

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: Closed Session
10:00 a.m. Tuesday, January 25, 2005
Munitz Conference Room

Meeting: Open Session
8:00 a.m., Wednesday, January 26, 2005
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Shailesh J. Mehta, Vice Chair
Jeffrey L. Bleich
Herbert L. Carter
Moctesuma Esparza
Debra S. Farar
Robert G. Foster
George G. Gowgani
Eric Guerra
William Hauck
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Melinda Guzman Moore
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Closed Session – Munitz Room

1. Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees, *Action*

Open Session – Dumke Auditorium

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 17, 2004

Discussion Items

2. California Academy of Mathematics and Science: National Model of Excellence and Winner of Blue Ribbon School Award, *Information*
3. Analysis of California State University Graduation Rates, *Information*
4. Facilitating Graduation: Progress Report #2, *Information*
5. Joint Doctoral Programs in Education with the University of California: Progress Report, *Information*

**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**

November 17, 2004

Members Present

Debra S. Farar, Acting Chair
Herbert L. Carter
Moctesuma Esparza
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
George Gowgani
Eric Guerra
William Hauck
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Melinda Guzman Moore
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Trustee Farar called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 15, 2004, were approved by consent as submitted.

California State University Accountability Process-The Third Biennial Report

Trustee Debra S. Farar provided a brief background of the CSU Accountability Process. She said that Cornerstones Principle 9 committed the CSU to account for its performance through periodic reports to the public. Following the Board of Trustees' approval of the Cornerstones Implementation Plan in March 1999, the CSU Accountability Process was developed through a systemwide process that included input from the Alumni Council, the California State Student Association, and the Academic Senate CSU. The Trustees approved the CSU Accountability Process in November 1999. Trustee Farar said that reports on Accountability had been presented to the Trustees in 2000 and 2002. She introduced Executive Vice Chancellor David S. Spence to present the third biennial report.

Dr. Spence provided information about trends in nine performance areas, based on data from 2002-03: (1) quality of baccalaureate degree programs; (2) access to the CSU; (3) progression to

the degree; (4) persistence and graduation; (5) areas of special state need; (6) relations with K-12; (7) remediation; (8) facilities utilization; and (9) university advancement.

Trustee Guzman Moore thanked Dr. Spence and Academic Affairs staff for their hard work in putting together the report and commended the campuses for the successes that were reflected in the document. She emphasized that to adequately assess the information contained in the report, the Board needed more time to review and discuss it. She asked that the issue be back on the agenda for the January Board meeting.

Describing Dr. Spence's report as a "market assessment of our students and whom we're serving," Trustee Guzman Moore said that it would be useful to have the data on remediation and graduation rates broken down according to students' race/ethnicity. She said she also wanted to know how many of the students reflected in the numbers were EOP and disabled students, what percentage of community college students are transferring to CSU, and which campuses are doing particularly well on issues of accountability. She said that the success models of the latter could be drawn upon by other campuses in the system.

Trustee Pierce commended Chancellor Reed and Dr. Spence for their leadership in the area of accountability. He also thanked the campus presidents for their commitment to establish strong alumni relations and said that, due in large part to their commitment, alumni membership and contributions have shown impressive growth. Trustee Pierce said that such progress would pay dividends for years to come as engaged alumni become stronger donors of the CSU.

Trustee Chandler asked if there is any program that encourages students who do not get admitted to the CSU to go through the community college transfer process. Dr. Spence said that a full dual admission program did not get the support it needed from the California Community Colleges but that a new approach, the Lower-Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) Project, promises to accomplish similar goals.

Chancellor Reed said that he has encouraged Dr. Mark Drummond, Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, to attend the January Board meeting. He said a significant portion of a recent meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, which Dr. Reed attended, was devoted to the issue of transfer generally and to SB 1785 specifically. SB 1785 calls for simplifying the transfer process by providing a uniform set of courses by major program for all CSU-bound students.

Board Chair Galinson asked about the effect on graduation rates of transferring from one campus to another. He said that he didn't want students to feel discouraged to move if it was in their best interests to do so. Dr. Spence acknowledged that while it is true that graduating is what is most important, the CSU wants each campus to do all it can to graduate students from that campus. CSU Monterey Bay President Peter P. Smith said that data show that in every sector of higher education, the more students move, the less likely they are to graduate.

