

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 3:15 p.m., Tuesday, July 17, 2012
Dumke Auditorium

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Peter G. Mehas, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Bernadette Cheyne
Kenneth Fong
Margaret Fortune
Steven M. Glazer
William Hauck
Lou Monville
Jillian Ruddell
Glen O. Toney

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 8, 2012

Discussion

1. Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements, Residence Requirements, and Special Sessions Credit, *Action*
2. Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs, *Action*
3. Career Technical Education (CTE): Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for California State University Admission; Recommendation to Amend Title 5, California Code of Regulations, *Information*
4. Update on SB 1440 the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, *Information*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

May 8, 2012

Members Present

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Bernadette Cheyne
Steven Dixon
Kenneth Fong
Margaret Fortune
Steven M. Glazer
Bob Linscheid, Chair of the Board
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
Glen O. Toney
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Trustee Debra S. Farar called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 20, 2012, were approved as submitted.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Dr. Christine Mallon, state university dean, presented the annual item with five attachments that detailed (1) new program projections for the next 10 years and program discontinuations; (2) an assessment of student learning outcomes; (3) a report on efforts to reduce bachelor's degree requirements to 120/180 units; (4) campus accreditation activities; and (5) a list of accredited schools, colleges, programs and departments in the system.

The eight new program projections represent about a quarter of what usually is presented due to state budget pressures. All eight recommended projections would be developed to be offered through self-support (students pay full cost) rather than state support. There were 14 discontinued programs this year, one fewer than last year. Dr. Mallon thanked the campuses for their candid reporting of assessment activities and findings. The report on the 120-unit goal for bachelor's degrees shows 81 percent require 120 units and no more. She stated that each year the system makes progress in reducing required units. Campuses have to justify why any program would be

above 120 units, and most often higher unit requirements are associated professional programs. She also referred to the attachments with lists of campuses going through accreditation, reporting that all campuses up for accreditation this year received it. The final attachment was a list of accredited schools, colleges, programs and departments across the system. The item was approved (REP 05-12-01)

Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements, Residence Requirements, and Special Sessions Credit and Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs

Dr. Mallon presented both items. The first change for item two is related to bachelor of arts degree requirements. The proposal is to remove a subsection stipulating that a minor may be required in the bachelor of arts degree. The change is to resolve confusion because the section is about major requirements but it says a minor may be required—and it is already the case that a minor may be required in any bachelor's degree. Campus administrators and the Academic Senate discussed the issue of requirements for minors and want to leave the matter up to the campuses. The second proposed amendment refers to the number of units a student has to complete on the campus where they are attending to earn a degree (30 semester units). The confusion is that there is a reference to extension credits and some campuses misunderstand this means regular academic credit earned in extended university, which is not correct. It is extension credits more commonly associated with professional development kinds of courses. The change will make that distinction.

The final change deals with special session credit and there is misunderstanding, particularly when it involves Cal State Online. As written, the section puts a limit of 24 units of special session credit that a non-matriculated student can apply toward a degree. A non-matriculated student is one who is not formally admitted to the university. Some campuses believe this means that only 24 units of credits earned in special session can be applied (even by matriculated students), which is not correct. Thus, if a student has not been admitted to a campus, he or she can take special session courses but only 24 of them can be applied toward the degree. This will become more important as the CSU increases its self-support offerings to extend access to the university for those in remote locations.

Item three explains new Title 5 sections related to nursing programs. Both of the new sections are related to existing Education Code sections. One section requires that the CSU establish a systemwide set of nursing prerequisites. It states that the Chancellor's Office will work with the Academic Senate to establish that set of courses. Campuses cannot require any more or any fewer or anything different from those standard prerequisites for students entering into nursing programs. The next new section requires that the CSU establish articulated, seamless nursing education pathways between California Community Colleges associate degree in nursing programs and CSU bachelor of science in nursing degree programs. Both items two and three will be brought forward to the trustees at the July meeting for action to adopt the recommended Title 5 changes.

Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Beverly Young, assistant vice chancellor for teacher education and public school programs, presented the results of a study to examine and compare the effects of CSU and non-CSU beginning teachers on student achievement, as measured by the state's standardized testing system. Known as value-added research, this methodology measures the portion of a teacher's expected effectiveness in specific tested areas. For that portion, the measurable analysis of how much students gain can be seen as evidence of CSU teacher graduate quality.

