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MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

January 27, 1998

Members Present
William D. Campbell, Chair
Joan Otomo-Corgel, Vice Chair
Roland E. Arnall
Martha C. Fallgatter, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Bernard Goldstein
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
James H. Gray
William Hauck
Eric C. Mitchell
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Anthony M. Vitti

Other Trustees Present
Ronald L. Cedillos
Maridel Moulton
Stanley T. Wang

Chancellor’s Office Staff
June M. Cooper, Senior Vice Chancellor and Interim Chief of Staff
Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

Others Present
Barry Munitz, Immediate Past Chancellor
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor Designate
Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**
The minutes of November 11, 1997, were approved as submitted.

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

**Closed Session**
The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees and the Committee on Educational Policy met in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c)(6) to consider the conferring of honorary degrees.

Immediate Past Chancellor Munitz introduced and welcomed California Secretary of Child Development and Education Marian Bergeson. Secretary Bergeson commended the SB 1422 Advisory Panel for its outstanding work in reviewing and making recommendations on teacher preparation. She stated the governor is fully committed to addressing these teacher preparation issues as demonstrated by the significant increase in funding for key programs to recruit, train and ensure effectiveness of teachers.

Secretary Bergeson outlined the following key elements of an effective teacher development system and elaborated on each of them:

1. Academic content and performance standards must be closely linked with the training and continued learning of new and experienced teachers, so that all teachers have a thorough understanding of these standards.

2. A standards-based performance assessment of each teacher, through a system that is thorough but fair, produces uniform results across the state.

3. Support and supervision is provided through induction programs so that new teachers can learn the skills they need as rapidly as possible.

4. Alternative routes to teaching accommodate “early deciders,” “late deciders,” “career changers,” and teachers from out-of-state.

Secretary Bergeson stated that teachers are the most important ingredient to turning our reforms into results in the classroom and in the individual academic skill improvement of every California student. She also observed that many of these issues have been addressed by Governor Wilson in his proposed 1998-99 budget.
Secretary Bergeson then introduced Dr. Sam Swofford, executive director, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Executive Director Swofford stated that the Commission welcomes CSU’s commitment to the education of 6 million students, and applauds CSU’s interest in improving education through more effective instruction in the classroom. The Commission wants to contribute to the effectiveness of K-12 education by strengthening the selection, preparation, accountability, and certification of future teachers, and looks forward to working with the California State University.

With the direction of Senate Bill 1422, the Commission initiated the most comprehensive review of teaching credential requirements in California’s history. It was a systemic look at the entire teacher certification structure, from teacher recruitment and preservice preparation through induction and including professional development and credential renewal. The Commission met with groups of teachers, teacher educators, administrators, school board members, parents, and representatives from the business community, and established eight regional networks.

Then the Commission established a 24-member advisory panel with diverse perspectives to conduct the formal review of credential requirements. The panel included members from K-12 education and postsecondary education, including six members from the California State University.

The panel’s report to the Commission was accepted. The Commission has been analyzing the report and recommendations in preparation for a major effort to reform and restructure the credentialing system in California. In addition, the Commission is sponsoring omnibus legislation in 1998 to move many of the panel’s recommendations into statute. This legislation calls for: (a) implementing standards to govern all aspects of teacher development, including subject matter studies, professional preparation, induction and continuing growth; (b) redesigning teacher preparation to provide a five-year option that integrates subject matter studies with coursework and field experiences in teaching; (c) embedding a standards-based teacher performance assessment in teacher preparation programs; (d) providing an induction program for every beginning teacher in California; and (e) expanding loan forgiveness program for teachers who serve in high-need areas or subjects.

Dr. William Wilson, director, Teacher Education and K-18 Programs, presented an overview of the advisory panel recommendations; and Dr. Beverly Young, associate director, presented recommendations most important to the CSU.

Dr. Munitz stated that CSU is moving in the right direction and suggested a possible need of an education major. Trustee Pesqueira suggested that CSU should strive to design a curriculum for an education major that is both rigorous and competitive with other CSU majors.

Trustee Petrossian stressed the importance of each teacher’s understanding of how to work with diversity in the classroom.

Trustee Campbell thanked Secretary Bergeson and Executive Director Swofford for their presentations and underlined that teacher preparation will remain foremost on the agenda of the Committee on Educational Policy.
Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs

Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Lindahl remarked that in the 1980s there was national concern regarding teachers coming from academically weaker students. Studies indicated most CSU students pursuing teacher education were in the top half of the students in their majors, but this was neither guaranteed by system policy nor widely recognized.

