

## **AGENDA**

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting:**           **9:00 a.m., Wednesday, November 17, 1999**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center**

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

Reconvene from Monday, November 15, 1999

#### **Discussion Items**

2. Special Report on Remediation, *Information*
3. Accountability Process, *Action*
4. Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access: Progress Report, *Information*

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 2  
November 15-17, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Special Report on Remediation**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

The Board of Trustees adopted in January 1996 a policy designed to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. Annual reports have been provided to the board each March in response to trustee policy calling for annual reports on systemwide and intersegmental activities to implement the elements of the trustee policy. Although these annual March reports will continue, this special report addresses the effectiveness of campus efforts to remediate students during their first year of enrollment and describes campus plans for reducing the proportions of regularly-admitted freshmen needing a second year of remedial education.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2  
November 15-17, 1995

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### **Special Report on Remediation**

##### **Remedial Education Policy Requirements**

Each March, the board receives an annual report on the number of first-time freshmen who take the CSU English and mathematics placement tests and the number who do not demonstrate proficiency and require remedial education. This special report provides information about campus activities to improve the effectiveness of remedial education so that more first-time freshmen enrolling at CSU in fall 1998 completed their required remediation prior to the fall 1999 term and campus plans to implement the requirements of Executive Order 665.

Executive Order 665 was issued by the chancellor to implement the provisions of the trustee remedial education policy adopted in January 1996. This executive order requires campuses to ensure that students needing remediation receive it beginning with the first term of enrollment, establish and enforce limits on remedial activity, and advise students who are not making adequate progress in developing foundational skills to consider enrolling in other educational institutions as appropriate, and permit students to continue for a second year of remedial education on a case-by-case exception basis.

Subsequent directions from the trustees and Chancellor's Office specified reporting requirements that go beyond reports about how many students were tested and placed in timely and appropriate ways. These further reporting requirements relate to the effectiveness of remedial activities and include information about the progress of students in completing successfully the remediation required by individual campuses and the identification of students who are not successfully prepared within two semesters (three quarters) or some combination of regular and summer terms extending through a full calendar year.

Each CSU campus prepared and submitted to the chancellor a plan in October 1999 describing the steps it is taking to meet the requirements of EO 665 and other directives. These campus plans have been used to develop this special progress report. Data will be presented at the November meeting on the numbers of new fall 1998 students who completed and who did not complete remedial requirements prior to the beginning of the fall 1999 term. Information will be provided about the number of students who were allowed to continue enrollment after a year of remediation, including the justification for making these exceptions.

##### **Campus Efforts to Remediate Students Prior to Fall 1999**

Campuses have developed and implemented a number of policies and programs to increase the number of first-time freshmen demonstrating proficiency in English and/or mathematics by the beginning of the fall 1999 term. Most communication with students about the remediation policy was handled through direct mailings, advising, and orientation sessions. Representative examples of these policies and programs are described below.

## **Methods Ensuring That Students Begin Remediation in the First Term**

### *Information Dissemination*

Campuses advised students about the requirement to take the EPT and/or ELM via correspondence. Frequently, these letters were signed by presidents and provosts followed by additional letters from academic advisors and deans. In many instances, students received personalized score reports and placement letters to advise them about the remedial courses they needed to take. Students were required to acknowledge in writing that they were aware of the need to register in appropriate remedial programs, to complete the remediation by the end of the first academic year, and the possibility of disenrollment at the end of the academic year if they did not attend remedial classes regularly and turn in all assignments.

### *Early Placement Testing*

Some campuses established dates by which students were required to have taken the EPT and/or ELM, e.g., by May 30 or June 15, to enable the campus time to counsel students.

### *Orientation Activities*

Students who were required to enroll in remedial programs were required to attend orientation programs. In some instances, students were not allowed to attend orientation programs until the required placement tests had been taken.

### *Registration Holds*

All campuses have implemented procedures to prevent students from registering for classes until they have taken the EPT/ELM and their scores have been received. Nearly all campuses have features in their registration systems that require students to register in required remedial courses before they are allowed to select other courses. These systems require students to enroll in designated remedial class(es) in order to register and prevent them from dropping a remedial class unless they change to another section or withdraw completely from the campus.

Campuses that do not have this electronic feature in their systems place holds on student registrations until faculty advisors certify that students have been counseled and have enrolled in appropriate remedial programs. Withdrawal from a remedial class requires the signature of the faculty member, academic advisor, or chair of the department.

Student information systems have been modified to track each student's completion of remedial courses and to update the remedial course "flags" so that students, if required, have to register in their second term in appropriate remedial course(s).

## **Improved Diagnostic Procedures to Identify What Students Need to Learn**

Students are directed to different levels and types of remedial classes and programs depending upon their ELM and EPT scores. Some scores require students to enroll in a one-semester remedial class or other short-term programs, e.g., eight Saturdays. Other scores require placement

in a two-semester or three-quarter course sequence. Students are provided instruction that is most appropriate to their experience and skill levels.

