AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 16, 2003
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Shailesh J. Mehta, Vice Chair
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson
Harold Goldwhite
M. Alexander Lopez
Ralph Pesqueira

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 14, 2003

Discussion Items

1. California State University Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs: First Biennial Report, Information
2. Revision to Title 5: Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs, Information
3. Notable Accomplishments in California State University Teaching, Research and Scholarship: The Desert Studies Center, ZZYZX, California, Information
Chair Achtenberg called the meeting to order on May 14, 2003 at 8:12 a.m.
Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 12 were approved by consent as submitted.

Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals

Chair Achtenberg stated that CSU enrollment projections 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 stated that CSU must rely increasingly upon methods that accommodate students in ways, at times, and at places that reduce our need for expanded physical capacity. Dr. Spence added that the purpose of the resolution is to specify Board policy to achieve CSU enrollment and access goals for the next decade.

Dr. Spence responded to questions that were raised in the March Educational Policy Committee meeting regarding the current utilization of physical capacity. Dr. Spence shared a report that shows that in fall 2000, the CSU system was using its classrooms at 85 percent of state utilization standards and its laboratories at 106 percent of standards. He also pointed to CSU’s accountability indicator that shows the extent to which CSU students are taking instruction beyond Monday through Thursday and after 4 p.m. Dr. Spence stated that from 1998 to 2000, instruction was increasingly held offsite, during the summer, and at other times when the campuses are underutilized, and that non-traditional instruction accounts for nearly one-third of total CSU instruction.

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence outlined several options available to campuses to expand enrollment capacity including: (1) expansion of summer term enrollments, (2) better use of current physical capacity during non-traditional times, (3) expanded use of academic technology, (4) development of new and expansion of existing off-campus centers, and (5) expansion of existing campus physical capacity. In addition, campuses that are at the system maximum enrollment ceiling of 25,000 AYFTES and are impacted will be given the authority to propose and begin planning for higher ceilings with the Board’s approval of the proposed resolution.

Trustee Goldwhite praised the plan and commented he was pleased that reasonable options are offered, adding that campus consultation is an important component. Trustee Galinson noted his appreciation for the thorough report and stated his concern that the definition of traditional classes should be extended to include classes Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mr. Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, clarified that state utilization standards are based on classes being held on Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., and that the graph refers to times and places when instruction traditionally has not been high. Trustee Galinson stated that distance learning needs further development and that each campus should consider this a priority. Dr. Hirano-Nakanishi,
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research, clarified that information about distance learning will be included in the next CSU Accountability report.

Trustee Galinson noted that as enrollment exceeds financial capacity it would be difficult for the CSU to grow, therefore stressing the importance of tying physical and financial capacity together. Academic Senate CSU Chair Kegley pointed out that the Academic Senate recently passed two resolutions regarding student fees and student access and limited incremental increases in campus enrollment ceilings. Trustee Pierce encouraged campus attention to land acquisition, particularly for land-locked campuses. Mr. Drohan suggested that opportunity purchases rather than state appropriations for land acquisition may be one route to explore. Trustee Pesqueira asked when will the CSU know that students are turning to other educational institutions because of the lack of course availability or overcrowding. Mr. Drohan responded that this is a complex question involving support budget, capital budget, and enrollment management. Chair Achtenberg urged consultation of surrounding communities when campuses plan physical expansion.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 05-03-04).

Recommendations of the California State University Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education

Chair Achtenberg commented that in fall 2001, Chancellor Reed asked President Maxson to reconvene the Presidents’ Commission to focus on the special issues and challenges surrounding the preparation of secondary teachers for California schools. Dr. Spence commented that the Presidents’ Commission’s ten recommendations regarding CSU preparation of secondary teachers, based on the findings of a final report “Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation”, are proposed in this item for adoption. He noted that it is important to assure the public that teacher education programs that prepare high school teachers meet current state standards.

Dr. Spence commented that the recommendations fall into three areas; (1) preparing teachers for a standards-based environment, (2) structure of teacher preparation programs, and (3) recruitment and retention. Trustee Goldwhite thanked the Presidents’ Commission and Dr. Spence’s staff for their work. Trustee Goldwhite asked about improved collaboration with the California Community Colleges (CCC). Dr. Spence noted that articulation is a priority and stressed the importance of working with the CCC. He added that Senator Alpert has authored a bill to reform teacher credential programs within the undergraduate years. Instead of legislation, however, a Title 5 provision may serve to provide for such changes. Dr. Spence commented that the CSU is working with Senator Alpert to provide an alternative to legislation.

President Maxson, CSU Long Beach, noted that the ten recommendations represent a collective decision by CSU Presidents, and noted their good work.
The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 05-03-05).

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.
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Summary

Dramatic actions have taken place at the twenty-three campuses and the Chancellor’s Office since California State University Chancellor Charles B. Reed appointed the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee in November 2000 and the California State University Board of Trustees approved a systemwide policy in July 2001 to curb student alcohol abuse.

For example, the CSU . . .

- Reports a trend toward less alcohol use by students and a reduction in alcohol-related incidents based upon initial, preliminary campus findings;
- Organized two successful systemwide alcohol conferences;
- Received more than $1.2 million from the California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) and Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC);
- Received considerable state and national media attention for its policies;
- Received the nationally prestigious Jeanne Cleary Campus Safety Award for developing a comprehensive systemwide alcohol policy; and
- Successfully recommended representatives as members of the Governor’s Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems.
In addition, the campus vice presidents for student affairs have met bi-monthly and are overseeing all campus activities. Chancellor Reed has provided more than $1 million for campus alcohol education, training, and prevention programs. All campuses have implemented Alcohol Advisory Councils.

In summary, the Office of the Chancellor and the twenty-three campuses continue to provide a campus atmosphere that contributes to the health and safety of its 407,000 students.

This report is the first biennial report on the implementation of the Trustees’ Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs.

Background

In November 2000, California State University Chancellor Charles B. Reed appointed a committee of presidents, students, vice presidents of student affairs, faculty, staff, and alumni to review the CSU’s alcohol policies and prevention programs following the alcohol-induced death of a student at California State University, Chico and incidents of alcohol poisoning at San Diego State University.

Alcohol abuse is not just a CSU problem. It is a national higher education problem. If higher education and campus leaders make the education and prevention of alcohol abuse a priority, a difference will be made in the lives of countless students.

The CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee, chaired by California State University, Fresno President John Welty, began its work in December 2000. Divided into six subcommittees, the members concentrated on broad policies that would be realistic and effective at CSU’s twenty-three unique campuses which range from a few predominantly residential institutions with a traditional 18-22 year-old student population, to the majority with large non-traditional, commuting students with an average age of 24.

The Board of Trustees approved a resolution at its July 10-11, 2001 meeting to adopt and implement the recommendations of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Final Report consistent with the individual missions of each campus and that a report be made to the Board of Trustees every two years assessing the outcomes of campus alcohol education and prevention programs. In addition, the resolution called for the Chancellor to report at that time on the success of obtaining external funding for system and campus programs.

As noted by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention of the U.S. Department of Education, the California State University has received favorable media attention due to the alcohol policy adopted in 2001 and the attraction of federal supplemental funds in
2002. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, widely read by academics across the country, ran a feature in May 2001 on the CSU’s examination of alcohol policies and recommendations to the Trustees for a comprehensive response, including partnerships with community interests.

