

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 9:00 a.m. Tuesday, May 18, 2004
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Shailesh J. Mehta, Vice Chair
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson
Kathleen E. Kaiser
M. Alexander Lopez

Closed Session – Tuesday, May 18, 2004, Munitz Conference Room

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

Open Session – Tuesday, May 18, 2004, Dumke Auditorium

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 17, 2004

Discussion Items

2. Modification of California State University Admission Policy for Upper-Division Transfer Students, *Information*
3. Extended University Operations in the California State University: A Report to the Board of Trustees, *Information*

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

**Trustees of The California State University
California State University, Fresno
Save Mart Center
2650 East Shaw Avenue
Fresno, California 93710**

March 17, 2004

Members Present

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Shailesh J. Mehta, Vice Chair
Debra S. Farar, Chair of the Board
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson
Kathleen E. Kaiser
M. Alexander Lopez
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Other Trustees Present

William Hauck
Eric Guerra
Frederick W. Pierce IV

Chancellor's Office Staff

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources

Chair Achtenberg called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 24, 2004, were approved by consent as submitted.

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for an Honorary Degree

Chair Achtenberg said that the item on the recommendation of a nominee for an honorary degree was completed in closed session.

Facilitating Graduation: Progress Report #1

Chair Roberta Achtenberg discussed the importance of the CSU Graduation Initiative and asked Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence to report on its status. Dr. Spence stated that in fall 2002 the Board of Trustees adopted a three-part initiative to improve the effectiveness with which students earn the baccalaureate degree. The two goals of the initiative are to graduate a higher proportion of students and to earn the degree by accruing fewer unneeded or unwanted course units.

The graduation initiative has three parts: improving preparation to begin college, strengthening the transfer process, and campuses helping enrolled students progress toward the degree effectively.

The college preparation component is based in the Early Assessment Program (EAP), which has two parts: early testing and 12th grade preparation. CSU and the California Department of Education have developed augmented 11th grade California Standards Tests in English and mathematics that align with CSU placement standards. High school juniors who wish to enter CSU will take these tests, enabling them to know before their senior year whether they are prepared to begin CSU study without further preparation in math and English.

Trustee Hauck inquired whether passing the test would excuse these 11th graders from remedial math and English, and Trustee Galinson asked further about what happens if they fail. Dr. Spence confirmed that if students pass at a certain level they are exempt from CSU placement examinations. If students do not pass the junior test, they can prepare for CSU, be admitted to CSU on the basis of courses and grades, and take the EPT/ELM placement tests. If they pass the EPT and ELM tests, they will not have to take remedial courses.

Trustee Galinson requested a follow-up on the augmented California Standards Test takers to see how many improve sufficiently in their senior year. Dr. Spence stressed the accountability of the program. Chair Achtenberg expressed interest in the development of best practices in remediating students before admission and asked about units saved by students if they did not need remediation. Dr. Spence said that in the first year or two, the program may cut the need for remediation in half.

Trustee Pesquiera expressed concern about cooperation from high schools and from students who may need further preparation in their senior year of high school. Trustee Kaiser pointed out that the feedback received by students and schools would result in very different expectations. Dr. Spence added that students would be given clear information about readiness for college level study much

sooner than before. Whereas the California Standards Test has been the basis for the Academic Performance Index (API) school score and therefore a high stakes test for schools, those tests have been low stakes tests for individual students. The augmented California Standards Test is a higher stakes test for students.

The EAP also includes activities through which high school seniors can prepare further for CSU. Students who need better skills in expository reading and writing can take a specially designed 12th grade course, developed jointly by teachers from high schools and the university. Modules from this course will be offered in fall 2004, and the release of the full course statewide to all high schools will occur by spring 2005. Students who need to upgrade their mathematics skills will have access to courses and to other individualized online interactive programs during their senior year. A final component of the EAP is teacher training. CSU teacher-education faculty sponsor reading institutes and are developing materials through which high school teachers can improve their skills in helping students to read and write effectively.

