

**AGENDA**

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 26, 2000**  
**Dumke Conference Center**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
**Debra S. Farar**  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Dee Dee Myers  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Stanley T. Wang

**Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 15 and 17, 1999

**Discussion Items**

2. Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories *Information*
3. Progress Report on CSU' *Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers, Information*
4. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees *Information*

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 1  
January 25-26, 2000

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees**

**Presentation By**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Chief Academic Officer

**Summary**

Recommendations 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”].

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting:** 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 26, 2000  
Dumke Conference Center

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
Dee Dee Myers  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Stanley T. Wang

#### Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 15 and 17, 1999

#### Discussion Items

2. Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories, *Information*
3. Progress Report on CSU's *Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*, *Information*
4. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees, *Information*

**MINUTES OF 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**

**November 15 and 17, 1999**

**Members Present**

William D. Campbell, Chair  
Michael D. Stennis, Vice Chair  
Martha C. Fallgatter  
Harold Goldwhite  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Dee Dee Myers  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Stanley T. Wang

**Other Trustees Present**

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  
Jackie R. McClain, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

**Approval of Minutes**

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m., November 15, 1999. The minutes of September 15, 1999, were approved as submitted. The minutes of October 27, 1999, were approved as amended.

**Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access**

Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence indicated that the growing numbers of qualified students seeking CSU access are placing increasingly heavy enrollment pressures on several campuses. Current CSU enrollment already exceeds CPEC's 1995 enrollment projections with the biggest gains in students from underrepresented groups, especially Latino students. Dr. Spence distributed

information about the capacity of CSU campuses to handle increased numbers of students, the extent of program and campus impactation, and recent CPEC data regarding Tidal Wave II.

Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West provided additional information about the capacity of CSU campuses to respond to CPEC's enrollment projections. He indicated that in fall 2000, CSU is expected to increase its enrollment by 4.5 percent to 291,000 FTE.

Existing campus facilities can provide access to 300,000 FTE students. CSU could enroll 400,000 FTE students if it were to receive its master plan construction funding. In addition, expansion of off-campus centers, year-round operations, and distance learning opportunities could add an additional 30,000 FTE students.

Trustee Hauck suggested that "systemwide" capacity is meaningless because students do not always live where the capacity exists. He indicated that CSU must rely upon bond financing to build new facilities but we do not have any guarantee that CSU will secure this funding. Mr. West acknowledged the accuracy of Trustee Hauck's observation and responded that this is the reason CSU describes its realistic capacity at 330,000 FTE students (300,000 FTE based upon existing capacity and 30,000 FTE by flexible scheduling and instructional delivery methods). CSU received and has allocated to ten campuses \$2.2 million to plan for year-round operations, which will expand opportunities during the summer 2000 to students enrolled in teacher preparation and nursing programs. In response to Trustee Pesqueira's and Trustee Wang's questions about how the 300,000 FTE was calculated, Mr. West indicated that the figure was based upon current standards for instructional space utilization.

Chancellor Charles Reed stated that this policy discussion was timely because it will help to strengthen CSU's request to the legislature for funding to expand year-round operations. Dr. Reed indicated that it should not make any difference when a student takes classes. CSU needs to continue investigating better utilization of the twelve weeks between May and September, not just in terms of an additional semester/quarter, but in terms of flexible, modular scheduling, i.e., in blocks of time. To provide more flexible scheduling, Dr. Reed indicated that CSU will require more faculty and office space, and appropriate student academic support services. Trustee Pierce asked for information about physical capacity, how this capacity would increase on a year-round operation basis, and the number of students enrolled in K-12 in the campus service area on a campus-by-campus basis.

Dr. Spence described provisions in the Education Code and Title 5 that dictate CSU enrollment management policies. He stressed that to date, CSU has admitted all CSU-eligible students except in a few major programs that are impacted. Citing the *CSU Statistical Abstract to July 1998*, Dr. Spence indicated that 93 percent of first-time freshmen and 99 percent of transfers were accommodated in 1997-98. Accommodated means that an applicant was admitted, determined ineligible, or failed to complete their application.

Dr. Spence indicated that as part of its enrollment management policy review, CSU needs to develop a progressive approach in which campuses would be required to take certain steps before requesting impactation, including creative use of its capacity. Dr. Reed indicated that expansion of off-campus centers/branches is one cost-effective way to serve students. He also indicated that while difficult,

CSU can explore the joint use of facilities with community colleges. Trustee Pesqueira asked if it were possible to set aside funding to establish off-campus centers. Mr. West responded that some policy makers question the need for off-campus centers and that the issue of fixed costs associated with off-campus centers is still under discussion with the Department of Finance. Vice Chair Stennis indicated that CSU would need to develop a policy to decide which students would be permitted to enroll on main campuses and which students would be required to enroll at off-campus centers.

