

AGENDA
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 18, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

8:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 19, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Herbert L. Carter, Chair
George G. Gowgani, Vice Chair
Jeffrey L. Bleich
Carol R. Chandler
Moctesuma Esparza
Debra S. Farar
Murray L. Galinson
William Hauck
Melinda Guzman Moore
Craig R. Smith
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

5:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 18, 2006 - Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 16 & 17, 2006

Discussion Items

1. Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree, *Action*
2. Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, *Information*
3. Planning Beyond Cornerstones, *Action*
4. The California State University Media Arts Festival, *Information*
5. Campus Enrollment Funding, *Information*

****Note**

8:00 a.m., Wednesday, May 17, 2006 - Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 16 & 17, 2006

Discussion Items

1. Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree, *Action*
2. Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, *Information*
3. Planning Beyond Cornerstones, *Action*
4. The California State University Media Arts Festival, *Information*
5. Campus Enrollment Funding, *Information*

****Note:** Depending on the length of discussions on Tuesday, July 18, 2006, Educational Policy items may have to be carried over to Wednesday for consideration.

**MINUTES OF THE 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 16-17, 2006

Members Present

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Moctesuma Esparza (Tuesday only)
Debra S. Farar
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
George G. Gowgani
Ricardo F. Icaza
Melinda Guzman Moore
William Hauck
Corey Jackson (Tuesday only)
Andrew LaFlamme
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Craig Smith

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of March 15, 2006 were approved by consent as submitted.

Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University

This item, presented in committee by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard and Academic Senate Vice Chair J. Theodore Anagnoson, recommended for approval an amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University. This amendment revised the formula for determining the size of campus delegations to the Academic Senate and reduced the total size of the Academic Senate from 58 elected members to 53 elected members. Membership will continue to include the Chancellor (or designee) as a non-voting member, the immediate past chair (if not an elected campus representative), and an emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association. Dr. Reichard explained how campus/system size ultimately determines size of membership with each campuses represented by 2 senators, while larger campuses are represented by 3 senators. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 05-06-03).

Student Membership on the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP)

This item was recommended for approval by consent to raise from three to four the number of student members serving on the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP), providing thereby a desired student member for the new fourth standing committee of ACIP. After a brief discussion by the committee regarding the selection process, the committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 05-06-02).

Evaluation of the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation

At the request of the Teacher Education and Public Schools Programs unit in Academic Affairs, the Program Evaluation and Research Collaborative at California State University, Los Angeles performed an external, independent evaluation of the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation (RIAP) to determine its effectiveness. Results of the evaluation of RIAP suggest that the program is having a beneficial impact in improving student English proficiency in schools that have had substantial participation in the program and have also participated in providing professional development to teachers for the 12th Grade Expository Reading and Writing Course. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Teacher Education & Public School Programs Beverly Young provided a summary of evaluation results, goals including ongoing pre-service preparation programs, plans for continued evaluation, and the implications for the EAP program. Dr. Reichard reiterated the CSU's commitment to refine studies and data, while Chancellor Reed pointed to several states mirroring the CSU's EAP program.

Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation

This agenda item, Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, included presentations made by President Jolene Koester from CSU Northridge (CSUN), and by President John Welty from CSU Fresno, respectively, describing key foci for their respective campuses' initiatives to facilitate undergraduates' progress to their baccalaureate degrees. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard, Academic Senate Vice Chair J. Theodore Anagnoson, as well as both campus presidents commented on the effectiveness of the peer visits in assisting campuses in these endeavors. Specifically, President Koester described how the peer review team vividly praised a changed campus climate produced by CSUN initiatives. President Koester also acknowledged how the peer review team validated and enhanced campus work by affirming campus strengths and weaknesses. Similarly, President Welty recognized that the peer review team raised significant questions and described the peer visit as effective in engaging campus foci on graduation initiatives.

The Educational Policy Committee recessed and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. on May 17, 2006.