Dr. Lindahl summarized the history and rationale for the existing Title 5 regulations governing admission and continuation in teacher preparation programs. As a result of changes in the Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies and the prospect of teacher education reforms currently being proposed by the Presidents Group on Teacher Preparation and K-18 Education, the specificity and relative inflexibility of the existing regulations are no longer appropriate.

The proposed new regulations are designed to maintain high standards while providing campuses greater flexibility in light of campus circumstances and curricular organization. Under the new regulations, the standards for admission to teacher preparation programs will be more general than before. Standards for admission specifically to student teaching will be replaced by campus authorization to establish standards at multiple points in a teacher preparation program. All campuses will still adhere to the CCTC requirements for candidate assessment before advancement to student teaching. The changes will free campuses to carry out key reform recommendations, as recommended by the Presidents Group, the CSU Institute for Education Reform, and the SB 1422 Advisory Panel. Dr. Lindahl stated that the proposed changes in Title 5 have been supported by the CSU deans of education, the vice presidents of academic affairs, the presidents, and the Academic Senate CSU.

Baccalaureate Education in the California State University

Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Lindahl indicated that the CSU baccalaureate degree has not been reexamined since the early 1970s. During the past two years the Academic Senate has conducted a careful reexamination of the CSU baccalaureate degree, prepared a report, Baccalaureate Education in the California State University, adopted the report, and developed a work plan to address the many issues to be pursued to continue improvement of CSU baccalaureate education.

Statewide Academic Senate Chair Jim Highsmith and the Senate Executive Committee illustrated the conclusions of the Senate’s report by conducting a brief commencement ceremony, including a commencement address by faculty trustee Bernie Goldstein and the awarding to all trustees of honorary degrees in lifelong learning. The ceremony elaborated on the following key components of a quality baccalaureate education.

Statewide Senate Vice Chair Marshelle Thobaben described the value of preparing individuals for lifelong intellectual endeavor, becoming productive members of society, and for participating in democratic institutions and society, as well as opportunities to understand values and ethics. Senate Secretary Walter Oliver emphasized that a sound baccalaureate education also provides knowledge that reaches beyond the mere comprehension or acquisition of facts or information to an awareness of its implications and meaning, including an appreciation and broad understanding of human experience throughout the world.

Senate Executive Committee Member-at-Large Judith Stanley pointed out that another characteristic of a valuable baccalaureate education is depth of knowledge that enables one to learn how to communicate
and act on knowledge and the ability to synthesize creatively and imaginatively. Executive Committee Member-at-Large Gene Dinielli stressed that a rich baccalaureate experience develops skills involving the application of knowledge, the ability to use critical thinking to make appropriate choices and decisions, the ability to write, speak, listen, and critically evaluate, the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty, and the ability to synthesize reasoned conclusions from information.

Finally, Chair Highsmith emphasized that an effective baccalaureate education develops the values of objective inquiry, tolerance, respect for diversity, open-mindedness, integrity, and intellectual honesty, combined with flexibility of mind and attitude, intellectual curiosity, and an appreciation for learning. He stated that the overall education process instills a sense of personal awareness, self-worth, self-confidence, empowerment, willingness to accept individual responsibility and leadership, and ability to work collaboratively.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION POLICY

Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Second Annual Report

Presentation By
Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Marvalene Hughes, President, CSU Stanislaus
Chair, Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee

Summary
The CSU Board of Trustees adopted in January 1996 a policy designed to reduce the need for remediation in English and mathematics at the college level. In March 1997, the board received the first annual report on systemwide and intersegmental activities to implement the elements of the trustee policy. This agenda item responds to trustee policy calling for annual reports to the Board of Trustees until policy goals are met.
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Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation: Second Annual Report

Background

At their January 24, 1996, meeting, the trustees of the California State University adopted an ambitious plan to work with the public schools to strengthen the preparation of their graduates. Capping two years of research, deliberation, and public comment about the increasing number of students requiring remedial instruction, the trustees approved a strategy designed to reduce the number of freshmen who need remediation in English and/or mathematics by ten percentage points by fall 2001, and to reduce gradually the need for remediation to not more than ten percent of regularly admitted new freshmen by 2007. The policy does not call for the elimination of remedial and developmental studies but seeks to reduce substantially the number of students requiring remediation while continuing to provide for the special needs of transfer, re-entry, and ESL students.

