

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 8:15 a.m., Wednesday, July 17, 2002
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
William D. Campbell, Vice Chair
Martha Fallgatter
Harold Goldwhite
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Ralph Pesqueira
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos
Anthony M. Vitti

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes

Discussion Items

1. California State University Enrollment Management Policies, *Information*
2. California State University Lower-Division Major Core Alignment Project, *Information*
3. Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University, *Action*
4. Notable Accomplishments in California State University Teaching, Research and Scholarship: The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at California State University, Los Angeles, *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**

May 15, 2002

Members Present

Debra S. Farar, Chair
William D. Campbell, Vice Chair
Daniel N. Cartwright
Martha Fallgatter
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
Ricardo F. Icaza
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Members Absent

Roberta Achtenberg
Dee Dee Myers
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Other Trustees Present

Bob Foster
Shailesh J. Mehta
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Erene S. Thomas
Kyriakos Tsakopulous

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
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Gary A. Hammerstrom, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Chair Farar called the meeting to order on Wednesday, May 15, 2002, at 9:04 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 13, 2002, were approved by consent as submitted.

California State University, Monterey Bay: Outcomes-Based Education

Chair Farar stated that in a context of outcomes-based education, CSU Monterey Bay developed its academic model by placing the focus on student learning and how student learning can be demonstrated. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence commented that outcomes-based education is a major component of the Cornerstones document, and that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) has adopted this process.

Dr. Peter Smith, President, CSU Monterey Bay, added that outcomes-based education leads to a deeper and better learning process defining quality of education. Dr. Smith stressed that while much has been accomplished at CSU Monterey Bay, outcomes-based education is a work in progress. Dr. Diane Cordero de Noriega, Provost, CSU Monterey Bay, gave an overview of CSU Monterey Bay's approach to outcomes-based education pointing out that all academic programs at the university, including general education and academic majors, stipulate specific learning outcomes. Dr. Cordero de Noriega stated that the assessment process provides all students with the knowledge of what is expected of them and directs them toward clearer learning expectations. As a result of this process, faculty continuously clarifies outcomes, criteria, and standards in order to improve the alignment of assignments and assessments with outcomes.

Chair Farar asked for a definition of the Capstone project. Dr. Cordero de Noriega responded that the project requires students to create a culminating project and present it to colleagues, families, and faculty. The Capstone project is a demonstration of learning and a celebration of student achievement.

Trustee Goldwhite congratulated the CSU Monterey Bay community upon their exemplary demonstration of CSU outcomes assessment. Dr. Goldwhite encouraged additional outcomes conferences. Trustee Pierce also commended CSU Monterey Bay on their work. Trustee Pierce questioned how the overarching objectives of critical thinking, oral, and written communication are addressed through outcomes-based education. Dr. Cordero de Noriega responded that these objectives are emphasized and incorporated in the General Education requirements and these outcomes are articulated more prominently in G.E. courses. President Smith stressed that even though the objectives are more explicit in lower division courses, there is a continuous thread through upper division courses.

Chair Farar expressed appreciation for the work done by CSU Monterey Bay faculty and staff.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

California State University Enrollment Management Policies

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

At the March 2000 meeting, the Board of Trustees adopted modifications to its enrollment management policy that emphasized the California State University's commitment to guarantee access to a local campus for every eligible undergraduate applicant. This item further modifies enrollment management policy in light of the experience of several campuses faced with severe program and campus impactation.

Background

When the Board of Trustees adopted its enrollment management policy in March 2000, it reaffirmed that upper division California Community College transfers have the highest priority for admission, that all fully eligible freshmen are accommodated somewhere in the system, that California residents have the highest priority for admission, that all CSU-eligible students are guaranteed admission to at least one local CSU campus, and that campuses must maintain a balanced program and achieve diversity as admission priorities are implemented.

Since implementation of the enrollment management policy, questions have arisen about some aspects of the policy. The proposed modifications to the enrollment management policy address the following areas requiring further clarification: (1) improvement in communication of campus admission policies and procedures, especially policies regarding local admission guarantees, (2) access to programs and majors that may not be available at an applicant's local CSU campus, (3) role of presidential advisory groups to assist the campus in the identification of effective enrollment management policies that recognize broad community interests, and (4) expanded analysis and reporting on the effect of enrollment management policies on students.

