

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 20, 2005
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Moctesuma Esparza
Debra S. Farar
Robert G. Foster
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman Moore
William Hauck
Corey Jackson
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 20, 2005

Discussion Items

1. Proposed Title 5 Revision of Student Conduct Code, *Action*
2. Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development, *Action*
3. Graduation Initiative Update, *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**

July 20, 2005

Members Present

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Bob Foster
George Gowgani
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
William Hauck
Corey Jackson
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

Chair Roberta Achtenberg called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 11, 2005 were approved by consent as submitted.

California State University Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs: Second Biennial Report

CSU Fresno President John Welty presented the second biennial report on the implementation of the Board of Trustees' Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs. His report summarized the activities that have taken place on campuses during the two years since the first biennial report was presented to the Board.

Several trustees praised the positive results of the report. Summarizing recommendations made by trustees Holdsworth and Chandler, Chair Achtenberg suggested that the Board consider ways to publicize the positive outcomes of the system's alcohol policies and prevention programs, and look at how the programs might be re-packaged so that they attract more support from the federal government and other outside agencies.

Proposed Title 5 Revision of the Student Conduct Code

Christine Helwick, General Counsel, explained the purpose and goals of a proposed overhaul of the Student Conduct Code contained in Title 5, which has not been significantly revised in many years. CSU President Paul Zingg provided a campus perspective on the proposed changes. He said that the revised code merits support for three reasons: (1) it emphasizes cooperation and partnership between campuses and local communities; (2) it accentuates the relationship students have with their campuses from application to commencement; and (3) it puts into proper context those campus conditions and expectations that help facilitate student achievement.

Ms. Latoya Jared, Director of University Affairs for the California State Student Association, said that most of CSSA's doubts about the proposed changes were alleviated during a conversation with the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, but that students had lingering concerns about the stated intent of the changes. Ms. Jared said the language on this issue needed to be made clearer. Chair Achtenberg asked General Counsel to address CSSA's remaining concerns before the item returns to the Board for action at the September meeting.

Trustees Carter, Foster, and Holdsworth asked about the level of discretion available to campuses to take action on off-campus student conduct. They said they hoped the Office of General Counsel would provide clear and careful guidelines to the campuses. Trustee Smith, Director of the Center for First Amendment Studies at CSU Long Beach, offered to help examine and refine the language in the revised code.

Dr. Marshelle Thobaben, Chair of the Academic Senate CSU, and Dr. Henry Reichman, member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU, thanked the Office of General Counsel for being receptive to faculty concerns about the language used in early versions of the proposed changes. Dr. Thobaben said that the participation of multiple parties in the revision of the code reflects shared governance at its best.

Community Service Learning in the California State University

Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence and President Zingg provided an update on community service learning in the CSU. San Jose State University student Natasha Lovelace talked about her involvement with that campus' service learning program, and emphasized how the experience has helped her to refine her career goals while allowing her to make a positive impact on the lives of others.

Chair Achtenberg asked about the economic impact of community service on the state. Season Eckardt, Director of Community Service Learning, said that CSU students provide 30 million hours of community service annually. She said that when the value of those hours is

calculated using only the minimum wage, the result is the equivalent of approximately \$200 million going toward the improvement of California communities.

Facilitating Graduation

Dr. Spence and Dr. Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, continued the discussion of campus efforts to facilitate graduation. Their presentation focused on plans for implementing the Board's May 2005 directive.

Chair Achtenberg commended Chancellor's Office, campus, and faculty leadership for their extraordinary work to date on facilitating student progress to the baccalaureate degree. She said that the trustees look forward to hearing the campuses' progress reports during the 2005-06 academic year.

Recognition of California State University Faculty Leadership and Support for Trustee Graduation Initiatives

Dr. Spence emphasized that CSU faculty support and leadership have been integral to the definition and implementation of the three-part graduation initiative adopted by the Board of Trustees. Board Chair Galinson, in comments that were widely supported by the trustees, commended and thanked the faculty for their dedication and hard work.