As described in the first annual report to the Board of Trustees in March 1997, much of the success of implementing the trustee policy is contingent on how well the CSU works with K-12 and other higher education segments to define standards for graduation from high school and to help students meet them before leaving high school. This multi-pronged effort emphasizes collaboration between the public schools and postsecondary education to define more clearly the skills students must bring from high school to ensure readiness for college. New early assessment and intervention programs will help determine the skill levels of high school students so that those who need remedial and developmental work can receive it while still enrolled in high school. The trustees’ policy to reach their goals by 2007 can be summarized in the following seven strategies:

1. **Strengthen teacher preparation** to ensure teachers can teach reading and basic skills;

2. **Set clear standards and assess performance** against those standards at regular intervals to ensure students will meet both high school graduation standards and university admission requirements;

3. **Communicate standards and expectations** to ensure that students, their families, and schools can plan effectively to meet university competence standards;

4. **Inform high schools and community colleges about student performance** after the student’s first year of attendance at CSU.

5. **Develop early intervention programs** for those students who need assistance meeting high school graduation standards by effective use of college student tutors, mediated, self-paced instruction (technology), and other learning strategies;

6. **Tutor and mentor K-12 students using CSU students**, especially those CSU students who are considering teaching as a career;
7. **Provide early assessment** after university admission and before first enrollment and ensure that students who need remedial or developmental activity receive it during the first term of enrollment.

This second annual report describes systemwide and campus activities to implement the trustee policy on precollegiate instruction.

**Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee**

The trustees directed the chancellor to establish an implementation advisory committee to oversee the implementation of the trustees’ remediation policy. A systemwide Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee, chaired by CSU Stanislaus President Marvalene Hughes, was appointed by the chancellor and charged with overseeing implementation of the policy, encouraging the sharing of best practices among campuses, and continuing CSU’s consultation with all constituencies.

Under the stewardship of President Hughes, the Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee has overseen the following activities:

- Communication of CSU collegiate skill standards and expectations clearly and early to students, parents, schools, and communities.
- Expanded use of CSU students as interns and mentors to strengthen basic skills acquisition of K-12 students.
- Increase in the number of entering freshmen who are assessed for precollegiate skills prior to first-term enrollment and engage in needed remedial or developmental activities immediately upon matriculation to CSU.
- Participation in an alternative, competency-based admission pilot program.
- Monitoring of campus progress in implementing successful programs and activities to achieve the trustee remediation policy.
- Addressing collegiate skill and developmental/remedial policies for other student categories such as ESL and transfer students.
- Development of an implementation schedule to ensure CSU campuses adhere to transfer admission policy requiring that upper division transfer students complete general education-breadth requirements in English and mathematics.

In addition, the Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee is nearing completion of the following projects:

- Assisting campuses to expand partnerships between CSU English and mathematics faculty and K-12 mathematics and English teachers to align curriculum and to discuss subject preparation, student preparation, and CSU admission requirements;
• Developing appropriate policies for ESL students, recognizing their needs while promoting timely acquisition of college skills; and

• Evaluating the continued use of the EPT and ELM after the work of the California Education Round Table assessment task forces is completed.

The committee has resolved several key policy issues embodied in the trustees’ policy that CSU alone can address. Upon completion of the projects in process, the committee’s charge to initiate and participate in intersegmental activities designed to advance trustee remediation policy goals through effective cooperation with the public schools and community colleges will have been met. The primary committee role then will shift to providing general advice, insights, and recommendations to the Executive Council as CSU implements the trustee policy.

The remainder of this board item will summarize activities undertaken as part of the seven strategies designed to reduce the need for remediation.

**Strengthen Teacher Preparation**

Education in California is truly an interdependent, interconnected system. The CSU relies on the K-12 sector and the community colleges to prepare students for university study. The schools and the community colleges, in turn, look to the CSU to prepare qualified teachers for their classrooms. Teacher preparation has thus been a primary focus in the past decade.

In 1996, the Presidents Commission on K-18 Education was formed. Recommendations addressing the disconnections cited in the Institute for Education Reform’s publication “Teachers Who Teach Our Teachers” were presented to the Board of Trustees in November of 1997. The centerpiece of the Presidents Commission recommendations focuses on the need to form collaborative partnerships with local school districts. The Presidents Commission report cited the need to have flexible teacher preparation programs jointly planned and implemented with public school partners that are tailored to student needs and that include multiple entry points and multiple pathways into the teaching profession. CSU teacher preparation programs, as well as graduate and certificate programs, need to increase productivity, be more agile, more entrepreneurial, more responsive, and more user friendly.