The study includes new teachers in their first two years of teaching. The non-CSU comparison includes graduates from the University of California, private colleges and universities and school districts that sponsor their own teacher preparation programs. In elementary school mathematics, 10 percent more of the students in CSU-teacher classrooms made expected grade level progress than students who were taught by non-CSU teachers. This includes all students--urban, limited English speakers and students with special learning needs. Overall, the findings are statistically significant that CSU teachers are more effective in helping both elementary and secondary students learn mathematics.

In reading and language arts in grades three through six, there was only a slight difference between CSU teachers and non-CSU teachers. By grade 7-11, the differences between CSU and non-CSU teachers widened to statistically significant margins. This was true in middle school and high school in English literacy and writing. The findings Dr. Young presented summarized a very large amount of data. CSU campuses and programs receive more detailed results specific to their programs, based on their own graduates.

CSU continues to operate the only systemwide comprehensive program evaluation effort in the nation. The CSU uses the data not only for accountability, but to measure efforts for ongoing program improvement. More than 10,000 school principals evaluate new CSU teachers. Since 2001, when data was first collected, there has been progress in virtually all important areas of teacher responsibility, including effectively teaching reading, math and other subject areas. The CSU asks for each principal's evaluative judgment about how well a CSU teacher is fulfilling his/her responsibility on behalf of his or her students.

Over the last several years, in addition to the specific areas that each campus selects as a focus for improvement, the system has identified areas that all campuses are asked to work on. There has been progress in each of those four areas: secondary reading across content areas; working with at-risk students; working with English language learners; and working with special needs learners. These areas represent the greatest challenges for all beginning teachers. Dr. Young said that based on the previous achievement findings, it is likely that CSU teachers outperform non-CSU teachers in these areas as well.

Trustee William Hauck asked how the data presented squared with the fact that half the students who enter CSU campuses are not ready to do college-level math or English. Dr. Young answered

that the data represents CSU beginning teachers in their first two years of work, which represents only about three percent of the teachers in California schools each year. She believes that CSU teachers enter the workforce very well prepared as novices for the challenges, and that most of the research about teachers attributes much of their job performance and effectiveness to working conditions and the teaching environment. California remains one of the most difficult places to teach students with diverse needs, issues of poverty, budget concerns, lack of materials and large classrooms.

Mr. Tom Torlakson, superintendent of public instruction, asked how best practices are shared at the campuses. Previously, Dr. Young said, every campus received only its own data. The deans of education have now mutually agreed that all the data will be open across all campuses. A committee identifies campuses that either are at the highest level of performance in certain areas or have shown the most improvement over time. They then convene faculty virtually from every campus and share what makes a difference in their programs. He also asked about the use of the California Standards Test (CST) and the kind of data that CSU is using to evaluate teacher effectiveness. Dr. Young said the CSU uses the value-added method, while recognizing that it is just one aspect of how teachers are affecting student achievement. She said many other responsibilities that teachers have cannot be measured by standardized tests. For 11 years, the CSU has conducted its survey. Each CSU teacher graduate one year out receives a personalized survey asking about all elements of their preparation and whether they feel well prepared and challenged. The CSU then matches that with the results from the employers of every graduate.

Trustee Margaret Fortune questioned what it means to make grade-level progress and if the students are proficient or advanced on the CST. In many of the populations that the CSU is studying, Dr. Young said many students begin each year below grade level in reading and math. When these students are taught effectively, many of them learn at least the equivalent of a full-year of skills. The CSU looks at raw achievement test scores and each student's growth compared to their previous year of growth.

Trustee Fortune said that proficiency on the CST only reflects 60 percent mastery of a skill, which is a D grade. She questioned the value of assessment as it relates to student achievement. Dr. Young said the expectation is that a teacher should take a student, on average, one year's growth from wherever they start. Trustee Fortune agreed with Trustee Hauck about how many students entering the CSU are not proficient in mathematics, English and language arts. She said that the CSU should not be satisfied only with measuring positive outcomes, but in program improvement. Dr. Young said that the program evaluation initiative started 11 years ago is about assessing what principals believe about CSU graduates, and that deans, faculty and presidents do not just look at the data but use it extensively for program improvement.