The resolution was adopted (REP 07-05-05).

Chair Achtenberg adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Title 5 Revision of Student Conduct Code

Presentation By

Keith Boyum
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Christine Helwick
General Counsel

Summary

This item proposes a modernization of the CSU Student Conduct Code, which has not been updated in many years. An initial draft was presented for information and discussion at the July meeting. Since that time, the text has been significantly revised in response to various comments and suggestions received from students, faculty, administrators and Trustees.

The substantive content of the revised draft is not radically different from the substance of the existing code. But it is a clearer expression of the university's positive expectations of students and the specific grounds that can form the basis for discipline. There are some new bases for discipline that did not exist when the original code was drafted (e.g., computer misuse). The proposed new code also clarifies for the first time the limits of the legal reach of the university to off-campus behavior, and states that discipline is only appropriate when the student misconduct results in a direct harm to the campus or the campus community. The new language is intended to give clearer guidance to campus judicial officers who had expressed some confusion about some aspects of the existing code.

If the proposed new code is adopted, a new Executive Order will follow that will set out the due process requirements that must accompany every student discipline charge.

Background

The Student Conduct Code provides notice regarding what is expected and unacceptable behavior for CSU students. Because student behaviors change over time, best practice calls for an update of university conduct codes every few years. The CSU Student Conduct Code has not been fully reviewed in many, many years. It needs to be updated.

The proposed new code sets out the expectations for student conduct and a listing of unacceptable behaviors in plain English. It addresses modern problems that were not issues at the time the original code was drafted (e.g. computer misuse). It states clearly for the first time the legal limit of the reach of the university into off-campus behaviors; discipline is appropriate only where there is a substantial disruption of the functions or operation of the university, or a threat to the safety or security of the campus community.

In preparing the proposed new code, input has been solicited from Presidents, the Academic Senate, CSSA, Provosts, Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, Student Judicial Officers, and Trustees, all of which has shaped the current version. Most issues and concerns have been resolved. There have been lively discussions about the First Amendment, off-campus jurisdiction, parallel criminal proceedings, and various aspects of due process. If the proposed new code is adopted by the Board, a new implementing Executive Order will be issued by the Chancellor that will contain direction for the campuses on the due process requirements that must accompany every disciplinary charge. They include a right to a hearing on the merits before a neutral hearing officer whenever a student challenges a proposed disciplinary sanction.. The Chancellor has pledged his full support to ensure that this new code is implemented appropriately on the campuses.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the California State University that Sections 41301, 41303, and 41304 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations be deleted, and replaced with a new Section 41301 (attached) the text of which is set forth in attachment A to agenda item 1 on the September 20-21, 2005 agenda for the Educational Policy Committee.

PROPOSED NEW CODE

Article 2. STUDENT CONDUCT

§ 41301. Standards for Student Conduct

The University is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy living and learning environment for students, faculty, and staff. Each member of the campus community must choose behaviors that contribute toward this end. Student behavior that is not consistent with the Student Conduct Code is addressed through an educational process that is designed to promote safety and good citizenship and, when necessary, impose appropriate consequences.

(a) Student Responsibilities

Students are expected to be good citizens and to engage in responsible behaviors that reflect well upon their university, to be civil to one another and to others in the campus community, and contribute positively to student and university life.

(b) Unacceptable Student Behaviors

The following behavior is subject to disciplinary sanctions:

(1) Dishonesty, including:

- (A) Cheating, plagiarism, or other forms of academic dishonesty that are intended to gain unfair academic advantage.
- (B) Furnishing false information to a University official, faculty member, or campus office.
- (C) Forgery, alteration, or misuse of a University document, key, or identification instrument.
- (D) Misrepresenting oneself to be an authorized agent of the University or one of its auxiliaries.

(2) Unauthorized entry into, presence in, use of, or misuse of University property.

(3) Willful, material and substantial disruption or obstruction of a University-related activity, or any on-campus activity.

