AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 8:15 a.m., Wednesday, May 14, 2003
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Harold Goldwhite
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Shailesh J. Mehta
Ralph Pesqueira
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos
Anthony M. Vitti

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 12, 2003

Discussion Items

1. Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and
   Access Goals, Action
2. Recommendations of the California State University Presidents’ Commission
   on Teacher Education, Action
Chair Achtenberg called the meeting to order on March 12 at 8:56 a.m.
Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 28, 2003 were approved by consent as submitted.

Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals

Chair Achtenberg stated that CSU enrollment projects are beginning to exceed future system physical capacity. Therefore, campuses must develop strategies for meeting access goals that do not rely solely upon the construction of new lecture halls, classrooms, and laboratories. Chair Achtenberg stressed that these strategies must focus upon providing instruction that better utilize existing facilities or do not require physical capacity. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence commented that options have been in development for several years, and were introduced at the November 2002 Board meeting. Dr. Spence commented that if each campus applies these strategies, as needed, enrollment demands should be met through 2011.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hammerstrom commented that several years ago, CPEC, using Department of Finance data, projected that the CSU would add 130,000 new students between 1998 and 2010. Dr. Hammerstrom stated that actual enrollments this past fall are already 20,000 over where CPEC estimated enrollment. The Department of Finance now projects CSU 2011 enrollment to exceed 513,000. Dr. Hammerstrom stressed that CSU enrollments are beginning to exceed the physical capacity, and the projected gap between enrollment and capacity is increasing. Dr. Hammerstrom stated that although CSU will continue to add physical facilities, CSU must also look to meeting enrollment growth through options that do not require physical space. The resolution proposed for action in May restates the Board’s commitment to accommodate the projected enrollment, given appropriate state support, and adopts as policy the use of several options available to campuses to expand enrollment recognizing that the mix of options will vary from campus to campus.

Chair Achtenberg stressed the importance of meeting these goals. Trustee Galinson commented he would like to see the data of classroom usage during the week, excluding summer, prior to the Board voting on a commitment of funds for additional classrooms. Dr. Spence responded that data are presented each year in an accountability report, and stressed that CSU needs to focus more on Friday and Saturday classroom usage. Chair Achtenberg asked how it is determined there is a demand for weekend classes. Dr. Hammerstrom responded that campuses try weekend classes to determine if there are students who will enroll. Dr. Spence stated that as more campuses have enrollment restraints, weekend classes might become more of a reality. Trustee Goldwhite noted that to schedule classes effectively, a campus needs to (1) know what the demand is for specific courses, (2) know student scheduling preferences, and (3) have the resources to teach Friday and weekend classes. If all is in place, projected enrollment demands can be successfully met. Trustee Pesqueira commented that the options, as presented, should work. Chair Achtenberg stated that this item would be brought to the Board in May for action.
Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree: A Report on the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation

Chair Achtenberg commented that CSU convened a Systemwide Task Force on Facilitating Graduation to study degree completion in the CSU and make recommendations for improved progress to the degree. Chaired by Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair, Academic Senate CSU, and Louanne Kennedy, Provost, CSU Northridge, the task force reviewed CSU graduation rates and developed a series of recommendations for CSU campuses, system, and the Board. Chair Achtenberg, as well as Dr. Spence, thanked and extended appreciation to the Task Force for their expertise and work. Chair Achtenberg commented that among the areas the Task Force reviewed were (1) preparation to attend college, (2) improved transfer procedures, and (3) increased efforts by the campuses to assist students to achieve a baccalaureate degree. Chair Achtenberg emphasized the importance to implement the report’s recommendations quickly as a way to use available resources more effectively while helping more students earn a degree. This will be especially important with reduced budgets and increased enrollments. Dr. Spence commented that the Presidents have been asked to prepare a plan to address the Task Force recommendations on or prior to November 2003.

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Kegley commented that at the March Statewide Academic Senate meeting, the principles and recommendations of the report were endorsed. Chancellor Reed complimented the Presidents and faculty for their work in streamlining the path to the degree.

Trustee Goldwhite complimented the process and report. Dr. Goldwhite recommended that transfer students be given the same positive experience when entering the CSU as first-time freshmen receive. Trustee Galinson commended all involved with the report. He expressed concern, however, that a student should be given flexibility to change majors and, if needed, to take additional units without any financial penalty. Chair Achtenberg responded that the Task Force took this concern into account and no extra charge was recommended.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 03-03-02).