Trustee Hauck also said the state has a set of standards that says what a child should be able to do at the end of each grade, and that by the fourth grade, if they cannot do basic math and basic reading and comprehension, they are pretty much lost. He said the statistics about how principals feel about teachers do not reveal how children are achieving against those standards. It is important for trustees to know what is occurring in terms of end results. He asked that future

reports lay out more explicitly what is being reported on, and spell out the proportion of CSU teachers included as related to the population of teachers as a whole.

Trustee Steven Dixon asked the presidents if the reports give information needed to institute actions to improve the quality of teachers.

CSU Long Beach President King Alexander said the national average of child/teacher ratio in America is 23 to 1, but in Long Beach it is 39 to 1. He said there is a state of crisis in K-12 education and California needs to be ashamed by its low level of spending on education. CSU San Marcos President Karen Haynes said these problems are why many campuses have memorandum of agreements with school districts and are more explicit about K-16 expectations. CSU Los Angeles President Jim Rosser said that every year when he gets the results he meets with the education dean and goes through every element, because he does not want students coming to the campus who are not college ready. A great teacher going into a school that accepts that graduation from high school means that reading at a 10th grade level and doing math at an 8th grade level is unacceptable.

San Francisco State President Bob Corrigan talked about how important the elementary school years are, especially for children of color. The campus is focusing on working directly with the elementary school teachers and with parents, churches and community to promote a culture of learning. CSU Dominguez Hills President Millie Garcia said she brings all the deans together, not just the dean of education, to work on this issue. Additionally, they work with families, and also connect with Latino parents in Spanish. Humboldt State University President Rollin Richmond said they work with the K-12 system on improving teacher quality. They have established a pilot program with one district to provide professional development, especially for new teachers.

CSU Monterey Bay President Dianne Harrison said that the campus looked at what CSUMB faculty are doing, and many of them are now in the school classrooms serving as mentors, which is helping improve school programs. CSU Bakersfield President Horace Mitchell echoed President Harrison and said they see teacher education as a university-wide program and not simply something housed in the School of Education. They no longer have a stand-alone School of Education; rather it is now a School of Social Science and Education, so there is more faculty expertise. CSU Channel Islands President Dick Rush said the campus has received a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) grant to tie together all the elements – community, schools, community colleges and faculty – to make a difference, especially in the STEM disciplines.

Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP)

Dr. Ephraim Smith, executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer introduced the item, applauding the accomplishments of the CSU-LSAMP program. It has produced significant improvements in the numbers, retention, graduation rate and success of students in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines, with particular focus on underrepresented students. CSU-LSAMP's successes mesh well with the CSU Graduation Initiative, particularly with respect to the goal of closing the achievement gap. He introduced presenters Dr. Joseph Sheley, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Sacramento State, and Dr. Juanita Barrena, professor emerita of biological sciences at Sacramento State.

Dr. Sheley said that CSU-LSAMP is a project supported by the CSU and the National Science Foundation (NSF). Since 1993, NSF has awarded CSU more than \$26 million to support four consecutive five-year phases which allow universities to engage in efforts to broaden participation of persons from underrepresented minority (URMs) groups in the STEM disciplines: science, technology engineering and mathematics. All 23 campuses have confirmed their participation in phase five should NSF funding continue. Sacramento State serves as lead institution. The major goal of the project is promoting success for students of color since that is how NSF evaluates it. However, CSU-LSAMP is open to students of any racial ethnic group who face social, educational or economic barriers to STEM careers.

Professor Barrena said there is heavy emphasis on academic advising. There also is emphasis on academic support to improve success in math and science, including activities such as calculus, boot camps, Summer Bridge programs and academic excellence workshops. The program has orientation and activities for new freshmen and transfer students. Students participate in research, internships and international science activities. The data presented in the report and the 200 profiles of CSU-LSAMP graduates are inspiring, she said. CSU-LSAMP contributed to the doubling - from 917 in 1993-1994 to 1,998 in 2010 and 2011 - of the number of STEM degrees awarded by the CSU to underrepresented students. The average six-year graduation rates for Latino and African-American students who participate in CSU-LSAMP are 2.1 times higher than the rates for non-participant Latino and African-Americans. Sacramento State President Alexander Gonzalez said that the program's impact on its participants has been very positive. Many of the students have gone on to STEM careers. In addition, the program demonstrates how faculty have worked with students to make a difference. Chancellor Charles B. Reed added that the CSU has doubled the number of math and science teachers in the last five years, which was a goal the CSU set.