CSU efforts to strengthen the transfer process are progressing well. Several significant Title 5 changes will be recommended to the Board in May. Dr. Spence praised the Academic Senate leadership for working the last six months to improve transfer. The recommendations for changes to CSU transfer admission policies would develop a model 60 unit lower division curriculum for each major, acceptable statewide at all 23 campuses. It would be composed of a core of 45 units, 39 of which would be mostly general education units, and another 6 units in lower division major prerequisite work. Prospective transfer students would be required to declare a major. CSU would require that students make a stronger commitment to a specific CSU campus by the time they complete 35 to 40 college units. This could result in conditional entrance or admission and better guidance for the remaining 15 units so that a full 60 units would be transferable to CSU. He emphasized that putting transfer on a statewide basis is necessary.

Chair Achtenberg expressed thanks to the leadership of the Academic Senate for their hard work and leadership and to Dr. Spence in developing this responsible educational policy. Dr. Kaiser expressed appreciation for the chair's recognition of the faculty's work on the plan to improve transfer.

Trustee Galinson praised the work of the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs staff. He encouraged a flexible CSU policy since an early declaration of a major might be difficult for an 18 year-old student. Dr. Spence said that the idea was to lay a clear path that many students would want to take, establishing a new high priority transfer admission category. He added that proper advising and early changes in majors could decrease the number of extra units taken while studying for a degree, and said that a statewide path for transfer would simplify the student advisement at the community colleges. Dr. Spence acknowledged, however, that following this admission path was voluntary. Chair Achtenberg spoke about the necessity for institutions to do everything they can to grant flexibility to students who may need to change focus legitimately.

Dr. Spence then discussed the third component of the graduation initiative: campus actions to help enrolled students earn the degree more effectively. He summarized the December 2002 recommendations of the systemwide task force on facilitating graduation and the subsequent plans made by each campus in response.

Executive Vice Chancellor listed three key aspects of the progress made by campuses toward implementation of the recommendations of the task force: 1) clear program requirements, 2) effective degree advising system, and 3) making sure students have courses when they need them. An earlier declaration of major and admission by major to the upper division will help campuses plan for course availability, which in turn will help students graduate sooner. He said that closer monitoring and accountability is now possible and that the November 2004 biannual accountability report will include graduation rate data and will show for the first time how the data compares to goals for improving graduation rates set by the campuses.

Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Chair Achtenberg stated that the annual evaluation cycle of CSU's teacher preparation programs responds to Trustee policy in "CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers" adopted in 1998. The twenty-one CSU Deans of Education initiated program improvements in 1999 and the annual cycle of systemwide evaluations was begun in 2001. Chair Achtenberg introduced Dr. Spence to present the outcomes of the third annual evaluation of CSU's teacher preparation programs.

Dr. Spence announced that the latest evaluation of CSU's teacher education programs shows that the CSU is effective in preparing teachers. The annual evaluation considers all major aspects of teacher education including how to teach and subject matter preparation, and studies how well CSU preparation serves the CSU graduates in K-12 classrooms after one year. The purposes of the study are to see how well CSU teacher education reforms are working in practice, to provide information to campuses to enable them to strengthen their programs, and to provide information to address issues and concerns coming from outside the CSU about teacher education programs. Questions are asked of CSU teacher education graduates and their supervisors to determine how many become teachers, how well they are prepared to teach in California with its diverse student population, and how CSU teacher preparation programs compare with other such programs nationally. More than 2,300 principals participated in the evaluation. Dr. Wright emphasized that the supervisors responding to the evaluation survey were very experienced in teaching and in evaluating first year teachers. Over the last three years more than 30,000 teachers have graduated from CSU teacher preparation programs. Cumulatively, 95 percent of these graduates have been teaching one year later, while the national average is 66 to 70 percent. Dr. Spence introduced Dr. David Wright, Associate Director, Evaluation and Assurance, to describe further the evaluation methods and significance of the findings.

