

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 15th, 2001
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Harold Goldwhite
Neel I. Murarka
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 21, 2001

Discussion Items

1. Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship:
CalStateTEACH, *Information*
2. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations – Summer Early Entrants, *Information*
3. Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Report, *Information*

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

**Trustees of The California State University
California State University, Long Beach
University Student Union-Multipurpose Room ABC
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, California**

March 21, 2001

Members Present

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of the Board
Harold Goldwhite
Neel I. Murarka
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Members Absent

Ralph R. Pesqueira

Other Trustees Present

Daniel N. Cartwright
Martha C. Fallgatter
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Stanley T. Wang

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
Freda Hinshe Otto, Administrator in Charge, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Closed Session

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for Honorary Degree

The Committee on Educational Policy met Tuesday, March 20, 2001 at 10:00 a.m. in closed session and acted on a nomination for an honorary degree.

Open Session

Chair Myers called the meeting to order on Wednesday, March 21, 2001 at 9:35 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 23, 2001, were approved by consent as submitted.

Meeting California's Need for the Education Doctorate

Chair Meyers introduced the item, stating that for 40 years the California Master Plan for Higher Education has included a provision for CSU to develop and offer joint doctoral programs with the University of California and independent universities. Presently, however, there are few joint doctoral programs in education. Dr. Spence pointed out that actively seeking legislative authority for the CSU to award the Doctor of Education degree is fully consistent with the mission of the CSU established by the Board of Trustees in 1985.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence said that according to a California Postsecondary Education Commission study, California now trails the nation by one-third in education doctorates awarded, relative to the number of K-12 students. Dr. Spence indicated that because California must produce substantially more education doctorates in the coming decades in order to meet the need for well-qualified educational leaders to promote school improvement, the capacity of the state to offer accessible, affordable, high-quality doctoral programs in education must be expanded significantly.

Dr. Spence emphasized the unmet need within the California Community Colleges, pointing out that community college administrators and faculty do not possess doctorates to the extent found in other states. California does not have public university doctoral programs focused on community college leadership. Dr. Spence also referred to an additional unmet need based on a shortage of individuals with the education doctorate qualified to be faculty members in California

schools of education. Teacher education has been one of the four fields in which faculty recruitment has been most difficult in the last two years.

Dr. Spence stated that joint doctoral programs have not met the need. Only four CSU-UC joint doctoral programs in education have been established since 1960 and only two doctoral programs in education have been established jointly with independent institutions. Dr. Spence remarked that the joint doctoral process would need to be redefined and transformed in order to become more effective at the scale required.

Dr. Spence noted that at the present time, doctoral education at independent institutions typically costs the student in excess of \$45,000. Even University of California fees are high enough to discourage many talented potential students. Doctoral education at a CSU campus, however, could cost the student as little as 11 percent of the tuition and fees at private colleges and universities, and as little as 40 percent of the fees at the University of California.

Dr. Spence commented there is a need for doctoral programs to be offered near locations where prospective students live and work. More than half of Californians live within 10 miles of a CSU campus, while just 21 percent live within 10 miles of a UC campus. Dr. Spence added that CSU campuses have developed an extensive network of collaboration and partnerships with K-12 administrators and teachers, and an applied doctoral program would represent a natural extension of these efforts.

Chair Myers inquired whether the legislative authority to develop doctoral programs has been pursued since the Trustees adopted applied doctoral study as part of the CSU mission in 1985. Trustee Campbell responded that the issue was presented to the legislature in the mid-1980s but was not subsequently pursued. Trustee Campbell added that given the current high priority for education and meeting its needs, CSU needs to pursue actively the authority to offer the education doctorate. Trustee Galinson agreed that authority to offer the education doctorate should be pursued quickly. Trustee Goldwhite commented that he and the CSU faculty could be supportive of doctoral programs in education but expressed concern about the securing of funding for such programs, especially in view of the CSU's continuing difficulty in supporting existing graduate programs adequately, and opportunities that might be at risk in our pursuit of the authority to grant Doctor of Education degrees.

Chair Myers asked if the Legislature were to grant authorization for the Ed.D, how long it would take to implement the program and what it would cost. Dr. Spence responded that program implementation would take from two to two and one-half years. It would be difficult at this time, however, to estimate the cost as faculty members have not yet begun to plan programs. Dr. Spence added that the CSU education doctorate could be more cost effective than comparable programs at the UC or independent colleges.