CSU Hayward President Norma S. Rees said that closer attention needs to be paid to the interaction between graduation rates and the funding reductions that the campuses have suffered during the past few years. As an example, she said that in the past it might have been possible for programs to offer the same course during the day and evening or more than once a year. She said that many of those offerings have since been cut back, depriving students of the opportunity to graduate expeditiously.

Trustee Kaiser asked Dr. Spence if part of the reason the CSU focuses on the graduation rates of native freshmen is because that is how campuses across the country are evaluated by the federal government. Dr. Spence indicated that the six-year graduation rates of native freshmen are the only national comparison standard. Trustee Kaiser asked how much of the 20-percent of freshmen applicants who are denied admission to the CSU is due to a reduction in funding to admit freshmen. Assistant Vice Chancellor Allison Jones replied that, typically, students who are CSU eligible and denied admission have applied to an impacted campus or major and are students outside the local area. He said that it is important to note that students who are denied admission in such instances are redirected to another campus at which they are guaranteed admission if they choose to accept it. He said that sometimes students choose not to accept the offer and attend a community college instead.

Trustee Esparza asked if it was possible to get data that compared graduation rates across campuses. He said that campus-specific information would enable the Board to understand better what special problems the individual campuses may have. Dr. Spence said that it was possible to provide that information but cautioned that comparing graduation rates is very sensitive and difficult. He said that rather than comparing campuses, CSU was putting into place a goal-setting process through which he and Chancellor Reed would meet with the presidents and identify ways in which the campuses could stretch to improve their graduation rates. He said that the goals would be specific to the individual campuses.

Trustee Esparza said that he was interested in knowing how the CSU prepares future teachers, with a focus on what might explain their successes and their failures once they get to the classroom and interact with students. Chancellor Reed said the CSU has been attempting to address those questions longer than any other system of higher education in the country. He said that the CSU follows up with the school and supervisor of every teacher the CSU prepares. He said that the CSU has been very receptive to what it learns from the field. As an example, he said that two years ago the CSU learned that it was not preparing middle school and high school teachers to teach reading across the curriculum. In response, the campus presidents, provosts and deans re-engineered some of their programs at the secondary level. Chancellor Reed said that the CSU wants to tie its teacher preparation performance to public school performance.

Trustee Jackson said that he would be interested in hearing the campus presidents' comments on Dr. Spence's report. He also referred to the need for stronger academic advising and asked when the issue would be examined more in depth. Dr. Spence said that Academic Affairs staff would be discussing the issue with the campus presidents and provosts in December.

Trustee Guerra asked if it was possible to find out the average unit load, per academic year, of first-time freshmen who earn a baccalaureate degree within six years. Assistant Vice Chancellor Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi said that such information has not been made available by the campuses. She noted, however, that many campuses give priority to register for classes first to incoming students and then to students nearest graduation. She underscored the importance of course roadmaps, which she said would allow administrators, faculty and students to get a clearer understanding of what is required year after year in terms of scheduling.

Dr. Spence expressed special concern about students who take full course loads each year yet still fail to graduate in four years. He said that efforts need to be made to find out why this occurs so often.

Trustee Guerra asked about the item in the report that showed that the average, CSU-bound community college student takes 81 units by the time they transfer. Dr. Spence said that the figure came from a five-year old study but that he had little reason to believe that the numbers would be different today.

Facilitating Graduation: Progress Report #2

Trustee Farar said that in May 2002, Dr. Spence convened the first meeting of the CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation. The task force considered strategies that can help CSU students make progress towards and complete baccalaureate degrees. In the report released in December 2002, the task force made several recommendations for improving degree completion and asked each CSU campus to address those recommendations. Trustee Farar said that Dr. Spence would provide an overview of campus progress to date.

Dr. Spence said that campuses had been asked to report, by program, the extent to which they were meeting important recommendations such as developing roadmaps, advising more effectively, and conducting degree audits. He said that within the next several weeks, Academic Affairs leadership would be visiting five or six campuses to get a better understanding of the challenges they face in their efforts to meet these recommendations. He said the group would also try to identify best practices, ways in which campuses were meeting the recommendations successfully. Dr. Spence said that he would report the group's findings to the Trustees at the January Board meeting. He said that special emphasis would be placed on the situations of specific campuses and, in light of those circumstances, the extent to which realistic goals for improvement over time could be set.

