

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 20, 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  
Kenneth Fong  
Murray L. Galinson  
Melinda Guzman  
William Hauck  
Lou Monville  
Craig R. Smith  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 18-19, 2006

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development, *Action*
2. A California State University Plan to Follow *Cornerstones*, *Action*
3. Proposed Title 5 Revision: Educational and Preventive Information Regarding Sexual Violence, *Information*
4. Graduation Initiative Update: Early Assessment Program, *Information*
5. Community Service Learning at the California State University, *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 18-19, 2006**

**Members Present**

Herb Carter, Chair  
George G. Gowgani, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg, Chair of the Board  
Jeffrey L. Bleich  
Carol R. Chandler  
Moctesuma Esparza (Tuesday)  
Debra S. Farar  
Murray L. Galinson  
Melinda Guzman  
William Hauck  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor  
Craig R. Smith  
Kyriakos Tsakopoulos (Tuesday)

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of May 16, 2006 were approved by consent as submitted.

**Planning Beyond Cornerstones**

Spurred by a need to examine the ways in which the CSU could best respond to California's present social, economic, and demographic transformation, this item, presented in committee by CSU Board of Trustees Chair Roberta Achtenberg and Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard, recommended for approval by resolution that the Board receive and consider at its September 2006 meeting 1) a report on the CSU's accomplishments under Cornerstones, and 2) a proposal for a formal systemwide consideration of the future of the California State University. Dr. Reichard described the future planning initiative in two parts, while Chair Achtenberg provided clarification of the proposed effort—including the coordination and guidance by a committee of stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, administrators, alumni, Board of Trustee members, and community partners), yet to-be-determined. Trustees were encouraged by the concept of a timely review and several Trustees immediately volunteered to be part of the collaborative process for a new strategic plan. The

committee unanimously recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 07-06-05).

### **Campus Enrollment Funding**

Stemming from a request by the Board during the May meeting, this agenda item featured a presentation on campus enrollment funding by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer Richard P. West and provided an overview of enrollment growth and systemwide targets, locations for growth, and CSU plans to meet access obligations. It is expected that funding for the 2.5% annual growth will be provided in the Governor's annual January budget proposal, which again in the year to come will either be approved or modified by the legislature as a part of the budget process. In addition, Chair Carter recognized California Faculty Association Dominguez Hills Chapter President David Bradfield, who offered several recommendations.

The Educational Policy Committee recessed and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. on July 19, 2006.

### **Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree**

Prior to the agenda item, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard formally recognized, with gratitude, the pending retirement of State University Dean of Academic Program Planning Jolayne Service and her extensive work on Title 5, as well as her 25 years of service to the CSU.

The agenda item—following discussion of the same item when it was presented for information at the May meeting—then was presented by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard, who proposed a resolution that would establish a CSU policy framework for CSU doctoral programs, consistent with the authorizing legislation. Dr. Reichard further explained to the Committee how much of the proposed policy is analogous to the existing Title 5 policy governing CSU master's degree programs. Dr. Service and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Teacher Education & Public School Programs Beverly Young offered additional program details and acknowledged both the strong partnership of the statewide academic senate in this program and the collaborative effort between Academic Affairs, graduate deans, faculty senate, and notable campus representatives. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 07-06-04).

### **Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation**

Following introductory comments by Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard about the overall program of Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, this agenda item prominently featured a media presentation by President Don W. Kassing of San José State University. President Kassing described San José State's project to develop "dashboard indicators" that chart students' progress toward and success in achieving the baccalaureate. Through the use of key measures, threshold levels, scorecards, and commercial software

(COGNOS), President Kassing demonstrated to the Committee how this dashboard, called for in the Chancellor's directive to campus presidents, provides key decision makers with convenient, frequently-refreshed data whereby campus leaders become better informed about program successes and acknowledge areas where further attention may be needed.