During 1996 and 1997, significant collaborative actions have taken place on CSU campuses that focus on the development of partnerships with local school districts including the Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project (LAAMP)/Delta Collaborative and the CSU Sacramento/Elk Grove Teacher Education Collaborative. Similar collaboratives are emerging throughout the CSU. The Center for Reading Improvement has conducted seminars and work sessions for CSU reading faculty in order to ensure not only awareness of the new California standards in reading and language arts, but also that CSU’s future teachers are being educated based on those standards. The CSU is currently preparing a major mathematics initiative that will provide subject matter content to teachers in public schools who are underprepared or who are teaching out of their credential area.
Evolving collaborative partnerships and the changing nature of teacher preparation will help ensure that future teachers will be prepared by professors not only connected with local school districts, but also involved with daily life in the public school classroom. These partnerships unite higher education and K-12 in dynamic and mutually beneficial interactions that reaffirm the basic missions of each.

New five-year integrated programs of teacher preparation are being developed as a result of CSU’s Presidents Commission report. Soon, many campuses will offer undergraduates an opportunity to participate in public school classrooms at an early stage in their preparation program. This program will integrate subject matter content with pedagogy, bringing together mathematics, science, and other subject matter faculty, education faculty, and their local school district partners to plan and deliver the program on both the university campus and in the public school district. These new programs, operational by the end of the next school year, will put into practice the process of joint planning and program implementation. Implementation strategies for these programs are developing on every CSU campus.

In response to the urgent demands for greater numbers of qualified teachers as the result of the implementation of statewide class size reduction, CSU has developed many new programs. These initiatives include those designed to prepare working teachers holding emergency permits. Campuses have also implemented innovative ways to work with local school districts to meet this new challenge. The class size reduction program stimulated CSU to take a leadership role in developing the Center for Teaching Careers, a statewide intersegmental approach to teacher recruitment, designed to staff every classroom with a well-qualified teacher. SB 824 (Greene) appropriated $500,000 in 1997-98 from federal Goals 2000 funds and, in addition, the CSU Institute of Education Reform raised over $400,000 from private foundations to contribute to this teacher recruitment effort.

Last, the California Education Round Table requested 1998-99 funding to support the Community Teaching Internship for Mathematics and Science. The teacher shortage is particularly acute in the areas of mathematics and science. This program is designed to recruit and prepare mathematics, science, and engineering majors enrolled in postsecondary education to teach in California’s K-12 public schools. Undergraduate mathematics and science majors will be placed as teacher interns in public school classrooms during their junior and senior years. This internship period will provide students with direct teaching experience.

**Set Clear Standards and Assess Performance**

The heart of the trustee remediation policy lies in educational quality and the setting of high standards to encourage improvement. The trustees have called for clear statements and assessments of the competencies necessary for successful college-level work.

Since the first annual report to the Board of Trustees, the California Education Round Table English and mathematics task forces completed standards that define what high school graduates should know and be able to do in English and mathematics to be prepared to pursue a career or to handle the demands of postsecondary education. These English and mathematics standards were forwarded
by these two task forces to the California Education Round Table which approved the content standards in January 1997 and sent them to the Commission for the Establishment of Academic Content and Performance Standards (AB 265).

In fall 1997, the commission recommended to the State Board of Education English standards that were similar to the California Education Round Table standards. The mathematics standards recommended by the commission were somewhat different than the California Education Round Table standards. The English standards adopted by the State Board of Education in late 1997 were heavily influenced by the Round Table standards. Although the mathematics standards adopted by the State Board were less rigorous than those recommended by the Round Table, they are expected to result in higher mathematics achievement by California high school graduates.

CSU faculty also are participating in the California Education Round Table task forces to develop assessment methods to measure student mastery of content standards in English and mathematics. The work of these task forces will provide the basis for CSU reexamination of the efficacy of the English Placement Test (EPT) and Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination. These task forces expect to complete and forward their recommendations to the Round Table in late fall 1998.

Communicate Standards and Expectations to High Schools and Community Colleges

The CSU is working with K-12 to ensure CSU entry requirements and English and mathematics expectations are known. The CSU holds annual conferences for high school and community college counselors to disseminate the latest information about the CSU, explain and interpret policies and practices, and reinforce generally linkages between the high schools, community colleges, and the CSU. Information about the trustee remediation policy was provided to all high school and community college counselors at the fall 1997 counselor conferences attended by over 5,000 high school and community college counselors.