President Rees, CSU Hayward, stressed that awarding the education doctorate is consistent with the mission of the CSU and would not transform the CSU into a research institution. Trustee Farar thanked Dr. Spence, Trustee Goldwhite, and President Rees for their comments. She related the challenges she faced in obtaining her Ed.D. and underscored the value and importance for many students of being able to pursue an education doctorate in the CSU.

Dr. Spence reported that at a recent Master Plan hearing Chancellor Orbach, UC Riverside, acknowledged the high quality of the CSU faculty. Chancellor Orbach's reservations about the CSU's awarding Ed.D. degrees independently were based on his evaluation of the importance of embedding an Ed.D. program in the environment of a research university. CSU representatives argued that the CSU environment already has a strong emphasis on advanced scholarship and applied research and also a high priority on preparing leaders for the public schools and community colleges.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Chair Myers stated that each year the Trustees receive a report on academic planning and program review. Dr. Spence presented the annual report and commented that academic planning at each university involves both the development of new degree programs and the regular review of existing programs. In approving the resolution, the Trustees would be granting the authority to plan a total of 15 new degree programs across the 22 existing CSU campuses.

Dr. Spence commented that the first academic plan for CSU Channel Islands, developed by the President and staff of the new campus in collaboration with the Faculty Council, is included in the agenda item. Dr. Spence added that the report includes summaries of campus program reviews and accreditation reports stemming from visits of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to five campuses.

The resolution was moved and seconded. The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (REP 03-01-01).

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: CalStateTEACH

Presentation By

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Peter Smith, President
California State University, Monterey Bay

John Welty, President,
California State University, Fresno

Summary

CalStateTEACH, CSU's new alternative path to the Multiple Subject CLAD teaching credential, graduated its first class in spring 2001. Conceived in August 1998, when the magnitude of the teaching crisis became apparent, CalStateTEACH is designed to serve teachers who hold emergency permits and teach full-time in an elementary school. The coursework has been specially constructed to integrate the theory and practice of teaching with the daily experiences of teachers in the classroom. The program is designed for working teachers who need a flexible form of instruction using home-based study combined with a rich mix of print, internet, video, and audio materials supported by regular mentoring.

CalStateTEACH: An Alternative Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation Program

In March 2001, 133 students were the first to become "CalStateTEACHERs." Approximately 400 friends and family observed as faculty and staff recognized the first graduates of CalStateTEACH, CSU's groundbreaking alternative teacher preparation program.

The program was conceived in August 1998, when the magnitude of the teaching crisis became apparent. Elementary classrooms in California are currently staffed with approximately 15,000 teachers who do not have appropriate certification. These teachers hold either a waiver or an emergency permit. It is estimated that by 2008, California will need between 250,000 and 300,000 additional teachers. Because some campus programs cannot increase capacity fast enough to meet the need and current models of teacher preparation are not easily accessible to full-time teachers who have other responsibilities, CSU has looked to an array of teacher preparation models.

The eighteen-month program of CalStateTEACH is an alternative path to a full teaching credential. Available to individuals residing and teaching in any geographic location in California, CalStateTEACH is designed specifically to serve teachers who hold an emergency permit and teach

full-time in an elementary school. The coursework has been specially constructed to integrate the theory and practice of teaching with the daily experiences of teachers in the classroom. After matriculating into CalStateTEACH, participants become “intern teachers” who are guided and supported by faculty of the California State University as well as on-site school personnel. There are no regular university classes to attend, although there are five Saturday seminars over the course of the program.

CalStateTEACH was designed to be accessible. Many potential teachers are unable to easily access the traditional campus-based approach to teacher education. They are parents with small children, rural dwellers who live too far from a university to conveniently attend classes, and busy urbanites who choose to devote their limited hours to learning rather than fighting traffic. Although they aspire to become educators, the other demands in their lives make participating in synchronous course requirements at a given location either very difficult or impossible. CalStateTEACH delivers its program through use of available technology. The program’s foundation is independent study with online, print, and CD ROM materials; web-based class discussions; and on-site coaching by CSU faculty. All participating intern teachers are required to have access to a computer connected to the internet.

The most important way of ensuring the quality of the CalStateTEACH curriculum was to draw upon a group of outstanding CSU faculty from elementary teacher preparation programs as well as faculty members from across the disciplines. The faculty members who developed this project were assigned to teams of four-to-six members. The curriculum, which has been formatively evaluated and improved along the way, has been approved by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and the California Commission on Teacher Certification.