Trustee Wang inquired whether CSU could increase capacity by reducing the time to degree. Chancellor Reed indicated that it could, but that CSU should think in terms of the number of units required to complete a degree and the acceptability of community college courses upon transfer rather than in terms of years. Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked if there were ways CSU might partner with the UC as it is trying to partner with the community colleges. Dr. Spence indicated that CSU will explore all forms of cooperation. Trustee Hauck indicated that some states are considering subsidizing students for a set number of units, e.g., 140, after which the student might be required to pay the entire cost of education.

Trustee Pierce concurred that campuses should avoid impaction if possible. He noted that CSU does not give access to a program but only to a campus. He indicated that CSU would need to decide whether freshmen can be defined as place bound if they have access to a community college. He also suggested that the trustees consider how to measure financial hardship should this become an indicator of being place bound. Lastly, he asked that the trustees consider how to encourage students to attend campuses with excess capacity.

Chair Campbell indicated that short-term and long-term solutions should emerge from a systemwide discussion, and described the following set of policy questions and issues to be addressed:

- What should access to CSU mean for a CSU-eligible student seeking admission? Should access be to a specific campus, to any campus, or to a regional campus?
- For a student seeking a specific program, what does access to CSU mean? Should access be to a program somewhere in CSU or to a program at a specific campus?
- What should access to CSU mean for the place bound student? How should a place bound student be defined, e.g., location, personal circumstances? What kind of access should the place bound CSU-eligible student have? Should it be to a campus in the CSU, to a specific local or regional campus? If place bound students should be granted access to a local campus, should the applicant be guaranteed access or given greater priority in competitive admission?
- What should CSU policy specify regarding campuswide impaction? What steps must a campus take to expand its capacity prior to requesting impaction?

### **Recess**

The meeting recessed at 4:00 p.m.

### **Wednesday, November 17, 1999—Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access**

Chair Campbell reconvened the meeting at 8:46 a.m. All members of the committee were present except Mr. Michael D. Stennis.

Chair Campbell indicated a work group will be appointed with Donald R. Gerth, president, CSU Sacramento, as chair and include at least three additional presidents, Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli, an additional faculty member, and a student. The work group will evaluate current enrollment management policies and make recommendations to the Committee on Educational Policy to guide the chancellor in reviewing campus impact requests.

### **Special Report on Remediation**

Chair Campbell applauded the trustees, presidents, and faculty for their work in the development and implementation of effective remediation policies and programs. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence also commended campus efforts to address more effectively the remediation needs of students.

Dr. Spence stated that this special remediation report responds to trustee requests for information about campus efforts to provide effective remediation. Dr. Spence reviewed criteria for permitting continued enrollment.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stressed that considerable progress has been made in the remedial process. He stated that in fall 1998, 68 percent of the total first-time freshmen admitted needed remediation. By fall 1999, 79 percent of the students who needed remediation demonstrated proficiency in mathematics and English. For the remaining students, 7 percent were disenrolled, 7 percent withdrew voluntarily, and 7 percent were permitted by the campus to re-enroll. Of the freshmen who entered in fall 1998 and continued their enrollment in fall 1999, 94 percent were fully proficient in English and mathematics.

Trustee Pesqueira commended the remediation efforts of the presidents, faculty, and especially the students. Trustee Goldwhite also congratulated all who participated in the remediation efforts. He asked the presidents to devote special attention to increasing the likelihood that students who are asked to complete their remedial classes at a community college will return to CSU to earn their degrees.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that outreach efforts are continuing and include cooperation with Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin, public school principals and teachers, and superintendents across the state. Secretary Eastin thanked the trustees and Chancellor Reed for their support in the outreach initiative. Secretary Eastin observed that the governor supports the reduction of mathematics and English class sizes. Secretary Eastin voiced concern about the fact that last year only 1,200 mathematics majors graduated from CSU when the state needs at least that many additional teachers to adequately staff classrooms. Chair Campbell stated that the solution to the remedial issue is CSU working closely with Secretary Eastin to improve mathematics and English preparation prior to enrollment.

