustees in March 2010. Early Start was defined as the summer course or activity in which students admitted to the university deemed not to be proficient in math and/or English must enroll before entering the university. The rationale for Early Start emanates from efforts to enhance retention and improve graduation rates by helping students to achieve basic proficiency in Mathematics and reading/writing more quickly. The mandate to implement early start programs on each campus was formalized in EO 1048.
The intent of the early start initiative was to provide those students needing remediation in math and/or English the opportunity to either complete or reduce the number of units or courses needed to reach proficiency before the beginning of their first fall term. The expectation is that these students would therefore reduce if not eliminate the number of units taken, which do not count towards the degree. The outcome should be a reduction in time to degree as well as a reduction in cost to the student. The goal was to achieve significant reduce time-to-degree and costs for those students not proficient in math and/or English. Clearly, assessments are needed to demonstrate the efficacy of early start programs and serve as indicators of program improvement that might be needed.

In establishing a benchmark against which the Early Start programs can be assessed, comparison can be made between the time currently taken to achieve proficiency and the time taken after the Early Start programs are initiated. The time comparisons can be calculated in units taken, those that do not count towards the degree, after the student begins matriculation in their first fall term.

As recommended by the Early Start Task Force (February 15, 2010), an assessment plan should require that each campus implement standardized assessments that include, but are not limited to, the following assessment measures.

Average number of units required to reach proficiency after freshmen begin their first term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>Current Averages</th>
<th>Post Early Start Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Freshmen Cohort Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>4 Year</th>
<th>5 Year</th>
<th>6 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not proficient at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freshmen Cohort Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
<th>2 Year</th>
<th>4 Year</th>
<th>6 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not proficient at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Success

- First year GPA and academic standing
- Grades in GE math and English

Comparisons between Under-Represented-Minorities (URMs) and non Under-Represented-Minorities (non URMs) as well as ESL and non-ESL cohorts.
Early Start Program Cost

- **Student Cost.** Fees charged (based on the number of Early Start units taken) and fees covered by financial aid and out-of-pocket cost to students.

- **Campus Cost.** Average program cost per student.
MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

SUBJECT: The Early Start Program — Executive Order No. 1048

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No.1048 on the establishment of the Early Start Program as mandated by the California State University Board of Trustees at its May 2010 meeting.

The new executive order is designed to facilitate a student’s graduation through changes in policies on fulfilling entry-level proficiencies in mathematics and English.

In accordance with 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.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please call Dr. Jeri Echeverria, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer at (562) 951-4710 or Mr. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, at (562) 951-4744.

CBR/nlp

Attachment

c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
    Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
    Vice Presidents, Student Affairs
Executive Order: 1048
Effective Date: June 2010
Supersedes: No prior Executive Order
Title: Early Start Program

This executive order is issued pursuant to Section 40402.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, and Section II (a) of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and is effective beginning with summer 2010 academic terms (semester or quarter).

This executive order establishes a program for CSU admitted freshmen who have not demonstrated proficiency in mathematics and/or English as established by CSU faculty. As of summer 2012, incoming freshmen who have not demonstrated proficiency in English and/or mathematics will be required to begin remediation prior to the term for which they have been admitted, e.g., summer prior to fall. All students will be required to have achieved proficiency in English and/or mathematics on or before the end of their first year of enrollment at a CSU campus, as directed by Executive Order 665.

If admitted freshmen have begun addressing deficiencies in mathematics and/or English in a recognized CSU program before enrollment, they will be permitted to enroll for the term for which they have been admitted, whether they have completed the remediation or not. If they have not started to address a deficiency in either mathematics and/or English, they will not be permitted to enroll at the CSU campus of their admission unless they have applied for an exception, and the requirement has been waived due to extraordinary circumstances. Students who have not registered in a proficiency activity (course, program, workshop, approved activity, etc.) that is intended to lead to proficiency before the first day of the semester or term upon which they plan to matriculate, may be disenrolled from courses in their first regular semester. The same shall be true if they drop and/or withdraw from the course, program, or activity and have not received an exception.

Deficiencies in mathematics and/or English are to be determined by test scores on the Early Assessment Program (EAP) taken at the end of 11th grade in a California public high school, or the Entry Level Mathematics Exam (ELM) and/or the English Placement Test (EPT) taken during the senior year of high school. As stated earlier, students who test below the prescribed
“cut scores” for each exam will be required to enroll in appropriate remedial classes or programs in either or both subject areas before enrolling in CSU as freshmen.

A. Administration of the Early Start Program

Each CSU campus will design a program for incoming freshmen to develop proficiency in mathematics and/or English before they enroll as matriculated freshmen. In consultation with the faculty of English and mathematics, campuses shall design a plan for implementation of the Early Start Program in spring and fall 2010 and submit their plans for review to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer (EVC/CAO) by Friday, November 19, 2010.

Once approved by the Early Start Implementation Team and the EVC/CAO, campuses will begin to make adjustments in their curriculum and related plans so that they may begin offering Early Start Programs in summer 2012 at the latest.

The Early Start Implementation Team will have the principal responsibility for monitoring and overseeing the Early Start Program. In so doing, it will assume the following responsibilities:

- oversee the implementation of the program as designated by the Board of Trustees;
- consider recommendations for program modifications;
- oversee the development of program assessment; and
- consider and make recommendations regarding re-setting (raising or lowering) proficiency scores.

The Implementation Team will work closely with the faculty of the English and Mathematics Councils but will retain oversight for the Early Start Program.

Membership of the Implementation Team will consist of:

- two provosts or vice presidents for Academic Affairs;
- two vice presidents for Student Affairs;
- one institutional research officer;
- one enrollment services/admissions officer;
- three faculty (the Statewide Academic Senate, the Mathematics Council, and the English Council will each be asked to recommend one member);
- two students (the California State Student Association will be asked to recommend two members);
- one dean of Undergraduate Studies/associate vice president for Academic Programs; and
- one assistant vice chancellor appointed by the EVC/CAO.

Membership on the Implementation Team will be staggered in 1-, 2-, and 3-year terms such that membership rotates in thirds and so that no member serves a term longer than three years. Members may serve two terms. A chair will be selected from the group for a two-year term and no member may serve as chair for more than one consecutive term. Seven members constitute a quorum. The group will be staffed by the Chancellor’s Office and will report to the EVC/CAO.
In addition, members of the Implementation Team will be involved in preparing information for semi-annual reports to the chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

**B. Programmatic Requirements**

The Board of Trustees of the California State University has mandated the following programmatic requirements for the Early Start Program:

1. That all CSU admitted lower division students who fall below designated proficiency scores on the EPT and ELM enroll in appropriate English and/or mathematics remediation classes or programs during the summer prior to the fall term for which they have been admitted. It should be noted that this requirement does not require that students demonstrate proficiency at the end of the summer – only that the remediation has begun.

2. Upon the recommendation of the English Council, the EPT Development Committee, and the Early Start Task Force, the proficiency score on the EPT will be reset from 151 to 147, effective for matriculated students enrolling in summer/fall 2011. Comparable proficiency scores on the SAT and ACT will be reset to correspond to the proficiency score of 147 on the EPT. Proficiency activities will begin in summer/fall 2012. By 2014, it is expected that all students needing to develop proficiency in English will enter the Early Start Program.

   Students who score 147 or above on the EPT shall now be placed in General Education (GE) level composition classes, based on practice that has evolved on many CSU campuses over the last decade and on evidence from the 2008 Educational Testing Service (ETS) validity study of the EPT, which confirmed that students scoring 147 or above generally succeed in GE level classes. It is recommended that campuses consider continuing to provide support such as tutoring, writers’ workshops, or “stretch” courses for students scoring between 147 and 150 since such support has contributed to the success of students as demonstrated in the validity study. Students scoring below 147 are measurably less successful, indicating that they continue to need additional coursework in developmental reading and writing. Campuses shall provide that coursework while continuing to develop innovative strategies to promote academic literacy for these students.

3. That the Mathematics Council consider recommending whether the ELM proficiency score should be reset. If so, that recommendation should be submitted to the Early Start Implementation Team on or before November 2010. If it is determined that the ELM proficiency should be reset, comparable proficiency scores on the SAT and ACT will be reset to correspond to the proficiency score established for the ELM.

4. That proficiency scores on the EPT and ELM be reviewed and analyzed every two years by the Early Start Implementation Team in consultation with the Mathematics Council and the English Council, as appropriate.