While the CalStateTEACH program employs a number of pedagogical and technological innovations, at its heart is the relationship between the more than 70 Learning Support Faculty and the intern teachers. The Learning Support Faculty members act as teachers, advisors, coaches, assessors, and guides—working with the intern teachers throughout the eighteen-month program.

A flexible and distributed administrative structure was developed to accommodate this unique program. The director and two other central administrators are located in three different offices throughout the state. CalStateTEACH has five regional centers, affiliated with the “lead campuses” of California State University, Hayward, California State University, Fresno, California State University, Monterey Bay, California State University, Fullerton, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and California State University, Los Angeles. Each regional center represents a collaborative among multiple CSU campuses. A statewide advisory board guides the program’s policy decisions.

Over 800 intern teachers have been enrolled in CalStateTEACH this year.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Revisions of Title 5 Regulations-Summer Early Entrants

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

This item presents revisions to Title 5, *California Code of Regulations* that will authorize campuses to allow students who have been admitted for a fall term to enroll in the summer term immediately preceding their term of admission. Students admitted under these provisions will be identified as summer early entrants and will not be regarded as matriculants until they enroll in the fall term for which they have been admitted.

Background

Five CSU campuses currently offer state-supported summer terms. Ten additional campuses will receive state funding to convert self-support summer sessions to state-support summer terms in 2001. The self-support summer terms on the remaining six campuses are scheduled for conversion in summer 2002 if appropriate state funding is received in the 2002-03 budget.

The majority of new CSU students are admitted for the fall term. Many of these students receive their letter of admission several months before the beginning of the fall term. As instruction opportunities during state-supported summer terms increase, it becomes more likely that students admitted for the fall semester at an early date, may wish to begin enrolling in state-funded courses at the CSU campus to which they have been admitted during the summer preceding the fall term of their formal admission.

Title 5, *California Code of Regulations* currently provides no authorization for students admitted to a fall term to enroll in state-supported courses in the preceding summer. However, current CSU policy encourages campuses to maximize student access and minimize student time to degree. The early entrance of fall admittees to summer terms will allow students to accelerate progress toward their degree or credential objectives. It will also facilitate the early remediation of first-time freshmen requiring assistance in mathematics and/or English.

Recommendation

The following resolution will be recommended for adoption at a subsequent meeting:

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

§40700. Matriculation.

Any student enrolling in any ~~semester or quarter~~ term, other than ~~summer session or~~ extension or as an auditor without credit, shall meet the standards for admission outlined in this subchapter.

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

§40701. Summer Early Entrant.

Any student admitted to a fall term may be enrolled in the immediately preceding summer term as a summer early entrant. Summer early entrant students will be regarded as matriculated when they enroll in the fall term for which they have been formally admitted.

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Report

Presentation By

John D. Welty
President
California State University, Fresno

Summary

Tragedy often results in a call to action. Such was the case on October 7, 2000, with the alcohol-induced death of Adrian Heideman, an 18-year-old student at California State University, Chico. This incident was preceded a week earlier by an incident of alcohol poisoning at San Diego State University, and then followed 10 days later by another near-fatal case of alcohol poisoning, also at San Diego State. These were not the first deaths nor near-deaths at CSU campuses related to alcohol poisoning. Something new was needed.

In the aftermath of such incidents, California State University Chancellor Charles B. Reed took immediate action, appointing a committee of presidents, students, vice presidents of student affairs, faculty, staff and alumni to review the CSU's alcohol policies and prevention programs. (*See Appendix A listing committee members.*) The question was simple and straightforward: How can we prevent any more tragedies? "We cannot look at alcohol abuse as just a way of college life. We need to increase education and awareness of the problem and then find solutions that really work and not just come up with policies that sit on a shelf. Our children's lives are at risk, and universities need to make every effort to prevent any more lives from being wasted," Chancellor Reed said when appointing the committee.

The committee began its work in December 2000. Chaired by California State University, Fresno President John Welty, the committee has met a half-dozen times. Divided into six subcommittees, the members concentrated on broad policies that would be realistic and effective at CSU's 23 unique campuses, which range from a few predominantly residential institutions with a traditional 18-22-year-old student population, to the majority with large, non-traditional, commuting populations with an average age in the mid-to-late 20s.