Report of Second Annual Systemwide Evaluation of California State University Teacher Preparation Programs

Chair Achtenberg introduced Dr. Spence who reported the outcomes of the second annual systemwide evaluation of teacher education in the CSU. Dr. Spence expressed his indebtedness to the Deans of Education for their leadership. Dr. Spence commented that the primary purpose of this evaluation was to see how well CSU teacher preparation reforms are working in the K-12 schools. In addition, the evaluation provides information that enables the campuses to strengthen their programs, and provides reliable data to address concerns coming from outside the CSU.
Dr. Spence commented that during a 24-month period from 1999 through 2001, CSU produced more than 20,000 qualified teachers, ninety-five percent of whom served in K-12 teaching positions for at least one school year. Dr. Spence stressed that for several years CSU campuses have worked to improve the preparation of K-8 teachers for reading and mathematics instruction, and the evaluation demonstrated that CSU is providing good preparation in both of these core subjects of the K-8 curriculum. Dr. Spence noted that the evaluation also showed that CSU provides preparation for high school teachers that is both strong and improving. In the report, California school principals commented that CSU teacher preparation was highly effective during 2000-01. Dr. Spence also reported that CSU is effective in different sets of schools, i.e., schools serving students at different income levels, in different communities, and at different performance levels. In addition, the evaluation findings indicated that CSU teachers were better prepared to teach each subject than were first-year teachers from other states. Dr. Spence noted that the findings indicated that one of the most important factors in preparing effective teachers is the intensity and quality of site-based assistance that school districts provide to CSU-enrolled credential candidates in practice teaching.

Mr. Artemio Pimentel, California State Student Association member, asked if the national comparative study relied on self-evaluations. Dr. Spence affirmed that this comparison was based on self-assessments by both groups of first-year teachers of the effectiveness of their prior preparation.

Trustee Campbell commented that the way CSU approached teacher education has changed during the past several years. He asked about the quality of students who apply for teaching education programs. Dr. Spence responded that only those applicants in the top half of their undergraduate class are eligible to be admitted to CSU teacher preparation programs. Trustee Mehta commented that his impression is that the CSU is currently graduating better teachers. Dr. Spence commented that in the past two years, the annual systemwide evaluations have affirmed the high quality and excellent preparation of our teaching graduates. Chair Achtenberg asked if the relationship between teacher preparation and student learning is being measured and if the CSU is succeeding. Dr. Spence commented that this is a complex evaluation question and pointed out that a grant from the Ford Foundation would provide the means for a study. President Koester, CSU Northridge, noted that CSUN is currently engaged in a five-year study, which will explore links between teacher preparation and student outcomes. Trustee Pesqueira commented that CSU needs to begin to prepare teachers early and that an undergraduate minor in Education may provide an option. Trustee Goldwhite commented that although CSU does a good job in preparing teachers, when the graduate begins teaching there are other factors within K-12 schools that may undermine that teacher’s effectiveness. Dr. Spence recognized the leadership of Chancellor Reed in the field of teacher preparation, and acknowledged the work of Assistant Vice Chancellors Dr. William Wilson and Dr. Beverly Young, and Mr. David Wright.

Community Service Learning in the California State University
Chair Achtenberg and Trustee Galinson complimented Ms. Erika Randall, Director, Community Service Learning, the faculty, staff, and students for their work. Ms. Randall stated that in April 1999, Governor Gray Davis called for a community service requirement for all students enrolled in California’s public institutions of higher education. In March 2000, the California State University Board of Trustees passed a resolution requiring that each CSU president ensure that all students have opportunities to participate in community service, service learning or both; endorsing campus efforts to make service an expectation, condition or requirement for the undergraduate-education experience; and requiring a report on an annual basis of CSU’s efforts to provide those opportunities. Ms. Randall stated that Governor Davis allocated $2.2 million in the 2001-2002 state budget for the development of at least 220 courses with new service-learning components, and that CSU must match the state investment with outside resources. For the 2001-2002 year, campuses reported developing 306 courses with new service-learning components during that academic year, and that across the system, the matching $2.2 million was secured from external sources.

Ms. Randall introduced Ms. Jeannie Kim-Han, Director of Community Service Learning at CSU Fullerton, who highlighted the benefits that CSU students, faculty, the campus and community received from service-learning experiences. Ms. Randall also introduced Ms. Shannon Beshara, Corporate Development Director for Working Wardrobes, a non-profit organization that provides assistance to adult victims of domestic violence and drug abuse as they re-enter the workforce. Ms. Beshara described how service-learning experiences have benefited and continue to benefit her organization and students. Ms. Randall noted that since 2000, the CSU has increased by 80 percent the number of opportunities for students to participate in service learning courses.

Notable Accomplishments in California State University Teaching, Research, and Scholarship: Study at Sea on the Training Ship Golden Bear

Chair Achtenberg introduced President William Eisenhardt, California Maritime Academy, who introduced a video, which showcased the training ship Golden Bear. The Golden Bear is a floating town which twice a year transports CSU students on 60 day cruises that feature rigorous training, academic instruction, and visits to interesting ports in the Pacific. President Eisenhardt thanked the faculty of the California Maritime Academy, CSU Monterey Bay, and Cal Poly University, San Luis Obispo. In addition, President Eisenhardt thanked Professor Robert van Spyk for making the video. Trustee Pesqueira highly recommended a visit on the training ship Golden Bear. The Board members were invited to attend the April 26 graduation ceremony at the Maritime Academy.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Chair Achtenberg stated that each year the Trustees receive a report on academic planning and program review. Dr. Spence presented the annual report, noting that academic planning at each university involves both the development of new degree programs and regular review of existing
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programs. In approving the resolution, the Trustees would be granting the authority to plan a total of 28 new degree programs across the 23 CSU campuses. Campuses will still have to submit proposals for implementation of the programs to the Chancellor’s Office, and Dr. Spence emphasized that in the current budget climate, campuses will be asked tough questions about their ability to fund proposed new programs.