The Common Management System Support for the Facilitating Graduation Initiative

This agenda item summarized the objectives of the California State University's Common Management System (CMS) Student Administration (SA) module. CMS involvement and support in facilitating the graduation initiative was presented by Gary W. Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer; Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer; Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; and David Ernst, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Information Technology Services. The team described how objectives are being met, how CMS interacts with the campus based actions of the "22 points," and how campuses are drawing upon the sophisticated data made available through the CMS SA module. With the Human Resources and Finance modules put in place first, CMS looks forward to the full implementation of the SA module on campuses by 2008. With security a big challenge in higher education, all campuses have or soon will have an information security officer. In trying to strike a balance, CMS was described further as a technological enabler—responding to the changing environment of needs of both the campuses and the students.

Proposed Title 5 Revision: The Doctor of Education Degrees

This item, presented by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard, summarized the proposed Title 5 amendments establishing a CSU policy framework for CSU doctoral programs, consistent with the authorizing legislation. Dr. Reichard further acknowledged that much of this proposed policy is analogous to the existing Title 5 policy governing CSU master's degree programs. Academic Senate Executive Committee Member at Large Cristy Jensen described how faculty in the work group were given an opportunity early and often to collaborate with the CSU on draft language. Assistant Vice Chancellor of Teacher Education & Public School Programs Beverly Young provided clarification on length of time deemed necessary to complete the degree. In addition, Dr. Reichard noted this item would return in July for Board action.

Chair Achtenberg adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

SB 724 (Scott, 2005), now codified as Education Code Sections 66040 through 66040.7, granted the California State University the authority to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree, under certain conditions. Although the CSU has long offered doctoral degree programs jointly with University of California campuses and non-public universities in California, many of the policies and procedures governing those programs have been policies and procedures already in place at the CSU's partners. The proposed Title 5 amendments would establish a CSU policy framework for CSU doctoral programs, consistent with the authorizing legislation. Much of this proposed policy is analogous to the existing Title 5 policy governing CSU master's degree programs.

The proposed amendments would acknowledge the authority of the CSU to offer programs leading to the Ed.D.; ensure that program objectives, curricula, and governance are in conformity with the conditions established by legislation; guide admissions, curriculum development, academic requirements, and the nature of the culminating experience (dissertation); and ensure that students are fully informed of systemwide and campus-based policies and procedures governing their progress through the program. This policy framework is expected to encourage the development of rigorous programs that will be effective in instilling the knowledge and skills an educational leader needs to improve California's public schools and community colleges.

The policy was drafted in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University. We are particularly indebted to an ad-hoc faculty workgroup appointed by the Academic Senate for detailed discussion and refinement of the policy. An earlier draft of the amendments was presented to the Board as an information item at the May 2006 meeting. The amendments embodied in the resolution below have been reorganized and, in a few instances, clarified but are substantially the same as in the earlier draft.

Proposed Resolution

The following resolution is proposed for adoption.

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 Article 1 of Subchapter 2, Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

§ 40050.1 Function: Instruction Leading to the Doctor of Education Degree.

Notwithstanding Section 40050, the Doctor of Education degree may be awarded independently of any other institution of higher education, provided that the program leading to the degree satisfies the criteria in subdivision (a) of Section 40511.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 66040.3 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040.3, 66600, and 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

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 Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 2, Section 40100 as follows:

§ 40100. Authorization to Establish Curricula.

A campus may be authorized by the Board of Trustees to establish and maintain curricula leading to the bachelor's degree, ~~and~~ the master's degree, and the doctoral degree; provided, that in the case of the doctoral degree, the requirements of Section 40050 or Section 40050.1 are satisfied.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 66040.3 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040.3, 66600 and 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

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 Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 7 as follows:

§ 40511. The Doctor of Education Degree.

(a) A California State University program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall be distinguished from a University of California doctoral degree program by its conformity with the following criteria:

(1) the program shall prepare administrative leaders for possible service in one of the following settings:

(A) public elementary and secondary schools, or

(B) community colleges;

(2) the program shall focus on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in California public schools and community colleges;

(3) the program shall be offered through partnerships in which California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges, as appropriate, shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, dissertation development, and program assessment and evaluation; and

(4) the program shall enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.

(b) Each campus offering a program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall establish requirements for admission to the program. The requirements for admission shall include, at a minimum, the requirements stated in Section 41020.