Dr. Spence emphasized that the CSU is still in a significant budget and enrollment crunch. He explained that one of the reasons for having the Graduation Initiative was not only to be fair to students and facilitate their earning of a baccalaureate degree, but to create access for new students that CSU might not be able to admit unless current students moved through the pipeline more efficiently.

At Trustee Guzman Moore's request, Dr. Spence provided background on the creation of the Task Force on Facilitating Graduation. Trustee Guzman Moore suggested that the CSU might consider hosting a higher education summit on pressing issues facing CSU, the University of California, and the California Community Colleges. She said that such a summit might enable the state's higher education segments to more clearly articulate their concerns to the legislature.

CSU Monterey Bay President Peter P. Smith asked the Board to consider a few items while reviewing the information presented by Dr. Spence. He said the information was good and would get better but, at the same time, what was crucial in a period of economic downturn was that individual campuses develop the capacity to undertake these tasks day in and day out. He said he also hoped that the Board would not confuse graduation rates, which the CSU wants to increase, with unintended disincentives to admit students in the top third of their graduating class who by their very nature have been less successful in high school. Dr. Smith said that if the CSU becomes preoccupied with looking good, then the students who are generally eligible for CSU from the 16-30 percentile will be perceived as riskier for the system. The resulting cost to society would be high. He said that it was important for the CSU to be careful about not skimming for certain students.

Trustee Gowgani said student advisement and course requirement flexibility are crucial to facilitating graduation and should be addressed when the issue of accountability comes before the Board again in January. Dr. Spence said that the importance of student advising is acknowledged widely and that he was hopeful it would be addressed effectively through work with the Academic Senate CSU and the California State Student Association.

Trustee Carter said that he was concerned about CSU graduation rates but that he was more concerned about the system serving the people of California. He said that more important than whether it took a student five years or 10 years to graduate was the quality of education the CSU provided. He emphasized that the campuses have students who arrive at CSU at different levels of preparedness and said that the system's responsibility is to serve people as they come to CSU. He suggested it would be unfair to hold campuses like CSU Dominguez Hills and CSU Los Angeles to the same graduation rate standards as CSU Chico or Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

Chancellor Reed said that he and Dr. Spence made a commitment to the presidents not to compare institutions. He said that the campuses have different resources, different programs, different students, and so forth. He said that he and Dr. Spence need to negotiate campus-specific goals with the presidents, with the intention of stretching each campus to its full potential. Trustee Kaiser shared Chancellor Reed's sentiments and said that the diversity of the campuses needs to be celebrated, not used as a weapon against them.

CSU Los Angeles President James M. Rosser underscored the importance of taking into consideration the diversity of the campuses. He said that CSU Los Angeles was established to serve a working class student body, not traditional 18-24 year-olds. He said that, in any given

year, the campus enrolls only about 1,500 students who are first-time freshman out of high school. Since 1970, the majority of the campus' students have been women. Since 1972, the majority of the campus' students have been students of color. Dr. Rosser said that CSU Los Angeles ranks among the top 150 universities in the country whose baccalaureate recipients go on to get Ph.D.s.

Trustee Holdsworth said that it might be useful to see how the Early Assessment Program links to the Graduation Initiative. He said that identifying such linkages would better enable the CSU to inform the communities and local schools about their responsibilities to get their students ready to go to a CSU.

Trustee Guerra said that while working toward his baccalaureate degree, he found that time to graduation has important financial implications. Dr. Spence said that a primary goal of the Graduation Initiative is to make it possible for students who want to finish as directly as possible to do so.

The meeting was adjourned by Trustee Farar.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review and Recommendation of Nominees for Honorary Degrees

Presentation By

Roberta Achtenberg
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

Recommendations from the Committee on Educational Policy, Subcommittee on Honorary Degrees, will be addressed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 11126 (c) (5) [closed session “to consider the conferring of honorary degrees”].

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

California Academy of Mathematics and Science: National Model of Excellence and Winner of Blue Ribbon School Award

Presentation By

Dr. Kathleen Clark, Principal
California Academy of Mathematics and Science
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dr. James E. Lyons, Sr., President
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Summary

The CSU Dominguez Hills campus is host to a unique 9th-grade to 12th-grade high school known as the California Academy of Mathematics and Science (CAMS). The Academy is a public, four-year high school which focuses on preparing young people, particularly minorities and women, for careers in mathematics and science. In a September 2004 letter from U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige, CAMS was notified that it had been selected as a national model of excellence and as a recipient of the 2004 No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon School award. In California, only 33 schools (from elementary to high school) were given this national honor. In Los Angeles County, six schools were recognized. Of those six, three are high schools: Beverly Hills High School, La Canada High School, and CAMS.