Dr. Spence noted that this year’s report did not include summaries of campus program reviews. Reporting of accountability information is being streamlined, and while campuses will continue to review degree programs periodically, reporting in the future will focus on changes in degree requirements and the assessment of student learning outcomes. The report did include summaries of the results of accreditation visits of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) to three CSU campuses. The accreditation of CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Long Beach, and California Maritime Academy was reaffirmed.

Dr. Spence drew the Trustees’ attention to the number of degree programs that had reduced unit requirements to 120 semester units, the additional programs that had reduced unit requirements somewhat, and the programs yet to be reviewed. He praised the work of the campuses and thanked particularly the Academic Senate CSU and the campus academic senates.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 03-03-03).

In closing, Executive Vice Chancellor Spence recognized and thanked Trustee Campbell for his many years of service to the CSU Board of Trustees.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.
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Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals
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Summary

Beginning this year, CSU enrollment projections will exceed system physical capacity. Thus campuses must develop strategies for meeting access goals that do not rely solely upon the construction of new lecture halls, classrooms, and laboratories (physical capacity). Although the CSU will continue to add capacity space as the capital budget allows, the additional strategies must focus upon providing instruction that better utilize existing facilities or do not require physical capacity. This item restates Board policy regarding CSU enrollment and access goals and identifies the options available to campuses as they develop new strategies.

Background

For many years, projections of enrollments in higher education in California have warned of a vast increase during the first decade of the 21st Century. However, not only are enrollments increasing, the projections themselves are increasing. For example, in 1995, the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, projected that the CSU would enroll 406,317 headcount students in the Fall 2004. By 2000, the Department of Finance’s projection of CSU enrollment for Fall 2004 had been revised upward to 414,091 headcount students. The most recent Department of Finance projections of CSU enrollment for Fall 2004 have now reached 436,172 headcount students (see Attachment A; enrollment histories and projections for key regions of the state are shown in Attachment B, to be distributed at the Board meeting).

The current Department of Finance projections indicate that over the next eight years, by Fall 2011, CSU enrollment will have grown to 513,550 headcount students, an increase of 26 percent over the 406,684 enrolled in Fall 2002. This enrollment increase of nearly 107,000 students presents a significant challenge for the CSU in that many campuses are rapidly approaching their physical capacity as measured in lecture hall, classroom, and laboratory space. Indeed across the
The CSU plans to meet this increased enrollment need primarily by expanding service on its current campuses and by creating off-campus centers in parts of the state which are increasingly under-served. Fortunately, the CSU has a range of options available to increase our institutional capacity to provide educational services. These options include the following.

1. **Expansion of summer term enrollments**
   In 2000, the Chancellor’s Office completed a feasibility study for the expansion of summer enrollments. This study concluded that based upon the experience of four CSU quarter system campuses that had offered state-supported summer terms for several years, urban campuses should be able to achieve summer term enrollments equivalent to 40 percent of fall term enrollments and rural campuses should be able to achieve 25 percent of fall term enrollments. The study also concluded that these levels could not be achieved for several years.

   All but five CSU campuses have now received funding to convert their self-support summer sessions to state-support summer terms. Converting campuses have generally observed a jump in summer enrollments because the State University Fee is less than the self-support fees charged through extended educations divisions.

2. **Better utilization of current physical capacity space**
   Besides expanding summer enrollment, many campuses may also have opportunities to better utilize lecture halls, classrooms, and laboratories (capacity space) by scheduling classes at off-peak times such as evenings, Fridays, and weekends. (The current utilization of capacity space in the CSU is summarized in Attachment E, to be distributed at the Board meeting.)

3. **Expansion of the use of academic technology**
   Where it can be used in ways that the faculty determine are consistent with the high quality of instruction offered in the CSU, academic technology offers the opportunity to provide instruction in ways that reduce or eliminate the need for physical capacity space, thus expanding student access. Mixed mode or hybrid courses meet in campus lecture halls, classrooms, or laboratories for a portion of the course time and fulfill remaining time requirements using Web-based instructional modules that the students complete at
locations and times of their choosing. Totally on-line courses and academic programs can be completed by students who otherwise would not be able to attend CSU campuses.

