**AGENDA**

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting:** **10:15 a.m., Tuesday, November 5, 2013**
**Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium**

Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Rebecca D. Eisen
Douglas Faigin
Margaret Fortune
Lupe C. Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
William Hauck
Lou Monville
J. Lawrence Norton
Cipriano Vargas

**Consent Items**
Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 24, 2013

**Discussion**
1. Update on the Early Assessment Program , *Information*
2. Update on SB 1440: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, *Information*
3. The California State University Institute for Palliative Care at California State University San Marcos, *Information*
4. The California State University Nursing Programs Update, *Information*
5. Outstanding Faculty Website, *Information*

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

**September 24, 2013**

**Members Present**
Roberta Achtenberg, Chair
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair
Rebecca D. Eisen
Douglas Faigin
Margaret Fortune
Lupe C. Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
William Hauck
Peter G. Mehas
Lou Monville
J. Lawrence Norton
Cipriano Vargas
Timothy P. White, Chancellor
Bob Linscheid, Chair of the Board

Trustee Roberta Achtenberg called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of July 23, 2013, were approved as submitted.

Speaker Daniel Thomas Clark, a Fresno State student and vice president of legislative affairs for the California State Student Association, thanked the governor and trustees for supporting SB 1440, particularly since he is a former transfer student. He said the pathway needs to be better communicated to community college and high school students so more students use that option.

**Reducing Bottlenecks and Improving Student Success**

Trustee Roberta Achtenberg said the CSU has worked for 10 years to promote student success through innovative strategies and initiatives. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim P. Smith presented background on the meetings with the Governor's office and Department of Finance on the $10 million designed to infuse technology into the curriculum, especially in the high-demand, prerequisite courses needed by undergraduate students. He quoted from the budget bill signed by the governor describing how priority will be given to developing

courses that serve a greater number of students while providing equal or better learning experiences. The CSU, he said, has been a leader nationally in the number of online programs, currently numbering 104, with approximately 3,250 fully online classes.

Gerry Hanley, senior director of academic technology services, said the focus on implementing the program has been to provide more courses, more successfully for more students. He cited four areas the Chancellor's Office and campuses are working on: (1) improve retention with innovative pedagogies and technologies (2) improve access to needed courses; (3) improve access to facilities, especially STEM lab courses; and (4) provide effective and timely advising.

The course redesign program looked at high-enrollment, low-success courses, finding those faculty who had demonstrated exemplary teaching and technology practices and bringing them together with other CSU faculty in summer 2013 eAcademies. More than 150 faculty participated in the eAcademies in engineering, physics, chemistry, mathematics, critical thinking, statistics and biology. Mr. Hanley gave an example from San José State's circuits' course using edX technologies with the flipped pedagogies. Forty percent of the students in a face-to-face class would need to repeat the class for their major. In the edX class, only 9 percent of the students received grades that required them to re-take that class. Four other CSU campuses are implementing the San José strategy with an estimated 500 to 650 students now enrolled. With 30 percent fewer students having to re-take the class, 150 new seats have opened up for the circuits' course. He also cited a hybrid business math class from Cal State Northridge that used online technologies blended with faculty student-interactions and self-assessment tools. Four campuses are now using the model, reaching an estimated 3,100 students and producing an estimated 465 new seats in math classes with more math students succeeding.

Another part of the course redesign strategy involves "promising practices," classes that have not yet demonstrated sufficient success to scale them to other campuses. The Chancellor's Office asked campuses to provide proposals to redesign their courses with technology, and 77 proposals were funded, with 19 of the 77 faculty members creating fully online courses. Additionally, the CSU has created a concurrent enrollment program that allows students to enroll in an online course at a different CSU campus, providing more pathways to graduation. In fall 2013, there are 33 fully online courses offered by 11 campuses that are available for students. For the fall semester, 197 students from 15 campuses registered for one of the 33 courses. The new program has a website that is connected to each campus website where students can search and sign up for the classes. The program began in June and was rolled out in August. Campuses are being invited to increase the number of courses for spring and summer quarters and semesters.

Lab classes in the STEM disciplines often are constrained by campus facilities, so the CSU is pursuing the use of virtual labs. If half the sessions within a lab course can be taken online, it is possible to double the number of students who need to take the lab course. The CSU has been a leader in this area, Mr. Hanley said. The fourth element in the $10 million student success program is eAdvising. Campuses provide a complex array of classes, and sometimes students are not certain what classes are needed for graduation. The CSU is developing tools that are

available 24/7 for students. Electronic academic program planners help students look ahead to what courses will be necessary and available to complete their degree. Early warning tools are available when students choose courses that do not keep them on the right path. The scheduling tools enable campuses to determine future demand for courses so they can schedule the right distribution of courses for students.

The second component of the student success project involves the $7.2 million that was allocated by Chancellor White. The CSU has funded 30 projects across 15 campuses to scale high-impact practices that lead to student success and timely graduation. Dr. Smith mentioned one example, the Statway program developed by Stanford University and the Carnegie Foundation. One of the eAcademies is focused on Statway. The CSU has participated in the program since 2010. Social science students who need remediation in math, for example, ordinarily would need one or two semesters to complete their remediation. Then they would have to take freshman mathematics, General Education math and possibly a statistics course if their program required it, meaning as many as four semesters to fulfill the requirement. Statway looks at statistics as the requirement for social science students, and then determines what algebra course was needed. What was once four semesters is now a two-sequence course. By the end of the freshman year, social science students have finished remediation and freshman math. Statway is now on four campuses. The CSU is working with the Carnegie Foundation to add five more campuses.