(4) Participating in an activity that substantially and materially disrupts the normal operations of the University, or infringes on the rights of members of the University community.

- (5) Willful, material and substantial obstruction of the free flow of pedestrian or other traffic, on or leading to campus property or an off-campus University related activity.
- (6) Disorderly, lewd, indecent, or obscene behavior at a University related activity, or directed toward a member of the University community.
- (7) Conduct that threatens or endangers the health or safety of any person within or related to the University community, including physical abuse, threats, intimidation, harassment, or sexual misconduct.
- (8) Hazing, or conspiracy to haze, as defined in Education Code Sections 32050 and 32051: “Hazing” includes any method of initiation or pre-initiation into a student organization, or any pastime or amusement engaged in with respect to such an organization which causes, or is likely to cause, bodily danger, physical harm, or personal degradation or disgrace resulting in physical or mental harm, to any student or other person attending any school, community college, college, university or other educational institution in this state; but the term “hazing” does not include customary athletic events or other similar contests or competitions.

A group of students acting together may be considered a ‘student organization’ for purposes of this section whether or not they are officially recognized. Neither the express or implied consent of a victim of hazing, nor the lack of active participation while hazing is going on is a defense. Apathy or acquiescence in the presence of hazing is not a neutral act, and is also a violation of this section.

- (9) Use, possession, manufacture, or distribution of illegal drugs or drug-related paraphernalia, (except as expressly permitted by law and University regulations) or the misuse of legal pharmaceutical drugs.
- (10) Use, possession, manufacture, or distribution of alcoholic beverages (except as expressly permitted by law and University regulations), or public intoxication while on campus or at a University related activity.
- (11) Theft of property or services from the University community, or misappropriation of University resources.
- (12) Unauthorized destruction, or damage to University property or other property in the University community.
- (13) Possession or misuse of firearms or guns, replicas, ammunition, explosives, fireworks, knives, other weapons, or dangerous chemicals (without the prior authorization of the campus president) on campus or at a University related activity.

- (14) Unauthorized recording, dissemination, or publication of academic presentations (including handwritten notes) for a commercial purpose.
- (15) Misuse of computer facilities or resources, including:
 - (A) Unauthorized entry into a file, for any purpose.
 - (B) Unauthorized transfer of a file.
 - (C) Use of another's identification or password.
 - (D) Use of computing facilities, campus network, or other resources to interfere with the work of another member of the University Community.
 - (E) Use of computing facilities and resources to send obscene or intimidating and abusive messages.
 - (F) Use of computing facilities and resources to interfere with normal University operations.
 - (G) Use of computing facilities and resources in violation of copyright laws.
 - (H) Violation of a campus computer use policy.
- (16) Violation of any published University policy, rule, regulation or presidential order.
- (17) Failure to comply with directions of, or interference with, any University official or any public safety officer while acting in the performance of his/her duties.
- (18) Any act chargeable as a violation of a federal, state, or local law that poses a substantial threat to the safety or well-being of members of the University community, to property within the University community or poses a significant threat of disruption or interference with University operations.
- (19) Violation of the Student Conduct Procedures, including:
 - (A) Falsification, distortion, or misrepresentation of information related to a student discipline matter.
 - (B) Disruption or interference with the orderly progress of a student discipline proceeding.
 - (C) Initiation of a student discipline proceeding in bad faith.
 - (D) Attempting to discourage another from participating in the student discipline matter.
 - (E) Attempting to influence the impartiality of any participant in a student discipline matter.
 - (F) Verbal or physical harassment or intimidation of any participant in a student discipline matter.
 - (G) Failure to comply with the sanction(s) imposed under a student discipline proceeding.

(20) Encouraging, permitting, or assisting another to do any act that could subject him or her to discipline.

(c) Application of this Code

Sanctions for the conduct listed above can be imposed on applicants, enrolled students, students between academic terms, graduates awaiting degrees, and students who withdraw from school while a disciplinary matter is pending. Conduct that threatens the safety or security of the campus community, or substantially disrupts the functions or operation of the University is within the jurisdiction of this Article regardless of whether it occurs on or off campus. Nothing in this Code may conflict with Education Code section 66301 that prohibits disciplinary action against students based on behavior protected by the First Amendment.