4. Development of new and expansion of existing off-campus centers
The CSU currently has eight permanent off-campus centers approved by the Board and CPEC, the last, the Antelope Valley Center operated by CSU Bakersfield, having been approved by CPEC last month. Several campuses have off-campus operations that are likely to achieve the enrollment levels required for permanent status in the next few years. A few of these, in rural areas of the state, provide upper-division educational opportunities for students who might not otherwise be able to complete their degrees. Several others, in more urban areas, ease demand pressures on impacted or nearly impacted campuses. Under current conditions, the best opportunities for off-campus operations appear to lie in cooperating with community colleges to use their excess capacity where it exists, or to develop joint-use facilities that take advantage of the community colleges’ more flexible bonding authority. However, the major obstacle to serving students with this approach has been the State’s unwillingness to fund the start-up and fixed costs of these off-campus centers.

5. Expansion of main campus physical capacity space
Each of the prior options addresses means for increasing the institutional capacity to provide education in ways that do not require additional physical capacity on main campuses. However, many campuses may also be able to utilize the current availability of capital funds to construct new capacity space to meet access demands. The passage of Proposition 47 in November insures the availability of limited bond funding for the short-term. Future bond ballot measures will present the opportunity to provide funding for additional growth at existing campuses.

Eight CSU campuses have physical capacity enrollment ceilings at the historic maximum of 25,000 academic year FTES. As indicated at the November 2002 presentation to the joint meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings, and Grounds, and the Committee on Educational Policy entitled Setting Campus Enrollment Ceilings to Assist Enrollment Management, this historic maximum was based largely on conjecture and opinion, not empirical analysis of campus environments. Several campuses may be able to expand physical capacity beyond 25,000 AY FTES if this limitation were removed.

Each CSU campus faces a different physical capacity environment and different enrollment demands. These variations mean that individual campuses will need to use the available options in different ways and combinations. Policies that encourage this flexibility will best serve students in the years to come.
It has long been the policy of the Board to accommodate enrollment demand where it exists. The proposed resolution formalizes that policy and encourages campuses to choose the combination of options most appropriate to their situations. The resolution, by authorizing campuses that are at or near the historic system maximum enrollment ceiling of 25,000 academic year full-time equivalent students to develop master plan revisions that increase their ceiling, effectively removes the system maximum enrollment ceiling. If this resolution is adopted, the Board would establish enrollment ceilings for campuses based upon individual campus needs unimpeded by arbitrary limitations.

**Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

**RESOLVED.** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that this Board advises the Governor, the Legislature, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission of the following:

That, according to enrollment projections based upon current demographic projections and implementation of state policy directions regarding educational equity and access, the California State University must be prepared to accommodate some 107,000 additional students in the year 2011; and be it further

**RESOLVED.** That given appropriate state support, the California State University pledges to accommodate these additional students; and be it further

**RESOLVED.** That it is the policy of the Board of Trustees that campuses shall, within the constraints of state enrollment funding, expand summer term enrollments so as to better utilize existing physical capacity and facilitate student progress to their objectives; and be it further

**RESOLVED.** That it is the policy of the Board of Trustees that campuses shall expand existing and develop new off-campus centers to provide access to student populations that are unable to attend existing campuses and to relieve enrollment pressure on existing campuses that are at or approaching impaction; and be it further

**RESOLVED.** That it is the policy of the Board of Trustees that campuses shall expand the use of academic technology in ways that maintain and improve the
high quality of education provided by the CSU in order to free existing physical capacity and expand access; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees directs the Presidents and their respective staffs, in consultation with constituent groups, to review campus master plans and where found to be appropriate, consider increasing enrollment ceilings; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes campuses that are at or near the historic system maximum enrollment ceiling of 25,000 academic year full-time equivalent students to prepare campus master plan revisions that exceed the limit for presentation to the Board; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees authorizes campuses to proceed within the scope of existing and proposed campus master plans, to fully utilize existing campus capacity and to accelerate new physical capacity within the context of the annual CSU Five-Year Capital Outlay program; and be it further