**The CSU Bottleneck Courses Survey Report**

Trustee Achtenberg, who has been on the board almost 13 years, noted that 10 years ago the board approved the Graduation Initiative. The CSU was first among the nation's universities when trustees undertook the first step. She complimented the Chancellor's Office for the progress it has made, level of sophistication that has occurred, and the action and speed taken to create programs, particularly with a small budget.

Ron Vogel, associate vice chancellor for academic affairs, presented a PowerPoint outlining the detailed survey of bottleneck courses. Bottlenecks were defined as an undergraduate course that students are required to take to earn their degree in a timely manner (from four to six years), but for any given reason it could not be offered. The online survey of 10 items was sent to CSU's 866 undergraduate department chairs in June. He collected information on every course taught in the CSU during fall 2012 including the number of times a student attempted to register for each section, the number of sections taught, and the number of fill-rates in each section. The data included more than 6 million records. Dr. Vogel said they received a 91 percent response rate.

The survey focused on bottleneck courses and not on student behavior. Dr. Vogel estimated that there were 3,840 sections of bottleneck courses, but that the number was overestimated because of the interplay of bottleneck and general education courses versus the sections actually needed. He gave an example of 100 students trying to get into sociology 101, and the same students trying to get into psych 101 and into art 101. Each chair is going to report that they need five additional sections (15 total). But the problem is that the students only need one, two or three of

the courses. Maybe only five sections were needed. Sometimes a course is not really a bottleneck because while students say they need a physics course, there may be other alternatives and courses that the students could to take to satisfy the requirement.

Dr. Vogel said they looked at main courses in the major by the department chairs because the chairs are closer to the real problems. According to the chairs, the top ranked reasons for all the bottlenecks in the CSU are: (1) not enough funding to hire faculty; (2) not enough tenure and tenure-track faculty available; (3) not enough qualified part-time faculty available; (4) time and day constraints for scheduling rooms; (5) not enough seating capacity in the labs; (6) not able to substitute the class with another class; (7) not enough seating capacity for lecture course; (8) other, meaning chairs were allowed to give their own reasons for the bottlenecks; and (9) students repeating a required class to improve their grade. They found 36 percent of the bottlenecks were lower-division in the major courses and 64 percent were upper-division for a total of 866.

Looking at the disciplines, 37 percent of the bottlenecks occurred in the STEM fields, followed by liberal arts at 24 percent; health and human services at 17 percent; arts at 13 percent; business 5 percent; and education at 4 percent. The top three reasons cited for the bottlenecks in the above majors were: not enough tenured, tenure-track faculty; not enough qualified part-time faculty; and not enough funding to hire faculty. On average, 70 percent of CSU students who are in bottleneck courses are getting in, but 30 percent are not. Conservatively, Dr. Vogel said, 2,103 additional major course sections are or were needed in 2012-2013. It is difficult to establish a system-level response because every campus has different policies, enrollment patterns, scheduling, space issues and funding.

Dr. Smith outlined several steps that will be taken regarding bottlenecks: (1) sampling undergraduate students for their views on bottlenecks; (2) providing more sections for current students; (3) adding more sections to the concurrent enrollment program and possibly more sections in the STEM area with virtual labs; (4) beginning a process of faculty discussion on upper-division course articulation from one campus to the next; (5) expanding Statway so more social science students can condense their math requirements; and (6) assessing the strategies for evaluating student-faculty-institutional benefits.

Trustee Doug Faigin called the report a terrific first step. However, while all that is being done has the potential to help on bottlenecks and increase the number of students graduating, he said, the CSU is still going to be rejecting 30,000 qualified applicants this year because there is not enough room. He said the programs discussed were traditionally sized online courses, as opposed to serving hundreds of students. He wanted a presentation on the online programs at San José State and the campus efforts scaling up online courses and programs to alleviate some of the problems, and why that campus was rejected for some of the $10 million allocated for innovative efforts.

Dr. Smith said the programs proposed by San José are being reviewed. Funding is going to programs that have demonstrated prior success before scaling to other campuses. The Chancellor's Office received proposals for several large sections from other campuses. San Francisco State proposed a labor course with hundreds of seats, but the CSU has not yet built the infrastructure to support the concurrent enrollment program so students can move from one campus to another electronically. It will be completed by year's end, he said, adding that more courses will be offered in the spring, some of them serving larger numbers of students.

San José State President Mo Qayoumi said the campus did receive funding to offer three of the Udacity courses in spring 2014. The three courses taught last spring were statistics, college algebra and remedial math. The grades were lower than in same face-to-face classes so they did not show success and receive funding. The campus expanded the courses for the summer and added general psychology and computer programming. More than 2,000 students took the courses for credit and the results were promising, with grades in three of the courses better than face-to-face. The courses are offered through Extended Education at $150 a course for three credits with no state support or federal assistance. Because of the funding received from the Chancellor's Office, they will expand the program in the spring to any eligible students. He said they had more than 94,000 students who benefited from these courses who were not paying any fees or tuition and basically using these courses as an open online system. He would like to offer more courses in a similar manner in the next year.

