

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 1:15 p.m., Wednesday, November 8, 2000
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Room – Open Session

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 19, 2000

Discussion Items

1. Enrollment Capacity Building Efforts in the CSU, *Information*

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 11:30 a.m., Closed Session: Munitz Conference Room

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

Discussion Items

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

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
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**

September 19, 2000

Members Present

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

Other Trustees Present

Daniel N. Cartwright
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Frederick W. Pierce IV
Anthony M. Vitti
Stanley T. Wang

Members Absent

Roberta Achtenberg

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
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement

2

Ed. Pol.

Christine Helwick, General Counsel

Charles W. Lindahl, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Closed Session

Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

The Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees of the Committee on Educational Policy met Tuesday, September 19, 2000, at 11:30 a.m. in closed session and acted on nominations for honorary degrees.

Open Session

Chair Myers called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of July 19, 2000, were approved as submitted.

Academic Plan Update or Fast-Track Program Development

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence presented the action item, giving a brief summary of the traditional and fast-track processes for reviewing and approving new degree programs. California State University, Long Beach submitted a request to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree program with a major in Chinese Studies. The proposed program meets the criteria for the fast-track process.

It was moved and seconded to recommend approval of the proposed resolution (REP 09-08-00).

CSU Accountability Process – First Annual Report

Chair Myers introduced the item by stating that accountability is a high priority of the California State University. Discussion of the Accountability Process was initiated soon after the Cornerstones Implementation Plan was approved by the Board in November 1999 and the process was developed through a systemwide consultative process that included the campuses, the Academic Senate CSU, the Alumni Council, and the California State Student Association.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence stated that the purpose of the Accountability Process is to assure the public that the CSU system and campuses are performing effectively. Although the Accountability Process establishes responsibilities and requirements for annual reporting for both the Chancellor's Office and the individual campuses, Dr. Spence explained that the current report concerned the individual campuses and aggregate system data. The Accountability Process report includes nine performance areas, plus an additional campus performance area that addresses the quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs. Dr. Spence stressed that the

1998-1999 data establish campus baseline performance from which individual campuses can measure their progress and improvement. Dr. Spence outlined each of the nine performance areas noting the progress made. First-time freshman and upper-division transfer enrollments have increased 17 percent and eight percent respectively since 1996. Trustee Galinson questioned the numbers of part-time students and their impact upon graduation rates. Dr. Spence responded that 20 percent of fall 1993 first-time freshmen enrolled in 15 or more units per semester (on a pace to complete the degree in four years), 66 percent enrolled in 12-15 units (on a pace to complete the degree in six years), and 14 percent took fewer than 12 units per semester. This means that 80 percent of CSU first-time freshmen are not on course to complete a 120-unit baccalaureate degree in four years. Trustee Pierce asked why 70 percent of the students were reported as full-time. Dr. Spence responded that different definitions of “full-time” exist for different purposes. For example, under federal financial aid regulations, full-time is defined as enrollment in 12 units or more. In addition, many students who begin full-time do not remain full-time. Chair Myers asked why community college transfer students had higher graduation rates than native students. Dr. Spence responded that upper-division transfer students, having completed the lower-division, have already demonstrated through two years of successful study a substantial commitment to earning the degree.

Trustee Galinson asked how many K-12 students and teachers are in California. Dr. Spence responded there are approximately six million K-12 students and 270,000 teachers. Chancellor Reed commented that compared to other states, the CSU is far ahead in its outreach efforts to K-12.

Dr. Spence commented that 94 percent of the fall 1998 regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who returned to campus in fall 1999 were prepared both in English and mathematics. Trustee Pierce inquired about the fall 1999 remediation follow-up data, and Dr. Spence responded that data would be presented at the January 2001 Board meeting.

Trustee Pesqueira expressed concern that many students seem to be choosing to attend high-tuition private schools rather than the CSU. Dr. Spence responded that the CSU needs to increase year-around course availability and continue to evaluate the time and place needs of students.

Dr. Douglas Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement commended the presidents for their work to increase dues-paying alumni membership programs, and noted that all universities are moving in this direction. Trustee Pierce also thanked the presidents for progress in this area.

Dr. Spence commended the presidents and staff for their work in collecting and presenting the Accountability Process Annual Report 2000. He commented that CSU will continue to review the data and look at each campus' progress.

Trustee Farar commended Dr. Spence, the presidents, and staff for their important work, and stressed the importance of avoiding comparisons between campuses.

