

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Meeting: 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 23, 2009**  
**Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Herbert L. Carter, Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg, Vice Chair  
Carol R. Chandler  
Debra S. Farar  
Kenneth Fong  
Margaret Fortune  
George G. Gowgani  
Melinda Guzman  
William Hauck  
Raymond W. Holdsworth  
Linda A. Lang  
Robert Linscheid  
Peter G. Mehas  
Henry Mendoza  
Lou Monville  
Russel Statham  
Glen O. Toney

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 13, 2009

#### **Discussion Items**

1. Academic Plan Update for Fast-Track Program Development, *Action*
2. California State University Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs: Fourth Biennial Report, *Information*
3. Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, *Information*
4. Special Honorary Degrees for Students Displaced by Executive Order 9066, *Action*
5. Update on Efforts to Close the Achievement Gap in K–12 Education, *Information*
6. Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Residency Reclassifications, *Information*

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

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

**July 21, 2009**

**Members Present**

Herbert L. Carter, Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg, Vice Chair  
Jeffrey L. Bleich, Chair of the Board  
Debra S. Farar  
Margaret Fortune  
George G. Gowgani  
Melinda Guzman  
William Hauck  
Raymond W. Holdsworth  
Linda A. Lang  
Robert Linscheild  
Peter G. Mehas  
Henry Mendoza  
Lou Monville  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor  
Russell Statham  
Glen O. Toney

Chair Herbert L. Carter called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of May 13, 2009 were approved as submitted.

**Proposed Title 5 Revision: California Code of Regulations – Conferral of Degree upon Completion of Degree Requirements, Action**

As part of the CSU's "Facilitating Graduation" initiative, it is necessary to provide the University with assistance in enrollment strategies. These strategies will assist the University in encouraging and guiding students towards degree completion. Jeri Echeverria, executive vice chancellor and chief academic officer, presented the language proposed to amend Title 5 allowing presidents to confer of degrees. The amendment would allow university presidents to

preclude students from enrolling in state-supported courses when or if the student has met his or her necessary degree requirements. The proposed amendment also states that, in these instances, a president may take actions necessary to confer said degree. The intention of the amendment is to keep students who have completed their degree requirements from taking excess units at state-supported fee levels. Dr. Echeverria and her staff recommended adopting the amendment to Title 5.

Trustee Statham suggested that a status report be provided at a future board meeting and requested additional data on the facilitation of graduation. President Koester reported on the tracking of CSU Northridge students in excess of more than 140 units. President Koester reinforced the fact that although the number is fairly small, this additional tool will support the advising process in order to encourage students to approach graduation earlier and in a systematic approach.

Trustee Carter concluded the discussion by reminding the board that the resolution is not a mandate.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

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

#### Presentation By

Jeri Echeverria  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### Summary

In January of each year, campuses may expand their academic plans by submitting for Trustee approval a list of proposed projections for new degree programs. Approved projections on campus academic plans indicate that the Trustees have approved a campus request to develop a degree program. In addition to the March updates to the master plans, policy also allows for the June submission of “fast-track” degree program projections for Trustee consideration at the September meeting. Fast-track proposals represent only bachelor’s and master’s degree programs that can be implemented without major capital outlay, that do not require accreditation approval, and that will require no expenditure beyond the campus’ existing resources. Trustee approval at the September meeting allows the Chancellor to approve the program proposals for implementation following a system-level review indicating that the degree program is appropriately planned and provided for.

This fast-track process is one of a handful of mechanisms that facilitate responsive program planning, allowing the campuses to provide a timely response to the state’s changing workforce needs. To be proposed via fast track, a degree program must meet all of the following six criteria:

1. The proposed program 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.
2. The proposed 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.
3. The proposed program can be adequately housed without a major capital outlay project.
4. It is consistent with all existing state and federal law and Trustee policy.
5. It is either a bachelor’s or master’s degree program.

6. The proposed program has been subject to a thorough campus review and approval process.

This summer only one fast-track projection was submitted, and the proposal specifies that the required criteria have been met and that the program will be supported by sufficient faculty, facilities, and information resources.

**San Francisco**  
MS Geographical Information Science

**Recommended Action:**

The proposed resolution refers to the academic plans approved by the Board of Trustees in March 2009 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 plan degree projections for San Francisco State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the March 24-25, 2009 meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy) be amended to include a projected Master of Science degree with a major in Geographic Information Science. Implementation is planned for fall 2010.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **California State University Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs: Fourth Biennial Report**

#### **Presentation By**

Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor

John D. Welty  
President  
California State University, Fresno

Allison G. Jones  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Student Academic Support

#### **Summary**

The Board of Trustees approved a resolution at its July 10-11, 2001 meeting to adopt and implement the recommendations of the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee Final Report consistent with the individual missions of each campus and that a report be made to the Board of Trustees every two years assessing the outcomes of campus alcohol education and prevention programs. In addition, the resolution called for the Chancellor to report at that time on the success of obtaining external funding for system and campus programs.

This report is the fourth biennial report on the implementation of the Trustees' Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs adopted in July 2001. It summarizes activities that have occurred on campuses in the last two years since the third biennial report was presented to the Board of Trustees in July 2007.

CSU's alcohol policy is called the most comprehensive alcohol policy of any university system in the country. The policy is visionary and ambitious. In order for the CSU to be successful in its effort to address student alcohol abuse, collaboration and cooperation with others, including public agencies, is necessary. In the first compact of its kind in California, a memorandum of understanding was signed on February 13, 2002 involving the following six state agencies and the CSU to fight alcohol abuse on and off university campuses: the Business, Transportation, & Housing Agency, Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), Alcohol

and Drug Programs (ADP), the California Highway Patrol (CHP), the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), and the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS).

The Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) funded eight CSU campuses totaling \$750,000 for the period of October 1, 2002 through December 31, 2004 to (1) reduce alcohol abuse and alcohol-impaired driving by 18 to 39 year old college students; (2) strengthen peer education programs related to alcohol abuse and driving under the influence of alcohol; (3) strengthen peer education programs, utilizing social norms marketing strategies, focusing on reducing alcohol-impaired driving; and (4) offer responsible beverage service training.

CSU received a second Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) two-year grant that funded ten CSU campuses totaling \$750,000 for the period of February 1, 2005 through December 31, 2006. This grant is designed to reduce by 5 percent the incidence of driving after consuming alcohol by 18 to 25 year-old CSU students by December 30, 2006 and to reduce by 5 percent alcohol-related misconduct by CSU students by December 30, 2006. This grant addresses alcohol-related incidents at the college level, particularly driving under the influence of alcohol and general incidents related to alcohol abuse. The CSU Alcohol and Traffic Safety (ATS) Project was part of the California Traffic Safety Program and was made possible through the support of the California Office of Traffic Safety, State of California, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

The current California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grant is the third of three OTS grants focusing on the twenty-three campuses of the California State University system and administered by Fresno State University for the period October 1, 2007 through September 30, 2009. The \$701,259 OTS grant targets alcohol-related incidents at the college level, particularly driving under the influence and incidents related to alcohol abuse. The grant supports the management approach by the Campus Alcohol Safety Councils via mini-grants which includes Social Norms marketing, safe rides programs, and/or peer education activities. The CSU campuses participating in this current grant include: Channel Islands, Fresno, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Maritime, Northridge, San Francisco, and San José.

Finally, many campuses have expanded campus policies on alcohol and other drugs to include the use of tobacco as well.

Campuses reported the following:

- A decrease in students driving after consuming alcohol;
- A reduction in alcohol-related misconduct;
- A reduction in the number of underage students who consume alcohol;
- A reduction in the number of students who reported binge drinking (5 or more drinks in one sitting);

- An increase in the number of students who seek medical assistance for intoxicated friends;
- An increase in alcohol-free events;
- An increase implementing online personal drinking assessments;
- A reduction in the number of DUIs ;
- An increase in the number of students receiving beverage service training; and
- An increasing number of campuses partnered with local law enforcement agencies, firmly enforcing alcohol-related laws.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Recognizing that alcohol abuse is not just a national higher education problem but also a CSU problem, Chancellor Charles B. Reed appointed a committee in November 2000 to review the CSU's alcohol policies and prevention programs that would help to prevent alcohol-induced deaths and alcohol poisoning of students who attend CSU. The CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee, chaired by California State University, Fresno President John Welty, included presidents, students, vice presidents of student affairs, faculty, staff, and alumni. The committee concentrated on broad policies that would be realistic and effective at CSU's twenty-three unique campuses. Many CSU campuses serve traditional-aged students who are 18 to 22 years old, many of whom reside on campus. The majority of CSU campuses are campuses to which students commute and where the average age of the students are older.

Alcohol abuse is a threat to the health and academic success of CSU students, but prohibition of alcohol is not a realistic response to the problem. There is no single response to the issue that will solve the problem. Therefore, the Board of Trustees' policy requires each campus to design programs that are appropriate for its institution, student population, and location. Additionally, the federal Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act of 1989 requires all colleges and universities receiving federal funds to maintain alcohol and other drug prevention programs and to review their effectiveness at least every two years.

### **Guiding Principles**

Effective alcohol education and prevention programs being developed and implemented by campuses respond to the following principles adopted by the Board of Trustees in July 2001:

- Provide a safe and secure environment for all students;
- Encourage student health and wellness in an environment supportive of learning;
- Promote healthy choices for students;
- Enforce laws and policies consistently as regards the use of alcohol;

- Support safe, legal, responsible, moderate consumption of alcohol for those who choose to drink; do not punish responsible, legal behavior;
- Encourage students to take responsibility for each other; Good Samaritan behavior should be supported and recognized, and students should be supplied with the tools to help others practice safe and responsible behavior;
- Provide assistance, if appropriate, to those students who need support, treatment, and services;
- Involve students in all steps of the process and program development;
- Focus alcohol abuse prevention efforts on campus and community environments since the university is part of the surrounding community that influences students' behavior; and
- Use social norms principles and peer education as core components of an education and prevention program. (The Social Norms approach uses informational campaigns to correct widespread student misperception of peers' drinking. Peer educator programs, such as the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network, use students to encourage their peers to develop responsible habits and attitudes regarding alcohol and related issues.)

The Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee divided its work into six areas: (1) Policies; (2) Enforcement and Legal Issues; (3) Education and Prevention Programs; (4) Training, Intervention and Treatment; (5) Assessment; and (6) Resources. Below are the committee's recommendations adopted by the Board of Trustees that campuses and the CSU system are expected to follow to create and strengthen their alcohol-related policies and programs.

#### *General Recommendations*

1. The Chancellor should require campuses to develop comprehensive alcohol policies and programs that are consistent with each campus mission, have a commitment to holding individuals and student organizations accountable for their behavior and a commitment to offering effective education programs which are regularly assessed.
2. Each campus should actively apply its policies.
3. Each campus should communicate alcohol policies to new students and their parents before and when they arrive on campus.
4. Each campus should create a university-wide alcohol advisory council, including community membership, which annually develops and reviews programs and goals, assesses the effectiveness of the campus program, and makes recommendations to the president. These councils should be under the direction of the Vice Presidents for Student Affairs.

5. Each campus should gather data every two years to determine if its policies and programs are achieving the desired outcomes. Findings should be reported to the Chancellor and the Trustees.
6. The CSU should sponsor conferences in which campuses share best practices, policies and programs as well as feature state and national experts.
7. State laws should be reviewed by the campus alcohol advisory councils and recommendations made to trustees and presidents for any changes that can enhance and support campus policies.
8. The campuses and the CSU Chancellor's Office should devote sufficient campus and system resources to ensure the effectiveness of programs and policies.
9. Partner with the community and law enforcement agencies to provide a safe off-campus environment, to enforce applicable legal sanctions, and to encourage legal and responsible behavior among students.
10. Develop effective training, intervention and treatment programs that will work on all campuses.

### **Role of Vice Presidents for Student Affairs**

The vice presidents for student affairs were charged with responsibility for developing and implementing campus alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs. In response to this charge, the vice presidents for student affairs appointed an Alcohol Policy Implementation Steering Committee which has met bi-monthly since the summer 2001 and has provided guidance to campuses about effective policy implementation strategies.

### **Campus Compliance with CSU Alcohol Policy**

Since adoption of the CSU Board of Trustees' alcohol policy, campuses and the CSU system have continued to create, implement, and strengthen alcohol-related policies and programs in response to the following key recommendations developed by the Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs Committee chaired by President John Welty:

- Campuses developed comprehensive alcohol policies and programs that were consistent with their campus missions.
- Campuses held individuals and student organizations accountable for their behavior and offered effective education programs that were regularly assessed.
- Campuses communicated alcohol policies to new students and their parents before and when they arrived on campus.

- Campuses created university-wide alcohol advisory councils, including community membership, which annually developed and reviewed programs and goals, assessed the effectiveness of the campus program, and made recommendations to the president.
- Campuses assessed the effectiveness of their policies and programs to determine if they were achieving the desired outcomes.
- The CSU sponsored annual alcohol conferences that enabled campuses to share best practices, policies and programs.
- Campuses partnered regularly with the community and law enforcement agencies to provide a safe off-campus environment, to enforce applicable legal sanctions, and to encourage legal and responsible behavior among students.
- Campuses developed effective training and intervention programs.

### **Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems**

Established in 2002, the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems coordinates California's strategic efforts to reduce the inappropriate use of alcohol and other drugs. California's high-level Council provides California with leadership continuity to advance alcohol and other drug prevention. This council deals exclusively with prevention issues unlike similar councils in other states that address all substance abuse issues including treatment. The Council provides coordinated direction and actions to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention efforts that are delivered through a very broad range of disparate public and private sources attempting to address continually changing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug problems in various populations and settings. Activities include sharing prevention data, identifying effective approaches, establishing high-level prevention objectives, identifying means of working more efficiently with alcohol and other drug-related issues, leveraging or redirecting opportunities to achieve objectives, and partnering with law enforcement, ABC, and community organizations.

Key state agency staff members have been appointed from the Office of the Attorney General, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Alcohol Beverage Control, Department of Health Services, Office of Criminal Justice Planning, Office of Traffic Safety, the Office of the President of the University of California, and the Office of the Chancellor, California State University. Upon the recommendation of Chancellor Charles B. Reed, the Governor appointed Dr. Paul Oliaro, vice president for student affairs, CSU Fresno, and Mr. Allison G. Jones, assistant vice chancellor, academic affairs, student academic support, Chancellor's Office to represent CSU on this council.

## **Campus Funding**

Several campuses applied for and received other grants to support campus alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs. These grants are listed by campus on Attachment A.

## **CSU Annual Alcohol and Education Conferences**

CSU has sponsored seven annual alcohol and other drugs education conferences since the implementation of the CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention Programs was adopted by the Board of Trustees. Over 200 campus staff and students attended the 7<sup>th</sup> annual conference hosted by CSU, Long Beach in April 2008. Its theme *Alcohol and...Other Drugs, Tobacco, Violence and You* recognized alcohol abuse is often accompanied with other dangerous activities resulting in multiple risks for students. Because the issue of student alcohol use and abuse is an issue that affects all students in higher education, the University of California and private colleges participated in the planning of the conference and attended the CSU conference. Conference participants share their best practices, policies, and programs that promote responsible alcohol use and alcohol and other drug abuse prevention.

The theme of multiple risks for students focused on five core areas: (1) prevention efforts to change student attitudes, motivation, and knowledge about alcohol and other drugs issues (Social Norms marketing, counseling programs), (2) prevention efforts that provide a channel for safer, less destructive behaviors (safe ride programs, substance-free parties, themes living area), (3) efforts to restrict access to alcohol to reduce harmful behaviors associated with excessive drinking (DUI checkpoints, shoulder tap enforcement, advertising restrictions), (4) activities to establish a supportive environment for achieving responsible drinking (town/gown coalitions, coordinated enforcement task force), and (5) systematic data collection and analysis that identify problem areas, and provide new ideas for program innovation and evaluation.

To recognize exceptional leadership and exemplary programs, the recipients of three awards are announced at the annual conference: (1) the Student Leadership Award, (2) the Champions Award that recognizes students, staff, and administrators who exhibit exceptional leadership in promoting alcohol and other drug initiatives on their campus, in their community, or for the CSU, (3) the Innovation Award for those who have created an innovative event, activity, or strategy to better and more effectively serve CSU students and the community.

In 2008, a new award entitled, *Recognition Award*, was established to recognize a person, group or entity outside of the CSU for outstanding contribution to the conference, efforts in alcohol abuse prevention and service to CSU students.

## ***CSU ALCOHOL AND TRAFFIC SAFETY (ATS) PROJECT OCTOBER 2007 – SEPTEMBER 2009***

### **Purpose of the Grant**

The current California OTS grant is the third of three OTS grants focusing on the twenty-three campuses of the California State University system and administered by Fresno State for the period October 1, 2007 – September 30, 2009. The \$701, 259 OTS grant targets alcohol-related incidents at the college level, particularly driving under the influence and incidents related to alcohol abuse. The grant supports the management approach by the Campus Alcohol Safety Councils via mini-grants which includes Social Norms marketing, safe rides programs, and/or peer education activities. The CSU campuses participating in this current grant include: Channel Islands, Fresno, Humboldt, Cal State Los Angeles, Cal Maritime, Northridge, San Francisco, and San José.

Because the grant period will end on September 30, 2009, the information included in this Biennial Report only reflects activities thru December, 2008. Overall, we have seen reasonable to good progress on our two main goals and each of our objectives. A more detailed summary and final evaluation will be prepared at the conclusion of the grant period.

### **Goal #1 - Reasonable Progress to Date**

**To reduce the incidence of driving after consuming alcohol by 18-25 year old CSU students 5% from each campus' 2005 base year total by September 30, 2009.**

Measurement of progress will include, on three of the eight campuses, use of the CORE survey and on two of the eight campuses use of the NCHA survey. The remaining schools use either a different survey or a combination of the CORE and NCHA surveys.

The CORE survey contains a series of items pertaining to consequences associated with alcohol and drug use. One of the items is specific to DWI/DUI arrests within the past year. The other item pertains to driving a car while under the influence.

The NCHA survey contains two items pertaining to drinking and driving: 1) within the last thirty days, did you drive after drinking any alcohol at all, and 2) within the last thirty days, did you drive after having five or more drinks. Possible responses for these two items include: not applicable/don't drive; not applicable/don't drink; no; and yes.

**Goal #2 – Good Progress to Date**

**To reduce the incidence of alcohol-related misconduct by CSU students by 5% from each campus' 2005 base year total by September 30, 2009.**

To measure progress on this goal, we will also use the CORE survey which contains a series of items pertaining to various problematic experiences associated with alcohol and drug use that can be used to assess alcohol-related misconduct. These items are divided into three groups: public misconduct or behaviors that involve actual or potential harm to others, serious personal problems, and less serious (and more common) experiences that nevertheless indicate excessive use. We will also use the NCHA survey which contains seven items pertaining to consequences occurring in the last school year as a result of drinking.

**Objective #1 - Reasonable Progress**

To establish mini-grant 2005 base year measurements on eight CSU campuses by Dec 31, 2007. Comparison data will be available thru post tests at the end of the grant period.

Base year measurements for 2007 are available for seven of the eight (75%) campuses who implement either the CORE or NCHA surveys.

**Objective #2 – Good Progress**

To develop partnerships with law enforcement and conduct at least two DUI checkpoints each fiscal year to enforce campus policy by September 30, 2009, and to continue to foster those partnerships throughout the grant period.

Seven out of the eight campuses (88%) have partnered with law enforcement agencies and conducted DUI checkpoints during the grant period.

Example 1: Northridge partnered with Cal State Northridge Public Safety and California Highway Patrol to conduct DUI checkpoints close to the campus on September 25, 2008 and April 30, 2009.

Example 2: Cal Maritime partnered with Vallejo Police Department for its first DUI Checkpoint on Nov 20, 2008 and its second on March 17, 2009.