RESOLVED, That these recommendations will be developed individually and subject to collective bargaining and campus or systemwide consultation as appropriate.
## 2002 SERIES CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
<th>TOTAL CSU</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,035,671</td>
<td>1,932,137</td>
<td>125,044</td>
<td>1,513,010</td>
<td>74,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,011,946</td>
<td>1,909,818</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,998,295</td>
<td>1,907,549</td>
<td>124,789</td>
<td>1,508,651</td>
<td>74,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,985,653</td>
<td>1,904,270</td>
<td>125,417</td>
<td>1,496,586</td>
<td>74,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: UC and CSU report fall census enrollment, and CCC reports fall term-end enrollment. UC enrollment excludes Health Sciences. UC graduate enrollment includes students in self-supporting programs. CCC enrollment updated for 1997-2000.
## California State University Enrollments and Planning Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Greater Los Angeles Basin</th>
<th>Bay Area</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>DOF 2002 Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>35,937</td>
<td>153,205</td>
<td>80,035</td>
<td>99,606</td>
<td>369,053</td>
<td>369,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>34,509</td>
<td>150,762 -2%</td>
<td>78,639 -2%</td>
<td>97,994-2%</td>
<td>361,904-2%</td>
<td>361,904-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>32,791</td>
<td>144,237 -4%</td>
<td>76,545 -3%</td>
<td>94,120-4%</td>
<td>347,693-4%</td>
<td>347,693-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>30,503</td>
<td>133,550 -7%</td>
<td>71,904 -6%</td>
<td>89,682-5%</td>
<td>325,639-6%</td>
<td>325,639-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>31,108 2%</td>
<td>128,820 -4%</td>
<td>71,737 0%</td>
<td>87,703-2%</td>
<td>319,368-2%</td>
<td>319,368-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>32,992 6%</td>
<td>130,946 2%</td>
<td>72,870 2%</td>
<td>88,796 1%</td>
<td>325,604 2%</td>
<td>325,604 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>34,390 4%</td>
<td>136,865 5%</td>
<td>74,774 3%</td>
<td>90,774 2%</td>
<td>336,803 3%</td>
<td>336,803 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>35,271 3%</td>
<td>140,758 3%</td>
<td>75,755 1%</td>
<td>91,995 1%</td>
<td>343,779 2%</td>
<td>343,779 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>36,478 3%</td>
<td>144,478 3%</td>
<td>76,372 1%</td>
<td>92,476 1%</td>
<td>349,804 2%</td>
<td>349,804 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>37,152 2%</td>
<td>149,733 4%</td>
<td>77,236 1%</td>
<td>94,826 3%</td>
<td>358,947 3%</td>
<td>359,719 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>37,865 2%</td>
<td>154,139 3%</td>
<td>76,908 0%</td>
<td>98,451 4%</td>
<td>367,368 2%</td>
<td>368,469 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>40,667 7%</td>
<td>163,636 6%</td>
<td>79,329 3%</td>
<td>103,679 5%</td>
<td>387,311 5%</td>
<td>388,605 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>41,982 3%</td>
<td>171,683 5%</td>
<td>85,095 7%</td>
<td>107,755 4%</td>
<td>406,515 5%</td>
<td>406,684 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>42,308 1%</td>
<td>179,340 4%</td>
<td>88,028 3%</td>
<td>110,299 2%</td>
<td>419,975 3%</td>
<td>423,087 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43,356 2%</td>
<td>185,866 4%</td>
<td>90,641 3%</td>
<td>112,905 2%</td>
<td>432,768 3%</td>
<td>436,172 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>44,246 2%</td>
<td>193,787 4%</td>
<td>93,383 3%</td>
<td>115,545 2%</td>
<td>446,961 3%</td>
<td>446,329 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>45,888 4%</td>
<td>201,287 4%</td>
<td>96,237 3%</td>
<td>118,178 2%</td>
<td>461,590 3%</td>
<td>456,221 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47,565 4%</td>
<td>208,580 4%</td>
<td>99,103 3%</td>
<td>120,937 2%</td>
<td>476,185 3%</td>
<td>466,062 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48,959 3%</td>
<td>214,256 3%</td>
<td>101,969 3%</td>
<td>123,914 2%</td>
<td>489,098 3%</td>
<td>478,562 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>50,841 4%</td>
<td>219,729 3%</td>
<td>104,728 3%</td>
<td>126,889 2%</td>
<td>502,187 3%</td>
<td>490,683 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>52,762 4%</td>
<td>224,011 2%</td>
<td>107,515 3%</td>
<td>129,862 2%</td>
<td>514,150 2%</td>
<td>502,013 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>54,722 4%</td>
<td>228,306 2%</td>
<td>110,328 3%</td>
<td>132,836 2%</td>
<td>526,192 2%</td>
<td>513,550 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Southern campuses include San Diego and San Marcos.
Greater Los Angeles Basin campuses include Channel Islands, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, and San Bernardino.
Bay Area campuses include Hayward, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, San Francisco, San Jose, and Sonoma.
Other campuses include Bakersfield, Chico, Fresno, Humboldt, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, and Stanislaus.
CSU FTES Enrollment vs Physical Capacity

CSU CY FTES are consistent with DOF/DRU Series 2002 Enrollment Projections for the CSU.
CSU Campus Physical Capacity with Summer Enrollment Responsibility and FTES Instruction --
Actual and Projected

AY Permanent Physical Capacity and SER – Actual and Planned
AY Lecture and Lab FTES – Actual and Planned
All AY Onsite FTES – Actual and Planned
All AY FTES – Actual and Planned
All CY FTES – Actual and Demand

Difference between AY Lecture Lab
AND 2003-2004
AY Physical Capacity Plans
and Summer Enrollment
Responsibilities
Greater Los Angeles Basin Campus  
(Channel Islands, Dominguez Hills, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, San Bernardino)  
Physical Capacity with Summer Enrollment Responsibility and FTES Instruction -- Actual and Projected
Bay Area Campus
(Hayward, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, San Francisco, San Jose, Sonoma)
Physical Capacity with Summer Enrollment Responsibility and FTES Instruction -- Actual and Projected

