

## **AGENDA**

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting: 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, November 13, 2001**

**Closed Session: Munitz Conference Room**

Debra S. Farar, Chair  
William D. Campbell, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Daniel N. Cartwright  
Martha Fallgatter  
Murray L. Galinson  
Harold Goldwhite  
Ricardo F. Icaza  
Dee Dee Myers  
Ralph R. Pesqueira

#### **Discussion Items**

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

## **AGENDA**

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting: 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, November 14, 2001**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center**

Debra S. Farar, Chair  
William D. Campbell, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Daniel N. Cartwright  
Martha Fallgatter  
Murray L. Galinson  
Harold Goldwhite  
Ricardo F. Icaza  
Dee Dee Myers  
Ralph R. Pesqueira

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 10, 2001

#### **Discussion Items**

2. Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Refund of Fees Including Nonresident Tuition,  
*Action*
3. Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development, *Action*
4. Report of First Systemwide Evaluation of California State University Teacher  
Preparation Programs, *Information*
5. A Report from the Academic Senate of the California State University,  
*Information*

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

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

**July 10, 2001**

**Members Present**

Debra S. Farar, Chair  
William D. Campbell, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Daniel N. Cartwright  
Martha Fallgatter  
Murray L. Galinson  
Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Chair of the Board  
Harold Goldwhite  
Dee Dee Meyers  
Ralph R. Pesqueira  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

**Other Trustees Present**

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  
Louis Caldera, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Chair Farar called the meeting to order on Tuesday, July 10 at 1:50 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of May 15, 2001, were approved by consent as submitted.

**Notable Accomplishments in CSU Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: MERLOT**

Chair Farar introduced the item, stating that CSU professors who want to incorporate web resources into their courses have a difficult time finding the right materials to meet the needs of their students. To address this problem, the CSU developed the Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching project, also known by its acronym MERLOT. MERLOT has been designed both to improve the quality of learning materials available and to help institutions avoid duplication of effort.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence added that the MERLOT project was developed by the CSU's Center for Distributed Learning and is housed at Sonoma State University and now is a system and nationwide project. Dr. Spence introduced Sonoma State University President, Ruben Armiñana. President Armiñana introduced a video of the MERLOT project and acknowledged the work of chancellor's office staff members Dr. Cher Thomas, Director, Academic Technology Applications, Academic Affairs and Dr. Gerard Hanley, Senior Director, Academic Technology Support, Information Technology Services.

**Proposed Revisions of Title 5 Regulations-Summer Early Entrants**

Chair Farar explained that the proposed revisions to Title 5 would 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. These students will be enrolled on a regular state-subsidized basis and 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.

Dr. Spence stated that the proposed revisions would apply to all first-time freshmen and transfer students, and would have a positive effect on the remedial program. Student Trustee Cartwright inquired if a student registers in the summer, would the summer term count toward fulfilling the one-year remediation requirement. Dr. Spence responded that enrolling in the summer would not allow extra time to complete the remediation requirement but would give the student a head start. Trustee Goldwhite asked if the proposed revisions to Title 5 would apply to students enrolled in summer 2001. Dr. Spence responded it would. Chair Farar added that the proposed revision would maximize year round operations.

It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed resolution (REP 07-01-03).

**Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Report**

Chair Farar introduced this item stating that Chancellor Reed had appointed a committee of presidents, students, vice presidents of student affairs, faculty, staff, and alumni to review the

CSU's alcohol policies and prevention programs and to recommend ways to address the problem of alcohol abuse by students. Working since December 2000, under the leadership of CSU Fresno President, John Welty, the committee has developed broad policies that would be appropriate and effective at CSU's 23 campuses.

Dr. Spence introduced President Welty, chair of the committee. President Welty noted that the policy recommendations would provide a comprehensive approach for the campuses to address alcohol abuse. President Welty added that the Chancellor would provide challenge grants to each campus for developing a campus plan. President Welty commented there has been positive feedback within the CSU system as well as throughout the country, and several national organizations have expressed interest in working with the CSU.

Trustee Pesqueira commented that the policy recommendations are positive and added that campuses need to establish a method of program assessment to ensure progress. President Welty responded that every two years campuses will submit a report to the Board. Trustee Pesqueira stated that accountability should also include campus organizations. President Welty responded that it is expected that each campus will enforce the policy and hold campus groups accountable. Trustee Galinson complemented the committee on its work, and asked if it will continue. President Welty responded the committee will not continue, however, the campus Vice Presidents for Student Affairs will take responsibility for overseeing the program. Chair Farar thanked President Welty and the committee for its work.

It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed resolution (REP 07-01-04).

### **Student Participation in Policy Development**

Chair Farar stated that in 1998, the California State Student Association began discussion of the need for the CSU to clarify the role of CSU students in the development of campus and systemwide policy affecting students. In 2001, CSSA passed a resolution calling on the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to adopt a policy ensuring student participation in policy development.

Dr. Spence commended the committee for their work; specifically, Student Trustee Dan Cartwright, former Student Trustee Neel Murarka, Sonoma State University President, Ruben Arminañá, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo President, Warren Baker, CSU Sacramento President, Donald Gerth, CSSA Chair, Shaun Lumachi, and Christy Zamani, Student Relations Liaison, CSU Chancellor's office. Dr. Spence added that the Executive Council supports the proposed policy. CSSA Chair Lumachi thanked Dr. Spence for his support. Chair Lumachi observed that this policy will give students a chance to work with campus presidents on issues of importance to students.