### **The California State University Media Arts Festival**

For this final agenda item, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Gary W. Reichard described a major commitment of the CSU to develop stronger ties with the entertainment industry as part of the Chancellor's Advocacy initiative. His comments summarized the unique opportunities experienced through the Media Arts Festival for all CSU students who are interested in a career in film/video. Through a film/video competition, a series of seminars with industry professionals, and recognition of an outstanding CSU faculty member, Dr. Reichard further shared with the Committee how the Media Arts Festival helps students to transition from student-filmmakers to working film/video industry professionals. Following Dr. Reichard's comments, the Committee saw a video documenting the 2005 Media Arts Festival, held at CSU Channel Islands last October.

Chair Carter adjourned the meeting.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development**

#### **Presentation By**

Gary W. Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **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 State University campuses at Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Los Angeles, San Marcos, and Stanislaus to include the projection of new degree programs for which fast-track proposals have been submitted to the Chancellor.

The proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plan and specify the conditions under which the projected programs 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 subsequently reviewed by the Office of the Chancellor before being submitted 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 the 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) the program could be offered at a high level of quality by the campus within the existing resource base, or there is a demonstrated capacity to fund the program on a self-support basis;
- (b) the program 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) the program can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project;
- (d) the program is consistent with all existing state and federal law and Trustee policy;
- (e) the program is a bachelor's or master's degree program; and
- (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 June of the same year, 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, and be incorporated in campus catalogs and other campus informational materials in the spring. While it is expected that authorized programs will be ready for full implementation by the subsequent academic year, some programs may be implemented in a limited manner in the spring term.

CSU campuses submitted seven fast-track proposals in Spring 2006:

Dominguez Hills	BS in Biochemistry
Dominguez Hills	BA in Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peacebuilding
Fresno	BS in Cognitive Science
Fresno	BS in Environmental Science
Los Angeles	MS in Environmental Science
San Marcos	MA in History
Stanislaus	MS in Genetic Counseling

The programs as proposed meet the criteria for the fast-track process. The facilities, faculty, and information resources needed to offer the programs are in place.

### **Dominguez Hills**

*The proposed Bachelor of Science with a major in Biochemistry* has been developed to prepare students for graduate work in chemistry or biochemistry; teaching chemistry in secondary schools; employment with industry or government; entry into professional schools such as medicine or dentistry; or entry into law school with a view toward specialization in patent or environmental law.

*The proposed Bachelor of Arts with a major in Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peacebuilding* (NCRP) is designed to provide undergraduate preparation for careers in which applying skills in conflict resolution and violence prevention create a safer environment in schools and other community settings. The program will also prepare graduates for advanced study, such as in the existing CSU Dominguez Hills NCRP option within the Master of Arts in Behavioral Science. This program has been designed to be responsive to community needs and will build on the faculty and information resources established for the MA program.

### **Fresno**

*The proposed Bachelor of Science with a major in Cognitive Science* incorporates the perspectives of several disciplines that investigate human cognition. This proposed program integrates aspects of psychology, linguistics, neuroscience, philosophy, and computer science models and experimentation in a study of the mind. The program prepares graduates for advanced study in cognitive science and for jobs in business and industry in which a multi-disciplinary background is highly desirable.

*The proposed Master of Science in Environmental Science* will give students rigorous training in the biological and physical sciences, emphasizing the earth science disciplines of geochemistry, hydrology, climatology, engineering geology, and oceanography. Graduates will be prepared for employment as environmental scientists and will be prepared to enter graduate study in the sciences.

### **Los Angeles**

*The proposed Master of Science in Environmental Science* has been developed based on the Master's of Interdisciplinary Studies degree, in which students develop specialized knowledge in the field through courses offered in the biological sciences, chemistry, biochemistry, geological sciences, geography and urban analysis, sociology, and political science departments. This proposed program prepares students for environmental science research, doctoral study, community college teaching, and technical positions in universities, industry, or governmental agencies.

### **San Marcos**

*The proposed Master of Arts in History* is designed to ground students in historical theory and research, while also allowing students to acquire an advanced understanding in one area

of the historical human experience; develop a critical understanding of history; develop advanced historical research, writing, and presentation skills; and acquire skills in new media technology to research, preserve, and deliver historical content to the public. This degree prepares students for a variety of careers in education and the public and private sectors.