Background

Alcohol abuse on college and university campuses is not a new issue. To reduce abuse, it must be addressed in a comprehensive manner. To determine the latest research on the topic, the committee began by meeting with state and national experts who made presentations on the issue from legal, law enforcement, prevention, treatment and training perspectives. (*See Appendix B listing presenters.*)

A few overarching points were developed after these discussions: (1) First and foremost, CSU presidents must make this issue a priority in a demonstrable manner. The “Be Vocal, Be Visible, Be Visionary” statement from the Presidents’ Leadership Group formed by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention is an example of what the committee envisions; (2) all campuses should develop comprehensive policies that are consistently enforced; (3) prevention and education programs must be offered by a well-trained staff; (4) students must be involved in policy planning and execution to a significant degree; (5) treatment programs must be available for those students who need this assistance; and (6) data must be gathered systematically to determine the nature and extent of the problem as well as the success of policies and programs.

In congruence with the mission of higher education, prevention programs should recognize and promote individual student responsibility. Thus, programs should be developed that encourage students to make behavioral decisions based on critical thinking and the best knowledge available to them.

In addition, a campus culture must be developed that encourages and supports healthy behavior. The Social Norms approach, which through informational campaigns seeks to correct widespread student misperception of peers’ drinking, has proven to be effective. Students must be engaged in this effort and success can be achieved through the use of peer educators, such as the program developed by the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network.

The committee has adopted the following principles that it believes should direct the development of all policies and programs at CSU campuses.

Guiding Principles

- Provide a safe and secure environment for all students
- Encourage student health and wellness in an environment supportive of learning
- Promote healthy choices for students

- Enforce laws and policies consistently concerning the use of alcohol
- Support safe, legal, responsible, moderate consumption of alcohol for those who choose to drink; do not punish responsible, legal behavior
- Encourage students to take responsibility for each other; Good Samaritan behavior should be supported and recognized, and students should be supplied with the tools to help others practice safe and responsible behavior
- Provide assistance, if appropriate, to those students who need support, treatment, and services
- Involve students in all steps of the process and program development
- Focus alcohol abuse prevention efforts on campus and community environments since the university is part of the surrounding community that influences students' behavior
- Use social norms principles and peer education as core components of an education and prevention program.

General Recommendations

1. The Chancellor should require campuses to develop comprehensive alcohol policies and programs which include, at a minimum, policies which are consistent with the campus mission, a commitment to holding individuals and student organizations accountable for their behavior, and a commitment to offering effective education programs which are assessed on a regular basis.
2. Each campus should communicate alcohol policies to new students and their parents before and when they arrive on campus.
3. Each campus should create a university-wide alcohol advisory council, including community membership, which annually develops and reviews goals, assesses the effectiveness of the campus program, and makes recommendations to the president. These councils should be under the direction of the vice presidents for student affairs.
4. Each campus should gather data every two years to determine if its policies and programs are achieving the desired outcomes. Findings should be reported to the Chancellor and the Trustees.
5. The CSU should sponsor conferences in which campuses share best practices, policies and programs as well as feature state and national experts. As a first step, the CSU should co-sponsor the National Social Norms Conference with the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network on July 18-20, 2001, in Anaheim, California.
6. State laws should be reviewed by the campus alcohol advisory councils and recommendations made to trustees and presidents for any changes that can enhance and support campus policies.

7. The CSU should devote an additional \$1.1 million to this effort with the Chancellor providing up to \$25,000 Challenge Grants to each campus, with the campus required to match the amount.

Specific Summaries and Recommendations

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention committee divided its work into six areas, which are briefly summarized for this agenda item. The six areas are: (1) Policies; (2) Enforcement and Legal Issues; (3) Education and Prevention Programs; (4) Training, Intervention and Treatment; (5) Assessment; and (6) Resources.

(1) Policies:

It is critically important that campuses develop and subsequently enforce their alcohol-related policies so that the entire campus community, as well as prospective students and their parents, businesses, vendors and others working with the campuses, know what is expected.

General Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Include in their alcohol policy the following: (a) a succinct philosophical statement unique to each individual campus; (b) a summary of federal, state and local laws; and (c) institutional regulations
- Develop a CSU listserv of the chairs of each campus' alcohol advisory council that would allow for information sharing. Arrange for these representatives to meet at and attend one alcohol education conference/workshop/seminar each year
- Actively enforce existing "age 21" laws on campus, which help decrease alcohol consumption
- Consider the development of innovative and safe late-night and weekend programming alternatives on campus for students
- Communicate campus alcohol policies to new students and their parents before and when they arrive on campus
- Develop a collaboration/partnership among scholars, researchers, and health and student affairs professionals to develop and implement research driven programs to advance existing efforts to understand and change dangerous drinking behaviors and other issues affecting college students
- Designate campus representative(s) who are charged with ensuring that all students, faculty, staff and administrators receive Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act (DFSCA) policy information.