(c) The program leading to the Doctor of Education degree shall conform to the following specifications:

(1) The curriculum shall be organized as a cohort-based program and shall include learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice, including field experiences. The core curriculum shall provide professional preparation for leadership, including but not limited to theory and research methods, the structure and culture of education, and leadership in curriculum and instruction, equity, and assessment.

(2) The pattern of study shall be composed of at least 60 semester units earned in graduate standing. At least 48 semester units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, and the remaining units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students or courses organized primarily for master's and doctoral students.

(3) At least 42 semester units shall be completed in residence at the campus or campuses awarding the degree. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for part of this residence requirement. The campus may establish a transfer policy allowing application to degree requirements of relevant coursework and credits completed as a

matriculated student in another graduate program, on the condition that the other program is appropriately accredited.

(4) A qualifying examination shall be required.

(5) The pattern of study shall include completion of a dissertation.

(A) The dissertation shall be the written product of systematic, rigorous research on a significant professional issue. The dissertation is expected to contribute to an improvement in professional practices or policy. It shall evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and a rationale.

(B) The dissertation shall identify the research problem and question(s), state the major theoretical perspectives, explain the significance of the undertaking, relate it to the relevant scholarly and professional literature, set forth the appropriate sources for and methods of gathering and analyzing the data, and offer a conclusion or recommendation. It shall include a written abstract that summarizes the significance of the work, objectives, methodology, and a conclusion or recommendation.

(C) No more than 12 semester units shall be allowed for a dissertation.

(D) An oral defense of the dissertation shall be required.

(d) Each campus shall create and distribute to all students enrolled in a Doctor of Education degree program a student manual or handbook detailing, at a minimum, the following:

(1) requirements for admission with classified standing;

(2) policies on the transfer of credit earned at other institutions;

(3) policies on professional ethics and academic integrity;

(4) policies on student fees;

(5) provisions for advising and mentoring;

(6) policies and procedures for petitioning for a variance in academic requirements;

(7) policies and procedures for obtaining a leave of absence or for withdrawing from the university;

(8) policies and procedures regarding student grievances;

(9) policies on harassment and discrimination;

(10) policies and procedures for establishing and amending a plan of study;

(11) requirements for satisfactory progress in the program;

(12) policies on academic probation;

(13) requirements for field experience embedded in the program;

(14) requirements for advancement to candidacy;

(15) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for administering a qualifying examination (if the qualifying examination is unique to the individual student);

(16) dissertation requirements;

(17) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for supervising a dissertation;

(18) forms to be completed by students in the course of the degree program;

(19) the names and areas of expertise of faculty members affiliated with the degree program.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 66040.3 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040.3, 66600, and 89030, Education Code.

§ 40512. The Doctor of Education Degree: Requirements.

(a) Advancement to Candidacy. For advancement to candidacy for the Doctor of Education degree, the student shall have achieved classified graduate standing and met such particular requirements as the Chancellor and the appropriate campus authority may prescribe. The requirements shall include a qualifying examination.

(b) To be eligible for the Doctor of Education degree, the candidate shall have completed a pattern of study, including a dissertation, that is consistent with the specifications in subdivision (c) of Section 40511 and that is approved by the appropriate campus authority. A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better shall have been earned in coursework taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree, except that a course in which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average.

(c) The student shall have completed all requirements for the degree within five years of achieving classified standing in the doctoral program. The appropriate campus authority may extend the time for completion of the requirements if:

(1) the extension is warranted by individual circumstances, and

(2) the student demonstrates current knowledge of research and practice in educational leadership, as required by the campus.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 66040.3 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040.3, 66600, and 89030, Education Code.

And, be it further

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 Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 3, Article 8 as follows:

§ 41020. Admission to Doctor of Education Programs.

(a) An applicant may be admitted with classified graduate standing to a program leading to a Doctor of Education degree established pursuant to Section 40511 if the applicant satisfies the requirements of each of the following numbered subdivisions:

(1) The applicant holds an acceptable baccalaureate degree earned at an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association, or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

(2) The applicant holds an acceptable master's degree earned at an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association, or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

(3) The applicant has attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.0 in upper-division and graduate study combined.