Trustee Wang praised the efforts of the campuses and Chancellor Reed. He asked if those students who need both remedial English and mathematics were double counted. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence responded that students were only counted once, even if the student required both remedial mathematics and English. Trustee Wang asked that trustees be kept aware of the remedial trend. Dr. Spence commented that because this is the first year of student testing, the results are being carefully monitored and will be provided in the annual March report to the trustees.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked if passing a proficiency test in mathematics and English can be used as a measure of student success. Dr. Spence responded that CSU needs to look at its exams and determine better ways to match diagnostic results with appropriate instructional remedies. Chair Campbell agreed that work is needed to develop effective testing. President Caret, San Jose State University, noted that the writing portion of the test is problematic for limited English proficient students.

Trustee Myers asked if students who withdraw are more likely to be those who needed remedial mathematics or English. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence responded that students withdraw for a variety of reasons and the inability to acquire proficiency in English and mathematics may be one of the reasons.

### **Accountability Process**

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that the proposed Accountability Process is a consensus document. The purpose of the process is to tell the public about CSU's work and its value in terms with which the public can identify. He added that a section on faculty scholarship and creative achievement was included in the document, and that performance areas 10 through 13 will be addressed by the submission of a report from each campus on a four-year-cycle.

Statewide Academic Senate Chair Dinielli commended Chancellor Reed and Vice Chancellor Spence for their work with the faculty, and expressed gratitude for being included in the process. He commented that not only is the accountability report a measure of the system, but an explanation of each campus mission and how that mission is brought to fruition.

Trustee Pierce thanked Vice Chancellor Spence for his inclusion of indicators of alumni contributions in the report. Trustee Pierce commented that the report will measure the numbers of alumni, formal membership, and alumni who become donors, and will produce a consistency in reporting. This will contribute to a more successful alumni program.

Trustee Goldwhite stated that the accountability process demonstrated that a plan can be produced expediently and still give all CSU constituencies the opportunity for full participation in the process.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (REP 11-99-03).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 2  
January 25-26, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories**

##### **Presentation By**

Robert L. Caret, President  
San Jose State University

Kenneth Coale, Acting Director  
Moss Landing Marine Laboratories

##### **Summary**

This continues a series of presentations to the Board of Trustees on notable accomplishments of California State University faculty in teaching, research, and scholarship. One exceptional feature of the CSU system is the ability of institutions to work together to accomplish what would otherwise be impossible for any individual campus. There is no better example of this than the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML), a collaboration that enables students from several different CSU institutions to have access to the frontiers of science. Moss Landing comprises the marine facilities and graduate program in marine science for a consortium of seven CSU campuses: Fresno, Hayward, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus. Hands-on field and laboratory experience prepares students for a variety of careers in the marine sciences.

## ITEM

2

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 2

January 25-26, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Recognition of Outstanding Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Moss Landing Marine Laboratories**

Located on the doorstep of Monterey Bay and the nation's largest marine sanctuary, the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML) represent some of the best features of the California State University: students and faculty working side-by-side on cutting-edge research, a commitment to the advancement of learning, and a collaboration that enables students from several different CSU institutions to have access to pioneering work in science.

Moss Landing comprises the marine facilities and graduate program in marine sciences for a consortium of seven CSU campuses: Fresno, Hayward, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus. It has a governing board, composed of three individuals from each consortium campus, which meets twice a year to provide advice and direction to the program. With a teaching faculty of nine, augmented by adjunct professors, support researchers, and affiliated scientists, MLML trains 100 graduate students and 20 undergraduates every year and enjoys an international reputation for excellence in the marine sciences.

Founded in 1966 with a gift from the Beaudette Foundation and a grant from the National Science Foundation, MLML is the second oldest marine institution on the Monterey Bay. The mission of the laboratories is to advance students to the frontiers of marine science through involvement in cutting-edge research. Students are expected to contribute significantly to their field of interest, and most publish their thesis research in peer-reviewed scientific journals. Hands-on field and laboratory experience prepares students for a variety of careers, and many graduates hold positions in government, regulatory agencies, universities, schools, and colleges nationwide. Over 87 percent of MLML graduates stay in the marine science field throughout their careers.

