

AGENDA
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 3:55 p.m., Tuesday, May 16, 2006
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

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

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

3:55 p.m., Tuesday, May 16, 2006-- Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 14, 2006

1. Student Membership on the Academic Council on International Programs, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Evaluation of the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation, *Information*
3. Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, *Information*
4. The Common Management System Support for the Facilitating Graduation Initiative, *Information*
5. Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree, *Information*
6. Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University, *Action*

****Note**

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 14, 2006

1. Student Membership on the Academic Council on International Programs, *Action*

Discussion Items

2. Evaluation of the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation, *Information*
3. Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation, *Information*
4. The Common Management System Support for the Facilitating Graduation Initiative, *Information*
5. Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree, *Information*
6. Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University, *Action*

****Note:** *Depending on the length of discussions on Tuesday, March 16, Educational Policy items may have to be carried over to Wednesday for consideration*

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

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

March 14, 2006

Members Present

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Herbert L. Carter, Vice Chair
Carol R. Chandler
Debra S. Farar
Robert G. Foster
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
George G. Gowgani
Melinda Guzman Moore
William Hauck
Corey Jackson
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Craig R. Smith

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of January 31 – February 1, 2006 were approved by consent as submitted.

Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Tenth Annual Report

Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, presented information on the effectiveness of efforts to remediate students during their first year enrollment as provided in the *Remedial Education Policy Implementation: Tenth Annual Report*. He reviewed current report data on the extent to which CSU freshmen are ready at time of entry for college-level work including systemwide efforts and partnerships to address college readiness. Dr. Reichard pointed to the Early Assessment Program (EAP) as key to ensuring California high school graduates enter the CSU fully prepared to begin college-level study. Further, he explained how the EAP program, embedded within the 11th grade California Standards Test, measures college preparedness in English and mathematics. Professional development for English and math teachers to integrate college-readiness standards into their courses in the eighth through 11th grades was also referenced. The Committee proposed a review of data (available next year) to determine further whether proficiency goals set by the Board of Trustees are attainable.

Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation

Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard, joined by Bill Wilson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education Evaluation and Assurance and David Wright, Associate Director, provided a summary of the Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation, extracted from a comprehensive look at the outcomes of teacher preparation programs on 22 CSU campuses. Five annual cohorts of CSU teaching graduates participated in the evaluation, which included 12,760 teachers. Highlights of the evaluation, which used a common set of questions including teaching ability and pedagogy, were presented to the Committee. The summary established that nearly 100% of CSU credential graduates become teachers and nearly all CSU credential graduates are prepared to teach their major subjects, according to principals polled in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Dr. Wright noted that evaluations are being conducted in Long Beach and other districts. In response to an inquiry for more quantitative data, Dr. Wilson confirmed that additional evaluation findings are not ready for reporting at this time. With no state uniform data collection requirement in place and schools managing data in different ways, the time-consuming process of cleaning the data, until a common methodology is in place, was acknowledged. Further, Chancellor Reed observed how research for the purposes of establishing best practices is unique to the CSU and described how academic leaders and faculties on each CSU campus are using these findings to make needed improvements in teacher education programs.

Academic Planning and Program Review

Chair Achtenberg stated that this was an action item summarizing the California State University academic planning process over the past year and submitting campus academic plans for up to ten years. Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard made the initial presentation regarding the six academic planning topics (and proposed resolution) addressed in this item. As background, he stated that this report recapped 45 newly projected plans (excluding doctoral programs). Pointing to Campus Academic Plans located in Attachment A, he explained how academic planning at each university involved the planning and development of new programs, and included the regular review of existing programs. Dr. Reichard further explained how the proposed resolution would approve the updated campus academic plans and specify the conditions under which projected programs may be implemented. Also included in his summary were the proposed joint doctoral programs that have been granted permission to negotiate. Dr. Reichard reviewed the development of joint Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) programs. Beginning in 2007, all programs preparing audiologists will have to be at the doctoral level to be accredited. California now has one Au.D. program, offered jointly by San Diego State University and the University of California, San Diego. He discussed how five other CSU campuses have been offering accredited programs in Audiology at the master's level, as did San Diego State University before the establishment of the Au.D.; these six CSU campuses have been providing the only opportunities in the state for Californians to study to become audiologists. Dr. Reichard noted that San Francisco State University and the University of California, San Francisco have been invited to develop a proposal for a joint program leading to the Au.D. as have also California State University, Northridge and the University of California, Los Angeles in which

some faculty from California State University, Los Angeles may participate. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (REP 03-06-01).