(d) Procedures for Enforcing this Code

The Chancellor shall adopt procedures to ensure students are afforded appropriate notice and an opportunity to be heard before the University imposes any sanction for a violation of the Student Conduct Code.

EXISTING CODE

[Will be deleted and replaced in entirety]

Article 2. Student Discipline

§41301. Expulsion, Suspension and Probation of Students.

Following procedures consonant with due process established pursuant to [Section 41304](#), any student of a campus may be expelled, suspended, placed on probation or given a lesser sanction for one or more of the following causes which must be campus related:

- (a) Cheating or plagiarism in connection with an academic program at a campus.
- (b) Forgery, alteration or misuse of campus documents, records, or identification or knowingly furnishing false information to a campus.
- (c) Misrepresentation of oneself or of an organization to be an agent of a campus.
- (d) Willful, material, and substantial obstruction or disruption, on or off campus property, of the campus educational process, administrative process, or other campus function.
- (e) Physical abuse on or off campus property of the person or property of any member of the campus community or of members of his or her family or the threat of such physical abuse.
- (f) Theft of, or non-accidental damage to, campus property, or property in the possession of, or owned by, a member of the campus community.
- (g) Unauthorized entry into, unauthorized use of, or misuse of campus property.
- (h) On campus property, the sale or knowing possession of dangerous drugs, restricted dangerous drugs, or narcotics as those terms are used in California statutes, except when lawfully prescribed pursuant to medical or dental care, or when lawfully permitted for the purpose of research, instruction or analysis.
- (i) Knowing possession or use of explosives, dangerous chemicals or deadly weapons on campus property or at a campus function without prior authorization of the campus president.
- (j) Engaging in lewd, indecent, or obscene behavior on campus property or at a campus function.
- (k) Abusive behavior directed toward, or hazing of, a member of the campus community.

(l) Violation of any order of a campus president, notice of which had been given prior to such violation and during the academic term in which the violation occurs, either by publication in the campus newspaper, or by posting on an official bulletin board designated for this purpose, and which order is not inconsistent with any of the other provisions of this Section.

(m) Soliciting or assisting another to do any act which would subject a student to expulsion, suspension or probation pursuant to this Section.

(n) Unauthorized recording, dissemination, and publication of academic presentations for commercial purposes. This prohibition applies to a recording made in any medium, including, but not limited to, handwritten or typewritten class notes.

(1) The term “academic presentation” means any lecture, speech, performance, exhibition, or other form of academic or aesthetic presentation, made by an instructor of record as part of an authorized course of instruction that is not fixed in a tangible medium of expression.

(2) The term “commercial purpose” means any purpose that has financial or economic gain as an objective.

(3) “Instructor of record” means any teacher or staff member employed to teach courses and authorize credit for the successful completion of courses.

(o) For purposes of this Article, the following terms are defined:

(1) The term “member of the campus community” is defined as meaning California State University Trustees, academic, non-academic and administrative personnel, students, and other persons while such other persons are on campus property or at a campus function.

(2) The term “campus property” includes:

(A) real or personal property in the possession of, or under the control of, the Board of Trustees of the California State University, and

(B) all campus feeding, retail, or residence facilities whether operated by a campus or by a campus auxiliary organization.

(3) The term “deadly weapons” includes any instrument or weapon of the kind commonly known as a blackjack, sling shot, billy, sandclub, sandbag, metal knuckles, any dirk, dagger, switchblade knife, pistol, revolver, or any other firearm, any knife having a blade longer than five inches, any razor with an unguarded blade, and any metal pipe or bar used or intended to be used as a club.

(4) The term “behavior” includes conduct and expression.