SB 1440, the Student Transfer Achievement Reform (STAR) Act

Dr. Smith said the CSU continues to make progress working with the community colleges on transfer degrees. The Transfer Model Curriculum (TMCs) matches between the CSU and community college campuses show that music and education are now added to the list. Campuses are working very hard and additional similar programs are being continuously added. He said that the CSU is optimistic that all campuses will be approaching 100 percent matches by year's end.

Two more added TMCs are journalism and geography, which brings the number to 20. They expect to have 25 or 30 by next year.

Eric Forbes, assistant vice chancellor for student academic support, said the community colleges only approve programs based on TMCs. There continues to be urgency in the CSU to approve at least one option in each academic discipline so that every student in the system can find a way to a baccalaureate degree. The CSU has about 2,500 individual applicants; however, these students applied to many CSU campuses, so as yet there is no certainty about duplicated information. It will take at least until the October census date to determine how many students actually have committed to a CSU campus.

Most transfer students are local and continue to be local. Of the early SB1440 participants, only 50 needed to be redirected to another campus. Even though the CSU provided a GPA “bump,” only 40 students needed it for admission. Nine campuses will remain open in spring 2013 to receive SB1440 students only. In the absence of CCC student tracking and electronic transcripts, the CSU continues to work with the community colleges on verification of the transfer degree. The CSU receives final verification when the transcripts arrive. The CSU has been working with the central community college office on many components, but staff have found that regional meetings with particular community colleges are a good supplement to the statewide work.

The CSU and campus public affairs units hope to finalize web pages and collateral marketing materials by August 2012. The campuses will feature SB1440 at the transfer and high school conferences in the fall. Dr. Smith said that the CSU is making progress since all but one community college has approved at least one TMC. It is still slow, however, especially since community colleges are not using electronic transcripts. The CSU has to do paper verification; until this is solved, it places students in a “time warp.”

Trustee Farar adjourned the Committee on Educational Policy.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements, Residence Requirements and Special Sessions Credit

Presentation By

Christine Mallon
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Summary

This item presents for board adoption three recommended changes to Title 5. All are intended to clarify Title 5 regulations and facilitate student progress toward degree completion, and all have been presented to the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) and campus administration for consultation.

The first, Title 5 Section 40500, defines the required curriculum—including the minimum required units for a bachelor of arts degree. The current regulation addresses minors, which are not required for the bachelor of arts curriculum. This confuses the issue of minors offered outside those programs. The proposed amendment deletes reference to minors. Individual campuses will be free to determine the minimum requirements for minors within bachelor of arts degrees. In addition, the proposed amendment adds a reference to quarter units.

The second proposed amendment intends to clarify that “extension credit” means those credits often associated with professional development, rather than meaning credit earned through extended education. The current Section 40403 is not clear that academic credit earned through extended education may be applied toward degree requirements. There is much confusion on this issue, and it has slowed the progress of some students toward degree conferral, even when all degree requirements have been satisfied. In addition, the proposed amendment adds reference to quarter units in addition to semester units.

The last proposed amendment seeks to clarify the language between non-matriculated and matriculated students of Title 5 Section 40407.1. Many have mistakenly believed that there is a limit on special session units that matriculated students can apply toward the degree. That misunderstanding has slowed students’ progress toward degree completion. The new language intends to make the limitation clearly applicable only to those students in non-matriculated status. Matriculated students are not limited in the number of special session units that can be applied to a degree. In addition, the proposed amendment adds a reference to quarter units in addition to semester units.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under Section 89030 of the Education Code, that Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations sections 400500, 40403 and 40407.1 are amended as follows:

Title 5. Education
Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1. California State University
Subchapter 2. Educational Program
Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees

§ 40500. Bachelor of Arts Degree: Required Curriculum. To be eligible for the Bachelor of Arts degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major 24 semester units (36 quarter units).

There shall be one major with a minimum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units). At least 12 semester units (18 quarter units) in the major shall be upper-division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by the campus.

~~(c) Minor. A minor consisting of 12 or more semester units, of which six must be in upper division credit, may be required.~~

~~(d)~~(c) Additional Units. Units to complete the total required for the degree may be used as electives or to meet other requirements.