For example, students with EPT scores of 149-150 (151 demonstrates proficiency) may be enrolled in freshman composition but required to take a 2-unit remedial tutorial. Developmental writing may be required for students with low EPT scores (below 140). In mathematics, students who score below 380 on ELM (550 demonstrates proficiency) may be placed in smaller classes to give the instructor more time to work individually with students who need intensive and extensive remedial work. Students who score between 380 and 470 on ELM may be given the opportunity to take an elementary algebra diagnostic test at the beginning of the semester which might result in a student skipping the first semester of a two-semester sequence remedial course.

Many campuses use the Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP) to help identify specific areas that need additional attention rather than a full range of remediation in mathematics because the ELM is a placement test and does not provide diagnostic information that identifies the areas in which the student needs additional remedial work.

### **Using Varied Instructional Methods**

All campuses are exploring alternative ways to deliver remedial instruction. Campuses are tailoring programs and classes that best meet the student's need for remediation and learning styles. While traditional lecture formats may work successfully for some students, other students may learn more effectively in a lecture-laboratory format. When lecture formats are used, CSU student tutors, typically English and mathematics majors, supervise instruction of small groups of students (about 20 or fewer) to supplement the classroom instruction. Computer-assisted instruction that uses video and interactive systems is effective for students who are computer literate. Remedial writing activities offered by campus writing centers are used to support English remediation activities and classes. In these centers, CSU student tutors meet with students to review assignments and to provide additional instruction.

### **Using Technology to Deliver Remedial Instruction**

All but five campuses used technology to support the remedial education program. Typically, computer labs provide additional repetition and reinforcement by allowing students to work on a self-paced basis. Some campuses are developing web-based remedial courses.

Campuses report mixed success with the use of mediated instruction. Some students are uncomfortable with remedial instruction offered entirely by computer or do not feel comfortable in a computer environment. More frequently, campuses cited the need for direct faculty contact and intervention with students, especially with students who require more than one term of remediation.

### **Summer Remedial Programs Prior to the First Term**

All campuses except one offer first-time freshmen opportunities to enroll in appropriate remedial courses and activities prior to the beginning of the student's first fall term of enrollment. These

summer programs are designed to encourage students to enroll in workshops to prepare them for transition into baccalaureate-level courses as quickly as possible. Except for year-round campuses which offered general funded summer remedial courses, enrollment in summer courses typically occurred through self-support programs in extended education/special session classes. Summer courses ranged in length from six to eight weeks. In many instances, campuses waived or subsidized the fee for low-income students. Some campuses negotiated agreements with local community colleges to offer remedial courses during the summer. For students who needed limited remediation, weekend and short-term summer programs were developed.

### **Summer Remedial Programs After the First Academic Year**

All campuses except two provided intensive summer school programs and classes on campus for students who were unable demonstrate proficiency in English and/or mathematics after the 1998-1999 academic year. All campuses permitted students to enroll in appropriate remedial or general education level English and/or mathematics courses at local community colleges as a way to certify proficiency prior to the beginning of the 1999 fall term. At many campuses, local community colleges offered remedial courses on the CSU campus during the summer for students.

### **Criteria Used to Determine if Students Can Continue for the Fall 1999 Term**

Students who were unable to acquire the required competencies during the academic year were given an additional opportunity during the summer. As described earlier, campuses either provided intensive summer school programs and classes on campus for students and/or developed arrangements with local community colleges to provide remedial instruction.

### **Criteria for Disenrollment**

Campuses disenrolled students who:

- did not demonstrate good faith by completing each course and completing each assignment;
- did not take advantage of the opportunity to attend summer sessions on campus or at a local community college to complete their remedial work; or
- failed the same remedial course twice.

Campuses disenrolled students for failure to register for the required remediation courses or for ceasing to attend required classes prior to census date.

### **Criteria for Permitting Continued Enrollment**

Campuses allowed students to continue only for the fall 1999 if they:

- enrolled in remedial courses and programs and completed all assignments and, due to circumstances beyond their control, were unable to enroll in summer sessions. These students will be required to demonstrate proficiency by the end of the fall 1999 term;
- completed the fall 1998 term but withdrew from campus for the spring term or winter/spring quarters. These students are allowed one more term to complete their remedial work;

6

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 2

November 15-17, 1999

- were unable to enroll in required classes because the campus was unable to schedule sufficient number of remedial courses;
- were prevented from demonstrating proficiency prior to the beginning of the second academic year due to physical or learning disabilities identified by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA);
- documented unique circumstances, e.g., medical emergency; or
- completed all required remediation in one of two areas and need only one course to complete remediation in the second area.

Students who were disenrolled were advised to enroll at local community colleges. Campuses either administratively disqualified, withdrew, or placed students on a leave of absence. Completion of the required remedial courses within one year enables such students to return without having to reapply for admission. Students must submit an official academic transcript showing completion of the necessary remedial or baccalaureate-level coursework in English and/or mathematics. Students who do not complete the remedial requirements within one calendar year will be required to reapply for admission and to submit transcripts documenting completion of the remedial course work. A “disqualification” notation on a student’s academic transcript will be expunged when the student is reinstated.

