

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting: 8:45 a.m. Wednesday, September 15, 2004**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair  
Shailesh J. Mehta, Vice Chair  
Jeffrey L. Bleich  
Herbert L. Carter  
Moctesuma Esparza  
Debra S. Farar  
Robert G. Foster  
George G. Gowgani  
Eric Guerra  
William Hauck  
Kathleen E. Kaiser  
Melinda Guzman Moore  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 14, 2004

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Graduation Initiative Update, *Information*
2. Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development, *Action*
3. Recommendations of the California State University Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs, *Action*
4. Status on the May 2003 recommendations based on the CSU Presidents' Commission On Teacher Education report, "Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation" *Information*

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

**Trustees of The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor  
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California**

**July 14, 2004**

**Members Present**

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair  
Shailesh Mehta, Vice Chair  
Debra S. Farar  
Robert G. Foster  
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board  
Eric Guerra  
Kathleen E. Kaiser  
Jack O'Connell, Ex Officio  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos  
Anthony Vitti

**Other Trustees Present**

Carol Chandler  
George Gowgani  
Ricardo Icaza  
Corey Jackson  
Melinda Guzman Moore  
Frederick W. Pierce IV

**Members Absent**

William Hauck

**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  
Larry Mandel, University Auditor  
Chair Achtenberg called the meeting to order at 8:47 a.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of May 18, 2004, were approved by consent as submitted.

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

Chair Roberta Achtenberg stated that the proposed revisions to Title 5 were presented as information at the May 2004 Board of Trustees meeting and that a revised version reflecting feedback from legislative staff and the community colleges regarding admission guarantees was being presented for action. The proposed revisions to Title 5 will provide the highest priority for admission to community college transfer applicants who elect to complete a specific set of courses that satisfy CSU General Education-Breadth requirements, lower division major preparation courses, campus specific lower division major preparation, and other elective courses. If adopted, the change would be effective for students seeking admission to fall 2006 and subsequent terms. As several new trustees were in attendance, Chair Achtenberg said that Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence would review the item in detail and answer any questions. She added that members of the public would speak to the Committee before the vote was taken, and that there would be a public hearing at the Plenary session. Chair Achtenberg introduced Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence to present the revised item for action.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that the Title 5 revision is a major component of the graduation initiative adopted by the Board two and a half years ago. Improving transfer is critical to the CSU system and to California. CSU enrolls approximately 55,000 community college transfers each year, and two of three CSU baccalaureate graduates each year began at the community college. Currently, the average student takes more units than required to obtain a baccalaureate degree. The CSU system, CSU campuses, and the community colleges contribute to this problem by a lack of shared common lower-division requirements, not expecting students to declare a major in a timely way, and a lack of commitment by students to a specific destination CSU campus in a timely manner. Reducing the number of extra units taken by 10 units could provide access to CSU for 15,000 additional students each year. The Title 5 change proposed seeks to provide a straight path to the baccalaureate degree for transfer students so that they can take the right 60 units at the community college and upon transfer to CSU take the minimum number of units required to complete the baccalaureate degree.

Dr. Spence explained that for this highest admission priority category, three things are expected of students: (1) They must select a major before completing 45 lower-division units; (2) They need to complete the systemwide and campus-specific lower-division curriculum for each major determined by CSU faculty; and (3) They need to apply to and commit to a specific CSU campus by the completion of 45 units. Commitment to a specific campus by the completion of 45 units would permit the CSU campus to inform students about any specific campus lower-division course requirements. The proposed Title 5 language permits the CSU campus to provide an

admission guarantee subject to enrollment demand, available space, and satisfactory completion of any impactation criterion for that campus or major. He added that high demand majors refers to those majors in which large numbers of students enroll. These will be the first majors for which faculty will identify lower-division transfer patterns. These majors represent the majors in which about 80 percent of the transfer students are enrolled. The remaining majors will then be addressed. With the common curricula, students would be able to take and transfer effectively at least 45 semester units of lower division work no matter which CSU campus they decided to attend. The expectation that transfer students would commit to and apply for admission to a specific CSU campus before they complete 45 semester units would enable the CSU campus to inform students of any specific campus course requirements for the remaining 15 units and to provide an admission guarantee to those students.