Proposed Resolution

To assist campuses to address the educational needs of the diverse student population in their respective service regions in response to continuing enrollment pressures, the Board of Trustees

proposes the following modification to its enrollment management policy adopted in March 2000:

The following resolution will be proposed for adoption at the September 2002 meeting.

WHEREAS, California law acknowledges the responsibility of the State of California to provide the resources necessary for higher education to fulfill the requirements of the Master Plan for Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, Education Code Section 66202.5 states, “The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth ... to accommodate eligible California freshmen applicants and eligible California Community College transfer students...;” and

WHEREAS, Education Code Section 66202 outlines categories for enrollment planning and admission priority in the following order: continuing undergraduate students in good standing, California Community College transfer students, transfer students from other four year campuses and institutions, and finally freshmen or sophomore level students; and

WHEREAS, California State University and its campuses remain committed to serving the diversity of the state through its enrollment management policy and local service regions; and

now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University that the following principles are adopted by the Board of Trustees effective with students seeking admission to the CSU for fall ~~2004~~2003 to aid the Chancellor and campuses in carrying out the mission of the CSU and to ensure that CSU campuses continue to comply with the provisions of the Master Plan for Education:

- CSU commits itself to the provision of equal educational opportunities for all admitted and enrolled CSU students.
- CSU reaffirms its commitment to the Master Plan to accommodate within the CSU all fully eligible students in the upper one-third of recent California high school graduates and all fully eligible, upper-division California community college transfer students.

- Appropriate to the mission of the CSU system and that of its member campuses, each CSU campus is expected to maintain a balanced student body and to provide broad-based access to the people of California.
- CSU outreach, admission, and retention policies shall continue to provide encouragement, support, academic and counseling services, and access to students traditionally underrepresented in California higher education toward the goal of enrolling a student population reflective of campus service areas and California's growing diversity. To ensure that each campus works toward this goal within its service area, the Office of the Chancellor will coordinate all statewide efforts related to these services.
- It is the intent of the CSU Board of Trustees that campuswide impaction be avoided. The trustees will seek the instructional and physical capacity resources necessary to serve all fully eligible students who desire a CSU education. The physical capacity of each campus and its off-campus centers will be established and publicized twelve months prior to the beginning of each academic year. The CSU system shall work with CSU campuses for which program impaction is inadequate to manage their enrollment pressures. A campus may be designated as impacted campuswide only if the campus can demonstrate that it has exhausted existing enrollment capacity by implementing such approaches as flexible scheduling and year round operations, expanding distance learning and use of technology, increasing the capacity of existing off-campus centers, establishing new centers, and using facilities imaginatively, but not at the expense of regular campus maintenance and capital outlay needs.
- CSU-eligible students are guaranteed admission to at least one local CSU campus. Admission, however, does not include assurance of admission to a specific program.
- If a major or program is not offered as part of the curriculum at an applicant's local CSU campus, CSU-eligible students are guaranteed admission to an alternate CSU campus closest to the high school from which the applicant graduated or the community college from which the student is transferring that offers the major or program that the applicant is seeking.
- First-time freshmen and upper division transfer students shall be admitted to a local CSU campus on the basis of established CSU system admission policies, i.e., those standards defined in the first principle listed above. The local admission guarantee will be announced and figure prominently in all campus recruitment, outreach, and admission materials.
- For purposes of admission, "local" first-time freshmen are defined as those students who graduate from a high school historically served by a CSU campus in that region,

and local upper division transfer students are defined as those who transfer from a community college historically served by a CSU campus in that region. The boundaries of a campus service region shall contain the entire territory of the school district or community college district in which the local high school or community college campus is located.