Specific Recommendations

A. Vendor Advertising and Industry Funding

- Develop appropriate institutional controls regarding alcohol beverage industry funding and sponsorship of institutional and student-sponsored events
- Adopt a policy that might state, “Alcoholic beverage trademarks or logos must be clearly subordinate to the sponsored event itself. Similarly, the name of an alcoholic-beverage manufacturer or product may not be connected to the name of the institutional event or facility, but may be promoted as a sponsor of the event”
- Develop awards and other incentives to encourage student organizations and athletic programs to utilize other funding sources and positive promotional campaigns for events that are not alcohol related.

B. CSUMentor and Web Information

- Develop a template for campus alcohol policy information on CSUMentor that would ensure that similar alcohol policy related information would be available about each CSU campus
- Add an introductory statement on CSUMentor about the CSU system’s concerns regarding the use of alcohol by students. Place the CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee’s philosophy and guiding principles statements on this site
- Provide a “hot button” on the CSUMentor website specifically labeled alcohol policies to make it easier to find alcohol related information
- Develop links from the CSUMentor Alcohol Policies information sections to alcohol education information and resources.

(2) Enforcement and Legal Issues:

The primary objectives of alcohol enforcement should center on the health and welfare of members of the campus community; the promotion of legal and responsible behavior; an environment supportive of learning; and should facilitate the prevention, assessment, early intervention, and treatment of alcohol-related problems.

Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Provide an educational program to make students aware of the risks attendant on illegal and irresponsible consumption of alcohol
- Inform and distribute to students all campus alcohol-related regulations and policies
- Reinforce legal and responsible student behavior

- Enforce campus rules as well as state and local laws and regulations. For example, post the most relevant penal code sections on campus websites
- Inform students that being under the influence of alcohol is no excuse for inappropriate behavior. All sanctions will apply
- Develop campus rules and policies through appropriate governance procedures
- Partner with the community and law enforcement agencies to provide a safe off-campus environment, to enforce applicable legal sanctions, and to encourage legal and responsible behavior among students.

(3) Education and Prevention:

The abuse of alcohol poses a threat to the health and academic success of CSU students, but prohibition of alcohol is not a realistic response to the problem of abuse. There is no single response to the issue of alcohol abuse that will “solve” the problem. Multiple interventions are required to bring about desired outcomes. Each campus should design programs that are appropriate for their institution and for each student subgroup. There is no “One size to fit all.”

General Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Convene an advisory council to examine issues of alcohol use by students. The group will identify appropriate and realistic behaviors related to alcohol use, consistent with the institutional culture and mission
- Include in their councils full campus representation from student affairs; student activities; Greek life; residential life; public safety; public affairs; faculty; campus alcohol educator; student health center; psychological services; student representatives (including athletes); foundation; dining services, or if appropriate, holder of university liquor license; community members, which may include alumni, local business owners, neighborhood bar owners, and residents
- Use the assessment data to develop a plan to address issues raised during the assessment.

Examples of programs that could be included in campus plans include the Social Norms approach, media campaigns aimed at students, creation of appropriate alcohol-free activities on weekend nights and BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network chapters. The programs that are developed should be tied to student organization and activity requirements, and may include those aimed at the leadership of organizations who may use alcohol (*e.g.*, fraternity, sorority, residential students). Faculty should consider infusing their curriculum with alcohol-related topics, such as having a marketing class develop a project aimed at new underage student programs.

Specific Recommendations

(A) Faculty/Staff Advising for Clubs/Organizations:

- Institute annual orientation programs for organization advisors and for student officers that outline expectations, information on alcohol use/abuse, as well as other policies and issues
- Include expectations of members, officers and advisors in the annual student organization registration documents that must be signed by both student organization officers and the faculty/staff adviser
- Develop alcohol and risk management education programs for student organization officers
- Develop a roster of faculty/staff with interests, expertise and who are available to provide in-class discussions/lectures or meet with groups of faculty, staff or students regarding alcohol use/abuse and related issues
- Train all those who regularly interact with students, such as faculty advisors, resident advisors, coaches, peers, faculty and student affairs professionals, to understand and identify alcohol related problems and to link students with intervention services.