Example 3: Channel Islands University Police Department piloted a Mock DUI Check Point on March 11, 2009 with and without the DUI intoxication goggles for nine students.

**Objective #3 – Good Progress**

To assist campuses in developing or improving online personal drinking assessment programs similar to eCHUG (Check Up to Go), MyStudentBody.com, alcohol.edu, etc. by September 30, 2009.

All eight CSU campuses have made one of the online personal drinking assessment programs noted above available to their students.

Example 1: Channel Islands uses a mandatory online alcohol assessment – alcohol.edu - for freshmen orientation and resident hall students.

Example 2: Northridge utilizes an online personal drinking assessment program for new students in their University 100 classes.

Example 3: San Jose requires all students who have been sanctioned for violation of the alcohol policy to complete the e-CHUG online alcohol assessment. In addition, all incoming freshmen are being encouraged to take e-CHUG before they start their first semester at SJSU.

**Objective #4 – Limited Progress**

To implement mini-grants in eight CSU campuses to identify strategies to reduce availability and accessibility of alcohol, particularly to minors by January 31, 2009.

Four of the eight (50%) campuses offer TIPS training – TIPS training is a skill-based training program designed for alcohol beverage servers to prevent intoxication, drunk driving and underage drinking.

Example 1: Cal State Los Angeles has eight certified TIPS trainers who piloted a training session for sixteen Resident Advisors and two Resident Life Coordinators on January 14, 2009.

Example 2: Humboldt continues to promote its Designated Drive Program that encourages Arcata local establishments to partner with the program by serving non-alcoholic beverages, at no cost, to students wearing the green designated driver wristband. Over 6,000 wrist bands have been distributed since the program was implemented in 2005-2006.

Example 3: Fresno State piloted a Student Safety Pledge in spring 2009 that 200 students signed that reminds students to use responsible drinking habits when partying, i.e., not drinking and driving and not getting into a car with someone who has been drinking.

Example 4: Cal State Northridge has two certified TIPS trainers who have scheduled TIPS trainings (to occur prior to September 30, 2009) for approximately 100 students/staff from Housing, the University Corporation, University Athletics, Police Services, and Health Promotion. Participants will include servers, peer educators, Matador Patrol, Athletics staff members, and the entire Resident Advisor staff. The trainers, one from Health Promotion and the other from the University Corporation will conduct most, if not all, of the trainings together.

### **Objective #5 – Good Progress**

To provide support to campus peer educators (Health Centers, Bacchus & Gamma clubs, SADD, etc.) through training and information dissemination efforts by September 30, 2009.

Example 1: Channel Islands had six students complete the three-credit upper division class for peer educators and were certified as PEER Educators by the Bacchus network.

Example 2: Cal State Los Angeles has provided TIPS training and support to members of their Student Health Advisory Committee and two Health Science interns/peer educators on May 22, 2009; Public Safety Eagle Patrol.

Example 3: Three Cal State Northridge Health Promotion peer educators (one of whom was a Health Science intern) attended the spring 2009 Regional BACCHUS Area Conference. The peer educators completed the Certified Peer Educator course at the conference.

Example 4: San Francisco peer educators participated in the “Sex in the City” panel in spring 2009 coordinated by the Office of International Programs for J-1 students entering the University that educated them on safety issues related to substance abuse (alcohol and other drugs) with an emphasis on the laws regarding alcohol and driving under the influence as the laws are often different in international countries.

### **Objective #6 Good Progress**

To provide technical support to eight mini-grant campuses throughout the grant period. Fresno State administrators have assisted all eight campuses with grant proposals, quarterly reports (QPRs), billing reimbursements, roll-over requests, and promotional requests.

Example 1: OTS Coordinators meeting held on April 24, 2008 at the Long Beach Marriott brought all the CSU campus coordinators together to meet one another, share administrative goals and objectives, and to receive OTS manuals, guides, and templates for OTS reports.

Example 2: Grant Accountant and OTS Project Director worked with all eight campuses to develop their roll-over requests for unspent fiscal year-one money.

Example 3: Several staff from the OTS grant host campus (Fresno State) worked with the other campuses to provide guidance on grant proposals, submission of budget changes, quarterly reports, activities, promotional items, and evaluation documents.

### **Objective #7 – Good Progress**

To sponsor at least two on-campus alcohol-free events each semester allowing students opportunities to exhibit responsible choices.

All of the eight campuses have been active with their two on campus alcohol-free events each semester.

Example 1: San José State brought the Professional Encouraging Educational Reform Statewide DUI/DWI A.W.A.R.E.III Simulator to their campus on November 3, 2008 for one of their on-campus alcohol-free events. Eighty-seven students were able to ride the simulator that showed them about the dangers of drinking and driving, and over 100 students visited the five educational booths. The OTS booth distributed Clips that had the “Friends don’t let friends drive drunk” message.

Example 2: Humboldt State had its new student orientation for 400 students on August 22, 2008 and peer educators gave out sweatshirts and t-shirts to students with their Option B – I Choose to Drive Sober message.

Example 3: Cal Maritime (CMA), one of only seven degree-granting maritime academies in the United States, complies with U.S. Coast Guard regulations regarding the consumption of alcohol and the operation of maritime vessels. As a result CMA has taken a proactive view of the alcohol-free activities it provides students to boost harm reduction by providing movie nights, entertainment on-campus, dances, and other day trips that are subsidized by the Associated Students, Inc.

Example 4: In a collaboration of University Athletics, Housing, the University Student Union and Health Promotion, students were invited to take a Sober Study Break from finals and attend a CSUN vs. UCLA basketball game projected onto a large screen in Housing. The Wellness Coach/Certified Addiction Specialist, a Health Educator, and four peer educators were available to mix “mocktails”, distribute alcohol related literature, and provide resource and referral information to approximately 250 students. Raffle winners received bean bag chairs in school colors and labeled, “Friends Don’t Let Friends Drink and Drive.”

The University Student Union’s “Matador Nights” are alcohol-free evening programming events put on several times each year. These events are created, themed, and programmed by students. 1,500 students attended the spring 2009 “Matador Nights - Las Vegas” event.

Health Promotion's Wellness Coach/Certified Addiction Specialist and peer educators provided alcohol related literature (purchased through OTS grant), resources and referrals, and mixed "mocktails".

#### Other Innovative Practices Accomplished

Example 1: San José's Greek Life Party Rules was written by the Assistant Director for Fraternity and Sorority Life, and was implemented during the fall of 2008. All fraternities and sororities must register their parties with the University one week before the event, submit a guest list with ages of the attendees, provide one Greek Life sober monitor for every twenty-five Greek life attendees, and one University police officer for every two times the chapter membership in attendance. During the past two semesters, seventy-five safe party applications have been submitted to the University with over 8,000 people in attendance.

Example 2: San Francisco's Digital Storytelling Workshop" was developed by faculty, staff, and students to help convey the message of how drinking and driving impacts not only the driver, but the victims, family and friends of all involved in the accident. A pilot program, funded by the OTS grant, allowed the Prevention Education staff to hold a digital storytelling workshop on April 17-19, 2009 to capture 2-3- minute personal stories on film. A screening of all the stories was held on Sunday, April 19, 2009. The stories will be used to educate other student leaders in their peer training program. This program is now scheduled to film the next generation of stories during the fall 2009 – spring 2010 school semesters.

#### **Summary of Year 1**

Year 1 of the Office of Traffic Safety grant has shown positive progress on the goals and objectives of the OTS/CSU grant. Benchmarks for performance measurements were established through NCHA and the CORE surveys. Statistics for DUIs, traffic accidents, and student misconduct were collected for three of the four semesters. Information on the usage of on-line alcohol assessment programs for the campuses was captured. Strategies to reduce availability and accessibility of alcohol, particularly to minors, were discussed, and implementation has begun on some campuses. Education classes were provided for Peer Educators. On several campuses, alcohol-free events were provided for students that allowed them to exhibit responsible choices.

### **Next Steps**

Year 2 will focus on the following:

- Sustainability of the OTS efforts with the enhancement of current TIPS training for on campus student clubs
- Piloting of a Student Pledge program
- Implementation of mandatory online alcohol assessment programs for freshmen orientation
- Partnering with United Educators, a leading risk liability insurer in the United States (for colleges and Universities) that offers a 10% premium discount to their partners who implement alcohol.edu.

### **TIPS Training**

TIPS (Training for Intervention Procedures) is a skills-based training program designed to prevent intoxication, drunk driving, and underage drinking by teaching servers and consumers of alcohol what they need to recognize potential alcohol related problems and intervene to prevent alcohol related tragedies. Four of the eight (50%) campuses currently offer TIPS training. Staff members from the Residence Halls, Student Health Center, University Police, Center for Student Involvement, and Greek Life have been TIPS Certified at various campus and have conducted training sessions to Resident Hall Advisors and On-Campus Clubs and Organization to promote alcohol education across the campuses.

The next OTS Coordinators meeting is scheduled for mid-March 2009 in Fresno, California. Coordinators will be asked to share best practices with their experiences with TIPS training for their campuses. The four campuses that are not providing TIPS training will learn about the TIPS Commercial and TIPS University programs train-the-trainer programs available.

### **Student Safety Pledge**

In support of the Faculty Pledge, a student safety pledge has been developed that asks students to pledge responsible drinking habits which include: not drinking and driving and not getting in the car with someone who has been drinking. This pledge will be piloted at Fresno State's Spring Break Event asking students to have a fun, yet safe spring break. The pledge will then be introduced to the eight CSU campuses – Channel Islands, Fresno, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Maritime, Northridge, San Francisco and San José for consideration for implementation – with a challenge to follow suit.

### **Online Alcohol Assessment Programs**

All eight of the CSU campuses participating in the OTS grant are utilizing on-line alcohol assessment programs with three of the campuses instituting mandatory usage of alcohol.edu for their freshmen orientation and one campus implementing mandatory usage of alcohol.edu for

Fraternity and Sorority members. MyStudentBody and eCHUG provide services for the other campuses and currently are not mandatory.

Brandon Busted of Outside the Classroom writes that their surveys show that “on average, about half of incoming first-year students are abstainers, while just under a quarter are binge drinkers. Within the first six weeks of being on campus, however, the percentage of students abstaining drops to about thirty percent, and the percentage of bingers grows to about forty-five percent. In other words, binge drinking almost doubles and abstention decreases by nearly half in just weeks...” Students are most vulnerable when they arrive on campus. Mandatory on-line alcohol assessment and education during freshmen orientation may be one option for our campuses to consider. The investment in time, effort, and money will provide a benefit for the students and university for the four years leading to graduation.

**Risk Management Opportunities – Alcohol.Edu for College and United Educators (UE)**

Efficacy research for alcohol.edu for College has been ongoing for the past six years with overwhelming evidence in support of Alcohol.edu College as an effective prevention program. The independent evaluation of alcohol.edu for College indicates “that students who completed Alcohol.edu experienced a 50% reduction in negative academic and personal consequences” (N = 20,150).

United Educators is the leading risk liability insurer for colleges & universities with approximately 700 institutions in the United States. United Educators and Outside The Classroom (owners of alcohol.edu) have been working together to coordinate historical claims data for their partner campuses that are United Educators members with the goal of offering a premium discount to their partners who implement alcohol.edu. Currently United Educators members receive a 10% discount on the alcohol.edu program.

## *CSU CAMPUS ACTIVITIES*

### **Campus Programs**

All CSU campuses have been active in developing and implementing alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement programs. While the following list provides a few examples of campus activities, each CSU campus' single, most effective alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement program that has affected student behavior in a positive way is provided in Attachment B.

- Regularly sponsoring education and prevention programs, e.g., during new student orientation programs, prior to spring breaks, and during "Greek Week";
- Sponsoring "Alcohol awareness weeks" or similar programs and workshops focused on the effects of alcohol drinking and binge drinking, relationship between alcohol and unwanted, non-consensual sex, negative effect of alcohol use on personal and academic success, consequences of drunk driving along with many other topics;
- Provide alcohol- and drug-free social activities on-campus during days and times associated with collegiate alcohol consumption (e.g., pool parties, video game tournaments, concerts, dances, comedy shows, and movie nights on Thursday through Saturday evenings);
- Develop service learning and community engagement opportunities as an alternative to the traditional college break "party" experience;
- Provide online alcohol education courses such as Alcohol.Edu for College, Alcohol Wise, and MyStudentBody.com
- Training all those who regularly interact with students, such as faculty advisers, resident advisers, coaches, peers, faculty, and student affairs professionals to understand and identify alcohol-related problems and to link students with intervention services;
- Develop and mandate social host training for student clubs and organizations
- Targeting alcohol education and prevention programs with high-risk groups such as fraternities, sororities, athletes, housing residents, and student organizations;
- Limiting the sale of alcohol on campuses, e.g., reducing the number of hours alcohol is sold, reducing the size of drinks, implementing one-drink per ID rule;
- Notifying parents and legal guardians about students who violate campus drug or alcohol-related policies;

- Reducing the number of alcohol-related items sold in the campus bookstores (shot glasses and beer tankards, often super sized, bearing the seal of the university, may contribute to the myth that drinking alcohol in larger quantities is an indispensable part of the college experience);
- Establishing and continuing working relationships between campuses, municipal law enforcement, and ABC, e.g., to set up DUI checkpoints in and around campus;
- Engaging ABC licensing hearings to impose health and safety conditions on nearby alcohol licenses;
- Engaging alcohol retailers in continuing dialogue to promote sales and service practices (e.g., less reliance on low drinking prices as a marketing ploy to students) on a voluntary basis;
- Encouraging adoption of responsible beverage service practices by bars and restaurants on campus and in the surrounding community; and
- Establishing community-collegiate alcohol prevention partnerships that encompass wide participation from representatives of other area institutions of higher education.

### **Tobacco Initiatives**

The 2009 Biennial report represents the first time each campus was asked to provide a brief summary of its activities related to tobacco use. The activities identified include smoke-free campus policies, compliance with State and CSU smoking in public building policy and secondhand smoke policy, smoking policy review committees, cessation programs, educational resources and programs, training, and student surveys. All campuses reported being in compliance with the State and CSU smoking policies and twenty campuses reported having at least one other activity in place for students. The tobacco initiatives are listed by campus on Attachment C.

The most notable smoke-free policies are from California Maritime Academy and San Francisco State University that prohibit smoking on campus except for in strictly enforced designated areas. At California State University, Chico, the Academic Senate approved a proposed policy to prohibit smoking on campus except in designated areas. The campus is currently researching the appropriate placement of the designated areas and will forward its final proposed policy to university president. California State University, San Marcos implemented a smoking ban throughout its student housing complex, and California State University, Stanislaus prohibits smoking at outdoor public events where people are seated in close proximity to one another such as outdoor concerts, sporting events and celebrations like Commencement.

Ten campuses have initiated smoking policy review committees to enforce State and CSU policies. The committee makes recommendations for improving signage, enforcing the twenty foot distance restriction from building entrances, exits and operable windows, and enhancing campus awareness of the smoking policy. In addition, many committees are engaged in assessing campus interest in developing a smoke-free environment policy.

Campuses have developed partnerships with county health services, community-based treatment centers, American Cancer Society, American Lung Association and other organizations to provide a wide range of educational programs and cessation services. Many campuses provide students with cessation services that include “Quit Kits,” nicotine patches and one-on-one counseling sessions. A few campuses partnered with organizations like the American Lung Association to provide cessation training for health educators and peer health educators.

Approximately half of the campuses have assessed their students’ tobacco use with instruments such as the National College Health Assessment (NCHA), the CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey or a campus developed survey. On average, eighty-two percent of students self-reported to have never smoked or have not smoked in the last thirty days. The following example from California State University, Northridge demonstrates the type of data collected.

The American College Health Association’s NCHA includes questions related to cigarette, cigar, and smokeless tobacco use as well as perceived use. Benchmarking for California State University, Northridge and national data from the spring 2006 ACHA-NCHA survey is excerpted in the tables below.

### **Cigarette Use**

| <b>Item</b>                       | <b>Cal State Northridge</b> | <b>National</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Never used                        | 61.8%                       | 64.9%           |
| Used, but not in the last 30 days | 21.1%                       | 17.5%           |
| Used 1-9 days                     | 7.7%                        | 9.3%            |
| Used 10-29 days                   | 4.0%                        | 4.1%            |
| Used all 30 days                  | 5.4%                        | 4.3%            |

**Reported Use versus Perceived Use**

Reported use for all students within the past 30 days compared to how often students perceived the typical student on campus used tobacco within the same time period.

**Cal State Northridge**

|                   | Never                |                           | Used One or More Days |                           | Used Daily           |                           |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
|                   | Reported Use (Total) | Perception of Typical Use | Reported Use (Total)  | Perception of Typical Use | Reported Use (Total) | Perception of Typical Use |
| Cigarettes        | 61.8%                | 9.7%                      | 11.7%                 | 44.1%                     | 5.4%                 | 46.1%                     |
| Cigars            | 80.1%                | 39.6%                     | 3.0%                  | 55.3%                     | 0.0%                 | 5.1%                      |
| Smokeless Tobacco | 92.2%                | 45.1%                     | 1.2%                  | 47.5%                     | 0.2%                 | 7.4%                      |

**National**

|                   | Never                |                           | Used One or More Days |                           | Used Daily           |                           |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
|                   | Reported Use (Total) | Perception of Typical Use | Reported Use (Total)  | Perception of Typical Use | Reported Use (Total) | Perception of Typical Use |
| Cigarettes        | 64.9%                | 14.3%                     | 13.4%                 | 53.6%                     | 4.3%                 | 32.1%                     |
| Cigars            | 74.5%                | 46.5%                     | 5.2%                  | 49.9%                     | 0.1%                 | 3.6%                      |
| Smokeless Tobacco | 89.6%                | 48.9%                     | 2.8%                  | 41.6%                     | 0.5%                 | 9.4%                      |

**Measurable Outcomes**

The CSU Alcohol Policies and Prevention policy requires each campus to gather data every two years to determine if its policies and programs are achieving the desired outcomes. On the basis of these assessments, campuses report reductions on a variety of measures of alcohol abuse and alcohol-related incidents, including a reduction in alcohol use by students and a reduction in negative, alcohol related incidents. In some instances, the assessment represents a longitudinal study of behavior change while other studies assess student behavior about the consequences of alcohol and drug use to guide campus risk reduction efforts. The following section provides more information about campus assessment activities.