As noted in the July 2001 report to the Board of Trustees, alcohol abuse is a threat to the health and academic success of CSU students, but prohibition of alcohol is not a realistic response to the problem. There is no single response to the issue that will solve the problem. Each campus should design programs that are appropriate for its institution, student population, and location. Additionally, the federal Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act of 1989 requires all colleges and universities receiving federal funds to maintain alcohol and other drug prevention programs and to review their effectiveness at least every two years.

With this understanding, the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee outlined the following guiding principles that were adopted by the Board of Trustees in July 2001:

*Guiding Principles*

- Provide a safe and secure environment for all students;
- Encourage student health and wellness in an environment supportive of learning;
- Promote healthy choices for students;
- Enforce laws and policies consistently as regards the use of alcohol;
- Support safe, legal, responsible, moderate consumption of alcohol for those who choose to drink; do not punish responsible, legal behavior;
- Encourage students to take responsibility for each other; Good Samaritan behavior should be supported and recognized, and students should be supplied with the tools to help others practice safe and responsible behavior;
- Provide assistance, if appropriate, to those students who need support, treatment, and services;
- Involve students in all steps of the process and program development;
- Focus alcohol abuse prevention efforts on campus and community environments since the university is part of the surrounding community that influences students’ behavior; and
• Use social norms principles and peer education as core components of an education and prevention program. (The Social Norms approach uses informational campaigns to correct widespread student misperception of peers’ drinking. Peer educator programs, such as the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network, use students to encourage their peers to develop responsible habits and attitudes regarding alcohol and related issues.)

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee divided its work into six areas: (1) Policies; (2) Enforcement and Legal Issues; (3) Education and Prevention Programs; (4) Training, Intervention and Treatment; (5) Assessment; and (6) Resources. Below are the committee’s recommendations adopted by the Board of Trustees that campuses and the CSU system are expected to follow to create and strengthen their alcohol-related policies and programs.

General Recommendations

1. The Chancellor should require campuses to develop comprehensive alcohol policies and programs that are consistent with each campus mission, have a commitment to holding individuals and student organizations accountable for their behavior and a commitment to offering effective education programs which are regularly assessed.

2. Each campus should actively apply its policies.

3. Each campus should communicate alcohol policies to new students and their parents before and when they arrive on campus.

4. Each campus should create a university-wide alcohol advisory council, including community membership, which annually develops and reviews programs and goals, assesses the effectiveness of the campus program, and makes recommendations to the president. These councils should be under the direction of the vice presidents for student affairs.

5. Each campus should gather data every two years to determine if its policies and programs are achieving the desired outcomes. Findings should be reported to the Chancellor and the Trustees.

6. The CSU should sponsor conferences in which campuses share best practices, policies and programs as well as feature state and national experts.

7. State laws should be reviewed by the campus alcohol advisory councils and recommendations made to trustees and presidents for any changes that can enhance and support campus policies.
8. The campuses and the CSU Office of the Chancellor should devote sufficient campus and system resources to ensure the effectiveness of programs and policies.

9. Partner with the community and law enforcement agencies to provide a safe off-campus environment, to enforce applicable legal sanctions, and to encourage legal and responsible behavior among students.

10. Develop effective training, intervention and treatment programs that will work on all campuses.

The following agenda item reports on the outcomes of campus alcohol education and prevention programs implemented in response to the Board of Trustees’ alcohol policies. Since campuses submitted biennial reports that followed the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act 1989 Amendments regulations, the overview of the campus information addressing the general recommendations of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee is provided in a format that identifies the general areas found in both the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act regulations and the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee’s final report.

**Role of Vice Presidents for Student Affairs**

The vice presidents for student affairs were charged with responsibility for developing and implementing campus alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs. In response to this charge, the vice presidents for student affairs appointed an Alcohol Policy Implementation Steering Committee consisting of the following representatives:

- Boice Bowman, Dominguez Hills
- Jim Kitchen, San Diego State University
- Francine Martinez, San Marcos
- Paul Moore, Chico
- Paul Oliaro, Fresno
- Monica Rascoe, San Jose
- Shirley Uplinger, Sacramento, chair
- Allison Jones, Chancellor’s Office

This steering committee has met bi-monthly since the summer 2001 and has provided guidance to campuses about effective policy implementation strategies.
Governor’s Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems

Governor Davis established in 2002 the Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems to coordinate California’s strategic efforts to reduce the inappropriate use of alcohol and other drugs. This high-level Council provides California with leadership continuity to advance alcohol and other drug prevention. The Council provides coordinated direction and actions to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention efforts that are delivered through a very broad range of disparate public and private sources attempting to address continually changing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug problems in various populations and settings. Activities include sharing prevention data, identifying effective approaches, establishing high-level prevention objectives, identifying means of working more efficiently with alcohol and other drug-related issues, and leveraging or redirecting opportunities to achieve objectives.

Key state agency staff have been appointed from the Office of the Attorney General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Alcohol Beverage Control, Department of Health Services, Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Office of Traffic Safety, the Office of the President of the University of California, and the Office of the Chancellor, California State University. Upon the recommendation of Chancellor Charles B. Reed, the Governor appointed Dr. Shirley Uplinger, Vice President for Student Affairs, CSU Sacramento, and Mr. Allison G. Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support, Chancellor’s Office to represent CSU on this council.

Memorandum of Understanding with Governor Davis’ Administration

CSU’s alcohol policy is being called the most comprehensive alcohol policy of any university system in the country. The policy is visionary and ambitious. In order for the CSU to be successful in its effort to address student alcohol abuse, collaboration and cooperation with others, including public agencies, is necessary.

In the first compact of its kind in California, a memorandum of understanding was signed on February 13, 2002 involving six state agencies and the CSU to address the problem of alcohol abuse among university students. Chancellor Charles B. Reed signed the MOU with Business, Transportation, and Housing (BT & H) Secretary Maria Contreras-Sweet. The MOU commits the CSU and the state agencies to fight alcohol abuse on and off university campuses. The state agencies include the Business, Transportation, & Housing Agency, Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP), California Highway Patrol (CHP), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), and the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS).
Governor Gray Davis and his administration recognize alcohol abuse by students is a statewide issue and has health and safety consequences for many local communities. The Davis’ Administration is committed to supporting the efforts of the CSU in addressing these problems and has various departmental resources with applicable backgrounds, knowledge, and skills to assist CSU implement its education and prevention programs.

At the signing ceremony, Chancellor Reed indicated that “Alcohol abuse on university campuses continues to threaten the health and academic success of students and has negative impacts on the campus and surrounding communities. This relationship with these state agencies definitely will make a difference in the lives of CSU students.” Secretary Contreras-Sweet, a member of Governor Davis’ Cabinet, added that “This partnership between CSU and the six state agencies will address the tragic consequences of high-risk drinking and the potential loss of life by students who have so much to offer society.”