4

Ed. Pol.

It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed resolution (REP 07-01-05).

**Announcement**

Dr. Spence recognized Dr. Charles W. Lindahl, on the occasion of his retirement, for his 37 years of dedicated service to the CSU.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

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

**Presentation By**

Debra S. Farar, 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"].

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Refund of Fees Including Nonresident Tuition**

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

This item recommends adoption of changes to Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations* governing refunds of student fees including nonresident tuition fees.

#### **Background**

Policies governing the refund of CSU student fees (including special sessions and extension course tuition fees) and nonresident tuition fees are included in Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations*. The policy governing refund of fees for student services, facilities, and materials appears in §41802 and the policy governing refund of nonresident tuition appears in §41913. These policies have been in place since 1978 with only minor modifications since that date. The Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (P.L. 102-325) imposed a requirement that institutions participating in federal Title IV student financial aid programs provide for a pro rata refund policy for first-time students who are recipients of federal Title IV student financial aid. At that time, Section 41802.1 was added to Title 5 to enable campuses to comply with the new federal statute and retain eligibility to receive federal Title IV student aid monies.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (P.L. 105-244) modified the statutory requirements relating to institutional refunds and the return of federal Title IV financial aid funds. While the modified statute does not dictate what institutional policies must be regarding the refund of institutional charges, it does govern the return of federal Title IV program funds when a student withdraws during a term. The statute and implementing regulations assume that Title IV financial aid funds received by a student were first applied to institutional charges. Institutions are required to return to Title IV student aid programs a portion of any Title IV funds received by the student or on his/her behalf that represents the “unearned” portion of charges by the institution. The “unearned” portion is based on the number of days in the term that the student was not enrolled.

While this statutory change was being considered and implementing regulations developed, the CSU was attempting to deal with findings related to “unofficial withdrawals” in audits of the

administration of federal funds. Audits of Continuing and Extended Education by the University Auditor's staff during this period concluded that the refund policy was outdated, resulting in operational inefficiencies and poor service, and recommended that the refund policy be reviewed and updated to reflect the current operating environment. Additional audits of student records conducted by the University Auditor's staff identified problems with campus compliance with student withdrawal processes. Further, Quality Improvement Program efforts identified inconsistencies in campus interpretations of the refund policies and the need for more efficient and improved service. More recent changes with respect to expanding academic offerings and the utilization of non-standard academic terms contribute to the need for modification of policies to provide a more consistent and equitable approach to refunding student fees.

In accordance with a June 5, 2000 memorandum from Executive Vice Chancellors David Spence and Richard West, a systemwide task force was convened to conduct a comprehensive review of all issues relating to potential changes in the CSU refund policies and procedures and to propose modifications to the Title 5 refund policy.

The recommendations of the systemwide task force have been modified based on consultation with the CSU Financial Aid Advisory Council, Chief Administrative and Business Officers, Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, Office of General Counsel, and CSU Presidents. The following summarizes the proposed changes:

- Sections 41802.1 and 41913 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations will be deleted in their entirety;
- Section 41802 will be modified to address the refund of tuition and mandatory systemwide and campus-based fees for state-supported academic periods and courses;
- Section 41802 will include the delegation of authority for campuses to establish refund policies governing tuition or fees required to enroll in courses offered through a self-support instruction program (e.g., special session tuition fees and extension course tuition fees);
- Section 41802 will include the delegation of authority for campuses to establish any applicable refund policies for campus-based penalty fees, deposits, and security or guaranty fees;
- Campuses will have the authority to assess an administrative charge for students who either cancel registration for an academic period, who drop courses, or who withdraw during an academic period (current administrative fees authorized by Title 5 to be withheld from refunds are \$5 for campus mandatory fees, \$10 for special session fees, and \$20 for extension course fees);
- Students who cancel registration or drop all courses prior to the first day of the academic

period will be entitled to a full refund of tuition and mandatory fees;

- Refunds in accordance with Section 41802 will be made on a pro-rata basis up to the 60 percent point in the academic period for all academic terms or courses of 4 weeks or more;
- The pro-rata refund will be calculated as the proportion represented by the number of days that the student was enrolled to the number of days in the academic period, excluding breaks of five days or more;
- Students who withdraw after the 60 percent point in the academic period or who fail to follow campus-established procedures for dropping courses or withdrawing will not be entitled to any refund of tuition or mandatory fees;
- For academic terms or courses of less than 4 weeks in length students will not be entitled to a refund if they fail to cancel registration or drop the course prior to the first day of the academic term or the course;
- Students will no longer be required to request a refund. Refunds will be “automatic” when a student follows campus-established procedures to cancel registration, drop courses, or withdraw for the academic period;
- Any refund of tuition and mandatory fees will be applied first toward any required return of funds received by students or on their behalf from federal, state, institutional, or external sources that were awarded to students on the basis of their enrollment and then returned to students or, with the students’ concurrence, carried as a credit balance on their account with the university; and
- Exceptions to the refund policy will be authorized in a limited number of circumstances.