***Assessment Instruments***

- Several on-line alcohol interventional and personalized feedback tools have been introduced on CSU campuses.
  - Alcohol.Edu (Channel Islands, Chico, Maritime, San Francisco, Somona)
    - AlcoholEdu is an online, science-based course that provides detailed information about alcohol and its effect on the body and mind.
  - Alcohol 101 (San Bernardino)
    - Alcohol 101 Plus is an interactive online program aimed at reducing the harm associated with the misuse of alcohol on college campuses
  - College Wise (East Bay, San Luis Obispo)

- Alcohol Wise includes an assessment component used to measure the impact the program has on student knowledge and behaviors.
  - e-Chug and e-Toke (Humboldt, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Bernardino, San José)
    - Developed by counselors and psychologists at San Diego State University, these were designed as personalized “interventions” to reduce levels of hazardous use and the tragic consequences that too often follow, e.g., sexual assault, alcohol poisoning, DUI injuries and death, violence, unwanted pregnancies, poor academic performance.
  - Marijuana 101 (Pomona)
    - Marijuana 101 is an interactive online program designed to inform students about the marijuana’s effects on the brain, health issues, school and job performance, and the consequences and realities of using marijuana.
  - MyStudentBody.com (San Marcos)
    - MyStudentBody’s comprehensive primary prevention program addresses the most relevant health-related issues on college campuses today, covering drug and alcohol abuse, sexual health, nutrition, tobacco, and stress.
- BASICS (Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students)
  - BASICS is a preventive intervention for college students 18 to 24 years old. It is aimed at students who drink alcohol heavily and have experienced or are at risk for alcohol-related problems such as poor class attendance, missed assignments, accidents, sexual assault, and violence.
- Campus survey (Bakersfield, Dominguez Hills, Humboldt, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego)
  - Several campuses have developed their own survey instruments, which involved a random sample.
  - Surveys involve pre-test and post-test assessments to track longitudinal behavior trends
- CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey (Chico, Monterey Bay, Sacramento, San Francisco, Sonoma)
  - The CORE Drug and Alcohol Survey was developed in the late 1980s by the US Department of Education and advisors from several universities and colleges. The survey is used by universities and colleges to determine the extent of substance use and abuse on their campuses. The survey is now administered by the CORE Institute at Southern Illinois University - Carbondale (SIUC).
- National Alcohol Screening Day each April (Sacramento)

- Students are asked to complete an Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT), which is reviewed by Counseling Center staff.
- National Collegiate Health Assessment (NCHA) (East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Northridge, Pomona, San Marcos, San José, Stanislaus)
  - This survey is coordinated by the American College Health Association, which initiated the survey in 1998.
  - This survey is based upon a random sample to assess changes in drinking behavior and to determine attitudes, feelings and perceptions of the students on campuses related to health and other issues. Campuses are transitioning from a paper only survey to a web-based survey.
  - It consists of fifty-eight questions dealing with six areas of student health and demographic section.
  - The survey provides the largest known comprehensive data set on the health of college students, providing the college health and higher education fields with considerable research on student health.
  - Campus survey findings are compared with national norms (reference group).
  - Findings are used to achieve the following outcomes:
    - Determine priority health issues among student populations
    - Measure progress and effectiveness of intervention strategies
    - Support institutional policies and local laws that affect the health of a campus community
    - Monitor prevalence and care for specific chronic disease groups
    - Monitor acute illness and prevention efforts
    - Identify students' level of self-knowledge about health protection practices and illnesses
    - Identify students' perceptions about peer behavior
    - Assess the impact of health and behavior factors on academic performance
- Ping my Health On-line Assessment Tool (Pomona)
  - Data collected includes lifetime tobacco use, quit attempts, perceptions of tobacco use, and use of tobacco products other than cigarettes.
- Prevention Research Center's California Safer Universities Survey (Chico, Fullerton, Long Beach, Sacramento, San José, San Luis Obispo)
  - The primary purpose of the survey was to collect data on alcohol and other drug use on college campuses in the CSU and UC and to evaluate the efficacy of a "Risk Management" approach to alcohol problem prevention.
  - This assessment utilized an internet survey as its mode of data collection.
  - Each campus provided approximately 1,000 undergraduate students over the age of 18 for the study sample.

- The questionnaire asked up to 434 questions of each respondent, with skip logic used to minimize the number of questions.
- Questions included student demographic information, alcohol use, settings where alcohol was consumed, ease in obtaining alcohol, other drug use, and perceived use by other students.
- Campuses were paired with a campus with similar demographics and divided into control and intervention sites.

### *Trends*

Based upon the surveys administered by CSU campuses, the following trends have been identified:

- The Core Alcohol and Drug Survey includes several types of items about drugs and alcohol. One type deals with the students' attitudes, perceptions, and opinions about alcohol and other drugs, and the other deals with the students' own use and consequences of use. As an example, San Francisco State University reported the following reductions based on a comparison between the 2007 and 2009 surveys:
  - Number of underage (under 21) students who consumed alcohol in previous 30 days by 3.4%;
  - Number of students who reported binge drinking (5 or more drinks in one sitting) in prior two weeks by 1.1%;
  - Number of students who consumed alcohol in the past 30 days by 1.7%
  - Number of students who have driven a car while under the influence by 1.8%
  - Number of students who performed poorly on a test or important project as a result of drinking or drug use by 2.0%

Although the two-year reductions were modest, it represents several years of effective educational campaigns and programs. Most importantly, the student behaviors have positively changed and demonstrate less problematic experiences when compared to the national averages and percentages.

The average number of drinks consumed per week at SFSU (based on a sample of 1,340) is 3.3 drinks. The national average is 5.5 drinks (based on a sample of 70,247). The percentage of students who report having binged in the last two weeks at SFSU is 38.2% compared to the national average of 46.7%.

The proportion of students who report having had problems as a result of drinking or drug use is another indicator of the level of substance abuse. The percentages of students who reported that within the past year they had various problematic experiences are given

in the following table. The top group of items represents public misconduct or behaviors that involve actual or potential harm to others. The second group represents possibly serious personal problems. The last group may consist of less serious (and more common) experiences which nevertheless may indicate excessive use.

| <u>SFSU</u><br><u>Percentage</u> | <u>National</u><br><u>Percentage</u> | <u>Experience</u>   |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1.0                              | 1.4                                  | Been arrested for DWI/DUI   |
| 7.4                              | 13.7                                 | Been in trouble with police, residence hall, or other college authorities |
| 3.6                              | 6.8                                  | Damaged property, pulled fire alarms, etc.                                |
| 21.4                             | 27.0                                 | Driven a car while under the influence                                    |
| 23.1                             | 32.3                                 | Got into an argument or fight   |
| 1.3                              | 1.3                                  | Tried to commit suicide   |
| 7.5                              | 4.5                                  | Seriously thought about suicide   |
| 13.9                             | 16.2                                 | Been hurt or injured  |
| 6.9                              | 10.1                                 | Been taken advantage sexually   |
| 2.1                              | 3.2                                  | Taken advantage of another sexually                                       |
| 6.8                              | 5.2                                  | Tried unsuccessfully to stop using  |
| 15.5                             | 10.8                                 | Thought I might have a drinking or other drug problem                     |
| 21.2                             | 22.1                                 | Performed poorly on a test or important project                           |
| 31.9                             | 37.2                                 | Done something I later regretted  |
| 27.4                             | 30.1                                 | Missed a class  |
| 25.7                             | 30.9                                 | Been criticized by someone I know   |
| 31.2                             | 33.9                                 | Had a memory loss   |
| 50.6                             | 54.3                                 | Got nauseated or vomited  |
| 59.8                             | 62.5                                 | Had a hangover  |

- Surveys that assess students’ knowledge about alcohol and its effects on the body and mind, e.g., Alcohol.Edu (Sonoma), report the following key outcomes:
  - Learning outcomes related to blood alcohol concentration (BAC): 24% of drinkers reported that the course changed the way they thought about their previous use of alcohol. Specifically, these students reported that they “probably had a higher BAC when drinking” than they thought before.
  - Learning outcomes related to social responsibility: 92% of our students reported that Alcohol.Edu prepared them to help in situations where they have identified an alcohol overdose.
  - Positive social intentions: After completing the course, 83% of our students reported that they intend to “support the choice not to drink” and 78% intend to “contribute to a healthier and safer campus environment regarding alcohol use.”
  - Intentions and actual actions regarding protective behaviors: In Survey 1, regarding their behavior over the next 30 days, 9 out of 10 drinkers reported their intention to alternate alcoholic drinks with non-alcoholic beverages and 8 out of 10 reported their intention to set a personal limit on the number of drinks they will

- have per occasion. In Survey 3, 7 out of 10 and 8 out of 10, respectively, reported following through on their intentions.
- Risk behaviors: In Survey 3, drinkers reported a prevalence of certain risk behaviors, such as chugging (52%), doing shots (69%), and playing drinking games (68%).
  - Drinking rates: The number of our students who identified as non-drinkers went from 60% in Survey 1 to 52% in Survey 3. During that same time frame, heavy-episodic drinkers and problematic drinkers went from 23% to 27% and 4% to 6%, respectively.
  - Type of alcohol consumed: In Survey 3, of those students at our institution who identified as drinkers, the majority reported consuming beer (44%), mixed drinks (14%), or shots (30%) the last time they drank.
  - Method of obtaining alcohol: In Survey 3, drinkers reported that they obtained their alcohol mainly at parties (41%), or from someone they know who is 21 or older (33%).
  - Location where drinking occurs: Sonoma State University students reported drinking mainly at an off-campus residence (54%), or at an on-campus residence (32%).
- Safer California Universities studies reported the following key findings on the consequences of alcohol and drug use that campuses use to guide risk reduction efforts:
    - 21.1% reported some form of public misconduct (such as trouble with police, fighting/argument, DWI/DUI, vandalism) at least once during the past semester/quarter as a result of drinking. (Fullerton)
    - 28.4% reported experiencing some kind of serious personal problems (such as suicidality, being hurt or injured, trying unsuccessfully to stop using, sexual assault) at least once during the past semester/quarter as a result of drinking. (Fullerton)
    - 38.2% reported experiencing some kind of minor personal problem (such as missing class, having a memory loss, having a hangover, vomiting) at least once during the past semester/quarter as a result of drinking. (Fullerton)
  - The National College Health Assessment (NCHA) is a self-report questionnaire administered to approximately 10,000 students, via student email, each spring before spring break. The survey addresses many health behaviors, including alcohol use. The NCHA administered in 2008 found the following:
    - 44% of students have never used alcohol, or abstained from alcohol within the last 30 days. (Fullerton)

- Less than 1% of current drinkers (used alcohol within the last 30 days) use alcohol daily. (Fullerton)
- 80% of students who use alcohol had 4 or fewer drinks the last time they consumed alcohol. (Fullerton)
- 97% of students who use alcohol reported participating in one or more preventive behaviors, such as avoiding drinking games or having a designated driver, while drinking. (Fullerton)
- There is a *slight tendency of a decrease in the number of days per month* respondents said they drank during the last month. The proportion who reported almost daily drinking (20-29 days in the last month) declined (2.8% to 1.9%), especially among women (2.6% to 1.2%). (Fresno)
- The *somewhat fewer days drinking* inferred appears to be strongest among men. More men responded they were not abstainers but had not been drinking in the last 30 days (16% to 21%). (Fresno)
- The distribution of “number of drinks” for women “thinned” somewhat in the upper-tail of the range; fewer women had been drinking “9” or “11+ drinks” (0.5% decreased to 0.0% and 4.4% fell to 2.3%). (Fresno)
- Very frequent high-risk drinking by women (“6 or more times” in the previous two weeks) declined (1.8% to 0.7%). (Fresno)
- There was a modest increase in the proportion of men who thought that the typical CSU, Fresno student *did not drink* (0 drinks) the last time s/he partied or “socialized” (4.4% to 9.5%). (Fresno)
- More men reported they used a designated driver “usually” or “always” (70% to 78%). (Fresno)
- More men reported they ate “before and/or during drinking” (76% to 83%). (Fresno)
- Fewer women reported they had been threatened or forced to have sex as a consequence of drinking behaviors (1.0% to 0.0%). (Fresno)
- Driving-after-drinking declined among men (36% to 25%). (Fresno)

### **Special Accomplishments**

Campuses were asked to highlight any other special or unique programs and/or accomplishments that the campus believed helped to implement the CSU Alcohol Policy that had a positive, measurable, impact on students. The following examples are representative of the types of unique programs offered by campuses.

- Channel Islands added an alcohol education component to its freshman Island View Orientation to give students important information about alcohol and the consequences of irresponsible drinking. The program was called “That Tune Show” - an entertaining game show used to educate students about alcohol statistics and behaviors.
- Chico changed and enforced stricter University Housing alcohol policies that resulted in the number of alcohol incidents in the residence halls decreasing every year since the implementation of stricter enforcement and policy changes.
- Dominguez Hills developed and distributed campus-wide awareness posters with messages about drinking and the consequences of drinking. Sample messages were “Letting her Sleep it Off Could Kill Her,” “Be a Hero with a Zero” and “The Designated Driver is the One Who Doesn’t Drink ... Not the One Who Has Had the Least to Drink.”
- Fresno implemented the Alcohol Safety Council Faculty Pledge, which is an agreement designed to: improve classroom awareness; educate faculty with regard to policies and laws; and provide useful tools to direct students to appropriate solutions and resources regarding alcohol abuse related issues.
- Fullerton successfully implemented a social marketing campaign targeted at students who are the age of 21 years or older. “Imagine If...” was a campaign that asked students to imagine if they provided alcohol to someone under 21 and that person was hurt, injured another person, or was penalized for alcohol use.
- Long Beach conducted an Alcohol Use and Risk Behavior assessment for special populations of students (student athletes, fraternity and sorority members, and students in residence halls). In its findings, 42% of special population students reported risky drinking for ten days during the past month, compared to only 2% of Health Status Survey (HSS) students (general population students) even though students from the special populations were more likely (43% vs. 34%) than HSS 2006 participants to be non-drinkers.
- Monterey Bay observed National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week on October 19 to 25, 2008, and its week’s events attracted the attention of local news station KION, which featured an October 24<sup>th</sup> news story highlighting National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week and alcohol education efforts at CSUMB.
- Northridge hired a Certified Addiction Specialist/substance-use counselor (“Wellness Coach”) in the Klotz Student Health Center’s Health Promotion Department. Most of the students identified as alcoholic have started to attend 12-step meetings and have either

maintained sobriety or reduced their drinking patterns significantly. Most of these students continue to adhere to follow-up visits or maintain telephone contact with the Wellness Coach.

- Cal Poly Pomona evaluated the student learning achieved as a result of its 1<sup>st</sup> annual B.E. S.M.A.R.T. Alcohol Awareness Fair. A total of 118 point of contact surveys were completed using PDAs and analysis conducted using the Student Voice Assessment Software. Survey data indicated the “Green Bean” Poster Campaign was effective in getting students’ attention and causing them to think about alcohol consumption. Data also indicated the B.E. S.M.A.R.T. event was reasonably effective at raising students’ level of knowledge and/or awareness regarding the dangers of high risk drinking and the campus resources available for problems related to alcohol abuse.
- Sacramento developed the Alcohol, Tobacco, Other Drugs and Sexual Assault (ATODSA) Peer Health Educator Program to provide education about alcohol, tobacco, other drugs, sexual assault, intimate partner violence and other health related issues to students through outreach activities, educational presentations and media.
- San José sponsored a DUI simulator that was a full and intact car connected to a virtual reality computer system. Students were able to get into the car, wear virtual reality goggles and actually see the course they were ‘driving’. The computer system simulated different levels of intoxication and the students were able to experience what it would be like to drive intoxicated.
- San Francisco implemented a program called *Knock and Talk*. When the university police become aware of an upcoming party from fliers around campus or Facebook, they visit the residence before the date of the planned party and discuss with the occupants underage drinking, noise ordinances, safety plans for serving alcohol and crowd control, etc.
- Sonoma participates in a coalition with the cities of Rohnert Park and Cotati that is committed to addressing underage drinking and adult high risk drinking in the Rohnert Park, Cotati, and Sonoma State University communities.

## **Conclusion**

In general, campuses report a trend toward less alcohol use by students and a reduction in alcohol-related incidents. Specifically, they report the following:

- There is a pattern of reduction in alcohol abuse and driving under the influence of alcohol.
- Several efforts, such as the training of beverage servers, implementation of alcohol policies, and increase law enforcement operation in and around stadiums, combined to reduce alcohol-related problems at home football games.
- Fewer students report driving after drinking.

- Student misperceptions of peer alcohol consumption (quantity-per-occasion and prevalence) were reduced, which leads to more responsible drinking.
- Those who drink do so less frequently and are drinking smaller amounts.
- Campuses report a decline in the number of drinks consumed per week.
- The number of student alcohol-related misconduct incidents is declining.
- Campuses inform local retailers each fall about their obligations to the laws regarding sales of alcohol.

These measurable outcomes have been achieved by strengthening alcohol abuse training programs, using social norms theory marketing strategies, strengthening partnerships with local enforcement agencies, increasing peer training, creating feeder school training programs, and changing student perceptions about their peers' alcohol-related behaviors.

The 23-campus CSU system continues to establish partnerships to promote safe, healthy, and learning-conducive environments. The alcohol policy adopted by the California State University Board of Trustees in 2001 has generated additional resources from state and federal governments and reported progress in reducing alcohol-related problems.