### **Stanislaus**

*The proposed Master of Science in Genetic Counseling* has been developed to provide a multidisciplinary curriculum, including rigorous academic training and extensive clinical internship experiences, and prepares graduates for careers in healthcare careers requiring knowledge of medical genetics and skills in counseling. This program intends to fill a regional void in workforce recruitment in northern California, where there are no other genetic counseling programs.

### **Recommended Action:**

The proposed resolution refers to the academic plans approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2006 and includes 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 master plan for California State University, Dominguez Hills (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Bachelor of Science with a major in Biochemistry, with a projected implementation date of Spring 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, Dominguez Hills (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Bachelor of Arts with a major in Negotiation, Conflict Resolution, and Peacebuilding, with a projected implementation date of Spring 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, Fresno (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Bachelor of Science with a major in Cognitive Science, with a projected implementation date of Spring 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, Fresno (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Bachelor of Science with a major in Environmental Science, with a projected implementation date of Spring 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, Los Angeles (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Master of Science in Environmental Science, with a projected implementation date of Spring 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, San Marcos (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Master of Arts in History, with a projected implementation date of Fall 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the academic master plan for California State University, Stanislaus (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projection of a Master of Science in Genetic Counseling, with a projected implementation date of Fall 2007; and be it further

**RESOLVED** that each 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

### **A California State University Plan to Follow *Cornerstones***

#### **Presentation By**

Roberta Achtenberg  
Chair of the Board

Gary Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

At the July 2006 meeting, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution calling for “a report on the CSU’s accomplishments under *Cornerstones*, as well as a proposal for a successor planning initiative, including coordination and consultation mechanisms, timetables, and themes to be explored in the planning process.” This item is in response to that request.

#### **Background**

In May 1996, the California State University undertook the strategic planning initiative called *Cornerstones*, which produced a system-wide planning framework that was formally adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 28, 1998. The Board adopted a formal Implementation Plan in March 1999, enumerating priorities for action under each of the ten *Cornerstones* principles. The full text of the *Cornerstones* Implementation Plan may be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html>.

#### **Assessing Achievements Under *Cornerstones***

In the years since adoption of the Implementation Plan, much has been accomplished within the *Cornerstones* planning framework. As a result of the Accountability Process (based on Principle 9 of *Cornerstones*), which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in November 1999, biennial reports have been presented to the Board on progress by the individual campuses on a number of priorities. Specifically, there have been reports in 2000, 2002, and 2004 on campus achievements in several major performance areas, including quality of baccalaureate degree programs, access to the CSU, progression to the degree, persistence and graduation rates, relations with P-12 and college readiness, college readiness after one year, facilities utilization,

and facilities advancement. Beyond these accountability reports, there has been no single summary of the CSU's achievements under the *Cornerstones* Implementation Plan.

In general, the Board of Trustees can take great satisfaction in the progress made by the CSU under the ambitious *Cornerstones* plan. Achievements across the system have been especially noteworthy in areas related to learning outcomes and assessment of student achievement of those outcomes (Principle 1); sharpening of the focus on support for student success and active learning (Principles 2 and 3); outreach efforts to P-12 (Principle 5); efforts to improve progress to degree, retention, and graduation rates (Principle 5); and accountability and reporting of campus outcomes (Principle 9). Moreover, the CSU has developed funding strategies for such purposes as integrated technology initiatives, P-12 outreach, applied research, and joint doctoral programs (Principle 8), and has adhered to *Cornerstones* Principle 10, which affirmed that "campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals." The all-important balance between the system-wide strategic plan and priorities, on the one hand, and the unique nature and strengths of individual campuses, on the other, has been carefully maintained. In sum, the CSU and its campuses have made significant advances in most of the areas identified as priorities under *Cornerstones*, and these priorities have been made integral to the way the university does its business.