5. That each CSU campus should develop its own approach to satisfying the requirements of the Early Start Program and submit its plans for the program with a communication plan
intended for students, parents, counselors, and administrators at high schools and community colleges in their service area on or before Friday, November 19, 2010.

Submissions should be mailed to the EVC/CAO.

a. Campus plans should include general plans for any and all curricular modifications related to the Early Start Program. Proficiency activities may be offered in a variety of approaches recommended by appropriate faculty and administrative leadership. Examples might include the following: state supported summer courses, Extended Education Special Session courses, courses offered via a coordinated program developed with regional community colleges, summer bridge programs, online coursework, and other best practices. Final approval will be granted by the EVC/CAO.

b. Campus plans should include an outline of plans to communicate with regional high schools, community colleges, parents and students regarding the Early Start Program.

c. Each plan should also address how exceptions (below) will be addressed and what processes will be implemented for student appeals. Information regarding the Early Start Program and the appeals process should be incorporated in informational materials regarding Early Start as well as the University Catalog.

6. Each campus will determine how to approach consideration of exceptions, and the final authority to grant an exception shall rest with the campus president or his/her designee. General exceptions should be rare and limited to those instances where unavoidable circumstances or challenges can be demonstrated.

7. Any student who has begun and/or partially achieved proficiency in a recognized CSU Early Start Program will have his/her status recognized by all other CSU campuses without further review. The Implementation Team will develop a certification process for campuses to utilize.

8. This executive order shall not affect current evaluation of applications and admissions for international students who are accepted based on their Test of English as a Foreign Language scores or their scores from an equivalent test used by the campus. International students are subject to the first-year requirement of Executive Order 665.
C. Definitions

1. Matriculated Status

“Matriculated status” requires that a student be enrolled in a term for which (s)he has been admitted and in courses, which will be counted towards a degree or credential.

2. Early Entrants

“Early Entrants” for the summer term have been admitted for the fall term and are enrolled for the immediately preceding summer term in coursework that either meets degree requirements or are eligible remedial courses.

D. Financial Aid Eligibility

1. Matriculated students who are required to enroll in remediation during the summer immediately after high school and immediately preceding the fall term shall be classified as “early entrants.”

2. As authorized in the August 12, 2002 letter from the U.S. Department of Education and reaffirmed by the Office of the Chancellor on May 5, 2010, “early entrant” students are eligible for all federal Title IV financial aid if they meet the following conditions:
   a. The student has been admitted to an eligible degree or certificate program for the fall term;
   b. The student is not required to take or complete any coursework or acquire any additional credentials before enrolling in the fall in the eligible degree program;
   c. The student, after being admitted to the eligible program enrolls as an “early entrant” in the summer term immediately preceding the fall term;
   d. The courses these students take in the summer term are not courses that they transfer into their eligible program in the fall. Rather, the students take courses in the summer term that are part of their degree program, either as required courses or elective courses, or are eligible remedial courses;
   e. The summer early entrant students are identified/coded differently by campuses from other students who are enrolled in the summer term but who are not admitted to an eligible degree program; and
   f. The students are otherwise eligible for Federal Title IV student financial assistance.
3. Students who meet the conditions of 1 and 2 above may be eligible to receive Federal Title IV student financial assistance for their enrollment in Early Start summer courses. If they are eligible to receive federal financial aid, all Title IV regulations apply to them. For example, their efforts during the summer must be considered in the school’s measurement of satisfactory academic progress, and to the extent that any of the regulations do not allow individual treatment of students, they must be treated in the same fashion as other eligible students in the consideration of loan and other aid.

4. Pell Grant Eligibility

   a. Students who meet the conditions in 1 and 2 above may be eligible to receive Federal Title IV Pell Grants for Year-Round enrollment, e.g., summer, fall, winter/spring, provided they meet certain unit and academic progress requirements:

      1. The student must have a Pell eligible Expected Family Contribution (EFC) and meet Title IV eligibility requirements;

      2. Summer will be the leading term of the Pell Grant award year;

      3. To receive a Pell Grant for the winter/spring term(s) that would result in the receipt of a second Pell Grant award, the student’s enrollment during this period must advance the student beyond an academic year’s worth of units (typically 24 semester units or 36 quarter units);

      4. During the term in which the student receives funding from a second Pell grant award, the student must be enrolled at least half-time; and

      5. Additional guidance regarding awarding two Pell Grants in an award year will be forwarded to campus financial aid officers at a later date.

E. Implementation Timeline

Planning for the implementation and launching of the Early Start Program will begin in spring 2010. The first phase of the program will be launched in summer 2012 and the second in summer 2014. More specific timelines include the following:

November 2010       Mathematics Council considers ELM proficiency score and submits recommendation.

November 19, 2010   Campus Plans for Early Start Program due to the EVC/CAO.

January 2011        Responses to campus plans due to each campus.
February 2011 Begin campus implementation processes.

Fall 2011 English proficiency score reset from 151 to 147 effective for freshmen admitted to CSU for summer/fall 2011.

Fall 2011 Campuses will begin tracking progress of English students in introductory English who scored above old proficiency scores.

2010 – 2012 Campuses develop required curricular coordination, and develop and publish communication plans.

Summer 2012 Launch Early Start Program in mathematics and for “at risk” English students.

Fall 2012 Begin monitoring, collecting and analyzing campus information on first cohort of Early Start Program (as compared with earlier cohorts).

Fall 2012 Implementation Team will consider and implement appropriate adjustments and plan for second phase of implementation (for all remaining English students).

2012 – 2013 Implementation Team will develop a CSU-level Assessment Program for the Early Start Program in consultation with the English and Mathematics Councils.

Summer 2014 Launch final phase of Early Start in English for all students who have not demonstrated proficiency.

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, on websites, 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.

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: June 11, 2010
Resolution Regarding Consultation about the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ (AASCU) Red Balloon Project

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) reaffirm that according to the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA) the faculty of the California State University (CSU) are to be consulted in matters of curriculum and instruction; and be it further,

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support ongoing faculty efforts to design and review curricula and modes of instruction as needed to support disciplinary and CSU mission goals, and the needs of CSU students and the public at large; and be it further,

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage CSU faculty and campus senates to participate in curricular or instructional activities under the aegis of the AASCU Red Balloon Project only when appropriate consultation with faculty governance bodies has taken place, and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to
   - The Chancellor
   - The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
   - Campus presidents and provosts
   - Campus senate chairs

RATIONALE: The Red Balloon Project is an initiative developed by AASCU to re-imagine and then redesign higher education for the 21st century. The project is national in scope, and of interest to faculty, proposes new models of institutional organization and design (new departmental and college structures)
faculty workload (different kinds of faculty work and the use of part-time faculty, curriculum (limiting degrees to 120 hours, interdisciplinary programs, new designs for general education), course design (reduced seat time, student-centered learning, undergraduate research, project-based learning), and Instructional Design (new forms of student engagement, use of technology in teaching, distance education). 1 There are currently seven CSU campuses participating in the Red Balloon Project, including Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Monterey Bay, San Marcos and Northridge. As the project has clear curricular and instructional implications, the ASCSU is concerned that consultation with appropriate faculty and shared governance bodies takes place.

Commendation for Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Support

WHEREAS, Allison Jones began his career in higher education administration in 1970, and has been employed with the California State University (CSU) since 1985 and the Office of the Chancellor since 1988; and

WHEREAS, Allison Jones has admirably coordinated support to CSU's 23 campuses in the areas of K-12 academic outreach, admission, enrollment management, financial aid, educational opportunity programs, student services, student health, transfer services, disabled student services, and remediation; and

WHEREAS, Allison Jones has capably served on several systemwide, statewide, and national advisory committees that address outreach, admission, enrollment management, transfer, financial aid, and remediation issues; and

WHEREAS, Allison Jones has skillfully served as the chair of the governing boards of ASSIST and CAN as well as the chair of the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee, which is composed of faculty, staff and student representatives from all sectors of California education; and

WHEREAS, Allison Jones has competently served on numerous educational boards and councils including the Scholarshare Investment Board, the Governors Interagency Coordinating Council on the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems, the P-16 Council and the California ACT Advisory Council; and

WHEREAS, given his strong commitment and experience, Allison Jones was appointed by the Chancellor of the CSU to the task force charged with implementing the provisions of the Governor's California Veterans Education Opportunities Partnership in spring 2006; and
WHEREAS, given his extensive experience and knowledge, U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings first appointed Allison Jones to the federal Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, which provides advice and counsel to the Secretary of Education and Congress on student financial aid policy issues in June 2007; and

WHEREAS, after 25 years, Allison Jones will be leaving the CSU to accept the position of Senior Fellow for Postsecondary Engagement with the Achieve organization based in Washington, D.C.; and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate CSU will be worse off for missing Allison Jones’ good humor and well-informed perspectives; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU express our shared appreciation of Allison Jones’ keen dedication to the CSU and outstanding leadership as Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Support especially his oversight of systemwide enrollment management during very challenging times; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU wish Allison Jones the best as he begins the next chapters of his career and life as a national leader in higher education administration.
June 18, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents
FROM: Charles B. Reed
  Chancellor
SUBJECT: General Education Breadth Requirements —
  Executive Order No. 1033

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 1033, relating to California State University General Education Breadth (CSU GE Breadth) requirements.