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>Grant</b>  | <b>Purpose</b>   | <b>Grant Period</b>    | <b>Amount</b> |
|-----------------|---|--|------------------------|---------------|
| Bakersfield     | NCAA CHOICES Program  | To work toward the elimination of high-risk consumption of alcohol on college campuses by promoting low-risk choices.  | Sept. 2006 - June 2009 | \$30,000      |
| Channel Islands | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant   | To reduce student driving after drinking and other alcohol-related misconduct.   | 2007 - 2009            | \$30,200      |
| Chico           | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California  | To evaluate the risk management approach to preventing alcohol-related problems by implementing a variety of environmental interventions on campus and the campus community. | 2007 - 2009            | \$45,000      |
| Dominguez Hills | Harbor Distributing (a donation from the regional beer distributor)   | The purpose of the donation was for alcohol education programs with an emphasis on risk reduction.   | Summer 2007            | \$10,000      |
| East Bay        | Alameda County Binge Drinking Prevention Project : The California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) awarded a three-year grant to the Alameda County Department of Behavioral Health Care Services (ACBHCS) | To reduce binge drinking among youth ages 18 to 24 in the communities of Berkeley and Hayward.   | 2005 - 2007            | \$199,430     |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| Campus | Grant   | Purpose   | Grant Period                  | Amount  |
|--------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Fresno | CSU Alcohol and Traffic Safety                        | To reduce drinking and driving as well as alcohol-related misconduct among CSU students. Eight CSU campuses are participating. Fresno State is the Grant Administrator.   | October 2007 – September 2009 | \$701,259<br>(This amount is for a two-year grant. Of the total grant amount, \$440,000 has been allocated to the eight CSU campuses in the form of mini-grants.) |
|        | Social Norms Project                                  | To conduct social norms marketing activities designed to reduce alcohol abuse and alcohol-related consequences among Fresno State students.   | 2007-2008                     | \$64,866<br>(This amount is for a two-year grant.)  |
|        | Aetna Wellness Resource Center                        | To establish a Wellness Resource Center within University Health & Psychological Service.   | 2008                          | \$30,000  |
|        | Donaghy Sales, Inc.                                   | Unrestricted contribution to spearhead the new Fresno State Stall Seat Journal (SSJ).   | 2007                          | \$5,000   |
|        | Fresno State Instructionally-Related Activities (IRA) | To send Fresno State student representation to the: (1) 2007 and 2008 Annual California Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drugs Education Conferences and (2) 2007 and 2008 National Conferences on the Social Norms Approach. | 2007 & 2008                   | \$7,000   |
|        | Fresno State Parents' Association                     | To send Fresno State student representation at both the 2007 and 2008 Annual California Higher Education Alcohol and Other Drugs Education Conferences.   | 2007 & 2008                   | \$4,000   |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b> | <b>Grant</b>   | <b>Purpose</b>  | <b>Grant Period</b>         | <b>Amount</b> |
|---------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Fullerton     | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California                     | This study, funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), was designed to help identify the most effective ways of preventing and responding to heavy alcohol consumption by college students. CSU Fullerton was a control group campus.  | 2007-2008                   | \$50,000      |
|               | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California                     | Projects will focus on enforcement of current state and campus alcohol policies, especially related to underage drinking and drinking and driving. This project will focus on raising awareness of alcohol policies and consequences for violations, as well as increased community enforcement of DUI. CSU Fullerton is now an experimental group. | 2008 - 2010                 | \$12,000      |
|               | State Inventive Grant in partnership with Orange County Health Care Agency's Alcohol and Drug Education and Prevention Team (ADEPT) and the University of California, Irvine | Grant provided funds to produce intervention programs intended to reduce binge drinking among college students, problems related to binge drinking on college campuses and in the surrounding community.  | October 2006-September 2007 | \$75,000      |
|               | Computerized Alcohol Screening and Intervention (CASI), Funded by the University of California, Irvine   | Funded a computerized self-assessment of high risk alcohol use behaviors, which will be conducted in the Student Health and Counseling Center.  | 2008 - 2009                 | \$18,000      |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| Campus     | Grant  | Purpose   | Grant Period | Amount   |
|------------|--|---|--------------|----------|
| Humboldt   | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant  | To develop an impaired driving prevention program targeted at drivers between the ages of 18-24 on roadways leading to and from Humboldt State University.  | 2006 - 2008  | \$63,000 |
|            | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant  | This project focuses on developing an impaired driver prevention program at Humboldt State University (HSU) partnering with the community and local police agencies. The program will be conducted through an extensive public awareness campaign centered on student activities both on and off campus, combined with enhance enforcement on sections of roadway surrounding the University which are most affected by drinking and driving behaviors of students. | 2007 - 2009  | \$51,105 |
| Long Beach | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California | <p>This study, funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAAA), is designed to help identify the most effective ways of preventing and responding to heavy alcohol consumption by college students.</p> <p>In 2008, the grant was renewed for another 5-year study, with funding amount to be determined.</p>   | 2007 - 2008  | \$44,000 |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b> | <b>Grant</b>   | <b>Purpose</b>  | <b>Grant Period</b> | <b>Amount</b> |
|---------------|--|---|---------------------|---------------|
| Los Angeles   | Safe & Sober @ Cal State L.A. (CSU Alcohol Traffic and Safety Project mini-grant)            | To reduce the incidence of driving under the influence and campus alcohol policy violations through the enhancement of current prevention, intervention, and policy enforcement efforts and the implementation of new (to the campus) environmental management and individual prevention and intervention strategies. | 2007 - 2009         | \$57,632      |
|               | Driving Under the Influence College Corridor, Phase III: California Office of Traffic Safety | To develop an impaired driver prevention program that incorporates extensive awareness campaigns centered on student activities both on and off campus, combined with enhanced enforcement on sections of roadway surrounding the communities which are most affected by drinking and driving behaviors of students.  | 2009 - 2010         | \$42,800      |
| Maritime      | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant  | To reduce alcohol abuse, alcohol-related vehicle accidents and alcohol-related misconduct among college students.   | 2007 - 2009         | \$54,487      |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| Campus       | Grant  | Purpose  | Grant Period  | Amount   |
|--------------|--|--|---------------|----------|
| Monterey Bay | The Joseph and Ida Lisken Family Foundation  | To develop and deliver the Alcohol Awareness Pilot Project. The pilot program utilized elements of the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) and the e-CHUG assessment and feedback tool. This intervention, used with students found in violation of campus alcohol policies, consisted of an hour long psycho-educational class, two-weeks of individual self-monitoring, and a feedback session with a licensed clinician. | February 2007 | \$15,000 |
| Northridge   | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant                                      | To reduce alcohol abuse, alcohol-related vehicle accidents and alcohol-related misconduct among college students.  | 2007 - 2009   | \$63,811 |
| Pomona       | <i>Cal Poly Pomona has not received any alcohol and drug related grants since 2007</i> |  |               |          |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| Campus     | Grant  | Purpose  | Grant Period | Amount   |
|------------|--|--|--------------|--|
| Sacramento | Alternative Break Project Activity Grant: Sacramento State University Enterprises, Incorporated  | To provide funding for breakfast and lunch for student volunteers working for Habitat for Humanity during Spring Break on March 28-31, 2007.   | January 2007 | \$660  |
|            | Alternative Break Project Activity Grant: Sacramento State University Enterprises, Incorporated  | To provide funding for breakfast and lunch for student volunteers working for non-profit agencies during Winter Break (January 21-25, 2008) and Spring Break (March 31- April 4, 2008).  | January 2008 | \$1,825  |
|            | Safe Spring Break Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Simulator: Sacramento State University Enterprises, Incorporated   | To provide students with the opportunity to experience the impact that alcohol use has on driving skills.  | January 2008 | \$1,000  |
|            | Safer California Universities Project Extension: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California | To study the effects of an environmental prevention and risk management approach on college student drinking. The project assessed student drinking in different settings (bars and restaurants, Greek houses, outdoor settings, house parties, and residence halls), and implemented environmental management strategies to measure the impact on student alcohol consumption. The original project ended in spring 2008, but was extended for five more years to measure the impact of implementing environmental management strategies on campus control sites. | October 2008 | \$9,600<br>((\$9,600 per year through 2013; total funding is \$48,000) |

## GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT 2007-2009

| Campus         | Grant  | Purpose   | Grant Period | Amount    |
|----------------|--|---|--------------|-----------|
| San Bernardino | <i>CSU San Bernardino has not received any alcohol and drug related grants since 2007</i>  |   |              |           |
| San Diego      | Investigating Collegiate Natural Drinking Groups Grant: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA)                                       | The project will investigate collegiate drinking-group construction, motivations, and dynamics. The goal of the research is to advance our ability to measure and understand the dynamics of natural drinking groups within the context of college drinking behavior.   | 2007-09      | \$214,906 |
| San José       | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant  | To reduce by 5% the incidence of driving after consuming alcohol and to reduce by 5 % the incidents of alcohol-related misconduct.  | 2007 - 2009  | \$54,506  |
|                | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California | To evaluate the efficacy of a “Risk Management” approach to alcohol problem prevention. Aim to reduce intoxication and harm related to intoxication.<br><br>This project is now in Phase 2 of implementation. In Phase 1 SJSU was part of this study as a control campus, but is now an intervention school and will have specific interventions that need to be implemented. These same interventions that were implemented in Phase 1 of the study resulted in the decrease of intoxication and the decrease of harm related to intoxication. | 2007 - 2009  | \$48,000  |

**GRANTS RECEIVED BY CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES  
TO SUPPORT ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT  
2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>Grant</b>   | <b>Purpose</b>   | <b>Grant Period</b> | <b>Amount</b> |
|-----------------|--|--|---------------------|---------------|
| San Luis Obispo | Safer California Universities: A Multi-Campus Alcohol Problem Prevention Study in partnerships with the Prevention Research Center, Berkeley, California | This study, funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAAA), is designed to help identify the most effective ways of preventing and responding to heavy alcohol consumption by college students.   | 2007 - 2009         | \$9,000       |
| San Francisco   | CSU Office of Traffic Safety (CSU OTS) mini-grant  | To reduce the incidence of driving after consuming alcohol by 18-25 year old CSU students 5% from each campus' 2005 base; and to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related misconduct by CSU students by 5% from each campus' 2005 base year.  | 2007 - 2009         | \$61,062      |
| San Marcos      | <i>CSU San Marcos has not received any alcohol and drug related grants since 2007</i>  |  |                     |               |
| Sonoma          | <i>Sonoma State University has not received any alcohol and drug related grants since 2007</i>   |  |                     |               |
| Stanislaus      | Social Norming Grant: Stanislaus County Behavioral Health and Recovery Services (BHRS)   | BHRS collaborated with California State University, Stanislaus on developing a Social Norming planner/student handbook that was distributed to all incoming freshmen during fall 2008. CSU Stanislaus held youth focus groups to identify the social norming messages to be included within the publication. Data were drawn from earlier studies conducted on campus. | 2008                | \$8,000       |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

**The following table summarizes for each California State University campus its single, most effective alcohol education, prevention, and enforcement program that has affected student behavior in a positive way. It is important to note that campuses have initiated multiple programs. This chart identifies only the most effective program for each campus.**

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>Program</b>                                       | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>  |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Bakersfield     | Alcohol Training for Coaches and Athletes Conference | This conference prepares athletic directors, coaches, athletic trainers, team captains and Student Athlete Advisory Committee members to effectively communicate with student-athletes and one another about high-risk drinking. In addition, the conference discusses developing policies, learning rules/regulations around sports and alcohol, drug testing and learning inventive ways to address these with student athletes. Each conference has incorporated ideas concerns coach's needs and wants and how to best communicate with their athletes. The conferences have utilized local experts in their field.                         |
| Channel Islands | Spring Alcohol Awareness Program                     | The program was a two-day event that focused on educating students about the consequences of drunk driving. It was organized and presented by the PSY 492 Peer Education class in collaboration with Student Leadership Programs and the OTS grant committee. Specifically, the program focused on cultivating students' awareness of their own responsibility concerning drinking and driving, and for maintaining conscientious attitudes toward alcohol during spring break.   |
| Chico           | AlcoholEdu On-line Alcohol Education Program         | For the past three years, CSU Chico has been administering AlcoholEdu® for College to its entire first-year student population, with the goal of not only changing individual students' knowledge and behaviors, but of changing the drinking culture on the campus as a whole. The objective is to create a learning community with a common educational experience that motivates behavior change, resets unrealistic expectations about the effects of alcohol, links choices about drinking to academic and personal success, helps students practice safer decision-making, and engages students in creating a healthier campus community. |

## EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009

| Campus          | Program   | How Student Behavior Influenced   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Dominguez Hills | Alcohol Awareness Coordinating Team (AACT) Educational Videos | AACT developed two educational videos that were produced by a digital media arts student and the production was entirely student developed and produced. The content of these videos included interviews with current students to see what facts they knew about alcohol and its effects. As students provide what they believe to be the answers the facts appear on the bottom of the screen. The videos were used in Greek week and Housing programs. In addition to these two groups, arrangements were made with the instructors of University 101 to show the videos during their segment on wellness and health. Students were provided with a pre-test and then shown the video. After viewing the video, they were asked to complete the post-test. Upon conclusion of the exercise, students were provided a fact sheet on alcohol awareness which included campus and community resources and directed them to the AACT web site for more information.           |
| East Bay        | <i>"For Real"</i> Alcohol Classroom Program                   | Student Health Services' Health Promotion staff and Peer Advocates for Wellness (PAW) collaborated with the CSUEB Freshman Year Experience (FYE) Program which provides first-time freshmen with support for both academic and personal growth during their first year in college. The FYE program connected Health Promotion staff with instructors who taught classes which CSUEB freshmen are required to complete in order to graduate. As a result, Health Promotion staff and PAW students were able to come to classrooms and give presentations tailored to freshmen students about overall wellness, which included education on alcohol-use, safe sex, and nutrition. During Winter and Spring Quarter 2007, Health Promotion staff attended 17 classes, reaching approximately 870 students. Health Promotion has continued collaborating with the First Year Experience Program during Fall Quarter 2008 and will continue into Winter and Spring Quarter 2009. |

## EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009

| Campus    | Program  | How Student Behavior Influenced  |
|-----------|--|--|
| Fresno    | Wicked Wellness Carnival (WWC)   | The purpose of the event was to present alcohol education and wellness messages that promoted responsible drinking and healthy behaviors to students in a fun carnival-like atmosphere. In 2007, the WWC had a general Halloween theme and reached over 700 students. In 2008 focused on the theme from the Broadway play, <i>Wicked</i> and reached over 1,000 students.  |
| Fullerton | Student Organization Social Host Training  | In collaboration with the State Incentive Grant, CSUF has been able to mandate social host training for student clubs and organizations. This training is offered through the already established "Blueprints" training program, where student leaders learn about campus policies regarding event hosting and utilization of campus facilities and space. The social host component includes laws and campus policies regarding alcohol service at CSUF events, as well as risk management practices for safe events. This new program was implemented in August of 2007. Although the grant has ended, this component of student organization training will continue.  |
| Humboldt  | An alcohol-awareness and safe driving campaign titled - <i>Option B: Choose to Drive Sober</i> | The campaign promotes safe-and-sober motor vehicle operation, informing students of the risks of using alcohol and driving under the influence; offering them safe alternates and options. Thus the campaign is called <i>Option B</i> , the other option to DUI. This campaign has developed a unique logo and a three part approach to lower the instance of drinking and driving on and adjacent to the university. The three parts of this campaign include educating students about the physiological and psychological effects of alcohol and other drugs, engaging students in alcohol-free social and recreational activities, and enhanced enforcement of motor-vehicle laws. The concept for the <i>Option B</i> campaign was generated from a student and staff campus committee. The success of the program is due to the collaboration among the local California Highway Patrol, the Arcata Police Department, HSU Police Department and on-campus educational/social programming. |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b>    | <b>Program</b>  | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>   |
|------------------|---|--|
| Long Beach       | 21 <sup>st</sup> Birthday Card Program  | Under the direction of the Vice President for Student Services, the CSULB Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs (ATOD) Program began distributing birthday cards to all students during the month they reach 21 years of age. The purpose of the cards is to inform students of the choice to either abstain from consuming alcohol, or make responsible and safe decisions if drinking. The ATOD Program has received praise for the 21 <sup>st</sup> birthday cards from students, parents, and campus faculty and staff. To date 7,807 cards have been sent to CSULB students. |
| Los Angeles      | <i>No new programs were implemented over the past two years which have documented outcome/impact assessments.</i> |  |
| Maritime Academy | Alcohol EDU for College   | Alcohol EDU for College is an online alcohol education program. Each first year student took a summer assessment and an educational baseline on alcohol use and abuse. It was then re-assessed 45 days into the semester. Other students who were involved in alcohol related infractions also have taken part in this program.  |
| Monterey Bay     | CSUMB Decision Making Workshop  | To encourage undergraduate students to reflect on their communication skills and personal guidelines when making decisions that impact themselves and others. The workshop is one of the most well-received alcohol education efforts to come about in recent years and was developed as a direct result of the Alcohol Pilot Project.   |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b> | <b>Program</b>  | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>  |
|---------------|---|---|
| Northridge    | Save a Life Tour  | <p>The “Save a Life Tour”, a multimedia alcohol educational program and drunk-driving simulator, was brought to campus by the Klotz Student Health Center, University Student Union, Department of Public Safety, and University Athletics. The Tour was part of “Get the Matador Buzz”, an alternative programming event targeted to athletes and marketed to the entire student body. The “Buzz” was designed to help students learn about the risks and consequences of alcohol overuse and abuse – especially driving under the influence - and how to avoid these risks. An estimated 600+ students participated in the “Buzz.” Students experienced the “most realistic, sophisticated drunk driving simulator in the country.”</p> |
| Pomona        | B.E. S.M.A.R.T. Alcohol Awareness Fair (Better Educated Students Managing Alcohol Responsibly Together) | <p>To provide a festive venue for professional and peer education on responsible use of alcohol through visual displays, interactive games, and resource/information booths. Attendance at the 1<sup>st</sup> B.E. S.M.A.R.T. event was estimated at well over 300 and 118 students completed brief, on-the-spot surveys during the event. Just under half (46%) of those surveyed reported knowing more about the dangers of high risk drinking than they did before attending the event, and nearly three quarters (72%) agreed they knew more about places on campus where they or a friend could get help with a drinking problem as a result of attending B.E. S.M.A.R.T.</p>  |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b>  | <b>Program</b>                               | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>   |
|----------------|--|--|
| Sacramento     | Alternative Break                            | To provide Sacramento State students the chance to participate in a service opportunity that addresses the social needs of the surrounding community, facilitate a deeper understanding of the importance of volunteerism and community engagement, offer an alternative to the traditional college break "party" experience, and serve the greater Sacramento community. The Alternative Break is a collaborative project organized and implemented by three Sacramento State departments: the Community Engagement Center, the Student Health Services Alcohol Education Program, and the Office of Student Activities.  |
| San Bernardino | <i>Liquor is Quicker</i> Program             | To educate students on the general effects of alcohol drinking and binge drinking on the body's ability to function normally   |
| San Diego      | Aztec Nights                                 | The Aztec Nights program was instituted to provide students with alcohol- and drug-free social activities, concentrated in the first five weeks of the semester. Each weekend, large free events were planned, attracting between 150 and 4,500 students. Evaluation results demonstrated that alcohol violations and medical transports were reduced more than 50% after implementing this program.   |
| San Francisco  | <i>Creating a Culture of Consent</i> Program | The sexual violence prevention team and the alcohol and other drugs prevention team joined together for a campaign to address the relationship between alcohol and un-planned, unwanted, and non-consensual sex. Activities targeted groups who were identified in our CORE survey to be particularly vulnerable to high-risk behaviors while drinking (athletes, fraternities/sororities and freshmen). "Creating a Culture of Consent" workshops led by our prevention specialists and students were given to each of the men and women's athletic teams, with many fraternities and sororities and with freshmen in housing who were referred for alcohol or marijuana use. |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>Program</b>  | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>  |
|-----------------|---|---|
| San José        | 1 <sup>st</sup> Thursday program  | The 1 <sup>st</sup> Thursday program, sponsored by the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee, provides alternative activities for students to participate in rather than to go out and possibly consume alcohol. Past 1 <sup>st</sup> Thursday programming includes: Luau Pool Party, Fall Festival BBQ, Video Game Tournament, and a Hypnotism Show. All these programs have been well attended with hundreds of students in attendance. Although these are activities that are fun for students to attend we are able to bring awareness to students about the alcohol policy by tabling at each event and providing give-away material that has alcohol information printed on it. |
| San Luis Obispo | Alcohol Wise online alcohol course                                      | Cal Poly implemented the Alcohol Wise online alcohol course for all incoming freshmen. Approximately 81% of the students completed the survey. The post-test survey indicated that students increased their knowledge about the effects of alcohol and related negative behaviors. Cal Poly will continue to implement this program next year.  |
| San Marcos      | Campus-Initiated Alcohol Education, Prevention, and Enforcement Program | All first-year students participated in the online program MyStudentBody.com. The campus requires all first-year students to complete this educational tool during the fall semester to raise awareness of the negative effect of alcohol on personal and academic success and to promote responsible alcohol use. Students learned the affects of alcohol on the body and how to identify alcohol poisoning and excessive drinking. Approximately 820 first year students experienced the Alcohol GEL 101 presentations.   |

## **EFFECTIVE CAMPUS-INITIATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS 2007-2009**

| <b>Campus</b> | <b>Program</b>         | <b>How Student Behavior Influenced</b>   |
|---------------|------------------------|--|
| Sonoma        | AlcoholEdu for College | <p>For the second year in a row, Sonoma State requires that every member of our incoming first-year class complete AlcoholEdu for College. AlcoholEdu for College is an objective, science-based, online alcohol prevention program designed specifically for college students. In addition, it serves as a means of assessing the alcohol-related attitudes, experiences, and behaviors of our Sonoma State students. The campus had a 97% completion rate for the three hour module consisting of a survey and pre-test, concluding exam, and final survey. All of the sections are completed over a six-week period.</p>  |
| Stanislaus    | Late Night Stanislaus  | <p>The philosophy of the Late Night Stanislaus program is to offer students a variety of programs and events in a fun and interactive setting. The program has a strong focus on providing opportunities for students to be active on-campus at times frequently associated with collegiate alcohol consumption. In support of this focus the program is typically offered Friday evenings from 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. Some past and present activities include comedy shows, concerts, dances, movie nights, sports tournaments, game and arcade tournaments, craft nights and casino nights.</p> <p>In addition to the themed programs sponsored during Late Night Stanislaus, the University Student Union maintains extended evening hours and offers students additional activities including pool, ping-pong, and various gaming consoles (e.g., Wii, Play station, etc.).</p> <p>Program participants are provided free refreshments throughout the evening. The program has been well-received by students and developed a faithful participant base. The Late Night Stanislaus Program was renamed Friday Night Warriors for the 2008-2009 academic year.</p> |

## CAMPUS INITIATIVES RELATED TO TOBACCO USE 2007-2009

The following spreadsheet identifies each campus' activities addressing issues related to tobacco use – policy, education, student use, survey results and enforcement initiatives.

| Campuses        | State/CSU Policy Compliance | Smoke-free/ Designated Area Policy | Draft Smoke-free Policy | Policy Review/ Committee | Cessation Programs | Educational Resources and Programs | Training | Survey |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Bakersfield     | X                           |                                    |                         |                          |                    |                                    |          |        |
| Cal Maritime    | X                           | X                                  |                         |                          | X                  | X                                  |          |        |
| Channel Islands | X                           |                                    |                         |                          | X                  | X                                  |          |        |
| Chico           | X                           |                                    | X                       | X                        | X                  | X                                  | X        | X      |
| Dominguez Hills | X                           |                                    |                         |                          |                    |                                    |          |        |
| East Bay        | X                           |                                    |                         | X                        | X                  |                                    | X        |        |
| Fresno          | X                           |                                    |                         | X                        |                    | X                                  |          | X      |
| Fullerton       | X                           |                                    |                         | X                        |                    |                                    |          |        |
| Humboldt        | X                           |                                    |                         |                          |                    |                                    |          |        |
| Long Beach      | X                           |                                    |                         |                          |                    | X                                  |          | X      |
| Los Angeles     | X                           |                                    |                         |                          | X                  |                                    |          |        |
| Monterey Bay    | X                           |                                    |                         |                          | X                  | X                                  |          |        |
| Northridge      | X                           | 1                                  |                         |                          | X                  | X                                  |          | X      |
| Pomona          | X                           |                                    |                         |                          | X                  | X                                  |          | X      |
| Sacramento      | X                           |                                    |                         | X                        | X                  | X                                  |          | X      |
| San Bernardino  | X                           |                                    |                         | X                        | X                  |                                    |          |        |
| San Diego       | X                           |                                    |                         |                          | X                  |                                    | X        |        |
| San Francisco   | X                           | X                                  |                         | X                        | X                  |                                    |          | X      |

**CAMPUS INITIATIVES RELATED TO TOBACCO USE  
 2007-2009**

| <b>Campuses</b> | <b>State/CSU<br/>Policy<br/>Compliance</b> | <b>Smoke-free/<br/>Designated Area<br/>Policy</b> | <b>Draft Smoke-<br/>free Policy</b> | <b>Policy Review/<br/>Committee</b> | <b>Cessation<br/>Programs</b> | <b>Educational<br/>Resources and<br/>Programs</b> | <b>Training</b> | <b>Survey</b> |
|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------|
| San José        | X  |   |                                     | X                                   | X                             | X   |                 | X             |
| San Luis Obispo | X  |   |                                     |                                     |                               | X   |                 |               |
| San Marcos      | X  | 2   |                                     | X                                   | X                             | X   |                 |               |
| Sonoma          | X  |   |                                     | X                                   |                               | X   |                 | X             |
| Stanislaus      | X  | 3   |                                     |                                     | X                             |   |                 | X             |

1 – Smoking is prohibited within stadium seating areas, tennis courts, and other recreational facilities. Smoking is also prohibited in outdoor dining areas posted as Smoke-Free.