Trustee Lou Monville said the board is concerned about access and capacity and asked about the 19 fully online courses being funded for the future. Mr. Hanley said 19 of the 77 awards were to redesign courses fully online. Additionally, the Udacity course will be scaled to four other CSUs, with two more interested. The Chancellor's Office has been assisting San José to execute the Udacity contract. Trustee Monville also asked what the $33,000 allocated for individual course redesign entails versus creating a course from the ground up. Mr. Hanley said cost depends on a variety of factors. The CSU funding supports faculty learning and implementing exemplary practices. There is faculty assigned time, including using teams of faculty because of the scaling across multiple sections. The Chancellor's Office provided 75 percent of their cost for supplemental instruction services where students in the classes have assistance and tutors who supplement the faculty member's expertise. Also there is the systemwide purchasing of technology contracts that keep that cost low.

Trustee Steven Glazer asked about the breakdown of the $10 million. Mr. Hanley gave a rough estimate: $500,000 for the eAcademies; $2.7 million for the promising practices course redesign; $1.5 million for the eAdvising with degree audit tools; $1.5 million for the concurrent enrollment infrastructure; $500,000 for broadly scaling these innovations across more campuses through our faculty development initiative; $600,000 for assessment; and a margin for the unexpected. (He distributed a written budget to the trustees later in the meeting.) Trustee Lupe Garcia asked about the ability to move faster on the infrastructure so there would be more than the current 33 fully online concurrent courses. Dr. Smith said the infrastructure will be ready for next fall, so processing students' requests would begin next summer. Trustee Lawrence Norton asked about e-

academies and how participants were selected. Mr. Hanley said the participants volunteered. Given that the request went out over the summer, there was a good turnout. Faculty came looking for exciting innovative technology and what they found most valuable were the peer-to-peer communications connections. The goal is to enable faculty across disciplines, teaching common courses to have an easier way to share exemplary practices and really begin to implement them in their courses. Student trustee Talar Alexanian said bottlenecks have been a problem especially in the past years for students who want earn a degree and graduate in a timely fashion. She said that putting all courses fully online, however, is not in the best interests of students, is not what students want and is not yet supported as a successful pedagogical model for the system.

Trustee Faigin asked how many students the new promising online courses will serve. Dr. Smith said San Francisco State presented a course for 700 students. The current infrastructure cannot handle 700 students, but the system will be able to in the future. Dr. Smith said it helps alleviate bottleneck issues because if a student at one campus cannot enroll in a class, the student might find an online class on another campus. So they would be maximizing benefits of a system. If the CSU put more courses online it will make a dent. If CSU can save one class per student or one class for every other student, there are many savings.

Chancellor White said the CSU is better than some might believe and less so than will be in the not too distant future. The charge accepted in January was that the $10 million would be used to increase the number of courses to undergraduate students through the use of technology. The system posited that the CSU was going to be successful with the governor's budget so it went ahead with beginning a program of online classes. The alternative would have been to spend a year thinking about how to spend it and not be able to tell the Governor or legislature or trustees for 12 months what had been done with that money but ask for more in the next budget. The CSU went forward and a lot of people did a lot of work. He said he did not want to lose a year because of the importance and urgency of the matter. It is a work in progress. The bottleneck survey will help influence the kinds of things the CSU will continue to invest in to make it better for students. He commended the presidents for their work. Academic Senate Chair Diana Guerin pointed out that currently there is not a faculty trustee on the board, but if there were she/he would say the CSU needs more faculty to assist with the bottlenecks.

Governor Brown expressed his appreciation for the work completed. When people start acting on what has been asked, there is a lot to be learned. The board has asked for more money, but the governor said the CSU is not alone. There are many claims on state funding, and the CSU will have to convince the legislature it is worth more than others. He said he thinks it will be difficult to get more from the state, even though he "would not rule it out." Moving to online classes, he said it is not human nor is it offering the full experience, but he is looking at the reality of what money is available the next couple years. Online is very important and technology is important. The CSU is a part of the state budget and cannot be separated, and in that context there are constraints. He said he is very impressed and that the CSU should go further to fully embrace the use of technology, recognizing how the world has changed and will continue to change.

**SB 1440: The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act**

Eric Forbes, assistant vice chancellor for student support services, spoke to the chart on the PowerPoint showing the number of similar programs with the CSU and the community colleges. There has been improvement, but there are some disciplines lacking similar programs. The CSU has shifted attention to tracking the number of students who pursue these Associate of Arts degrees. As of early September, the California Community Colleges conferred around 1,100 of these degrees in spring 2013. The Chancellor's Office expects that number to rise as more colleges report. It also looks at how many actually are coming to the CSU. There is a complexity to the numbers concerning the status of e-Transcripts, for automating the transfer of data between the community colleges and the CSU. Mr. Forbes said the CSU is now refreshing some of the material on the web, adding more stories from current students and convening focus groups to help understand how students use the website and program.

Trustee Bob Linscheid asked about how many students are on a pathway to transfer from a community college. Mr. Forbes said there are large numbers of students who continue to come to the CSU who will not earn a transfer degree, because there is another legitimate pathway to complete lower-division general education requirements as well as four basic subjects and transfer to the CSU with 60 or more units. The community colleges do not do a good job with tracking their students, Mr. Forbes said. The CSU knows more about the CCC students because they apply to the CSU long before they apply to graduate from the community colleges. East Bay President Leroy Morishita said they are receiving just a handful of AA transfer applications, fewer than 20 last year and probably about 25 or 30 applying this year. He said it is going to take another year or so before the community colleges will be as prepared to transfer students.