Over 17,000 high school and community college counselors were advised in the November 1997 CSU Review about CSU admission standards and entry requirements. The CSU Review included a special one-page insert urging high school counselors to advise high school students to complete a fourth year of mathematics, to complete a second year of laboratory science and a second year of social science, and to enroll in honors or AP courses.

In the November 1997 CSU Review, community college counselors were advised to urge community college students seeking transfer admission to CSU to complete all lower division requirements in their major, to meet with their transfer advisor, and to attend CSU campus orientation and advising programs. In addition, a joint letter from the CSU and the Los Angeles Community College District was sent in February 1998 to over 7,200 community college students enrolled in the ten District community colleges indicating an intent to transfer to a four-year college. These students had completed at least twenty-four semester units of college-level work. The letter communicated transfer admission requirements and encouraged students to make an appointment at their community college Transfer Center to meet with CSU campus representatives to discuss CSU admission requirements and the transfer process.
Communicating CSU collegiate skill standards requires more visible and clear means for providing feedback to high school teachers, principals, and district officials about the ability of their students to perform college-level work. The Precollegiate Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee works with all CSU campuses to develop, expand, and implement programs that enhance communication between CSU campuses and high school representatives. The following are examples of the activities in which CSU campuses are involved:

- CSU faculty from mathematics and English are meeting more regularly with K-12 English and math teachers to discuss subject area preparation and university expectations, curriculum development, high school standards, and university expectations.

- Teacher education councils developed by many campuses are composed of superintendents, associate superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, teachers from area school districts in addition to faculty and administrators. These groups discuss topics related to K-16 education including CSU entrance standards and the school district’s high school graduation standards.

- CSU faculty are working closely with K-12 teachers in summer and academic year weekend workshops to provide opportunities for K-12 teachers to improve their English and mathematics teaching skills. These in-service workshops provide effective classroom strategy models and establish a support network for prospective teachers.

- Campuses have developed formal consortia with their K-12 and community college English and mathematics faculty, admission and outreach staff, high school principals, chairs of English and mathematics departments, individuals responsible for curriculum development, and counselors.

- Campus web sites have been provided to respond to the most frequently asked questions and descriptions of competencies needed for EPT and ELM.

Inform High Schools and Community Colleges about Student Performance

For many years, CSU annually has provided to each high school and community college that sends five or more students to the CSU system an Academic Performance Report (APR) tailored especially for that institution. These reports present in summary form information on the academic performance of students in their first year at CSU. For freshmen, this information includes grade point averages, mean SAT and ACT scores, persistence from first to second year, and performance on the EPT and ELM. Aggregate information for each institution is compared to system averages so high schools can compare their graduates’ performance with that of graduates throughout the state. These reports are disseminated annually to most of the 860 public high schools and many private schools as well as over 100 community colleges. During this past year, extensive efforts were made to streamline and clarify the reports to ensure accurate interpretation and improve their utility. A summary of student performance information by high school has been placed on the World Wide Web to help improve the academic preparation of students planning to enroll in the CSU.

In addition to providing this information, the CSU is trying to help high schools and community colleges to use it more effectively. Campuses have identified three- and four-person English and Mathematics Project Teams that include at least one English and one mathematics faculty member to work with local high school English and mathematics teachers to discuss CSU expectations for...
entering freshmen. These campus English and mathematics project teams began in December 1997 meeting with high school staff members to discuss the Academic Performance Report (APR) for their students who entered CSU. These discussions provide a basis for understanding where high school instruction might be strengthened and for developing cooperative programs between CSU campuses and high schools.

**Develop Early Intervention Programs**

The CSU recognizes the need for students to be tested as early as the 10th grade and prior to CSU enrollment. The earlier students, teachers, and parents are aware of deficiencies, the more time students have to acquire the needed competencies. While the California Education Round Table task forces complete the development of content standards and assessment measures, CSU has developed several projects that allow students, their teachers, and their counselors to assess how well students have mastered skills necessary for successful university-level study. The following projects are representative samples of some of the types of activities in which CSU is involved:

- **CSU** supports a number of projects that expand the use of diagnostic instruments at the high school level that will lead to a reduction in the need for remedial education. The Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP), developed jointly by CSU and UC faculty members, offers tests to students from the pre-algebra level to calculus. In 1996-97, the MDTP tests were administered in over 900 California high schools to over 345,000 students. In addition, over 225,000 California Community College students took the MDTP.