MLML students and researchers have access to considerable resources. As a comprehensive marine research library, MLML houses over 30,000 monographs and, through a collaborative agreement with the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI), has access to extensive electronic resources. In addition, MLML is home to one of the nation's largest scientific diving programs where students receive advanced training in the latest underwater research techniques including underwater photography, propulsion, communication, and mixed gas diving. MLML maintains a small boat facility with several Boston whalers and zodiacs, which are available to all trained students, staff, and faculty. In addition, MLML owns two coastal research vessels for deeper or offshore work, both available for student and faculty projects. MLML also operates a 135-foot research vessel, R/V Point Sur, which is owned by the National Science Foundation and is used by scientists nationwide for the study of coastal waters from Mexico to Canada.

These opportunities have created an environment for top-notch research by MLML scientists committed to involving CSU students in their work. In a landmark experiment in the equatorial Pacific, Dr. Kenneth Coale and Dr. Ken Johnson demonstrated that iron is the key to ocean

productivity over much of the world's oceans. Featured on the cover of the British science magazine *Nature*, this finding is of great importance with respect to carbon dioxide and global warming and has been declared one of the three greatest discoveries in ocean sciences of this century. Implications of this finding are now being investigated by the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, and many other scientists both nationally and internationally.

MLML has sponsored other significant research projects on animal life in ocean waters. Because whales are so large, fast, and shy, scientists are able to observe them only from the surface. Yet much of what whales do is underwater. Dr. Jim Harvey and Dr. Jennifer Hurley have trained sea lions to carry video cameras to film whales in their natural environment, unmolested by robotic vehicles, people, or lights. This novel project caught the attention of *National Geographic*, the Discovery Channel, and others. As a result, MLML's youngest trained sea lion, Sake, was the mascot for the U.S. pavilion at the World Expo in Lisbon, Portugal, last year, and research continues using sea lions as scientific observers.

In another project, a ten-year study in Antarctic waters near the Palmer Peninsula, Dr. Valerie Loeb has found that a subtle but widespread warming trend has reduced sea ice coverage, thus eliminating habitat for krill, a key link in the Antarctic food chain. Already reduction in krill abundance is having a detrimental effect on penguin and whale populations there. This finding too was featured on the cover of *Nature* magazine and has rekindled interest in long-term Antarctic studies of krill and climate.

These are only a few examples of recent projects in which MLML faculty have involved students in ground-breaking research. From rubber boots to satellites, MLML scientists and students use whatever methods are required to address specific and important questions in marine science. A continued commitment to excellence has made MLML faculty competitive with other nationally recognized marine institutions, and the hands-on approach to education has positioned CSU graduates at the forefront of marine sciences.

## BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3  
January 25-26, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Progress Report on *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers***

##### **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 July 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a statement entitled *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*. This statement is composed of ten goals, each having a specific timeline for completion. Developed and recommended by the CSU Presidents Commission on Teacher Preparation and K-18 Education, the goals were formulated to increase the number and quality of credential holders prepared by the CSU. Campuses have made significant progress in achieving the goals set in the four responsibility areas of access, curriculum, high standards, and collaboration with schools. All of the goals are to be reached by July 2000. A final report on the goals will be presented to the trustees in January 2001. This report describes programs through November 15, 1999.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3  
January 25-26, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Progress Report on CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers**

##### **Background**

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 Committee on Educational Policy for California State University Board of Trustees adopted a policy statement at its July 14-15, 1998, trustee meeting to reaffirm teacher education as one of CSU's highest priorities. This statement, entitled *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*, was developed by the Presidents Commission and was intended to reinforce CSU's dedication to preparing more high quality teachers as quickly as possible. (See Attachment A)

The commitment statement identified four areas with ten explicit goals and specified dates for each goal. These areas include:

- *Access* – To build capacity and efficiency of California's largest public university;
- *Curriculum* – To develop opportunities for early and better articulated teacher preparation;
- *High Standards* – To establish the CSU benchmark for a well-prepared California teacher;
- *Collaboration with Schools* – To broaden university/K-12 shared role in teacher preparation.

##### **Process for Evaluating Progress Toward Commitment Goals**

Evaluation of the progress toward the CSU teacher education goals is being conducted in three phases.

Phase I began in spring 1999 when campuses were requested to report their progress on goals to date and submit this information to the Chancellor's Office. This qualitative information, along with the informal discussions at the semi-annual deans' meetings indicated that campuses were taking the necessary steps to fulfill their responsibilities toward goal implementation.

Phase II of the process was conducted in fall 1999. A formal questionnaire was distributed to each campus having a teacher preparation program. The questionnaire consisted of several questions for each goal area requiring brief responses from each campus. In addition, campuses were asked to list the activities, products, and other quantifiable evidence that demonstrated achievement of the goals. The data collected from this instrument is the basis for this report on progress to date.