Dr. Wright emphasized that the average percentage levels (80-90 percent) of supervisor ratings indicating high or adequate preparation were significantly positive. This judgment was based on comparisons to national averages and also to the fact that the subjects were first year teachers, who are not expected to be polished teachers until they have undergone a two-three year state-sponsored induction program for beginning teachers.

Trustee Galinson expressed doubt that a 50 percent response rate was sufficient. He also asked whether the study differentiated between urban and suburban schools. In response, Dr. Wright commented that the 50 percent response rate has been consistent over the course of the evaluations and that the study did compare suburban and urban schools, a result to be shown later in the presentation. Dr. Wright continued that in a new state policy, the state now asks first year teachers to participate in an extensive induction program, working on a weekly basis with a senior mentor teacher.

Dr. Wright stated that in the two successive cohorts, the CSU has been making steady progress toward an eventual goal of 100 percent effectiveness in teacher preparation. In response to a request for clarification from Trustee Kaiser, Dr. Wright stated that each of the three cohorts represented first year teachers.

Dr. Wright then reintroduced Dr. Spence to present additional evaluation results. With respect to strengths, the evaluations continue to show that supervisors find high percentages of CSU-trained teachers well or adequately prepared to teach in their first year. These positive evaluations apply to elementary school teachers across all subjects, particularly reading and mathematics, as well as to high school teachers in their primary subject areas. Dr. Spence said that the evaluation shows a possible weakness in preparing high school teachers to teach reading. State standards have not emphasized preparation in this area. Once CSU learned of the reading problem, reading specialists across the state began to address it. Trustee Kaiser commented on the possible correlation between the relative lack of preparation in this area and the problem area of reading comprehension in our remediation reduction efforts.

Dr. Spence stated that the results show that the CSU is effective in preparing teachers to meet diverse needs of all students in California including the culturally diverse, English language learners, and special needs/special education students. In response to a question from Trustee Galinson, Dr. Spence clarified that the special needs/special education students referred to are students who have been mainstreamed into regular classrooms. The category of cultural diversity is the most general category in meeting diverse needs of all students. Results in this area show 82 percent effectiveness, an improvement that he attributed to CSU initiatives.

In response to a question from Chair Achtenberg about how teachers are taught to teach better in culturally diverse settings, Dr. Wright replied that CSU works with students to change attitudes so that all are committed to the certainty that every child can learn and that teacher education students learn to

facilitate the child's way of learning and to foster success of that child. In addition, whereas in the past students may have trained at sites closest to the campus, now credential candidates visit, observe, and meet teachers in schools where they can experience the cultural diversity they need to understand.

Dr. Spence displayed results showing that preparation in the area of classroom management and student behavior and discipline is effective. Of the two, there is more work to be done in preparing teachers to deal with student behavior and discipline. In addition, results showed that CSU has been 87 to 89 percent effective in subject matter preparation and that improvement had been made in teaching methods preparation. Responding to a question from Trustee Kaiser concerning instructional effectiveness, Dr. Spence commented that in the past, methodology classes were taken after the subject matter degree was earned, but that over the last two years it has been possible to begin such study earlier.

For purposes of comparing CSU's graduates who became first year teachers to their counterparts in the rest of the nation, CSU had available a national three-year old, self-assessment survey of first year teachers showing preparation to teach the subject they were hired to teach. In that study 66 percent of the respondents were well or adequately prepared, while CSU graduates participating in the CSU evaluation reported that 75 to 83 percent were well or adequately prepared. In addition to looking at overall preparedness, the national study focused on the preparation of teachers to teach effectively students from diverse backgrounds. A comparison of these results show that CSU students were better prepared, an important factor for California.

Trustee Pesqueira expressed interest in data comparing CSU graduates with graduates of private, for-profit schools in California, and asked whether the national study would be able to provide this information. Dr. Wright said that the particular national study did not ask where the student attended.