Some principles and priorities identified under *Cornerstones*, however, have not been as well addressed. Lack of progress in these areas has been largely due to constraints (and contractions) resulting from budget difficulties at the State level. Principles and priority areas that do not seem yet to have been sufficiently addressed include: "reinvestment" in faculty in the form of professional development to support the full range of faculty responsibilities (Principle 4); graduate education and continuing education as key elements of CSU mission (Principle 6); and development of a new State policy framework for higher education (Principle 7). These principles and priorities should be considered in a successor planning process. *NOTE: These evaluative comments are supported by a detailed report on achievements under Cornerstones, to be mailed to each Trustee in the week prior to the Board meeting.*

### **Coordination, Consultation, Timeline, and Themes for the New Planning Process**

Given the successes achieved by the CSU and its constituent campuses under the strategic plan known as *Cornerstones*, and the emergence of new issues and challenges since that planning initiative was launched, it is time for the CSU to launch a successor strategic planning initiative to guide development over the next decade. Appropriate guiding principles for such a planning process are the two fundamental and ingrained commitments of the CSU that have deepened under *Cornerstones*. *Access/ Outreach* is the first of these, and includes improvement of college-going rates in P-12, strengthened academic preparation of P-12 students, and ensuring of levels

of financial aid sufficient to assure genuine access to the CSU for all qualified students. The second guiding principle is *Excellence*, which includes providing adequate salaries and professional support for CSU faculty and staff, as well as elements identified by campuses as essential to high-quality academic programs for students.

Like *Cornerstones*, this planning process should be broadly consultative, yet should be completed within a reasonable period of time. Moreover, to ensure immediate impact, the plan should include action steps so that a separate implementation plan will not be necessary. An additional goal should be to establish clear, relative priorities among individual objectives, and to present those priorities in such a way that they can serve as a guide to resource allocation strategies within the CSU.

Coordination and Planning Process: The planning process should be coordinated by a steering committee that includes members of the Board of Trustees, campus presidents, administrators, faculty, and students. In addition, given the breadth of the university's mission, the steering committee for this initiative should include representatives of CSU alumni and of community stakeholders. The proposed membership of the steering committee for the new initiative is presented in Attachment 1.

The *Cornerstones* planning process was broadly inclusive, including consultation with the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU), with administrators, and with campus faculty leaders through an Academic Conference, as well as campus-based forums and meetings on the proposed plan. A new planning process must be similarly broadly consultative, and should embrace campus-generated themes and priorities. Since many CSU campuses have recently completed, or are presently engaged in, campus strategic planning efforts, it is reasonable to ground the planning process in campus-based conversations that focus on issues and objectives that have been identified in those campus strategic plans, together with those, as noted above, that have not yet been sufficiently addressed under *Cornerstones*. It is proposed that the planning process would begin with the steering committee identifying general themes and common issues derived from campus strategic plans, to guide initial campus conversations, as well as discussion by the ASCSU.

As described in Attachment 2, the results of these campus-based conversations would be collated and organized by the steering committee, and would be the basis for a system-wide "summit" at which faculty, students, and administrative staff would identify the principles, priorities, and actions defining the strategic plan. The first draft of the plan would be presented for final comment by campuses and the ASCSU, with the intent of presenting the Board of Trustees with a final draft for consideration in May 2008.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 2  
September 19-20, 2006  
Page 4 of 4

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the California State University will undertake a strategic planning exercise to succeed *Cornerstones*, to establish specific program objectives, set priorities, and guide resource allocations over the next several years. Such a process shall be organized and conducted in the manner described in Attachments 1 and 2 to this item. General themes of the planning process shall be “Access/ Outreach” and “Excellence.” It is the intent of the Board of Trustees that the resulting strategic plan will be presented for consideration by the Board prior to the end of the 2007-2008 academic year.