Chair Achtenberg adjourned the meeting.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Student Membership on the Academic Council on International Programs

Summary

This item raises from three to four the number of student members serving on the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP), providing thereby a desired student member for the new fourth standing committee of ACIP.

Background

The Board of Trustees established the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) as a key part of its "Policy for the California State Colleges International Programs" adopted via Board resolution on July 9, 1969.

The ACIP consists of one member from each CSU campus, selected by means approved by the local academic senate. The ACIP's central duty is to recommend to the Chancellor policies and procedures for international programs consistent with Trustee policy.

Via a resolution adopted on January 28, 1976, the Board of Trustees expanded the membership of the ACIP to include three student members, who are chosen annually in accordance with selection guidelines established by the Council. Three students were suitable in that the ACIP had established three standing committees, namely Academic and Fiscal Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, and Student Affairs Committee.

The ACIP has now added a fourth standing committee, the Program Review Committee. Consistent with what is now longstanding ACIP practice, the group wishes to have a student member for that committee.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the membership of the Academic Council on International Programs of the California State University be expanded to include one additional student member, for a total of four student members, to be chosen annually in accordance with selection guidelines established by the Council.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Evaluation of the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
And Chief Academic Officer

Beverly Young
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Teacher Education & Public School Programs

Summary

The Early Assessment Program (EAP) adopts as its ultimate goal a higher proportion of students who are fully proficient and do not require remediation in English and/or mathematics. Rates of proficiency and remediation in English have proven especially resistant to change. As of Fall 2005, nearly 45% of first-time freshmen at California State University required remedial instruction in English.

To help address the problem of low proficiency rates in English, a program of professional development, the Reading Institutes for Academic Preparation (RIAP), was established for high school teachers. This program is intended to help high school teachers implement standards-based approaches to improve academic literacy across all content areas. This program was established in 2001-2002 and has been funded entirely by the CSU since 2002-2003. Currently there are 17 campuses funded to offer Reading Institutes for a total of 575 participants. In 2004 RIAP became a part of the Early Assessment Program. High school teachers participating in RIAP assume leadership roles in promoting the Early Assessment Program at their school sites and districts and learn about the 12th Grade Expository Reading and Writing Course.

At the request of the Teacher Education and Public Schools Programs unit in Academic Affairs, the Program Evaluation and Research Collaborative (PERC) at California State University, Los Angeles performed an external, independent evaluation of RIAP to determine its effectiveness. Results of the evaluation of RIAP suggest that the program is having an impact in improving student English proficiency in schools that have had substantial participation in the program and have also participated in professional development for the 12th Grade Expository Reading and Writing Course.

Academic Affairs staff will provide a summary of the evaluation, plans for continued evaluation, and the implications for the EAP program.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Report of Peer Visits Focused on Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Jolene Koester
President
California State University, Northridge

John Welty
President
California State University, Fresno

Summary

Teams of respected senior faculty and administrators have begun “peer visits” to campuses to review Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation. The first such visit was to CSU Northridge on March 22, 2006, and the second was to CSU Fresno on April 20, 2006. Presidents Koester and Welty will describe key foci for their respective campuses’ initiatives to facilitate undergraduates’ progress to their baccalaureate degrees, and will comment on the effectiveness of the peer visits in assisting campuses in these endeavors.