(5) The term “hazing” means any method of initiation into a student organization or any pastime or amusement engaged in with regard to such an organization which causes, or is likely to cause, bodily danger, or physical or emotional harm, to any member of the campus community; but the term “hazing” does not include customary athletic events or other similar contests or competitions.

(6) The causes for discipline in this section shall, as appropriate, include computer-related crimes as provided in Section 502 of the Penal Code.

(p) This Section is not adopted pursuant to Education Code Section 89031.

(q) Notwithstanding any amendment or repeal pursuant to the resolution by which any provision of this Article is amended, all acts and omissions occurring prior to that effective date shall be subject to the provisions of this Article as in effect immediately prior to such effective date.

§41303. Conduct by Applicants for Admission.

Notwithstanding any provision in this Chapter 1 to the contrary, admission or readmission may be qualified or denied to any person who, while not enrolled as a student, commits acts which, were he enrolled as a student, would be the basis for disciplinary proceedings pursuant to Sections 41301 or 41302. Admission or readmission may be qualified or denied to any person who, while a student, commits acts which are subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Section 41301 or Section 41302. Qualified admission or denial of admission in such cases shall be determined under procedures adopted pursuant to Section 41034.

§41304. Student Disciplinary Procedures for the California State University and Colleges

The Chancellor shall prescribe, and may from time to time revise, a code of student disciplinary procedures for the California University and Colleges. Subject to other applicable law, this code shall provide for determinations of fact and sanctions to be applied for conduct which is a ground of discipline under Sections 41301 or 41302, and for qualified admission or denial of admission under Section 41303; the authority of the campus President in such matters; conduct related determinations on financial aid eligibility and termination; alternative kinds of proceedings, including proceedings conducted by a Hearing Officer; time limitations; notice; conduct of hearings, including provisions governing evidence; a record, and review; and such other related matters as may be appropriate.

The Chancellor shall report to the Board his actions taken under this section.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development

Presentation By

Keith O. Boyum
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Summary

In July 1997, the Board of Trustees revised the process for reviewing and approving new degree programs. The new process includes a provision for a limited semi-annual updating of campus academic plans to accommodate "fast-track" program proposals submitted in the early part of the calendar year. The proposed resolution would approve an updated academic plan for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, to include the projection of a new degree program for which a fast-track proposal has been submitted to the Chancellor.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plan and specify the conditions under which the projected program may be implemented.

Background

Each year, campuses update and submit to the Board of Trustees the academic plans guiding program, faculty, and facility development. These plans list the degree programs currently being offered, the proposed new programs, and the dates for review of existing programs. Degree programs that have been recently discontinued are also noted in the agenda item. The plans are the product of extensive consultation and review at each campus and are reviewed by the Office of the Chancellor before their submission to the trustees. This review is grounded in a body of trustee and state policy that has been developed over the last four decades. The Board of Trustees authorizes the inclusion of proposed programs on the academic master plan. The trustees have delegated to the chancellor the authority to approve implementation of degree programs that have been authorized. In most cases, the implementation proposal must be submitted for review to staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), and their concurrence is obtained before the degree program is established.

In July 1997, the Board adopted revised procedures for the review and approval of new degree programs. In addition to the long-established process described above, campuses have two alternative processes for establishing programs: the "fast track" and the pilot program. The fast

track combines the program projection and program implementation phases of the traditional process for a proposed program that meets the following criteria:

- (a) it could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the campus's existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
- (b) it is not subject to specialized accreditation by an agency that is a member of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors, or it is currently offered as an option or concentration that is already recognized and accredited by an appropriate specialized accrediting agency;
- (c) it can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project;
- (d) it is consistent with all existing state and federal law and Trustee policy;
- (e) it is a bachelor's or master's degree program;
- (f) the program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

The fast track provides for a brief agenda item at the September Board of Trustees meeting that makes it possible for a proposal to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office by the prior June, have concerns resolved by the time of the Board meeting in September, be authorized by the Board, be referred to CPEC prior to or soon after the meeting, be endorsed by CPEC by December, be incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring and perhaps be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term, and be ready for full implementation in August.