In response to CSU Trustee initiatives on facilitating graduation and improving intersegmental transfer, the Academic Senate CSU charged the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) to study CSU general education policy, as it was previously outlined in Executive Order 595.

In a truly consultative and intersegmental process, GEAC members collected campus feedback that was informed by faculty, general education leadership, administrators of undergraduate education, directors of admissions and records, and articulation officers, among others. GEAC members, including representatives from CSU and California Community College faculty and administration, have synthesized campus recommendations in this new executive order. The structure and minimum curricular requirements remain unchanged, but the policy emphasis has moved from curricular content to what students learn through the breadth of their general education experiences.

Perhaps the most significant advancement is that this executive order identifies, for the first time, goals for CSU general-education student learning outcomes, in recognition of the CSU’s commitment to the quality of our educational programs. The executive order directs campuses to conduct assessments of general education learning outcomes through regular reviews of their general education courses and breadth programs.

Supporting efforts toward facilitating graduation, this revised policy emphasizes the system-level minima for required general education credits. To improve intersegmental transfer, longstanding policy has been modified to allow the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum to satisfy CSU General
Education Breadth requirements in ways that allow more efficient progress to the degree.

Campuses are expected to coordinate their specific general education requirements with those set forth in this executive order and in Title 5. In accordance with 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.

If you have questions regarding this executive order, please call Dr. Christine Hanson, State University Dean, Academic Program Planning, at (562) 951-4672.

CBR/cmh

Attachment

c: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
Executive Order No. 1033

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

Executive Order: 1033
Effective Date: June 18, 2008
Supersedes: Executive Order No. 595
Title: CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

This executive order is issued pursuant to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 40402.1, 40403, 40405, 40405.1, 40405.2, 40405.4, and 40508, and Sections 1 and 2 of Chapter III of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

This executive order is intended to establish a common understanding of the minimum requirements for CSU General Education Breadth and to provide for the certification of coursework completed by transfer students at regionally accredited institutions. Reciprocity among the CSU campuses for full and subject-area completion of lower-division General Education Breadth Requirements is also addressed in this executive order.

This document also addresses:

- Applicability of the policy (Article 1, page 1),
- Pathways to fulfillment of general education requirements (Article 2, page 2),
- Premises of CSU General Education Breadth (Article 3, page 4),
- Distribution of General Education Breadth units (Article 4, page 6),
- Transfer and articulation (Article 5, page 9),
- Implementation and governance (Article 6, page 16).

Article 1. Applicability

1.1 Prior to Completion of CSU Lower-Division General Education Requirements

The requirements, policies, and procedures adopted pursuant to this executive order shall apply to students enrolling in fall 2008 and subsequent terms who have not previously been enrolled continuously at a campus of
the CSU or the California Community Colleges and who have not satisfied lower-division general education requirements according to the provisions of Title 5 Sections 40405.2 or 40405.3.

1.2 Subsequent to Completion of Entire CSU General Education Requirements

Subsequent to initial completion of all CSU general education requirements (at the lower and upper divisions), a student may not be required to satisfy further exclusively general education requirements associated with an additional major program or baccalaureate degree.

Article 2. Fulfilling General Education Requirements in the CSU

2.1 Pathways

Policies adopted by the Board of Trustees in July 1991 provide three pathways for undergraduate students to fulfill CSU general education requirements:

1. CSU General Education Breadth

Fulfillment of CSU General Education Breadth Requirements (Title 5, Section 40405.1), including the completion of an upper-division requirement consisting of a minimum of nine semester units or twelve quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree; or

2. Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)

Completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) (Title 5, Section 40405.2), as certified by a California community college, plus a minimum of nine upper-division semester units or twelve upper-division quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree; or

3. University of California (UC) Campus Lower-Division

Completion of lower-division general education requirements of a University of California campus (Title 5, Section 40405.3), as certified by that campus, plus a minimum of nine upper-division semester units or twelve upper-division quarter units at the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree. Implementation of this alternative is contingent on development of a formal agreement between the California State University and the University of California.

2.2 Minimum Requirements

2.2.1 General Education Requirements

Every baccalaureate candidate who has not completed either the IGETC or UC-campus pathway specified in Article 2 shall complete
the CSU General Education Breadth requirements described in Article 4, Subsections A through E, totaling a minimum of 48 semester units or 72 quarter units.

2.2.2 Minimum Grades
Each CSU campus shall establish the minimum grades for satisfactory completion of CSU General Education Breadth courses.

2.2.3 Upper-Division Requirement
At least nine of these semester units or twelve of these quarter units must be upper-division level, taken no sooner than the term in which upper-division status (completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units) is attained.

2.2.4 Residency Requirement
Campuses may require that at least nine of the 48 semester units or twelve of the 72 quarter units shall be earned at the campus granting the degree. In all cases, students shall meet the residency requirements specified in Title 5 Section 40403.

2.2.5 Exceptions
Exceptions to the foregoing requirements may be authorized only under the following circumstances:

a. In the case of an individual student, the campus may grant a partial waiver of one or more of the particular requirements of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40405.1, to avoid demonstrable hardship, such as the need to extend the time required for completion of the degree in the case of a senior-level transfer student.

b. In the case of high-unit professional major degree programs, the chancellor may grant exceptions to one or more requirements for students completing the particular program. Such exception must be approved at the campus level prior to initiating a request to the Chancellor’s Office. A full academic justification shall be submitted to the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, Academic Affairs, who shall submit his or her recommendation and the campus recommendation (along with all relevant documents) to the chancellor.

c. Each campus is authorized to make reasonable adjustments in the number of units assigned to any of the five required distribution areas (A through E) if campus requirements and CSU GE-Breadth distribution requirements unduly exceed any of the minimum GE Breadth credit requirements. However, in such cases, the total number of general education units required shall
not be fewer than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units. (No campus is required to adjust normal course credit configurations for the sole purpose of meeting the requirements specified herein.)

2.2.6 Double Counting

2.2.6.1 General Education, Major, and Other Requirements
Through a process of campus-wide curriculum review and approval, campuses may permit the “double counting” of courses for General Education Breadth with major requirements and prerequisites only after giving careful consideration to the impact of such actions on general education programs.

2.2.6.2 General Education and US History, Constitution, and American Ideals Statutory Requirement
CSU campuses may permit up to six semester units or eight quarter units taken to meet the United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40404) to be credited toward also satisfying General Education Breadth Requirements.

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

3.1 Background

CSU General Education Breadth requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons.

These requirements are designed to provide the knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives that will enable CSU students to expand their capacities to take part in a wide range of human interests and activities; to confront personal, cultural, moral, and social problems that are an inevitable part of human life; and to cultivate both the requisite skills and enthusiasm for lifelong learning. Faculty are encouraged to assist students in making connections among disciplines to achieve coherence in the undergraduate educational experience.

Courses approved for GE-Breadth should be responsive to the need for students to have developed knowledge of, or skills related to, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, intellectual inquiry, global awareness and understanding, human diversity, civic engagement, communication competence, ethical
decision-making, environmental systems, technology, lifelong learning and self-
development, and physical and emotional health throughout a lifetime.