Background

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

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

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

The first campuses to receive committees of peer visitors focused on actions to facilitate graduation were CSU Northridge and CSU Fresno. Other campuses hosting visiting teams in Spring 2006 include CSU Channel Islands, CSPU San Luis Obispo, San Jose State University, and San Francisco State University. The balance of CSU campuses will receive visiting teams in Fall 2006, or Spring 2007. In addition, a systemwide conference is planned for October 20, 2006 at which strong and recommended practices for facilitating graduation will be featured.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The Common Management System Support for the Facilitating Graduation Initiative

Presentation By:

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Academic Officer

Richard P. West
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Chief Financial Officer

Keith Boyum
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

David Ernst
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Information Technology Services

Summary

At the March 2006 Board presentation on the comprehensive Integrated Technology Strategy the Trustees requested more information on how the Common Management System (CMS) technology supports the Facilitating Graduation Initiative. The mission of the California State University's Common Management System (CMS) project is to provide efficient, effective, high quality service to students, faculty, and staff. This mission includes achievement of a "target administrative environment" by the year 2008 based on three primary goals:

Perform administrative functions in concert with a **common set of administrative "best practices" approaches.**

Support administrative functions (initially including human resources, financials, and student services) with a **shared, common suite of applications software. (Oracle/PeopleSoft).**

Operate the administrative software suite at a **shared data center (Unisys, Salt Lake City, UT).**

Campuses first went "live" with CMS in 2000 and as of April 2006, twenty-one campuses are live with Human Resources, twenty with Financials, and ten with Student Administration.

Student Administration

The Student Administration (SA) module of CMS most directly supports the objectives of the Facilitating Graduation Initiative. The SA application began after the first-wave implementation of Human Resources and Finance. Three pilot campuses (Fresno, Long Beach, and Sonoma) were the first to "go live" with Student Administration in 2002. Seven other campuses have

followed with ten now live on the SA application, and two in progress to complete this calendar year.

The Student Administration application provides a full suite of services to manage the student administration function on campuses. The student administration modules include:

Campus Community - provides the foundation of all biographical, demographic information, and defining academic structure. This is the integration link between HR and SA.

Admissions - provides the ability to process applicants and admit students including an interface with CSU Mentor to match and record student applicants and related information.

Financial Aid - provides a foundation for the budgeting, packaging, awarding of aid, disbursement, and monitoring satisfactory academic progress.

Student Records - provides a foundation for scheduling classes, registering students, producing transcripts, academic record maintenance, posting degrees, and posting transfer credit.

Student Financials - provides a foundation for student financial data, including billing students, maintaining student accounts, tuition calculation, and processing payments.

Academic Advisement - provides a foundation for processing degree audit reports and facilitating graduation through tracking student degree progress.

Self Service - provides such functionality as:

- Personal Portfolio - allows users to view and maintain their own profiles, including name, address, phone, and email address.
- Learner Services - allows users to review the status of their admissions application, financial aid awards and enroll in classes.
- Learning Management - allows advisors to review the student's academic progress and allows faculty to review their course schedule and class rosters.

There are non-core modules available to campuses, as well. These provide recruiting (the ability to track student prospects), cashiering (the ability to process cash payments, credit card payments, and refunds) and contributor relations that provide a foundation for tracking constituents, fundraising campaigns and events, and prospect strategies. Some campuses are already implementing optional functionality. As is the case in cashiering, the functionality may be available through third-party applications.

A more complete description of the functionality provided through CMS is available on the CMS website at:

http://cms.calstate.edu/T1_Documents/ProjectPlansAndStatus/CMSCoreFunctionality/CMSCoreFunctionality20050829.doc

Current Campus SA Implementation Schedule

May 2006	Live on CMS Student Administration: California Maritime Academy, Channel Islands, Chico, Fresno, Long Beach, Northridge, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Jose, and Sonoma
July 2006	Los Angeles
October 2006	San Luis Obispo
October 2007	Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Sacramento, San Bernardino
October 2008	Fullerton, San Diego, San Francisco, and the SA Collaborative (current Banner campuses, which includes Bakersfield, Humboldt, Monterey Bay, San Marcos, and Stanislaus)

CMS Involvement and Support in the Facilitating the Graduation Initiative

The Facilitating Graduation initiatives cover a wide range of student-related campus services and functions. Some of the initiatives are campus-based process and policy issues that do not require the involvement or support of CMS. Other initiatives are directly linked to CMS functionality and services. CMS already provides support through the collection and reporting of information and delivers functionality to meet the requirements of many of the initiatives. Some initiatives are not currently addressed by CMS functionality, but can be. CMS has developed a plan to address those initiatives through modifications and/or enhancements.