Dr. Spence said that CSU students should be prepared to teach equally well all groups of students wherever they are. CSU graduates are almost equally well prepared to teach in urban and suburban/rural schools. This year's survey asked students to rate the overall value of their CSU preparation. The responses indicate that CSU teacher preparation programs are very significant forces in preparing teachers.

Trustee Pesqueira asked whether there were statistics on the different ages of the persons being surveyed. Dr. Spence said our evaluations have focused primarily on the performance of the teacher education programs themselves. Therefore, we have asked for very little demographic information from the respondents. Dr. Spence thanked David Wright, Bill Wilson, and the Deans of Education for continuing the effort to improve teacher education programs.

CSU Hayward President Norma Rees commented on Secretary Richard Riordan's visit to CSU Hayward when she was pleased to share favorable data concerning CSU teacher preparation programs

and to emphasize the kind of accountability CSU teacher preparation programs have that other schools in California do not. Further, regarding the percentage of supervisors responding to the evaluation, she opined that the positive comments were of great value because the participation of the supervisors was voluntary.

Trustee Galinson asked about differentiating results by campus. Dr. Spence said that individual campus data are analyzed extensively and that campuses are provided information on how they compare with the system as a whole. Conversations are held with the deans and provosts about areas needing improvement. An annual statement is required from each campus about how they are using the data to make improvement. Trustee Galinson said this kind of comparison was important and should be encouraged.

Chair Achtenberg asked about the development of data over time. David Wright offered that later in 2004 there would be a report of three-year persistence, and that by 2006, we can expect to have data on how many teachers remained in classrooms over a five-year period.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Chair Achtenberg stated that the item summarizes the CSU academic planning process over the past year and submits campus academic plans for the next five years. While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs it also includes the regular review of existing programs, which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation. To better align with other accountability-related reporting requirements, summaries of information on the assessment of learning outcomes for programs undergoing campus review are provided in this review. Chair Achtenberg introduced Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence to present the item for action.

Dr. Spence said that each year a number of new programs proposed and planned by campuses for inclusion on campus five-year academic master plans are brought to the Board for approval. This year there are fourteen new programs, nine of which are concentrations or options of existing major programs. None require significant new facilities. All of the programs come back to the chancellor's office for further review to make sure funding and facilities are sufficient.

There was a brief discussion about the cost of various programs. Dr. Spence reiterated that the programs are reviewed thoroughly before final approval by the Chancellor for actual implementation. Trustee Kaiser added that there is an overlap of time between the end of a program and the beginning of its substitute program so that students can complete their degrees. At times, therefore, there may appear to be an increase in the number of academic programs.

Trustee Kaiser questioned why there were a high number of programs at Dominguez Hills, Long Beach, and San Jose that had not been reviewed for total units required for a baccalaureate degree. Dr. Spence

replied that in a Title 5 change three and a half years ago, campuses were given four years to complete their review cycle. He added with the increased emphasis on reducing the number of units taken, follow-up conversations with the campuses would be held.

Dr. Spence reported that good progress has been made in reducing the total number of required units of the degree programs. Of the 1,300 CSU degree program, 957 have had the total required units reduced to 120 each. Another 133 programs have been reduced to an average of 126 units for completion. The chancellor's office is continuing to monitor this progress.

Chair Achtenberg expressed thanks and pleasure that such good progress had been made on reducing the number of units toward the degree. She requested a motion to recommend the passage of the proposed resolution contained in the Academic Planning and Program Review item to the Plenary Session for approval. The motion (REP-03-04-03) was proposed, seconded, and approved for recommendation.

Dr. Spence referred the trustees to a handout that summarized the 17th annual student research competition held at Stanislaus last spring. This year's competition will be at Northridge in June.