(B) Alcohol Education Centers & Counseling/Psychological Services:

- Assess existing counseling/psychological services, campus wellness centers, peer education programs and health education programs and determine how best to provide enhanced alcohol-related services
- Develop a source and distribution means for alcohol education materials
- Include alcohol use and abuse information in the training of all campus peer advisors and residential staff.

(4) Training, Intervention and Treatment:

As history has amply illustrated, virtually every attempt to regulate human behavior by enacting and enforcing policies without the appropriate support programs to effectively implement them has resulted in less than desired outcomes, or all-out failure. What is essential to the success of these efforts is to develop effective training, intervention, and treatment programs that will work on the 23 unique campuses. Those with younger residential populations (traditional campuses) would be expected to have greater and more comprehensive training program elements than those campuses that serve older commuter populations (commuter campuses). The greater the risk of alcohol abuse and irresponsible alcohol consumption, the more comprehensive should be the training elements, and the greater the training responsibilities that should be shared across the campus community.

Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Assess their individual needs and determine what level of training should be developed and followed to meet those needs
- Adopt, at a minimum, a level one (basic) training program, which includes a campuswide understanding of alcohol-related behaviors, new student and parent orientation sessions, and social norms training for selected campus officials
- Develop and implement level two and three training programs if the campus assessment process determines that there are significant numbers of higher-risk student groups (for example, Greeks, athletes and large residential populations) for which training should be mandated. Faculty and community resources should be involved at these levels
- Determine at each level which campus offices and individuals should be involved to best meet the needs of students. For example, at level one, student affairs, campus police and counseling services staff, new students and parents; at level two, resident housing directors, associated student organizations, and faculty advisors; at level three, community leaders, local businesses, national support organizations
- Develop procedures for intervention protocols based on the severity of student behavior. At all levels, the campus president is directly responsible for specifying who should act where intervention is merited
- Designate campus health and counseling professionals as core resources for intervention treatment services
- Develop and maintain current community agency providers that can be of benefit to students
- Support and appoint a team to attend CSU conferences on alcohol-related topics to learn the latest techniques and best practices to assist students.

(5) Assessment:

It is vital that campus pronouncements about student attitudes and behavior related to alcohol be based on carefully gathered facts rather than speculation. The same holds for assumptions guiding alcohol-related policy and program development. Assessment of program effectiveness can only be accomplished by employing the best available evaluation procedures and instruments. With implementation of the federal Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act of 1989, all colleges and universities receiving federal funds have been required to maintain alcohol and other drug prevention programs and to review their effectiveness at least every two years. This mandate, combined with growing academic interest, has resulted in the development of a host of

publications and instruments related to student alcohol and other drug use and prevention programs.

Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Assess their policies and programs every two years to determine if they are meeting established outcomes. Findings should be reported to the Trustees and Chancellor
- Include in their assessments the following characteristics:
 1. Patterns of Student Alcohol Use
 2. Consequences of Alcohol Use
 3. Alcohol-Related Beliefs and Perceptions
 4. Protective Behaviors
 5. Environmental Influences
 6. Effectiveness

(See Appendix C for an expanded report.)

(6) Resources:

The CSU is the largest four-year university system in the country, and ought to leverage its size in obtaining resources for the campuses to fund programs supporting the Social Norms approach and other education and prevention programs. There are several levels of possible funding sources: federal; state; foundations/corporations; county governments; and campus budgets.

Recommendations

Campuses should:

- Devote sufficient campus resources to ensure program effectiveness
- Develop a plan to enhance existing activities using the \$25,000 Challenge Grants created by Chancellor Reed to be matched by each campus
- Report to the Trustees and Chancellor at the end of each year what was accomplished with the funds.

The Chancellor's Office should:

- Assist the campuses by providing a systemwide grant writer to seek out opportunities and write proposals
- Sponsor an annual meeting of the chairs of the campus alcohol advisory councils and other staff and faculty involved in this effort to share best practices. The vice presidents for student affairs shall assume responsibility for this annual meeting

- Investigate funding sources at all levels and assist the campuses in applying for grants and contracts from such places as The National Institutes of Health National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism; U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; California Department of Education; Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs; Alcohol Beverage Control (ABC); California Wellness Foundation; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; the Mott Foundation; Anheuser Busch; and Miller Brewing Co.