- ELM testing pilot projects for selected public high schools are being conducted by Hayward, Northridge, San Diego, San Jose, and San Marcos to determine the extent to which earlier testing improves student preparation and access to the CSU. High school juniors who require additional coursework are identified to enable the high school to work with the student during the senior year.

- One CSU campus offers an intermediate algebra class over cable television to area high schools. The program includes pre- and post-testing with the ELM examination. CSU faculty provide presentations on television as well as in video format for students to review at their convenience. A telephone line provides an opportunity for students to participate in question and answer sessions. Internet access for homework and discussion is provided. CSU students serve as classroom interns by being present in high school classrooms when the class is being taught.

- CSU and UC executed a contract with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in February 1998 to develop an on-line diagnostic English examination available to 11th graders who may be interested in attending the CSU or UC. The service will provide students an opportunity to write a response to a previously administered but retired essay question from CSU’s EPT and UC’s Subject A Examination. Responses will be evaluated by trained faculty readers, and students will receive an overall evaluation of their essay accompanied by diagnostic statements designed to help them and their teachers improve their reading and writing skills. This electronic English diagnostic test will be pilot tested with high school juniors later this spring. Students may access these diagnostic English essay questions through the California Higher Education web site, CSUMentor™, or UC Pathways.
The information from these tests is provided both to students and to teachers to help strengthen curriculum and preparation to enable students to know what they must do to prepare for baccalaureate level study.

CSU Students Tutor and Mentor K-12 Students

For some time, the CSU has used student interns to provide college information to high school and community college students. Trustee policy and the California Education Round Table initiatives called for expansion of the number of CSU students who provide assistance to middle and high school students in the acquisition of basic English and mathematics skills. In 1995-96, the CSU initiated the systemwide Precollegiate Academic Development (PAD) program to train and support CSU students working with middle and high schools to help students acquire English and mathematics skills. The CSU has allocated $1.5 million to support this program. In addition, the legislature and governor demonstrated their confidence in this program by allocating an additional $1 million in the 1996/97 CSU budget and another $1 million in 1997/98 CSU budget to expand this program. The total of $3.5 million enabled campuses to double the number of CSU students participating in the Precollegiate Academic Development program. In addition to its emphasis on raising skill levels in English and mathematics, the program encourages students to take more rigorous courses, assists them to succeed in those courses, and raises their aspirations. In 1996-97, nearly 900 CSU students provided mentoring in English and mathematics skills to over 20,000 K-12 students at 363 elementary, middle, and high schools.

The final 1997-98 budget included $5 million requested by the California Education Round Table to support the Student Academic Development Partnership Program in K-6. This program will enable school districts to secure tutoring assistance for elementary school students, especially in reading, writing, and mathematics, and to provide much needed support to teachers in raising the academic preparation and educational aspirations of their students. Tutors who are recruited for the program are prospective, preservice teachers, i.e., student tutors and teacher aides who are considering teaching as a profession.

The California Education Round Table requested funding in the 1998/99 budget to expand use of college students as tutors in the K-6 grades. The Governor’s Budget released in January 1998 included $5 million to support continuation of the intersegmental Student Academic Development Partnership Program funded for the first time in 1997-98.

CSU campuses are involved in national service learning activities that provide opportunities for CSU students to help K-12 students improve basic skills:

- Campus Compact encourages students to become involved in their communities to provide services to K-12 students.
- America Reads encourages college students to serve as reading tutors. President Clinton submitted in January 1998 a budget request for $260 million for America Reads to support local programs that provide tutoring and to help improve reading instruction in elementary schools so that every child can read by the end of the third grade. Approximately 20,000 CSU students will serve as
tutors in this program. San Francisco State University President Robert Corrigan serves as chair
of the national America Reads Steering Committee.

- AmeriCorps is a national service program that allows individuals of all ages and backgrounds to
help earn money for education in exchange for a year of community service. Upon completion of
service, members receive a $4,725 education award in the form of a voucher. Approximately
25,000 AmeriCorps members have participated in over 430 programs across the nation. Many of
these volunteers are students inquiring about applying for admission to CSU.

- The CSU hosted two colloquia on community service-learning in March and October 1997 to
enhance communication throughout the state and to assist campuses to work together on shared
community service initiatives. These meetings yielded a systemwide strategic plan to advance
community service-learning across the CSU.