2 – Smoking banned throughout student housing complex.

3- Smoking is prohibited at outdoor public events where people are seated in close proximity to one another such as outdoor concerts, sporting events and celebrations like Commencement.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students**

#### **Presentation By**

Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor

John D. Welty  
President  
California State University, Fresno

Allison G. Jones  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Student Academic Support

#### **Brief History and Introduction**

In 1976, the California Legislature adopted Education Code Sections 89240 through 89242. This law expressed a legislative intent concerning intercollegiate athletics, stating “that opportunities for participation in athletics be provided on as nearly an equal basis to male and female students as is practicable, and that comparable incentives and encouragements be offered to females to engage in athletics.” This article of the Code further called upon the CSU Trustees to ensure that reasonable amounts of General Fund monies would be allocated to male and female students, “except that allowances may be made for differences in the costs of various athletic programs.” These California statutes echoed Federal legislation (Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972), which prohibits discrimination based on sex, including in the athletics programs of educational institutions.

On October 15, 1993, the California State University and the California National Organization for Women (CA NOW) entered into a consent decree in order to increase participation of female students in intercollegiate athletics on NCAA-member campuses, to increase expenditures for women’s athletic programs, and to increase grants-in-aid and scholarships for female student athletes. The CSU entered into this decree because it believed strongly that female and male students should have an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

In March of 2000, following a review of the 1998-1999 systemwide and campus data, it was agreed by CA NOW and the CSU that major progress had been made in each of the areas of

participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female athletes. In March of 2000, it was determined that the consent decree had been satisfied.

In the spring of 2000, the Chancellor of the CSU and the CSU presidents made the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring of the former CSU/CA NOW consent decree in order to continue to monitor progress in the area of female athletes' participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid. The report which follows for the 2007-2008 academic year, is the ninth annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

### **2007-2008 Report Summary**

The CSU report for 2007-2008 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2008 Reports, submitted January 15, 2009 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. During 2007, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by the CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The corrective action plans are listed in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has twenty NCAA member campuses with CSU Monterey Bay becoming a full NCAA member as of the 2006-2007 academic year.

Under the consent decree, each campus of the California State University System was required to achieve gender equity in its campus intercollegiate athletic program within five years by addressing specific goals and taking specific actions related to those goals. The following are goals for each category.

**Participation:** Participation by female and male athletes on each campus will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates on that campus;

**Expenditures:** Expenditures will be within ten percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible female and male undergraduates, with the deduction for non-comparable expenses for two men's and two women's sports; and

**Grants-In-Aid:** Grants-in-aid will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible female and male undergraduates.

### *Systemwide Impact*

At the CSU systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics has increased from 1,862 in 1992-93 to 4,106 in 2007-2008, on the twenty NCAA member campuses, an increase of 120.5 percent over the past fifteen years. During the previous year, 107 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 2.7 percent.

In 1992, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 34.7 percent, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5 percent. As of fall 2007, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 56.7 percent and a female student athlete participation of 56.2 percent resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 0.5 percent.

Overall, CSU expenditures for women's athletics increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-93 to \$90.8 million in 2007-2008. The total increase over the previous year was \$7.5 million, a 9.0 percent increase. Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-93 to \$14.3 million in 2007-2008. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was just over \$1 million, for an 8.3 percent increase.

### *Campus Impact*

Participation - During 2007-2008, seventeen of the twenty NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in participation including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma, Stanislaus.

The campuses not in compliance and the percentage by which they missed the goal are: Dominguez Hills, 0.5; Long Beach, 0.3; and San Bernardino, 2.6.

Expenditures - Nineteen campuses met or exceeded their targets goals in expenditures including: Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Sonoma and Stanislaus.

One campus was less than two percent from compliance: San Jose, 1.1.

Grants-In-Aid - Fifteen campuses met or exceeded their target goals in grants-in-aid including: Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, and Stanislaus.

Five campuses did not meet their target goals: Dominguez Hills, 0.6; Fresno, 7.1; San Diego, 5.3; San Jose, 2.1; and Sonoma, 2.4.

*Campus Challenges in Achieving Target Goals*

Although the CSU system has made tremendous improvements to increase participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female student athletes, some campuses have experienced difficulty in achieving full-compliance. The contributing factors impacting the campuses' ability to achieve gender equity compliance are the CSU enrollment increase in female student undergraduates from 1992 to 2007 and the NCAA grants-in-aid maximum limit for each sport.

The CSU female undergraduate enrollment increased from 147,566 female students in 1992-1993 to 203,327 in 2007-2008. This reflects a thirty-seven percent increase for female undergraduate students compared to a nineteen percent increase for male undergraduate students during that same time period. The rise in female undergraduate enrollment results in campuses increasing female student athlete participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid at a faster pace.

According to the NCAA Operating Bylaw 15.5, campuses are prohibited to award grants-in-aid above the maximum limit for each sport. Several campuses, particularly those with football, are issuing the maximum allowable number of grants-in-aid but remain unable to achieve their target goal.

*NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target goals for Two Consecutive Years (2005-06 and 2006-07)*

The CSU Presidential Monitoring Committee on Gender Equity in Athletics has recommended that the annual self-monitoring report identify campuses that do not meet their target goals for two consecutive years

**Participation:** Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in participation of women athletes during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years:

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dominguez Hills | -1.5%            | -0.5%            |
| Long Beach      | -0.8%            | -0.3%            |
| San Bernardino  | -3.2%            | -2.6%            |

**Expenditures:** There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008.

**Grants-In-Aid:** Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years:

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dominguez Hills | -2.9%            | -0.6%            |
| Fresno          | -8.0%            | -7.1%            |
| San Diego       | -6.8%            | -5.3%            |

These campuses were required to submit a corrective action plan at the same time the report was due to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future. Campus corrective plans are provided in the attached report.

### **2007-2008 Final Report**

The proceeding pages include the full report on the Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, which was publicly issued on September 1, 2009.

# Voluntary Self-Monitoring Report regarding Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students

Annual Report  
2007-2008

September 1, 2009

The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

[www.calstate.edu](http://www.calstate.edu)

Executive Summary

Summary of 2007-2008 Data – System Level

Summary of 2007-2008 Data – Campus Level

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2007-2008: NCAA Campuses

Part II: Report for Academic Year 2007-2008: Non-NCAA Campuses

Part III: Nine Year Review of the NCAA Member CSU Campuses Meeting Target Goals

Part IV: NCAA Member Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two Consecutive Years (2006-2007 and 2007-2008)

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for Results in 2007-2008 Reporting

Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee

Table 1: NCAA Eligible Men and Women

Table 2: Athletics Participants by Campus 2007-2008

Table 3: Expenditures by Campus 2007-2008 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 3a: Expenditures by Campus 2007-2008 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 4: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2007-2008 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 4a: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2007-2008 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 5: California Community Colleges: Six-Year Comparison on Men's And Women's Sport Participation

High School Participation Numbers & Most Popular Sports

## **Executive Summary**

### **Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students (former CSU/CA NOW Consent Decree)**

#### **The California State University 2007-2008**

##### **Background Information**

On October 15, 1993, the California State University (CSU) and the California National Organization for Women (CA NOW) entered into a consent decree in order to increase participation of female students in intercollegiate athletics on NCAA member campuses, to increase expenditures for women's athletic programs, and to increase grants-in-aid and scholarships for female student athletes. The CSU entered into this decree because it believed strongly that female and male students should have an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics.

Annual reports on progress made within the CSU and on NCAA member campuses were completed for the 1994-1995, 1995-1996, 1996-1997, 1997-1998 and 1998-1999 academic years. These reports were reviewed annually by the CSU Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee and by CA NOW representative Linda Joplin. In March of 2000, following a review of the 1998-1999 system wide and campus data, it was agreed by CA NOW and the CSU that major progress had been made in each of the areas of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female athletes (see CSU/CA NOW Report for 1998-1999, the final report established under the consent decree). In March of 2000, it was determined that the consent decree had been satisfied.

In the spring of 2000, the Chancellor of the CSU and the CSU presidents made the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring of the former CSU/CA NOW consent decree in order to continue to monitor progress in the area of female athletes' participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid. The report which follows for the 2007-2008 academic year, is the ninth annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

It should be noted that, beginning with the 2001-2002 report, the Presidential Monitoring Committee for Gender Equity in Athletics made the decision to compile data for the CSU's annual gender equity reports based on data submitted by campuses annually according to the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). This decision was made in order to streamline data collection and reporting requirements. Data not included in the NCAA/EADA survey but collected by campuses are reported in Table 3, Non-Comparable Expenses.

At the suggestion of the CA NOW in October of 2004, the CSU Monitoring Committee decided to revise the calculation of non-comparable expenses. Campuses may report certain non-comparable expenses, recognizing that certain sports have expenses that are unique or are, because of circumstances beyond campus control, much more expensive than similar services for other sports. Fan attendance, market differences and equipment costs are a few examples of these unique costs. For the purpose of calculating non-comparable costs, a campus should total legitimate non-comparable expenses for football and men's basketball and subtract them from the total costs of the men's program. The non-comparable costs for women's basketball and the other sport for which the highest non-comparable expenses are identified should be subtracted from the costs of the women's program. Once calculated, amended men's and women's expenses are added together and percentages are computed for men's and women's expenditures.

Starting in the fall of 2004, the NCAA decided that it would no longer utilize the Excel-based EADA reporting tool to collect athletically-related revenues and expenses. A new online system has replaced the Excel-based tool that streamlines the overall collection and reporting processes and integrates with changes made to the NCAA agreed-upon procedures. The NCAA extended the deadline for submitting data to January 15<sup>th</sup> following each fiscal year. NCAA changed its report date because of changes to its reporting procedures.

The CSU report for 2007-2008 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2008 Reports, submitted January 15, 2009 to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. For the 2007-2008 reporting, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by the CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The change is reflected in Part V in this report. In addition, the CSU currently has twenty NCAA member campuses.

The Office of the Chancellor will continue to report the systemwide efforts regarding equal opportunity in athletics for women students to the CSU Board of Trustees.

Questions regarding the Voluntary Self-Monitoring Report regarding Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students may be addressed to Mr. Allison G. Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support, at (562) 951-4744 or [ajones@calstate.edu](mailto:ajones@calstate.edu) or Mr. Ray Murillo, Associate Director, Student Programs, Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support, at (562) 951-4707 or [rmurillo@calstate.edu](mailto:rmurillo@calstate.edu).

### **Summary of 2007-2008 Data – CSU System Level**

The system level data are the cumulative totals of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid from NCAA-member campuses. Beginning in 2006-2007 the data represent twenty NCAA-member campuses as a result of CSU Monterey Bay being awarded full NCAA membership. Reports from 2005-2006 and earlier years included data reported by only nineteen CSU NCAA-members.

#### **1. Participation**

At the systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics within the CSU increased from 1,862 in 1992-93 to 4,106 in 2007-2008 on the twenty NCAA member campuses, an increase of 120.5% over the past fifteen years. During the previous year, 107 more females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year increase of 2.7%. During this same fifteen-year period, male intercollegiate athletic participation decreased 16.9% from 3,733 in 1992-93 to 3,194 in 2007-2008. During 2007-2008, 14 more males participated in intercollegiate athletics than in 2006-2007, a one year increase of 0.4%. The 2007-2008 athletics participants by campus can be found on table 2 on page 18.

The data also indicate that 56.2% of all intercollegiate athletic participants within the CSU in 2007-2008 are female, compared to 34.7% in 1992, the year before the CSU entered into the consent decree with the California National Organization for Women. In 1992, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2% and a female student athlete participation of 34.7%, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5%. As of fall 2007, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 56.7% and a female student athlete participation of 56.2% resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 0.5%.

Community college comparison data supplied by the California Community Colleges Athletic Association were updated in 2006-2007. The 2006-2007 data reflect participation rates at 67% for male athletes and 33% for female athletes. See page 23 for the six-year comparison data.

The California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) administers a biennial CIF participation survey of high school athletes. The 2009 survey results were made available in August 2009.

The 2009 CIF participation survey is included in this report. The 2009 high school participation numbers for male and female athletes are reported on pages 24-27. Participation percentages for male athletes at the high school level are 59.5% and female athletes are 40.5%.

## **2. Expenditures**

Expenditures for women's intercollegiate athletic programs on the CSU's twenty NCAA member campuses increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$90.8 million in 2007-2008. This represents an increase of 711% over the past fifteen years. The total increase over the previous year was \$7.5 million, a 9.0% increase. During this same period, expenditures for men's athletic programs grew from \$33.4 million to \$88.8 million, an increase of 165.9%. The total increase over the past year was \$6.4 million, a 7.8% increase.

In October 2004, the CA NOW and the CSU Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee agreed to a revision in the calculation of non-comparable expenses as discussed in the Executive Summary on page 1. The expenditures reported above are the adjusted totals, which are total expenditures minus the non-comparable expenditures. The total non-comparable expenditure for women's athletic teams is \$1,625,421, and the total non-comparable expenditure for men's athletic teams is \$9,423,973. The 2007-2008 expenditures by campus can be found on tables 3 and 3a on pages 19-20.

## **3. Grants-In-Aid**

Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes on the CSU's twenty NCAA member campuses within the CSU increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$14.3 million in 2007-2008. This represents an increase of 472% over a fifteen-year period. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was \$1,073,207, for an 8.3% increase. Grants-in-aid for male student athletes during the same period increased from \$4.6 million to \$12.9 million, which represents an increase of 180%. The increase over the past year was \$751,907 for a 5.7% increase. The 2007-2008 grants-in-aid by campus can be found on tables 4 and 4a on pages 21-22.

### **Summary of 2007-2008 Data – Campus Level**

Under the consent decree, each campus of the California State University System was required to achieve gender equity in its campus intercollegiate athletic program within five years by addressing specific goals and taking specific actions related to those goals. The following are goals for each category.

**Participation:** Participation by female and male athletes on each campus will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates on that campus;

**Expenditures:** Expenditures will be within ten percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible female and male undergraduates, with the deduction for non-comparable expenses for two men's and two women's sports; and

**Grants-In-Aid:** Grants-in-aid will be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible female and male undergraduates.

#### **1. Participation**

At the campus level, during the 2007-2008 academic year, the report indicated that seventeen of the twenty (17/20) NCAA member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in the area of women's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

#### **2. Expenditures**

In the area of expenditures, nineteen of the twenty (19/20) NCAA member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in expenditures for women's athletic programs.

#### **3. Grants-In-Aid**

In the area of grants-in-aid, fifteen out of the twenty (15/20) NCAA member campuses met or exceeded their goals for scholarship and grant aid to female student athletes.

#### **4. Campuses Meeting Target Goals in All Areas**

Thirteen campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2007-2008 academic year.

**Part I: Report for Academic Year 2007-2008 – NCAA Member Campuses (20) – Based on the NCAA/EADA Report for 2008, submitted to the NCAA on January 15, 2009**

**Participation, Expenditures, and Grants-In-Aid**

Thirteen (13) campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures, and grants-in-aid during the 2007-2008 academic year.

|             |              |                 |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Bakersfield | Los Angeles  | San Francisco   |
| Chico       | Monterey Bay | San Luis Obispo |
| East Bay    | Northridge   | Stanislaus      |
| Fullerton   | Pomona       |                 |
| Humboldt    | Sacramento   |                 |

Seven (7) campuses did not meet at least one of the three target goals:

|                 |           |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Dominguez Hills | San Diego |
| Fresno          | San José  |
| Long Beach      | Sonoma    |
| San Bernardino  |           |

**Participation**

Seventeen (17) campuses met their target goals in participation in 2007-2008.

|             |              |                 |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Bakersfield | Los Angeles  | San Francisco   |
| Chico       | Monterey Bay | San José        |
| East Bay    | Northridge   | San Luis Obispo |
| Fresno      | Pomona       | Sonoma          |
| Fullerton   | Sacramento   | Stanislaus      |
| Humboldt    | San Diego    |                 |

Three (3) campuses did not meet their target goals for participation:

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Dominguez Hills | -0.5% |
| Long Beach      | -0.3% |
| San Bernardino  | -2.6% |

**Expenditures**

Nineteen (19) campuses met their target goals in expenditures in 2007-2008.

|                 |                |                 |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Bakersfield     | Long Beach     | San Diego       |
| Chico           | Los Angeles    | San Francisco   |
| Dominguez Hills | Monterey Bay   | San Luis Obispo |
| East Bay        | Northridge     | Sonoma          |
| Fresno          | Pomona         | Stanislaus      |
| Fullerton       | Sacramento     |                 |
| Humboldt        | San Bernardino |                 |

One (1) campus did not meet its target goal for expenditures:

|          |       |
|----------|-------|
| San José | -1.1% |
|----------|-------|

**Grants-In-Aid**

Fifteen (15) campuses met their target goals in grants-in-aid in 2007-2008.

|                            |              |                 |
|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Bakersfield                | Long Beach   | Sacramento      |
| Chico                      | Los Angeles  | San Bernardino  |
| East Bay (no grants given) | Monterey Bay | San Francisco   |
| Fullerton                  | Northridge   | San Luis Obispo |
| Humboldt                   | Pomona       | Stanislaus      |

Five (5) campuses did not meet their target goals for grants-in-aid:

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Dominguez Hills | -0.6% |
| Fresno          | -7.1% |
| San Diego       | -5.3% |
| San José        | -2.1% |
| Sonoma          | -2.4% |

---

**Part II: Report for Academic Year 2007-2008 – Non-NCAA Member Campuses (2) –  
Based on Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report**

---

**Participation – 2007-2008**

|                  |            |
|------------------|------------|
| Maritime Academy | Target met |
| San Marcos       | Target met |

**Expenditures – 2007-2008**

|                  |            |
|------------------|------------|
| Maritime Academy | Target met |
| San Marcos       | Target met |

**Grants-In-Aid – 2007-2008**

|                  |            |
|------------------|------------|
| Maritime Academy | Target met |
| San Marcos       | Target met |

**Part III: Nine-Year Review of the NCAA Member CSU Campuses\* Meeting Target Goals**

The following information provides an overview of the number of NCAA member CSU campuses that met their target goals in one or more areas over the last nine years:

**Participation, Expenditures and Grants-In-Aid**

1999-2000: 9 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 7 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 6 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 10 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 11 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 11 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 13 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 13 of 20 campuses

**Expenditures**

1999-2000: 17 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 13 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 12 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 19 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 18 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 17 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 18 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 19 of 20 campuses

**Participation**

1999-2000: 12 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 10 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 7 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 12 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 17 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 18 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 16 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 17 of 20 campuses

**Grants-In-Aid**

1999-2000: 13 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 11 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 13 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 13 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 14 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 17 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 15 of 20 campuses

(\* Effective in 2006-2007, CSU Monterey Bay was moved to the NCAA member table as a result of being a full NCAA member.)