### **Summary**

All campuses have implemented procedures to improve the effectiveness of remedial education so that more first-time freshmen enrolling at CSU in fall 1998 completed their required remediation prior to fall 1999. For students who were unable to demonstrate proficiency in English and/or mathematics at the end of the first academic year or summer, campuses developed and implemented effective criteria and processes to determine whether students could re-enroll for a second year of remediation. The data that will be provided to the trustees will demonstrate that these measures were successful in helping the majority of students to demonstrate proficiency in English and/or mathematics thereby reducing significantly the number of students who either withdrew or who re-enrolled.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 3  
November 15-17, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Accountability Process**

#### **Presentation By**

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

#### **Summary**

At the May meeting, members of the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed a draft of the proposed Accountability Process. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence explained that while the draft document was in line with the accountability called for in the Cornerstones implementation plan, it was not yet ready for action by the board due to the necessity of insuring that it was aligned with the expectations of Compact II and the review of the accreditation process being conducted by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The development of Compact II and discussions with WASC have now proceeded parallel with continuing consultation with the campuses, faculty, students, and alumni. The comments and revisions resulting from this process have strengthened the draft document and broadened the understanding of the importance of institutional accountability in achieving the mission of the CSU.

As promised by Executive Vice Chancellor Spence in May, the proposed Accountability Process is being brought to the trustees for discussion and action. The final version of the plan proposed for adoption at the November meeting will be sent under separate cover for study prior to the meeting.

#### **Recommended Action**

Adoption of the proposed resolution for approval of the Accountability Process.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 3  
November 15-17, 1995

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

#### Accountability Process

#### Background

Principle #9 of the Cornerstones Report, adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees, January 1998, states:

*“The California State University will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which we reside, and in the continued contribution to the California economy and society, through regular assessment of student achievement and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.”*

The Cornerstones Implementation Plan, approved by the CSU Board of Trustees, March 1999, includes the following statement in support of this principle:

*“System and Campus Priority. The CSU will expand and/or develop mechanisms for evaluating institutional performance, and develop annual reports appropriately formatted to reach different audiences, describing institutional performance in the areas of student achievement, student satisfaction, the quality of teaching and support services, administrative effectiveness, the provision of service to the community and to the state’s economy and society, alumni/ae satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and faculty and staff satisfaction.”*

The CSU has an extensive assessment system already in place, and continues to be fully accountable as a public institution for the quality and integrity of the learning experience. The primary motivation for strengthening accountability is the desire to know more about the extent to which the CSU is doing what it professes to do.

Evaluating the contributions of an institution by how much and how well its students are learning and how their educational experience is affecting their values and attitudes is fundamental to the mission of the university. This process also responds to the interests of state government and the public at large. Elected officials, trustees, faculty, and administrators who must make decisions want and need clear, comprehensible evidence of institutional effectiveness upon which to base those decisions.

The plan for implementing the accountability process consists of underlying principles, a description of the performance areas for which the system and the campuses will be accountable to each other, and institutional accountability indicators. The final version of the plan proposed for adoption at the November meeting will be sent under separate cover for study prior to the meeting.

#### Proposed Resolution

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**WHEREAS,** The Board of Trustees of the California State University endorsed in January 1998, the Cornerstones report as a planning framework; and,

**WHEREAS,** The Board of Trustees approved in March 1999 the Cornerstones Implementation Plan and directed the chancellor and the presidents to assign high priority to carrying out its recommendations in the report; and,

**WHEREAS,** The chancellor and executive vice chancellor have conducted a thorough, participative systemwide process to develop the CSU Accountability Process, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED,** By the Trustees of the California State University, that the CSU Accountability Process, included in Agenda Item 3 of the November 17, 1999, meeting of the trustees' Committee on Educational Policy, be approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That appreciation be expressed for the valuable contributions of the Alumni Council, the California State Student Association, and the Statewide Academic Senate during the development of the accountability process.

## **BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 4  
November 15-17, 1999

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

#### **Review of California State University Enrollment Policies to Respond to Increasing Pressures on Access: Progress Report**

##### **Presentation By**

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

##### **Summary**

Enrollment demand for higher education between 1998 and 2010 is expected to increase by 715,000 students. CSU is expected to enroll about 130,000 of these students in the next ten years, an additional 11,000 to 13,000 annually. In response to this increased demand for access, the Committee on Educational Policy met on October 27, 1999, and on November 15 to initiate review of California State University admission and enrollment policies, to clarify CSU's responsibilities for access, and to consider principles that ensure campuses under heavy enrollment pressures manage their enrollments consistent with Master Plan provisions, state laws, and trustee policies. The committee will report on the process for developing these principles, the consultation process, and the timeline.