(4) The applicant is in good standing at the last institution of higher education attended.

(5) The applicant has demonstrated sufficient preparation and experience pertinent to educational leadership to benefit from the program.

(6) The applicant has met any additional requirements established by the Chancellor in consultation with the faculty and any additional requirements prescribed by the appropriate campus authority.

(b) An applicant who does not qualify for admission under the provisions of subdivision (a) may be admitted with classified graduate standing by special action if on the basis of acceptable evidence the applicant is judged by the appropriate campus authority to possess sufficient academic and professional potential pertinent to educational leadership to merit such action.

(c) An applicant who is ineligible for admission under the provisions of either subdivision (a) or subdivision (b) because of deficiencies in prerequisite preparation that in the opinion of the appropriate campus authority can be rectified by specified additional preparation, including examinations, may be admitted with conditionally classified graduate standing. The student shall be granted classified graduate standing upon rectification of the deficiencies.

(d) Only those students who continue to demonstrate a satisfactory level of scholastic competence and fitness shall be eligible to continue in Doctor of Education programs.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 66040.3 89030 and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040.3, 66600, and 89030, Education Code.

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 nonsubstantial 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.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Don W. Kassing
President
San José State University

Summary

Teams of respected senior faculty and administrators continued “peer visits” to campuses to review Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation. The first such visit was to CSU Northridge on March 22, 2006, and the second was to CSU Fresno on April 20, 2006. Subsequent visits took place at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (May 3), and San Francisco State University (May 11). The fifth campus visit in Spring 2006 took place at San José State University on May 8, 2006. President Kassing will describe key foci for campus initiatives to facilitate undergraduates’ progress to their baccalaureate degrees—specifically “dashboard indicators” at San José State University, and will comment on the effectiveness of the peer visit in assisting his campus in this endeavor.

Background

In Fall 2002, the Board of Trustees adopted a graduation initiative with three parts: improving preparation to begin college, strengthening the transfer process, and helping enrolled students to progress toward the degree. Since that time, the Board has received regular progress reports on the general topic of campus efforts to facilitate graduation. At its May 10-11, 2005 meeting, Executive Vice Chancellor David S. Spence presented to Trustees a list of twenty-two recommendations that set forth strong campus practices for facilitating student progress to the baccalaureate degree. The Board reviewed the list and adopted a resolution directing the Chancellor to charge the campus presidents and faculty to implement the recommendations in Dr. Spence’s report, and to file periodic reports on campus progress in meeting its stated goals.

Among the actions that the Board directed campuses to take is to welcome teams of peer visitors who will supply fresh and independent reviews of campus plans and progress. The general process is familiar to campuses, who regularly welcome teams of visitors for accreditation purposes.

In putting this Board mandate into effect, the Division of Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's Office has successfully partnered with the Academic Senate, CSU to recruit, train and deploy teams of visitors who bring to the task both many years of CSU experience, and practiced judgment. Two former Faculty Trustees are among the team leaders (Dr. Harold Goldwhite, CSU Los Angeles, and Dr. Kathleen Kaiser, CSU Chico), as is the Senate Vice Chair Dr. J. Theodore ["Ted"] Anagnoson. Other respected campus leaders, including three CSU Wang Award winners, fill out a roster of trained peer visitors. Drawn from this distinguished roster, teams of six visitors assemble on the evening prior to a visit to finalize logistics and identify points of emphasis. They then spend an intense day on the campus in interviews and observations that are informed by specific campus plans for facilitating graduation. The team finishes its day with a report-out meeting that includes the campus president, other senior administrators, and faculty and student leaders.

In addition to San José State University, other campuses hosting visiting teams in Spring 2006 included CSU Channel Islands, CPSU San Luis Obispo, and San Francisco State University. The balance of CSU campuses will receive visiting teams in Fall 2006, or Spring 2007. In addition, a systemwide conference is planned for October 20, 2006 at which strong and recommended practices for facilitating graduation will be featured.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Planning Beyond Cornerstones

Presentation By

Roberta Achtenberg
Chair, CSU Board of Trustees

Gary Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

The California State University has flourished under the general guidance of Cornerstones, a strategic planning process that originated in 1996. Ten years later, however, it is time to assess the CSU's achievements under Cornerstones and to consider a renewed planning effort consistent with the challenges and mission of the CSU moving forward.