**Part IV: NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two Consecutive Years (2006-2007 – 2007-2008)**

The CSU Presidential Monitoring Committee on Gender Equity in Athletics has recommended that the annual self-monitoring report identify campuses that do not meet their target goals for two consecutive years. These campuses were required to submit a corrective action plan at the same time the report was due to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future.

**Participation:** Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in participation of women athletes during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years:

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dominguez Hills | -1.5%            | -0.5%            |
| Long Beach      | -0.8%            | -0.3%            |
| San Bernardino  | -3.4%            | -2.6%            |

**Expenditures:** There were no NCAA member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008.

**Grants-In-Aid:** Three NCAA member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years:

| <b>Campus</b>   | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Dominguez Hills | -2.9%            | -0.6%            |
| Fresno          | -8.0%            | -7.1%            |
| San Diego       | -6.8%            | -5.3%            |

**Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for Results in 2008-2009 Reporting**

Campuses that did not meet their target goals for two consecutive years (2006-2007 and 2007-2008) were required to submit a plan to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future. Below are the corrective action plans from those campuses that were out of compliance for two consecutive years as reported in this annual self-monitoring report.

**2007-2008 Reporting**

| <b><u>Dominguez Hills</u></b> | <b><u>2006-2007</u></b> | <b><u>2007-2008</u></b> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Participation                 | -1.5%                   | -0.5%                   |
| Grants-In-Aid                 | -2.9%                   | -0.6%                   |

As a corrective measure for the 2008-09 and future academic years, the department has mandated roster minimums for women's sports and roster maximums for men's sports. Specifically, roster sizes for the largest male sports of baseball and soccer will be limited to 32 and 28 respectively. The net result of this new measure will reflect an increase of 19 participants on the women's side and a net decrease of 4 on the men's side which will ultimately correct the participation ratio, which missed target by 0.5% in 2007-08. This improved participation will also net close to a 2% increase in women's grants-in-aid, which will correct the grants-in-aid ratio that was out of compliance by 0.6% in 2007-08. With the increased participation and associated grants-in-aid for the increased numbers it will enable CSUDH Athletics to be proportionately in compliance within these two areas.

| <b><u>Fresno</u></b> | <b><u>2006-2007</u></b> | <b><u>2007-2008</u></b> |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Grants-In-Aid        | -8.0%                   | -7.1%                   |

The Athletic Director reports that Fresno State currently meets two of the three targets established by the Presidential Monitoring Committee on Gender Equity in Athletics. As in the past, the institution meets the Participation and Expense targets. With that, the institution does not meet the Athletics Grants-In-Aid target for this report.

As noted in last year's report, a Gender Equity Plan Task Force (GEPTF) was formed in late summer 2007. One of the charges of the GEPTF was to review the present Title IX compliance status of the Athletics Department at California State University, Fresno (Fresno State). Another of its charges was to create a five-year (2008-13) Gender Equity Plan to correct any deficiencies

in this area and to ensure a sustainable compliant program was developed for the next five-years. The GEPTF completed its work in late spring 2008 and a plan was approved shortly thereafter.

A portion of the approved Gender Equity Plan is designed to address the athletics financial aid (scholarship) inequities identified during the GEPTF's review of the athletics program. This portion of the plan recommended the addition of two new women's sports to the athletics program resulting in the equivalent of 26 additional scholarships over a three-year period from 2008 to 2011. The addition of the scholarships for these two new women's sports brings the institution into Title IX compliance which requires no more than a 1% disparity between the percentage of unduplicated male and female student-athletes and the athletics financial aid assigned to those groups.

The approved Gender Equity Plan is based on Office of Civil Rights (OCR) standards of athletics financial aid (scholarships) meaning that the varying in-state and out-of-state scholarship dollars are mitigated. Additionally, the athletics financial aid given to student-athletes whose eligibility is exhausted as well as the athletics financial aid for summer school is not included in the formula to meet the OCR standards. Fresno State, therefore, based the 2008-13 Gender Equity Plan on the number of full-ride-equivalencies available to the various sports. A subcommittee of the Athletics Advisory Board is in place to monitor the actual outcomes of the plan.

The two new women's sports, swimming and diving and lacrosse were for the 2008-09 academic year although the athletics financial aid to the student-athletes (26 scholarships) will be phased in over a three-year period. We believe that as Fresno State moves toward its goal of Title IX compliance, the result may translate into similar progress in meeting the CALNOW athletics financial aid target. Because the two standards (OCR and CALNOW) use different targets for compliance and financial aid values, it is difficult to assess the actual impact on the CALNOW target for athletics financial aid.

| <b><u>Long Beach</u></b> | <b><u>2006-2007</u></b> | <b><u>2007-2008</u></b> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Participation            | -0.8%                   | -0.3%                   |

Long Beach State is committed to both the spirit and the letter of Gender Equity. Since the inception of the CAL NOW Consent Decree, Long Beach State has been in compliance in all three areas. Beginning with the academic year 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, we have not met the five percent variance with regards to student-athlete participation as it compares to our general student population on campus. Under the guidelines established by the President's Monitoring Committee, we must now submit a plan of action to meet participation levels set under the CAL NOW Consent Decree.

Please accept the following as our plan to meet participation numbers over the next few years.

Participation percentages are to be within 5% of the general student population from the prior fall semester. It seems realistic that if you know in January the percentage you need to meet for the following academic year that should give you plenty of time to be in compliance. However this is truly not the case. There are many factors that cannot be controlled each year:

- the number of student athletes who will return the following year,
- which student athletes will be admitted to the University for the coming year
- the effect of a coaching change on recruiting or current player retention
- the number of female students admitted to the university as a whole, and
- which student athletes will meet NCAA eligibility.

**Plan**

Continue to use roster management while reviewing the squad size limits of each of our teams. Roster management requires us to cap the number of male athletes the men’s teams are allowed to carry while asking the women’s team to carry more athletes. It is important to be competitive while creating opportunities for women. Below is the plan for the next two years, however, there are many factors that could affect the numbers below.

| 08-09                   | Men    | Women  |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| Baseball/Softball       | 35     | 20     |
| Basketball              | 15     | 17     |
| Golf                    | 8      | 8      |
| CC/Track Indoor/Outdoor | 70     | 84     |
| Tennis                  |        | 7      |
| Soccer                  |        | 27     |
| Volleyball              | 18     | 16     |
| Water Polo              | 26     | 26     |
|                         | 172    | 205    |
|                         | 0.4562 | 0.5438 |

377

Target Number

54.7

| 09-10                   | Men    | Women  |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| Baseball/Softball       | 35     | 20     |
| Basketball              | 15     | 16     |
| Golf                    | 10     | 10     |
| CC/Track Indoor/Outdoor | 70     | 88     |
| Tennis                  |        | 8      |
| Soccer                  |        | 31     |
| Volleyball              | 20     | 16     |
| Water Polo              | 25     | 29     |
|                         | 175    | 218    |
|                         | 44.53% | 55.47% |
| Target                  |        | 55.37  |

The participation numbers for Track and Water Polo are estimates with each of the programs given a variance (Track +18 and Water Polo +3) they must meet for female participation over men participation rather than a hard and fast participant number.

| <b>San Bernardino</b> | <b>2006-2007</b> | <b>2007-2008</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Participation         | -3.4%            | -2.6%            |

The following is the 2008-09 athletic department's gender equity plan that addresses participation numbers.

**Program Area:** Participation Numbers

**Issue:** Participation by female and male athletes on each campus should be within five percentage points of the proportion of NCAA eligible women and men undergraduates on campus.

**Measurable Goals:** Increase the ratio of participation on women's teams 5% or more.

**Steps to Achieve:** Conduct roster management with our coaching staff by limiting the amount of male participants on our athletic teams while giving incentives to our women's teams to add female participants.

Hold open tryouts for all our women’s athletic teams in order to increase participation amongst the female student body.

Target Participation Numbers for 2008-09

| <u>Men:</u>  |                 | <u>Women</u>  |                  |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Baseball     | 31              | Basketball    | 20               |
| Basketball   | 16              | Cross Country | 16               |
| Golf         | 7               | Soccer        | 35               |
| Soccer       | 25              | Softball      | 25               |
|              |                 | Tennis        | 10               |
|              |                 | Volleyball    | 17               |
|              |                 | Water Polo    | 20               |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>79 (35%)</b> | <b>Total</b>  | <b>143 (65%)</b> |

**Individual(s) Responsible:** Head Coaches, Athletic Director, Sr. A.D.

**Timetable for Completion:** 2008-09 academic year

| <u>San Diego</u> | <u>2006-2007</u> | <u>2007-2008</u> |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Grants-In-Aid    | -6.8%            | -5.3%            |

San Diego State University is submitting the following plan for meeting the target goals in the area of female grants-in-aid rates.

The University plans to add one and possibly two female NCAA-sponsored sports in order to meet the future grant-in-aid targets. Current plans are to add women's lacrosse with initial coach hires during the 2009-10 fiscal year and first competition during the 2011-12 fiscal year. For 2011-12 fiscal year, the team would be fully functioning and would phase in the twelve (12) grants-in-aid beginning with the 2010-11 recruiting class. The addition of lacrosse will bring SDSU very close to the grants-in-aid target goal, depending on the ratio of in-state and out-of-state scholarships.

SDSU will continue to pursue the addition of Women's Sand Volleyball; however, that sport was only recently approved by the NCAA as an emerging sport and grants-in-aid limits are not yet articulated. Until those limits are published, it is SDSU’s belief it can meet the target relying on a three-part approach as follows:

1. Addition of Women's Lacrosse, which is on course with the hiring of the coach in FY 2009/10; and
2. Regulation of the number of out of state scholarships awarded to men and women athletes such that budget targets are met; and
3. Recognition that the percentage of female students in SDSU's enrolled population has declined such that the athletic department will be able to meet or exceed its compliance target.

SDSU has not abandoned plans for Women's Sand Volleyball. However, SDSU has put into place a plan it believes is achievable without reliance on a sport that is not yet fully developed. SDSU expects to be in compliance with the target goals by the conclusion of the 2011-12 fiscal year.

**The California State University  
Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee**

---

Dr. John D. Welty, Chair  
President  
California State University, Fresno

Dr. F. King Alexander  
President  
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. Ruben Armiñana  
President  
Sonoma State University

Dr. Milton A. Gordon  
President  
California State University, Fullerton

Dr. Dianne F. Harrison  
President  
California State University, Monterey Bay

Dr. Albert K. Karnig  
President  
California State University, San Bernardino

Dr. Jolene Koester  
President  
California State University, Northridge

**IV. Committee Staff**

Mr. Allison G. Jones  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

Mr. Ray Murillo  
Associate Director, Student Programs  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

Table 1

**NCAA Eligible<sup>1</sup> Men and Women on CSU Campuses  
 2007-2008**

**NCAA Member Institutions**

| Campus  | No. Women      | No. Men        | Total Eligible | % Women      | % Men        |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Bakersfield                                     | 3,323          | 1,660          | 4,983          | 66.7%        | 33.3%        |
| Chico   | 7,355          | 6,809          | 14,164         | 51.9%        | 48.1%        |
| Dominguez Hills                                 | 3,581          | 1,794          | 5,375          | 66.6%        | 33.4%        |
| East Bay  | 4,790          | 3,061          | 7,851          | 61.0%        | 39.0%        |
| Fresno  | 9,062          | 6,451          | 15,513         | 58.4%        | 41.6%        |
| Fullerton                                       | 13,193         | 9,527          | 22,720         | 58.1%        | 41.9%        |
| Humboldt  | 3,226          | 2,839          | 6,065          | 53.2%        | 46.8%        |
| Long Beach                                      | 18,258         | 12,347         | 30,605         | 59.7%        | 40.3%        |
| Los Angeles                                     | 7,201          | 4,490          | 11,691         | 61.6%        | 38.4%        |
| Monterey Bay                                    | 1,806          | 1,435          | 3,241          | 55.7%        | 44.3%        |
| Northridge                                      | 17,004         | 12,480         | 29,484         | 57.7%        | 42.3%        |
| Pomona  | 7,118          | 9,220          | 16,338         | 43.6%        | 56.4%        |
| Sacramento                                      | 10,534         | 7,511          | 18,045         | 58.4%        | 41.6%        |
| San Bernardino                                  | 7,590          | 4,045          | 11,635         | 65.2%        | 34.8%        |
| San Diego                                       | 14,093         | 10,603         | 24,696         | 57.1%        | 42.9%        |
| San Francisco                                   | 15,686         | 11,252         | 26,938         | 58.2%        | 41.8%        |
| San Jose  | 12,512         | 11,878         | 24,390         | 51.3%        | 48.7%        |
| San Luis Obispo                                 | 7,743          | 10,100         | 17,843         | 43.4%        | 56.6%        |
| Sonoma  | 4,704          | 2,902          | 7,606          | 61.8%        | 38.2%        |
| Stanislaus                                      | 3,169          | 1,758          | 4,927          | 64.3%        | 35.7%        |
| <b>Totals</b>                                   | <b>171,948</b> | <b>132,162</b> | <b>304,110</b> | <b>57.7%</b> | <b>42.3%</b> |
| <b>Non-NCAA Member Institutions<sup>2</sup></b> |                |                |                |              |              |
| Campus  | No. Women      | No. Men        | Total Eligible | % Women      | % Men        |
| Maritime Academy                                | 126            | 646            | 772            | 16.3%        | 83.7%        |
| San Marcos                                      | 3,658          | 2,347          | 6,005          | 60.9%        | 39.1%        |
| <b>Totals</b>                                   | <b>3,784</b>   | <b>2,993</b>   | <b>6,777</b>   | <b>38.6%</b> | <b>61.4%</b> |

<sup>1</sup>The term "NCAA eligible" means full-time, baccalaureate, degree-seeking students as defined in the NCAA/EADA report.

<sup>2</sup>The non-NCAA member campuses began voluntary reporting of data beginning Fall 1999. Enrollment data for non-NCAA member campuses are obtained from CSU Office of Analytic Studies, Statistical Reports.

Table 2

**CSU Intercollegiate Women and Men  
 Athletics Participants by Campus 2007-2008  
 NCAA Member Institutions**

| Campus          | No. Women    | % Women      | No. Men      | % Men        | Total        |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Bakersfield     | 299          | 70.2%        | 127          | 29.8%        | 426          |
| Chico           | 179          | 47.6%        | 197          | 52.4%        | 376          |
| Dominguez Hills | 139          | 62.6%        | 83           | 37.4%        | 222          |
| East Bay        | 124          | 57.7%        | 91           | 42.3%        | 215          |
| Fresno          | 336          | 60.6%        | 218          | 39.4%        | 554          |
| Fullerton       | 241          | 57.5%        | 178          | 42.5%        | 419          |
| Humboldt        | 198          | 50.9%        | 191          | 49.1%        | 389          |
| Long Beach      | 216          | 55.1%        | 176          | 44.9%        | 392          |
| Los Angeles     | 154          | 61.1%        | 98           | 38.9%        | 252          |
| Monterey Bay    | 128          | 54.9%        | 105          | 45.1%        | 233          |
| Northridge      | 267          | 56.3%        | 207          | 43.7%        | 474          |
| Pomona          | 113          | 46.5%        | 130          | 53.5%        | 243          |
| Sacramento      | 285          | 56.2%        | 222          | 43.8%        | 507          |
| San Bernardino  | 116          | 57.7%        | 85           | 42.3%        | 201          |
| San Diego       | 369          | 60.6%        | 240          | 39.4%        | 609          |
| San Francisco   | 146          | 59.1%        | 101          | 40.9%        | 247          |
| San Jose        | 213          | 49.5%        | 217          | 50.5%        | 430          |
| San Luis Obispo | 242          | 43.7%        | 312          | 56.3%        | 554          |
| Sonoma          | 180          | 60.8%        | 116          | 39.2%        | 296          |
| Stanislaus      | 161          | 61.7%        | 100          | 38.3%        | 261          |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>4,106</b> | <b>56.2%</b> | <b>3,194</b> | <b>43.8%</b> | <b>7,300</b> |

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

| Campus           | No. Women  | % Women      | No. Men    | % Men        | Total      |
|------------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Maritime Academy | 34         | 19.4%        | 141        | 80.6%        | 175        |
| San Marcos       | 165        | 58.1%        | 119        | 41.9%        | 284        |
| <b>Totals</b>    | <b>199</b> | <b>43.4%</b> | <b>260</b> | <b>56.6%</b> | <b>459</b> |

**Table 3**  
**Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2007-2008**

| Campus          | Women        |              | Men   |              | Total       |              |       |               |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------|---------------|
|                 | Non-Comp.*   | Adj. Total   | %     | Men          | Non-Comp.*  | Adj. Total   | %     | Total         |
| Bakersfield     |              | \$5,231,835  | 63.7% | \$2,984,685  |             | \$2,984,685  | 36.3% | \$8,216,520   |
| Chico           |              | \$2,409,596  | 48.3% | \$2,577,237  |             | \$2,577,237  | 51.7% | \$4,986,833   |
| Dominguez Hills |              | \$1,323,999  | 58.8% | \$927,961    |             | \$927,961    | 41.2% | \$2,251,960   |
| East Bay        |              | \$1,335,864  | 58.7% | \$941,337    |             | \$941,337    | 41.3% | \$2,277,201   |
| Fresno          | \$481,884    | \$12,227,663 | 49.5% | \$16,146,701 | \$3,680,775 | \$12,465,926 | 50.5% | \$24,693,589  |
| Fullerton       | \$5,064,625  | \$5,064,625  | 54.5% | \$4,229,379  |             | \$4,229,379  | 45.5% | \$9,294,004   |
| Humboldt        | \$2,308,784  | \$2,308,784  | 47.8% | \$2,519,575  |             | \$2,519,575  | 52.2% | \$4,828,359   |
| Long Beach      | \$7,063,175  | \$7,063,175  | 53.1% | \$6,238,832  |             | \$6,238,832  | 46.9% | \$13,302,007  |
| Los Angeles     | \$2,327,291  | \$2,327,291  | 60.3% | \$1,534,585  |             | \$1,534,585  | 39.7% | \$3,861,876   |
| Monterey Bay    | \$1,639,738  | \$1,639,738  | 55.1% | \$1,336,710  |             | \$1,336,710  | 44.9% | \$2,976,448   |
| Northridge      | \$5,122,998  | \$5,122,998  | 54.5% | \$4,268,642  |             | \$4,268,642  | 45.5% | \$9,391,640   |
| Pomona          | \$1,817,974  | \$1,817,974  | 46.3% | \$2,109,495  |             | \$2,109,495  | 53.7% | \$3,927,469   |
| Sacramento      | \$7,650,856  | \$446,738    | 52.7% | \$7,447,051  | \$981,865   | \$6,465,186  | 47.3% | \$13,669,304  |
| San Bernardino  | \$2,153,465  | \$2,153,465  | 57.1% | \$1,616,911  |             | \$1,616,911  | 42.9% | \$3,770,376   |
| San Diego       | \$13,607,813 | \$509,815    | 48.7% | \$17,798,045 | \$4,015,046 | \$13,782,999 | 51.3% | \$26,880,997  |
| San Francisco   | \$2,019,331  | \$2,019,331  | 55.8% | \$1,613,723  | \$11,745    | \$1,601,978  | 44.2% | \$3,621,309   |
| San Jose        | \$7,242,693  | \$186,984    | 42.9% | \$10,143,756 | \$734,542   | \$9,409,214  | 57.1% | \$16,464,923  |
| San Luis Obispo | \$7,306,029  | \$7,306,029  | 41.2% | \$10,418,823 |             | \$10,418,823 | 58.8% | \$17,724,852  |
| Sonoma          | \$2,448,973  | \$2,448,973  | 51.6% | \$2,293,082  |             | \$2,293,082  | 48.4% | \$4,742,055   |
| Stanislaus      | \$1,598,533  | \$1,598,533  | 58.8% | \$1,117,844  |             | \$1,117,844  | 41.2% | \$2,716,377   |
| <b>TOTALS</b>   | \$92,383,119 | \$1,625,421  | 50.5% | \$88,264,374 | \$9,423,973 | \$88,840,401 | 49.5% | \$179,598,099 |

For the purpose of calculating non-comparable costs, a campus should total legitimate non-comparable expenses for football and men's basketball and subtract them from the total costs of the men's program. The non-comparable costs for women's basketball and the other sport for which the highest non-comparable expenses are identified should be subtracted from the costs of the women's program. Once calculated, add the amended men's and women's expenses together and compute percentages for each. Total expenditures for campuses reporting non-comps are as follows: Fresno (\$28,856,248), Sacramento (\$15,097,907), San Diego (\$31,405,858), San Francisco (\$3,633,054), and San Jose (\$17,386,449)

\*Non-Comparable Expenses are based on the provision of the consent decree that allowance may be made for differences in costs of certain programs, including, but not limited to, football.