CMS Solutions Available and Planned

The following section describes the solutions currently available in CMS for facilitating graduation, the enhancements or improvements planned for those available solutions, and CMS plans for developing or securing additional solutions.

In the fall of 2005, CMS central staff and the Student Administration Implementing Campuses (SAIC) team began defining the role of CMS and Campus Solutions (the new Oracle/PeopleSoft name for the application formerly known as Student Administration) baseline in supporting the Facilitating Graduation initiatives. That role continues to be reviewed, refined and expanded. CMS can provide some technical solutions or support services in achieving the goals of the Facilitating Graduation initiatives; however, CMS Central and the campuses acknowledge that some changes will necessitate business practice changes on campuses. These changes would be the responsibility of departments other than CMS. However, CMS staff and the SAIC committee will continue to identify these issues and facilitate best practice across the CSU through CMS functionality changes. SAIC continues to meet monthly to address the Facilitating Graduation Initiative. CMS Central staff collaborates with campuses on an ongoing basis to continue developing functionality in support of the initiatives.

The initial review of the Facilitating Graduation Initiatives provided the following assessment of where CMS could provide support. On the chart below, *CMS Support* indicates those initiatives where CMS provides supporting information for implementation or tracking. *CMS Function* indicates those initiatives where CMS provides current functionality for implementation. *CMS Modification* indicates those initiatives where CMS will modify existing functionality to meet the needs of the initiative.

No.	Initiative	CMS Support	CMS Function	CMS Modification
1	Reduction of Required Units in Programs Leading to the Baccalaureate Degree	X		
2	Selective Reduction of Campus Graduation Requirements	X		
3	Emphasis on Graduation in Orientation Sessions for New Undergraduate Students (First-time Freshmen; Transfers)			
4	Strengthened Support for both General Education and Life / Career Goal Clarification for Lower-Division Students			
5	Prominent Association of Career Outcomes with Undergraduate Degree Majors in Catalogs, and Other Student Informational Materials & Resources			
6	Choice of Undergraduate Degree Major Required at a Reasonable, Early Juncture		X	
7	Wide Promulgation of Roadmaps to Undergraduate Degree in an Official, Centrally-Archived, Graphically Authoritative Format			
8	Alignment of Class Schedules to Roadmaps		X	
9	Provision in Policy of Mandatory Individual Student Study Plans to the Degree		X	
10	Use of Cumulated Individual Student Study Plans in Planning Class Schedules		X	
11	Adoption of Strategies for Student Success and Learning Support: Tutoring; Technology-mediated Supplementary Learning; and Similar Tactics			X
12	Renewed Enforcement of Policies that Limit or Discourage Drops, Withdrawals, Grades of Incomplete		X	
13	Adoption or Renewed Enforcement of Policy that Limits the Number of Course Repetitions		X	
14	Campus Provision of a Rich CMS Information and Communications Environment for Major Advising		X	
15	Strong, Timely Major Advisement, Including Mandatory Advisement upon Declaring or upon Changing a Major		X	X

16	Frequent Use of Degree Audits		X	
17	Mandatory Degree Audits not later than at 70 Semester Units (or Quarter-unit Equivalent)		X	
18	Mandatory and If Needed Intrusive Advisement as Student Approaches / Exceeds Minimum Units Required for the Degree		X	
19	Development and Use of “Dashboard Indicators” for Campus-wide Monitoring of Graduation			
20	Review by CSU Academic Peers of How Efforts at Encouraging Graduation are Succeeding, by Degree Program			
21	Provide the Board of Trustees with periodic reports			
22	Provide appropriate funding, support			

To improve current services and reduce existing functionality gaps, the SAIC organized overall efforts into five specific CMS projects. The summary description of each of the projects below is taken from a more detailed report of the projects available on the CMS website at http://cms.calstate.edu/T2_Documents/HCM89_SA_Documentation/Facilitating%20Grad%20Initiative_Status%2020060411.doc.