Phase III of the assessment process will be more formal in nature. An external evaluation will be conducted under the aegis of the CSU Presidents Commission. The Commission will oversee an external evaluation team to conduct campus visitations during the spring 2000 and summer/early fall 2000 to evaluate campus progress. The findings of the evaluation team will be reviewed by the Presidents Commission and presented to the Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Policy at its January 2001 meeting.

The external evaluation process will focus on campus achievement of *Commitments* and any additional or supplemental activities that are moving schools/colleges forward in new approaches to teacher preparation. The Presidents Commission will serve as the oversight group to the team of personnel conducting the evaluation.

This team will be composed of individuals external to the CSU with credibility and knowledge of current teacher preparation reform issues. They will conduct structured interviews with faculty and stakeholders such as area superintendents and current/past students. The team will also review documents/artifacts describing activities in which the education schools/colleges are involved.

The evaluation team will provide periodic progress reports to the Presidents Commission and will develop a draft and a final report that will include the following:

- Executive Summary
- Overall Findings
- Individual Campus Reports
- Recommendations to Consider

It is intended that by gathering data in these three stages, involving both formal and informal collection methods, the assessment process will yield an accurate assessment of campus achievement related to these Trustee goals.

### **Progress Reported Through Evaluation Phases I and II**

Campuses have met and exceeded the targeted goals and timelines for demonstrated progress toward the *CSUs Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers* as evidenced by the first two phases of evaluation. The type and amount of data submitted indicate the CSU campuses have taken seriously the responsibility to enhance access and improve the quality of their respective teacher preparation programs.

### ***Access***

There were three goals set in the area of access. The target date has passed for the first two, with campuses reporting full achievement of goals. The third goal, to increase credential recommendations by 25 percent by July of 2000, has also been achieved by campuses in the area of elementary credentials. It should be noted that this goal was achieved in one year, and it is expected to be well exceeded by the target date.

- Cal Teach is operational as a statewide teacher recruitment center with over 3.5 million visits to the website last year, more than 12,000 registered teachers, and more than half of the state's districts registered as recruiters.
- Every CSU campus has examined and improved its admissions, advisement, and student services for credential admissions. Advisement is available on-line at 13 campuses, and all the remaining campuses plan to be operational within the year.
- One year ahead of the target date, CSU recommendations for elementary credentials have already increased by 28 percent, and all teaching credentials have increased by 25 percent.

### ***Curriculum***

Both goals set in the area of curriculum had target dates in mid to late 1999, and campuses report meeting these goals as well. The curriculum areas included some qualitative program elements, which the presentation will describe in terms of ongoing improvements.

- All 21 of the CSU teacher preparation campuses have initiated integrated undergraduate or blended programs. Fourteen of these programs began enrollment in the fall of 1999, with over 600 students systemwide. The remaining campuses are all in the process of program approval, with six more programs to begin in 2000. The last campus will begin enrolling students in blended programs in January of 2001.
- Every CSU teacher preparation campus offers multiple pathways to credential status including flexible and non-traditional routes designed to serve students with varying needs. Programs are offered at K-12 sites via every campus, through distance learning, summer programs, and extended education.

### ***High Standards***

The two goals set in the area of high standards both have target dates of July 2000. The presentation will outline how campuses are on track for achievements in the areas that are under the control of the CSU, and how campuses are working with state agencies to facilitate progress in other areas.

- The CSU Deans of Education developed and approved a proposal for Common Admissions Standards which is currently under review by the Statewide Academic Senate. The deans are also discussing common transfer procedures, including guidelines for cross-campus courtesy placements.
- Common exit standards are being developed by the SB 2042 Panel, convened by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in response to legislation. These common exit standards will result in the development of a common exit assessment administered by the state for all program completers. The CSU is participating in the development of these standards and the assessment.

### ***Collaboration with Schools***

The three goals in the collaboration with schools section call for desired improvements and enhancements to campus relationships with K-12 agencies. The presentation will detail campus progress in these areas, not only in how the goals have been achieved, but in how improvements continue to develop.

- Every campus has reported an increase in campus/K-12 partnerships including over 475 intern agreements, 21 programs for teacher aides, and district site programs for emergency permit teachers. All 21 campuses participated in the CSU program to increase the mathematics preparation of middle-school teachers who needed to attain supplemental credential status in that content area.