**Annual review of the CSU teacher preparation program**

Beverly Young, assistant vice chancellor for teacher education and public school programs, updated the annual evaluation of CSU teacher preparation programs. The CSU is the only higher education system in the nation that systematically follows every one of its teacher graduates into the field to gather information about how they are doing and to evaluate their CSU program. Since 2001, every elementary, secondary and special education teacher graduate of the CSU receives a very detailed communication after they have been teaching for a full year, asking for specific feedback about areas in which they do and do not feel well prepared to teach. Teacher supervisors also evaluate the new teachers. Campus leaders and faculty analyze the results to determine what improvements are needed and to track innovations. The deans of education share results with school and community partners, discussing what works and what might be needed.

State budget cuts have hit teacher training hard: at the end of 2012 academic year, the CSU produced less than half of the fully qualified teachers it did 10 years ago. The programs are impacted not only by CSU cuts, but by reductions in K-12 hiring across the state. Dr. Young showed a PowerPoint with several charts illustrating what first-year teachers and their

supervisors think about their training. She said results from the past eight years are consistently high. The overall survey assessment question has been answered by close to 25,000 teachers, and slightly fewer supervisors. The CSU analyzes the data by grade level, subject area, and by type and location. The extensive method of data collection and program evaluation is the model cited by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan as the exemplar he would like all programs to follow nationally. The student achievement data showed that teachers prepared by the CSU had greater positive effects on student learning across grades and across content areas. Each campus annually analyzes its own specific results, and then identifies targeted areas for improvement based on the findings and corroborated by other sources of data.

One of the newer areas of the evaluation is college readiness. High school English teachers started higher in this area and CSU teachers improve at a faster rate. Math teachers also are improving, but they have further to go, reflecting not only a greater need for improvement but also the challenge of math in California high schools. California is only one of a small number of states that requires just two years of math for high school graduation; three years are required for CSU admission. When the teacher data is compiled across every CSU campus and the results are analyzed, they found that teachers who are professionally prepared at the CSU but completed their undergraduate degree elsewhere do well - 87 percent felt prepared for both skills and knowledge. However those who completed their full preparation at a CSU and matriculated from undergraduate to a professional preparation at a CSU campus did even better at 91 percent.

Trustee Peter Mehas, speaking as a former K-12 superintendent, complimented the CSU deans and presidents for reaching out to the teachers' employers and asking them to be candid about the teachers the CSU was turning out. It began a relationship with the K-12 schools that is very valuable, he said, adding that the relationship extends to working with the schools on the Early Assessment Program. The CSI is developing and putting out a better quality teacher, he noted.

Trustee Glazer was heartened to see the progress being made but asked about a recent national study on teacher preparation released by the National Council on Teacher Quality that was quite critical of teacher preparation. He asked about the metrics and standards used to make that judgment and if anything from that study might point to some blind spots in the work that the CSU doing to train and assess teachers. Dr. Young said the CSU, like 97 percent of the university preparation programs in the country, did not voluntarily participate in the study. She and others met with the council, pointing out some problems with their standards but the council did not respond, so former Chancellor Reed joined with other higher education systems and did not participate. When their report came out, many people across the country wrote about errors in the study. Dr. Young said the campuses did not find anything of great value in the study, primarily because it was filled with errors. Additionally, they did not publish all of their standards, nor how they rated many of the standards. Campuses did learn from the process of discussing the standings and looking at other sources of data from CSU programs. She said the faculty and deans continue to feel good about the quality of CSU teachers, even with the challenges of being a K-12 teacher in California with the struggle over test scores, the highest

percentage of English language learners in the country, many children in poverty, migrant children and a high rate of special needs children.

Trustee Bill Hauck asked what percentage of new teachers in the first two years remain as teachers. Dr. Young said the CSU always has had a strong retention rate, partly because of the good job of preparation, and partly because California has one of the best support and induction programs for new teachers. At the height of the CSU evaluation study, 95-96 percent of CSU graduates were employed in the schools one year out from graduation. Five years later, 80 percent were, almost double the rest of the country. She did not have the current retention rate because only 77 percent of the CSU teachers were hired. CSU graduates were unable to find jobs because of the economy, plus the districts around the state sent out 20,000 layoff notices, so some teachers may have lost jobs, meaning it was not their choice to remain in the profession. She said she would get the current rate to him.

Trustee Monville asked about the correlation of the increased success rate of teacher preparation to any improvement in student test scores. Dr. Young said a study the CSU compiled six years of data from the eight largest districts in California and found that students achieved at a higher rate if their teachers came from the CSU. One difficulty with current testing is that only certain grades are tested. Most high school subjects do not use standardized tests and some elementary grades are not tested. Other problems include changing to the new state system with the Common Core assessment, and reliable findings requiring testing over time, not just one year. Trustee Vargas asked about the changes with the Common Core standards and teacher training. Dr. Young said that they have known about the coming changes so CSU faculty have been proactive and have already preparing students for the changes. Teachers starting in CSU programs now and those who graduated last year already are being trained in the new standards, frameworks, material and the means of assessment. They are also working with county offices and Department of Education in professional development for current teachers.