The MOU creating the partnership between CSU and the six state agencies outlines seven steps toward reducing dangerous practices involving students and alcohol:

1. Work cooperatively to address the issue of student alcohol abuse and to share resources, as appropriate.
2. Jointly collect data that will help identify the scope and nature of the problems of the individual campuses, focus strategies, and address the issue of student alcohol abuse.
3. Support, provide resources, and participate in an Annual CSU Alcohol Issues Conference. The agencies of the State of California will provide speakers and/or workshop presenters, as appropriate.
4. Share information on grant funding opportunities and submit joint grant proposals, as appropriate.
5. Cooperate on a legislative agenda that addresses issues of alcohol education and alcohol abuse and its consequences.
6. Develop joint alcohol education, enforcement, training, and prevention programs for campus and community leaders. Such efforts are to include coordinated regional and statewide approaches.
7. Meet at least two times each calendar year to review the status, accomplishments, and future goals of the partnership.
Campus Biennial Reports

CSU campuses provided biennial reports assessing the outcomes of their alcohol policies and prevention programs. Campuses provided data that are associated with the biennial reviews that are required in the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act 1989 Amendments. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act regulations extend the scope of earlier federal legislation to require that, as a condition of receiving any funds under any federal program, an institution of higher education must certify that it has adopted and implemented a program to prevent the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of drugs, and the abuse of alcohol, by its students and employees.

Campuses used the “Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations Compliance Checklist” to help determine whether they are satisfying the minimum legal requirements of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act regulations. The reporting requirements found in Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act are very similar to most of the recommendations found in the CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Final Report. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act checklist includes (1) reporting on campus alcohol and drug prevention policy, (2) distribution of the policy, (3) description of campus programs, services and leadership, (4) development and consistent enforcement of sanctions, and (5) evaluation and assessment of the program’s effectiveness.

Funding

Chancellor’s Funding

The Chancellor provided $25,000 Challenge Grants to each campus for the 2001-02 academic year. Each campus was required to match this amount and to develop a plan to enhance existing activities. The reporting campuses indicated that the Challenge Grants are being used in a variety of ways. Some of the funding was used for programmatic activities and others used to fund training, intervention, and treatment programs. One campus utilized the funding to provide incoming students with a wellness and alcohol prevention journal that allowed students to monitor all aspects of the elements needed for healthy lifestyle. Other campuses used the funding for innovative programming activities and alcohol prevention workshops.

External Grants Received By CSU Campuses

In addition to the Chancellor’s Challenge Grants, several campuses applied for and received other grants to help support campus alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs. These grants are listed by campus on Attachment A.
Office of Traffic Safety Funding

The Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) funded eight CSU campuses totaling $769,322 over two years (2002-03 and 2003-04) for an alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement program known as the Sober Driver Initiative. Each campus seeking to participate was required to demonstrate that it had in place an Alcohol Advisory Council, prevention staff, peer education programs, and baseline data on alcohol use and alcohol-impaired driving among its students. In addition, campuses were required to certify that they were in compliance with all state of California DUI and ABC laws. Through an RFP process, the Vice Presidents of Student Affairs Alcohol Policy Implementation Steering Committee selected Chico, Fresno, Hayward, Long Beach, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Bernardino, and Sonoma to participate in this project effective October 1, 2002.

The project funded by OTS is designed to achieve the following goals:

1. To implement a coordinated DUI prevention program that includes the CSU, Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), and local law enforcement agencies as collaborative partners.

2. To reduce by five percent the incidence of alcohol abuse and impaired driving by CSU students on eight CSU campuses by correcting misperceptions about student alcohol consumption that will positively influence behavior through (a) social norms marketing campaigns, (b) peer education initiatives, and (c) Responsible Beverage Service training by September 30, 2004.

A social norms marketing campaign is aimed at correcting the misperceptions that students have about the level at which their peers drink alcohol. Providing students accurate information about campus norms related to alcohol use can reduce the amount of drinking by heavier drinkers while supporting the safer behaviors of moderate drinkers and nondrinkers.

3. To develop a model program which builds partnerships between CSU prevention programs and those of “feeder” high schools/agencies to combat alcohol abuse and alcohol-impaired driving by September 30, 2004.

While this grant is initially limited to eight CSU campuses, OTS may expand the program in subsequent years to other CSU campuses based upon the success of the first eight “pilot” campuses in achieving the project goals.
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control Funding

In addition, the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) will provide two, $360,000 grants totaling $720,000 to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses selected to receive OTS grants. While the OTS grant focuses on campus activities, the ABC grant addresses enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campuses, e.g., bars, restaurants, etc., working with the California Highway Patrol and local enforcement agencies. While a number of steps have been taken by all CSU campuses to address student alcohol abuse and alcohol-impaired driving, e.g., all CSUs have alcohol policies which restrict or prohibit access to alcohol on campus and at university-related functions, the majority of students’ drinking occurs off campus, in settings unrelated to the University. Therefore, ABC, at its expense, is conducting an environmental scan at all CSU campuses to determine if a drinking problem exists and if so, where (off-campus, Greeks, bars, restaurants, etc.).

Campus Alcohol and Drug Prevention Policies

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act recommend that campuses develop comprehensive written policies. These policies should be consistent with each campus mission, have a commitment to holding individuals and student organizations accountable for their behavior and a commitment to offering effective education programs which are regularly assessed. The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee provides further guidance by indicating that policies should include: (a) a succinct philosophical statement unique to each individual campus, (b) a summary of federal, state, and local laws, and (c) institutional regulations.

Each of the reporting campuses provided information regarding existing campus alcohol, drug, and tobacco policies. All campuses had policies in place. As necessary, existing policies for both employees and students were reviewed where applicable to ensure they met the recommendations of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee.

While most campuses indicated that minor changes were needed to existing policies, several recommended changes to include consequences and health risks associated with use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol. Many campuses also provided information about separate policies for student athletes, for housing, and residential life. Policies for student athletes tend to comply with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) guidelines. Housing and residential life policies vary from campus to campus. However, all policies adhere to federal, state, and local laws. Some campuses have a “dry hall policy” that prohibits alcoholic beverages in residence halls and many prohibit alcohol consumption in public spaces and restrict the type of consumption (i.e. no bulk alcohol containers).
Both the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act also recommend that local, state, and federal laws should be reviewed by the campus alcohol advisory councils and recommendations made to trustees and presidents for any changes that can enhance and support campus policies. In addition, the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee’s final report included recommendations for campuses to “develop appropriate institutional controls regarding alcohol beverage industry funding and sponsorship of institutional and student-sponsored events” and more specifically to adopt a policy that might state, “Alcoholic beverage trademarks or logos must be clearly subordinate to the sponsored event itself. Similarly, the name of an alcoholic-beverage manufacturer or product may not be connected to the name of the institutional event or facility, but may be promoted as a sponsor of the event.”

Several campuses indicated that advertising policies have been or will be put into place during the current biennium or the upcoming biennium. The advertising policies that were provided addressed the display of alcoholic beverage trademarks or logos in campus publications and promotional materials on campus. All campuses that included such policies regulated alcohol advertising in some way, while others prohibited it all together. One of the campuses made the review of alcohol promotion policies on campus one of their priorities in the biennium.