3.2 CSU Student Learning Outcomes
Each CSU campus shall define its GE student learning outcomes, to fit within the framework of the four “Essential Learning Outcomes” drawn from the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) campaign, an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

**LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Framework**
- Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Intellectual and Practical Skills
- Personal and Social Responsibility
- Integrative Learning

Within the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes framework, campuses may identify more specific outcomes, such as students’ ability to:

- think clearly and logically;
- demonstrate information competency—finding and examining information critically;
- carry out effective oral communication;
- write effectively;
- apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems;
- make informed, ethical decisions;
- understand and apply the scientific method;
- apply learning from study abroad experiences to general education areas;
- utilize technology in pursuit of intellectual growth and efficacious human interaction;
- demonstrate understanding of human beings as physiological and psychological organisms;
- demonstrate understanding of the physical world in which they live and the life forms with which they share the global environment;
- demonstrate knowledge of cultural endeavors and legacies of world civilizations;
- demonstrate understanding of how human societies have developed and now function;
• apply socially responsive knowledge and skills to issues confronting local or global communities;
• demonstrate life skills such as financial literacy;
• understand and apply the principles, methodologies, value systems, ethics, and thought processes employed in human inquiry;
• engage in lifelong learning and self-development; and
• integrate and apply the insights gained from general education courses.

3.3 Entry-Level Learning Skills

3.3.1 Minimum Competency
Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 40402.1, provides that each student admitted to the California State University is expected to possess basic competence in the English language and mathematical computation to a degree that may reasonably be expected of entering college students.

3.3.2 Remediation
Students admitted who cannot demonstrate such basic competence should be identified as quickly as possible and be required to take steps to overcome those deficiencies. Any coursework completed primarily for this purpose shall not be applicable to the baccalaureate degree.

Article 4 Subject Area Distribution

Instruction approved to fulfill the following subject-area distribution requirements should recognize the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural groups and by women as well as men.

Area A English Language Communication and Critical Thinking
Minimum 9 semester units or 12 quarter units
-one course in each subarea

A1 Oral Communication (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A2 Written Communication (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)
A3 Critical Thinking (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)

A minimum of nine semester units or twelve quarter units in communication in the English language, to include both oral communication (subarea A1) and written communication (subarea A2), and in critical thinking (Area A3), to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.
Students taking courses in fulfillment of subareas A1 and A2 will develop knowledge and understanding of the form, content, context, and effectiveness of communication. Students will develop proficiency in oral and written communication in English, examining communication from the rhetorical perspective and practicing reasoning and advocacy, organization, and accuracy. Students will practice the discovery, critical evaluation, and reporting of information, as well as reading, writing, and listening effectively. Coursework must include active participation and practice in both written communication and oral communication in English.

In critical thinking (subarea A3) courses, students will understand logic and its relation to language; elementary inductive and deductive processes, including an understanding of the formal and informal fallacies of language and thought; and the ability to distinguish matters of fact from issues of judgment or opinion. In A3 courses, students will develop the abilities to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas; to reason inductively and deductively; and to reach well-supported factual or judgmental conclusions.

**Area B  Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning**

**Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units**

- one course each in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td><strong>Physical Science</strong> (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td><strong>Life Science</strong> (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td><strong>Laboratory Activity</strong> associated with a course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td><strong>Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</strong> (3 semester units or 4 quarter units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in a related laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

In subareas B1-B3, students develop knowledge of scientific theories, concepts, and data about both living and non-living systems. Students will achieve an understanding and appreciation of scientific principles and the scientific method, as well as the potential limits of scientific endeavors and the value systems and ethics associated with human inquiry. The nature and extent of laboratory experience is to be determined by each campus through its established curricular procedures.

Courses in subarea B4 shall have an explicit intermediate algebra prerequisite, and students shall develop skills and understanding beyond the level of intermediate algebra. Students will not just practice computational skills, but will be able to explain
and apply basic mathematical concepts and will be able to solve problems through quantitative reasoning.

**Area C  Arts and Humanities**

*Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units*

-at least one course completed in each of these two subareas:

- **C1**  Arts:  Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater
- **C2**  Humanities:  Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages. Across the disciplines in their Area C coursework, students will cultivate intellect, imagination, sensibility and sensitivity. Students will respond subjectively as well as objectively to aesthetic experiences and will develop an understanding of the integrity of both emotional and intellectual responses. Students will cultivate and refine their affective, cognitive, and physical faculties through studying great works of the human imagination. Activities may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however Area C excludes courses that exclusively emphasize skills development.

In their intellectual and subjective considerations, students will develop a better understanding of the interrelationship between the self and the creative arts and of the humanities in a variety of cultures.

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content. Coursework taken in fulfillment of this requirement must include a reasonable distribution among the subareas specified, as opposed to restricting the entire number of units required to a single subarea.

**Area D  Social Sciences**

*Minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units*

A minimum of twelve semester units or eighteen quarter units dealing with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine
issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Students will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D. Coursework taken in fulfillment of this requirement must include a reasonable distribution among the subareas specified, as opposed to restricting the entire number of units required to a single subarea.

Area E  **Lifelong Learning and Self-Development**  
**Minimum of 3 semester units or 4 quarter units**

A minimum of three semester units or four quarter units in study designed to equip learners for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological beings.

Student learning in this area shall include selective consideration of content such as human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, financial literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying and avenues for lifelong learning. Physical activity may be included, provided that it is an integral part of the study elements described herein.

**Article 5. Transfer and Articulation**

This article pertains to regionally accredited non-CSU institutions that certify transfer students’ fulfillment of CSU General education breadth requirements.

**5.1 Premises of General Education Breadth Transfer and Certification**

a. It is the joint responsibility of the public segments of higher education to ensure that students are able to transfer without unreasonable loss of credit or time.

b. The faculty of an institution granting the baccalaureate degree have primary responsibility for maintaining the integrity of the degree program and determining when requirements have been met.

c. There shall ordinarily be a high degree of reciprocity among regionally accredited institutions unless there are specific indications that such reciprocity is not appropriate.

**5.2 Conditions for Participation in CSU General Education Breadth Certification**

Any institution that is accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association and that offers the BA or BS degree or the first two years of such
degree programs may participate in General Education Breadth certification if it agrees to the following provisions:

a. The participating institution shall designate a liaison representative who shall participate in various orientation activities and provide other institutional staff with pertinent information.

b. The participating institution shall identify for certification purposes those courses or examinations that fulfill the objectives set forth in Article 3 of this executive order and such additional objectives as may be promulgated by the chancellor of the California State University.

   1. The courses and examinations identified should be planned and organized to enable students to acquire abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

   2. Interdisciplinary courses or integrated sets of courses that meet multiple objectives of the CSU General Education Breadth requirements may be appropriate components of general education.

   3. Credit units of an interdisciplinary course or integrated set of courses may be distributed among different areas of general education, as appropriate.

c. The CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic Affairs, shall maintain a list of participating institutions’ courses and examinations that have been identified and accepted for certification purposes.

   1. Each entry in the list shall include specification of the area or areas and objectives to which the course or examination relates and the number of units associated with each area or objective. (See Attachment A.)

   2. The list shall be updated annually. Each participating institution shall transmit annually to the CSU Office of the Chancellor, Division of Academic Affairs, any proposed changes to its portion of the list. If a course is to be added or if the specification of areas and objectives for a course is to be modified, the participating institution shall include in its submission the approved course outline. If a course is part of an integrated set of courses, the submission shall identify the set and describe how the course complements the others in the set.

   3. A copy of the list shall be made available in printed or electronic form to any CSU campus or participating institution. Participating institutions are free to share their course outlines and
communications from the CSU about those course outlines with other participating institutions.

4. The participating institution shall be responsible for reviewing periodically its portion of the list to assure that entries continue to be appropriate and to reflect current knowledge in the field. It is also responsible for re-approving entries that are found to have remained appropriate and for directing to the subcommittee of the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee any questions such updating of the courses may have raised as to their congruence with CSU General Education Breadth areas and objectives.

5. The participating institution shall report certification for individual students in a format to be specified.

5.3. Certification Requirements

5.3.1 Definition
General education “certification” shall indicate that a participating institution has verified that a transfer student has met CSU lower-division requirements. CSU campuses shall accept participating institutions’ full certification or subject-area certification, as defined below.

5.3.2 Full Certification

5.3.2.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements
Students admitted to a CSU campus with full certification shall not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements.

5.3.2.2 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Full certification does not exempt students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.2.3 Qualification for Full Certification
To qualify for full certification, a student must satisfactorily complete no fewer than 39 lower-division semester units or 58 lower-division quarter units of instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of Articles 3 (Premises) and 4 (Distribution Areas). Community college certification does not guarantee that all CSU campus admission requirements have been met. The units must be distributed as follows below (except as specified in Subsection 5.3.4 below):
a. In Area A, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking.

b. In Area B, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.

c. In Area C, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities (see Attachment A).

d. In Area D, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with courses taken in at least two disciplines (see Attachment A).

e. Area E, no fewer than 3 semester units (4-5 quarter units).