Table 3A  
 Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and  
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2007-2008

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

| Campus           | Women              | Non-Comp.* | Adj. Total         | %            | Men                | Non-Comp.* | Adj. Total         | %            | Total            |
|------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Maritime Academy | \$146,201          |            | \$146,201          | 25.3%        | \$431,399          |            | \$431,399          | 74.7%        | 577,600          |
| San Marcos       | \$854,791          |            | \$854,791          | 58.4%        | \$608,681          |            | \$608,681          | 41.6%        | 1,463,472        |
| <b>Totals</b>    | <b>\$1,000,992</b> | <b>\$0</b> | <b>\$1,000,992</b> | <b>49.0%</b> | <b>\$1,040,080</b> | <b>\$0</b> | <b>\$1,040,080</b> | <b>51.0%</b> | <b>2,041,072</b> |

\*Non-Comparable Expenses are based on the provision of the former consent decree that allowance may be made for differences in costs of certain programs, including, but not limited to, football.

Table 4

NCAA Member Institutions  
 Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for  
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams  
 2007-2008

| Campus          | Women           |                        |                    |              | Men          |                 |                        |                    |              |              |
|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                 | # of FTE Grants | Total Dollars          | Avg. Grant         | % of Grants  | % of Dollars | # of FTE Grants | Total Dollars          | Avg. Grant         | % of Grants  | % of Dollars |
| Bakersfield     | 71.20           | \$841,899.00           | \$11,824.42        | 64.0%        | 61.4%        | 40.10           | \$528,252.00           | \$13,173.37        | 36.0%        | 38.6%        |
| Chico           | 24.52           | \$276,479.00           | \$11,275.65        | 53.5%        | 54.1%        | 21.27           | \$234,398.00           | \$11,020.12        | 46.5%        | 45.9%        |
| Dominguez Hills | 23.27           | \$229,781.00           | \$9,874.56         | 61.7%        | 62.5%        | 14.43           | \$137,873.00           | \$9,554.61         | 38.3%        | 37.5%        |
| East Bay        | No Grants Given |                        |                    |              |              |                 |                        |                    |              |              |
| Fresno          | 102.89          | \$1,566,382.00         | \$15,223.85        | 45.2%        | 46.2%        | 124.70          | \$1,822,942.00         | \$14,618.62        | 54.8%        | 53.8%        |
| Fullerton       | 67.73           | \$960,811.00           | \$14,185.90        | 63.3%        | 61.4%        | 39.19           | \$604,854.00           | \$15,433.89        | 36.7%        | 38.6%        |
| Humboldt        | 19.15           | \$243,393.00           | \$12,709.82        | 49.1%        | 49.4%        | 19.86           | \$249,105.00           | \$12,543.05        | 50.9%        | 50.6%        |
| Long Beach      | 74.04           | \$998,614.00           | \$13,487.49        | 62.7%        | 62.8%        | 44.11           | \$592,302.00           | \$13,427.84        | 37.3%        | 37.2%        |
| Los Angeles     | 29.41           | \$387,914.00           | \$13,189.87        | 60.3%        | 60.4%        | 19.35           | \$254,070.00           | \$13,130.23        | 36.7%        | 39.6%        |
| Monterey Bay    | 14.60           | \$141,400.00           | \$9,684.93         | 62.8%        | 60.5%        | 8.66            | \$92,200.00            | \$10,646.65        | 37.2%        | 39.5%        |
| Northridge      | 85.89           | \$1,105,213.00         | \$12,867.77        | 63.9%        | 63.6%        | 48.44           | \$632,524.00           | \$13,057.89        | 36.1%        | 36.4%        |
| Pomona          | 17.94           | \$242,211.00           | \$13,501.17        | 46.8%        | 46.8%        | 20.41           | \$275,536.00           | \$13,500.05        | 53.2%        | 53.2%        |
| Sacramento      | 108.16          | \$1,529,272.00         | \$14,138.98        | 52.0%        | 54.0%        | 99.91           | \$1,301,549.00         | \$13,027.21        | 48.0%        | 46.0%        |
| San Bernardino  | 29.75           | \$344,754.00           | \$11,588.37        | 58.0%        | 61.4%        | 21.51           | \$216,804.00           | \$10,079.22        | 42.0%        | 38.6%        |
| San Diego       | 117.36          | \$2,222,794.00         | \$18,939.96        | 47.8%        | 47.5%        | 128.06          | \$2,458,055.00         | \$19,194.56        | 52.2%        | 52.5%        |
| San Francisco   | 12.00           | \$184,650.00           | \$15,387.50        | 60.1%        | 59.0%        | 7.98            | \$128,128.00           | \$16,056.14        | 39.9%        | 41.0%        |
| San Jose        | 96.72           | \$1,370,565.00         | \$14,170.44        | 46.0%        | 46.9%        | 113.56          | \$1,550,002.00         | \$13,649.19        | 54.0%        | 53.1%        |
| San Luis Obispo | 79.88           | \$1,281,619.00         | \$16,044.30        | 42.8%        | 44.4%        | 106.65          | \$1,602,084.00         | \$15,021.88        | 57.2%        | 55.6%        |
| Sonoma          | 12.23           | \$185,821.00           | \$15,193.87        | 55.7%        | 55.8%        | 9.73            | \$146,935.00           | \$15,101.23        | 44.3%        | 44.2%        |
| Stanislaus      | 14.73           | \$201,964.00           | \$13,711.07        | 64.1%        | 64.1%        | 8.26            | \$113,225.00           | \$13,707.63        | 35.9%        | 35.9%        |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>1,001.47</b> | <b>\$14,315,536.00</b> | <b>\$14,294.52</b> | <b>52.8%</b> | <b>52.5%</b> | <b>896.18</b>   | <b>\$12,940,838.00</b> | <b>\$14,440.00</b> | <b>47.2%</b> | <b>47.5%</b> |

Table 4a

Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for  
 Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams  
 2007-2008

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

| Campus           | Women           |               |             |             |              | Men             |               |             |             |              |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
|                  | # of FTE Grants | Total Dollars | Avg. Grant  | % of Grants | % of Dollars | # of FTE Grants | Total Dollars | Avg. Grant  | % of Grants | % of Dollars |
| Maritime Academy | 0.70            | \$10,000.00   | \$14,285.71 | 50.0%       | 50.0%        | 0.70            | \$10,000.00   | \$14,285.71 | 50.0%       | 50.0%        |
| San Marcos       | 6.20            | \$110,068.00  | \$17,752.90 | 57.4%       | 57.4%        | 4.60            | \$81,844.00   | \$17,792.17 | 42.6%       | 42.6%        |
| Totals           | 6.90            | \$120,068.00  | \$17,401.16 | 56.6%       | 56.7%        | 5.30            | \$91,844.00   | \$32,077.89 | 43.4%       | 43.3%        |

Table 5



California Community Colleges  
**Commission on Athletics**

| SPORT         | 2000-01 |         | 2001-02 |         | 2002-03 |         | 2003-04 |         | 2004-05 |         | 2005-06 |         |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|               | MEN'S   | WOMEN'S |
| Baseball      | 2311    |         | 2328    |         | 2268    |         | 2348    |         | 2349    |         | 2518    |         |
| Badminton     |         | 123     |         | 116     |         | 130     |         | 126     |         | 128     |         | 98      |
| Softball      |         | 1080    |         | 1160    |         | 974     |         | 1093    |         | 1098    |         | 1156    |
| Basketball    | 1302    | 1010    | 1242    | 985     | 1114    | 965     | 1244    | 1006    | 1724    | 1024    | 1349    | 1060    |
| Cross Country | 643     | 534     | 649     | 491     | 556     | 499     | 554     | 457     | 593     | 538     | 593     | 544     |
| Football      | 4888    |         | 4827    |         | 4556    |         | 4845    |         | 5409    |         | 5636    |         |
| Golf          | 433     | 149     | 464     | 163     | 383     | 161     | 435     | 161     | 393     | 155     | 397     | 124     |
| Soccer        | 1355    | 1327    | 1359    | 1375    | 1279    | 1321    | 1358    | 1368    | 1498    | 1422    | 1667    | 1579    |
| Swimming      | 523     | 616     | 522     | 549     | 574     | 567     | 550     | 589     | 624     | 625     | 620     | 650     |
| Tennis        | 456     | 443     | 461     | 447     | 402     | 383     | 396     | 382     | 381     | 364     | 368     | 390     |
| Track & Field | 1503    | 783     | 1435    | 867     | 1226    | 759     | 1249    | 723     | 1457    | 790     | 1458    | 806     |
| Water Polo    | 530     | 565     | 482     | 520     | 489     | 466     | 510     | 527     | 530     | 526     | 563     | 558     |
| Wrestling     | 276     |         | 427     |         | 401     |         | 400     |         | 411     |         | 428     |         |
| Volleyball    | 176     | 907     | 185     | 932     | 160     | 856     | 177     | 916     | 183     | 869     | 184     | 945     |
| Totals M or W | 14376   | 7537    | 14381   | 7605    | 13408   | 7081    | 14066   | 7348    | 15552   | 7539    | 15781   | 7910    |
| Totals M & W  | 21913   |         | 21986   |         | 20489   |         | 21414   |         | 23091   |         | 23691   |         |
| Percentages   | 66%     | 34%     | 65%     | 35%     | 65%     | 35%     | 66%     | 34%     | 67%     | 33%     | 67%     | 33%     |



**CIF State Office**, 4658 Duckhorn Drive, Sacramento, CA 95834  
Phone: 916-239-4477 Fax: 916-239-4478

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**  
Date: August 3, 2009

**Contact: Quwan Spears, Sports Information Officer**  
qspears@cifstate.org

***HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS PARTICIPANTION REMAINS STEADY DESPITE  
ECONOMIC DOWNFALL***

**SACRAMENTO ---** The number of boys and girls participating in high school athletics in California remains steady, despite difficult economic times, according to the 2009 California Interscholastic Federation Sports Participation Survey.

The survey shows a total of 736,727 high school student-athletes participating in sports, an increase of 1.6% or 1,224 competitors from 2007, the last time the CIF conducted such an overview.

“The increase, although slight, is still a testament to the fact that our California schools and student-athletes are very much interested in increasing the athletic programs we have.” CIF Executive Director Marie M. Ishida said.

The survey, completed by the CIF’s 1,442 member schools, is part of the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) nationwide survey that measures the number of students competing in sports in the country.

Additionally, single-gender numbers for both boys and girls slightly increased from two years ago. There are 438,561 boys involved compared to 437,592 in 2007. Meanwhile, an additional 255 girls have become active during the same period, raising the 2009 total to 298,166.

-- more --

The sport of lacrosse experienced a huge increase with a combined gender-participation total of 12,321 (7,365 boys; 4,956 girls). It's an increase of 45 percent measured to the 2007 sum of 8,477 (5,323 boys; 3,154 girls).

Among the top 10 sports by participation, swimming and diving enjoyed the highest percentage increase at 14.1%, followed by volleyball (7.6%) and wrestling (6.1%) for boys. On the girls' side, track and field heads the list at 7.5% followed closely by swimming and diving at 7.3%.

Track and field, moreover, replaces soccer (41,727) as the most popular sport for girls with 41,736 athletes. Football remains the top sport for boys, despite a 3.4% drop in participation, with 104,224 players. Track and field is second with 51,689 participants, followed by basketball (42,521) and baseball (42,064).

Cross country, golf, lacrosse, soccer, tennis, track and field, and wrestling, enjoyed steady increases in participation since 1998 for girls. Five sports (cross country, lacrosse, tennis, track and field, and water polo) have seen increases in participation over the same time for boys.

A chart indicating results from the last five participation surveys follows. Only CIF-approved sports are listed individually. Also on subsequent pages is a summary of the top 10 sports, by gender, based on participation numbers.

**BOYS' BREAK DOWN**

| SPORT               | BOYS<br>1998   | BOYS<br>2001     | BOYS<br>2003     | BOYS<br>2005     | BOYS<br>2007     | BOYS<br>2009   |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Badminton           | 3,387          | 3,572            | 3,627            | 3,521            | 3,512            | 4,036          |
| Baseball            | 40,102         | 42,942           | 41,392           | 40,676           | 42,835           | 42,064         |
| Basketball          | 39,846         | 42,267           | 41,784           | 42,061           | 44,722           | 42,521         |
| Cross Country       | 18,668         | 19,593           | 20,465           | 22,782           | 25,790           | 26,766         |
| Field Hockey        | 12             | 36               | 36               | 52               | 193              | 123            |
| Football 11-player  | 91,301         | 97,236           | 95,504           | 99,079           | 107,916          | 104,224        |
| Football 8 - player | 1,280          | 1,263            | 1,129            | 1,623            | 1,784            | 2,507          |
| Football 9 - player | 190            | 246              | 251              | 166              | 246              | 0              |
| Football 6 - player | 9              | 82               | 96               | 47               | 0                | 0              |
| Golf                | 10,783         | 11,990           | 11,764           | 11,459           | 11,897           | 11,295         |
| Gymnastics          | 12             | 19               | 91               | 3                | 37               | 79             |
| Lacrosse            | 0              | 0                | 2,240            | 3,608            | 5,323            | 7,365          |
| Skiing              | 390            | 582              | 414              | 617              | 761              | 671            |
| Soccer              | 35,537         | 38,053           | 38,501           | 39,453           | 44,730           | 44,705         |
| Softball            | 580            | 1,129            | 963              | 456              | 743              | 311            |
| Swimming and Diving | 14,687         | 15,685           | 15,731           | 17,579           | 18,852           | 21,518         |
| Tennis              | 15,380         | 15,804           | 16,716           | 17,238           | 19,139           | 19,266         |
| Track and Field     | 39,262         | 40,843           | 41,349           | 45,038           | 49,911           | 51,689         |
| Volleyball          | 11,660         | 13,326           | 12,156           | 13,133           | 14,532           | 15,638         |
| Water Polo          | 10,725         | 11,411           | 11,500           | 12,570           | 14,064           | 14,852         |
| Wrestling           | 23,163         | 24,326           | 22,007           | 23,318           | 25,896           | 27,469         |
| Other               | 0              | 0                | 1,103            | 1,663            | 1,472            | 1,462          |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>356,974</b> | <b>**386,248</b> | <b>**382,108</b> | <b>**398,684</b> | <b>**437,592</b> | <b>438,561</b> |

Whenever a school provides only a team for boys in a particular sport, girls are permitted to qualify for the "student" team (s).  
 \*\*Note: As part of the National Federation survey, the CIF measures participation in all sports and activities.  
 The above list does not comprise all sports/activities sponsored by schools and required in the NFHS survey

| Top 10 Boys Sports       | Participants | Increase or Decrease<br>(Since 2007) |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Football (11 players) | 104,224      | -3.4                                 |
| 2. Track & Field         | 51,689       | +3.5                                 |
| 3. Soccer                | 44,705       | -0.1                                 |
| 4. Basketball            | 42,521       | -4.9                                 |
| 5. Baseball              | 42,064       | -1.7                                 |
| 6. Wrestling             | 27,469       | +6.1                                 |
| 7. Cross Country         | 21,766       | +3.7                                 |
| 8. Swimming & Diving     | 21,518       | +14.1                                |
| 9. Tennis                | 19,266       | +0.6                                 |
| 10. Volleyball           | 15,638       | +7.6                                 |

**GIRLS' BREAK DOWN**

| SPORT               | GIRLS<br>1998  | GIRLS<br>2001    | GIRLS<br>2003    | GIRLS<br>2005    | GIRLS<br>2007    | GIRLS<br>2009  |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Badminton           | 4,462          | 4,722            | 4,929            | 4,500            | 4,491            | 5,219          |
| Baseball            | 412            | 826              | 662              | 417              | 385              | 325            |
| Basketball          | 30,979         | 33,831           | 33,912           | 33,596           | 34,991           | 32,980         |
| Cross Country       | 14,245         | 16,060           | 16,618           | 18,159           | 20,873           | 21,901         |
| Field Hockey        | 2,111          | 2,629            | 2,170            | 2,952            | 3,654            | 3,925          |
| Football 11-player  | 200            | 313              | 236              | 253              | 149              | 141            |
| Football 8 - player | 0              | 0                | 0                | 1                | 15               | 46             |
| Football 9 - player | 0              | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0              |
| Football 6 - player | 1              | 55               | 3                | 30               | 0                | 0              |
| Golf                | 1,447          | 4,588            | 5,547            | 5,972            | 6,652            | 7,017          |
| Gymnastics          | 1,230          | 1,260            | 859              | 896              | 732              | 1,039          |
| Lacrosse            | 0              | 0                | 1,834            | 2,286            | 3,154            | 4,956          |
| Skiing              | 243            | 389              | 222              | 432              | 544              | 565            |
| Soccer              | 30,222         | 34,663           | 35,380           | 37,424           | 40,895           | 41,727         |
| Softball            | 28,979         | 31,992           | 30,118           | 30,055           | 31,306           | 31,801         |
| Swimming and Diving | 25,157         | 24,596           | 23,255           | 24,508           | 25,115           | 26,965         |
| Tennis              | 17,383         | 18,812           | 19,496           | 19,847           | 21,818           | 22,908         |
| Track and Field     | 29,682         | 33,153           | 34,378           | 36,113           | 38,817           | 41,736         |
| Volleyball          | 30,879         | 34,194           | 32,756           | 34,015           | 36,499           | 38,920         |
| Water Polo          | 9,487          | 12,257           | 12,185           | 13,099           | 13,482           | 13,871         |
| Wrestling           | 494            | 752              | 957              | 1,230            | 1,142            | 1,493          |
| Other               | 0              | 0                | 726              | 756              | 684              | 631            |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>227,613</b> | <b>**271,214</b> | <b>**270,225</b> | <b>**278,284</b> | <b>**297,911</b> | <b>298,166</b> |

\*Whenever a school provides only a team for boys in a particular sport, girls are permitted to qualify for the "student" team (s).  
 \*\*Note: As part of the National Federation survey, the CIF measures participation in all sports and activities.  
 The above list does not comprise all sports/activities sponsored by schools and required in the NFHS survey

| Top 10 Girls Sports  | Participants | Increase or Decrease<br>(Since 2007) |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Track & Field     | 41,736       | +7.5                                 |
| 2. Soccer            | 41,727       | +2.0                                 |
| 3. Volleyball        | 38,920       | +6.6                                 |
| 4. Basketball        | 32,980       | -5.7                                 |
| 5. Softball          | 31,801       | +1.5                                 |
| 6. Swimming & Diving | 26,965       | +7.3                                 |
| 7. Tennis            | 22,908       | +4.9                                 |
| 8. Cross Country     | 21,901       | +4.9                                 |
| 9. Water Polo        | 13,871       | +2.8                                 |
| 10. Golf             | 7,017        | +5.4                                 |

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Special Honorary Degrees for Students Displaced by Executive Order 9066**

#### **Presentation By**

Jeri Echeverria  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

#### **Summary**

Each year in January the Board of Trustees consider nominations for the awarding of honorary doctoral degrees, as provided for in Board policy. This item proposes that the Trustees make an exception to existing policy to allow the conferral of honorary baccalaureate degrees to persons who were enrolled in the University during 1941-1942 and who were forced to suspend their studies when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, compelling the relocation of nearly 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, two-thirds of whom were American citizens by birthright, from their homes to federal camps.