Background

Founded in 1990 on the campus of CSU Dominguez Hills, CAMS is among the most innovative and successful educational reform programs in the United States. It is also one of the most ethnically diverse schools, with a student body that is 12.8% African American, 7.4% Asian (underrepresented), 19.1% Asian (all other), 14.4% European-American, 13.4% Filipino, 31.4% Latina/Latino, 0.7% Native American, and 0.2% Pacific Islander. About 60% of CAMS families speak at least two languages (English and another), and 43% of students participate in the federal lunch program.

With a current enrollment of 618, of which 53.4% are female, CAMS admits students from a consortium of 11 Southern California school districts. Interested students apply to the Academy while in eighth grade through the 76 middle schools in the consortium. Since the first graduating class in 1994, more than 95% of all CAMS students have matriculated directly to four-year colleges and universities after graduation.

CAMS's success is founded on a rigorous curriculum. This includes four years of math (including university calculus) and the equivalent of six years of science. In foreign languages, students are required to take two years, but four years are recommended and are available in Spanish and Japanese. Eleventh- and twelfth-grade students are able to take university courses through CSUDH and receive university credit. Dominguez Hills faculty members and industry scientists provide an extensive array of university electives as well as teaching resources. The average number of university units completed by CAMS graduates is 22.

Impact of the Program

As the number of American college students majoring in mathematics and science continues its precipitous decline, it is all the more important that high schools prepare a pool of students capable of and interested in a career in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. As the nation loses ground in these fields, and as the nation's workforce becomes increasingly composed of minorities and women, it is all the more apparent that the school's mission is vital to the future of the nation.

The opportunities offered to CAMS students would not be possible without private support. Donations from more than twenty corporations and foundations have contributed to the integrity and success of CAMS. Among those providing significant support are The Ahmanson Foundation, Northrop Grumman Corporation, Honeywell Corporation, The Boeing Company, Edison International, Weingart Foundation and others.

This support includes funding for important capital projects. In 2001, CAMS opened a new instructional facility. The \$8 million dollar project was funded in part with \$4 million in gifts from the private sector. Currently, another building is on the drawing board and recently received \$400,000 in support from Northrop Grumman Corporation.

In awarding the NCLB Blue Ribbon to CAMS, however, the U.S. Department of Education recognized not public and private funding but student academic achievement, an area in which CAMS excels.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Analysis of California State University Graduation Rates

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

At the November 2004 Board meeting, Trustees received the third biennial Accountability report, and heard a presentation by Executive Vice Chancellor Spence. Members of the Board welcomed Dr. Spence's plan to offer a further opportunity for discussion of the data at the next-upcoming Board meeting. Among other Accountability indicators, some Board member comments indicated particular interest in rates of access to the CSU, persistence and graduation with the baccalaureate degree.

In a report to be distributed at the January 25-26 meeting, Board members will receive an analysis focused on access as freshmen by racial / ethnic sub-group; graduation rates by racial / ethnic sub-group; and comparisons of CSU graduation rates with national bench marks by racial / ethnic sub-group.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Facilitating Graduation: Progress Report #2

Presentation By

Dr. David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

In March 2003, the CSU Board of Trustees endorsed the report of the Task Force on Facilitating Graduation, directed the chancellor to encourage the campus presidents and faculty to pursue actively the recommendations of the report, and requested periodic reports on campus progress in meeting the goals. This is the second report on progress in improving degree completion.

Background

Long known for its commitment to access—to giving students with potential and ability the chance for a college education, the California State University would also like to be known for its success in graduating the students it admits. Study after study has shown that college graduates have better health, are more active in the community, engage in more cultural and social activities, earn larger salaries, and find more professional satisfaction than those who do not earn the degree. The marked disparity between those with and without the baccalaureate prompted the CSU, in 2002, to convene a systemwide Task Force on Facilitating Graduation to study the topic of degree completion in the CSU and to make recommendations for helping students progress to the bachelor's degree.

Chaired by Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair of the Academic Senate CSU, and Louanne Kennedy, Provost at CSU Northridge, the task force reviewed CSU graduation rates from a number of perspectives, researched the factors that correlate with degree completion, explored strategies employed at universities across the nation, considered a range of policy options, and ultimately developed a series of recommendations for CSU campuses, the CSU system, and the CSU Board of Trustees.