Trustee Galinson questioned if holding Friday afternoon, after hours, or Saturday classes affects time-to-degree, and asked if any campuses have surveyed students regarding after hours classes. President Corrigan, San Francisco State University, commented that in its campus survey, students were in favor of Saturday classes to hasten their time to degree. President Lyons, CSU Dominguez Hills, commented that nearly 50 percent of classes at CSU, Dominguez Hills are offered after 4:00 p.m. or on Saturday and Sunday.

Trustee Campbell said that the purpose of this report is to create a set of tools that the Chancellor can use to set goals with the presidents. He also inquired if it is a goal to reduce the six year average time to graduation to five years, and if it is a student's obligation to proceed in a timely manner toward a degree. Dr. Spence responded that these are goals and that every campus is working to simplify the path to the degree. Trustee Murarka commented that students are indeed moving toward graduation as quickly as possible, but pointed out that many CSU students are older and have other priorities such as family and employment obligations that require them to enroll part-time and stop-out for a term or two.

Chancellor Reed commended the Board and the presidents for their work. He commented that it took the Board only two years to develop Cornerstones and only one year to put the implementation plan in place and develop an accountability plan. Dr. Reed stressed that CSU has data and information that no other system has. Dr. Reed observed that the Accountability Process report is a baseline report for each campus standing on its own, and he will discuss ways to build on this report with each President. Dr. Reed noted that some objectives will take many months to achieve, but as system financial resources are sustained and an expanded financial aid package is implemented, CSU will make further progress.

Trustee Pierce applauded the report and commented that as benchmarks are established and goals are set, further progress will be made. He also suggested benchmark data be collected from outside our system. Trustee Goldwhite congratulated Dr. Spence, the Presidents, and staff for the quality of the report. He also thanked Dr. Spence for his governance report to the Academic Senate CSU.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Enrollment Capacity-building Efforts in the CSU

Presentation By

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

Warren H. Fox, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission

Summary

Periodically, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) prepares projections of enrollment demand for California public colleges and universities, and estimates the physical capacity of public higher education institutions necessary to meet those enrollment projections. Executive Director Fox will brief the Board of Trustees on the latest enrollment projections and capacity estimates from CPEC.

According to earlier projections from CPEC, the CSU should expect to accommodate an additional 130,000 students over the next decade. This is equivalent to adding a campus the size of CSU Chico each year through 2010. However, given the great expense and time of building new campuses, the traditional method of addressing enrollment surges, the CSU must find more cost effective and timely ways to increase its enrollment capacity. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence will update the Board of Trustees on CSU's efforts at capacity-building.

Background

Over the next ten years, the CSU can expect a major surge in student enrollment demand. Approximately 130,000 additional students (94,600 FTES) will seek admission by the year 2010. This increase can be attributed to several factors, chief of which are (1) the children of the baby-boom generation reaching college-age, and (2) continued improvement in the college participation rate among high school graduates.

The CSU and the state responded to the earlier enrollment surge of the 1960's by launching the largest physical building program in its history. The dozen existing campuses were expanded and seven complete new campuses were built. However, this approach is no longer time or cost effective. As a result, the CSU has for some time been pursuing other alternatives and implementing strategies for expanding capacity.

Enrollment Capacity-building Efforts

1. Conversion of existing government facilities to new campuses.

Over the past several years, the CSU has established two new campuses, Monterey Bay and Channel Islands, using surplus facilities provided by other governmental agencies. These are not opportunities that occur often and may not always be in the best interests of the CSU. However, the recent cases fit well with CSU needs and planning.

While the conversion of surplus physical facilities to educational use has not been without cost, those costs have been considerably lower than for the construction of new facilities. Significant funding of these costs has been provided by the originating agencies and by private sources. The overall expense to the state has been modest compared to the benefits for capacity-building.

Both new campuses contain additional facilities that can be converted to educational use as enrollment growth warrants. Physical conversion at Monterey Bay will require state funding, although at continued advantageous cost levels. It is expected that surplus land and facilities at Channel Islands that can be made available for commercial use will generate a revenue stream to pay for new remodeling or construction of educational facilities at that site.

2. Expanded use of existing campus facilities, including YRO.

CSU campuses have long attempted to schedule classes on days and at times that are most convenient for their students. Campuses use student surveys and scheduling experiments to assess student willingness to attend classes at various times. When physical capacity exceeds enrollment demand, this approach is suitable. However, as enrollments on individual campuses have increased and capacity has been reached during the most popular times, campuses have begun working on ways to encourage students to attend at non-traditional times—early mornings and evenings, and on Fridays and weekends.