~~(e)~~(d) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Arts Degree, of which at least 40 (60 quarter units) shall be in the upper-division credit, shall be 124 semester units (186 quarter units). For candidates for the Bachelor of Arts degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units (180 quarter units) shall be required, including at least 40 semester units (60 quarter units) in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

Title 5. Education
Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1. California State University
Subchapter 2. Educational Program
Article 5. General Requirements for Graduation

§ 40403. Required Residence.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Section, 30 semester units (45 quarter units) shall be earned in residence at the campus granting the degree. Twenty-four of these units (36 quarter units) shall be earned in upper-division courses and 12 of the semester units (18 quarter units) shall be in the major.

(b) Extension credit (often associated with professional development activities) or credit by evaluation shall not be used to fulfill any requirement prescribed by this section; provided, however, that the Chancellor may designate specified extension courses that may be offered for residence credit and may establish policies and procedures under which residence credit may be earned by evaluation. Academic credit earned through extended education may be applied toward the degree requirements.

(c) When the circumstances of an individual case make it appropriate, the appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned at other campuses or institutions for residence credit.

Title 5. Education
Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1. California State University
Subchapter 2. Educational Program
Article 5. General Requirements for Graduation

§ 40407.1. Special Session Credit.

A maximum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units) taken by a student in non-matriculated status may be applied toward the degree. This maximum applies to ~~in~~ special session course credit earned through state supported or self supported ~~regular~~ course offerings ~~in non-matriculated status may be applied toward the degree. There is no limit on the number of special session course units that may be earned in matriculated status and applied toward the degree.~~ The Chancellor is authorized to establish and revise criteria for application of special session credits earned through enrollment in state supported or self supported regular course offerings toward the degree, in accordance with applicable law.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs

Presentation By

Christine Mallon
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Summary

This item presents for board adoption two recommended changes to Title 5, both related to existing Education Code sections regarding common requirements of nursing degree programs.

Education Code section 66055.5 requires the establishment of one common set of prerequisites for California State University (CSU) nursing degree programs. The first proposed Title 5 change would specify that the chancellor shall consult with the Academic Senate CSU to establish the systemwide prerequisites for admission to CSU nursing programs and to amend those standard requirements, as necessary. The proposed section specifies that campuses shall not require more, fewer, or different prerequisites than those adopted systemwide. This will help to achieve uniform adoption of the nursing program prerequisites at the campuses offering nursing degree programs.

The second change is proposed to assist in the implementation another provision of Education Code section 66055.5, which requires articulation agreements between CSU and California Community Colleges (CCC) undergraduate nursing programs, and section 89267.5 (often referred to as Assembly Bill 1295). This law requires seamless articulated transfer between CCC associate degree in nursing programs and CSU bachelor of science in nursing degree programs.

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under Section 89030 of the Education Code, that sections 40540 and 40541 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations are added as follows:

Title 5, California Code of Regulations
Division 5 -- Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1 -- California State University
Subchapter 2 – Educational Programs
Article 10 – Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs

§ 40540. Systemwide Prerequisites for Nursing Degree Programs.

- (a) The Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University shall establish a standardized list of nursing degree program prerequisites for the various campuses of the California State University on a systemwide basis.
- (b) The standardized list of nursing degree program prerequisites shall conform to professional accreditation requirements.
- (c) No campus may require more, fewer, or different program prerequisites than those included on the systemwide list.
- (d) The Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University may amend the standardized prerequisites for nursing degree programs.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030, 89035, Education Code. Reference: Section 66055.5.

Title 5, California Code of Regulations
Division 5 -- Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1 -- California State University
Subchapter 2 – Educational Programs
Article 10 – Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs

§ 40541. Baccalaureate Nursing Degree Programs Articulation and Transfer.

Each California State University campus that offers a baccalaureate nursing degree program shall negotiate and implement articulation agreements with community college districts from which a significant number of nursing students transfer to that CSU campus nursing degree program.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030, 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66055.5 and 89267.5.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Career Technical Education (CTE): Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for California State University Admission; Recommendation to Amend Title 5, California Code of Regulations

Presentation By

Christine Mallon
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Carolina Cardenas
Associate Director
Academic Outreach and Early Assessment

Summary

This information item proposes formal adoption of a systemwide curriculum review procedure and proposes an amendment to Title 5. Both are related to recent legislation on career technical education (CTE). California Education Code section 66205.8 requires that by January 1, 2014, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees adopt a procedure by which a student can apply a high school career technical education course to satisfy a general elective course (area “g”) requirement toward CSU admission requirements. A shared CSU and University of California (UC) process is already in place. However, as the UC and CSU do not both offer the same degree programs, there is a need for a curriculum review procedure to address courses that would be applicable only to CSU admission.