- Fourteen of the campuses employ district personnel via joint appointment to work as visiting faculty members, and all 21 campuses also employ district personnel as adjunct faculty in teacher preparation.
- All but one of the CSU teacher preparation programs are partners with school districts in the state's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program for novice teachers. Nineteen of the campuses are partners with districts and teacher organizations in programs for lifelong professional development of teachers.

### **Future Action**

Over the approximately 18 months since making these commitments, the CSU has made dramatic and positive changes in all aspects of teacher preparation. Most recent events include the systemwide Ahmanson Conference. This event, hosted by Chancellor Reed and funded by the Ahmanson Foundation, brought together the administrative and faculty leadership from the 30 California universities with the largest teacher preparation programs. Collectively this group is responsible for over 80 percent of credential recommendations annually. The conference was devoted to a sharing of best practices across the public and private segments of teacher preparation, highlighted by an opening address from the chancellor and a lunchtime address on educational policy by California Secretary for Education Gary Hart.

One week later, the CSU was a leading co-sponsor in the Irvine Foundation Presidential Summit. This event, an invitational gathering of the California presidents of universities engaging in teacher preparation, was the first meeting ever of this group, designed to focus attention on the critical importance of this work to the state. The summit culminated in the public release of a joint statement agreeing to move teacher preparation higher on every university agenda and to make it central to each institution's mission.

The CSU has also played a major role in the recent federal move to teacher preparation program accountability through the recently enacted Title 11 legislation. At both the campus and system levels, CSU faculty and administrators are serving to help shape the federal guidelines and implementation strategies. Two CSU campuses, Chico and Los Angeles, were also selected (as part of nine nationally) to assist the U.S. Department of Education in a pilot implementation trial of the new reporting requirements.

It is apparent that progress toward the CSU's *Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers* has produced a strong momentum on campuses to improve the preparation of teachers in California and in increasing student enrollments and credential recommendations.

ATTACHMENT A  
Ed. Pol.—Agenda Item 3  
January 25-26, 2000

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 4  
January 25-26, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees**

##### **Presentation By**

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

##### **Summary**

An element of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan is the revision of Title 5 to reduce the minimum total units required for a bachelor's degree to 120 semester units (180 quarter units). Minor changes in the language governing undergraduate degrees are also proposed to make the constraints on the units required for different bachelor's degrees more comparable, where appropriate and consistent with campus practice in the CSU.

The proposed standards are being discussed with the CSU Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate CSU, and the Executive Council. The revisions to Title 5 will be presented for action at a subsequent meeting this year.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4  
January 25-26, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees

##### Background

The first principle of Cornerstones declares, "The California State University will award the baccalaureate on the basis of demonstrated learning, as determined by our faculty." While in the long term, the assessment of learning in the CSU may be less tied to courses than it currently is at most university campuses, the awarding of credit units for the minimally satisfactory completion of a course remains the prevalent measure of student achievement in U.S. higher education.

The Governor's Budget Summary 1999-2000 stated, "The Governor believes UC and CSU must shorten the time it takes a student to graduate.... CSU must move to immediately reconcile its 124-unit graduation requirement with UC's 120-unit requirement." Current CSU policy, as embodied in Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations*, requires that students earn at least 124 semester units (equivalent to 186 quarter units) to qualify for a bachelor's degree. This requirement has been in effect at least since the 1960s. The requirement is somewhat anomalous in light of the CSU's definition of a full-time equivalent student: one who is enrolled for fifteen units a term. Successful completion of four academic years of study at fifteen units per term would leave a student four semester units or six quarter units short of the total units required for graduation. That is, to graduate in four years, a student would have to enroll for more than a full-time equivalent course load for one or more terms. It is believed that the 124-unit requirement for graduation is linked to a four-unit physical education activity requirement that was imposed on CSU students in mid-century but which most CSU campuses no longer embrace.

U.S. institutions of higher education have long exhibited differences in the minimum unit requirement for graduation. For example, institutions in which full-time students are routinely expected to take four courses each semester typically require 32 or more courses for graduation; with each course identified by the institution as four semester units for purposes of comparison with other institutions, this requirement equates to 128 semester units. This type of requirement is especially common at liberal arts colleges (e.g., members of the Claremont Colleges, Amherst, Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr) but is also found at some universities (e.g., Duke). Universities for which the credit unit, not the course, is the primary measure of student workload are much more likely, however, to consider 120 semester units or equivalent the minimum units required for a baccalaureate degree. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges defines a BA or BS degree as "an undergraduate degree normally representing about four years (120 semester or 180 quarter units) of college study, or its equivalent in depth and quality of learning experience." The minimum unit requirement for a baccalaureate degree in the University of California is typically 120 semester or 180 quarter units. The CSU would be well within the bounds of common practice, in California and nationally, to make 120 semester units the minimum to be required for graduation.