This information was presented in the report entitled “Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree: A Report on the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation.” (See <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/FacilitatingGraduation.pdf>)

Update on Activities

In the task force's report released in December 2002, the group made several recommendations: some addressed to the CSU system, some to the individual CSU campuses, and some to the CSU Board of Trustees.

For CSU Campuses:

1. Develop 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation roadmaps for all academic degree programs.
2. Develop class schedules designed to accommodate these roadmaps and ensure that required courses will be available during the specified terms.
3. Require a mandatory progress-to-degree audit at a specific checkpoint.
4. Improve online and hard-copy university catalogues.
5. Use summer term to promote student progress to degree.
6. Offer new students an intensive first-year experience.
7. Expand faculty professional development.
8. Improve advising practices.

For the CSU System:

9. Ensure that there is an infrastructure and funding to allow each campus to establish on-demand, online progress-to-degree audits.
10. Sponsor multi-campus workshops for the sharing of effective practices for facilitating graduation.
11. Consider the need for CSU systemwide policies on course drops, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats.

For the CSU Board of Trustees:

12. Review campus plans and progress annually.
13. After four years, assess the improvements in graduation rates, and consider if more incentives and disincentives are needed for both students and institutions.
14. Consider budgetary augmentation to implement recommendations.

Below is a summary of progress in implementing the recommendations.

CSU System

In December 2003, the Office of the Chancellor and the Academic Senate CSU sponsored a two-day conference for all CSU campuses to share effective strategies for facilitating transfer and degree completion. Workshop topics included developing roadmaps, degree audits, better advising, and student support services. Over 200 people, from presidents to faculty to counselors, attended to learn about best practices.

In June 2004, the Office of the Chancellor convened 23 individuals from CSU campuses specifically to discuss first-year experience courses. The group discussed helping new students integrate into the campus experience through learning communities, service-learning experiences, and support from peer mentors. Research shows that students who feel integrated into the university community and local community are more likely to graduate than those who feel disengaged.

CSU Campuses

The task force report asked each CSU campus to develop a plan, based on institutional research, to improve graduation rates. Each plan would contain elements common to all CSU institutions and some elements unique to the specific culture and environment of the campus. Campuses were expected to address the development of roadmaps, the development of class schedules designed to accommodate these roadmaps, mandatory progress-to-degree audits, improved university catalogs, and the effective use of summer terms. They were encouraged to also consider developing first-year experience courses, effective advising practices, and faculty development experiences for improved instructional effectiveness.

Almost all CSU campuses have completed or are close to completing roadmaps, as well as class schedules to accommodate the roadmaps, for students who plan to graduate in four years. Mandatory degree-audits and mandatory advising for all students have proved to be more difficult to implement. Degree audits are a feature of PeopleSoft, but most campuses have not yet implemented this particular feature. Funds for investing in mandatory advising had to compete with funds for course offerings in a difficult budget year. However, these activities remain priorities for all the campuses.

The following are a few selected examples of campus best practices in improving student progress to degree:

CSU Long Beach: Mandatory Advising for Freshmen. It is important for freshmen to see an advisor promptly and to actually take the required classes for their academic program. The campus therefore makes advising mandatory for freshmen, as part of a comprehensive program to direct students to appropriate classes. The university has made a commitment to provide enough class sections to guarantee that every freshman can have a full program (at least 12 units) of appropriate courses and that every student can complete basic skills courses early in the college career. First-semester freshmen are not allowed to register until an advisor has approved their program. Most obtain advising during the summer or winter before their first semester. Advisors place students into pre-baccalaureate classes where required and into other classes appropriate to their level of preparation and academic goals. Once registered, first-semester freshmen may not change their programs without the permission of an advisor. Freshmen are also required to see an advisor before they are allowed to register for a second semester. This mandatory advising

includes both a review of requirements and exercises to have students look ahead and plan programs based on their career goals.

CSU Hayward: Degree Audit System. The campus's DegreeWorks audit system is currently in production and being used by faculty and university advisors to assist in their advising function. In this academic year, DegreeWorks will be accessible to students to monitor their progress towards degree requirements. In addition, in 2005, a Curriculum Planning Assistant query and reporting tool for DegreeWorks will be implemented. It will allow the university to query the degree audit system to determine the courses and number of seats required in a given term in order to make sure students can get the classes they need to graduate.

