

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 1:00 p.m., Wednesday, November 12, 2014
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Talar Alexanian
Rebecca D. Eisen
Douglas Faigin
Lupe C. Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
Lillian Kimbell
J. Lawrence Norton
Steven G. Stepanek

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 9 - 10, 2014

Discussion

1. Associate Degrees for Transfer: SB 1440 Update, *Information*
2. The California State University Graduation Initiative Update, *Information*
3. Student Success and Completion Initiatives, *Information*
4. Preparing Educators for the Common Core State Standards, *Information*

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

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

September 9-10, 2014

Members Present

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Talar Alexanian
Rebecca D. Eisen
Douglas Faigin
Lupe Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
Lillian Kimbell
Lou Monville, Chair of the Board
Steven G. Stepanek
Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Trustee Farar called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of July 22, 2014, were approved as submitted.

The Alliance to Accelerate Excellence in Education at California State University San Marcos

Dr. Karen Haynes, president, California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) introduced the Alliance to Accelerate Excellence in Education initiative that officially launched in July 2013 with financial support from the Price Family Charitable Fund and the David T. and Doris E. Staples Foundation. Also known as "the Alliance," the program provides strategic direction for and administrative oversight of the university's 10 guaranteed admission programs with local school districts spanning both San Diego and Riverside Counties. Noting the potential for scalability and replication of CSUSM's unique model, President Haynes said in its inaugural year, the Alliance created the foundation upon which to build a seamless step-by-step framework for students, families, teachers, faculty and community service providers to work together on improving college readiness and closing the achievement gap for the region's most educationally at-risk students. Dr. Patricia Prado-Olmos, director of the Alliance, presented a PowerPoint highlighting key statistics of the Alliance partner programs successes since the program's first guaranteed admission agreement with the San Marcos Unified School District (SMUSD) in

2006. Since the initial agreement, nine other districts in the region have signed partner memoranda of understanding (MOUs) serving a total regional student population of approximately 195,187 students. Dr. Prado-Olmos outlined the first-year priorities which included infrastructure, growth, outreach events and refinement of key Alliance action initiatives and projects. She briefly explained the Alliance's five focus areas that support the promise of guaranteed admission: (1) Family Empowerment Network; (2) Undergraduate Fellowships; (3) Professional Development Collaborative; (4) Student Enrichment; and (5) Assessment, Analysis and Accountability. These programs were developed from CSUSM's strong and long established community partnerships and relationships and built from existing community and school research-based practices in college readiness and preparation, she said.

Dr. Prado-Olmos noted that steady enrollment of students admitted through guaranteed admission MOUs from the 10 Alliance partner school districts has continued with an overall increase in enrollment from partner districts to CSUSM occurring as well. Citing academic performance data to date, she said the data indicates that Alliance students typically enter CSUSM with higher high school GPAs, have higher standardized test scores, are better prepared for college, do not need remediation in any academic area, sustain higher academic performance in college and are more likely to stay in college than the general student population. Dr. Prado-Olmos said an important contributing factor to their success is that the Alliance is focused on understanding the success of their students, identifying the high-impact practices that support their success and working in partnership with regional school districts and business partners to use high-impact practices strategically and effectively for the success of all students. President Haynes reaffirmed the importance and impact of model programs such as the Alliance and stressed why the continued work to scale and replicate similar models throughout the CSU continues to be of utmost importance.

Chair Lou Monville expressed his gratitude for both the presentation and the work being done in the Alliance mentioning he has followed the progress of the program and asked them to highlight some best practices in better preparing students to attend college that could be scaled in other regions. President Haynes noted that Alliance students are entering college without needing any remediation which makes an impact in their first-year success. Also, she mentioned the importance of early conversations in the MOU process with partner K-12 school districts working to focus on aligning efforts to ensure students not only graduate high school but are truly college ready. Trustee Margaret Fortune asked about school districts raising money for scholarships for Alliance students and what that development model looked like. President Haynes said that it varies by district but with the continued success of the program, outreach and development efforts will continue to improve. Trustee Rebecca Eisen inquired about the potential for replication and scalability throughout the CSU. President Haynes noted that the initial Alliance MOU with the SMUSD was in fact a replication of the Sweetwater School District MOU with San Diego State University. Modifying the agreement based on the region and their specific student population coupled with broad consultation and collaboration early on contributed to the success of the initial pilot MOU that then served as the model for future partner districts.