The use and sometimes abuse of alcohol on university campuses is a national issue. How to deal with the issue is especially complicated on some California State University campuses where the majority of students are of legal drinking age. It is equally complicated at residential campuses with their younger populations. There is no easy solution or “one way” of doing things. What the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee is recommending is a comprehensive review of existing campus policies, creation of a campus advisory council dedicated to the issue, development of realistic goals with an assessment component, enforcement of local and state laws and strong presidential leadership that sets the campus tone. The full subcommittee reports, as well as documents related to student records and disciplinary regulations and enforcement options, will be available on the CSU website for review. The committee is continuing to refine this document, and will bring a final report to the Board of Trustees at the July meeting.

Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Members

Dr. John D. Welty	President (Committee Chair)	CSU Fresno
Dr. Tomas A. Arciniega	President	CSU Bakersfield
Dr. Manuel A. Esteban	President	CSU Chico
Dr. James E. Lyons Sr.	President	CSU Dominguez Hills
Dr. Stephen L. Weber	President	San Diego State University
Dr. Robert L. Caret	President	San Jose State University
Dr. Judy Sakaki	Vice President for Student Affairs/Dean of Students	CSU Fresno
Dr. Shirley Uplinger	Vice President for Student Affairs	CSU Sacramento
Dr. Walt Schafer	Professor of Sociology	CSU Chico
Mr. Larry Adamson	President, CSU Alumni Council	Midnight Mission Corp.
Mr. Jeff Iverson	CSU, Chico Associated Students	CSU Chico
Ms. Jamie Hernandez	CSU, Fresno Associated Students	CSU Fresno
Mr. Leo Davila	San Jose State University Associated Students	San Jose State University
Ms. Veronica Shippy	Cal Poly SLO Associated Students	Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
Mr. Roger Eagleton	CSU, Bakersfield Associated Students, Inc.	CSU Bakersfield
Mr. Jason Rollingson	San Diego State University, Associated Students	San Diego State University
Mr. Shaun Lumachi	CSSA, Associated Students, Inc.	CSU Sacramento
Mr. Clint Freeland	Student	CSU Northridge
Mr. Abe Meltzer	General Counsel, Chancellor's Office	Office of the Chancellor
Ms. Colleen Bentley-Adler	Public Affairs, Chancellor's Office	Office of the Chancellor
Mr. Ross Miyashiro	Academic Affairs, Chancellor's Office	Office of the Chancellor

Presenters at meetings of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee

Dr. Jim Moon, vice president for student affairs, California State University, Chico

Ms. Renee Twigg, Network of Colleges & Universities Committed to the Elimination of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, and Director, Student Health Services, California State University, Long Beach

Mr. Jerry Jolly, Assistant Director, Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) – Northern Division

Mr. Michael Haines, M.S., Director of the National Social Norms Resources Center, Northern Illinois University

Mr. Drew Hunter, Executive Director of the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network

Dr. Linda C. Lederman, Director of the Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research at Rutgers University

Assessment (full report):

It is vital that campus pronouncements about student attitudes and behavior related to alcohol be based on carefully gathered facts rather than speculation. The same holds for assumptions guiding alcohol-related policy and program development. Assessment of program effectiveness can only be accomplished by employing the best available evaluation procedures and instruments.

With implementation of the federal Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act of 1989, all colleges and universities receiving federal funds have been required to maintain alcohol and other drug prevention programs and to review their effectiveness at least every two years. This mandate, combined with growing academic interest, has resulted in the development of a host of publications and instruments related to student alcohol and other drug use and prevention programs.

Purpose of Assessment:

Alcohol-related assessment can be used to address several questions such as: What are patterns of student alcohol use? Are there discernable differences among various student groups as to use of alcohol? What are the personal consequences of alcohol use? What are student, faculty, and staff beliefs and perceptions of student alcohol use, and how do these compare with actual use patterns? What are the patterns of protective behaviors that reduce high-risk drinking and its harmful effects? What environmental factors in the campus and the community encourage and discourage high-risk drinking? How effective are policies and programs in preventing underage and high-risk student drinking?

Campuses should use the broad categories below to research what is occurring on their campuses:

1. Assessing Patterns of Student Alcohol Use

In decision-making about alcohol prevention policies and programs, it is vital that campus leaders have accurate information about a number of facets of student alcohol consumption, including, for example, frequency of consumption, amount of drinking, location of drinking, etc. Also campuses should determine demographic factors such as age, year in school, gender, club membership, etc.

2. Assessing Consequences of Alcohol Use

During the past several years, researchers studying student alcohol use have developed survey questions that yield useful self-report data of harmful personal consequences of alcohol use. For example, that includes public misconduct, arrest, damaged property, personal injury, fighting, psychological problems, driving under the influence, and performing poorly in classes.