Governor Brown asked about the financial connection between local CSU campuses and school districts. Dr. Young said the CSU does not have any financial connections, only partnerships with districts and county offices because teacher preparation, by definition, is a one-year post-baccalaureate program and by definition half of it is filled with placements of student teachers in the classroom and the financial decisions of districts does not affect that. The governor also had some concern about the "endless quest" to get more data, referring to the national report that Trustee Glazer had mentioned. He said there is a testing mania in Washington and Sacramento, adding that not everything is worth measuring and not everything that can be measured is worth measuring, quoting Einstein. He said what goes on in the classrooms between students and teachers is the best measure of CSU program success.

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

Chris Mallon, assistant vice chancellor for academic programs and faculty development, presented a change to the academic plan at Cal State Dominguez Hills for a new degree bachelor

of science in earth science. Cal State Dominguez Hills President Willie Hagan said it has strong demand from students**. (REP 09-13-05)**

Trustee Achtenberg adjourned the committee on educational policy.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Update on the Early Assessment Program**

**Presentation by**

Ephraim Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Beverly Young
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Teacher Education and Public School Programs

Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Research and Resources


**The Early Assessment Program**

The Early Assessment Program (EAP) is the California State University's (CSU) flagship initiative for improving the preparation of high school students for college. The program was established to provide opportunities for students to measure their readiness for college-level English and mathematics in their junior year of high school, and to facilitate opportunities for them to improve their skills during their senior year. The EAP goal is to have California high school graduates enter the CSU fully prepared to begin college-level study. In English, the CSU has developed the Expository Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) for seniors to improve their ability to read and write at the college level. In math, the CSU has implemented the Strengthening Mathematics Instruction (SMI) program to help secondary math teachers improve their skills in teaching algebra through calculus classes. The CSU also continues to offer advanced professional development to thousands of California high school teachers in both English and mathematics.


**Early Assessment Results**

The number of 11$^{th}$-graders ready for college-level English and math continues to increase since the voluntary test was launched in 2006. Nearly 39,000 more students are demonstrating proficiency in English than when EAP testing was first instituted. The number of high school juniors who are ready for college-level math has nearly doubled in that same span.

With eight years (2006-2013) of complete testing data available (see the table at the end of this report), key findings include:

- **The EAP participation rate** has increased by 10 percentage points with 82 percent of high school juniors taking the voluntary test. The number of students participating in the voluntary assessment has increased by 70,000 students to more than 387,000 statewide.

- **Readiness to take EAP Math**
  There has been a steady increase in the number of students taking Algebra II, and in the number taking EAP math from almost 185,000 in 2006 to more than 250,000 in 2013. There probably is no state that has increased the numbers of high school students enrolled in, at least, Algebra II than California.

- **EAP Math**
  While the proficiency rate has increased by a modest 2 percentage points, the number of students ready for college-level math has increased from 16,120 to 30,781, an increase of 91 percent. This indicates that high school students were not just enrolling in more challenging mathematics courses; they have been demonstrating increased proficiency for college-level mathematics.

- **EAP English**
  Participation in EAP English has risen to 88 percent statewide. Proficiency rates increased to 23 percent, and there were 87,318 students demonstrating college readiness in 2013. The spring 2012 EAP English test included a new category, English Conditional. Conditionally ready students are deemed ready for college-level English if they successfully complete a full senior year in an Expository Reading and Writing Course, an Advanced Placement English class or the International Baccalaureate. The more than 56,000 high school seniors whose EAP scores show they were "conditionally ready" in spring 2013 now are able to use their senior year to become fully prepared in English.

## External Evaluation of the EAP

The EAP continues to generate national interest, and is regarded as the model for the nation's move to implementing college and career readiness assessment through high school standardized testing. Summaries of additional external evaluation results regarding the program's effectiveness in reducing the need for remediation, the program's impact on application and enrollment rates and its effectiveness in California's Community Colleges (CCC) will be presented at the meeting.

## Transition to California's New Assessment System

The EAP college readiness determination has been based on the 11th-grade assessment using the California Standards Test (CST), which has been suspended for the current academic year in

California. The state's assessment plan, which was proposed by State Superintendent Tom Torlakson, enacted in AB 484 (Bonilla), and signed into law by Governor Brown in October 2013, allows California students to participate in the field test of the new Smarter Balanced assessment system this year. Individual students, schools and districts will not receive assessment results from this field test.  This will allow a transition from the current CST system to the new Measurement of Academic Performance and Progress (MAPP) assessment system that is designed to be aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in both English Language Arts and mathematics.

While participation in the EAP has always been voluntary for individual students, this year it will be voluntary for districts and schools to offer the assessment opportunity to 11th-grade students. Districts that choose to do so will have the full assessment cost covered by the California Department of Education, and must order test materials by early December to test in spring 2014.

The CSU and the CCCs have taken a number of steps to maximize the continued opportunity for all students who wish to learn of their college readiness status before their high school senior year.  A summary of these steps and the current status of California districts planning to offer the test will be presented at the meeting.