5.3.3 Subject-Area (Partial) Certification

5.3.3.1 Fulfillment of Lower-Division Requirements by Area
Students admitted to a CSU campus with subject-area certification may not be held to any additional lower-division general education coursework in the subject areas certified.

5.3.3.2 Certification Limits on Credits that Exceed Minimum Subject-Area Requirements
For subject-area certification, campuses are not required to certify credits that exceed the minimum number of units required for the five Subject Areas—A through E.

5.3.3.3 Additional Lower-Division Graduation Requirements
Subject-area certification does not exempt students from completing unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education requirements at the campus awarding the degree.

5.3.3.4 Qualification for Subject-Area Certification
To qualify for subject-area certification, a student must satisfactorily complete instruction appropriate to meet the objectives of one or more subsections of Article 4 (Subject-Area Distribution). Except as specified in Subsection 5.3.4, the units must be distributed as follows:
a. For Area A, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student.

b. For Area B, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), including instruction in mathematics/quantitative reasoning and physical science and life science, at least one part of which must include a laboratory component. A single course may not be certified as meeting more than one subarea for any given student, except for laboratory components incorporated into a physical or life science course.

c. For Area C, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with at least one course in the arts and one in the humanities (see Attachment A).

d. For Area D, no fewer than 9 semester units (12-15 quarter units), with courses taken in at least two disciplines (see Attachment A).

e. For Area E, no fewer than 3 semester units (4-5 quarter units).

5.3.4 Exceptions to Certification Requirements
At the discretion of the campus, exceptions to the requirements for full certification and subject-area certification (as specified above) may be made for programs in which instruction is integrated into a set of courses or into interdisciplinary courses designed to meet multiple objectives. Interdisciplinary courses in this case would be expected to be offered at an appropriately greater number of units.

5.4 Certification of Courses and Examinations

5.4.1 Qualification for Certification
A participating institution may certify completion of courses or examinations taken at other eligible institutions, provided that all such courses and examinations would be identified for certification purposes by the institution offering them.

5.4.2 If so identified, those courses and examinations shall contribute to qualification of a student for either full certification or subject-area certification, as appropriate.
5.4.3 California Community Colleges may include non-CSU upper-division courses in certification of lower-division CSU General Education Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum.

5.5 Limitations of Certification

5.5.1 Restriction to General Education Requirements
Neither full certification nor subject-area certification exempts students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements that may exist outside of the general education program of the campus awarding the degree.

5.5.2 Maximum Number of Credits Allowed

5.5.2.1 Limit on Certification on Total General Education Units
A participating institution shall not certify a student for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent. If more than one participating institution certifies a student, the CSU campus granting the degree is not required to accept certification for more than 39 semester units or the quarter equivalent.

5.5.2.2 Limit on Certification of Units in Areas B through D
A participating institution shall not certify a student for more than 30 semester units (45 quarter units) total in subject areas B through D combined. If more than one participating institution certifies a student, the CSU campus granting the degree is not required to accept certification for more than 30 semester units (45 quarter units) total in subject areas B through D combined.

5.5.2.3 Limit on Requirements After Transfer
Upon transfer, no student shall be required to complete more units in General Education Breadth than the difference between the number certified in accordance with this executive order and the total units in General Education Breadth required by the campus granting the degree.

5.5.2.4 Restrictions on Certification of Upper-Division Courses
Baccalaureate-granting institutions certifying a student for units earned in upper-division courses or examinations may provide certification only for those units that were completed during or after the term in which the student achieved upper-division status (i.e., earned a total of at least 60 semester units or 90 quarter units).
5.6 General Education Reciprocity Among CSU Campuses

5.6.1 Full Lower-Division Reciprocity

a. Full lower-division reciprocity is the process through which all lower-division general education requirements that one CSU campus has designated as having been satisfactorily and entirely completed shall be accepted as fulfilling all lower-division general education requirements of the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree—without regard to differences that may exist between the GE requirements of two campuses.

b. A course or examination is to be regarded as satisfactorily completed if the student’s performance meets the minimum standards for full acceptance toward satisfying a requirement as set by the campus at which the course or examination was taken.

c. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division general education requirements is equivalent to qualification for full certification, as defined in Article 5 above.

5.6.2 Reciprocity as Fulfillment of Full Lower-Division General Education Requirements

Transfer students admitted with documentation of full lower-division general education program completion at another CSU campus shall not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements by the campus awarding the degree.

5.6.3 Reciprocity for Subject-Area General Education Requirements

5.6.3.1 Definition

a. Subject-area lower-division reciprocity is the process through which lower-division general education subject-area requirements designated by CSU campuses as having been satisfactorily completed shall be recognized as fulfilling the corresponding subject-area general education requirements of the CSU campus granting the baccalaureate degree—without regard to differences that may exist in the configuration of the two programs or in the content of the subject area.

b. Students seeking to transfer under the provisions of this section shall be responsible for requesting verification that lower-division general education program or subject-area requirements have been met. Upon the request of a currently or formerly enrolled student, the CSU campus
from which the student seeks to transfer shall determine the extent to which that student has satisfactorily completed the lower-division general education requirements in each subject area, and shall provide official documentation of such completion.

c. For the purposes of this section, completion of lower-division general education subject-area requirements is equivalent to qualification for subject-area certification, as defined above.

d. Transfer students admitted with documentation of completion of one or more general education subject areas at another CSU campus may not be held to any additional lower-division general education requirements in that subject area by the campus awarding the degree.

5.6.4 Reciprocity Limitations
The provisions of Article 5.6 do not exempt students from unmet lower-division graduation requirements of the CSU campus awarding the degree or from lower-division courses required by individual baccalaureate majors at the CSU campus awarding the degree.

Article 6 Implementation and Governance

6.1. General Education Advisory Committee
A systemwide Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee is hereby established. While it is important that the membership of this committee be broadly based, it shall in largest part be drawn from the instructional faculty of the California State University.

At minimum, the membership shall also include Chancellor’s Office staff, one California Community College instructional faculty member, one CSU campus academic affairs administrator, and one articulation officer from the CSU system and one from the California Community College system. Each member of the committee shall have an equal vote.

The chancellor or the executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer may from time to time request that the committee address and provide advice on other issues related to the development and well-being of California State University General Education Breadth policy and programs.
The responsibilities of this committee shall be as follows:

a. To review and propose any necessary revisions in the objectives, requirements, and implementation of CSU General Education Breadth policy to ensure high-quality general education.

b. To continue to study general education policies and practices inside and outside the system and, as appropriate, to stimulate intersegmental discussion of the development of general education curricula.

c. To review the implications of CSU General Education Breadth policy for students transferring to the CSU and for the institutions from which they transfer, and to propose any necessary adjustments to pertinent policies and practices so that students may be better served in their educational pursuits and achievement of the baccalaureate degree.

d. To report as appropriate to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

6.2 Campus Responsibility

6.2.1 Development and Revision of Campus Requirements
Campus faculty have primary responsibility for developing and revising the institution’s particular general education program. Within the CSU General Education Breadth distribution framework, each CSU campus is to establish its own requirements and exercise creativity in identifying courses, disciplines, and learning outcomes. In undertaking this task, careful attention should be given to the following:

a. Assuring that General Education Breadth requirements are planned and organized so that their objectives are perceived by students as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

b. Considering the organization of approved courses so that students may choose from among a variety of “cores” or “themes,” each with an underlying unifying rationale.

c. Periodically reviewing approved courses to ensure that they remain responsive to the essential learning outcomes framework identified in Section 3.2.

d. Using evidence of student attainment of learning outcomes to inform the ongoing design of General Education curriculum and instruction.
e. Considering the possibility of incorporating integrative courses, especially at the upper-division level, that feature the interrelationships among disciplines and traditional general education categories.

f. Providing for reasonable ordering of requirements so that, for example, courses focusing on learning skills will be completed relatively early and those emphasizing integrative experiences will be completed relatively later.

g. Developing programs that are responsive to educational goals and student needs, rather than programs based on traditional titles of academic disciplines and organizational units.

h. Considering possibilities for innovative teaching and learning, including activity as well as observation in all general education coursework.