The Graduation Initiative: Completion and Student-Athletes

Ken O'Donnell, senior director for student engagement and academic initiatives and partnerships, introduced the information item providing a context for athletics embedded in the broader student experience. The item was prompted by inquiries from trustees at the July board meeting regarding graduation rates of California State University (CSU) National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I student-athletes compared to the graduation rates of the overall CSU student population. Mr. O'Donnell pointed out the numerous contributions beyond athletic competition that benefit all students in the university setting including life lessons of resiliency and teamwork, inspiring and emulating the drive to win tempered with an appropriate response to losing constructively, and the cohering effects of an integrated, shared sense of school pride in athletics that transcend often hierarchical, compartmentalized institutional structures. These important life lessons taken from the field and imbued in the classroom and campus have far reaching implications on the broader campus culture creating more coherence, engagement and integration that can contribute to student success, he said. Given this context, he also cautioned that straight apples-to-apples comparisons of student-athletes to the overall student population's graduation rates poses some challenges due to differing methodologies to calculate these rates. However, he noted that on average Division I CSU student-athletes perform better than the broader student population. Citing 2006 cohort data, the six-year Federal Graduation Rate (FGR) for CSU Division I athletes was 59 percent compared to 52 percent for CSU first-time freshman based on the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data. This trend was also consistent among Division II campuses with student-athletes slightly outperforming the first-time freshman graduation rates. He reported that these trends confirmed principles embedded in the work of systemwide initiatives already underway, such as the Graduation Initiative, where students benefit from built-in peer support networks and cohering connections to campus life that make a difference. He added that even financial aid can work better when it is presented as a two-way street - when students understand there is an expectation of something from them in return.

CSU Bakersfield President Horace Mitchell, who also serves on the NCAA Division I Board of Directors, explained the Academic Performance Program (APP) established by the NCAA over a decade ago to ensure that member institutions are dedicated to providing student-athletes with an exemplary educational and intercollegiate athletics experience in an environment that recognizes and supports the primacy of their academic mission, while enhancing the ability of student-athletes to earn a degree. He clarified that the NCAA has created an academic point of access to postseason competition for all teams, based on a benchmark of academic performance using the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR), a term-by-term measure of eligibility, retention and graduation for student-athletes who have received institutional financial aid based, to any degree, on their athletic participation. The NCAA uses the APR to hold Division I institutions accountable for the academic progress of their student athletes. President Mitchell explained that teams must have a four-year rolling class average minimum score of 930 (out of a possible 1000) to participate in post-season championships. He reported that the overall average

APR for Division I CSU campuses of 967 exceeds the average for all other comprehensive universities in the nation (967 vs. 965). This finding demonstrates that athletic aid, the socializing benefits of group interaction, intrusive advising and peer support help improve overall student retention and persistence, he said. To the point of holding CSU athletic directors (ADs) accountable for student-athlete retention, success and graduation, President Mitchell referenced Section 4.01 from the CSU standard template for MPP coach and AD contracts that expressly outlines standards and guidelines for ADs and coaches with regards to student-academic performance.

Student Trustee Talar Alexanian asked about demographic data of CSU student-athletes and whether there was also an achievement gap among this group. Ray Murillo, director of student programs, said NCAA reports academic success rates as well as graduate success rates broken down by both sport and ethnicity. The NCAA also reports nationally on student-athlete demographic data and does recognize that achievement gaps do exist. This report did not include demographic data for CSU student-athletes but the analysis could be conducted to determine if and where achievement gaps exist among student-athletes, he said. Trustee Lupe Garcia asked about the average Grade Point Average (GPA) of graduating student-athletes in comparison to the broader student population. Mr. O'Donnell explained again that the APR encompasses student progress on a term-by-term basis taking into account not only grades, but also if students are taking the appropriate classes to progress to degree with a minimum 2.0 GPA in order to maintain athletic eligibility. Chancellor Timothy White commented that there is a positive ripple effect of intercollegiate athletics at every level on a campus, and although it may be challenging to quantify and measure those exact effects on academic success, there is a broader student community involved in the support of athletics from business majors involved in marketing and public relations to sports entertainment majors working in venue logistics and interacting with large media partners such as ESPN and ABC. These expanded high-impact practices that relate to athletics as a whole on campuses provide opportunities for building on student success and achievement for all CSU students.