## Detailed Longitudinal EAP Results

| CST/EAP Participation | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students taking CST | 440,205 | 461,682 | 465,986 | 466,353 | 469,457 | 473,094 | 470,349 | 468,583 |
| Number of students taking EAP | 317,056 | 346,038 | 356,169 | 369,465 | 380,837 | 384,871 | 386,324 | 387,405 |
| Participation Rate % | 72% | 75% | 76% | 79% | 81% | 81% | 82% | 83% |

| English | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of students taking English CST | 418,154 | 440,763 | 446,153 | 447,783 | 451,575 | 446,861 | 440,116 | 435,222 |
| # of student taking English EAP | 312,167 | 342,348 | 352,943 | 366,949 | 378,870 | 382,917 | 383,562 | 384,722 |
| Participation Rate | 75% | 78% | 79% | 82% | 84% | 86% | 87% | 88% |
| # of students ready | 48,072 | 55,206 | 60,392 | 59,381 | 77,826 | 85,506 | 86,939 | 87,318 |
| % College Ready | 15% | 16% | 17% | 16% | 21% | 22% | 23% | 23% |
| # of students conditionally ready |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58,468 | 56,552 |
| % College Conditional |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15% | 15% |
| # of students not ready | 264,095 | 282,775 | 288,599 | 303,998 | 297,630 | 293,760 | 237642 | 240367 |
| % Not Ready for College English | 85% | 83% | 82% | 83% | 79% | 77% | 62% | 62% |

| Math | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students Tested CST A2/SH | 184,709 | 201,827 | 209,873 | 220,321 | 231,357 | 239,913 | 246,277 | 253,004 |
| Students Tested EAP | 137,067 | 141,648 | 147,885 | 169,478 | 178,667 | 190,917 | 203,906 | 212,836 |
| Participation Rate % | 74% | 70% | 70% | 77% | 77% | 80% | 83% | 84% |
| # of students ready | 16,120 | 17,173 | 19,442 | 22,247 | 26,056 | 29,525 | 30,426 | 30,781 |
| % Ready | 12% | 12% | 13% | 13% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 14% |
| # of students conditionally | 58,822 | 60,697 | 62,660 | 74,467 | 75,502 | 81,849 | 92,831 | 97,378 |
| % Conditionally Ready | 43% | 43% | 42% | 44% | 42% | 43% | 46% | 46% |
| # of students not ready | 62,125 | 63,710 | 65,718 | 72,688 | 77,053 | 79,487 | 80,596 | 9,738 |
| % Not Ready | 45% | 45% | 44% | 43% | 43% | 42% | 40% | 5% |

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Update on SB 1440: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act**

**Presentation By**

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Eric Forbes
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Student Academic Support

Ken O'Donnell
Senior Director
Student Engagement and
Academic Initiatives & Partnerships

**Summary**

The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act calls for the California Community Colleges (CCC) and California State University (CSU) to create clear, efficient transfer pathways to the baccalaureate, requiring no more than 60 semester hours of credit for the two-year degree, and another 60 units after transfer to complete a bachelor's degree in a similar discipline.

Carrying out the new law entailed work on three fronts:

1. Working with faculty to create the transfer curriculum in popular majors
2. Managing enrollment and admissions intersegmentally, to prioritize transfer applicants who hold the new degrees
3. Communicating the benefits of the new program to students, counselors and the public

As of late September, CCC students could pursue any of more than 38,000 combinations of efficiently paired associate degrees and CSU baccalaureate programs. Each one follows a statewide Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) to ensure maximum access and portability.

In early October, Executive Vice Chancellor Smith directed CSU campuses, at their discretion, to identify additional matches to the already published TMCs. For example, a campus that has found its bachelor's degree in philosophy "similar" to the TMC in philosophy may now add other programs, such as religious studies, that also fit the major. The expanded use of "similar" designations should benefit students whose academic plans are less precise, and smaller departments where programs will not develop statewide TMCs.

The governor recently signed Senate Bill 440, which also is expected to add to the number of pathways available to students. It calls for the creation of transfer degrees in "areas of emphasis," such as social science, rather than specific majors such as psychology. It also codifies performance goals and timelines the two segments adopted during implementation.

Since the September trustees meeting, the CSU has completed its annual round of fall Counselor Conferences. Interest in the new program from students remains high. Representatives shared screen shots of a searchable online database that will make it easier for prospective students to learn which majors are available at specific campuses.

More than a thousand transfer students matriculated this past fall into the CSU holding Associate Degrees for Transfer, a tenfold increase above the same time last year.

### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**The California State University Institute for Palliative Care at California State University San Marcos**

**Presentation By**

Roberta Achtenberg
California State University Trustee

Karen S. Haynes
President
California State University San Marcos

Helen B. McNeal
Executive Director

**Summary**

In September of 2012, Trustee Roberta Achtenberg and President Karen Haynes shared plans for the launch of the California State University (CSU) Institute for Palliative Care at California State University San Marcos. In its first year, the institute has successfully launched programs, both face-to-face and online, to train more than 350 health care professionals and more than 780 community members about palliative care, while integrating palliative care content into 24 courses for undergraduates in disciplines including nursing, psychology, sociology and communicative and speech disorders. This item will provide an update on the institute's programmatic and financial progress the past year, and share plans for the initial replication of the institute's model at three other CSU campuses beginning in 2014.

**Background**

In 2011 and 2012, Trustee Achtenberg, President Haynes and a small group of experts in palliative care who volunteered their time, worked together to develop a plan for the creation of the CSU Institute for Palliative Care. This plan was presented to the Board of Trustees in September 2012. Thanks to funding from the Archstone Foundation and California HealthCare Foundation, the institute was launched on September 20, 2012, at its home campus, Cal State San Marcos.