As an example, CSU Sacramento has begun evening and weekend degree programs for upper-division transfer students in communication studies, liberal studies, and psychology. Students in these programs can complete all degree requirements, including upper-division general education requirements and elective courses in evening and weekend classes, over a two to three year time period. CSU Northridge has doubled the number of sections and the FTES of classes meeting on Saturdays in the past five years. Courses with a Saturday meeting have increased from 2.3 percent to 4.6 percent of total enrollments at Northridge over five years.

The most significant effort in improved facilities utilization involves the expansion of year-round operation at CSU campuses. Four CSU quarter-system campuses, Hayward, Los Angeles,

Pomona, and San Luis Obispo, have offered state-supported summer quarters for many years. Summer quarter enrollments range from 17 to 43 percent of fall quarter enrollments at these campuses. Nine semester-system campuses have begun limited state-supported summer terms over the past three years. This past summer, Humboldt began a full state-supported summer semester with enrollments above projected targets.

Over the next two-summertime, all self-support summer courses for matriculated students will be converted to state-support. This step will allow formal recognition of long standing summer programs and the inclusion of these FTES in campus enrollment targets and enrollment reports. State-support for summer terms, which means lower state university fees for students and faculty compensation for teaching equivalent to that received during the academic year, will provide campuses with strong incentives to further expand summer enrollments.

3. Development of additional off-campus centers.

The CSU currently operates seven off-campus centers that have been formally approved by the Board of Trustees and CPEC. Four of these, at Imperial Valley (San Diego), Ventura (Northridge)¹, Stockton (Stanislaus), and Contra Costa (Hayward), occupy permanent, CSU-owned facilities. Several others, not yet large enough to warrant formal approval, are in operation and expanding enrollments. For example, CSU Bakersfield will be requesting Chancellor's approval (200+ FTES) of its center in the Antelope Valley in the next year.

The CSU is currently conducting or planning enrollment needs analyses for the San Diego region, the Los Angeles basin, the San Francisco Bay region including Alameda and Contra Costa counties², the Imperial Valley, and the Crescent City region³. In addition a study group of faculty and provosts is developing a set of draft guidelines for the operation of off-campus centers which will soon be distributed for the normal systemwide consultation process. Through these efforts, the CSU expects to expand the number of off-campus centers to better provide access in remote regions of the state and to ease enrollment pressures at existing campuses.

Several of these new centers are expected to be "collaborative institutions," a new form of higher education partnership tentatively defined by CPEC⁴ as "an institution of higher education where courses and programs are offered by more than one institution of higher education." Examples of

1 The CSU Northridge Ventura Center currently operates on the facilities of CSU Channel Islands. After CSUCI begins operation in Fall 2002, the Ventura Center will be phased out over a four to five year period of time.
2 In response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 179 (Torlakson).
3 In response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 82 (Chesbro).
4 CPEC is revising its Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational Centers. A collaborative institution will be defined and incorporated in these new guidelines.

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 1

November 8-9, 2000

Page 4 of 4

collaborative institutions that are being discussed and planned by CSU campuses include the utilization of available classrooms at Cañada College in Redwood City for programs offered by San Francisco, the placement of temporary classroom facilities on the campus of Antelope Valley Community College for programs offered by Bakersfield, the joint use of facilities at the NASA Research Park, Moffit Field, by San Jose, U.C. Santa Cruz, and De Anza Community College, and a new center at Otay Mesa involving San Diego and Southwestern Community College. These collaborative institutions, besides sharing facilities, will achieve improved articulation and ease of transfer for the students they serve.

4. Expansion of distance education.

For some time, the term “distance education” has been used to refer to the employment of both high and low technologies to bring higher education to remote populations that would otherwise be unable to complete academic programs. More recently, as creative faculty have begun to use the capabilities of the Web to achieve a synergy between traditional instruction and self-paced learning, “distance education” is taking place as well in campus computer labs, in dormitory rooms, at kitchen tables, and at work sites.

This past year, Chancellor Reed established the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) composed primarily of faculty and provosts, to advise Executive Vice Chancellor Spence on the application of technology to teaching and learning in the CSU. Thus far, ATAC has agreed upon an academic technology mission statement and has nearly completed a set of principles for the use of academic technology. These principles will emphasize that the faculty have the responsibility for determining the pedagogies and instructional methods that they will use to achieve the learning objectives that they have defined for their students. The CSU System and campuses have the responsibility for creating the infrastructure, both technical and professional, that allows faculty to choose from the full range of pedagogies and instructional methods.

Through these efforts, the CSU believes that distance education to provide access to remote students and the adoption of multi-mode instructional methods in on-campus courses will allow existing physical classroom and laboratory facilities to be better utilized. The resulting expansion of student enrollments and the expansion of faculty positions will also require new office space and support facilities on most of our campuses.