### **Recommendation**

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 and repeals its regulations in Title 5, *California Code of Regulations*, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 5, Articles 3 and 4, Sections 41802, 41802.1, and 41913, as follows:

§ **41802**. Refund of Fees ~~Other Than Including~~ Nonresident Tuition ~~and Parking Fees~~.

(a) General. Money collected as a mandatory fee, ~~other than parking fees and or~~ nonresident tuition, may be refunded ~~to a student~~ in accordance with the provisions of this section.

~~(b) Refunds to Veterans. A person who has applied for or obtained enrolled status under any federal or state veterans' educational assistance plan may receive all refunds of fees in accordance with the regulations under which the federal or state veterans' educational assistance plan is operated, regardless of any limitations set forth in this section~~

(b) Cancellation of Registration. A student who registers for classes for an academic period and who drops all classes or otherwise cancels registration for the period prior to the first day of instruction for that period shall be entitled to a refund of all tuition and mandatory fees paid less an administrative charge established by the campus.

~~(c) Application for Refund of Fees. (1) Method of Application. Written application for a refund of fees, stating the reason for the request for refund, shall be made to the president. The application shall be delivered to the registrar of the campus, except that an application for refund of extension fees shall be delivered to the campus official in charge of the collection of extension course fees. If the president determines that the refund is payable, payment thereof shall be made pursuant to subsection (f).~~

~~(2) Persons Eligible to Make Application. The application shall be made and signed by the person who applied for or obtained enrollment for the term for which the fee was paid. If, in the opinion of the president, personal application is impossible, an authorized representative of the applicant may make the application.~~

~~(3) Time of Application. Application for refund of fees, in whole or in part, shall be delivered to the proper authority within the following time limits, unless in the opinion of the president physical disability prevents it:~~

~~(A) Student services fee, instructionally related activities fee, student body organization fee, and student body center fee Not later than 14 days following the day of the term when instruction begins except when otherwise specified in this section.~~

~~(B) Any fee refundable due to a campus regulation or because of compulsory military service At any time prior to the date when academic credit is awarded for any course or courses for the applicant is registered.~~

~~(C) Special session tuition fee Not later than the end of the second week of the session for which the applicant is registered.~~

~~(D) Extension course tuition fee Prior to the fourth meeting of the class.~~

~~(E) Other fees Prior to the time the fee has been earned by the Trustees as determined by the Chancellor or designee or, if not determined by the Chancellor, the president or designee.~~

(c) Adjustment of Registration. A student who, within the campus designated drop period and in accordance with the campus procedures, drops units resulting in a lower tuition and/or mandatory fee obligation shall be entitled to a refund of applicable tuition and mandatory fees less an administrative charge established by the campus.

~~(d) Fees Which May Not Be Refunded.~~

~~(1) A late registration fee and~~

~~(2) The student body organization fee, instructionally related activities fee, and student body center fee except upon student withdrawal from all classes.~~

(d) Withdrawals.

(1) For state-supported semesters, quarters and non-standard terms of courses of four (4) weeks or more:

(A) A student who, on or after the first day of instruction and up to a date that includes the sixty percent point in the academic period, either

1. drops all of the courses in which the student enrolled prior to the end of the campus-designated drop period, or

2. officially withdraws for the enrollment period in accordance with university procedures.

shall be entitled to a refund of tuition and mandatory fees on the basis of the proportion represented by the number of days in the academic period, excluding breaks of five days or more.

(B) A student who officially withdraws from the university after the sixty percent point in the academic period, fails to drop classes prior to the end of the campus drop period, or fails to officially withdraw from the campus, shall not be entitled to any refund of tuition or mandatory fees.

(2) For state-supported, non-standard terms or courses of less than four (4) weeks: a student registered for a state-supported, academic period or any course of less than four (4) weeks in duration shall not be entitled to any refund of tuition and mandatory fees if the student fails to either drop the courses or cancel registration prior to the first day of instruction for state-supported, non-standard terms or the first scheduled meeting of a state-supported course of less than four weeks that occurs during a regular semester or quarter.

(3) For self-support, special sessions and extension course tuition fees: Refunds of tuition and fee charges for self-support, special sessions and extension courses shall be made in accordance with policies and procedures established by the campus offering the session or course.

~~(e) Fees Which May Be Refunded. The following fees may be refunded:~~

~~(1) A fee collected in error.~~

~~(2) The student services fee, instructionally related activities fee, student body organization fee, and student body center fee upon complete withdrawal from the campus except that five dollars shall be retained from the student services fee to cover the cost of registration in all cases other than those mentioned in subparagraph (e)(4).~~

- ~~(3) The difference between the two applicable student services fees, less five dollars, if the unit load of the applicant is reduced to a lower fee category not later than 14 days following the day of the term when instruction begins.~~
- ~~(4) Any fee, other than an application fee, paid by an applicant unable to continue a course because of a campus rule, compulsory military service or his or her death or physical disability. In each such case, the circumstances concerning the inability to continue shall be stated on the application for refund.~~
- ~~(5) Application fees shall be refunded only upon satisfactory proof that the applicant was unable to begin the term with respect to which application was made by reason of his or her death, physical disability or compulsory military service.~~
- ~~(6) All or part of a fee, other than a student services fee, instructionally related activities fee, a student body organization fee, a student body center fee, a summer session tuition fee, or an extension course tuition fee, not earned by the Trustees. No refund shall be made unless the chief fiscal officer of the campus or designee has certified to the amount not earned by the Trustees.~~
- ~~(7) Special session tuition fees, in accordance with the following formula:~~