San Francisco State: Mandatory Advising in the Major. The School of Engineering has implemented a mandatory advising system to better serve all undergraduate engineering students. Every semester, a notice is sent to all engineering students indicating that they MUST attend the mandatory advising meetings held on advising day at the end of each semester. Separate meetings are arranged for (1) Lower Division, (2) General Education, (3) Civil Engineering, (4) Electrical Engineering, and (5) Mechanical Engineering. The purpose is to provide good advice to all students on topics including university policies, college regulations, curriculum modifications, what to do and what not to do, etc. Information is presented to students in auditorium settings, and individual advising is available after the general meetings. All students need to fill out a Student Planning Worksheet in which all required and elective engineering courses are listed so that students know how many courses they still need to take in order to graduate. Prerequisite requirements for all engineering courses are listed, and a transfer evaluation form is also included to make sure transfer courses are approved by engineering faculty. If a student does not attend either the regular advising day or a make-up advising day, then an advising hold is placed on his/her record. Students need to see the Director of the School of Engineering in order to have the advising hold released. Two to three times a week, the Engineering office sends a list of students to the Registrar's Office to release the advising hold for those students who have been advised.

Cal Poly Pomona: Course Scheduling to Meet Student Demand. Many departments have developed practices for course scheduling to meet student demand. These strategies include the following: 1) The highest priority for scheduling is for graduating seniors. 2) Schedules are designed to accommodate working students, with sections distributed throughout the morning, afternoon, and evening. 3) After initial registration, resources are reallocated to meet the demand from students. This involves adding and deleting sections for many courses. 4) Departments adjust the number of sections offered each term based on prerequisites and trends. 5) Departments publish each spring a list of upper-division electives for the following academic year.

Humboldt State: Advising for Students who are Undeclared or in Transition. The advising center provides assistance to undeclared students in finding an appropriate major through advising, special workshops, and referrals. The center monitors the progress of undeclared students to

assure that they are meeting their academic goals in a timely manner. In addition, the center assists students who have declared majors but are considering a change of major. Another important function is to counsel students who are considering dropping out of school. The center is a required stop for students planning on leaving the campus without earning a degree. Finally, the center works with students considering educational leaves or exchange programs to ensure proper course articulations are completed so that students will be able to complete degree requirements in a timely fashion.

Monitoring Campus Progress

Staff members of the Chancellor's Office visited selected campuses to review and discuss campus activities to improve graduation rates. These visits are likely to continue, with an emphasis on looking at individual degree programs on the campus and how well they are able to comply with the report's recommendations.

Today's meeting of the Board of Trustees will feature a panel discussion led by Executive Vice Chancellor David S. Spence, CSU presidents, students, and faculty. In this forum campus representatives can clarify issues that facilitate or obstruct improved graduation rates.

In the time between this meeting of the Board of Trustees and the March 2005 meeting, there will be consideration of a formal process for monitoring and encouraging campus efforts to improve degree completion.

Future Activities to Encourage Improved Degree Completion

Campuses will be encouraged to renew efforts to address the recommendations for roadmaps, schedules that accommodate students' needs, progress-to-degree audits, and improved advising. In addition, the Chancellor's Office will begin a discussion of a series of policy changes that may include the following:

- Encouraging alternate ways to earning course credits (more AP courses, credit-by-exam, challenge exams)
- Reconsidering policies for drops, withdrawals, and incompletes
- Reducing the number of course repeats allowed
- Requiring the declaration of a major at 45 units
- Putting limits on changes of major
- Providing incentives for students to complete a degree with a minimum number of units.

The final recommendation of the Task Force on Facilitating Graduation is directed to the CSU Board of Trustees. It states, "After four years, assess the improvements in graduation rates, and consider if more incentives and disincentives are needed for both students and institutions."

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Joint Doctoral Programs in Education with the University of California: Progress Report

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Background

The California State University and the University of California entered into a formal agreement in November 2001 to create an expedited mechanism to establish new joint Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) programs to meet the state's need for skilled leaders in K-12 schools and community colleges. In accord with this agreement, the systems established the Joint Ed.D. Board to solicit, develop, fund, and expedite the approval of proposals for joint Ed.D. programs that build on the strengths of CSU and UC campuses and reflect the co-equal status of CSU and UC in their development and implementation. Each system pledged \$2 million dollars over an initial two-year period to support this initiative.