- President Clinton’s 1999 Education Budget Request to Congress includes $32 million to support
programs to help children develop competence in reading and mathematics.

**Provide Early Assessment**

*Increase the number of students tested after admission but prior to enrollment*

Systemwide policy was revised to require that each entering CSU first-time freshman, except those
who qualify for an exemption, shall be required to take the CSU Entry Level Mathematics (ELM)
examination and the CSU English Placement Test (EPT) after admission and prior to enrollment.
Systemwide and campus publicity efforts have been expanded to inform students about the need to
take the EPT and the ELM prior to enrollment.

As CSU campuses continue to implement programs and strategies to increase the number of students
tested, the number of new regularly admitted students needing remediation in the first term of
enrollment is likely to increase. This is because students who delay or evade testing are usually the
least prepared and are more likely to fare poorly on the EPT and the ELM. Therefore, the number of
entering students needing remediation in mathematics and English remediation rates will probably
increase over the short term.

*Increase the number of students needing remediation who enroll in appropriate remedial courses
in the first term of enrollment*

Campuses are developing and expanding a number of innovative approaches to ensure that students
needing remediation receive it beginning with the first term of enrollment. On some CSU campuses,
remedial English and mathematics courses are offered during the summer for entering freshmen
who do not achieve qualifying scores on the EPT and/or the ELM. Special admit students are
expected on some campuses to take the EPT and the ELM as part of their participation in orientation
and summer bridge programs. Reading and writing programs are being developed and expanded in
tutorial formats.

Computer-assisted instructional aides are being employed in the areas of mathematics, reading,
writing, study skills, and general test preparation to minimize the number of remedial courses
students have to take. At some CSU campuses, faculty are teaching remedial mathematics by using software that permits students to proceed at their own pace. Using this self-paced computer program, faculty can increase the number of students taught in each section, and students have access to instruction that is learner-centered (interactive, adaptive to individual learning pace and style, diagnostic and tutorial). Evaluation at one campus indicates that students using the computer technology have as high a success rate in completing remedial courses and that they fare as well in subsequent college-level mathematics courses as do students who were exempt from remedial courses.

**Develop policies for ESL students**

A series of recommendations has been developed by the advisory committee to promote the timely acquisition of college skills and address the special needs of ESL (English as a Second Language) students in four policy areas: definition, identification, assessment, and instruction of ESL students. These recommendations are now the subject of systemwide consultation.

**Summary**

Working with the entire educational community—the public schools, the California Community Colleges, the University of California, and the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee—the CSU has provided leadership to help ensure that students come from high schools and the California Community Colleges well prepared to make the most of their college opportunity. Significant progress has been achieved in six key areas since the Board of Trustees adopted its policy to reduce substantially the need for remediation by 2007:

- Statewide standards in English and mathematics for graduating high school seniors have been developed;
- The California Education Round Table has two task forces completing development of proposed assessment methods;
- Comprehensive efforts are under way to improve preparation of teachers;
- The number of CSU students helping middle and high school students improve English and mathematics skills is being expanded;
- The provision of information to high schools and community colleges about student performance has been expanded;
- Communication with K-12 students, families, counselors, and schools about CSU entry requirements and English and mathematics expectations is being strengthened; and
- The number of first-time freshmen tested after admission and prior to enrollment is increasing.

Working cooperatively with other education segments, state and legislative representatives, and the community, the CSU expects the next generation of college students to enter the CSU with significantly enhanced skills and the ability to enter directly into their studies and achieve unprecedented success. The ability to implement all aspects of the trustee policy will depend upon the continued success of intersegmental collaboration and consensus on the development of statewide standards and assessment tools for graduating high school seniors.
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Summary
This annual report on academic planning and program review is in accord with Board of Trustees’ policy established in 1963. While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs, which can lead to program consolidation and discontinuation.

The five-year curricular plans for each campus have been updated to cover the years 1998-99 through 2002-03 (a few campuses have curriculum development processes that require longer planning time frames). These campus academic plans are in Attachment A to this agenda item. This is the first year that the new planning approval process, adopted by the board in July 1997, is in effect; programs that are taking advantage of the new alternatives to the traditional process are noted. Summaries of academic program review activities for each campus appear in Attachment B. In 1996-97, one campus received a comprehensive visit by a team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC); a summary of the team’s report is included as Attachment C. The attachments have been distributed separately.