As required by statute, the proposed curriculum review process was developed by the faculty and approved by the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU). If adopted by the trustees, the proposed process would codify for the system a curriculum review procedure.

Proposed CSU Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for CSU Admission

This proposed procedure establishes a curriculum review process for reviewing and approving high school career technical education courses that are proposed for satisfying a general elective requirement (area “g”) for admission as a first-time freshman to the CSU.

1. In satisfaction of Education Code section 66205.8, the CSU criteria for evaluating high school CTE courses proposed for area “g” elective course requirement are the same evaluation criteria used in the shared CSU and UC “a-g” review process.
2. If a CTE course falls outside the range of courses in the established shared intersegmental (UC-CSU) criteria, as documented in the UC “a-g” Subject Area Requirements, the course reviewed for CSU admission must address a domain associated with a degree program offered by the CSU.
3. For courses considered only for CSU admission, if the domains of study are outside the confines of shared intersegmental “a-g” criteria, the CSU may adopt course review standards in addition to those on the “a-g” Subject Area Requirement.
4. Existing CSU course standards shall be used to determine course eligibility.
5. If no such CSU standards exist, a course may be evaluated by using standards for courses that are roughly equivalent to the proposed course.
6. Appropriate Chancellor’s Office staff will perform the initial screening. Any resubmitted application shall be considered by a subject-matter expert (or experts) approved by the ASCSU including faculty of the CSU as appointed by the ASCSU.
7. The chancellor is authorized to amend these procedures, based on recommendation from the ASCSU.

Following board adoption, this procedure will be codified in an executive order and implemented systemwide.

Recommended Amendment to Title 5

In order for CSU admission policy to comply with Education Code section 66205.8, the following amendment to Title 5 needs adoption. Introduced at this meeting for information, the following recommended changes to Title 5 will be presented at the September meeting for action.

**Title 5, California Code of Regulations
Division 5 Board of Trustees of the California State Universities
Chapter 1 – California State University
Subchapter 3 – Admission Requirements
Article 1 – Construction and Definitions**

§40601. Particular Terms

The following terms, whenever used or referred to in this subchapter, shall have the following meanings, respectively, unless a different meaning appears from the context:

(a) The term “Chancellor” means the Chancellor of the California State University or designee.

(b) The term “the campus” means the campus to which application for admission is made.

(c) The term “appropriate campus authority” means the president of the campus or designee.

(d) The term “college” means:

(1) Any institution of higher learning which is accredited to offer work leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts or to the degree of Bachelor of Science, by the applicable regional accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education, except an institution which is accredited only as a “specialized institution.”

(2) Any foreign institution of higher learning which, in the judgment of the Chancellor, offers course work equivalent to that offered by institutions included within subdivision (d)(1) of this section.

(e) The term “application” means the submission to the campus by the person applying for admission of all documents including official transcripts of all the applicants’ academic records and information which the applicant is required to personally submit, and the payment of any application fee due pursuant to Section 41800.1.

(f) The term “eligibility index” means:

(1) For admissions prior to fall term 2004, that number derived from a weighted combination of the grade point average for the final three years of high school or of the grade point average for the final three years of high school excluding the final year or final term thereof, and in any case excluding courses in physical education and military science, and the score on either the American College Test or the Scholastic Aptitude Test pursuant to Section 40752 or Section 40802; such weighing of grade point averages and test scores shall be determined and adjusted

by the Chancellor on the basis of the probability of academic success in the California State University.

(2) For admissions commencing with fall term 2004, that number derived from a weighted combination of the grade point average for courses taken in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects during the final three years of high school and the score on either the American College Test or the Scholastic Aptitude Test pursuant to Section 40752 or Section 40802; such weighing of grade point averages and test scores shall be determined and adjusted by the Chancellor on the basis of the probability of academic success in the California State University.

(g) The term “good standing at the last college attended” means that at the time of application for admission and at the time of admission, the applicant was not under disciplinary or academic suspension, dismissal, expulsion or similar action by the last college attended and was not under disciplinary suspension, dismissal, expulsion or similar action at any institution of The California State University.