Adjournment

Chair Achtenberg adjourned the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

Presentation By

Roberta Achtenberg
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Modification of California State University Admission Policy for Upper-Division Transfer Students

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

Protecting access to the California State University, particularly when the state fiscal support is insufficient to fund student demand, is one of the CSU's highest priorities. Ensuring that a higher percentage of students graduate from CSU in a timely manner is key to promoting individual economic and societal success, ensuring that the state's workforce needs are met, fulfilling students' expectations, and honoring the state's investment in higher education. Finding ways to guarantee that students can meet standards for graduation with fewer accrued units is fairer to students and a better use of state resources.

In response to these challenges, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted a graduation initiative that consists of three parts: (1) increase the academic preparation for college, (2) improve the community college transfer process, and (3) identify a clear path to the degree for matriculated students. Because CSU annually enrolls approximately 55,000 community college transfer students, it is imperative that a clear path to the degree be identified for these students.

In 2000, the California State University conducted a study to learn more about courses completed at California Community Colleges and how the credits were used to satisfy CSU degree requirements in general education and lower division major prerequisites. The study evaluated transcripts of a sample of students who transferred from California Community Colleges and graduated from CSU in spring 1999. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure that the results take CSU campus enrollment, California Community College institution of origin, and date of matriculation at CSU properly into account. The study documented that the average California Community College student who transferred to CSU accrued 157 semester units—81 units at a California Community College and 76 units at the CSU. Transfer students are allowed to transfer a maximum of 70 semester units; hence, on average, a California Community College transfer student "lost" 11 semester units upon transfer to CSU.

To ensure that students planning to transfer to the CSU can earn a baccalaureate degree in the most direct manner without losing credits for courses taken at a community college, the CSU needs to

create for each major a lower-division pattern of courses that will advance students toward graduation at any CSU campus offering the major. A CSU campus may then identify any additional, distinct course requirements it considers necessary to prepare the students for upper-division study in that major. This will help identify a clear path to the baccalaureate degree for all community college transfer students, protect against the loss of credit by ensuring that community college students interested in transferring to the CSU can choose to take only courses that bring them closer to graduation, maximize access to CSU campuses and programs, simplify student advising, and provide a basis for community college transfer degrees and programs. To best use of this path, community college students will need to identify a major program early and commit to a CSU campus by the time they complete 45 semester units.

The degree-major *core* transfer pattern—the part of the path that will be an acceptable and efficient choice for students transferring to any CSU campus offering the major—will include at least 45 semester units and will ordinarily have the components listed below. (Semester units are featured because all but three California community colleges are on semester calendars.)

1. Completion of CSU General Education-Breadth requirements of 39 semester units or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum of 37 semester units;
2. Completion of the requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals; and
3. Completion of a statewide lower-division major preparation pattern of a minimum of 6 semester units, to the extent such courses are required for the major.

A course in the pattern may fulfill more than one requirement.

The degree-major *campus-specific* transfer pattern will typically include:

4. Completion of any additional, campus-specific lower-division major preparation requirements; and
5. Completion of elective courses.

Together, the core and campus-specific transfer patterns for a major will identify a path of at least 60 units and no more than 70 units. It is proposed that students who complete the core and campus-specific transfer patterns successfully be given the highest priority among community college transfer applicants for admission to that CSU campus and major.

While it is desirable to have such a path for every undergraduate major offered, it is most important to the achievement of significantly increased access to identify the paths for the majors attracting large numbers of students at many CSU campuses. The Title 5 amendments proposed in the resolution below therefore focus on such high-priority majors.

This policy change is submitted to the Board of Trustees for information at its May 2004 meeting and will be presented for action at the July 2004 meeting. If adopted, the change would be effective for students seeking admission to fall 2006 and subsequent terms.

Proposed Resolution

The following resolution will be proposed for adoption at the July 2004 meeting.