*FORMULA FOR REFUND SPECIAL SESSION FEES*

*Time of Receipt of Written Withdrawal and  
Application for Refund by the Campus Registrar ————— Refund*

- ~~(A) Prior to the last day a student may register  
without payment of a late fee. (Total fee paid minus \$10.00)~~
- ~~(B) On or after the last day a student may register  
without payment of a late fee~~
  - ~~1. Five Week Session or longer~~
    - ~~First two days campus classes are scheduled (Total fee paid minus the fee for one unit)~~
    - ~~Any other day of the first week (Total fee paid minus the fee for one unit time 65%)~~
    - ~~Any day of the second week (Total fee paid minus the fee for one unit time 25%)~~
  - ~~2. Three and Four Week Sessions~~
    - ~~First two days campus classes are scheduled (Total fee paid minus the fee for one unit)~~
    - ~~Any other day of the first week (Total fee paid minus the fee for one unit times 65%)~~
  - ~~3. Two Week Session or Less (No refund)~~
- ~~(8) The entire extension course tuition fee if the campus discontinues the course, or, if the student withdraws from the course, a portion of the extension course tuition fee according to the following formula:~~

*FORMULA FOR REFUND EXTENSION COURSE TUITION FEE*

*Time of Receipt of Written Withdrawal and  
Application for Refund by Campus Official  
Designated for Collection of the Fee ————— Refund*

~~(A) Prior to the date of the first class session ————— Total Fee Minus \$00 \$20 per course as determined by the campus. If a campus refunds less than the total fee, the amount retained shall not exceed the cost of processing the fee refund.~~

~~(B) On or after the date of first class session:~~

~~1. Courses of five meetings or longer or, if there are no meetings, more than four weeks duration ————— 65% of fees collected until 25% of the course time has elapsed, after which no refund.~~

~~2. Course of four meetings or less or, if there are no meetings, four weeks or less duration ————— No refund.~~

(e) Exceptions. Notwithstanding subdivision (d):

(1) Tuition and mandatory fees shall be refunded and an administrative charge may not be retained if

(A) The tuition and mandatory fees were assessed or collected in error;

(B) The course for which the tuition and mandatory fees were assessed or collected was cancelled by the university; or

(C) The university makes a delayed decision that the student was not eligible to enroll in the term for which mandatory fees were assessed and collected and the delayed decision was not due to incomplete or inaccurate information provided by the student;

(D) The student was activated for compulsory military service.

(2) Tuition and mandatory fees may be refunded if the student or an authorized representative petitions the university for a refund demonstrating exceptional circumstances and the chief financial officer of the university or designee makes a determination that the tuition and mandatory fees have not been earned by the university.

~~(f) Payment of Refund. Refund made before the fee is deposited in the State Treasury may be paid from the cash state bank account containing the fee. After a fee has been deposited in the State Treasury the campus, on behalf of the student, shall present the State Controller a claim against the appropriation in which the fee was deposited.~~

(f) Payment of Refunds: Any refund of tuition and mandatory fees shall be applied in the following order:

(1) Any refunds shall first be applied toward any required return of funds that had been received by the student or on his/her behalf from federal, state, institutional, or external sources that were conditioned on the student's enrollment.

(2) The balance of any refunds shall be returned to the student or, with the student's concurrence, carried as a credit balance on the student's account with the university.

(g) Penalty Fees, Deposits, and Security or Guaranty Fees. Fees assessed to reimburse the university for additional costs resulting from dishonored payments, late submissions,

or misuse of property are not subject to refund. Fees collected as a security or guarantee shall be refundable as determined by the university based on terms stipulated at the time and in accordance with conditions of their collection.

(h) "Mandatory fees," as used in this section, means systemwide fees and campus fees that are required to be paid in order to enroll in state-supported academic programs.

(i) Since the change arises in the middle of an academic year, campuses may refund fees including nonresident tuition fees following the former refund standards during a transition period that shall end with the commencement of the Fall term 2002.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 68051, 89030 and 89700, Education Code. Reference: Section 68051 and 89700, Education Code.

~~§ 41802.1. Refund of Fees and Charges for First-time Students Receiving Title IV Financial Aid.~~

~~Notwithstanding Sections 41802, 41913, 42019, 42102, 42201 and any other provision of this title to the contrary, fees and charges normally refunded under the previously listed sections shall be refunded pursuant to this section for a student receiving a grant (Federal Pell Grant or Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant), loan (Federal Perkins Loan or Federal Family Education Loans which are Federal Stafford Loans, Supplemental Loans for Students, and Parents Loans for Undergraduate Students), or work assistance (Federal Work Study employment) under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, who is attending the institution for the first time, and only for the first term of that attendance. The refund of fees and charges shall be equal to the portion of the period of enrollment for which the student has been charged that remains on the last day of attendance by the student, rounded downward to the nearest ten percent of that period, less any unpaid charges owed by the student for the period of enrollment for which the student has been charged, and less a reasonable administrative fee not to exceed the lesser of five percent of the fees and charges to be refunded, or \$100. No fees shall be refunded when the date of a student's withdrawal is after the 60 percent point in the period of enrollment for which the student has been charged. "The portion of the period of enrollment for which the student has been charged that remains" shall be determined by dividing the total number of weeks comprising the period of enrollment for which the student has been charged into the number of weeks remaining in that period as of the last recorded day of attendance by the student.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Sections 89030 and 89700, Education Code. Reference: Sections 89030 and 89700, Education Code; Title 20 United States Code, Section 1091b (106 STAT. 619-620).~~