(h) The term “first-time freshman” means an applicant who has earned college credit not later than the end of the summer immediately following high school graduation or an applicant who has not earned any college credit.

(i) The term “undergraduate transfer” means any person who is not a first-time freshman pursuant to Section 40601(h), and who does not hold a baccalaureate degree from any college.

(j) The term “full-time student” means any student whose program while in attendance at a college averaged twelve or more semester units per semester, or the equivalent.

(k) The term “resident” shall have the same meaning as does the same term in Section 68017 of the Education Code, and shall include all persons so treated by the provisions of that section.

(l) The term “unit” means a semester unit within the meaning of Section 40103, or the equivalent thereof.

(m) The term “transferable” when used in connection with college units, college credit or college work, shall mean those college units, credit or work which are determined to be acceptable (either for specific requirements or as electives) toward meeting the requirements of a baccalaureate degree. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time to revise procedures for the implementation of this subdivision.

(n) For admissions prior to fall term 2003, the term “comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects” means four years of English, three years of mathematics, one year of United States history or United States history and government, one year of laboratory science,

two years of foreign language, one year of visual and performing arts, and three years of electives from any combination of English, mathematics, social science, history, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, and other fields of study determined by the Chancellor to be appropriate preparation for California State University study.

(o) Commencing with admissions for the fall term 2003, the term “comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects” means, in each area of study, at least four years of English, three years of mathematics, two years of history or social science, two years of laboratory science, two years of foreign language, one year of visual and performing arts, and one year of electives from any combination of English, mathematics, social science, history, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, CSU-approved career technical education courses, and other fields of study determined by the Chancellor to be appropriate preparation for California State University study.

An agenda item will be presented at the September meeting to take action to adopt the preceding recommended change to Title 5.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Update on SB 1440: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act

Presentation By

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Ken O'Donnell
Senior Director
Student Engagement
and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships

Summary

Since the May 2012 meeting of the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) has published *Reforming the State's Transfer Process: A Progress Report on Senate Bill 1440*. The report, found at <http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2012/edu/progress-sb-1440/progress-sb-1440-051112.aspx>, gives a very detailed and balanced account of efforts by the CSU and the California Community Colleges (CCC) to execute the new legislation.

Our written response to the report (letter to Senator Alex Padilla dated May 21, 2012) expressed appreciation for its quality, agreeing in particular with its finding that the state will need better means to accommodate the expected increase in applications for transfer admission under the law. Currently, the CCC and CSU manage the flow of these new applications manually, but as more students learn about the improved pathway to the baccalaureate degree, the segments must commit to sharing student records electronically to better serve students efficiently and quickly.

The report also called for wider adoption of the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) framework, resulting in more two-year degrees in the community colleges, and in the universities a greater number of baccalaureate degrees that could be finished within 60 required semester-units (or 90 required quarter-units) after transfer. The CSU agrees with this section of the LAO report. CSU faculty continue to make new determinations of "similar" programs as construed by the law, and community colleges are adding to the pool of applicable associate degree programs. Faster progress is the CSU's goal so that students have wider choices for degrees.

Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item 4
July 17, 2012
Page 2 of 2

The strongest form of that encouragement has doubtless been in CSU enrollment management. The CSU has closed transfer admission for spring 2013 for all applicants except those holding associate degrees developed under the new law. Media coverage of this decision generated considerable interest among students, their families and counselors, adding significantly to demand for the new degrees. The LAO's report singled this out as evidence of the CSU's full-fledged support of implementation.

Despite its overall positive review of efforts to date, the LAO report closes with a call for additional legislation. The authors doubted that the two segments would accelerate their development of curriculum otherwise. At a recent meeting of the SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee, leadership from both segments advised LAO staff against this line of thinking: the momentum created so far would be threatened if lawmakers were to change the rules.

This August will see the launch of the formal marketing campaign for the new Associate Degrees for Transfer, with a mix of publications and online materials that emphasize the guarantees of priority admission and a cap on units required after transfer. Moreover, the CSU is participating in several "train the trainer" sessions for CCC advisers across the state this summer, with additional support at the CSU fall counselor conferences.

In the coming academic year, the CSU and CCC faculty and administrative leadership expect to create TMCs for the last of the most popular majors for transfer, and to lay additional groundwork for automated processing of student applications for transfer admission.