Planning Beyond Cornerstones

Ten years have elapsed since the last formal systemwide consideration of the future of the California State University. In May 1996, the California State University undertook a major strategic planning initiative called "Cornerstones." This effort was spurred by a need to examine the ways in which the CSU could best respond to California's social, economic, and demographic transformation looking to the twenty-first century. As a result of the work of students, faculty, system administrators, presidents, and trustees, four themes were identified in the Cornerstones process: learning for the 21st century; meeting the enrollment and resource challenge; accountability; and postbaccalaureate and continuing education. The Cornerstones Report was endorsed as a systemwide planning framework by the CSU Board of Trustees on January 28, 1998. The Board then adopted a formal implementation plan in March 1999.

In the ensuing years, much has been accomplished within this planning framework. Campuses have identified and assessed student learning outcomes; new pedagogies have been introduced, including online instruction; efforts have been undertaken to streamline pathways to the baccalaureate degree; articulation with community colleges has been improved; strong partnerships with K-12 have developed; regular accountability reports have been adopted; and a "compact" between the state and the CSU has been developed. For more detail on these topics, see the Cornerstones Implementation Plan at <http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html>

Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item 3
July 18-19, 2006
Page 2 of 2

Now seems a good time to take a fresh look and to re-think where the CSU has been and where it is going. Bold new ideas about the future of the CSU have emerged in recent discussions among presidents, provosts, and academic senators, and they could serve as a spur to consideration of a new planning venture that would go “beyond Cornerstones.” Any new systemwide planning effort would draw upon the insights of Cornerstones; but the new initiative would likely entail more than simply an update or modest revision of Cornerstones. Stakeholders who might be engaged in the process would include students, faculty, staff, alumni, community partners (including K-12 and industry partners), administrators, and trustees; and a very inclusive systemwide consultation process would be developed. By undertaking a new planning process at this time, CSU trustees can lead the way into the next decade of CSU excellence.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that at its September 2006 meeting, the Board will receive and consider a report on the CSU’s accomplishments under Cornerstones, as well as a proposal for a future planning initiative, including coordination and consultation mechanisms, timetables, and themes to be explored in the planning process.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The California State University Media Arts Festival

Presentation By

Gary Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

The California State University Media Arts Festival is an annual three-day event, which brings CSU students from all 23 CSU campuses together with film/video professionals for intensive workshops, and other activities related to media. The students work closely with actors, screenwriters, film directors, and other creative artists to learn more about their craft and about what it takes to be successful in the media industries.

The CSU Media Arts Festival: Film Competitions, Workshops, Recognition

The CSU Impact Report showed that almost half of the state's bachelor's degrees related to media, culture, and design industries come from the CSU. The CSU is renowned for its high-quality graduates in fields such as art, film, video, music, radio, communications, and journalism. These graduates excel because of the first-rate education they get on their campuses, as well as the opportunities provided by systemwide programs such as CSU Summer Arts and the CSU Media Arts Festival.

Every year for the past fifteen years, film/video professionals and CSU students have come together at a Cal State campus for an intensive workshop designed to hone the skills of fledgling actors, producers, screenwriters, and filmmakers. There are three components of the Festival: a film competition, a series of workshops, and a recognition of an outstanding CSU media professor.

The film competition gives talented CSU students studying film, video, and new media an opportunity to present their work for critical review by experts. In a typical year, the Media Arts Festival receives over 200 entries to the student competition. A panel of media faculty members from throughout the CSU system screens these entries, and this faculty panel selects the finalist projects. A panel of film industry leaders then screens the finalists, and the industry professionals select the *Rosebud Award* winner in each of seven categories, and the winner of Best in Show.

Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item 4
July 18-19, 2006
Page 2 of 2

In addition to showing student films to colleagues and experts, the Media Arts Festival strives to bridge the gap between student and working professional. The Festival offers seminars featuring working directors, producers, writers, animators, and others representing every aspect of the film, video, animation, and new media industries. The guest presenters at the Media Arts Festival provide invaluable inside information that supplements the curriculum on CSU campuses. This intimate contact with working professionals allows students to ask questions that may not have been answered through their regular coursework, and also establishes relationships, which may lead directly to jobs.

In 2000, the Festival began recognizing the outstanding film/video/new media faculty of the CSU with a *Rosebud Award* for service to the students of the CSU and noteworthy professional accomplishment.

The Media Arts Festival also plays an important role in systemwide media advocacy by convening faculty from throughout the state to discuss common issues and develop solutions, and by acting as a central clearinghouse for industry contacts and support.

The Media Arts Festival draws industry-wide attention to the fine work being produced by students of the CSU, and the fine teaching offered at our campuses. The Festival is raising the profile of the many schools of the CSU, leading to greater professional opportunities for our students.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Campus Enrollment Funding

Presentation By:

Richard P. West
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Summary

The California State University manages its operations according to terms established in the annual budget act, which incorporates understandings reached with the Governor and the legislature. Although there are many deficiencies in the CSU budget, the Master Plan for Higher Education emphasizes access as a key tenet of state policy. The CSU's obligation under the Master Plan is to provide space for the top one-third of graduating high school seniors, who are eligible and wish to attend, and to provide access to transfer students from the California Community Colleges. Enrollment growth (access) has always been a major driver of funding from the state. In the 2006-07 budget year, enrollment funding represents 31% of the University's total increase in funding.

State Enrollment Funding Policy and Budgeting

The Higher Education Compact calls for 2.5 percent annual enrollment growth at the University. This level of growth is consistent with enrollment targets projected on the basis of numerous factors including review of the Department of Finance-Demographic Research Unit's enrollment projections, consultation with campus presidents, and reviews of K-12 enrollment patterns. From 2005 through 2014, the Department of Finance projected enrollment demand for the CSU to increase by more than 82,000 students, with fall term headcounts growing from a projected 405,841 students to a 2014 headcount of 488,312 students. It is expected that funding for the 2.5% annual growth will be provided in the Governor's annual January budget proposal, which is then either approved or modified by the legislature as a part of the budget process.

Funding has always been based on a full-time equivalent student (FTES), which is a unit of measure equal to 15 semester or quarter units per term. FTES is reached by dividing total semester or quarter credit hours taken by all students on the campus by 15. For each additional student that the CSU enrolls, the state provides funding at a marginal cost to support instruction and student educational and institutional support services. The calculation methodology for this marginal cost rate was negotiated in 1996 and updated in 2006, between the CSU, the University of California, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office at the request of

the legislature. The intent of the marginal cost rate is to provide funding for the expenses each additional student adds to the overall costs of operating the campus. Although a major portion of each new student's marginal cost funding is for instruction, student services, academic support and administrative services also are included in the funding calculation. Nothing in the marginal cost calculation includes consideration for fixed costs created by campus growth over time. There are many ways marginal cost could be calculated. Many institutions allocate funding based on level of student (lower division, upper division and graduate), type of program, maturity and size of campus, and headcount versus FTE students. The state funds each student at the same average amount regardless of level or program. The CSU allocates enrollment growth to campuses using the same methodology as the state funding approach.

The legislature, in response to the analysis provided by the Legislative Analyst or for other reasons, can modify the Governor's January budget proposal. In some annual budgets the legislature has added constraints with incentives or controls on enrollment growth – such as a requirement that the CSU return dollars to the state if the University's enrollment target is not met. Such a constraint was included with the 2004-05 budget, and when CSU missed its enrollment target by 0.85%, or 2,741 FTES, the University was required to return \$15.5 million to the state. Similar control language was included in the 2005-06 budget and has been included for 2006-07. Often the CSU has operated under a budget act that provided no tolerance for an enrollment level that was even one FTES short of the established target.

Enrollment History by Campus

Table 1 shows the recent history of enrollments at each of the campuses in the system.