3. Assessing Alcohol-Related Beliefs and Perceptions

Measuring beliefs and perceptions has taken on greater importance in recent years as a result of the social norms movement throughout the country. As noted elsewhere in this report, misperceptions of peers' drinking may be an important factor driving high-risk drinking among college students. To assess the degree to which this may be true on a given campus, it is important that data be collected on student beliefs about peers' drinking. Commonly used questionnaire items measuring such perceptions include: How often do you think the average student on your campus uses alcohol? Overall, what percentage of students here do you think consume no alcoholic beverages at all? Overall, what percentage of students here do you think consumed five or more drinks in a row on at least occasion in the last two weeks? On any given occasion, how many drinks are most typically consumed by you and by others in each of the following places? Give your best estimate.

Campuses also might find it useful to survey beliefs and perceptions of faculty and staff related to student alcohol use, since this part of the campus social environment might also perpetuate upward misperceptions of student drinking.

4. Assessing Protective Behaviors

Several recent social norms campaigns have focused on identifying protective behaviors that students sometimes engage in to minimize risk of over-consumption and its harmful consequences, then publicizing the frequency of such behavior through social marketing techniques. Examples include these items: When I go out drinking, I ... stop drinking at least one to two hours before I go home; eat before and during the time I am drinking; alternate with non-alcoholic beverages; have a designated driver.

5. Assessing Environmental Influences

Patterns of student alcohol consumption are influenced by a host of factors in the surrounding social environment. These include societal influences (e.g., alcohol advertising), community influences (e.g., degree of enforcement of underage drinking and open container laws, and number of bars near campus), and campus influences (e.g., relative availability of alcohol-free weekend evening activities, and relative prevalence of misperceptions of peers' drinking). Since a comprehensive, effective alcohol prevention approach must target environments as well as individual attitudes and conduct, it is vital that assessment focus on key features of those environments.

Campuses might assess a number of aspects of the community that are likely to influence patterns of student alcohol consumption—and therefore represent potential targets of environmental change. Examples are these: (a) Laws and ordinances regulating underage

drinking, open containers, drinking and driving, keg parties, noise, special holidays, false IDs, and serving alcohol to minors, and purchasing alcohol for minors. (b) Patterns of cooperation

between community and campus law enforcement agencies. (c) Number of bars and off-sale outlets within given radius of campus. (d) Frequency of drink specials.

A number of features of the campus environment also need to be assessed. Examples are:

(a) Expressed concern by the campus administration about the alcohol issue and support for prevention-type programs; (b) Campus life and the availability of on-campus social activities on weekend evenings, athletic and recreational opportunities, Greek life, alumni activity and health and counseling services. (c) Alcohol policies: content, awareness, support and communication of policies, rules, and regulations. (d) Alcohol availability and promotion: ads in campus newspaper, radio, TV; sale of alcohol on campus; alcohol-related merchandising at campus bookstores; alcohol sponsorships of campus events. (e) Enforcement: role of campus police in alcohol enforcement and their coordination with other campus units and outside agencies; residence hall rules and penalties for alcohol violations; student judiciary processes and contact with parents over violations. (f) Academics: lack of Friday classes; weekend library hours; dissemination to faculty of sources of funding of studies related to alcohol and student culture; encouragement of faculty focus on alcohol issue in classes where relevant to discipline; focus on alcohol issue in orientation of new students and their parents and new faculty.

(6) Assessing Effectiveness

Assessment should include measuring the effectiveness of policies and programs in preventing underage, excessive, and high-risk student drinking. At a minimum, it is recommended that campuses conduct annual or bi-annual surveys of student consumption patterns, attitudes, and perceptions, as well as their protective behaviors to assess the total impact of the campus environment on desired outcomes such as reducing the amount of underage and high-risk drinking and increasing healthy behaviors within the student body. Where possible, it is recommended that the outcomes of specific policies or programs be assessed using standard evaluation designs and instruments as appropriate.

Examples of assessment instruments will be included in the July report to the Trustees.

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 11:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 15 2001

Closed Session: Munitz Conference Room

Dee Dee Myers, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
William D. Campbell
Harold Goldwhite
Neel I. Murarka
Ralph R. Pesqueira

Governmental Code Section 3596[d] – Committee Members
Chair of the Board
Chancellor and Staff

Discussion Items

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for Honorary Degree (Government Code Section 11126[c])[5]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review and Recommendation of Nominee for Honorary Degree

Presentation by

Dee Dee Myers, 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”].