AY Permanent Physical Capacity and SER -- Actual and Planned
AY Lecture and Lab FTES -- Actual and Planned
All AY Onsite FTES -- Actual and Planned
All CY FTES -- Actual and Planned
All CY FTES -- Actual and Demand

Difference between AY Lecture Lab AND 2003-2004 AY Physical Capacity Plans and Summer Enrollment Responsibilities

Summer
Offsite
Onsite
Other

CSU Academic Research
Other Campus (Bakersfield, Chico, Fresno, Humboldt, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus)
Physical Capacity with Summer Enrollment Responsibility and FTES Instruction -- Actual and Projected

AY Permanent Physical Capacity and SER -- Actual and Planned
AY Lecture and Lab FTES -- Actual and Planned
AY Onsite FTES -- Actual and Planned
AY Offsite FTES -- Actual and Planned
AY FTES -- Actual and Planned
CY FTES -- Actual and Demand

Difference between AY Lecture Lab
AND 2003-2004
AY Physical Capacity Plans and Summer Enrollment Responsibilities
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1. Introduction

This is a report of the utilization of instructional space throughout the California State University. The purpose of this report is to compare the utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories for the fall 2000 term to established standards to inform capital outlay planners about the needs for space and to inform the campuses about their use of space. The report was prepared using the methodology and standards employed by the University of California in its annual reports.

2. Methodology

Utilization is measured by determining the average number of hours per week that the stations in a given category of space are used by scheduled course sections, whether or not the course sections are of the same type of instruction as the room itself. That is, a lecture course taught in a laboratory space adds to the average use of laboratory stations, despite the fact that the course is not a laboratory course. Courses that are taught by individual supervision do not regularly meet in a classroom or a class laboratory and, thus, do not contribute to the use of a room. Enrollments in these courses do not enter into the calculation of the equivalent measures weekly station hours (WSH) or weekly student contact hours (WSCH), for this report as it focuses only on lecture and laboratory FTE. Also produced is a summary of the average weekly usage by size of room. Although the standards are based on the hours between 8 A.M. and 10 P.M., Monday through Friday, the summaries span the time between 7 A.M. and 10 P.M. Monday through Saturday.

3. Utilization Standards for Instructional Space

Utilization standards for classrooms and teaching laboratories in public higher education are set by the state legislature. These standards divide instructional space into three categories: lecture, lower-division teaching laboratory and upper-division teaching laboratory. Teaching laboratories on the graduate-division level are held to the same utilization requirements as upper-division laboratories.

The normative standards for classrooms and teaching laboratories are derived from two factors:

(1) the average hours per week a room (and thus a station) is expected to be scheduled, and

(2) the percent of student stations expected to be occupied when the room is scheduled.

The product of these factors yields the average number of hours per week a station is expected to be occupied. For this report, the standards were applied to rooms grouped by space type (lecture or lab), then by station count, not individual rooms.

Through ACR 151 (enacted in 1970), the legislature set the current standards for lecture room utilization. The average lecture room is to be scheduled 75% of the hours from 8 A.M. to 10 P.M., Monday through
Friday (70 hours) for a total of 53 scheduled hours per week. When scheduled, the lecture room is to have, on the average, 66% of the stations filled.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 10 P.M. M-F} & \quad 70 \\
\times \text{Percent to be scheduled} & \quad 75 \% \\
\text{Total Scheduled Hours per Week (WRH)} & \quad 52.5 \\
\text{[Amount of time a room is scheduled each week]}
\end{align*}
\]

When scheduled, the lecture room is to have, on the average,

\[
\text{Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ)} \quad 66 \%
\]

Combining these requirements leads to an average lecture station occupancy rate standard of 35 hours per week:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 10 P.M., M-F} & \quad 70 \\
\times \text{Percent to be scheduled} & \quad 75 \% \\
\times \text{Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ)} & \quad 66 \% \\
\text{Weekly Station Hours (WSH)} & \quad 35 \\
\text{[Amount of time a station is occupied each week]}
\end{align*}
\]

In 1973 budget language, the legislature set laboratory standards. Lower-division laboratories are to be scheduled an average of 27.5 hours per week and filled to 85% of capacity, yielding a standard 23.4 station hours per week.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 5 P.M., M-F} & \quad 45 \\
\times \text{Percent to be scheduled} & \quad 61 \% \\
\text{Total Scheduled Hours per Week (WRH)} & \quad 27.5 \\
\text{[Amount of time a room is scheduled each week]}
\end{align*}
\]

When scheduled, the lower division lab room is to have, on the average,

\[
\text{Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ)} \quad 85 \%
\]

Combining these requirements leads to an average lower division lab station occupancy rate standard of 23.4 hours per week:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 5 P.M., M-F} & \quad 45 \\
\times \text{Percent to be scheduled} & \quad 61 \% \\
\times \text{Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ)} & \quad 85 \% \\
\text{Weekly Station Hours (WSH)} & \quad 23.4 \\
\text{[Amount of time a station is occupied each week]}
\end{align*}
\]