6.2.2 GE Breadth Requirements and the Development of New Baccalaureate Degrees

The development of new baccalaureate programs shall include consideration of how the degree requirements will incorporate at least the minimum required general education distribution credits, the major program requirements, and other graduation requirements. Justifications must be provided to the Office of the Chancellor for any program extending the baccalaureate credit requirement beyond 120 units (Title 5, Section 40508).

6.2.3 Campus Standing General-Education Committee

The effectiveness of a General Education Breadth program is dependent upon the adequacy of curricular supervision, its internal integrity and its overall fiscal and academic support. Toward this end, each campus shall have a broadly representative standing committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty, and which shall also include student membership, to provide for appropriate oversight and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of these requirements.

6.2.4 General-Education Academic Advising

Each campus shall provide for systematic, readily available academic advising specifically oriented to general education as one means of achieving greater cohesiveness in student choices of course offerings to fulfill these requirements.
6.2.5 **General-Education Review and Assessment**

Each campus shall provide for regular periodic reviews of general education program policies and practices in a manner comparable to those of major programs, including evaluation by an external reviewer. The review should include an assessment of general education student learning outcomes (as designed by campuses in consonance with but not constrained by the objectives stated in Article 3.2 of this executive order).

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: June 18, 2008
Attachment A
Requirements for Certification of CSU General Education Breadth

Area A
English Language Communication and Critical Thinking
References: Article 4-A, Article 5.3.2.3-A, Article 5.3.3.4-A
A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
-one course in each subarea
Oral Communication.................................................................A1
Written Communication............................................................A2
Critical Thinking.................................................................A3

Area B
Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning
References: Article 4-B, Article 5.3.2.3-B, Article 5.3.3.4-B
A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
-one course in subareas B1, B2, and B4, plus laboratory activity related to one of the completed science courses
Physical Science.................................................................B1
Life Science.................................................................B2
Laboratory Activity.............................................................B3
associated with the course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2
Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning...........................................B4

Area C
Arts and Humanities
References: Sections Article 4-C, Article 5.3.2.3-C, Article 5.3.3.4-C
A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
-at least one course in each subarea
Arts (Art, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater).............................................C1
Humanities (Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English)....................................................C2

Area D
Social Sciences
References: Article 4-D Article 5.3.2.3-D Article 5.3.3.4-D
A minimum of 9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
-courses to be taken in more than one subarea
Anthropology and Archeology.................................................D1
Economics.................................................................D2
Ethnic Studies*...............................................................D3
Gender Studies*............................................................D4
Geography.................................................................D5
History*.............................................................D6
Interdisciplinary Social or Behavioral Science............................D7
Political Science, Government, and Legal Institutions..........................D8
Psychology.................................................................D9
Sociology and Criminology....................................................D0
* Ethnic Studies, Gender Studies, or history courses emphasizing artistic or humanistic perspectives may be categorized in Area C.

Area E
Lifelong Learning and Self-Development
References: Article 4-E Article 5.3.2.3-E Article 5.3.3.4-E
3 semester units or 4-5 quarter units required

E
Does Participation in Multiple High Impact Practices Affect Student Success at Cal State Northridge?: Some Preliminary Insights

by

Bettina J. Huber

August 2010
Does Participation in Multiple High Impact Practices Affect Student Success at Cal State Northridge?: Some Preliminary Insights

Building on discussion at a number of AAC&U meetings and preliminary work by George Kuh, this brief report summarizes one aspect of a larger study of the effect of selected high impact practices (i.e., service learning, internships, senior experience, research with faculty, and study abroad) on four measures of student persistence and success: GPA at college exit; time to degree, which was considered separately for respondents entering as first time freshmen and transfer students; and a measure of timely graduation. The larger study relied on the responses of 863 graduating seniors at Cal State Northridge (CSUN) who participated in the Spring 2007 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which includes questions about the high impact practices (HIPs) dealt with. Table 1 shows the frequency with which respondents reported participating in each one. The relevant NSSE responses were a key element in a series of regression analyses focusing on two questions: whether selected background and college experience factors (e.g., racial and ethnic background, units attempted in Fall 2006, major) foster HIP participation and whether the HIPs under study have an effect on student persistence and success, independent of the background and experience factors that also affect these outcomes.

In addition to examining the potential impact of individual HIPs on student success, their cumulative impact was examined with the aid of a summary measure of HIP participation, a simple count of the number of experiences respondents reported participating in. The findings relating to this measure of cumulative impact are the focus of discussion here. Table 2 shows the number of HIPs that respondents

---


2 Since all seniors invited to respond to the NSSE have accumulated sufficient units to graduate during the administration year, this measure simply assesses whether they, in fact, did so.

3 Although the response sample is largely representative of the larger group from which it is drawn, analysis suggests that less able students may be somewhat underrepresented.
participated in; one fifth participated in none and about three-fifths participated in one or two.\(^4\) Tables 3a and 3b show the individual HIPs mentioned by respondents who reported participating in more than one. Among respondents participating in two HIPs, three pairs predominate: service learning and internships, internships and senior experience, and service learning and senior experience. The three HIPs included in these pairs are also the ones the most frequently mentioned by respondents reporting participation in three HIPs. Finally, they, along with research with faculty, are the almost exclusive focus of respondents saying that they participated in four of the five HIPs considered.

In assessing the findings reviewed here, it is important to bear in mind that the measure of HIP participation used does not tell us how many high impact courses or experiences students attempted. Rather, given the wording of the NSSE items used, it tells us whether respondents engaged in two or more types of high impact activities. Thus, a respondent who completed three internships, but nothing else, received a HIP summary score of one, while a person completing a single internship and one senior experience course received a score of two.

Figures 1-5 summarize the significant effects of HIP participation on three of the four measures of student success examined — the participation measure had no significant effect on the time to degree of respondents entering CSUN as transfer students. Figures 1a-c suggest that HIP participation enhances GPA at exit, reduces time to degree among respondents entering as first time freshmen, and increases the likelihood that respondents will graduate in a timely fashion (i.e., in 2006-07, as expected). With the exception of the last, these bivariate effects are modest. Figures 2-5 indicate, however, that the impact of HIP participation on all three measures of success and persistence varies by two student characteristics: a low-income background (i.e., receipt of a Pell Grant during the year under study) and a Latina/o background. Given the socio-economic character of the seniors in the response sample, this second

\(^4\) Because so few seniors engaged in more than three HIPs, the top three categories are combined for presentation purposes.
served as a means of examining the joint effect of first-generation status and a traditionally underserved background.

Figure 2 indicates that the GPAs of both Latina/o respondents and Pell grant recipients are more positively affected by HIP participation than is the case for other respondents. In fact, the GPAs of the latter do not change significantly as a result of HIP participation. Among the Latina/o and Pell respondents, in contrast, significant gains are evident, especially for students participating in more than one HIP. The average GPAs of those Latina/o and Pell students who have not participated in HIPs during their college years are somewhat lower than those of other students. If, however, they have participated in three or more, their average GPAs slightly exceed those of other students.

Figure 3 summarizes the effect of HIP participation on the average time to degree of Latina/o and other respondents who entered CSUN as first time freshmen; Pell Grant status has no differentiating impact in this case. Although both Latina/o and other students have lower average times to degree as a result of HIP participation, the former reduce their degree time more. For the Latina/o respondents, participation in two HIPs reduces average time to degree by 1.8 years; for other respondents, the reduction is 0.5 years. For both groups, the benefit of HIP participation is not linear, something that was also evident in Figure 1b. Students participating in more than two HIPs during their college careers have somewhat higher average times to degree than those participating in two. These findings suggest that participation in more than two types of HIPs may be too much of a good thing, perhaps because of the extra time required to complete courses involving such divergent high impact activities.

Figures 4 and 5, which summarize variation in the measure of timely graduation, suggest that extensive HIP participation fosters eventual graduation, even though, as just noted, it may slow degree time somewhat. Figure 4 shows that HIP participation benefits Latina/o students more strongly than others, whose modest gains are not statistically significant. The percentage of Latina/o respondents graduating “on time” increases noticeably as HIP participation increases, rising from 38% to 73%.
A different, and atypical, picture emerges when Pell Grant status is examined. Here, as Figure 5 indicates, Pell Grant recipients do not benefit significantly from HIP participation. Instead, the respondents without Pell Grants are the ones who clearly gain, with the percentage graduating on time increasing from 46% for no participation to 73% for respondents participating in three or more different types of HIPs.