**Distribution of Policy**

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act recommend that each campus should communicate alcohol and drug prevention policies to students and employees. This should include communication with new students and their parents before and when they arrive on campus. Campuses are encouraged to post all alcohol and drug prevention policies on their websites. This should also include the CSU electronic admissions website, CSUMentor, so that alcohol policy information would be available about each CSU campus to all prospective students. Campuses should designate representative(s) who are charged with ensuring that all students, faculty, staff, and administrators receive Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act policy information. In addition, students should be made aware of the risks associated with illegal and irresponsible consumption of alcohol.

Campuses provided information about the distribution methods of its alcohol and drug prevention policies as recommended by Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Campuses distributed these policies to students through print media such as their academic catalog, student life and residential life handbooks, and class schedule. In addition, many campuses indicated that the policies are available on their website and some provide information in their admission materials. These campus alcohol policy
websites are linked to CSUMentor and additional campus alcohol policy websites will be linked as they become available on the campus website. Some campuses also sent information about their policies directly to students and employees. All campuses indicated that they provide additional information in compliance with the Jeanne Clery Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. Each campus also indicated that there is a designee assigned to review the distribution of the policies.

Sanctions and Enforcement

Campuses indicated that they are actively applying policies through campus judiciary procedures and enforcing federal, state, and local laws. Campus rules and local laws and regulations are also provided in the information that is distributed to students and employees regarding alcohol and drug prevention. Most campuses referenced information provided in the Clery Act and indicated that they are satisfied with the current enforcement of the alcohol and drug policies. Several campuses have also indicated that they have established a strong working relationship with the local Alcohol and Beverage Control regional offices and local law enforcement agencies to ensure enforcement of all serving and sales laws in the community. Most campuses also provide educational disciplinary action that is intended to be constructive in encouraging a safe campus environment.

Programs, Services and Leadership

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommends that each campus create a university-wide alcohol advisory council, including community membership, which annually develops and reviews programs and goals, assesses the effectiveness of the campus program, and makes recommendations to the president. These councils should be under the direction of the vice presidents for student affairs.

Alcohol Advisory Councils

All campuses provided information about their university-wide councils and/or committees that were formed to address alcohol and drug policies and prevention programs on the individual campus. These advisory groups typically include the members of the campus and local community as recommended by Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. Through the work of these advisory bodies, campuses have been able to coordinate efforts across departments, share educational resources on alcohol and drug issues, connect with off-campus service providers and community agencies, insure compliance with federal, state, and local laws, discuss and review policy, establish normative behavior and expectations of the campus, and reinforce the importance of high quality, consistent alcohol and drug education programs across their campus.
In compliance with the recommendations of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee, many campus advisory groups have partnered with community and law enforcement agencies to provide a safe off-campus environment, to enforce applicable legal sanctions, and to encourage legal and responsible behavior among students. Several campuses indicated that this partnership has helped address the problems of excessive and/or illegal use of alcohol at off-campus venues. This includes the training of off-campus servers about campus alcohol policies, banning of glass bottles at community events, assisting in providing a safe environment for off-campus Greek housing, reducing off-campus alcohol advertising and promotion, and stricter enforcement of underage drinking violations at off-campus businesses.

The CSU Chancellor’s Office developed and implemented a CSU listserv of the chairs of each campus’ alcohol advisory council that allows them to share information.

**Innovative Programs**

Several campuses provided information about the development of innovative and safe late-night and weekend programming alternatives on campus for students. These include activities such as the following:

- Development of student presentation “Survivor: How Not To Become The Weakest Link.” The campus Alcohol and Drug Education Committee wanted to provide students with an interactive program that follows the format of the popular television shows Survivor and The Weakest Link. The program has been very popular.
- Several campuses created programming using Fatal Alcohol Goggles which simulate what alcohol can do to a person at levels above the legal limit.
- Several campuses provided alternative “Safe Spring Break” programming.
- One campus implemented a weeklong “OKSOBERFEST” designed to support students who choose not to drink, promote drinking safety for those who do drink and are of legal age, and to show that there are nonalcoholic ways to have fun.
- 21st Birthday Card Campaign where students receive cards just prior to their 21st birthday encouraging them to celebrate safely.
- Friday Night Challenge, where students presented a program idea that is alcohol free.
- One campus provided incoming students with a wellness and alcohol prevention journal that allowed students to monitor all aspects of the elements needed for healthy lifestyle.
• Several campuses sponsor alcohol and drug education or wellness centers with the purpose of providing additional support for students and employees in preventing substance abuse.

In addition to these late night and evening programs, the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention of the U.S. Department of Education cited the following programs as exemplary in its January 27, 2003 report (see section on Evaluation and Assessment):

• Using a portion of student health service fees for prevention programs;
• Publishing a good neighbor relations encouragement article in both campus and city daily newspapers;
• Engaging ABC licensing hearings to impose health and safety conditions on nearby alcohol licenses;
• Engaging alcohol retailers in ongoing dialogue to promote sales and service practices (e.g., less reliance on low drinking prices as a marketing ploy to students) on a voluntary basis;
• Encouraging adoption of responsible beverage service practices by bars and restaurants on campus and in the surrounding community;
• Establishing community-collegiate alcohol prevention partnerships that encompass wide participation from representatives of other area institutions of higher education;
• Establishing new working relationships between campuses, municipal law enforcement, and ABC;
• Reducing the number of alcohol related items sold in the campus bookstores (shot glasses and beer tankards, often super sized, bearing the seal of the university, may contribute to the myth that drinking alcohol in larger quantities is an indispensable part of the college experience); and
• Modifying policies at football games to control tailgating and use of alcohol in the stadium thus resulting in a decline in alcohol related problems, e.g., moving the last call for alcohol sales from the end of the third quarter to half time.

In addition to these alternative programming activities, a few campuses provided information on awards and other incentive programs to encourage student organizations and athletic programs to utilize other funding sources and positive promotional campaigns for events that are not alcohol related.
Many campuses included information on how alcohol and drug prevention information has been incorporated into the curriculum. This included a listing of courses that provide students with valuable information on alcohol and drug abuse and prevention.

**Effective Campus-Initiated Programs**

Campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in a positive way. A description of each campus’ single, most effective program is provided on Attachment B.

**CSU Alcohol Education and Prevention Conferences**

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommended that CSU sponsor conferences in which campuses share best practices, policies, and programs as well as feature state and national experts and support attendance at national and regional conferences. In response to this recommendation, CSU held its inaugural Alcohol Education Conference on Friday, April 12, 2002, at the Los Angeles Airport Crowne Plaza Hotel. The conference was designed to offer a variety of speakers and presentations that would further the work of campus alcohol advisory councils by helping them to make meaningful progress in the development of campus alcohol policies, programs, and procedures. Campus alcohol policy committees shared their programmatic successes and insights. Several campuses also supported the attendance by advisory group members at the National Social Norms Conference, National Conference on Alcohol, Drug Use and Abuse in Higher Education, Department of Education’s Alcohol Conference, and several other regional conferences. Participants on panels included not only CSU campus representatives but also representatives of the Alcohol Beverage Control and Alcohol and Drug Programs. Chancellor Charles B. Reed was the keynote speaker, and Kathryn P. Jett, Director of the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the featured luncheon speaker, spoke about building collaborative partnerships.