~~§ 41913. Refund of Nonresident Tuition.~~

~~(a) General. Money collected as nonresident tuition may be refunded to a student in accordance with the provisions of this section.~~

~~(b) Application for Refund Tuition:~~

~~(1) Method of Application. Written application for a refund of tuition, stating the reason for the request for refund, shall be made to the president of the campus. The application shall be delivered to the registrar of the campus. If the president determines that the refund is payable, payment shall be made pursuant to subsection (f) of section 41802.~~

~~(2) Persons Eligible to Make Application. A student shall make the application personally if able to do so. If, in the opinion of the president of the campus, a student is unable to make the application personally, the parents or guardian of the student who is a minor or the duly authorized representative of the student who is of the age of majority may make the application. If, in the opinion of the president of the campus, illness or accident of the student prevented the student from making application for refund within the time limits specified in this section, application may be made at a later date.~~

~~(c) Tuition Collected in Error. Money collected in error may be refunded in full upon proper application and without regard to time limits set forth in this section. Money which may be so refunded includes, among other money collected in error, nonresident tuition collected upon a preliminary determination of nonresident status based upon the application of the student where the determination is later found to be incorrect.~~

~~(d) Tuition for Semester. If the day of the term when instruction begins is any day of the calendar week other than Monday, or other than Tuesday if Monday falls on a holiday, the week shall be disregarded for the purposes of this section. In such a case, the first week shall be deemed to begin on the following Monday. Tuition paid for a course scheduled to continue for an entire semester may be refunded in accordance with the following schedule if application therefore is received by the registrar within the following time limits:~~

<del>Time Limit</del>	<del>Amount of Refund</del>
<del>(1) Before or during the first week of the semester</del>	<del>100%</del>
<del>(2) During the second week of the semester</del>	<del>90%</del>
<del>(3) During the third week of the semester</del>	<del>70%</del>
<del>(4) During the fourth week of the semester</del>	<del>50%</del>
<del>(5) During the fifth week of the semester</del>	<del>30%</del>
<del>(6) During the sixth week of the semester</del>	<del>20%</del>

~~(e) Tuition for Academic Year Quarter or Academic Summer Quarter. Tuition paid for courses scheduled to continue for an entire academic year quarter or an entire academic summer quarter may be refunded in the following amounts if application therefore is received by the registrar within the following time limits:~~

<del>Time Limit</del>	<del>Amount of Refund</del>
<del>(1) Before or during the first week of the quarter</del>	<del>100%</del>
<del>(2) During the second week of the quarter</del>	<del>75%</del>
<del>(3) During the third week of the quarter</del>	<del>50%</del>
<del>(4) During the fourth week of the quarter</del>	<del>25%</del>

~~(f) Tuition for Courses Scheduled for Less Than an Entire Semester or Entire Academic Year Quarter or Academic Summer Quarter. One half of the tuition paid for courses scheduled to continue for less than a semester, less than an academic year quarter, or less than an academic summer quarter may be refunded if application therefore is received by the registrar before the end of the first half of the period of time for which the course is scheduled, without regard to the day of the week upon which the course begins.~~

~~Note: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 68051, 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 68051 and 89705, Education Code.~~

And, be it further

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

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

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

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

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

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

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

#### **Background**

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

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

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

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

The fast track provides for a brief agenda item at the September Board of Trustees meeting that makes it possible for a proposal to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by the prior June, have concerns resolved by the time of the Board meeting in September, be authorized by the Board, be referred to CPEC prior to or soon after the meeting, be endorsed by CPEC by December, be incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring and perhaps be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term, and be ready for full implementation in August. Because the regularly scheduled September meeting was cancelled, and since no program would be ready for implementation before January, this item was deferred.

Four fast-track proposals were received in spring 2001: a request from California State University, Fresno to establish a Bachelor of Science degree program with a major in Interdisciplinary Health and Rehabilitation Sciences; a request from California State University, Long Beach to establish Bachelor of Arts degree programs with majors in French Studies and Italian Studies; and a request from California State University, Stanislaus to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree program with a major in Agricultural Studies. The programs as proposed meet the criteria for the fast-track process. The faculty, facilities, and information resources needed to offer the programs are in place.

CSU Fresno has been offering instruction in Health Science and other allied health programs (e.g., the Master of Physical Therapy program) for many years. The existing Health Science program would continue to emphasize community-oriented health concerns, such as health education, industrial hygiene, occupational safety, and health administration. The proposed interdisciplinary program would provide superior preparation for students planning to undertake graduate work in a rehabilitation-oriented health specialty, such as Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, or Rehabilitation Services. This reorganization of the baccalaureate health-oriented curricula was prompted in part by the recent designation of the master's degree as the entry-level degree for several health professions and the need for baccalaureate curricula to articulate effectively with the graduate-level professional curricula.