**ATTACHMENT 1.  
(Revised)**

**PLANNING BEYOND CORNERSTONES:  
PROPOSED STEERING COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

**Trustees** –approximately 10-11 (including faculty and student Trustees)

Chancellor's Office – 5 (Chancellor Reed; Vice Chancellors McClain, Reichard, and West;  
General Counsel Helwick)

**Presidents** – 9

**Provosts** – 2

**Vice President for Student Affairs** – 1

**Faculty** – 8 (ASCSU Executive Committee members plus three faculty members recommended  
by ASCSU, from campus Academic Senates with fewer than fifteen years of experience)

**Students** – 2 (one undergraduate and one graduate student; recommended by CSSA)

**Alumnus/a-** 1 (recommended by CSU Alumni Council)

**Community stakeholders** – 6 (three from P-12; three from industry)

## **PLANNING BEYOND CORNERSTONES: PROPOSED PROCESS AND TIMETABLE**

**October 2006** – Initial meeting of Steering Committee, with some key readings pre-assigned for discussion; purpose would be to frame more thoroughly, for campus discussions, issues/themes approved by Board of Trustees, based on review and analysis of themes in individual campus strategic plans

**November 2006** – dissemination of detailed issues/themes to campuses (Presidents, Provosts, Vice Presidents for Student Affairs, Senate Chairs, ASI Presidents, members of ASCSU on each campus), with request for structured campus-level discussion involving students, faculty, staff, and, as possible, external stakeholders such as members of campus advisory boards; simultaneous dissemination to the Academic Senate, CSU (ASCSU) for comments

**November 2006 – mid-March 2007** – Campus-level discussions of issues/themes, with reports sent to Steering Committee; at least two to three members of Steering Committee would attend each campus discussion

**March 2007** – Steering Committee meeting to consider reports from campus-level discussions, and collate/organize them for distribution back to campus leadership and ASCSU as context for CSU-wide Summit

**April 2007** – convening of CSU-wide “Issue Summit” for discussion of major issues and ideas from campus discussions; recommendations formulated and sent to Steering Committee

**May 2007** – Steering Committee meets to consider report and recommendations from CSU-wide Issue Summit and to frame first draft of strategic plan

**June – August 2007** – drafting of strategic plan (with iteration, if possible, between campus leadership and Steering Committee during the drafting)

**September 2007** – dissemination of draft strategic plan to campuses (Presidents, Provosts, Vice Presidents for Student Affairs, Senate Chairs, and ASI Presidents), with request for feedback from each campus by November (perhaps based on another structured discussion)

Attachment 2  
Ed. Pol. Item 2  
September 19-20, 2006  
Page 2 of 2

**September-November 2007** – convening of three “subject-area convocations” around major themes in first draft, to involve external stakeholders and policy advocates (potential subjects: economic development; access/outreach/student financial aid; accountability)

**November 2007** – feedback on first draft received from campuses

**December 2007 – January 2008** – Steering Committee meets to consider suggestions for revision to strategic plan and to formulate revised draft

**February 2008** – circulation of revised draft to campuses and ASCSU for final comment

**March – May 2008** – preparation of strategic plan for submission to Board of Trustees for approval at May meeting

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Proposed Title 5 Revision: Educational and Preventive Information Regarding Sexual Violence**

**Presentation By**

Gary W. Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

Christine Helwick  
General Counsel

**Summary**

Assembly Bill 1088, filed with the Secretary of State on October 7, 2005, added Section 67385.7 to the Education Code. This section requires the CSU, in collaboration with campus-based and community-based victim advocacy organizations, (1) to provide educational and preventive information about sexual violence as part of established on-campus orientations at all campuses; (2) to post this information on the campus Internet website; and (3) to develop and adopt regulations setting forth procedures for the implementation of Education Code, section 67385.7. This item responds to this legislation and is presented for information and discussion at this meeting.

**Proposed Revision**

The following resolution will be presented for approval at the November 14-15, 2006 meeting of the Board of Trustees:

**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 adopts Section 41550 of Article 5, Subchapter 4, Chapter 1, Division 5 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

**§ 41550. Educational and Preventive Information Regarding Sexual Violence**

Each campus, in collaboration with campus-based and community-based victim advocacy organizations, shall provide educational and preventive information about sexual violence as part of established on-campus orientations. For a campus with an existing on-campus orientation program, this information shall be provided, in addition to the sexual harassment information required to be provided pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 66281.5 of the Education Code, during the regular orientation for incoming students. The campus shall also post the same information on its campus Internet website.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Graduation Initiative Update: Early Assessment Program**

#### **Presentation By**

Gary W. Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **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.