One fast-track proposal was received in spring 2005: a request from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo to establish a Bachelor of Arts degree program with a major in Comparative Ethnic Studies. The program as proposed meets the criteria for the fast-track process. The faculty, facilities, and information resources needed to offer the program are largely in place, and the campus has made the commitment to provide from its existing resource base the single additional faculty position needed. This interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary major, emphasizing comparative analysis of the experiences of multiple groups, would build on a flourishing minor that the San Luis Obispo campus already offers. The proposed program would be unique in its attention to the interplay of gender, race, science, and technology. The campus has compiled strong evidence of student demand for the program and expects it to make valuable contributions to the campus beyond its direct impact on students who choose it as their major.

Recommended Action

The proposed resolution refers to the campus academic plans approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2005 and includes the customary authorization for newly projected degree programs. The following resolution is recommended for adoption:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Academic Plan for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 5 of the March 15-16, 2005, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Comparative Ethnic Studies, with a projected implementation date of 2006; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the degree program newly included in the campus Academic Plan is authorized for implementation, at approximately the date indicated, subject to the chancellor's determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the program will be available.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Graduation Initiative Update

Presentation By

Keith O. Boyum
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Background and Current Situation

In Fall 2003 the California State University Board of Trustees adopted a three-part initiative to improve the effectiveness and efficiency with which students earn the baccalaureate degree. Centrally, the initiative calls for the California State University to increase high school students' academic preparation for college, to improve the community college transfer process, and to identify a clear path to the degree for matriculated students. As implemented, these programs are (1) the Early Assessment Program; (2) the Lower Division Transfer Patterns program; and (3) Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation.

1. The Early Assessment Program (EAP), a collaborative effort among the California State University, California Department of Education, and California State Board of Education, helps to ensure that college-bound high-school graduates have the English and mathematics skills expected by CSU faculty. EAP information is conveniently available to the general public via the Internet, at <http://www.calstate.edu/eap/>.

Beginning in **2001**, under the guidance of SB 233, CSU faculty have succeeded in identifying the test items required to assess CSU readiness from existing school tests—namely, the 11th grade California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English and mathematics.

A pilot administration in Spring **2003** indicated that the California Standards Tests in Grade 11 English Language Arts, Algebra II and Summative High School Mathematics—augmented with 15 multiple-choice items each and an essay—were useful for providing end-of-year juniors with early signals on their readiness for college in English and mathematics.

2004. Mathematics. Almost three quarters (115,762) of the 157,394 end-of-year juniors who completed the Algebra II and Summative High School Mathematics California Standards Test volunteered for the California State University's Early Assessment of Readiness for College Mathematics. The California State University and California Public Schools were encouraged by the response. Rather than learning about their

readiness for college mathematics late in their senior year, high school juniors preparing for college had time during their 2004-05 senior year to improve their knowledge and skills in mathematics, if needed. About half of incoming freshmen to the CSU have not been ready for college-level mathematics. The good news was that 55% of the end-of-year juniors (63,504 of 115,762) who completed the CSU's EAP in Mathematics showed enough proficiency in mathematics to enroll in college math as of Fall 2004. Unfortunately, math skills diminish significantly when they aren't used. Only 13,643 (21% of the 63,504 college-math-proficient end-of-year juniors, and 12% of the 115,762 who completed the EAP Math test) were so advanced in mathematics that they could undertake no mathematics activities during their senior year and remain college proficient in mathematics. The balance of proficient end-of-year juniors (49,861, or 79% of the 63,504; 43% of the 115,762 who completed the EAP Math test) needed to engage in an approved senior year experience to maintain their mathematics skills and knowledge. End-of-year juniors who were not ready for college-level mathematics needed to improve their skills. Students were encouraged to work with their high school counselors and teachers to improve their skills.