- CSU campuses shall utilize program impaction where appropriate prior to requesting campuswide impaction.
- CSU campuses may pursue program impaction for those programs receiving more fully eligible applicants than can be accommodated. Campuswide impaction shall be authorized only when program impaction is inadequate to cope with an excess number of fully eligible applicants.
- To assist the campus in the identification of effective enrollment management policies, new or existing, that address the education needs of the local student population in terms of outreach, admission, and enrollment, each campus president shall consult with a presidential advisory group. The members of the presidential advisory group will include faculty, students, administrators, representatives of educational institutions from the campus' service area, and local community leaders representing broad community interests. In selecting members of the presidential advisory group, sensitivity to the cultural diversity of the campus and participants' cultural competence will be essential.
- Supplemental admission criteria will be used to screen applicants for impacted programs. Campuses approved by the chancellor to implement supplemental admission criteria shall provide public notice to all students who may be affected by these criteria, parents/families, and appropriate education agencies no later than twelve months prior to the term in which the supplemental admission criteria take effect and shall be publicized widely. Supplemental admission criteria may be used in campuswide impaction situations provided that CSU-eligible students guaranteed regional access shall be admitted. In unusual circumstances in which a campus must respond to unanticipated enrollment pressures, a campus may implement enrollment management strategies or supplemental admission criteria without a twelve-month notice with the approval of the chancellor in accordance with Board of Trustee policy and following consultation with the presidential advisory group. In such instances, the campus shall notify immediately (1) local K-12 schools and community colleges that serve area students and (2) all students affected by the change and their families. Students whose street or e-mail addresses are on file at the campus will be notified directly. Local media announcements shall be used to inform the broader community and students who may not have yet been in direct contact with the campus.

- Each campus shall maintain a process by which students can confirm their admission eligibility status and processes.
- The effects of these principles and other CSU admission policies and practices shall be monitored carefully and reported by the chancellor on at least an annual basis to ensure that CSU continues to honor its Master Plan obligations in a clear and consistent way. This report will include but is not limited to the examination of campus-based services and programs to assist students at affected campuses, analysis of the impact of approved pilot programs and supplemental criteria on student enrollment, and data on the racial and ethnic composition of the student population at campuses implementing enrollment management policies.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

California State University Lower-Division Major Core Alignment Project

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Jacquelyn Kegley
Chair, Academic Senate, CSU

Summary

The Lower-Division Major Core Alignment project was initiated by the Academic Senate of the California State University in collaboration with the Academic Affairs Division of the Chancellor's Office. The original impetus for the project was the Partnership with the Governor that called upon the CSU to work with the California Community Colleges to create transfer program agreements that would facilitate student transfer to the CSU. The specific goal of this project has been to achieve consensus among CSU program faculty on a set of lower-division requirements for at least each of the twenty largest undergraduate majors in the CSU that would be accepted at all or most CSU campuses offering the major. This presentation will update the Board on the progress made in achieving this goal.

Background

This project seeks to identify a set of courses and/or competencies that will satisfy the lower-division expectations for a particular major at all or most CSU campuses, so that a student can complete those expectations at a community college and know that they will be appropriate regardless of the specific CSU campus to which the student transfers. This set of courses and/or competencies is referred to as a "common core," but the project does not, in fact, *require* all CSU departments offering a major to agree upon the same specific courses as lower-division requirements. Instead, the goal is to provide students seeking to undertake one of the twenty largest majors in the CSU with the information they need to plan their community-college course work in such a way as to expedite the timely completion of their baccalaureate major degree program after they transfer to a CSU campus.

To achieve this goal, faculty discipline groups have been meeting to discuss the lower division expectations most pertinent to their particular discipline and to identify, define, and reach consensus on a common set of lower-division courses and/or requirements for their major. When there is agreement upon course titles and descriptions, they will be submitted for approval to the California Articulation Numbering system (CAN) and disseminated widely, in both electronic and printed formats, as common course numbers in both the community colleges and the CSU.

This information will then serve as a major-specific lower-division curriculum guide for all counselors, faculty, and students regardless of the particular community college where a student begins or the particular California State University campus to which he or she transfers. The set of lower-division competencies and/or courses that are identified for a particular major may not be exhaustive of the lower-division major requirements of any individual CSU campus, as some programs/major may find it necessary to maintain a requirement specific to their curricular objectives.