Most projects are reported as “In Progress”, which reflects a range from ongoing work on a project with no final resolution to date to ongoing work with final resolution on several of the elements within the project. While many improvements are “in progress” services and support are already being provided in those areas.

1. **Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP):** Streamlined loading and maintenance of transfer credit data using ASSIST, along with mechanisms to identify LDTP students and to verify completion of program requirements.

Initiatives Addressed: All Initiatives
Actions Required: Improve setup and maintenance processes for transfer credit; enhance CSU Mentor interface to identify LDTP students; revise degree audit to place LDTP students at the appropriate point in their degree program
Project Status: In-Progress

2. **Degree Progress/Graduation Planning System (GPS):** Electronic roadmap and individualized study plans that feed into registration and degree audit and displays not only completed requirements, but requirements remaining to be completed with a timeline for completion. A first step in this effort is enhancing the delivered degree audit report to make it more user-friendly and useful.

Initiatives Addressed: #6-Undergrad degree major, #7 Roadmaps to undergrad degree, #8-Alignment of class schedules to roadmaps, #9-Mandatory study plans, #10-Planning class schedule, #14-Major advising information, #15-Mandatory advisement, #19-Monitoring graduation

Actions Required: Enhance degree audit; create electronic roadmap and degree planner; create individualized study plans that can be used to create enrollment requests by term

Project Status: In-Progress

3. **Repeat Functionality:** Additional options are needed in the enrollment process to improve enforcement of campus repeat rules. Enhanced presentation of data about repeated courses would also provide more accurate transcript and degree audit information.

Initiatives Addressed: #13-Adoption or renewed enforcement of the policy that limits the number of course repetitions.

Actions Required: This project requires a code change from Oracle PeopleSoft; selective prevention of enrollment in a course previously taken based on the grade received; preserving term GPA for term of the original attempt; exclusion of repeated course from meeting additional requirements in Degree Audit; enforcement of limits on how many times a course may be repeated as well as global limit on repeats for the undergrad career.

Project Status: In-Progress (Pending Oracle review and action)

4. **Degree Audit Usage Tracking:** Implement a system trigger that populates a new table when a degree audit is requested to provide a history of how degree audits are being used.

Initiatives Addressed: #9-Mandatory study plans, #14-Major advising information, #15-Mandatory advisement, #16-Frequent use of degree audits, #17-Mandatory degree audits not later than at 70 semester units, #18-Mandatory advisement as student approaches/exceeds 70 semester units required for degree.

Actions Required: A persistent table that holds a history of degree audit requests over time is needed

Project Status: In-Progress

5. **Improved Reporting and Analytics:** Enhancements to existing reports and creation of new ones required by specific initiatives. Enhanced sharing of information and timely access to data for campus decision-making.

Initiatives Addressed: #8-Alignment of class schedules to roadmaps, #10-Planning class schedule, #17-Mandatory degree audits not later than at 70 semester units, #18-Mandatory advisement as student approaches/exceeds 70 semester units required for degree, #19-Monitoring graduation, #21-Board of Trustees Reports

Actions Required: Improve existing reports; create new reports identified through the initiative; develop a process to extract and share information

Project Status: In-Progress

CMS and the campuses are working together to realize the most rapid implementation of the features and functionality of the Oracle/PeopleSoft student application necessary to support the Facilitating Graduation Initiative. Current information available to the CSU indicates that there will be several important enhancements to the Oracle/PeopleSoft products that will provide even better support for the Facilitating Graduation Initiatives. While some of this functionality could be developed within the current versions of the Oracle/PeopleSoft applications, such as enhanced degree audit, the cost is prohibitive and the product would be short-lived given the availability of the functionality in the next version of the software application. A recent Oracle announcement deferring the delivery of the Fusion Student application and the fact that PeopleSoft 9.0 will deliver functionality that better supports the Facilitating Graduation Initiatives has lead to consideration of implementing PeopleSoft Student Administration 9.0 as early as 2008-09 to provide significantly improved support for facilitating graduation.

CMS Solutions On Campus

The Facilitating Graduation initiatives requires the tracking of degree audit usage including capturing when an advising transcript is requested, who requested it, and the type of transcript produced. CMS developed a modification that allows for the collection of this data.