Funded by grant dollars and projected to be self-supporting within five years, the institute is the first statewide initiative in the country to focus on palliative care workforce development and

community awareness. It was tasked to create a model program to educate current and future professionals and the community about palliative care. This model then will be available for replication at interested CSU campuses and other campuses around the country.

Palliative care, which focuses on quality of life and relief of suffering, whether physical, emotional, psychological or spiritual, is a complement to curative and life-sustaining treatment for those with chronic and serious illness. Research has demonstrated that it improves patient and family satisfaction with care, improves longevity and outcomes and reduces health care delivery costs. As such, it will be vitally important to California's aging population and to the state's health care systems, and will provide a critical skill that will distinguish health care professionals trained in the CSU system.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**The California State University Nursing Programs Update**

**Presentation By**

Christine Mallon
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

**Summary**

More than three million nurses serve this country's health care needs. Even more are needed, however, and their educational attainment will need to be elevated to meet the needs of the aging national population and the expanding health care system associated with the Affordable Care Act. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that by 2020 another 1.2 million new nurses will be needed to fill new and vacant nursing positions. California State University (CSU) nursing programs, now offered on 20 campuses, work to supply the need not just for registered nurses, but for the highly educated nursing workforce called for in *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health* report[1], issued by the independent nonprofit Institute of Medicine (IOM). That report set a national 2020 target for 80 percent of nurses to be trained to the baccalaureate level (up from 50 percent) and for twice as many nurses trained to the doctoral level than now. The IOM report also recommended instituting seamless educational pathways in which students can pursue advanced degrees that will prepare them to practice to the highest extent of their education and training.

**Seamless Pathways for Educating Highly Trained Nurses**

For more than 60 years, CSU nursing programs have contributed to the health care workforce. With programs on all but three campuses, CSU nursing programs now include bachelors; bachelor's degree-completion ("ADN/RN to BSN"); second baccalaureate; masters; entry-level masters (for non-nursing bachelors); and, as of fall 2012, doctor of nursing practice (DNP) degree programs. In 2011-2012, the CSU conferred 3,284 nursing degrees, producing 2,575 bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) graduates and 709 master of science in nursing (MSN) graduates (see Table 1).

The CSU's nursing programs respond to demands from state and national governments, accreditors, licensure board and the health care employment sector, all of which point to better

---

[1] http://www.iom.edu/Reports/2010/The-Future-of-Nursing-Leading-Change-Advancing-Health.aspx

patient outcomes associated with more highly educated nurses. In answer to the IOM report and in fulfillment of Education Code section 89267.5, the CSU and the California Community Colleges (CCC) developed seamless, articulated pathways between associate degree in nursing (ADN) programs and bachelor of science in nursing (BSN) programs to increase the state's number of bachelor's trained nurses. ADN-to-BSN programs achieve some cost savings for the CSU because the majority of the expensive pre-licensure clinical training is carried out at CCCs. In response to Education Code section 66055.5, CSU faculty and nursing directors developed a systemwide set of nursing program prerequisites to make admission and degree completion more simple and consistent across the state. Community college adoption of the CSU prerequisites would further achieve the kind of seamless pathway recommended in the IOM report. A CSU ADN-to-BSN Nursing Degree Pathways website (http://www.calstate.edu/adn-bsn/) lists advising roadmaps and program prerequisites for ADN graduates wishing to complete a CSU BSN degree.

| CSU ADN-to-BSN Nursing Degree Pathways | Systemwide CSU Nursing Prerequisites |
|---|---|
|  | **Nursing Program Prerequisite Courses** <br> 1. Oral communication <br> 2. Written communication <br> 3. Critical thinking <br> 4. Chemistry (general, integrated, inorganic or organic)-with or without lab, as it is taught on the campus where the course was taken <br> 5. Human anatomy (with required lab) <br> 6. Human physiology (with required lab) <br> 7. Microbiology (with required lab) <br> 8. Statistics |

**Nursing Faculty Shortage**

CSU nursing enrollments have fluctuated with the economy since 2008-2009. CSU BSN programs appear to be recovering from an earlier downturn. While MSN programs have slowed the rate of decline, the CSU is still waiting for enrollments to recover (see Table 2). As with nursing programs nationally, the CSU cannot fully satisfy nursing enrollment demands and must turn away qualified nursing applicants every year. In the last admission cycle for example, CSU Chico was unable to admit 86 percent of its fully qualified nursing applicants for fall 2013 and CSU San Marcos turned away nearly 89 percent. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing reported that "The primary barriers to accepting all qualified students at nursing colleges and universities continue to be a shortage of faculty (60.7 percent) and an insufficient number of

clinical placement sites (61 percent)."[2] Illustrating the widespread problem, a survey by the association indicated that only 27.5 percent of responding institutions reported that they had no need for additional full-time faculty in 2012-2013.

Hiring and retaining nursing faculty is a challenge because of availability, cost and salary competition with other employment sectors. Nurses with advanced degrees can earn more lucrative salaries in clinical practice or administration than is common for college or university faculty positions. As the current faculty ages and moves toward retirement, what has been termed a "nursing faculty crisis" will only increase. A 2010 report by the National League of Nursing and the Carnegie Foundation Preparation for the Professions Program indicated that 48 percent of nurse educators were (at that time) 55 years old or older[3]. And while historically, an insufficient production of new nursing Ph.D.s further limited the pool of available faculty, there is a growing interest in doctor of nursing practice (DNP) programs. This has inspired greater enrollments in research-based doctoral programs, including Ph.D. and doctor of nursing science (DNS, DNSc). This trend, along with the two new CSU research-infused DNP programs in the southern and northern regions will likely increase the production of future nursing faculty, so needed in California to meet the tremendous student demand for nursing education programs. The two DNP programs provide the culminating degree in the seamless pathway that begins with the community college ADN programs.