Of the injustice suffered, the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians said in its report, *Personal Justice Denied*, "The broad historical causes which shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership. Widespread ignorance of Japanese Americans contributed to a policy conceived in haste and executed in an atmosphere of fear and anger at Japan." Although the confinement of Japanese Americans ended in 1945, a presidential apology and formal redress and reparations came much later. President Gerald Ford repealed the executive order in 1976, saying, "We now know what we should have known then—not only was that evacuation wrong, but Japanese Americans were and are loyal Americans...." The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-383) authorized a presidential apology and acknowledged that, "a grave injustice was done to citizens and permanent resident aliens of Japanese ancestry by the evacuation, relocation, and internment of civilians during World War II...."

Assembly Bill 37, authored by Assemblymember Warren T. Furutani, brings this injustice to the public's attention and seeks to right this wrong by initiating efforts to confer special honorary degrees on each person, living or deceased, who was forced by Executive Order 9066 to leave their higher education pursuits behind. One historian has asserted that 247 students enrolled at the Fresno, San Diego, San Francisco, and San José campuses were forced to suspend their studies in during the exclusion and relocation campaign. It is possible that additional students may have been removed from their studies at other (now-CSU) campuses that were in existence at that time, including the California Maritime Academy, Chico, Humboldt, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo.

The California State University Trustees, faculty, and administration now seek to honor the academic intentions of those students displaced by Executive Order 9066, seeking to confer upon them California State University honorary baccalaureate degrees. This will require an exception to Board policy on honorary degrees.

CSU "Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees," approved by the Board of Trustees on January 24, 1996, authorizes only honorary doctoral degrees, establishes criteria for awarding the degrees, and specifies that the Trustees shall determine the number of honorary degrees to be awarded in any academic year. For the purposes of honoring the those alumni whose academic progress was interrupted by Executive Order 9066, it is proposed that the Trustees approve the conferral of special honorary baccalaureate degrees in the name of the California State University and The Board of Trustees, to be awarded to all CSU alumni who were forced to leave the university as required by the actions of the United States government in Executive Order 9066. It is proposed that the honorary degrees be conferred upon all affected alumni who during the 1941-1942 academic year were enrolled at institutions that later become CSU campuses, that no time limit or annual limit shall be placed on the degrees to be conferred, and that the awarding of posthumous degrees shall be allowed.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:

1. An exception is made to the Trustees' "Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees" to authorize the awarding of honorary baccalaureate degrees to individuals whose study at what have become California State University campuses was disrupted by the institution of Executive Order 9066 in 1942.
2. These honorary degrees shall be conferred by the Board of Trustees and the California State University in the name of the California State University.
3. These honorary degrees shall be awarded to each person, living or deceased, who was forced to abandon his or her studies at a CSU campus as the result of Executive Order 9066. Representatives of any qualifying deceased person may accept the diploma on the deceased person's behalf.
4. There shall be no time limit on the awarding of these degrees to individuals who meet the qualifying criteria.
5. There shall be no limit on the number of such degrees that may be awarded annually.
6. The Chancellor is delegated the authority to establish policies to ensure the timely execution of this resolution.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### Update on Efforts to Close the Achievement Gap in K–12 Education

#### Presentation By

Hon. Jack O'Connell  
State Superintendent of Public Instruction and  
*Ex Officio* Trustee of the California State University

Rick Miller  
Deputy Superintendent  
P–16 Policy and Information Branch  
California Department of Education

#### Introduction

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell, an *ex officio* Trustee of the California State University (CSU), and Rick Miller, Deputy Superintendent for the P–16 Policy and Information Branch at the California Department of Education (CDE), will present an informational briefing to update the CSU Trustees on the efforts to close the achievement gap in K–12 education.

The briefing will include information about:

1. The nature of the achievement gap in K–12 education;
2. The State Superintendent's plan for closing the achievement gap;
3. The progress that has been made to date in addressing the achievement gap; and
4. The ways in which the state's postsecondary education systems, and the CSU in particular, can work collaboratively and in partnership with the K–12 education system to address the achievement gap.

### **What is the Achievement Gap in K–12 Education?**

Today, disparities in academic achievement continue to exist among California's student subgroups. For instance:

- The proportion of white students in grades two through eleven who score at proficient or above levels on the state's English–language arts assessments is substantially greater than the proportions of African American, Hispanic/Latino, and economically disadvantaged students who score at proficient or above levels on the same assessments.
- Although nearly two-thirds of Asian students and more than half of white students are now scoring at proficient or above levels on the state's mathematics assessments, substantially smaller proportions of African American, Hispanic/Latino, and special education students are meeting that performance standard.
- When statewide test results are reflected in the Academic Performance Index (API), a key state accountability indicator published annually by the CDE, the racial/ethnic disparities in student academic achievement continue to stand out. Specifically, the API of African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander students continues to be significantly lower than the API for white and Asian students at every school level: elementary, middle, and high school.

### **State Superintendent's Plan for Closing the Achievement Gap**

For over a decade, State Superintendent O'Connell has championed the implementation of California's rigorous academic standards and accountability system. While this system has led to significant achievement gains over the past five years, the available data clearly reveal the need to focus in new ways on the groups of students whose achievement persistently lags behind.

As a result, State Superintendent O'Connell has made closing the achievement gap his top priority in his second term of office. State Superintendent O'Connell has stated repeatedly that the achievement gap is a pervasive issue in many, if not all, California schools, and that the gap threatens the future competitiveness of our state in this demanding global economy.

In December 2004, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell announced the establishment of the California P-16 Council (Council). Specifically, the Council was charged with examining ways to:

1. Improve student achievement at all levels and eliminate the achievement gap;

2. Link all education levels, from preschool, elementary, middle, high school, and through higher education, to create a comprehensive, seamless system of student learning;
3. Ensure all students have access to caring and qualified teachers; and
4. Increase public awareness of the link between an educated citizenry and a healthy economy.

The members of the Council represent a wide-range of expertise from throughout California, including teachers, administrators, parents, business leaders, students, academics and philanthropy. In addition, several of the statewide Council members serve on regional councils. A complete list of Council members can be found at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/pc/p16council.asp>. Allison Jones, CSU Assistant Vice Chancellor, is a member of the Council.

In 2007, State Superintendent O'Connell directed the Council to examine specific strategies for closing the achievement gap in California. In directing the Council to provide him with recommendations for closing the achievement gap, State Superintendent O'Connell emphasized to the Council that California's K-12 education system faces unique and enormous challenges with respect to:

- The number of students enrolled in the state's public schools (6.3 million as of 2008-09);
- The diversity of the student population (71 percent are students of color as of 2008-09);
- The income profile of the students' families (51 percent eligible for free or reduced price meals in 2007-08);
- The percent of students enrolled in special education (10.8 percent in 2007-08); and
- The percent of students designated as English learners (24.7 percent in 2007-08).

The Council started with the premise that the major factors inhibiting successful learning for all students can be grouped into four main themes: access, culture and climate, expectations, and strategies. At the end of 2007, the Council provided the State Superintendent with 14 recommendations for closing the achievement gap.

On January 22, 2008, State Superintendent O'Connell delivered his fifth annual State of Education Address and unveiled an ambitious, comprehensive plan aimed at closing the pernicious achievement gap that exists between students who are white and students of color,

English learners, students in poverty, and students with disabilities. This plan for closing the achievement gap is based on the Council's 14 recommendations.

Additionally, State Superintendent O'Connell changed the "Core Purpose" statement of the CDE to reflect this important goal of closing the achievement gap. The statement now reads that the purpose of the CDE is "to lead and support the continuous improvement of student achievement, with a specific focus on closing achievement gaps."

### **Progress to Date in Addressing the Achievement Gap**

The following brief summary of the progress to date in implementing each of the Council's 14 recommendations for closing the achievement gap is organized by the four main themes mentioned above:

#### **Access**

#### **Council Recommendation 1: Provide High-Quality Prekindergarten Programs**

In 2008, two legislative measures were passed to implement this recommendation: Assembly Bill (AB) 2759 (Chapter 308, Statutes of 2008) consolidated the state's three pre-existing preschool programs into one, creating the California State Preschool Program. Senate Bill (SB) 1629 (Chapter 307, Statutes of 2008) established the Early Learning Quality Improvement System Advisory Committee.

#### **Council Recommendation 2: Better Align Educational System from Prekindergarten to College**

The CDE, along with the state's postsecondary education system leaders, the business and career technical education communities, and the Governor's Office have partnered to participate in the Achieve Alignment Institute, which is an integral part of the American Diploma Project. The team is focused on forming a consensus around what it means to be college-ready and work-ready in order to ensure that high school graduates can enter the workforce successfully or enroll in credit-bearing college coursework without remediation.

#### **Council Recommendation 3: Develop Partnerships to Close the Achievement Gap**

The CDE's P-16 Policy Development Office has developed partnerships with city, county, and state agencies; faith-based organizations; businesses; parent support organizations; and other interested entities. The primary goal of these partnerships is to embed "closing the achievement gap" as a primary driver of the efforts being pursued by these organizations, and to develop the "Resource Kit for Partnerships to Close the Achievement Gap." This resource kit is designed to

provide information on data analysis, needs assessment, and asset mapping; create broad connections with local resources; develop infrastructures and partnership agreements; evaluate existing partnerships; and create partnership sustainability plans. It is anticipated that the resource kit will be available for free download by the end of September 2009 at <http://www.closingtheachievementgap.org>.

## **Culture and Climate**

### **Council Recommendation 4: Provide Culturally Relevant Professional Development for All School Personnel**

A Culture and Climate Roundtable of national and state experts has been convened to discuss the development of a statewide framework to support this recommendation. Focus groups are being held to gain valuable input from practitioners, school administrators, and stakeholders. The first draft of the framework is currently under development at the CDE.

### **Council Recommendation 5: Conduct a Climate Survey**

The CDE has augmented the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) and California School Climate Survey (CSCS) to provide better data on issues related to race, culture, school conditions, and other factors that impact the achievement gap. Over the next two years, the CDE anticipates that 800 school districts will receive CHKS and CSCS data collected from approximately 5,000 schools. The reports for both surveys will be available at the CDE and WestEd Web sites, and will be accessible to students, parents, school personnel, and local community members.

## **Expectations**

### **Council Recommendation 6: Augment Accountability System**

An expert panel has been convened to design an index to augment the current accountability system. The panel is currently meeting regularly in order to complete the project. Additionally, focus groups are being conducted for all stakeholders, including district and school site leaders, to solicit input about additional indicators that might be critically needed to close the achievement gap.

### **Council Recommendation 7: Model Rigor**

The Brokers of Expertise Project is identifying the best and promising practices in the delivery of curriculum and instruction related to algebra. This work is moving forward with the California K–12 High Speed Network and the Imperial County Office of Education. The CDE is working

with mathematics experts throughout the state to identify, collect, and align all possible material to the state's content standards in mathematics.

### **Council Recommendation 8: Focus on Academic Rigor**

By joining over 30 other states in the American Diploma Project, California has created a leadership team to focus on the policies and practices that will enable more of the state's high school graduates to be well-prepared for both college and careers.

### **Council Recommendation 9: Improve the Awards System**

The CDE has adopted a revised Distinguished School application that requires all schools receiving the award in 2009 and beyond to have had measured improvement in closing the achievement gap. As part of the new requirements, which are described in a letter available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/el/le/yr08ltr1113.asp>, applicants are to provide their signature practice for closing achievement gaps so that the CDE can share the practice throughout the state.

### **Strategies**

### **Council Recommendation 10: Create a Robust Data System**

Through the generosity of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, a large-scale review of California's data collection systems and continuous learning practices was completed in December 2008. As a result of this effort, McKinsey & Company formulated 10 specific recommendations as part of a report entitled, "Framework for a Comprehensive Education Data System in California," which is available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/pc/index.asp#mckinsey>.

### **Council Recommendation 11: Provide Professional Development on the Use of Data**

This recommendation was enacted into law by the passage of AB 2391 (Chapter 239, Statutes of 2008) in August 2008. This bill adds California *Education Code* Section 99237.6, which allows teachers to fulfill up to 40 hours of the 80 hours of SB 472 follow-up training with training on data analysis that includes strategies on the use of data to close the achievement gap.

SB 472, which authorized the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program, allows a local educational agency to receive incentive funding to provide teacher training in mathematics and reading/language arts. The training consists of an initial 40 hours on State Board of Education-approved instructional materials and an additional 80 hours in follow-up training.

### **Council Recommendation 12: Share Successful Practices**

The CDE has committed \$1.5 million (matched by over \$1.2 million dollars from private foundations) to contract with the Imperial County Office of Education, through the California K–12 High Speed Network, to coordinate and develop the Brokers of Expertise project. The CDE has also partnered with various county offices of education to identify valuable instructional content, educational research, and promising practices suitable for statewide dissemination. The Brokers of Expertise test site, which will focus on fourth grade English-language arts, Algebra 1, and Career Technical Education, is currently being field-tested by 35 educators across the state. In June 2009, 10 pilot school groups were identified to use the Brokers of Expertise in a variety of activities. In addition, the expansion of the pilot to include 100 schools is expected to be completed in June 2010.

### **Council Recommendation 13: Fully Implement the California K–12 High-Speed Network**

Due to the instability of the state’s fiscal condition and the pressures on the state budget, little progress has been made on this recommendation. However, the CDE is exploring other alternatives for delivering technology access to students with the most challenging needs. To this end, the CDE supports the School2Home Initiative, supported by the California Emerging Technology Fund and the Children's Partnership, which is bringing technology into the classroom by, for example, providing laptop computers to middle school students.

### **Council Recommendation 14: Create Opportunities for School District Flexibility**

In May 2008, the State Board of Education approved waivers as part of a pilot program involving a partnership between the Fresno and Long Beach Unified School Districts. Both districts now have increased flexibility with respect to spending various educational funds, and have initiated efforts to secure support from other external partners.

Since the inception of this historic partnership, the two districts have created new and collaborative connections with regional postsecondary institutions. The goal of this specific aspect of the partnership is to ensure that students and parents are aware of college-entry requirements as well as to improve the alignment of each region’s K–16 educational systems.

### **Prospects for Expanded Partnerships between K–12 and Postsecondary Education Systems to Address the Achievement Gap**

California’s K–12 and postsecondary education systems have a long history of working together on a multitude of initiatives and projects. Obviously, both systems have much to gain from working collaboratively with each other to ensure that the state’s students are ready to pursue a variety of pathways beyond high school graduation. To close the achievement gap, it is

absolutely critical that the leaders of all California's educational systems remain committed to the goal of expanding the partnerships that are needed to ensure that all students can be successful in preparing for adult life.

In addition to the many intersegmental efforts that are already underway, significant potential continues to exist for expanded K-12/postsecondary partnerships in the area of teacher education. In May 2007, State Superintendent O'Connell initiated a first-ever meeting between the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and all the deans and directors of California's teacher education programs. This meeting has since evolved into an annual gathering for the purpose of sharing information and perspectives about the role of teacher education in closing the achievement gap.

In addition, shortly after the May 2007 meeting, State Superintendent O'Connell formed a Teacher Education Deans Advisory Group with representatives from all the state's postsecondary education systems. The advisory group meets periodically to advise the State Superintendent on specific initiatives that the advisory group may wish to pursue, and to assist the State Superintendent in planning the annual meeting with the state's teacher education deans and directors.

Recently, the advisory group has focused on the following three potential areas that warrant increased attention and effort, and that could probably be best facilitated through additional regional or local partnerships between K-12 and postsecondary education institutions:

- Improvement in field experience placements for student-teachers,
- Expansion in the availability of effective teacher professional development, and
- Infusion of the teacher preparation curriculum with the most effective teaching practices.

In pursuing any of these objectives, it could be strategically advantageous for representatives of the K-12 education system to be provided with the opportunity to become active members of the new partnership that has recently established the CSU Center to Close the Achievement Gap (CSU Center). These K-12 representatives could contribute essential perspectives and skills that could assist the CSU Center in pursuing its mission "to transform preparation and performance of new teachers and administrators in participating CSU Colleges of Education across the state."

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

### **Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Residency Reclassifications**

#### **Presentation By**

Allison Jones  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Student Academic Support

Christine Helwick  
General Counsel

#### **Background**

Trustee policy for determining the residency of students for purposes of tuition and financial aid is set out in Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. Generally, in accord with Education Code requirements, a student must demonstrate through a variety of criteria that s/he has been physically present in California for one year prior to the date residency is determined, with the intent to remain indefinitely. The law does not intend for students to automatically become residents for tuition purposes after having been enrolled at a CSU campus for one year.

Title 5, section 41905, lists the relevant indicators that determine residence intent. These include, among other things, registration to vote, automobile registration, obtaining a California Driver's license or ID card, filing a California tax return, opening a bank account, and so on. No one single factor is controlling and all must be considered.

Where a student is initially classified as a non-resident, s/he may seek reclassification in a subsequent semester or quarter. CSU has considered financial independence as one factor in these reclassification decisions, rather than a threshold requirement. As a result, CSU students have often been able to achieve California residency after their first year of enrollment in CSU, notwithstanding their financial dependence on nonresident parents or others. It is time to tighten up what has become this loophole. Education Code section 68044 has long required CSU to adopt regulations that make financial independence relevant in the consideration of residency reclassification.

The following proposed new amendment to Title 5, is presented for discussion:

§ 41905.5. Residence Reclassification - Financial Independence Requirement.

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 6  
September 22-23, 2009  
Page 2 of 2

Each nonresident student requesting reclassification to resident for tuition purposes must demonstrate financial independence. A student shall be considered financially independent for tuition purposes if s/he has not been claimed as a dependent on a nonresident parent's tax returns in any of the three calendar years prior to the reclassification application, has not received more than \$750 in financial assistance from a nonresident parent in any of the three calendar years prior to the reclassification application, and has not lived with a nonresident parent more than 6 weeks in any of the three calendar years prior to the reclassification application.