While the program is voluntary and while CSU will continue to guarantee admission to all fully-eligible upper division transfer students to a campus in the CSU system, Dr. Spence stated that CSU believes that most transfer students will want to select the most direct path to the baccalaureate degree defined in the Title 5 revision. He gave high praise and expressed appreciation to the faculty for their work toward development of a lower-division common transfer curriculum. He emphasized the significance of faculty and campuses working on the common curriculum that will benefit students. He pointed out that several of the faculty leaders who had worked so hard on the project were in attendance at the meeting.

Trustee Melinda Guzman offered commendation to the faculty for the work done so far. She asked for clarification on how the high demand majors would be chosen so as to better judge the overall impact on majors at the campuses.

Dr. Spence said that one of the goals of the approach being proposed was to provide the clear path for as many students as quickly as possible. By developing common curricula for the highest demand majors first, more students would be served in the first two years. He emphasized, however, that state law and Title 5 require that CSU provide the highest priority, after continuing students, to upper division transfer students, who complete 60 semester units, including a minimum of 30 GE Breadth semester units with a GPA of “c” or better. These students would still be fully eligible for admission to the CSU.

Trustee Guzman expressed concern that those students who were making up a-g requirements at a community college should not be penalized. Dr. Spence stated that any student coming to the CSU with the right 60 units would have the same priority. Trustee Guzman underscored that to do otherwise could indirectly close some doors for students.

Trustee George Gowgani praised the proposal and inquired how students would be chosen if they overwhelmingly applied to one program or campus. Dr. Spence replied that for impacted campuses and majors, students would have to complete satisfactorily any impactation criteria established for that campus or major.

Trustee Kathleen Kaiser applauded the efforts of the faculty and asserted that the proposal should not impede anyone's transferability. She spoke of the frustration of students transferring to a CSU campus with lots of units but perhaps not the right units. She pointed out the importance of helping students coming to a CSU as a junior to be on an equal academic footing with students who began there as freshmen.

Trustee Chandler expressed enthusiasm for the plan. She asked whether students could apply to multiple CSU campuses and whether they would be redirected if they applied to an impacted campus or major. Dr. Spence said that students were encouraged to apply to multiple campuses when they encounter impacted programs. Trustee Chandler also encouraged academic outreach to juniors and seniors in high school as part of the program.

Chair Roberta Achtenberg said there would be an opportunity for further discussion after hearing from the members of the public and requested that Dr. Spence respond to each speaker as needed.

Dr. Marjorie Lewis, president of Cypress College and Vice President South of the Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges (CCC), urged communication between the CSU and CCC systems in the development of policy affecting students of both systems. She expressed concern about the lack of specificity in the language in the Title 5 revision about an admission guarantee and perceived differences to that agreed upon in SB 1785 discussions between legislative staff, CSU, and the CCC.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence said that most recent revision provides more specific language regarding the guaranteed admission issue, that state law defines priorities for transfers so that the lower-division transfer pattern by major will never be the only path to transfer, that students would need to declare a major by 45 units rather than 30 as proposed previously, and that the implementation process would clarify more of the specifics.

Dr. Tom Clark, Trustee of the Long Beach Community College District and Vice President of the California Community Colleges Trustees Association, expressed concern that the lower-division transfer pattern by major plan could negatively impact the ability of some students to transfer. He expressed appreciation for development of a consistent lower-division alignment system across campuses by majors. He pointed out that the associated costs of administering the lower-division transfer pattern by major plan could be significant in the area of student advisement, especially in the current environment of under funded programs.

Mr. Daniel Nannini, Transfer Center Director, Santa Monica College District, and President of the California community Colleges Transfer Center Directors Association recommended full funding and full participation by CSU campuses in existing programs such as ASSIST and IMPAC.

Dr. Spence, while acknowledging that some good points were made, emphasized the need for a common lower-division core curriculum in order to provide more opportunities and mobility for students as more and more CSU programs become impacted.

Dr. Kate Clark, President of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges stated that the proposed Title 5 language was not parallel to that agreed upon for SB 1785. She expressed doubt about the ability of the community colleges to adequately advise students given the ratio of counselors to students and stressed the need to see the verbal agreements achieved in June 2004 in print. She recommended postponement of the Trustees' vote in order to craft language that could go into effect whether or not SB 1785 becomes law. She expressed pride in collaborative efforts of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges and the Academic Senate, CSU in developing the Integrated Teacher Education program.