The CSU must plan now to address the two principle barriers to expanding nursing education: a shortage of faculty and an insufficient number of clinical placements. When the production of doctorate-trained nurse educators increases the pool of available faculty, the CSU will need to be poised to invest in this critically needed resource. As a greater number of nursing faculty are recruited and hired to teach, CSU schools and colleges of nursing will need to hire more coordinators of clinical placements and will, in some cases, be asked to pay health care institutions for clinical training. To respond to state and national healthcare workforce needs, funding to overcome these two barriers should be a priority consideration in future years' budget requests.

---

[2] http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Media/NewsReleases/2009/StudentEnrollment.html
[3] http://www.nln.org/governmentaffairs/pdf/nursefacultyshortage.pdf

**Table 1**

**2011-2012 CSU Nursing Degrees Granted**

| Master of Science in Nursing | | | | Bachelor of Science in Nursing | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Campus** | **MSN Post-RN** | **MSN Pre-RN** | **Total** | **Campus** | **BSN Post-RN** | **BSN Pre-RN** | **Total** |
| Bakersfield | | - | - | Bakersfield | - | 95 | 95 |
| Channel Islands | - | - | - | Channel Islands | 14 | 35 | 49 |
| Chico | 4 | - | 4 | Chico | 19 | 99 | 118 |
| Dominguez Hills | - | 162 | 162 | Dominguez Hills | - | 224 | 224 |
| East Bay | - | - | - | East Bay | - | 186 | 186 |
| Fresno | 35 | 28 | 63 | Fresno | 145 | 5 | 150 |
| Fullerton | 92 | 23 | 115 | Fullerton | 103 | 45 | 148 |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | Humboldt | - | 57 | 57 |
| Long Beach | 58 | 11 | 69 | Long Beach | 34 | 181 | 215 |
| Los Angeles | 59 | 17 | 76 | Los Angeles | 76 | 86 | 162 |
| Monterey Bay | - | - | - | Monterey Bay* | - | - | - |
| Northridge | - | - | - | Northridge | 32 | 32 | 64 |
| Sacramento | 24 | 4 | 28 | Sacramento | 41 | 135 | 176 |
| San Bernardino | 7 | - | 7 | San Bernardino | 12 | 129 | 141 |
| San Diego | 42 | - | 42 | San Diego | 22 | 202 | 224 |
| San Francisco | 42 | 10 | 52 | San Francisco | 25 | 101 | 126 |
| San Jose | 15 | - | 15 | San Jose | 1 | 170 | 171 |
| San Marcos | - | - | - | San Marcos | 8 | 128 | 136 |
| Sonoma | 46 | 22 | 68 | Sonoma | 28 | 22 | 50 |
| Stanislaus | 8 | - | 8 | Stanislaus | 25 | 58 | 83 |
| **Grand Total** | **432** | **277** | **709** | **Grand Total** | **585** | **1,990** | **2,575** |

*Monterey Bay has implemented a post-RN bachelor's program but did not have graduates in 2011-2012.

**Table 2**

**Full-Time Equivalent Nursing Enrollments**
**California State University**

|  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **BSN** | 4,190.0 | 4,355.7 | 5,185.6 | 5,828.6 | 5,250.2 | 4,893.0 | 5,065.6 |
| **MSN** | 1,006.5 | 1,473.5 | 1,659.2 | 1,765.1 | 1,733.9 | 1,489.8 | 1,413.3 |

*Data as of January 10, 2013.*

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

**Outstanding Faculty Website**

**Presentation By**

Ephraim Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Diana Guerin
Chair
Academic Senate, CSU

Marge Grey
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Communications

**Background**

The California State University (CSU) Outstanding Faculty website is intended to recommence a Board of Trustees tradition that recognizes the contributions of faculty who advance the CSU mission. From 1963-1964 through 1994-1995, the trustees, utilizing funds from the Joseph M. Schenck Foundation of Los Angeles, sponsored a program to select Outstanding Professors from the system's campuses. Two faculty were designated each year, with awards of $4,000 each. This award was discontinued after 1994-1995.

In fall 1998, Trustee Stanley T. Wang provided $1 million to reward outstanding faculty and administrators. During a 10 year-period, four faculty and one administrator throughout the CSU system received $20,000 awards each year. The Wang Family Excellence Awards were last awarded in 2008.

The new Outstanding Faculty website recognizes faculty who excel in (1) teaching; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and/or (3) service. Consistent with a resolution passed by the Academic Senate in 1994, the website recognizes outstanding faculty from each of the 23 institutions in the system. The website currently showcases 56 distinguished faculty members from 14 campuses that submitted information last summer. Within the month, the site will be updated with profiles of 23 additional outstanding faculty from five campuses submitted this fall.

Publicizing these faculty and their contributions communicates to prospective students and their parents, policymakers, donors and other external audiences the distinguished faculty who comprise the CSU. Featuring faculty who are successful in their careers may assist in the recruitment of other high-quality faculty who are committed to quality public higher education.