This project will greatly facilitate the flow of students intending to transfer from a California Community College to a CSU as well as enhance the mobility of students moving between the CSUs. Ultimately, a common core of lower-division core requirements in a major will enhance the ability of students to graduate from the CSU in a timely and effective fashion.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Jacquelyn Kegley
Chair, Academic Senate, CSU

Summary

This item recommends approval of amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University. These amendments revise the formulae for determining the size of campus delegations to the Academic Senate. They also extend membership in the Academic Senate to include a representative of the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

Background

At its meeting of January 2002, the Academic Senate, CSU, passed a resolution proposing amendments to its Constitution as described below. As required by the Constitution, these proposed amendments were submitted to the individual campus academic senates for faculty ratification. By May 1, 2002, the Academic Senate, CSU, had been notified by a majority of the campuses, that a majority of faculty on those campuses had ratified the proposed changes.

Chapter VII, Section 2, of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees states "Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University shall become effective when ratified according to its provisions and approved by the Board of Trustees."

The key changes recommended are the following:

- The representation formula would be revised to provide a minimum of two senators from each campus. A campus would receive one additional senator (a total of 3) if its full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) exceeded the systemwide average FTEF, and would receive a second additional senator (a total of 4) if its FTEF exceeded twice the systemwide average FTEF.

Action Item

Item 3

July 16-17, 2002

Page 2 of 2

- The Academic Senate would be granted the authority to resolve issues concerning the implementation of the above section on campus representation, through its by-laws. Such issues could involve definitions, sources of data, or implementation dates.
- The membership of the Academic Senate, CSU, would be expanded to include an emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

The specific proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate, CSU, are included in Appendix A. They have been carefully reviewed by the staff of the Chancellor's Office, who concurs with the changes. If approved and implemented, the changes would increase the size of the elected campus representatives to the Academic Senate from 51 to 58. Appendix B shows the distribution of the campus representatives to the Academic Senate based upon the fall 2001 total of 15,721.7 FTEF, yielding a systemwide campus average of 683.6 FTEF.

Besides the elected campus representatives, the Academic Senate membership currently includes the Chancellor (or representative) as a non-voting member and the immediate past chair (if not an elected campus representative). To this would be added the emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association. The Academic Senate understands that the expansion of campus representatives and the emerita/emeritus member would be accomplished without an increase in budgeted resources. The Academic Senate Executive Committee intends to accommodate the proposed amendments through reductions in member travel and/or release time assignments.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University included in Appendix A to Agenda Item 3 of the July 16-17, 2002, meeting of the Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy, having been ratified by the faculties of a majority of the campuses, are approved by the Board.

The Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University

Article II

Section 1. Membership

1. The Academic Senate shall consist of ~~54~~ elected campus representatives apportioned as follows:
a minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the 1/n fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., 2/n times the systemwide FTEF)

2. The Academic Senate shall also include:
 - ~~(a) one senator from each campus with an FTEF of 100 or less~~
~~two from each campus with an FTEF of over 100~~
~~one extra senator for as many campuses as possible apportioned on the basis of the highest FTEF;~~
 - ~~(b)~~ a) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member (who shall not be counted as a campus representative if not an elected member);
 - ~~(c)~~ b) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.
c) one emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association

3. The Academic Senate shall have the power, through its by-laws, to resolve issues concerning the implementation of this section (Article II, Section 1.) of the Constitution (membership).