The second annual CSU Alcohol Education Conference occurred on April 24-25, 2003 at the Hilton Arden West Hotel in Sacramento. The conference provided an opportunity for campuses to share information, best practices, policies, and programs that promote responsible alcohol use and abuse prevention. Program sessions addressed enforcement, legal issues, education and prevention programs, training, intervention, treatment, assessment, and resource development. The keynote address was given by Wesley Perkins, author and leading authority on social norms.
Training, Intervention, and Treatment

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommended that CSU develop effective training, intervention, and treatment programs that will work on all campuses. Campuses provided information that addressed the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommendation. Most indicated that substantial training is provided to a variety of departments, advisors, and student officers. Several campuses provided information regarding staff training for residence hall directors and advisors. Most campus’ Student Health Centers also provided additional training, intervention, and treatment programs for students and employees. There were many references to active alcohol abuse and drug prevention education programs, and many campuses conduct health fairs that address alcohol and drug abuse issues. Several campuses provide information about specific intervention and treatment programs and identify training and orientation programs for organization advisors and student officers. A few campuses provide on-line intervention programs including variants of self-testing programs like the one offered as part of the National Alcohol Screening Day. One campus provided information regarding Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings that were being conducted on campus.

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommended that campuses adopt, at a minimum, a level one (basic) training program, which includes a campus-wide understanding of alcohol-related behaviors, new student and parent orientation sessions, and social norms training for selected campus officials. Most campuses provide information about this training during new student orientation programs. The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee also recommended that campuses develop and implement level two and three training programs if the campus assessment process determines that there are significant numbers of higher-risk students groups (for example, Greeks, athletes, and large residential populations) for which training should mandated. Faculty and community resources should be involved at these levels. Only one campus provided information regarding training programs at these levels.

Evaluation and Assessment

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee recommendations and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act require that each campus gather data every two years to determine if its policies and programs are achieving the desired outcomes. All campuses indicated that they are providing information regarding alcohol and drug abuse and violations through the required annual Clery Act Information. In addition to the information provided through the Clery Act reports, many campuses administered the “Core Alcohol and Drug Survey” which was developed to measure alcohol and other drug usage, attitudes, and perceptions among college students at two and four-year institutions. Development of this survey was funded by the U.S. Department of Education and the survey includes several types of items about drugs and alcohol. One campus also administered the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol survey. In
addition to these evaluations and assessments, many campuses also conduct campus surveys through their student health centers and also collect statistics from external agencies such as the Alcohol and Beverage Control. Many campuses indicated that the information collected through these survey instruments will be used in the development social norms campaigns.

**Measurable Outcomes**

Campuses that conducted an assessment in spring 2002 to establish baseline data are just completing a spring 2003 assessment. Therefore, campuses are in the process of analyzing the results of the survey data to determine the extent to which campus alcohol policies have impacted alcohol-related student behaviors. Therefore, while campuses report a trend toward less alcohol use by students and a reduction in alcohol-related incidents, the following campus findings must be viewed only as initial, preliminary findings.

- A five to ten percent reduction in alcohol use measured by the decline in the median number of drinks consumed per week;
- A ten to fifteen percent reduction in student alcohol-related misconduct;
- A five to ten percent reduction in underage students consuming alcohol in a thirty-day period;
- A three to five percent reduction in binge drinking;
- A twenty to twenty-five percent decline in the number of alcohol-related judicial cases;
- A thirty percent reduction in the number of residential halls alcohol-related incidents;
- A twenty to thirty percent reduction in DUI; and
- A three to five percent reduction in property damage caused by excessive drinking.

These initial, preliminary findings are encouraging and suggest that campus alcohol policies developed in response to the CSU Board of Trustees’ alcohol policy are resulting in a reduction in alcohol-related student behaviors. More specific, detailed data will be provided in the second biennial report.

**California Alcohol Issues Partnership (CAIP)**

The Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) entered into an interagency agreement with the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention of the U.S. Department of Education to
conduct an assessment of campus practices as well as campus and community prevention experiences. This information was collected from copies of campus biennial Federal Drug Free Schools and Communities Act report and a survey provided by the Higher Education Center. The information from this report will be used to begin an assessment to help CSU to establish baseline data as part of CSU’s grant agreement with the Office of Traffic Safety.

The Center analyzed the reports in December 2002 and issued its findings and recommendations on January 27, 2003. The following section summarizes the Center’s key findings and their implication.

**Key Assessment Findings and Implications**

1. The CSU system consists of different types of campuses. The following disparities regarding variables often associated with alcohol-related problems in national studies prompt differential responses among the 23 campuses.
   - On-campus undergraduate residence ranges between 0 and 59 percent (for first year students, between 0 and 95 percent),
   - The mean age systemwide is 24 and at one campus 32, hence the majority of CSU students are of legal drinking age.
   - The percentage of male students ranges between 30 and 55 percent.
   - Greek participation ranges from 0 to 13 percent.

2. Where can drinking alcohol lead to problems?
   - Motor vehicles. Between 14 and 24 percent of students reported drinking in cars. Possession of an open container of alcoholic beverages in a motor vehicle in a public place is a violation of California law. Most CSU campuses overwhelmingly serve commuters, with 13 of the reporting campuses indicating commuters at 80 percent or higher, hence traffic safety is of even more significance.
   - Living quarters. The most frequently identified drinking location was “where I live” (57 percent).
   - Licensed premises. The next most likely venue for alcohol consumption is the category, “bars and restaurants” (48 percent). Licensed establishments, e.g., bars and restaurants, are frequently cited as a drinking venue by alcohol impaired drivers. Responsible beverage service and enforcement of underage/intoxicated patron laws are strategies for reducing risks associated with sale and service of alcoholic beverages in licensed premises. The enhanced activities envisioned by ABC for the eight demonstration
communities (Chico, Fresno, Hayward, Long Beach, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Bernardino, and Sonoma) should provide opportunities for such technologies as ASIPS (Alcohol/drug Sensitive Information Planning System developed by Friedner Wittman and colleagues at UC Berkeley) and last-drink surveys that can further elaborate on drinking venues that disproportionately contribute to problem levels.

3. Local partnerships. Over half of reporting campuses indicated participation in campus-community partnerships; virtually all reporting campuses identified their county alcohol and drug program administrator and California ABC district administrator.

4. National affinity. The overwhelming majority of CSU campuses are members of the national association, The Network: Colleges and Universities Committed to Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention. Typically, Network member campuses have ready access to information resources from the U.S. Department of Education and its Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.


6. State Incentive Grants (SIG). The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs will receive additional Federal prevention funds (from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) for subvention to the counties and will ask that counties deploy the funds to encourage development of campus community partnerships in those locations where colleges and universities are situated.

7. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) promising practices.

- Transportation alternatives. At least two campuses support “safe rides” programs. The NIAAA Call to Action cites “safe rides,” i.e., alternatives to impaired driving, as a promising strategy for alcohol problem prevention in the general community.

- Parents. Four campuses specifically identified communication with parents of incoming students as one of their prevention tools. NIAAA cites parental communication as a promising strategy.