CSU Long Beach has long-established instructional offerings in French and Italian languages and literatures, and there is extensive, relevant course work available in Art History, Film, Geography, History, Liberal Arts, Music, and Political Science. The campus currently offers BA and MA programs in French and a minor in Italian. The proposed French Studies and Italian Studies programs are analogous in structure and objectives to the Chinese Studies major that was projected as a fast-track program in September 2000 and subsequently approved for implementation.

CSU Stanislaus is proposing a liberal arts, multidisciplinary baccalaureate program, provisionally titled "Agricultural Studies," for students who have earned an agriculture-related associate degree at a community college and are seeking professional advancement. Any instruction requiring agricultural facilities will have been completed at the community college level. It is expected to fulfill a need among place-bound working professionals in the Stanislaus region for opportunities to pursue an agriculture-related bachelor's degree, and it has been designed in collaboration with community college Agriculture deans and leaders of the region's agriculture community.

### **Recommended Action**

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2001 and includes the customary authorization for newly projected degree programs. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California State University, Fresno (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Science with a major in Interdisciplinary Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, with a projected implementation date of 2002; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California State University, Long Beach (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in French Studies and a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Italian Studies, with projected implementation dates of 2002; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California State University, Stanislaus (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 20-21, 2001, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Agricultural Studies, with a projected implementation date of 2002 and a footnote indicating that the degree title is under discussion; and be it further

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

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Report of First Systemwide Evaluation of California State University Teacher Preparation Programs**

#### **Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

This report summarizes the purposes, findings and intended uses of the first systemwide evaluation of professional teacher preparation programs in the California State University, an assessment linked to the implementation of the *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*.

#### **Background Information**

In July 1998 the Trustees adopted the *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers* and established benchmarks and timelines for implementing this *Commitment*. The Board pledged to improve the quality and effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, to expand the capacity of each campus to produce excellent teachers, and to hold the campuses accountable for meeting these goals. The campuses reported on implementation of the *Commitment* in a series of updates to the Chancellor and the Board in 1999 and 2000. To track the effects of the *Commitment* in its third year (2000-01), the Office of the Chancellor and the Deans of Education directly evaluated the quality and effectiveness of all CSU programs of professional teacher preparation. This report describes the "systemwide evaluation," the first of its kind in the CSU.

#### **Purposes of the Systemwide Evaluation**

In addition to tracking the effects of the *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*, the Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs was designed to

- (1) provide accurate information to campus leaders,
- (2) enable them to make needed improvements in programs, and
- (3) anticipate expanded State accountability measures in the preparation and certification of beginning teachers.

To achieve these purposes, statistical sampling techniques were employed for generating valid, reliable data that could be generalized to the entire population of teachers who complete credential programs in the CSU. The purposes of the evaluation reflect ongoing priorities of the Governor, the Trustees, the Chancellor, and the campuses. It is the first in a series of inter-related research-and-evaluation efforts to be completed from 2001 through 2004.

### **CSU Responsibilities for Preparing First-Year Teachers**

Few university graduates are prepared to immediately assume all the challenges of a career position in their field. Most graduates hired into new positions undergo a period of formal or informal training as they acquire the practical experience necessary to apply the academic skills and knowledge acquired at the university. This is certainly true for newly credentialed teachers in their first years on the job. That such individuals are assigned full classroom duties during this period of induction to the profession often generates insecurities and doubts about themselves and the adequacy of their preparation.

The Systemwide Evaluation provides information related to the actual responsibilities of CSU campuses to prepare university students to *begin* serving as K-12 teachers. In this regard, recent changes in State law and policy have the effect of changing CSU campus responsibilities somewhat. The policy change is based on the fact that K-12 teaching in the 21st century is complex and challenging – so much so that very few university students can become proficient at it solely by completing a program of initial preparation, no matter how excellent and effective that program is. The complexities and challenges of teaching range from planning and delivering instruction, managing behavior, assessing student progress, and communicating with students, parents, principals and other teachers; all in a context of rich student diversity and in a school organization that is increasingly accountable for pupil success in learning an academic curriculum that is very demanding at each grade level.

In this context, the responsibilities of CSU campuses are to select, prepare, and verify the readiness of large numbers of beginning teachers whose work is to be coached and assisted in the supported environment of an “induction program.” The State already underwrites most of the costs of these induction programs at a total cost of more than \$80 million per year. It is expected that within two years, this induction period will be required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing thus insuring that this on-the-job learning period will be completed by each fully prepared candidate.

Determining how well the University is accomplishing its role in this overall process is the primary focus of the evaluation. However, as the evaluation results are examined, it is important to recall that the University’s task is only part of a broader process.

## **Responsibility for the Systemwide Evaluation**

The *CSU's Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers* focused on programs of professional teacher preparation on 21 CSU campuses. In 2001 the Deans of Education on these campuses took the lead in organizing and planning the first System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs in order to assess their progress in implementing the Board's *Commitment*. Led by a five-member committee chaired by Dean Lionel (Skip) Meno, College of Education, San Diego State University, the 21 Deans of Education posed a series of questions to be addressed in the evaluation, and they decided who would be asked to answer these questions.