Campuses agreed upon a set of requirements to enhance the degree audit for better presentation and a more understandable transfer credit and degree progress report. The requirements are being used to design and develop a new and improved degree audit with prototypes available for review this summer

CMS is developing support for the Facilitating Graduation initiatives in the current version of the software (8.9). To make full use of the planned functionality such as transfer credit and academic advisement campuses must implement or upgrade to the 8.9 version. Currently four campuses are fully utilizing this functionality in the earlier version of PeopleSoft with 2 more to be completed this year. The remaining campuses will complete implementation of this functionality in 2007 or 2008

Long Beach, Maritime Academy, San Jose and Sonoma have fully implemented transfer credit and academic advisement. Channel Islands, Chico, Fresno, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo are in the implementation process for this functionality.

The CMS staff is an active partner with campuses and other departments of the Chancellor's Office to ensure the most effective and rapid implementation of the Board of Trustee's Facilitating Graduation initiatives. CMS will continue to provide and improve the functionality necessary to achieve success

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Proposed Title 5 Revision—The Doctor of Education Degree

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Summary

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

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

The policy has been drafted in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University. We are particularly indebted to an ad-hoc faculty workgroup appointed by the Academic Senate for detailed discussion and refinement of the policy.

Proposed Resolution

The following resolution will be proposed for adoption at the July 2006 meeting.

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Article 1 of

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

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

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

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

And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 2, Section 40100 as follows:

§ 40100. Authorization to Establish Curricula.

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

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

And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under the authority prescribed herein and pursuant to Section 89030.1 of the Education Code, that the board hereby amends its regulations in Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 7 as follows:

§ 40511. The Doctor of Education Degree.

(a) A California State University program leading to a Doctor of Education degree is distinguished from a University of California doctoral degree program by its conformity to the criteria in Subdivision (b).

(b) A California State University program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall:

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

(A) public elementary schools,

(B) public secondary schools,

(C) community colleges;

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

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

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

(c) Each campus offering a program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall establish requirements for admission to the program.

(1) The requirements for admission shall include, at a minimum, the following:

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

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

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

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

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

(F) The applicant has met any additional requirements established by the Chancellor in consultation with the faculty.

(2) An applicant who does not qualify for admission under the provisions of subdivision (1) may be admitted by special action if, on the basis of acceptable evidence, the applicant is judged by the appropriate campus authority to possess sufficient academic and professional potential pertinent to educational leadership to merit such action.

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

- (1) requirements for admission with classified status;
- (2) policy on the transfer of credit earned at other institutions;
- (3) policy on professional ethics and academic integrity;
- (4) policies on student fees;
- (5) provisions for advising and mentoring;
- (6) policy and procedures for petitioning for a variance in academic requirements;
- (7) policy and procedures for obtaining a leave of absence or withdrawing from the university;
- (8) policy and procedures regarding student grievances;
- (9) policy on harassment and discrimination;
- (10) policy and procedures for establishing and amending a plan of study;
- (11) requirements for satisfactory progress in the program;
- (12) policy on academic probation;
- (13) requirements for field experience embedded in the program;
- (14) requirements for advancement to candidacy;
- (15) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for administering a qualifying examination (if the qualifying examination is unique to the individual student);
- (16) dissertation requirements;
- (17) policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for supervising a dissertation;
- (18) forms to be completed by students in the course of the degree program;
- (19) the names and areas of expertise of faculty members affiliated with the degree program.

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

§ 40512. The Doctor of Education Degree: Requirements.

(a) Advancement to Candidacy. For advancement to candidacy for the Doctor of Education degree, the student shall meet the requirements of Section 41011 and such particular requirements as the chancellor and the campus may prescribe. The requirements shall include a qualifying examination.

(b) To be eligible for the Doctor of Education degree, the candidate shall have completed the following minimum requirements:

(1) The completion of a specified pattern of study approved by the appropriate campus authority.

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

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

(C) At least 42 semester units shall be completed in residence at the campus or campuses awarding the degree. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for part of this residence requirement. The campus may establish a transfer policy allowing application to degree requirements of relevant coursework and credits completed as a matriculated student in another graduate program, on the condition that the other program is appropriately accredited.