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Subchapter 2 of Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

Article 9. Degree-Major Transfer Patterns

§ 40530. Definitions

(a) The term “degree-major core transfer pattern” means a set of lower-division curricular specifications comprising at least 45 units but no more than 60 units that will be accepted at every CSU campus offering a program leading to that degree and major. Each unit that a student completes in the degree-major core transfer pattern reduces by one unit the total number of additional units that the student must complete to earn that degree with that major. A degree-major core transfer pattern will ordinarily include courses that fulfill General Education-Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum requirements; United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals requirements; and major-specific lower-division requirements. A course in a degree-major core transfer pattern may contribute to completion of more than one requirement.

(b) The term “degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern” means a set of lower-division curricular specifications beyond the degree-major core transfer pattern, comprising units that will be accepted at a particular CSU campus offering a program leading to that degree and major. Each unit that a student completes in the degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern reduces by one

unit the total number of additional units that the student must complete to earn that degree with that major.

(c) For purposes of this article, majors are distinguished by the CSU program code assigned to them and the degrees to which they lead.

(d) For purposes of this article, a major will be considered high-priority if it meets criteria established by the Chancellor. In establishing criteria, the Chancellor shall consider (1) the number of CSU campuses at which the major is offered and (2) the proportion of the undergraduate student body enrolled in the major at the CSU campuses offering that major.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

§ 40531. Development of Degree-Major Core Transfer Patterns

(a) A degree-major core transfer pattern shall be established for each high-priority major. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University, shall develop procedures for establishing degree-major core transfer patterns. The procedures shall include extensive participation of faculty members who teach required and restricted-elective courses in the major. The procedures shall encourage the development of degree-major core transfer patterns that are consistent with the recommended lower-division course-taking patterns of CSU first-time freshmen.

(b) If a degree and major frequently incorporate options or concentrations that would individually meet the criteria established for high-priority majors, the procedures shall allow for the development of a distinct degree-major core transfer pattern for each of those common options or concentrations.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

§ 40532. Development of Degree-Major Campus-Specific Transfer Patterns

Each CSU campus shall develop a degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern for each high-priority major it offers. The number of units in the degree-major core transfer pattern plus the number of units in the degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern shall be no less than 60 and no more than 70. The procedures shall encourage the development of degree-major campus-specific transfer patterns that, in combination with the corresponding degree-major core transfer

patterns, resemble the recommended lower-division course-taking patterns of CSU first-time freshmen.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 3, Article 2, Section 40651 as follows:

§ 40651. Administrative Procedures.

(a) Upon establishment of enrollment quotas for any campus pursuant to Section 40650 of this Article, admission of students otherwise qualified shall be within such quotas with the objective of providing maximum opportunity and appropriate diversity among students.

(b) In determinations of priority for admission:

(1) The policy of the State that students who begin their higher education in California public Community Colleges be able to continue their education without interruption, shall be considered.

(2) The following factors may be considered:

(A) Previous enrollment at the campus;

(B) The applicant's degree or credential objective;

(C) Whether the applicant has completed military or other national service;

(D) Geographical proximity to the campus where the distance involved in attending another institution would create a hardship;

(E) Access to suitable educational alternatives;

(F) The date the application is filed; (an application shall be considered filed as of the date it is postmarked or when it is personally delivered to the office on campus designated for such purpose.);

(G) The needs of the campus in maintaining a balanced program with respect to foreign students, out-of-state students, recipients of scholarships and awards, and with respect to students who would make a significant contribution to the campus because of their background or special abilities.

(3) Applicants who complete successfully a degree-major core transfer pattern and degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern as defined in Section 40530

shall be accorded the highest priority for admission as undergraduate transfers to that campus and major.