In short, the findings summarized above suggest that HIP participation serves to enhance student performance and persistence in several important ways, with traditionally underserved and low-income students often benefitting disproportionately. These findings must be viewed with some caution, however, given the relatively small size of the sample used. This is especially true for the findings relating to the seniors entering as first time freshmen, who account for only 36% of the respondents. Nonetheless, one aspect of the findings may be clear enough to act on. All of the findings summarized indicate unequivocally that participation in multiple high impact activities of different kinds provides greater benefit to students than participation in only one type. Insofar as academic departments already offer an array of courses encompassing the high impact practices dealt with, encouraging their majors to engage in different types may require only small curricular changes. Given the data summarized here, such modest change might yield a significant increase in student success and persistence.
Figure 1a. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on CSUN GPA of Senior NSSE Respondents

Mean GPA at CSUN Exit

None: 2.98
1 HIP: 2.98
2 HIPS: 3.09
3 or more HIPS: 3.11

[Eta=.111 (.021)]

Figure 1b. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on Time to Degree of Senior NSSE Respondents Entering as First Time Freshmen

Mean Time to Degree

None: 5.67
1 HIP: 5.58
2 HIPS: 4.78
3 or more HIPS: 5.14

[Eta=.196 (.024)]

Figure 1c. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on Timely Graduation of Senior NSSE Respondents

Percentage Graduating "on Time" (i.e., in 2006-07)

None: 50%
1 HIP: 59%
2 HIPS: 67%
3 or more HIPS: 70%

[Eta=.140 (.001)]
Figure 2. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on CSUN GPA by Racial & Ethnic Background and Pell Grant Status of Senior NSSE Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 HIP</th>
<th>2 Hips</th>
<th>3 or more Hips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o Respon.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Respon.</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recip.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Pell Received</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Eta} = 0.221 (0.002) \]
\[ \text{Eta} = 0.090 \text{ (NS)} \]
\[ \text{Eta} = 0.203 (0.053) \]
\[ \text{Eta} = 0.079 \text{ (NS)} \]

Figure 3. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on Time to Degree by Racial & Ethnic Background of Senior NSSE Respondents Entering as Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 HIP</th>
<th>2 Hips</th>
<th>3 or more Hips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o Respon.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Respon.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Eta} = 0.295 (0.055) \]
\[ \text{Eta} = 0.205 (0.094) \]
Figure 4. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on Percentage of Senior NSSE Respondents Graduating on Time by Racial & Ethnic Background

Figure 5. Impact of Participation in High Impact Practices on Percentage of Senior NSSE Respondents Graduating on Time by Pell Grant Status
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General Education and Transfer: the Key to Student Success

“General education courses have become the doorway into college for the great majority of the nation’s students, including the underserved: first generation students, ethnic and racial minorities, and those from low-income families. These courses therefore play a huge role, not just in how well students actually learn in college, but also in whether or not they even stay in college.”

Carol Geary Schneider
President, AAC&U

“In its first phase the Compass Project focused attention on the needs of CSU students to see the purpose and relevance of general education -- the courses required of all students, regardless of major. We’ve seen that to move this work forward, a more integrated, meaningful GE transfer curriculum is called for -- one that will improve student success not only for those already in the CSU, but also for the hundreds of thousands planning to transfer in.”

Professor John Tarjan
Chair, Academic Senate, CSU, 2008-2010
Chair, Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee, 2010-2011
“California’s young adult population is increasingly composed of groups, particularly Latinos, that historically have relatively low levels of educational attainment.”

Closing the Gap
Public Policy Institute of California
April, 2009
“Economists increasingly worry that America’s postsecondary education system cannot keep up with historic increases in the demand for college-educated workers.

“The worry is justified. Demand for workers with college educations will outpace supply to the tune of 300,000 per year. By 2018, the postsecondary system will have produced 3 million fewer college graduates than demanded by the labor market.”

Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements through 2018
Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce
June, 2010
Where Do CSU Degrees Come From?

40% of CSU graduates begin at the university conferring the degree.

60% of CSU graduates begin somewhere else -- usually a California Community College.

Source: CSU Office of the Chancellor, 2008-09 Degrees Conferred.
California State University Six-Year Graduation Rate

“Currently fewer than 50% of our students graduate in six years. Every interrupted education is a lost opportunity for the student, the student’s family and community, and the state.

“Historical changes in California’s population compel us to better serve the students we’ve most often failed: underrepresented minorities, the economically disadvantaged, and the first generation to college -- at a time when the intellectual demands of the world have never been greater.”

CSU Office of the Chancellor
Graduation Initiative Systemwide Plan
April, 2010

Source: IPEDS, 2009

Systemwide 6-year Graduation Rate: 48%
Community College Transfer Rate

“While methods for computing transfer rates vary, several recent studies found rates in the CCC to be low relative to the number of students that likely enrolled with an intent to transfer.

One found that about one-quarter of “transfer-focused” students transferred; another found that among students seeking a college credential, 18 percent transferred; and several others found transfer rates generally ranging between 20 and 30 percent using different assumptions about who should be included in the pool of potential transfer students.”

Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California
Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy
August, 2009
At What Point Are They Leaving?

California’s college and university students drop out all along the way.

But a disproportionate number leave while enrolled in general education courses -- typically in the first two years.

Most of the state’s general education curriculum is conceived as relatively unengaging, interchangeable three-unit lectures, intended to facilitate transfer and -- ironically -- student success.

1/4 successfully transfer to university

1/2 successfully graduate six years later
... Engaging in educationally purposeful activities helps level the playing field, especially for students from low-income family backgrounds and others who have been historically underserved. Moreover, engagement increases the odds that any student – educational and social background notwithstanding – will attain his or her educational and personal objectives, acquire the skills and competencies demanded by the challenges of the 21st century, and enjoy the intellectual and monetary gains associated with the completion of the baccalaureate degree..

*High Impact Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why They Matter*
George Kuh, 2008
First-Year Seminars and Experiences
Many schools now build into the curriculum first-year seminars or other programs that bring small groups of students together with faculty or staff on a regular basis. The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students’ intellectual and practical competencies. First-year seminars can also involve students with cutting-edge questions in scholarship and with faculty members’ own research.

Common Intellectual Experiences
The older idea of a “core” curriculum has evolved into a variety of modern forms, such as a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies and/or required participation in a learning community. These programs often combine broad themes—e.g., technology and society, global interdependence—with a variety of curricular and cocurricular options for students.

Learning Communities
The key goals for learning communities are to encourage integration of learning across courses and to involve students with “big questions” that matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another and with their professors. Many learning communities explore a common topic and/or common readings through the lenses of different disciplines. Some deliberately link “liberal arts” and “professional courses”; others feature service learning.

Writing-Intensive Courses
These courses emphasize writing at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum, including final-year projects. Students are encouraged to produce and revise various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines. The effectiveness of this repeated practice “across the curriculum” has led to parallel efforts in such areas as quantitative reasoning, oral communication, information literacy, and, on some campuses, ethical inquiry.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects
Collaborative learning combines two key goals: learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one’s own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences. Approaches range from study groups within a course, to team-based assignments and writing, to cooperative projects and research.

Catalog of High-Impact Educational Practices

Undergraduate Research

Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students’ early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions.

Diversity/Global Learning

Many colleges and universities now emphasize courses and programs that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and worldviews different from their own. These studies—which may address U.S. diversity, world cultures, or both—often explore “difficult differences” such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad.

Service Learning, Community-Based Learning

In these programs, field-based “experiential learning” with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both apply what they are learning in real-world settings and reflect in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life.

Internships

Internships are another increasingly common form of experiential learning. The idea is to provide students with direct experience in a work setting—usually related to their career interests—and to give them the benefit of supervision and coaching from professionals in the field. If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member.

Capstone Courses and Projects

Whether they’re called “senior capstones” or some other name, these culminating experiences require students nearing the end of their college years to create a project of some sort that integrates and applies what they’ve learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of “best work,” or an exhibit of artwork. Capstones are offered both in departmental programs and, increasingly, in general education as well.

The High Price of “Facilitating Transfer”

Both the universities and the colleges already know what high-engagement educational practice looks like . . .

. . . so why isn’t it in the general education transfer curriculum?

“The community colleges, which must prepare students planning to transfer to any of several baccalaureate institutions, can ill afford to create general education programs with distinct character.”