Chair Achtenberg requested a response from Dr. Spence regarding language in SB 1785.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that as currently amended, the Title 5 proposal, while not a mirror image, was consistent with the provisions of SB 1785. Some specific implementation issues raised in the public comment will be addressed as an implementation issue in the executive order. He pledged to continue working with the community colleges in the implementation process. He emphasized the need to move forward in order to improve access for additional students.

Chair Achtenberg asked that a report on the status of the draft of the implementing executive order be provided at the September 2004 Board meeting.

In response, Chancellor Charles Reed cited several extended invitations and meetings between CCC Chancellor Mark Drummond and himself since December, including meetings with Senator Scott, Chancellor Drummond, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence, Assistant Vice Chancellor Allison Jones, and himself. Dr. Reed stated that CSU is doing the right thing.

Dr. Peter Smith, President, CSU Monterey Bay, urged persistence in the efforts so that the CSU could be more accountable to the state in the use of resources and to students.

Trustee Kathleen Kaiser, who was chair of the General Education Breadth Committee, said the proposal is a bold dramatic step, like the development of the GE-Breadth and IGETC pattern. She noted that it goes beyond these, however, in that it stresses the completion of GE in lower division. She related the importance of putting the new structure in place so the faculty could work out the upper division structure of their majors. She cited [www.csumentor.edu](http://www.csumentor.edu) as a resource for advising students of requirements.

Trustee Guerra said that he supported the need to move forward in providing some kind of common system to help students. He recommended access to ASSIST for transfer and continuing students on each CSU campus.

Dr. David McNeil, Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU stated that the proposal was important to the faculty and that the proposed changes in Title 5 closely follow recommendations made in Academic Senate resolution AS-26-45 passed in May 2004. He said that CSU faculty participated extensively in the crafting of the proposed Title 5 language and have been assured of full involvement in the implementation process. He stated that the faculty looked forward to working collaboratively with the community college colleagues.

Trustee Gowgani related his own experience as a transfer student and said the proposed change was a giant step toward solving some of the problems. He urged adoption of the resolution.

A motion to adopt the Title 5 change as revised and presented was moved and seconded. The Committee voted to approve the resolution. As requested, a report on the status of a draft of the implementing executive order will be provided to the Trustees at their September 2004 meeting.

### **California State Student Association (CSSA): Presentation to the Board of Trustees on the CSSA Strategic Plan**

Chair Achtenberg stated that this year, CSSA completed a process to develop a strategic plan to guide its activities for the next few years. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence and Ms. Susana Gonzalez, Executive Director of CSSA, were introduced to present the item.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence began by acknowledging the hard work of the CSSA and the support of the Chancellor on the new strategic plan. He added that the CSU looks forward to the plan as a basis for a high level of collaboration over the next year and introduced Ms. Susan Gonzalez to present CSSA's strategic plan.

Executive Director Susana Gonzalez stated that the CSSA is the official student voice for the CSU. It is composed of 46 board members, two from each of the associated students organization on each campus. The CSSA board is elected every year, with 6 executive officers and 6 special officers. One of the priorities of the 2003-04 CSSA Board was to develop the strategic plan. Ms. Gonzalez highlighted the importance to the Board of keeping communication lines open between the CSU Board of Trustees and CSU student representatives. The strategic plan agreement outlined the role of the CSSA Board and CSSA staff and worked toward consistency in policy development in future years. Approved goals of the strategic plan included increasing awareness of the CSSA's role, mission, and accomplishments, improving effectiveness of CSSA, to enhance CSSA's advocacy role, to develop more stability and autonomy for CSSA, and to create opportunities to collaborate in decision making. Two examples were given of ways to implement the strategic plan. First, the relationship between CSSA, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the Chancellor's Office can be enhanced by inviting Board of Trustees members to attend CSSA Board meetings when they occur in their local areas. Second, CSSA would like their officers to work closely with full-time professionals in various areas such as financial aid and alumni affairs. Executive Director Gonzalez thanked the strategic

plan committee members and highlighted the help and support given by Dr. Charles Reed and the facilitator, Barbara Kaufman, ROI Consulting Group. She invited exploration of the CSSA web site, CSUstudents.org, and concluded that the development of the strategic plan had been a process that would benefit the student leaders when they are in positions of leadership later in life.