(c) The Board of Trustees may, by resolution, establish particular policies for the implementation of priorities authorized by this Section. The Chancellor shall establish methods of determining priorities to be applied by each campus within the provisions of this Section, including any implementing resolutions adopted by the Board of Trustees. In addition, the Chancellor is authorized to establish criteria for use in admission to impacted programs.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030, and 89035, Education Code.
Reference: Sections 66202, 66600, and 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 3, Article 5, Sections 40803 and 40803.1 as follows:

40803. Applicants Who Are California Residents and Who Have Completed the Prescribed Number of Units of College Credit.

(a) An applicant who is a resident of California may be admitted to a campus as an undergraduate transfer, upon satisfaction of the requirements of subdivisions ~~(a), (b), and (d) or (a), (c), and (d)~~ (1), (2), and (4) or (1), (3), and (4), as appropriate:

~~(a)~~(1) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2000, the applicant has completed satisfactorily at least 30 semester (45 quarter) units in courses at a level at least equivalent to General Education-Breadth courses, including courses in written communication in the English language, oral communication in the English language, critical thinking, and mathematics and quantitative reasoning;

~~(b)~~(2) For admission prior to fall term 2005, the applicant has attained a grade point average of 2.0 (grade of C) or better in at least 56 semester (84 quarter) units of transferable college credit;

~~(c)~~(3) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2005, the applicant has attained a grade point average of 2.0 (grade of C) or better in at least 60 semester (90 quarter) units of transferable college credit;

~~(d)~~(4) The applicant was in good standing at the last college attended.

(b) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2006, an applicant who has attended a California community college and who has committed to a degree major program and campus of the California State University before earning more than 45 semester (68 quarter) units will receive the highest priority for admission if the applicant has completed successfully a degree-major core transfer pattern and degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern as defined in Section 40530.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

§40803.1. Applicants Who Are Not California Residents and Who Have Completed the Prescribed Number of Units of College Credit.

(a) An applicant who is not a resident of California may be admitted to a campus as an undergraduate transfer upon satisfaction of the requirements of subdivisions ~~(a), (b), and (d) or (a), (c), and (d)~~ (1), (2), and (4) or (1), (3), and (4), as appropriate:

~~(a)~~(1) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2000, the applicant has completed satisfactorily at least 30 semester (45 quarter) units in courses at a level at least equivalent to General Education-Breadth courses, including courses in written communication in the English language, oral communication in the English language, critical thinking, and mathematics and quantitative reasoning;

~~(b)~~(2) For admission prior to fall term 2005, the applicant has completed at least 56 semester (84 quarter) units of transferable college credit and has attained a grade point average in all units of transferable college credit which places the applicant among the upper one-half of eligible California residents who are applicants for admission under Section 40803, the required minimum grade point average to be determined by the Chancellor;

~~(c)~~(3) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2005, the applicant has attained a grade point average of 2.0 (grade of C) or better in at least 60 semester (90 quarter) units of transferable college credit and has attained a grade point average in all units of transferable college credit which places the applicant among the upper one-half of eligible California residents who are applicants for

admission under Section 40803, the required minimum grade point average to be determined by the Chancellor;

~~(d)~~(4) The applicant was in good standing at the last college attended.

(b) Commencing with admission to the fall term 2006, an applicant who has attended a California community college and who has committed to a degree major program and campus of the California State University before earning more than 45 semester (68 quarter) units will receive the highest priority for admission if the applicant has completed successfully a degree-major core transfer pattern and degree-major campus-specific transfer pattern as defined in Section 40530.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

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

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Extended University Operations in the California State University: A Report to the Board of Trustees

Presentation By

Dr. David. S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
And Chief Academic Officer

Dr. James E. Lyons, Sr.
President
California State University, Dominguez Hills
Chair, CSU Commission on the Extended University

Summary

Campus Extended University (self-support) courses, programs, and services assist traditional and non-traditional students throughout the year. During FY 2002-03, Extended University programs enrolled over 291,000 students.

While traditional academic programs such as Special Sessions, Open University (Concurrent Enrollment), and distance learning continue to experience enrollment growth, campus Extended University operations have developed a number of new programs that are custom designed to meet the needs of California's employers. Over the last five years, the California State University has become a major source of education and training for all ranks of state workers, most notably, the mid-career professional. Campus Extended University programs have become an essential resource for the future of California's economy.

A short video will highlight the remarkable growth in CSU's Extended University programs.