Robert Shoenberg, General Education in an Age of Student Mobility

“The four-year colleges have somewhat more leeway in designing programs for their native students, but they cannot hold transfer students to those requirements.”
Percentage of seniors who report that while in college they participated in these top five High-Impact Practices, as identified by the AAC&U for the first phase of the Compass Project.

Source: National Survey of Student Engagement Special Analysis, May, 2009
“Give Students a Compass helps institutions build capacity to support academic excellence for all students, emphasizing the success of students traditionally underrepresented in higher education.

The project is a collaborative: systems and campuses are working together to re-map general education, take new approaches to program design and assessment, and concentrate attention on the success of students from underserved groups.

Compass partners understand the value of collaboration, especially in large systems where students are highly mobile.

Hence the metaphor for the project: we need to give students a compass so that they can navigate successfully through complex college and university systems.

The project is part of AAC&U’s signature initiative, Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP), which fosters campus action, public advocacy, and useful evidence to make the aims and outcomes of liberal education a guiding framework for all students’ educational achievement—in professional and arts and sciences fields alike.”

aacu.org/compass
Phase One: 2008-2011

The CSU and UW systems are both participating in Give Students a Compass, as well as a national initiative to increase degree production while closing achievement gaps.

“What happens to quality in this ambitious agenda of producing 80,000 more graduates by 2025?

LEAP Wisconsin is the academic quality component of the Growth Agenda. We are working through this initiative to ensure that our students will graduate with a quality of mind that will enable their leadership in a 21st century, globally-engaged American democracy.”
In 2008 the CSU enacted Executive Order 1033, reframing general education in terms of expected learning outcomes. The new EO draws on language developed by the AAC&U for its campaign Liberal Education and America’s Promise, or LEAP.

“The LEAP campaign is organized around a robust set of "Essential Learning Outcomes" -- all of which are best developed by a contemporary liberal education. Students prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining:

1. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World**
   - Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts
   - Focused by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring

2. **Intellectual and Practical Skills**, including
   * Inquiry and analysis
   * Critical and creative thinking
   * Written and oral communication
   * Quantitative literacy
   * Information literacy
   * Teamwork and problem solving
   - Practiced extensively, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

3. **Personal and Social Responsibility**, including
   * Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global intercultural knowledge and competence
   * Ethical reasoning and action
   * Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
   - Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

4. **Integrative Learning**, including
   * Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies
   - Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems”
Phase One: 2008-2011

“A substantially revised GE program was approved on our campus by vote of the Academic Senate on February 11, 2010. This revised program embodies the LEAP and Making Excellence Inclusive goals explicitly, and the debate over GE change on our campus was directly and meaningfully informed by LEAP and MEI projects. Our goal is a re-visioning of GE on our campus to bring the program into line with the 21st century, LEAP outcomes and CSU EO 1033.

In particular we look to institutionalize High Impact Practices in GE. We are seeking strategic points in students’ GE experience, particularly in the first year and senior years, where High Impact Practices can be especially meaningful. Our target population is historically underrepresented students, but our intention is to structure High Impact Practices in such a way that they are experienced by all students.”

In early 2008 the CSU Compass steering committee identified three campus-based projects for support: redesign of the general education curriculum at Chico and Sacramento, and a university-community college partnership at San José State and Evergreen Valley College. Excerpts from the progress reports of June, 2010:

“Of course, our work continues in the service of disenfranchised, marginalized, and underserved young people and their communities. General education is being redesigned to institutionalize in intentional and logical ways specific practices and pedagogical structures in the part of the curriculum that is experienced by all students regardless of major.

We are more convinced than ever that the GE we have is the GE for faculty and the GE we need is the GE for students. They learn differently, what matters to them is a bit different than what mattered to us as learners decades ago, their needs are different and we will lose them if we persist in doing things the way we always have.”

“The curriculum for a special section of English 1B for prospective transfer students was jointly developed by Cathy Gabor, Composition Coordinator at SJSU, and Alexandria White, English Instructor at EVC.

The new course incorporated a service-learning project. The Writing Partners project matched 6th grade students from a high-need elementary school with the college students. They exchanged three letters during the semester and met at a culminating celebration and pizza party at SJSU.

Two peer mentors supported the class and acted as liaisons between the community college students and SJSU. They also helped students with their writing drafts.

36 students registered; 35 students completed the course.”
The partnership between San José State University and Evergreen Valley College focused on general education just prior to transfer. Faculty incorporated two high-impact practices -- civic engagement and peer mentoring -- into a GE class of 36 students. Community college students corresponded with sixth graders to improve writing skills on both sides, and met with university students to learn about life after transfer.

All but one of the community college students persisted to the end of the term -- in a course that typically sees attrition as high as 33%.

From a survey of the students:

“Having a pen pal was a good experience for my writing and to know more about the community, because it allowed me to get out of the box. I saw how important it is for younger children to be in contact with college students and get encouraged to pursue a higher education.”

“Meeting our sixth-grade pen pal was really fun, especially when we got to share stories. In other English classes we usually just work by ourselves, in this class we got to help influence the younger student in going to college or perhaps a right direction.”

“San José State now seems attainable.”
Purpose of the Second Phase of *Give Students a Compass*

The second phase of *Give Students a Compass* will bring together faculty who teach general education -- at both the California State University and the California Community Colleges -- to pilot regional collaboratives to bring more High-Impact Practices into the state’s general education transfer curriculum. Successful pilots could inform an improved statewide policy.

Research indicates a more engaging general education transfer curriculum could improve success for all students, particularly the traditionally underserved.

By keeping more of the university freshmen and sophomores -- and capturing more of the community college students who intend to transfer but don’t make it -- California can offset the decline in degree production anticipated by changing demographics and reduced state support.

*Three of every four California Community College students who intend to transfer don’t make it. NSSE data indicates transfers are less likely than other CSU students to engage in high-impact educational practices such as learning communities, which can improve engagement and persistence.*
"When faculty are involved in planning and decision-making from day one, not only are the results improved, but the commitment for implementation is strengthened."

Jane Patton, President
Academic Senate of the Community Colleges of California

"In fields such as medicine and engineering, spending for research amounts to about 5 to 15 percent of total expenditures. In contrast, we spend well less than a quarter of one percent of the overall education budget on educational R&D."

Anthony Bryk, President
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Actions to Put High-Impact Practices into the GE Transfer Curriculum

1. Focus on learning. Convene university and community college faculty to agree on the learning that matters for general education, without reference to inputs such as courses from an approved list.

2. Change the CCC-CSU relationship. Empower community colleges to take articulation beyond transcript evaluation of individual courses and certify student completion of program-level general education learning.

3. Reward High-Impact Practices. Foster use of engaging educational practices in the lower division as a means to improve student achievement of the learning that matters.

4. Give Students a Compass. Orient university freshmen and sophomores, and acclimate community college students to the purpose and feel of university life before they transfer, by actively communicating the learning that matters: not only the “what” but also the “why” of the learning outcomes we expect of all students.

   Use advising, peer mentoring, and high-impact practices in general education to highlight the value and relevance of learning beyond the major.
Actions to Bring Together the Faculty Who Teach General Education

1. Support broad and deep participation in the next annual national meeting of the AAC&U, in San Francisco. Inform statewide conversations about liberal education with the best current thinking.

2. Invite proposals from individual campuses, both California State Universities and California Community Colleges, to attend a special two-day pre-meeting conference on general education in California.

3. Promote formation of regional pilot projects to experiment with new approaches to general education and transfer.
After the Meeting: Regional Pilot Projects

Selection criteria

The Compass Project will support regional pilot projects that:
- are faculty driven
- meet the criteria for general education as set forth in CSU Executive Order 1033
- employ high-engagement educational practice while facilitating transfer
- may be taken to statewide scale if successful

Evaluation criteria

Successful pilot projects will:
- highlight for students the relevance and value of general education
- lead to higher student grades in subsequent coursework
- improve educational outcomes, especially for the historically underserved
- produce measurable benefits in student term-to-term persistence and graduation
“In today's economy, higher education is more important than ever. According to the Census Bureau, a college graduate's lifetime earnings are almost double that of a high school graduate.

But a higher degree is more than just a ticket to a better job. It can improve the economic situation of both individuals and their communities.

That's why it is in everyone's interest - communities, businesses, and educators - to help students succeed in school and pursue the highest degree they can.

In fact, we cannot state this fact strongly enough: The future success of our country's economy is inextricably linked with the educational attainment of our students.”

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
California State University
This document and supporting materials are available at:

calstate.edu/app/compass