- Positive options. Six campuses included descriptions of campus-based policies to reduce high-risk use (e.g., class scheduling and increasing alcohol-free social and recreational options), another NIAAA promising strategy.
Social norms marketing. Nine campuses have adopted social norms marketing campaigns, or plan to do so. While research is still underway regarding the efficacy of social norms marketing as a prevention tool, the experience from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation ten campus demonstration program suggests that such activities are best coupled with other environmental prevention strategies focused on specific problem indicators.

Alcohol promotions. At least four campuses are working with alcohol retailers to restrain price discount advertising to students.

Responsible beverage service. Five campuses are supporting training for managers and staff at campus and community alcohol outlets. At least nine of the campuses have licensed premises on-campus for sale of alcoholic beverages to students, faculty, staff, and visitors of legal age. With the exception of sports venues (One campus has curtailed second half alcohol sales in its football stadium and another has increased controls on tailgating), the campuses do not identify these premises (pubs, cafeterias, and membership clubs) as problematic. Indeed, on-campus alcohol outlets can be models of responsible beverage service and integration of alcohol sales and services within environments offering social and recreational options, inclusive of food service, to patrons.

Two campuses are adopting personal drinking assessment programs that provide norms clarification and motivational enhancement (e.g., Check Up to Go and its online variant, E-CHUG, as developed by researchers at San Diego State University) that shows promise in mediating higher risk drinking behaviors.

8. Other elements

Targeted populations. Reflecting national study findings, many CSU campuses have put into place prevention initiatives directed to Greeks, first year students, and residential students.

Service. One-third of CSU students reported being a volunteer on a regular basis. Leisure time options are associated with reduced levels of alcohol consumption in national studies.

The Center provided a few recommendations such as sustaining and strengthening relationships with county health officials and common reporting elements that will be evaluated by the Vice Presidents for Student Affairs Alcohol Policy Implementation Committee in consultation with campuses.
Conclusion

The 23-campus CSU system is making great strides in renewing commitments and establishing partnerships to promote safe, healthy, and learning-conducive environments. Already the alcohol policy adopted by the Trustees in 2001 is yielding results in the form of greater campus attention, additional resources from state and Federal governments, and reported progress in reducing alcohol-related problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>AAA Drinking and Driving Prevention Award</td>
<td>To recognize programs and activities at colleges for their efforts to prevent or reduce drinking and driving problems on campus and prevent or control the campus’s alcohol use which can result in impaired driving.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education’s National Conference on Alcohol and Other Drugs in Higher Education</td>
<td>Stipend to present campus program at the U.S. Department of Education’s National Conference on Alcohol and Other Drugs in Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>$55,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>No direct funding to the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education (2-year) Grant to assess the high risk drinking among first-year university students</td>
<td>To assess the high risk drinking among first-year university students.</td>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>$279,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Social Norms Resource Center at Northern Illinois Grant</td>
<td>To conduct social norms marketing education.</td>
<td>3-year grant</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>$55,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Grant Description</td>
<td>Funding Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative– Program Grant Administrator on behalf of the CSU.</td>
<td>CSU Fresno is the Grant Administrator for the OTS Sober Driver Initiative for the CSU.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct funding to the campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$203,479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>To fund a social norms marketing research project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County Health Care Agency Tobacco Grant</td>
<td>1999 – 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct funding to the campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>NCAA Alcohol Education Grant</td>
<td>To target alcohol education and alcohol abuse connected with athletics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with the Arcata City Police in its alcohol enforcement program.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Funding Agency</td>
<td>Use of Funds</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To support the expenses associated with participating in the National Alcohol Screening Day.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$54,995

No direct funding to the campus.

$55,849

No direct funding to the campus.