Trustee Farar commended CSSA for bringing the strategic plan forth and thanked Ms. Gonzalez for her presentation. She urged the new trustees to plan to attend CSSA Board meetings.

Trustee Kaiser urged CSSA leadership and encouraged the Trustees to help local student government groups to understand their ability to be an effective participant in the statewide CSSA organization.

### **Report of the California State University Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs**

Chair Achtenberg stated that at the chancellor's request, CSU Fresno President John Welty convened the Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership to identify issues and challenges associated with the preparation of K-12 administrators. A work group was formed to provide recommendations addressing the role, recruitment, and preparation of future education leaders. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence and Dr. John D. Welty, President, CSU Fresno, were introduced to present the item.

As background, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that this report on preparing K-12 leaders is the result of the third CSU presidents' task force since 1998. The first, chaired by President Maxson, reported in 1998 on how CSU should reinforce its commitments to additional numbers of high quality teachers as quickly as possible. In 2001 a second presidents' task force was convened to recommend ways to improve middle and high school teacher preparation in shortage areas such as math and science. In summer 2003, Dr. Reed asked President Welty to chair a 39-member group from across the state including 7 CSU campus presidents regarding preparing school administrators. He said that Dr. Welty would speak to the Board about the outcomes of the task force's efforts. He added that the task force plans to return to the Board in September with a schedule and implementation plan for the recommendations.

Dr. John Welty, President, CSU Fresno, began by recognizing CSU presidents Arciniega, Koester, Rees, Richmond, Rush, and Weber who assumed leadership in crafting the approach and the work of the 39 members of the task force comprised of CSU faculty, educational/academic administrators, K-12 teachers, principals, public policy officials, and members of the business community. He noted that task force and subcommittee members Lynne Cooke of the Academic Senate, CSU, and Jacob Perea, Dean of the San Francisco State School of Education, were present.

The task force identified several areas needed in the preparation of educational leaders. First, educational leaders need to be instructional leaders, and improvement and achievement needs to be emphasized in the schools. Professional standards set in California for educational leaders in recent years provide a basis for improved preparation programs. In order to succeed, partnerships between higher education, K-12, and professional educator groups need to be supported by strong public policy encouraging the preparation of outstanding educational leaders. Higher education systems in California must be involved in preparing educational leaders because we have too few doctorally prepared educational leaders in the system. The preparation of site leaders in individual schools where the improvements are made is important as well as the preparation of superintendents and other district leaders. In addition, the university must accept as an all-university responsibility the education of educational leaders. The expertise of the faculty must be drawn upon in a number of disciplines to prepare a strong curriculum.

Dr. Welty drew the Trustees' attention to the report, *The CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs*, detailing 12 recommendations for action. He said that the key is to have education leadership programs focusing on preparing graduates who will function as effective instructional leaders and that the programs should be a blend of research, theory, and practice. Ongoing assessment of the programs is urged in the report so adjustments can be made as necessary. The specific recommendations in the report will provide a basis for implementation. In September 2004 it is the intent of the task force to return with a set of specific recommendations for the CSU.

Chair Achtenberg thanked Dr. Welty and Dr. Spence for the report and asked for questions or comments. There were none.

### **Report of California State University Northridge on the Carnegie Corporation-funded *Teachers for a New Era* Program**

Chair Achtenberg stated that California State University, Northridge is participating in a national effort funded by the Carnegie Corporation to prepare high-quality teachers to improve K-12 schools. Chair Achtenberg said that Dr. Jolene Koester, President, California State University, Northridge, would describe the work in progress to meet the critical goal of preparing high quality teachers. Dr. Charles Reed was introduced to begin the presentation.

Chancellor Charles B. Reed described the background of how California State University, Northridge became involved in the Carnegie Corporation-funded *Teachers for a New Era* Program. Cal State Northridge was selected along with three other institutions in the United States for this program. The Carnegie Corporation would invest \$5 million each over five years, with a requirement that the institutions raise a matching \$5 million and establish a \$1.5 million endowment for teacher education. In the *Teachers for a New Era* program, the Carnegie Corporation is investing in institutions that are willing to make a radical change in teacher preparation and to tie teacher preparation/teacher knowledge/teacher behavior to student outcomes. Student achievement and student learning is considered to be the most important

factor in improving teachers. A new relationship should be formed between the faculty of the arts and sciences and teacher education on the campus, hiring new faculty to be joint appointments in the two discipline groups. New relationships would be formed with school districts, including hiring school district faculty members also to serve as CSU faculty members. Cal State Northridge was chosen because of its size, complexity, diversity, and relationship with the Los Angeles Unified School District. In addition, Cal State Northridge was successful in raising funds for teacher education improvement that met the funding requirements by the Carnegie Corp. He introduced President Koester to continue the presentation.