The Committee on Educational Policy has asked for recurrent updates on the progress and success of these programs. This item focuses on the Early Assessment Program, and will be supplemented by a further presentation during the Committee meeting. The presentation will include data from the Spring 2006 administration of the Early Assessment Program exam.

**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. Full-scale administration of the Early Assessments of Readiness for College English, and for College Mathematics, respectively, was begun in Spring **2004**.

Since then, we have witnessed growth in interest in volunteering for this assessment on the part of California public high school 11<sup>th</sup> graders, and consequent growth in the number of students who took the assessments and received results that indicate their readiness for college.

The Spring **2005** administration of the assessment showed a 21% increase in the number of students receiving an indication of college readiness in English, when compared to 2004 figures. Some 185,695 students took the test, as compared to 153,433 in Spring 2004. Approximately 46% of eligible public high school 11<sup>th</sup> graders thus volunteered for the EAP English assessment. Again in **2005**, the number of students who volunteered for the CSU Early Assessment of Readiness for College Mathematics showed a modest gain of 3% when 2005 results are compared to 2004 (119,338 as compared to 115,552 in Spring 2004). While the number of EAP mathematics volunteers increased from 2004 to 2005, the number who received the appropriate California Standards Test reports increased by an even greater number (from 157,375 in 2004 to 171,838 in 2005). That is good news about the work of California high schools. However, the larger number who received an appropriate CST report meant a small reduction in the *percentage* of students showing interest in the EAP Mathematics Assessment, from 73% of CST test-takers in 2004 to 69% in 2005.

**2006.** The Educational Testing Service reports that all districts that had their STAR answer sheets to the contract processor by June 30, 2006, were confirmed to have received their Early Assessment results by August 15, 2006. These results include individual letters to students, and a roster of student test-takers and their Early Assessment statuses. This permits schools, parents and students to make course selections for students in the 12<sup>th</sup> 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.

**Curricular Reforms and Professional Development.** 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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 12<sup>th</sup> grade particularly for students identified via the EAP test as conditionally exempt from CSU's Entry Level Mathematics examination.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **Community Service Learning at the California State University**

#### **Presentation By:**

Gary W. Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

Colleen Bentley  
Director of Special Projects

Season Eckardt  
Administrative Director  
Community Service Learning

#### **Summary**

Nearly 10 years ago the California State University campuses came together to create a Strategic Plan for Community Service Learning, the first of its kind in the nation. Since that time, campus programs have flourished, the Office of the Chancellor has provided influential leadership and significant funding, and the Board of Trustees has passed a landmark resolution supporting community service and service learning. Through campus-based successes and systemwide coordination, the California State University has emerged as a national leader in developing opportunities for university students to serve California communities through a number of community engagement programs, including service learning courses.

As mentioned in the CSU Impact Report, California State University students give back to their communities in a big way, and CSU faculty members provide important guidance to these students. Nearly half of CSU's 400,000 students perform some kind of service on an annual basis, a phenomenal number, made even more impressive by knowing that CSU students are older, non-traditional, self-supporting students who do not have much free time. In 2005-06, CSU students provided 30 million hours of service, which equates to a minimum wage value of \$200 million. CSU students are serving and working for California.

The Office of the Chancellor recognizes the opportunity to spotlight these compelling stories of student engagement to the public, future and current CSU students, and our policy makers, including elected officials. Therefore, the Office of the Chancellor is in the final stages of completing a multi-media series, including a DVD that provides an extraordinary look at student

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 5  
September 19-20, 2006  
Page 2 of 2

and faculty contributions to improving the quality of life in California's communities. Six campuses and their community partners participated in this DVD – Chico, Humboldt, Monterey Bay, Northridge, San Francisco and San Marcos. While the DVD highlights only six campuses, a myriad of community engagement efforts takes place at all 23 CSU campuses.

The California State University's commitment to community service learning and community engagement aims to foster an ethic of service that will last for a lifetime, not just a semester in college. Our students are a shining example of that commitment.