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

Recommended Action
Adoption of the resolution.
Agenda Item 3
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COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Planning and Program Review
This item summarizes the California State University academic planning process over the past year and submits the campus academic plans for the next five years (up to ten years for campuses that require a longer planning time frame). While academic planning at each university involves the planning and development of new programs, it also includes the regular review of existing programs. This sometimes leads to program consolidation and discontinuation. Program consolidation and discontinuation is likely to be a more active concern of the campuses over the next several years as a result of Cornerstones recommendations, opportunities for increased collaboration through technology, and a more concerted effort by the campuses to focus their program offerings in accord with their missions.

Five academic planning topics (and a proposed resolution) are addressed in this item:

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)
2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs
3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)
4. Program Discontinuations
5. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)

1. Campus Academic Plans (Attachment A)

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the existing degree programs offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. They are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus.

The academic plans are reviewed annually by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy which has been developed over the last three decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of these proposed programs on the academic master plan. Consequently, the “proposed” columns of the academic plans in Attachment A represent only “planning authorization.” If and when a campus decides to pursue implementation of a new program (other than a pilot program), a detailed degree proposal must be submitted to the chancellor before the planned implementation dates. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the concurrence of the California Postsecondary Education Commission must also be sought before a degree program can be established. Not all projected programs are eventually implemented; this year, campuses requested that several projected programs be removed from their academic plans.
2. Implementation of Revised Process for Review and Approval of Academic Programs

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 proposed programs that meet certain criteria. Several of the newly projected programs on the updated academic plans are on the fast track and will probably be implemented by fall 1998. The pilot program process allows campuses, under certain conditions, to implement a limited number of programs without prior review and approval by the chancellor or the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A pilot program may admit students for no more than five years, unless converted to regular-program status; conversion requires a thorough program evaluation, review and comment by the Chancellor’s Office and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and approval by the board and the chancellor. We expect to have received notice of the first pilot program this spring.

The new alternative processes are congruent with the Cornerstones recommendations, which called for “streamlining the system process governing program development and program approval, minimizing standardization and maximizing institutional flexibility…. This will balance against greater system accountability for outcomes…."

The revised procedures also specify that projected programs be removed from campus academic plans if an implementation proposal is not developed within five years or the date originally projected for implementation (whichever is later), unless a new justification is submitted. This provision does not apply to “foundation” liberal arts and science programs. The request for proposed updates to the academic plans listed thirty projections that would automatically be removed from the academic plans. Campuses have requested that twenty-five be retained.

3. Review of Existing Degree Programs (Attachment B)

In 1971, the Board of Trustees adopted policy requiring that each campus review every academic program on a regular basis. Since that time, summaries of campus program reviews have been provided annually to the board. The summaries appear as Attachment B to this item.

In the early 1990s, several campuses were unable to use external reviewers in the program review process because of budget difficulties. Campuses are again employing external reviewers on a regular basis, some from other CSU campuses and some from outside the system. A few campuses have recently revised their program review processes, often better to coordinate reviews with campus strategic planning initiatives. In general, the campus review processes are as rigorous in determining areas for improvement as in recognizing program strengths.

4. Program Discontinuations

Campuses have informed the chancellor of the discontinuation of the following degree major programs since the last report on academic planning and program review. For some of the
programs listed below, part or all of the instruction associated with the discontinued program has been subsumed within other degree programs.

Chico ................... MS, Agriculture
Fresno .................. BA, Physics
Hayward ............... BA, Physics
Los Angeles .......... BA, Home Economics MA, Business Education
                      BS, Business Education MA, Vocational Education
                      MA, Home Economics

The Cornerstones report declares that to maintain their public responsibilities, CSU faculty and administration will “eliminate redundant and/or unneeded low-enrollment programs” and “encourage program consolidation and cross-campus sharing to preserve essential low-enrollment programs.” We note that there has already been substantial consolidation of options or concentrations within existing degree programs on some campuses, and that activity is likely to increase.

5. Summary of WASC Visiting Team Report (Attachment C)

The Board of Trustees adopted a resolution in January 1991 that requires information on recent campus accreditation visits to be included in the annual agenda item on academic planning and program review. A summary of the results and recommendations resulting from the visit by a team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to CSU Sacramento during 1996-97 can be found in Attachment C.

Proposed Resolution

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans in Attachment A. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 17-18, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance 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 programs will be available; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.