For upper-division and graduate-division laboratories, each room is to be scheduled, on the average, for 22 hours per week at 80% occupancy, yielding a standard of 17.6 station hours per week:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 5 P.M.} & \quad 45 \\
\times \text{Percent to be scheduled} & \quad 49 \%
\end{align*}
\]
Total Scheduled Hours per Week (WRH) 22.0
[Amount of time a room is scheduled each week]

When scheduled, the room is to have, on the average,

Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ) 80 %

Combining these requirements leads to an average upper division/graduate laboratory station occupancy rate standard of 17.6 hours per week:

Scheduled Hours from 8 A.M. – 5 P.M. 45
Percent to be scheduled x 49 %
Percent Station Occupancy (% stn occ) x 80 %
Weekly Station Hours (WSH) 17.6
[Amount of time a station is occupied each week]

Thus, a campus is not fully utilizing its instructional space until its lecture stations are in use 35 hours per week; its lower-division laboratory stations are in use 23.4 hours per week; and, its upper- and graduate-division laboratory stations are in use 17.6 hours per week. It should be noted that the laboratory standards are based on a 45-hour week, that is, 8 A.M. to 5 P.M., Monday through Friday.

Because teaching laboratory instruction may serve each level of the student population in a given week, or even simultaneously, depending on class enrollment and scheduling, for purposes of this report, the average of the two standards, lower-division and upper-division as shown above, results in 20 hours per week expected utilization.

Utilization Standards are expressed in terms of Weekly Room Hours (WRH) and Weekly Station Hours (WSH). The Weekly Room Hour (WRH) denotes the amount of time a room is scheduled each week in a term. The Weekly Station Hour (WSH) is the based on the number of hours each room is scheduled and the number of seats in the room in a week. The Weekly Student Contact Hour (WSCH) calculation is based on the number of hours each room is scheduled and the number of students enrolled in the class in a week scheduled to be face-to-face with a faculty member in class from the APDB.

4. Report Appendices

Appendix A - Systemwide summaries of classroom and teaching laboratory utilization, Tables U-1C and U-1T.

Appendix B - Campus-specific table of classroom and teaching laboratory utilization Tables U-2C and U-2T. Includes utilization by size of room.
**TABLE U-1C: CLASSROOM UTILIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Total Number of Stations</th>
<th>Total Weekly Student Contact Hours</th>
<th>Total Weekly Station Hours</th>
<th>Average Weighted WRH</th>
<th>Average % Station Occupancy</th>
<th>Average Weekly Hours Station Use</th>
<th>Utilization as a % of Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>42,804</td>
<td>68,993</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>152,536</td>
<td>228,549</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>69,229</td>
<td>97,277</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5,179</td>
<td>147,677</td>
<td>229,048</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>239,111</td>
<td>359,219</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>112,856</td>
<td>177,503</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>61,473</td>
<td>99,839</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7,842</td>
<td>236,077</td>
<td>340,984</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5,615</td>
<td>149,027</td>
<td>219,608</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>21,910</td>
<td>33,957</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>119,464</td>
<td>180,546</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td>151,388</td>
<td>215,082</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7,540</td>
<td>212,535</td>
<td>299,827</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>118,726</td>
<td>180,034</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>260,051</td>
<td>373,953</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5,713</td>
<td>178,978</td>
<td>275,029</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>169,691</td>
<td>305,867</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>208,086</td>
<td>273,025</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>110.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>36,085</td>
<td>47,585</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>72,452</td>
<td>104,650</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>60,968</td>
<td>104,456</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>95,374</td>
<td>2,824,227</td>
<td>4,219,340</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**AVERAGED SCHEDULED UTILIZATION BY CAMPUS**

**FALL 2000**
### Agenda Item 1  
May 13-14, 2003

#### CAMPUS: SYSTEMWIDE

**TABLE U-1T: TEACHING LABORATORY UTILIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Total Number of Stations</th>
<th>Total Weekly Student Contact Hours</th>
<th>Total Weekly Station Hours</th>
<th>Average Weighted WRH</th>
<th>Average % Station Occupancy</th>
<th>Average Weekly Hours Station Use</th>
<th>Utilization as a % of Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>19,619</td>
<td>17,735</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>110.6%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>133.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>56,986</td>
<td>61,156</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>116.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>12,041</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>48,764</td>
<td>61,427</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>57,426</td>
<td>64,169</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>127.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>21,412</td>
<td>25,194</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>34,671</td>
<td>46,449</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>79,211</td>
<td>81,604</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>117.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>28,640</td>
<td>30,354</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>107.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>23,999</td>
<td>27,001</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>39,367</td>
<td>44,828</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>101.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>42,406</td>
<td>43,066</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>116.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>26,150</td>
<td>27,758</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>116.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>66,567</td>
<td>72,140</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>110.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>53,509</td>
<td>68,739</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>88,735</td>
<td>81,927</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>108.3%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>127.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>78,061</td>
<td>83,975</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>101.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>6,861</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>20,548</td>
<td>24,826</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>105.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>10,089</td>
<td>13,097</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>38,411</td>
<td>814,316</td>
<td>901,461</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>106.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where and When Non-Traditional Instruction Takes Place in the CSU