2004. English. Forty percent (153,846) of the 385,814 end-of-year juniors who completed the California Standards Test of Grade 11 English Language Arts volunteered for the California State University's Early Assessment of Readiness for College English. The California State University and California Public Schools were encouraged by the response. Rather than learning about their readiness for college English late in their senior year, high school juniors preparing for college had time during their senior year to improve their knowledge and skills in English through their twelfth grade English classes, if needed. About half of incoming freshmen to the CSU have not been ready for college-level English, so the California State University and California Public Schools expected that the vast majority of end-of-year juniors would not be ready for college-level English. Statewide, 22 percent (33,720) of the tested 153,846 end-of-year juniors were so advanced in their English proficiency that, after admission to a CSU campus, they would be able to enroll directly into college-level English classes without taking the CSU English Placement Test. Other students were encouraged to work with their high school counselors and teachers to improve their skills and knowledge.

2005. The Educational Testing Service reports that all districts that had their STAR answer sheets to the contract processor by June 30, 2005 were confirmed to have received their Early Assessment results by Friday, August 12, 2005. These results included individual letters to students, and a roster of student test-takers and their Early Assessment statuses. Such information permits schools, parents and students to make course selections for students in the 12th grade that can better prepare them for college-level English and mathematics. Because a small number of districts began their instructional year later than the norm, and thus administered assessment examinations

later than the norm, a complete accounting of EAP results is anticipated no earlier than mid-September.

2004, 2005 and Beyond. An emerging and significant effort focuses on professional development for K-12 teachers. The goal is to equip them to provide instruction that will better allow students to meet CSU expectations in English and mathematics. A particular focus for English professional development has been on the 12th Grade Expository Reading and Writing Course, which provides in-depth study of expository, analytical, and argumentative reading and writing, rather than surveys of British and American literature. In mathematics, better alignment with CSU expectations has been sought for the mathematics experience in 12th grade, particularly for students identified via the EAP test as conditionally exempt from CSU's Entry Level Mathematics examination.

2. The Lower Division Transfer Patterns project (LDTP), a joint effort of the Academic Senate CSU and the CSU Chancellor's Office, takes as its central purpose the provision of help in choosing efficient patterns of classes to community college students who wish eventually to transfer to the CSU. The overall goal is to facilitate the graduation of these students in a more timely fashion and without having taken excess units. Information about the LDTP project is conveniently available to the general public via the Internet, at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml>.

In **2000**, the California State University conducted a study to learn more about courses completed at California Community Colleges and how the credits were used to satisfy CSU degree requirements in general education and lower division major prerequisites. The study evaluated transcripts of a sample of students who transferred from California Community Colleges and graduated from CSU in spring 1999. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure that the results took CSU campus enrollment, California Community College institution of origin, and date of matriculation at CSU properly into account. The study documented that the average California Community College student who transferred to CSU accrued 157 semester units—81 units at a California Community College and 76 units at the CSU. Transfer students are allowed to transfer a maximum of 70 semester units; hence, on average, a California Community College transfer student “lost” 11 semester units upon transfer to CSU. Furthermore, all too often, some of the transferable units are not needed to meet requirements for the CSU degree and major.

In July **2004**, following consultation with CSU faculty and students, education policy leaders in the state legislature, and California Community College leadership, the California State University Board of Trustees adopted a change to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations to provide for Lower Division Transfer Patterns by Major. These patterns are specified as comprising a minimum of 45 semester units but no more than 60 semester units that will be accepted at every CSU campus offering a

program leading to that degree and major. Each unit that a student completes in a systemwide LDTP reduces by one unit the total number of units that the student must complete to earn that degree with that major. Systemwide lower-division transfer patterns by major ordinarily include courses that fulfill General Education-Breadth or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum requirements; United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals requirements; and major-specific, lower-division requirements. In addition, campus-specific lower-division transfer patterns by major were provided for, comprising a set of lower-division curricular specifications beyond the systemwide pattern. These are units that will be accepted at a particular CSU campus offering a program leading to a specified degree and major. Each unit that a student completes in a campus-specific LDTP reduces by one unit the total number of units that the student must complete to earn that degree with that major.