$325

$60,872
## GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT 2001-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grant Description</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the eight campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>No direct funding to the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Sky Conference Speakers Grant</td>
<td>To pay for a portion of presentation “DUI: A Powerful Lesson” by Mark Stemer attended by 800 students.</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCAA Speakers Grant</td>
<td>To pay for a portion of presentation “Sex Under the Influence” by Joel Goldman attended by 350 students.</td>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Help: Sacramento Mobilizing Against Substance Abuse</td>
<td>To pay for 21st Birthday Card Campaign design, printing, and distribution.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chevy’s Restaurant</td>
<td>To establish the Jesse Snow Memorial Fund to be utilized for the Safe Rides Program, non-alcoholic social events, and education/prevention efforts.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>$55,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with campuses receiving the Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>No direct funding to the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education Collegiate-Community Alcohol Prevention Partnership (C-CAPP)</td>
<td>To support the university-community coalition with the goal of reducing student DUIs and minor-in-possession offenses through increased enforcement.</td>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT 2001-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Diego (continued from previous page)</th>
<th>Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) Grant to support the C-CAPP.</th>
<th>To support the C-CAPP program and the use of science-based approaches to identify and reduce alcohol-related problems. To reduce heavy episodic drinking among SDSU students.</th>
<th>2002-04</th>
<th>$91,000 annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) Safe-Ride Program</td>
<td>To test the efficacy of safe ride programs for reducing college student DUIs.</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Beer Distributors Safe-Ride Program</td>
<td>To support safe-ride operations to reduce unsafe driving.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change Company</td>
<td>To fund the Pilot of Choices education program which uses materials provided to test the effects of harm reduction education program.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Materials and in-kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MADD, foundation, and private donors</td>
<td>To fund the Student-2-Student program, a support peer education and activism to prevent DUI.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-2-Student Program</td>
<td>To support the C-CAPP: Model Program which disseminates the C-CAPP intervention model.</td>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>To fund the ASPIRE program with the goal of reducing heavy episodic drinking and alcohol-related violations and problems.</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aztec Parents</td>
<td>To support alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement.</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Student Affairs Lottery Professional Development Grant</td>
<td>To support alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs Lottery Professional Development Grant</td>
<td>To support alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement.</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$1,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES
### TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT
#### 2001-03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Grant Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>CSAA College and University Impaired Driving Prevention Grant</td>
<td>To fund efforts to prevent or reduce the campus’s drinking and driving problems.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AlcoholEdu Grant Study</td>
<td>To evaluate the efficacy of AlcoholEdu on freshmen.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>NCAA Grant</td>
<td>To fund an athletics alcohol-prevention and education program</td>
<td>1998-2003</td>
<td>$500 annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Wal-Mart Foundation</td>
<td>To fund alcohol education program.</td>
<td>2000-03</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Inland Community Prevention Program (NICPP)</td>
<td>To support campus alcohol promotion intervention and environmental management strategies utilized by the campus.</td>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>$43,000 in direct services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Hospitality Coalition (RHC)</td>
<td>To support campus environmental strategies such as bar assessments and last drink survey results.</td>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>$8,000 in direct services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Office of Traffic Safety Sober Driver Initiative</td>
<td>To assist the campus to use social norms marketing to reduce among its students the incidence and prevalence of alcohol abuse and other traffic safety issues that are alcohol related.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>$55,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABC Grant provided to local law enforcement agencies to partner with the campuses receiving OTS Grant.</td>
<td>To fund enforcement, prevention, and education in the communities surrounding the campus, e.g., bars, restaurants and off-sale outlets.</td>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>No direct funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol and Drug Prevention Technical Assistance Project funded by Alcohol and Drug Programs</td>
<td>To provide technical assistance in developing a strategic plan for the campus Alcohol and Drug Advisory Council</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>NCAA Speakers Grant</td>
<td>To pay for a portion of conference presentation.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California State University campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in a positive way. The following table reflects campuses’ responses to this question. Please note that campuses initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>How Student Behavior Influenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Oksoberfest Program</td>
<td>This program was sponsored during the National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness week of October 21-25, 2002. The weeklong event was developed to support students who choose not to drink, promote drinking safety for those who do drink and are of legal age, and to show that there are nonalcoholic ways to have fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>Opened to students Fall 2002.</td>
<td>The campus alcohol policy has been in effect for 2002-03, the first year this new campus enrolled students. Data about the effect of the campus alcohol policy will be provided in the next biennial report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>“Did you Know”</td>
<td>This social norms marketing campaign was part of the Alcohol Poisoning Campaign which trained resident assistants, sports clubs, first-time freshmen, student organizations, and clubs on campus to recognize the signs and symptoms of alcohol poisoning and what to do in a crisis situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>Use of Fatal Vision Goggles</td>
<td>Fatal Vision Goggles simulate various levels of intoxication. Working with the campus police, Dominguez Hills has simulated a Sobriety Check Point at its Health Fairs and on its “Vendor Walkway.” Students are asked to put on the goggles and then the officers conduct a field sobriety check. The police speak to the students about the risks involved in drinking and driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Campus-Community Alcohol Advisory Council</td>
<td>This campus-community coalition has created much greater collaboration and cooperation with local education and law enforcement agencies to address issues related to excessive drinking and student alcohol abuse on and near the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California State University campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in a positive way. The following table reflects campus responses to this question. Please note that campuses initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>Partnership between CSU Fullerton and community agencies Community Service Programs and Project PATH North. These agencies, which are funded through state grants and contracts, work closely with the campus offices of Greek Life, Residence Life, New Student Orientation, Campus Dining, and the Alcohol and Other Drug Advisory Committee. The community agencies have provided a number of programs, including an alcohol education presentation for students in residence halls, responsible Alcohol Service Training for the campus catering and food service departments, assistance with the Student Health and Counseling Center alcohol education events, provided a “club drugs” presentation to the fraternity system, and will be working with the New Student Orientation Program in developing educational components for the summer 2003 orientation programs for new students and their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Alcohol Advisory Council The Alcohol Advisory Council developed an Alcohol and Other Drug policy. Working subcommittees implemented alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs through campuswide policy dissemination, staff training, and social norms campaigns. As an example, the campus will have discussed alcohol issues with all student athletes, parents of incoming students during orientation, and all new incoming students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Social Norms Survey The campus conducted a survey of its students using a national standardized instrument and utilized the survey results to initiate a campuswide social norming campaign to modify behavior by providing students accurate information about their peers’ alcohol and drug use. This education minimizes peer pressure and misperception about the level of alcohol consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs Peer Education Program This program enhances alcohol and drug prevention and peer education programs on campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California State University campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in positive way. The following table reflects campus’ responses to this question. Please note that campuses initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Alcohol Education Programming</td>
<td>Alcohol education and prevention programs addressed responsible alcohol behavior with new members of fraternities, sororities, and athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>Alcohol-EDU Interactive Program</td>
<td>The Alcohol-EDU Program is an interactive, on-line alcohol education program which all freshmen are required to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Alcohol Poisoning Educational Programs</td>
<td>The reduction in the number of alcohol-related conduct incidents for on-campus residents is attributed to a two-pronged approach of increased educational programs and increased enforcement by both the campus police and residential life staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>Social Norms Campaign with fraternities</td>
<td>A social norms campaign was implemented with social fraternities. The core message of the campaign was “0-4 What does it mean to you?” A website <a href="http://www.zerotofour.com">www.zerotofour.com</a> was created which provides extensive information about alcohol. 1,500 men and women participated in a multifaceted prevention campaign that targeted risk reduction behaviors. The intervention included a dynamic website comprised of a knowledge assessment, resources and safety tips for responsible alcohol use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>BACCHUS GAMMA General Assembly</td>
<td>Students and staff attended and participated in the BACCHUS GAMMA General Assembly during November 2002. This resulted in Greek leadership implementing policy changes requiring a representative to GAMMA from each Greek organization and establishment of social norms marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Sale of alcohol at football stadium</td>
<td>The change in the sale of alcohol at the campus football stadium was reported as the most dramatic example of an environmental change that has positively affected student behavior. Alcohol-related problems have been minimized at football games.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California State University campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in a positive way. The following table reflects campus’ responses to this question. Please note that campuses initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Alcohol-Free Events</td>
<td>The campus sponsors and/or funds alcohol-free events on Friday nights. More than 300 students typically attend these alcohol-free events. The campus reports that students who help plan these events become more sensitive to alcohol and alcohol-related issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>ASPIRE</td>
<td>ASPIRE is an individualized intervention program for students who violate the campus alcohol policies. The program is designed to reduce heavy episodic drinking and alcohol-related violations and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Athletic Alcohol Prevention Team</td>
<td>Campus staff meet individually with each member of all athletic teams. Female and male members of the campus prevention team work with the women’s and men’s teams respectively because college-age women and men use alcohol for different reasons. The campus uses a model that acknowledges the gender differences in alcohol use patterns and the etiology of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Springing into Spring Break</td>
<td>This week of activities before spring break was attended by over 300 students. The week began with an event in which breakfast treats were passed out with campus social norming messages on beverage napkins. The events held throughout the week included a Health Survival Skills workshop on the effects of alcohol and how to reduce risk and harm, use of fatal vision goggles to demonstrate the effect of alcohol on motor coordination, vision, and judgment, and workshops on the physical effects of alcohol use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Increased enforcement in residence halls</td>
<td>The campus Housing and Residential Life Office increased enforcement of alcohol and drug policies in the residence halls. Alcohol is not permitted in residence halls. Residence hall alcohol policy violations have decreased over fifty percent within one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED  
ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
2001-03

California State University campuses were asked to identify their single, most effective program initiated in response to the CSU Board of Trustees alcohol policy that has affected student behavior in positive way. The following table reflects campus’ responses to this question. Please note that campuses initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>Addressing alcohol promotion on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like most campuses, San Marcos is the target and recipient of hundreds of flyers and promotional materials on a regular basis from local bars and promoters advertising for night spots through the county. These ads, when examined closely, not only promote alcohol use in general, but often promote “lax security” and “18-year-olds welcome.” In response to these advertising and promotional activities, the campus developed a process to enforce its posting policy in such a way as to reduce the numbers of alcohol-related ads and flyers, and it developed community partnerships with local organizations and law enforcement to pressure local alcohol license owners and promoters not to promote on the San Marcos campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Limitations placed on alcohol sales license for a convenience store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The campus was successful in placing limitations on the alcohol sales license for a convenience store to be built directly across the street from the campus and its 2,450 students who reside on campus. At the request of the campus, the regional ABC office conducted an investigation of the proposed license, and a number of conditions were placed on the convenience store’s license, e.g., banning alcohol sales after 10:00 p.m., limitations on the type of alcohol, and the size of containers that may be sold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Late Night Stanislaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Night Stanislaus provides students the opportunity to find activities on campus that are fun and safe during hours that are typically dedicated to less productive activities such as student drinking. Offered Friday nights from 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m., the program provides students the opportunity to participate in activities from basketball to dances to comedy nights. Food and non-alcoholic beverages are served free of charge to students throughout the night.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revision to Title 5: Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs

Presentation By

David S. Spence
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Summary

Recent interest in the State Legislature has motivated a review of teacher preparation programs that integrate or blend the content of a baccalaureate degree with the pedagogic preparation for teaching in a single program that can be completed in four to four and one-half years. This item will present revisions to Title 5 that will establish guidelines for the development of integrated teacher preparation programs in the CSU.