With expanding knowledge bases and ever more sophisticated methods and tools, most fields of baccalaureate study have experienced pressure to include more courses and units in the undergraduate program, which extends students' time to degree. It is becoming increasingly clear, however, that an undergraduate education is rarely sufficient to prepare a graduate fully for life as a professional

and as a citizen. For the kinds of careers and lives that college graduates pursue, lifelong postsecondary learning—formal and informal—will almost certainly be required. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, four years after college graduation, 72 percent of the baccalaureate degree recipients who had *not* entered graduate education expected to earn a graduate degree during their careers. The Academic Senate CSU, in its study of baccalaureate education in the CSU, recognized this shift by emphasizing “knowledge and skills for lifelong intellectual endeavor”—those skills which graduates will find are “necessary to continue to learn throughout their lives.” If a baccalaureate degree should no longer be expected to be exhaustively comprehensive but to represent instead completion of one intermediate phase of an individual’s educational life, then balancing the pressure to incorporate additional areas of study within the baccalaureate program with the interest of students and the general public in expeditious completion of bachelor’s degree programs becomes less problematic.

With such considerations in mind, the Board of Trustees endorsed in March 1999 the Cornerstones Implementation Plan, which includes the following element:

The Board of Trustees will reduce the Title 5 baccalaureate degree unit requirement from 124 to 120 units. Each campus will re-examine the unit requirements for graduation and provide a monitoring system to ensure that acceptable justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the normative minimum of 120 units.

### **Discussion**

The proposed Title 5 language generally retains the structure of the bachelor’s degrees currently authorized but establishes 120 semester units as the minimum required for any bachelor’s degree and encourages campuses to establish no greater total-unit requirement for a degree program than can be strongly justified. The language is analogous in its generality to the existing Title 5 section on the master’s degree. For greater consistency, some features of the existing Bachelor of Arts degree are formally extended to other bachelor’s degrees, as they are in practice on most CSU campuses.

### **Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Article 6 of Subchapter 2 of Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

**§ 40500.            ~~Bachelor of Arts Degree: Required Curriculum.\*~~ The Bachelor’s Degree.**

~~\*(This section applies to students who enter the curriculum on or after the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

To be eligible for ~~the Bachelor of Arts~~ a bachelor's degree other than the Bachelor of Vocational Education degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements and Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals. ~~The courses in~~ Courses taken to meet General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major.....24 semester units:

~~There shall be one major with a minimum of 24 semester units. At least 12 semester units in the major shall be upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by the campus. Each candidate shall complete a specified pattern of study approved as a major by the appropriate campus authority.~~

(1) A major leading to the Bachelor of Science degree shall incorporate a minimum of 36 semester units, including at least 18 semester units in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

(2) A major leading to the Bachelor of Architecture or Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree shall incorporate a minimum of 45 semester units, including at least 27 semester units in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

(3) A major leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree or other bachelor's degree not specified in subsection (1) or (2) shall incorporate a minimum of 24 semester units, including at least 12 semester units in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

(4) At least one-fourth of the units in a major leading to the Bachelor of Music or Bachelor of Fine Arts degree shall be devoted to theory, history, repertory, and criticism, as distinguished from studio, production, and performance.

(5) The maximum number of units in a major shall be determined by the campus.

(c) Minor. The campus may require a minor of candidates pursuing specified majors, A minor consisting of shall incorporate 12 or more semester units, of which including at least six must be in upper-division credit, may be required semester units in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

(d) Additional Units. Units to complete the 124 total required for the degree may meet other requirements or be used as electives or to meet other requirements.

(e) Total semester units required for the Bachelor of Arts Degree, of which at least 40 shall be in the upper division credit.....124 semester units. A total of at least 120 semester units shall be required of each candidate, including at least 40 semester units in upper-division courses or their equivalent. Each campus shall establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that acceptable justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the normative minimum of 120 units.

For each campus, this section shall be effective on the commencement of the 2000-01 academic year for all candidates except those who elect to meet previously established graduation requirements pursuant to Section 40401.