Dr. Jolene Koester, President, California State University, Northridge stated that it was an honor for the campus to represent the CSU system in this landmark project. The project builds on a strong institutional commitment to improve the preparation of teachers and the active and relationship between the Eisner College of Education and the LAUSD. It has required everyone at Cal State Northridge committed to these efforts to rethink what is done based on the design principles of evidence, active engagement of faculty from across the university, and treating the preparation and profession of teaching as a clinical practice. She said that the real challenge is to link the academic teacher preparation programs with how well they perform as measured by how well their students perform in the classroom. Dr. Koester reported that progress has been made at Cal State Northridge in each of the design principles.

Dr. Reed added that an annual progress report must be made to the Trustees as part of the guarantee with the Carnegie Corporation and that both the president and provost of the university would be an integral part of the project.

Trustee Debra Farar commented on the significance of the prestige and honor the program brings to the CSU system. She added that this project would contribute greatly to the improvement of all of the nation's schools, and she thanked President Koester for all the work she and her campus had done.

Trustee Carol Chandler added her congratulations and inquired about the measurement of student success that would be used in the program.

Dr. Koester responded that the measurements were in the development process. She explained that the complicated process has been agreed upon conceptually, and they are working on the actual measurement methods.

Chair Roberta Achtenberg added her congratulations and stated that the Board would look forward to hearing more of the achievements of CSU Northridge as it participates in the *Teachers for a New Era* Program.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Achtenberg at 10:27 a.m.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Graduation Initiative Update**

**Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

**Summary**

The California State University Board of Trustees adopted a graduation initiative in January 2003 that calls for the California State University to increase the academic preparation for college, to improve the community college transfer process, and to identify a clear path to the degree for matriculated students.

An oral report will be provided on the implementation of the following programs that address academic preparation for college and improvement of the transfer process:

- The Early Assessment Program (EAP), a collaborative effort among the California State University, California Department of Education, and California State Board of Education, helps to ensure that college-bound high-school graduates have the English and mathematics skills expected by CSU faculty.
- The Title 5 modification of the CSU admission policy for upper division transfer students adopted by the Board of Trustees at its July 2004 meeting establishes an admission priority for students who apply for admission to the California State University (CSU) for fall 2006 or later terms and who complete a lower division transfer pattern by major.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development**

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

In July 1997, the Board of Trustees revised the process for reviewing and approving new degree programs. The new process includes a provision for a limited semi-annual updating of campus academic plans to accommodate “fast-track” program proposals submitted in the early part of the calendar year. The proposed resolution would approve updated academic plans for California State University campuses at Long Beach and San Luis Obispo, including projections of new degree programs for which fast-track proposals have been submitted to the Chancellor.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plans and specify the conditions under which projected programs may be implemented.

#### **Background**

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the degree programs currently being offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. Degree programs that have been recently discontinued are also noted in the agenda item. The plans are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus and are reviewed by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy that has been developed over the last three decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of proposed programs on the academic master plan. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the implementation proposal must be submitted for review to staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), and their concurrence is obtained before the degree program is established.

In July 1997, the Board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established process described above, campuses have two alternative processes for establishing programs: the “fast track” and the pilot program. The fast

track combines the program projection and program implementation phases of the traditional process for a proposed program that meets the following criteria:

- (a) it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus's existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
- (b) it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
- (c) it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project; and
- (d) it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and Trustee policy;
- (e) it is a bachelor's or master's degree program;
- (f) the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

The fast track process makes it possible for a proposal to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by June and to have any concerns about a proposal resolved prior to review and authorization by the Board of Trustees at its September meeting. Proposals are referred to CPEC for endorsement prior to or soon after the September Board of Trustees' meeting. Once authorized by the CSU Board of Trustees and endorsed by CPEC, the degree program is incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring. While authorized programs are ready for full implementation by the subsequent academic year, some programs may be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term.