eAdvising Update

Nathan Evans, director of enrollment management, presented the information item stating that over the past year through systemwide efforts surrounding the CSU Graduation Initiative, the CSU Chancellor's Office engaged campuses in shared investments in technologies to further support student success through strong academic advising and clear roadmaps to graduation. Mr. Evans explained that the term eAdvising covers a broad range of software and tools which utilize course, class schedule, and outcomes data available across campuses. He noted that other higher education systems, such as Austin Peay State University in Tennessee, Georgia State University and Arizona State University, have also been recognized recently for their investments in this arena. As part of the ongoing Enrollment Bottlenecks Solution Initiative, last year the CSU began targeting investment in technology which supports academic advising and guidance toward degree completion. All 23 CSU campuses developed four-year plans to implement new technologies for students, faculty and staff to provide clear pathways to graduation, track

progress to degree and offer a course schedule in line with student demand for courses necessary for graduation. He added that for the first year, the campuses were grouped into cohorts based on their common goals, readiness and strategies related to the current status of their degree audit system. In year two, campuses identified technology-based tools and solutions which would continue to expand access to guided academic planning. With increased use of these tools, measurements of average unit load per term, average units completed at graduation and other outcomes will allow for assessment of the use of these strategies and solutions as they directly relate to student success and reduced time to degree, he said.

Using an analogy, he compared paper maps to the advent of GPS systems providing real-time, updated information to help better navigate potential roadblocks in route to a destination. He highlighted the way universities are moving away from one-dimensional, static advising tools to more technology-driven solutions to help students successfully navigate their pathway to a degree. He outlined five key tools campuses are using to provide students with effective advising solutions that include: 1) computer-generated degree audit systems capable of providing interactive online degree audits to both students and advisers; 2) academic planners that convey the most efficient per-term enrollment recommendations based on a student's record; 3) class scheduling software that provides students and advisers with every possible schedule option that has seats available and is open for registration given the times the student indicates they are available; 4) early warning and case management tools that allow academic advisers and others on campus the ability to manage and track student progress; and 5) predictive analytic tools that aggregate information about course outcomes, academic roadmaps, and other student success markers to identify effective academic strategies and opportunities. While campuses are just beginning their second year of renewed investment in eAdvising, taken in aggregate, these tools provide each audience with effective, accurate, real-time information and interventions that can greatly impact student success.

Student Trustee Talar Alexanian commented on the importance of academic advising in the student experience and expressed appreciation to the campuses for making the investment in not only the eAdvising technology but complimentary initiatives that help students successfully graduate in a timely manner. Chair Lou Monville asked if there are efforts underway or in the works regarding advising tools and potential shared solutions with the community colleges to provide more seamless pathways for transfer students to the CSU. Mr. Evans said that the CSU has been engaged with the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office sharing best practices from some of the CSU campuses that have adopted new eAdvising technologies and also conversations have expanded to include partnerships in K-12 as well.

California State University Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) Update

Dr. Beverly Young, assistant vice chancellor for teacher education and public school programs, presented an update on the California State University (CSU) Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) stating the programs have been highly successful since the CSU was authorized to offer the Ed.D. through Senate Bill 724 in 2005. She said the programs are designed to serve students who

are working as full-time education professionals, equipping them with the knowledge and skills to effectively lead California's public schools, districts and community colleges. Currently, Ed.D. programs are offered by 14 CSU campuses that served approximately 740 students in 2013. All 14 programs offer a specialization in PreK-grade 12 (P-12) leadership, and nine also offer community college leadership programs. She said the curriculum emphasizes practice-relevant issues and challenges with topics addressing the most current state reforms, including, for example, the new standards in literacy, math, and science, Linked Learning school environments, transitional kindergarten, college readiness, technology innovations, and other topics that emerge almost daily. Dr. Young noted that the Ed.D. program directors are currently working with the chair of the State Board of Education, Dr. Michael Kirst, to establish a network of doctoral students focused on examining the effectiveness of the state's transition to the Common Core learning environment.