(D) A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better shall be earned in coursework taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree, except that a course in which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average.

(2) The completion of a dissertation.

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) the extension is warranted by individual circumstances, and
- (2) the student demonstrates current knowledge of research and practice in educational leadership, as required by the campus.

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

And, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees has determined that the adoption of the proposed revision will not impose a cost or savings on any state agency; will not impose a cost or savings on any local agency or school district that is required to be reimbursed under Section 17561 of the Government Code; will not result in any cost or savings in federal funding to the state; and will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees delegates to the chancellor of the California State University authority to further adopt, amend, or repeal this revision if the further adoption, amendment, or repeal is required and is nonsubstantial or solely grammatical in nature, or sufficiently related to the original text that the public was adequately placed on notice that the change could result from the originally proposed regulatory action.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University

Presentation By

Gary W. Reichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Marshelle Thobaben
Chair
Academic Senate

Summary

This item recommends approval of an amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University. This amendment revises the formula for determining the size of campus delegations to the Academic Senate and will reduce the total size of the Academic Senate from 58 elected members to 53 elected members. The membership will continue to include the Chancellor (or designee) as a non-voting member, the immediate past chair (if not an elected campus representative), and the emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

Background

Chapter VII, Section 2, of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees states, "Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University shall become effective when ratified according to its provisions and approved by the Board of Trustees."

At its July 16-17, 2002 meeting, the Board reviewed and approved amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate that had the effect of expanding the size of the Senate from 51 elected campus representatives to 58 and adding an emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association. The action item provided to the Board specified, "the Academic Senate understands that the expansion of campus representatives and the emerita/emeritus member would be accomplished without an increase in budgeted resources. The Academic Senate Executive Committee intends to accommodate the proposed amendments through reductions in member travel and/or release time assignments." Experience since that time has persuaded the leadership and a majority of the members of the Academic Senate that reductions necessary to accommodate the budget, which resulted in canceling some Senate

meetings and not being able to appoint sufficient senators to systemwide committees and task forces, diminished the effectiveness of individual Senators and the Senate as a whole.

As a result of these judgments, the March 2006 meeting the Academic Senate CSU passed a resolution that proposed an amendment to its Constitution in which the Academic Senate would consist of two representatives from each campus, totaling 46 Senators, with a third senator apportioned on the basis of full-time equivalent faculty to the seven largest campuses.

The specific proposed amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSU is included in Attachment A. Attachment B shows the distribution of the elected campus representatives to the Academic Senate CSU based upon the fall 2005 total of 17,046 FTEF.

As required by the Constitution, this proposed amendment was submitted to the individual campus academic senates for faculty ratification. At the conclusion of the voting, with all 23 campuses reporting, the total vote in favor was 2108 to 601. Twenty of the 23 campuses voted in favor of the change, with two campuses against, and one divided evenly. It is understood that the changes will take effect on the allocation of seats expiring May 31, 2006.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University which states, "The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of two senators per campus plus an additional senator from each of the seven largest campuses apportioned on the basis of FTEF," having been ratified by the faculties of a majority of the campuses, is approved by the Board.

The Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University

Article II

Section 1. Membership

- (a) The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of elected campus representatives apportioned as follows: two senators per campus plus an additional senator from each of the seven largest campuses apportioned on the basis of FTEF. ~~a minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF).~~

Faculty FTE by Campus, Fall 2005
Includes both Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty and Lecturers

	FTE	Number of Senators
Bakersfield	401	2
Channel Islands	148	2
Chico	746	2
Dominguez Hills	445	2
East Bay	544	2
Fresno	886	2
Fullerton	1,267	3
Humboldt	414	2
Los Angeles	849	2
Long Beach	1,430	3
Maritime	69	2
Monterey Bay	213	2
Northridge	1,277	3
Pomona	842	2
Sacramento	1,157	3
San Bernardino	650	2
San Diego	1,336	3
San Francisco	1,156	3
San Jose	1,203	3
San Marcos	308	2
San Luis Obispo	929	2
Sonoma	381	2
Stanislaus	<u>395</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	17,046	53