Source: CSU Accountability, November 2002 Agenda Item
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Summary

In fall 2001, Chancellor Reed asked President Maxson to reconvene the Presidents’ Commission, comprised of twelve campus presidents, to focus on the special issues and challenges surrounding the preparation of secondary teachers for California’s schools. Three subcommittees met during the 2001-2002 academic year to address the issues of standards-based education, CSU secondary preparation program structure, and recruitment and retention of teachers in shortage areas. At the November 2002 Board of Trustees meeting, a summary of the committees’ reports was presented. The Presidents’ Commission is presenting at this meeting recommendations and timelines for CSU preparation of secondary teachers based on the committees’ findings for adoption by the Board of Trustees.

Background

In response to the urgent need for well-qualified teachers for California public schools and the commitment to maintain and improve the quality of CSU-prepared teachers, the Committee on Educational Policy for California State University Board of Trustees adopted a policy statement at its July 14-15, 1998 meeting to reaffirm teacher education as one of the California State University’s highest priorities. This statement, entitled “CSU’s Commitment to Prepare High Quality Teachers,” was developed by the Presidents’ Commission to reinforce CSU’s dedication to preparing more high quality teachers as quickly as possible. Progress on the “Commitments” was presented to the Board over a period of three years.
The Presidents’ Commission was reconvened in September 2001 and met during the 2001-2002 academic year. The purpose of this new effort was to build on the previous commission’s work, bringing a special focus on the preparation of teachers for middle and high schools. Twelve CSU presidents formed this second commission and provided oversight for three subcommittees:

- Subcommittee I – Preparation of Secondary Teachers to Teach in Standards-Based Instructional Programs
- Subcommittee II – Structure of Secondary Teacher Preparation at the CSU
- Subcommittee III – Recruitment and Retention of Teachers in Areas Where Shortages Exist

The outcomes of the Commission’s work was presented to the Board of Trustees at its November 12-13, 2002 meeting, including a final report document entitled, “Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation”. The Presidents’ Commission is now returning to the Board with ten recommendations regarding CSU preparation of secondary teachers based on these findings. These recommendations, modeled after the “Commitments” goals adopted in 1998 and developed in the three sub-areas described above, are included in Attachment A.

**Proposed Resolution**

The following resolution is proposed for adoption:

**RESOLVED.** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the Board of Trustees endorses the ten recommendations included in agenda item 2, Attachment A, of the May 13-14, 2003 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy; and be it further

**RESOLVED.** That the Board of Trustees directs the Chancellor to encourage the campus presidents and faculty to pursue actively the recommendations of the California State University Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education.
Recommendations of the California State University Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education To Prepare and Recruit Quality Teachers in Secondary Credential Areas

Standards-Based (To strengthen connections between academic content standards, subject matter preparation, and accountability)

- By February 2004, each CSU campus’s subject matter programs will have aligned their baccalaureate curricula that prepare students for teacher credential programs with appropriate state content standards and content informed by national standards.
- By February 2004, all CSU campuses will have strengthened K-16 collaboration, bringing together subject matter faculty, education faculty, community college faculty, K-12 teachers, administrators, and the community.
- By February, 2005, all CSU campuses will request their faculty Senates to review the Retention/Tenure/Promotion processes in Letters, Arts, and Sciences colleges and departments in order to incorporate criteria acknowledging the contribution of faculty who participate in the preparation of prospective teachers.

Structure of Teacher Preparation Programs (To closely link subject matter and professional preparation)

- By November 2004, each CSU campus will have established mechanisms to ensure coordination of subject matter and professional preparation content for each single subject program.
- By February 2005, all CSU campuses will have evaluated the regional need for teachers in single subject disciplines, and will increase the number of blended programs in single subject shortage areas where appropriate.
- By February 2005, all CSU teacher preparation programs will incorporate the use of tutoring and community service as central features for early field experience by connecting fieldwork in grades 7-12 with specific content areas.
- By November 2004, CSU campuses will develop a collaborative council consisting of subject matter and credential program coordinators, outreach staff, and appropriate discipline-based departments at the community colleges to articulate coursework leading to entry into teacher preparation programs.

Recruitment and Retention (To increase mechanisms for the recruitment and retention of teachers in high shortage areas of mathematics, science, bilingual, and special education)

- By February 2004, each CSU campus will explore “future teachers” connections extended to high schools and community colleges with discipline-specific emphasis (e.g., Science Teachers of Tomorrow, Mathematics Teachers of Tomorrow, Bilingual Teachers of Tomorrow, etc.).
- By February 2004, all CSU campuses will have a coordinated system of advisement that is able to promote teaching as a career option to all students in mathematics, science, and other shortage areas, through faculty advisors and course instructors.
- By November 2004, all CSU campuses will develop and disseminate models of mathematics/science teaching excellence to provide opportunities and incentives for faculty to promote teaching as a career.