~~The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member shall not be counted as a campus representative.~~

Faculty FTE by Campus, October 2001

Includes both Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty & Lecturers

	FTE	Number of Senators
Bakersfield	324.4	2
Channel Islands	12.0	2
Chico	756.0	3
Dominguez Hills	434.8	2
Fresno	861.4	3
Fullerton	1,081.6	3
Hayward	541.7	2
Humboldt	402.9	2
Long Beach	1,298.8	3
Los Angeles	804.2	3
Maritime Academy	59.4	2
Monterey Bay	169.3	2
Northridge	1,126.7	3
Pomona	819.8	3
Sacramento	1,045.4	3
San Bernardino	631.3	2
San Diego	1,352.5	3
San Francisco	1,079.6	3
San Jose	1,108.3	3
San Luis Obispo	857.4	3
San Marcos	261.9	2
Sonoma	353.3	2
Stanislaus	339.0	2
Total	15,721.7	58
Average	683.6	

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Notable Accomplishments in California State University Teaching, Research and Scholarship: The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at California State University, Los Angeles

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at CSU Los Angeles has a long tradition of following the teacher-scholar model and mentoring students in pursuing state-of-the-art research. By any method of assessment, this practice has been successful: our faculty has won many awards, on-campus, system-wide, and nationally; the department has been awarded many millions of dollars of externally funded grants; it has published a thousand refereed journal articles, of which nearly six hundred have Cal State LA student co-authors; and most importantly, students have taken advantage of the opportunities the department and university offer and have succeeded – in Ph.D. programs at the best research universities; in professional schools; and in subsequent careers in industry, government and academia.

Background

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at CSU Los Angeles

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at California State University, Los Angeles is one of the premier molecular science departments in the country. The department involves large numbers of students in strong research programs that are funded by research and research training grants from such major federal and private agencies as the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Arnold and Mabel Beckman Foundation, and American Chemical Society.

The faculty is nationally recognized and has a proven record of contributing to the success of students. Among the faculty have been twelve Cal State LA Outstanding Professor awards, six CSU Outstanding Professor awards, a Wang Award winner, and a Presidential Award for Excellence in Science Mentoring, as well as winners of national awards from the American

Chemical Society, the world's largest professional scientific organization, and numerous awards from other entities.

Graduates of the BA, BS, or MS programs have been well served by their Cal State LA education, which provided strong foundations for their subsequent achievements in Ph.D. programs in chemistry and biochemistry; in medical, dental, and pharmacy schools; and in industrial positions. Many graduates have gone on to academic careers; in fact twenty percent of the department's faculty are CSLA chemistry or biochemistry alumni.

Although CSU Los Angeles is a large urban comprehensive university, the department has been modeled on elite liberal arts colleges such as Carleton, Oberlin, Wellesley, and Hope—all of which are highly effective in developing student potential and faculty careers through collaboration in productive research. The department is composed of a diverse and professionally vigorous faculty that subscribes to the teacher/scholar model. It is committed to the education of students through their active participation in pedagogically effective teaching programs and in rigorous research projects whose goal is both the development of the student and the generation of publishable new knowledge. The greater part of the extensive departmental research program is supported by external funding (currently nearly \$4 million a year), and many students finance their college education through participation in these programs as paid research assistants. The department has modern instrumentation, obtained by faculty largely through aggressive external grant initiatives, often with matching funds from the university, that gives the department capability in a broad cross-section of modern analytical techniques. CSLA's instrumentation can rival that at some Ph. D. granting institutions, with particular strength in spectroscopy, especially in magnetic resonance. By the end of summer 2002, the combination of NIH and university funds will establish a 600 MHz magnetic resonance facility (the first in the CSU).

Student Research Participation

Cal State LA chemistry and biochemistry majors reflect the rich ethnic, racial, and gender diversity of the campus, which itself mirrors the dynamic demographics of Los Angeles. Yet the students have several things in common: their interest in the molecular sciences and their participation in the vigorous research programs throughout the department. These projects employ the hands and minds of students and faculty alike in the creative process of doing science. This interaction focuses interest and builds strong teamwork skills. Although CSLA is a commuter campus, research participation is the focus that has built a community of faculty and student scholars. Students and their research directors can be found in the department at all hours pursuing their research projects. The close-knit environment of the department fosters friendships among the students, while research projects, seminars, and other gatherings allow for

further personal growth. Between 100 to 200 students participate each term, many of them supported through assistantships and fellowships funded by federal agencies and private foundations. The results of the research are often published in refereed professional journals (nearly six hundred articles to date) and/or presented at local, national, or international conferences. The number of students who move on to professional and graduate schools from these programs is quite high.