Draft Resolution

The following resolution may be considered for adoption at the September meeting:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Subchapter 2 of Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

Article 8. Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs

§ 40520. Definition

The term “integrated teacher preparation program” means a curriculum (a) that incorporates general education, a major, subject-matter preparation for teaching in elementary and/or secondary schools, professional preparation for teaching in elementary and/or secondary schools, and any other graduation requirements, and (b) in which students make progress concurrently toward a baccalaureate degree and a recommendation for a preliminary basic teaching credential, given satisfactory completion of the requirements for each. The components of an integrated teacher preparation program (i.e., general education, a major, subject-matter preparation for teaching in elementary and/or secondary schools, professional preparation for teaching in elementary and/or secondary schools, and
any other graduation requirements) need not be mutually exclusive. An individual course within an integrated teacher preparation program may contribute to completion of more than one of these components.

§ 40521. Total Unit Requirements

For completion of an integrated teacher preparation program, at least 120 semester units but no more than 135 semester units shall be required. The Chancellor may grant exceptions to the upper limit of 135 units on requirements for completion of an integrated teacher preparation program if the campus that will offer the program requests the exception and provides an adequate justification. Procedures for requesting, reviewing, and granting these exceptions shall be developed by the Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University.

§ 40522. Guidelines for Establishment of Campus Requirements

The Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University, shall establish guidelines for the identification and integration of lower-division and upper-division general education, subject-matter preparation, and professional preparation in integrated teacher preparation programs. The guidelines may include recommendations for unit requirements for each of these components. The consultation shall include California State University faculty members and administrators from campus academic units providing programs of professional preparation approved by the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing and from campus academic units providing programs of subject-matter preparation approved by the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing. The consultation shall also include the California Community Colleges.

§ 40523. Articulation with California Community Colleges

For students admitted to integrated teacher preparation programs, units earned in community college courses that are articulated with courses fulfilling integrated teacher preparation program requirements shall not be subject to the limitation imposed by subsection (b) of section 40409.

And, be it further

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

**RESOLVED.** That the Board of Trustees delegates to the chancellor of the California State University authority to further adopt, amend, or repeal this revision if the further adoption, amendment, or repeal is required and is non-substantial or solely grammatical in nature, or sufficiently related to the original text that the public was adequately placed on notice that the change could result from the originally proposed regulatory action.
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Notable Accomplishments in California State University Teaching, Research and Scholarship: The Desert Studies Center, Zzyzx, California
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Summary

The Soda Springs Desert Studies Center, in the Mojave National Preserve at Zzyzx, California, 11 miles southwest of Baker, California on I-15, is a modern field station of twelve buildings, overseen by a consortium of campuses in the California State University system. The Center provides opportunities for students and scholars to receive instruction, conduct research, and experience the desert environment. The Center manages 1,280 acres under a long-term management agreement with the National Park Service.

As the gateway to the entire Mojave National Preserve and Death Valley National Park, the Desert Studies Center provides easy access to fossil sites, the remains of Indian villages, historic wagon trails, old army forts, mining sites, and the salt flats of Silurian and Soda Dry Lakes. The Center contains the habitat of the Mojave Tui Chub, a federally registered endangered species of fish.

The Desert Studies Center can accommodate 70 researchers and students in dormitory style rooms. There is also a multi-station kitchen, bathhouse, laboratory, computer lab with satellite access, two classrooms, a library, and long-term researcher's quarters. The Center offers a variety of short-term courses on desert-related topics and field-oriented courses in anthropology, archaeology, art, astronomy, biology, geography, geology, history and physics.

Background

In 1974, Dr. Dalton Harrington, Department of Biology, California State University, San Bernardino proposed the concept of a Desert Studies Center at Zzyzx, California, in the East Mojave. In 1976, the Bureau of Land Management signed a cooperative management agreement with the California State University Desert Studies Consortium to manage 1,280 acres at Soda Springs in the east Mojave Desert. The Consortium includes the California State University campuses of Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Northridge,
Pomona, and San Bernardino. The Consortium established the operating structure for the education and research facility at Soda Springs and renamed the structures the Desert Studies Center.

The primary purpose of the California Desert Studies Consortium (CDSC) is to encourage the understanding of, and appreciation for, the California deserts by developing student academic skills and public awareness through a desert studies program. "Desert studies" is used as a general term, which includes those aspects of biology, ecology, meteorology, geology, archaeology, anthropology, geography, history, and other disciplines related to the study of the California deserts.

The administrative campus of the Consortium from 1976 - 1978 was California State University, San Bernardino. Beginning in 1978, California State University, Fullerton became the administrative campus and the home of the Desert Studies program. Each campus of the Consortium provides a faculty and administrative representative to a Board of Governors to oversee the management of the Desert Studies Center. Operating and equipment budget began as a $2,000 contribution from each of the seven campuses in 1976 to an O&E budget of $165,000 in 2002.

The four Directors of the Consortium have each contributed in a unique way to the establishment of the Center as we see it today. The first Director, Dr. Dalton Harrington, California State University, San Bernardino (1976 – 1978) was responsible for the initial stages and preparation of buildings for refurbishing and upgrading as dormitories. In 1978, Dr. Lon McClanahan, California State University, Fullerton became the second Director of the Consortium, and the administrative office of the Consortium was moved to CSU, Fullerton. In his tenure, Dr. McClanahan continued to emphasize improvements of the physical structures at the Center. When Dr. Gerry Scherba became the third Director of the Consortium in 1985, he emphasized the educational aspects of the Center and developed an extensive continuing education program through the Office of Extended Learning, California State University, San Bernardino.

With the retirement of Dr. Sherba in 1991, Dr. William Presch, California State University, Fullerton was appointed Director. The efforts initiated by past Directors were continued. Additional buildings were constructed, and the extended education program was expanded. Desert Studies administered 145 extended education classes through California State University, San Bernardino involving 4,800 students (1992-2002). A Desert Studies Consortium Publication Number Series was started. Today, 89 publications are listed in the series. The Judith A. Presch Desert Research Scholarship Endowment fund, supporting undergraduate and graduate students working in the Mojave Desert, was established in 1994. The Consortium published its first book: "ZZYZX: History of an Oasis" by Anne Duffield-Stoll and edited by Dr. William Presch. To enhance both the education and research activities, the use of the Internet through satellite access
has been established and also a World Wide Web Page for the California Desert Studies Consortium (http://biology.fullerton.edu/facilities/dsc/zzyzx.html).

As a self-contained community, the Desert Studies Center enters the 21st century as the premiere field station in the east Mojave Desert.