Three fast-track proposals were received in spring 2004: one request from California State University, Long Beach to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree program with a major in Linguistics and two requests from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. These include the desire to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree program with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies, to be offered through special sessions, and a Master of Arts in History. The programs as proposed meet the criteria for the fast-track process. The faculty, facilities, and information resources needed to offer the programs are in place.

*Long Beach:* The proposed BA with a major in Linguistics will replace an existing option in Language and Linguistics within the undergraduate English major. The campus already offers an MA in Linguistics, as well as the undergraduate option, a Linguistics minor, and certificate programs. Several CSU campuses have elevated undergraduate options or concentrations in

Linguistics to full degree programs, so there is precedent within the system for offering the major. The proposed Linguistics major is comprised entirely of existing courses, and the faculty and information resources to support the major are in place.

*San Luis Obispo:* The proposed self-support BA with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies is a program for working adults in the Central Coast area who have completed lower-division general education requirements and who transfer to California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo as upper-division students. Students will move through the program as a cohort, deepening their critical thinking, analytic, and research skills and exploring interdisciplinary approaches to current issues and public-policy debates. A faculty program committee, which will include tenured and tenure-track faculty representatives from at least three of the colleges within the university, will oversee the program.

The proposed MA in History is intended primarily for teachers or prospective teachers of history at the K-12 and community college levels in San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara Counties. Courses will be scheduled to accommodate students' work commitments. Interest appears to be strong enough to support a modest but reasonably cost-effective program. Similar programs are offered successfully at the majority of CSU campuses, and the proposed program will provide the sole opportunity to pursue graduate education in History within a hundred-mile radius of San Luis Obispo.

### **Recommended Action**

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2004 and includes the customary authorization for newly projected degree programs. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California State University, Long Beach (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 4 of the March 16-17, 2004, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Linguistics, with a projected implementation date of 2005; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 4 of the March 16-17, 2004, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Interdisciplinary Studies, with a projected implementation date of 2005 and a footnote indicating that the degree is to be

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 2  
September 14-15, 2004  
Page 4 of 4

offered through special sessions, and projection of a Master of Arts in History, with a projected implementation date of 2005; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that each degree program newly included in the campus Academic Plan is authorized for implementation, at approximately the date indicated, subject to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the program will be available.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Recommendations of the California State University Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs**

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

John D. Welty  
President  
California State University, Fresno  
Chair, Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs

#### **Summary**

In 2003, Chancellor Reed asked President Welty to convene the Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs, comprised of seven campus presidents, to focus on the special issues and challenges surrounding the preparation of administrators for California's schools. A thirty-nine-member work group was formed. These members included seventeen administrators and faculty from CSU campuses and twenty-two K-12 leaders, including several who had recently graduated from CSU-based education leadership programs, representatives from administrator professional organizations, state education agencies, and business and community organizations. Three subcommittees were formed and each was asked to focus its recommendations in a specific area:

***Subcommittee 1:*** The role of education leaders of the future

***Subcommittee 2:*** The recruitment of future education leaders

***Subcommittee 3:*** The preparation of future education leaders

The outcome of the Task Force's work, "The CSU Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs," was presented to the Board of Trustees at its July 13-14, 2004 meeting. The Presidents' Task Force is now returning to the Board with twelve recommendations regarding CSU preparation of administrative leaders based on these findings. These new recommendations, modeled after the recommendations from the two previous studies (1998 and 2002) on teacher preparation are included in Attachment A.

The following statement regarding these recommendations is offered by the Deans of Education, CSU:

The Deans of Education in the California State University system strongly support the conclusions of the CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs. The themes emphasized by the Task Force are essential to preparing tomorrow's educational leaders for California's schools. These themes recognize the need for comprehensive reform, for standards that evolve as CSU equips education leaders for the future throughout their career, for partnerships between higher education, professional groups, government, business and community leaders, for cohesive and coordinated programs across the higher education systems, for focus on instructional and school site leadership, and for making the preparation of education leaders an all-university responsibility.

The Chancellor's Office and the Deans of Education, working in concert with the Chairs of Educational Administration programs and education and community partners, plan to address the findings and recommendations of the report. The deans will also address systematically the issues raised in the report on their campuses in a coherent fashion with measurable outcomes and benchmarks over the next several years. The deans are committed to implementing both the administrative credential programs and the graduate programs at the masters and doctoral levels that are critical to fully addressing the mandate of the report: to prepare leaders for the diverse groups of students and the complex schools of California in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is proposed for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the Board of Trustees endorses the twelve recommendations included in agenda item 2, Attachment A, of the September 14-15, 2004 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy;

and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees directs the Chancellor to encourage the campus presidents and faculty to pursue actively the recommendations of the California State University Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership.