Table 1
FTES Enrollment Targets and Actuals
2002-03 through 2004-05

	2002-03 Target	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Target	2003-04 Actual	2004-05 Target	2004-05 Actual
Bakersfield	6,247	6,529.5	6,739	6,620.8	6,588	6,473.7
Channel Islands	1,320	1,299.1	1,611	1,583.0	1,575	1,730.2
Chico	14,646	14,573.7	14,500	14,133.9	14,174	14,160.8
Dominguez Hills	9,294	9,327.5	9,474	9,487.7	9,261	8,796.3
East Bay	11,765	12,265.6	12,085	12,001.1	11,814	11,682.7
Fresno	16,689	17,033.9	17,254	17,442.9	16,867	16,985.9
Fullerton	23,805	24,632.8	24,810	24,910.2	24,453	24,395.4
Humboldt	7,450	7,289.1	7,376	7,329.0	7,209	6,858.8
Long Beach	26,598	27,661.5	27,463	27,411.3	26,896	26,816.0
Los Angeles	16,653	17,051.8	17,083	17,016.4	16,700	16,531.1
Maritime Academy	830	808.8	852	867.8	833	871.6
Monterey Bay	3,261	3,287.4	3,617	3,569.8	3,536	3,577.5
Northridge	22,527	23,829.7	24,148	24,232.3	23,606	23,460.7
Pomona	17,267	17,651.9	17,632	17,644.5	17,236	16,754.0
Sacramento	21,950	22,134.9	22,537	22,457.5	22,082	21,716.8
San Bernardino	13,167	13,526.1	13,701	13,731.4	13,393	12,637.3
San Diego	27,201	28,241.4	27,941	27,459.5	26,812	27,157.2
San Francisco	21,836	22,863.5	22,777	23,576.5	22,468	23,209.0
San Jose	21,628	22,987.2	22,152	21,968.4	21,655	21,140.2
San Luis Obispo	16,900	17,598.3	16,901	17,169.2	16,521	16,263.9
San Marcos	5,642	6,075.6	6,049	6,139.2	5,913	5,854.4
Sonoma	6,715	6,810.4	6,890	6,996.7	6,736	6,778.3
Stanislaus	6,423	6,536.8	6,610	6,527.5	6,462	6,254.5
System Program	1,318	1,336.7	1,363	1,428.0	1,330	1,232.1
Total	321,132	331,353.0	331,565	331,704.4	324,120	321,338.5

Beginning in January 2005, campuses developed and refined enrollment plans to meet the Governor's budget enrollment target for 2005-06. Careful assumptions about reduced demand for teacher preparation and increased number of degree conferrals have been coupled with the need to increase instruction for continuing students and increase access and instruction for new first-time freshmen and upper-division undergraduate transfer students.

Current Enrollment Situation

As was true of 2004-05, the final state budget for 2005-06 required the CSU to meet or exceed its enrollment target. For each annualized FTE student that the CSU should fall short of this target, the University would be forced to return the General Fund portion of the marginal cost of enrollment funding. In recognition of this requirement, the Chancellor's expectation of all campuses was that their enrollments would be slightly in excess of the annualized target.

Campus presidents were informed in November 2005 that historical enrollment patterns for all campuses suggested the University would be very close to the overall target with little margin for error. It was clear at that time that achieving the system enrollment target would be dependent on several of the campuses significantly surpassing their targets, since a number of the campuses were well below target at that point. To recognize this imbalance across the system, presidents were informed there would be one-time funding adjustments, either up or down, following the final census data for spring 2006. Specifically, campuses that were greater than 2% over target for 2005-06 were promised additional marginal cost funding, on a one-time basis, for fall 2006. Similarly, for campuses greater than 2% below the annualized enrollment target, there would be a one-time funding reduction. Table 2 shows the campuses that were over target by 2% or more and those campuses that were under target by an amount greater than 2%, together with the associated reduction in the level of general funds appropriated for the campus.