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

**~~§ 40501. Bachelor of Science Degree: Required Curriculum.\*~~**

~~\*(This section applies to students who enter the curriculum on or after the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

~~To be eligible for the Bachelor of Science degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:~~

~~(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.~~

~~(b) Major.....36 semester units.~~

~~There shall be one major with a minimum of 36 semester units. At least 18 semester units in the major shall be upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by the campus.~~

~~(c) Total units required for the Bachelor of Science degree.....124 to 132 semester units.~~

~~The number of semester units for each curriculum shall be determined by each campus within the limits of 124 to 132, except that 140 semester units may be required in engineering.~~

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

~~NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66600, 89030 and 89221-89223, Education Code.~~

**§ 40503. Bachelor of Vocational Education Degree\***

~~\*(This section applies to students who enter the curriculum on or after the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

(a) Eligibility for Candidacy. Eligible candidates for this degree shall be limited to those vocational teachers who have been recommended by the Board of Examiners for Vocational Teachers and who meet the requirements established in the Education Code.

(b) Education Program. The educational program for each applicant candidate shall be have been determined by the campus in terms of accordance with the needs of the individual applicant candidate and the standards of the institution. A rigid pattern of subjects, ~~and prerequisites except as they may be necessary to advanced courses,~~ will not be required. Prerequisites will be required only as necessary for advanced courses.

(c) Requirements. Each applicant candidate for the degree shall have completed, ~~with a grade point average of 2.0 (grade C) or better, except that only those courses in which a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) is assigned shall be used in computing the grade point average, a course of 124 120 semester units, including the credits recommended by the Board of Examiners, and shall have met the General Education-Breadth Requirements prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.~~ The candidate shall have achieved a grade point average of 2.0 or better in those courses in which a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) was assigned.

(d) Major in Vocational Education. The credits recommended by the Board of Examiners for Vocational Teachers for the applicant's candidate's occupational, managerial, and supervisory experience shall be applied toward a major in vocational education.

(e) Credit for Vocational Teacher Training. The vocational teacher training completed by the applicant candidate may be used ~~toward a minor in education or toward electives if some other minor is used~~ as elective credit.

For each campus that is authorized to establish and maintain a curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Vocational Education degree, this section shall be effective on the commencement of the 2000-01 academic year for all candidates for the Bachelor of Vocational Education degree except those who elect to meet previously established graduation requirements pursuant to Section 40401.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030 and 89035, Education Code.  
Reference: Sections 66600, 89030 and 89221-89223, Education Code.

**NOTE:**

**~~§ 40505. Bachelor of Architecture Degree: Required Curriculum.\*~~**

~~\*(This section applies to students who enter the curriculum on or after the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

To be eligible for the Bachelor of Architecture degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) ~~General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.~~

(b) ~~Major.....45 semester units.~~

~~The major shall consist of a minimum of 45 semester units. At least 27 semester units in the major shall be in upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by each campus.~~

(c) ~~Total units required for the Bachelor of Architecture degree.....165 to 175 semester units.~~

~~The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester period or equivalent.~~

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

**~~§ 40506. Bachelor or Music Degree and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree: Required Curriculum.~~**

~~(This section applies to students who meet the requirements of Section 40401 and who enter the curriculum prior to the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

~~To be eligible for either the Bachelor of Music degree or the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:~~

~~a) General Education-Breadth Requirements, minimum 40 semester units. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Section 40405.~~

~~(b) Major=70 semester units. The major shall consist of a maximum of 70 semester units with at least one-fourth of these units devoted to theory and content as distinguished from studio, production, and performance.~~

~~(c) Total units required for the Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree = 132 semester units.~~

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

**~~§ 40506. Bachelor of Music Degree and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree: Required Curriculum.\*~~**

~~\*(This section applies to students who enter the curriculum on or after the commencement of the 1981-82 academic year.)~~

~~To be eligible for either the Bachelor of Music degree or the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:~~

~~(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.~~

~~(b) Major—70 semester units. The major shall consist of a maximum of 70 semester units with at least one-fourth of these units devoted to theory and content as distinguished from studio, production, and performance.~~

~~(c) Total units required for the Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree.....132 semester units.~~

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

**~~§ 40507. Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Degree: Required Curriculum.\*~~**

~~To be eligible for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:~~

~~(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.~~

~~(b) Major.....45 semester units.~~

~~The major shall consist of a minimum of 45 semester units, exclusive of those courses used to meet General Education-Breadth Requirements. At least 27 semester units in the major shall be in upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by each campus.~~

~~(c) Total units required for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree—155 to 165 semester units. The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester period or equivalent.~~

~~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.