## **Design of the Systemwide Evaluation**

In the evaluation, graduates of CSU's programs of professional teacher preparation were asked to answer questions about their employment status, the K-12 schools in which they were teaching, the intrinsic qualities of their CSU teacher preparation programs, the effectiveness of their preparation for the challenges of classroom teaching, and their professional expectations for the future. The school-based supervisors of the CSU graduates (who administer K-12 schools and are not CSU employees) were invited to answer the same questions about the effectiveness of the CSU graduates' preparation to begin teaching the California curriculum in public K-12 schools. The evaluation focused on the preparation of CSU graduates to begin teaching *K-12 Student Content Standards* adopted by the State Board of Education. The language of the evaluation questions reflected current state policy that CSU programs should prepare new teachers to *begin* teaching pupils the state's K-12 curriculum.

## **Overall Dimensions of the Systemwide Evaluation**

The new teachers in the evaluation completed CSU programs of professional teacher preparation during the 1999-2000 academic year. A total of 3,107 members of this cohort were randomly selected and invited to participate in the evaluation. Graduates teaching in K-12 schools answered a series of evaluation questions either online or using a traditional survey booklet. Evaluation materials were separately sent to the immediate supervisor of each teaching graduate. Each graduate was informed that her/his supervisor would participate, and each supervisor received the name of the CSU graduate whose preparation was to be evaluated. Both groups of participants were encouraged to participate anonymously, so the graduates' responses could not be linked to those of their super-visors.

Exactly half (50 percent) of the sampled teaching graduates responded to the evaluation questions. Among their immediate supervisors, 45 percent provided the requested answers. With these response rates from a stratified random sample, the evaluation results describe the

preparation of all new teachers in the CSU during 1999-2000. For every respondent who used websites to answer the questions, seven others elected to use traditional question-and-answer booklets.

### **First Finding: CSU Graduates Serve as K-12 Teachers in Record Numbers**

When the Board of Trustees adopted the *CSU Commitment* in July 1998, California's need for large numbers of well-prepared teachers had reached crisis proportions. How many of CSU's 1999-2000 graduates served as K-12 teachers one year later?

The evaluation found that 96 percent of the graduates of CSU teaching credential programs were teaching in K-12 schools one year later. This means that nineteen of every twenty graduates of CSU teaching credential programs met the challenges of teaching by serving as K-12 teachers at least one full year following their graduation. Among the studies of teacher participation rates in other states and at many institutions, a teacher participation rate as high as 96 percent is exceptionally high, perhaps unique. In 1999-2000, the CSU produced more than 10,500 fully qualified teachers who used their CSU preparation to teach K-12 students for at least one full year following CSU program completion.

Virtually all of CSU teaching graduates provided service in California's public K-12 schools in 2000-01. Very small numbers of them served as teachers in private K-12 schools or in schools outside of California.

One percent of the graduates of CSU teacher preparation programs began the 2000-01 school year as K-12 teachers but did not remain in teaching for the entire year. Three percent of the 1999-2000 cohort did not serve as K-12 teachers during the year following their graduation. The reasons why these CSU graduates did not immediately pursue a teaching career will be investigated in future evaluations. Some of them may plan to become teachers in the future.

### **Second Finding: CSU Effectiveness in Curriculum-Based Teacher Preparation**

Graduates of CSU teacher preparation programs and their school-site supervisors anonymously reported whether the graduates of 1999-2000 were "well prepared", "adequately prepared," "somewhat prepared" or "not at all prepared" to begin the work of classroom teaching in California's K-12 schools. The participants were assured of individual response anonymity. The resulting candor and honesty of their responses were evident in their open-ended comments and multiple-choice answers.

For students in grades K-8, instruction in reading-language arts is the most important single responsibility of CSU's teaching graduates in those grades. According to K-8 principals and other school supervisors, 81 percent of CSU graduates in grades K-8 were well prepared or

adequately prepared by the CSU “to begin to teach reading-language arts according to grade-level State Content Standards.” To supplement the principals’ reports, a similar question was answered by the CSU graduates, 74 percent of whom reported being well-prepared or adequately-prepared by the CSU “to begin to teach reading-language arts according to State Content Standards for my grade(s).”

The progress of K-8 students in mathematics is also crucial for their eventual success in school and their eligibility for CSU admission. Four-fifths (80%) of the school-site supervisors judged the CSU’s teaching graduates to be well prepared or adequately prepared by the CSU “to begin to teach mathematics according to State Content Standards.” Responding to a similar question, 70 percent of the CSU teaching graduates in grades K-8 reported they were well prepared or adequately prepared by the CSU “to begin to teach mathematics according to State Content Standards for my grade level(s).”

In grades 7-12, CSU’s teaching graduates are typically given specialized assignments to teach specific subjects as authorized by their preparation and their credentials. During 2000-01, these CSU teaching graduates were supervised by experienced department chairs, school principals and vice-principals, 86 percent of whom judged the CSU graduates to be well prepared or adequately-prepared “to teach her/his subject according to the State Curriculum framework and Content Standards for her/his grade(s).” In these grades, 74 percent of CSU’s teaching graduates reported that they were well prepared or adequately prepared “to begin to teach my subject area according to the State Curriculum Framework and Content Standards for my grade level(s).”