Students may agree with a specific CSU campus that they will complete an LDTP for a particular major. Students who so agree and who succeed in completing the pattern will be provided highest priority for admission as an upper division transfer from a California Community College.

This action by the Board was fully consistent with Senate Bill 1715, approved by the Governor on September 24, 2004, which called upon the CSU to establish systemwide lower division curricula for high demand majors.

Many observers judge that, beyond an opportunity for highest priority admission, the significance of LDTPs is that they constitute bright-line advice from CSU faculty to lower division students enrolled at California Community Colleges. Students may know precisely what course work constitutes optimum preparation and the most efficient pathway to the baccalaureate degree. This bright-line advice is available to all students, whether or not they choose to seek highest priority admission agreements.

In **2004-05**, with the strong partnership of the Academic Senate of the California State University, CSU faculty were convened by discipline from every campus offering an undergraduate major of interest for the purpose of defining LDTPs. Systemwide patterns for thirty undergraduate majors were achieved. Those campus-specific patterns not yet in hand will be gathered during Fall 2005.

In **2005-06**, we anticipate (a) completing the systemwide portions for an additional seventeen disciplinary LDTPs; (b) completing the campus-specific portions of LDTPs for all forty-seven disciplines [thirty in 2004-05 + seventeen in 2005-06]; (c) initiating the development of refreshed and elaborated descriptors for the courses that make up disciplinary LDTPs; and (d) beginning a process whereby California Community

Colleges may conveniently, via the Internet, forward courses for articulation with the refreshed and elaborated descriptors.

3. Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation (CAFG). Six major categories comprise this third element of the Trustees' graduation initiative. They include: (a) efficiency in academic program design; (b) support for students in choosing an efficient pathway to the baccalaureate degree; (c) the provision and use of tools to keep students on efficient pathways; (d) strong advising strategies and practices; (e) campus monitoring and feedback; and (f) assuring the priority of facilitating graduation. Information about CAFG will soon be made conveniently available to the general public via the Internet, at <http://calstate.edu/acadaff/cafg.shtml>.

Campus interest in improving student success through focused plans and best practices predates the formal Board-level graduation initiative. In May **2002**, a CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation began its work, co-chaired by Jacquelyn Kegley, then CSU Senate chair, and Louanne Kennedy, then provost of CSU Northridge. The Task Force considered strategies for helping CSU students make progress towards and complete baccalaureate degrees. A completed report, *Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree: A Report of the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation* (available at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/FacilitatingGraduation.pdf>) was forwarded in December 2002.

Subsequent to the adoption of the Task Force report, campuses completed plans for implementing key recommendations for providing students with well-supported, efficient pathways to the degree. These included the development of campus "road maps" to degrees in each major, degree audits by means of which individual students could know in detail their own progress to the baccalaureate, improvements in and fresh campus emphasis on advising, and more. These campus plans were forwarded to the Office of the Chancellor in late Fall **2003**. A December 2003 two-day conference on best campus practices in facilitating graduation ensued, and a June **2004** conference focused on the topic of first-year experience courses.

Trustee interest in campus practices has continued at a high level, and the Board adopted a focused set of directives for campus actions in May **2005**. These drew upon recommendations forwarded by the Statewide Academic Senate, and included 22 enumerated campus actions. An August 2005 directive to campus Presidents from Chancellor Reed called for certain actions to be undertaken forthwith, and others to be made the subjects of a report due in December 2005. Campus timetables for action and results are to be made part of the report. At the same time, the Division of Academic Affairs, Office of the Chancellor, will assist campus efforts, notably by providing opportunities for information and feedback. The Chancellor's coded memorandum to

Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item 3
September 20-21, 2005
Page 6 of 6

Presidents may be accessed at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2005-21.pdf>. In **2006** and beyond, Trustees will be given periodic reports focused on campus improvements and best practices in facilitating the efforts of matriculated students in achieving the baccalaureate.