## **Recommendations of the California State University Presidents' Task Force on Education Leadership Programs**

### **Focus on instructional leadership**

*Preparing education leaders whose schools increase learning and achievement by all and close the achievement gap*

- By February 2005, each CSU campus Education Leadership Program will demonstrate program design that focuses on preparing graduates who will function as effective instructional leaders.
- By June 2006, all CSU Education Leadership Programs will prepare graduates with the ability to distribute instructional leadership roles.
- By February 2006, each CSU campus Education Leadership Program will prepare education leaders for all levels/positions and in sufficient numbers to meet their local needs.
- By February 2005, the CSU system will demonstrate its advocacy for increased public support for instructional leadership roles by school leaders.

### **Systemic core program elements**

*Creating and implementing programs that share essential instructional features*

- By February 2006, all CSU campus Education Leadership Programs will include common core elements with the key skills and knowledge for instructional leaders.
- By February 2005, each CSU Education Leadership Program will be designed to contain learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice.
- By February 2005, all CSU Education Leadership Programs, working collaboratively with each other, will have developed a systemic recruitment plan linked to the knowledge and skills needed for effective education leaders.
- By November 2005, each CSU Education Leadership Program will have adapted to better meet local needs in leadership knowledge, skills, recruitment, and support.

### **Collaborative partnerships**

*Creating programs for initial preparation and career development of instructional leaders*

- By November 2005, each CSU Education Leadership Program will draw on multiple partners from inside and outside the university to design, implement, and build collaborative Education Leadership Programs.
- By February 2006, each CSU campus Education Leadership Program will be designed, taught, and supported by all members of the partnership.

### **Accountability**

*Sharing responsibility for program assessment and improvement*

- By June 2006, the CSU system will assess, initially and over time, Education Leadership Programs' graduates' satisfaction with the effectiveness of their programs.
- By November 2005, each CSU campus Education Leadership Program will conduct and participate in regular assessments of the effectiveness of their graduates.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Status on the May 2003 recommendations based on the CSU Presidents' Commission On Teacher Education report, "*Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation*"**

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

Robert C. Maxson  
President  
California State University, Long Beach  
Chair, Presidents' Commission on Teacher Preparation and K-18 Education

#### **Summary**

In response to the urgent need for well-qualified teachers for California public schools and the commitment to maintain and improve the quality of CSU-prepared teachers, the California State University Board of Trustees adopted a policy statement at its July 14-15, 1998 meeting to reaffirm teacher education as one of the California State University's highest priorities. This statement, entitled "CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers," was developed by the Presidents' Commission to reinforce CSU's dedication to preparing more high quality teachers as quickly as possible. Progress on the "Commitments" was presented to the Board over a period of three years.

The Presidents' Commission was reconvened in September 2001 and met during the 2001-2002 academic year. The purpose of this new effort was to build on the previous commission's work, bringing a special focus on the preparation of teachers for middle and high schools. Twelve CSU presidents formed this second commission and provided oversight for three subcommittees:

- Subcommittee I – Preparation of Secondary Teachers to Teach in Standards-Based Instructional Programs
- Subcommittee II – Structure of Secondary Teacher Preparation at the CSU
- Subcommittee III – Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Areas Where Shortages Exist

The outcome of the Commission's work was presented to the Board of Trustees at its November 12-13, 2002 meeting, including a final report document entitled, "*Teachers for Tomorrow: A*

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 4  
September 14-15, 2004  
Page 2 of 2

*Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation.*” (See <http://www.calstate.edu/TeacherEd/TFT.pdf>.) The Presidents’ Commission returned to the Board with ten recommendations regarding CSU preparation of secondary teachers. The Board of Trustees endorsed these recommendations on May 14, 2003.

In March 2004, the CSU Secondary Teacher Education Programs were surveyed to assess the status of each program’s accomplishments and progress in addressing the recommendations. The current accomplishments against the timeline established by the Board of Trustees are summarized in the status report to the CSU Board of Trustees on the May 2003 recommendations of the CSU Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education, “Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation, Spring 2004.”