Overall, the first annual evaluation of CSU programs of professional teacher preparation found that a large majority of CSU graduates are well prepared or adequately prepared to teach reading, language arts and mathematics skills in grades K-8, and to teach California’s academic curriculum in grades 7-12, all according to the standards and frameworks of the State Board of Education.

### **Third Finding: CSU Effectiveness in Teaching All Grades and Subjects**

Regardless of the grades and subjects to be taught by CSU graduates, they need specific instructional knowledge and skills that contribute to the education of all K-12 students. So the CSU Deans of Education asked school principals several questions about these areas of professional knowledge and skill. The 1,171 principals reported that 85 percent of CSU’s teaching graduates are well-prepared or adequately-prepared to “begin to promote student learning effectively,” that 81 percent reach this level of preparation to “begin to organize and manage a classroom for instruction,” and that 84 percent are equally prepared to “be confident,

responsive and supportive in her/his interactions with parents.” Of the 1,402 participating CSU graduates, identical reports were turned in by 79 percent, 71 percent and 65 percent, respectively. The main purpose of professional teacher preparation programs is to enable CSU graduates to get started effectively in schools that support their induction as novice teachers. In the State’s two-year induction program for new teachers, called the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), experienced teachers guide and coach the graduates of CSU campuses and of other institutions. To prepare prospective teachers for this phase of their development, CSU campuses enable future teachers to learn how to work collaboratively with experienced colleagues. School principals reported that 90 percent of CSU’s teaching graduates are well prepared or adequately prepared to “begin to work collaboratively with other teachers in the school.” Eighty percent of the CSU graduates gave identical responses to a similar question. Surprisingly, the evaluation also showed that 36 percent of CSU’s teaching graduates do not participate in the BTSA Program, and 30 percent are given no information about it. In a forthcoming change in State policy, participation in BTSA (or an alternative induction program) will be a credential requirement beginning in 2004.

To be successful, CSU teacher education programs include practice teaching in which university students are carefully observed, coached and assessed by university-based supervisors as well as experienced classroom teachers who serve as “cooperating teachers.” Regrettably, the evaluation showed that only 52 percent of CSU’s teaching graduates benefited from the dual services of university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Across the board, these teachers were the best prepared of CSU’s teaching graduates. Of the others, 18 percent were intern teachers in their own classrooms, so they had the advantages of university supervisors plus site-based coaches not in their classrooms. The remaining 31 percent were neither interns nor student teachers because they were hired by districts to be emergency teachers before completing their preparation. This group had the services only of university supervisors, and they reported being the least prepared of the three groups of teaching graduates.

### **Planned Uses of the Systemwide Evaluation Findings**

Deans of Education on the 21 CSU campuses have begun their analysis of these research findings. Depending on campus-specific needs and circumstances, the Deans will utilize the evaluation results (along with information from other sources) to make specific improvements in the curriculum and delivery of professional teacher preparation programs. The evaluation results will lead to program changes during 2001-02 and thereafter. Follow-up reports to the Board of Trustees will summarize the evaluation-based program changes that are implemented on the 21 CSU campuses. Additionally, the systemwide findings will be valuable in communicating the CSU’s continuing *Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers*.

### **Additional Areas of Systemwide Evaluation Beginning in 2001-02**

The Systemwide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation focused on programs of professional teacher preparation, where prospective teachers learn the principles and practices of pedagogy. There is also an urgent need for reliable information about CSU programs of subject matter preparation in which future teachers learn the subjects of the curriculum.

In 2001-02 the CSU campuses and the Office of the Chancellor will compile information about the extent to which subject matter preparation programs are aligned and congruent with the scope and content of the State Student Content Standards in English/language arts (K-8), mathematics (K-12), science (K-8) and history-social science (K-8).

It may also be feasible to evaluate the effectiveness of subject matter preparation by collecting information directly from CSU's teaching graduates and their supervisors.

Meanwhile, the Chancellor's staff is examining alternative ways to evaluate the outcomes of teacher preparation programs by compiling information about the actual performances of CSU's teaching graduates. An augmentation of resources beginning in 2002-03 would make it feasible to assess teacher preparation in terms of (1) the professional practices that CSU's teaching graduates actually use in their professional positions and (2) the aggregated effects of CSU's teaching graduates on the academic accomplishments of their students in K-12 schools.

Finally, it is expected that the Governor and the Secretary for Education will direct that new accountability measures be developed for all institutions that prepare beginning teachers for California schools. It is possible that the Governor's plans may dovetail with the current CSU teacher preparation evaluation efforts and thus give the CSU a "head start" toward meeting new accountability requirements as quickly and effectively as possible.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**A Report from the Academic Senate of the California State University**

**Presentation By**

David S. Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

Jacquelyn Ann Kegley  
Chair, Academic Senate CSU

Robert Cherny  
Vice Chair, Academic Senate CSU

**Summary**

As an outgrowth of its response to the query of the joint legislative committee reviewing the state Master Plan for Higher Education, the Academic Senate, CSU has developed a report entitled *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California*, which will be distributed at the meeting. This presentation will summarize the report and the recommendations contained therein.