The Board solicited proposals from partnerships of CSU and UC campuses for three types of grants:

- Short-term planning grants, used to support regional needs assessment; development of relationships with K-12, community college, and other higher education programs; activities to stimulate the interest and commitment of faculty; and preparation for program planning (including preparation of a development-grant proposal);
- Development grants, used to support all aspects of program development and expected to culminate in the completion and submission of a program implementation proposal; and
- Implementation grants (the release of which are conditional on final approval of the program implementation proposal), used to ensure that the necessary faculty complement is present as enrollments build from program initiation to steady-state levels, at which point the programs will be able to rely on receipt of enrollment-based funding.

Summary of Progress

Four new Ed.D. programs are now in operation, three of which have enrolled their second student cohort. One is a partnership among CSU Long Beach, CSU Los Angeles, Cal Poly

Pomona, CSU Fullerton, and UC Irvine. Within this degree program in Educational Administration and Leadership, students may emphasize urban educational leadership, higher education leadership, educational technology leadership, or K-12 instructional leadership. A second partnership, focusing on leadership for educational equity and the myriad challenges of education in urban environments, involves CSU Hayward, San Francisco State, San José State, and UC Berkeley. Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and UC Santa Barbara are offering a third Ed.D. program, aimed primarily at the preparation of leaders for small and mid-sized school districts outside of metropolitan areas. The newest program is a partnership among CSU San Marcos, San Diego State University, and UC San Diego. This program, with an emphasis on educational leadership for working professionals, will begin to enroll its first cohort of 18 students this month. There is a total of 86 students enrolled to date across the four programs. Five other CSU-UC consortia have received funding through the Joint Ed.D. Board for development of new or expanded Ed.D. programs. The attached table summarizes emphases and timelines for all programs.

All the partnerships are regionally based. They have been alert to the confluence of regional needs and campus academic strengths and interests. In many instances, the partnerships have committed additional resources for responding to the recognized needs. While there is some variation in program emphasis—which is consonant with the multiplicity of needs in California—most of the programs focus on strengthening the knowledge and skills that Ed.D. students need to bring effective leadership to public school or community college settings.

Table 1. Numbers of Students Admitted and Enrolled to Joint Ed.D. Programs Implemented under UC-CSU Joint Ed.D. Initiative

<i>UC</i>	<i>CSU</i>	<i>2003-04</i>	<i>2004-05</i>
Santa Barbara	San Luis Obispo	Apps 13 Admits 7 Enr 7	Apps 13 Admits 11 Enr 8
Berkeley	Hayward, San Francisco, San Jose	Apps 32 Admits 12 Enr 11	Apps 20 Admits 11 Enr 9
Irvine	Los Angeles Long Beach, Pomona, Fullerton	Apps 80 Admits 20 Enr 19	Apps 61 Admits 16 Enr 14
San Diego	San Diego, San Marcos		Apps 35 Admits 18 Enr ---

Attachment A

Ed. Pol. Item 5

January 25-26, 2005

Page 2 of 2

Table 2: Summary of Joint Ed.D. Program Emphases

UC	CSU	Program Status	Emphases
Santa Barbara	San Luis Obispo	In operation	Non-Urban Educational Administration (K-12 predominantly, but adding community college component)
Berkeley	Hayward, San Francisco, San José	In operation	Leadership for Educational Equity (focus on leadership at district or county level in urban areas—four themes within this emphasis)
Irvine	Fullerton	In operation	K-12 Instructional Leadership
	Long Beach		Higher Education and Community College Leadership
	Los Angeles		PreK-12 Urban Educational Leadership
	Pomona		Educational Technology Leadership
San Diego	San Diego, San Marcos	In operation	K-12 Administration and Leadership
Davis	Sacramento, Sonoma	Accepting applications	K-12 and Community College Administration
Santa Cruz	Monterey Bay, San José	Undergoing campus review	Collaborative Leadership in Teaching and Learning
Riverside	Dominguez Hills, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Bernardino	Undergoing campus review	Curriculum and Instruction (mathematics and science); Instructional Leadership—Policy Studies
Merced	Stanislaus	Planning in early stage	Instructional Leadership in mathematics and science
Davis	Fresno	Existing program, has not yet transitioned to new model.	Educational Leadership (planning in progress for separate emphases in K-12 and community college leadership)