Campus efforts to manage enrollment for 2005-06 resulted in the system surpassing the established target by nearly 2,155 FTES. Table 3 represents the enrollment targets for 2006-07 adjusted for experience in 2005-06. In Table 3, the column headed "Advance on 2007-08" shows enrollment that was funded primarily by using money taken from campuses that were short of target, and provided to campuses that have sufficient enrollment demand to exceed target. As previously noted, the 2006-07 state budget expectation is that the CSU meet or exceed its enrollment target. Any shortfall in enrollment will require a return of General Fund dollars to the state.

Table 2
2005-06 Enrollment Funding Redistribution

Campus	FTES Enrollment		General Fund Change
	greater than +2%	less than -2%	
Bakersfield		(85)	(\$416,330)
Channel Islands	477		\$2,248,578
Chico			
Dominguez Hills		(585)	(\$2,502,630)
East Bay		(647)	(\$3,050,605)
Fresno			
Fullerton	1,677		\$7,648,797
Humboldt		(241)	(\$1,229,341)
Long Beach			
Los Angeles		(317)	(\$1,425,549)
Maritime Academy	84		\$504,924
Monterey Bay		(49)	(\$259,700)
Northridge	481		\$2,220,296
Pomona			
Sacramento			
San Bernardino			
San Diego			
San Francisco	174		\$796,224
San Jose			
San Luis Obispo	156		\$800,124
San Marcos	76		\$357,960
Sonoma		(38)	(\$189,506)
Stanislaus			
Campus Total	3,125	(1,962)	\$5,503,242
SysProg			
CSU Total	3,125	(1,962)	\$5,503,242

Table 3
FTES Enrollment
Targets, Actuals and One-Time Advance
2005-06 through 2006-07

	2005-06 Target	2005-06 Campus Report	% Difference	2006-07 Planning Estimate	2006-07 Adjusted Target	06-07 Advance on 07-08	2006-07 Final Target
Bakersfield	6,753	6,533	-3.3%	6,909	6,667		6,667
Channel Islands	1,614	2,123	31.5%	2,150	2,225	125	2,350
Chico	14,528	14,540	0.1%	14,800	14,750		14,750
Dominguez Hills	9,493	8,718	-8.2%	9,570	9,150		9,150
East Bay	12,109	11,220	-7.3%	12,207	12,109		12,109
Fresno	17,289	17,439	0.9%	17,511	17,586	250	17,836
Fullerton	25,010	27,187	8.7%	25,650	25,750	652	26,402
Humboldt	7,389	7,000	-5.3%	7,450	7,240		7,240
Long Beach	27,551	27,768	0.8%	28,240	28,240	100	28,340
Los Angeles	17,118	16,459	-3.8%	17,408	16,611		16,611
Maritime Academy	854	955	11.8%	861	951		951
Monterey Bay	3,624	3,503	-3.3%	3,850	3,850		3,850
Northridge	24,196	25,161	4.0%	25,202	25,302	193	25,495
Pomona	17,667	17,642	-0.1%	18,000	18,075	125	18,200
Sacramento	22,617	22,306	-1.4%	23,236	22,860		22,860
San Bernardino	13,728	13,556	-1.3%	14,128	14,128		14,128
San Diego	27,616	27,638	0.1%	28,450	28,450		28,450
San Francisco	22,974	23,607	2.8%	23,474	23,559	316	23,875
San Jose	22,196	22,534	1.5%	22,478	22,561	239	22,800
San Luis Obispo	16,934	17,429	2.9%	17,327	17,500		17,500
San Marcos	6,072	6,269	3.2%	6,462	6,462		6,462
Sonoma	6,904	6,728	-2.5%	7,215	7,215		7,215
Stanislaus	6,624	6,713	1.3%	6,677	6,757		6,757
SysPrograms	1,363	1,350	-1.0%	1,305	1,305		1,305
Total	332,223	334,378	0.6%	340,560	339,303	2,000	341,303

Enrollment Funding Allocation Methodology

The expected enrollment and enrollment growth for the system is reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees each year as a part of the budget review prior to CSU's submission to the Department of Finance. Expectations about campus enrollments are part of a multi-year plan that guides year-to-year allocations for both the operating and capital budgets.

The enrollment funding allocation methodology has been well articulated throughout the system, and is consistent with expectations from state public policy makers that the CSU is funded to accommodate enrollment demand across the state.