Citing program data, she said the CSU has one of the most diverse graduate student groups in the nation with 34 percent Latino and 16 percent African-American in the current cohort. In addition, course assignments and dissertation research topics focus on advancing success among the state's diverse learners and on overcoming persistent achievement gaps. Graduates of the Ed.D. program include a diverse, accomplished group of education leaders that are superintendents of six large, urban school districts, Administrators of the Year, Principals of the Year, Men and Women in School Leadership Awardees, elected members of Community College League of California, and also include the current Mayor of Long Beach, Robert Garcia. To date, the Ed.D. programs have graduated over 600 students, with an impressive 92.5 percent completion rate with the majority of students completing these rigorous programs in three years and with degree-related employment of over 96 percent. Dr. Young noted that these success rates rank at the very top among doctoral programs nationally. She concluded by highlighting the CSU Ed.D. programs' recognition as a national model with the largest number of campuses in the nation in the prestigious, invitation-only Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. Some of the state's major philanthropic foundations have also recognized the quality of the CSU Ed.D. program including the S.D. Bechtel, Jr., the James Irvine, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation that have all established dissertation fellowships for CSU Ed.D. students, the only such doctoral fellowships in the nation.

Trustee Debra Farar expressed her appreciation and commended the work being done throughout the CSU Ed.D. programs and remarked that these programs were of personal interest to her as she recalled the initial challenge to get education doctoral programs approved in the CSU. President Mildred Garcia publicly thanked the dean, faculty, and students in the Ed.D. program at CSU Fullerton for their exceptional scholarship, research and contributions to both the Ed.D. program and broader community, particularly research in programs serving low-income, minority students.

Trustee Farar adjourned the Committee on Educational Policy.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Associate Degrees for Transfer: SB 1440 Update

Presentation By

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

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

Summary

The trustees have asked California State University (CSU) staff for regular updates on implementation of the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act ("SB 1440"), which led to the creation of Associate Degrees for Transfer, beginning in 2011.

All community colleges now offer Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) with more programs added each month based on those templates that have been created for the most popular transfer majors. Students can complete an ADT in 60 semester units, then transfer to the CSU and complete a baccalaureate degree in the same subject within no more than 60 additional semester units.

Nearly all CSUs have accommodated the ADT patterns for which they offer bachelor's degrees. Those subject areas or options that have been deemed similar are typically those with fewer course requirements or in less specialized concentrations. It is expected that these will also prove to be the ones students want to pursue, but the match of supply and demand will be monitored continually going forward.

The latest reporting period saw two developments in transfer curriculum. First, faculty have been creating "area of emphasis" pathways, which would provide community college students with less focused associate degrees that could prepare for transfer to a wider range of baccalaureate programs. Community college degree templates in health sciences and diversity studies are the likely first two areas.

Second, some faculty groups have been meeting voluntarily to create transfer curriculum pathways in subjects that were not covered by the original law. Engineering disciplines, often offered at above 120 semester units, may be close to creating a transfer degree template in engineering. The board will be kept apprised of both of these developments.

In terms of enrollment, the “degree with a guarantee” approach to transfer continues to gain in popularity. This fall the CSU admitted several thousand students who held ADTs, a significant increase over the previous year. At this point in the law’s implementation, the majority of pathways are still less than two years old, making this transfer group an exceptional population – as such the behavior of these early adopters may not be the best indicators of future patterns.

At its last meeting, the board requested CSU staff to chart out the anticipated growth of SB 1440 transfers to determine the impact to the CSU in the years ahead. Since the Education Code charges the CSU with the responsibility of maintaining a relatively stable 60/40 enrollment pattern (upper division/lower division classes) and requires the CSU to balance the admission of transfers with the admission of first-time freshmen, the impact of this transfer pathway will only be felt on the CSU’s capacity to admit transfer students. As the admission of SB 1440 students have priority over the admission of upper-division community college transfers as well as from other private and public four-year institutions, there could be a significant change in the *composition* of future entering transfer classes. For fall 2014, for example, 22 percent of the entering transfer cohort at CSU Fullerton is comprised of students holding ADTs.

In the time since that meeting, staff in the Chancellor’s Office have discussed this possibility and attempted to create the kind of quantitative case the board requested to demonstrate when transfer students could potentially absorb all of the system’s capacity. For several reasons, staff have been unable to prepare such scenarios:

1. The current, “early adopter” population of ADT holders is too anomalous to support a case built on extrapolation.
2. So far, the students who do hold ADTs appear to have been planning to transfer even without them. In other words, the new degrees have not led to a growth in the transfer population, so much as the replacement of one kind of transfer student with another.
3. Historically, the CSU’s balance between freshmen and transfer admission has fluctuated within a very narrow range, typically around 50 percent of each. In recent years, the biggest influence on the ratio has been not student interest but state support: the public budget cycle is out of phase with admission calendars, and campuses use the transfer-heavy spring terms to restrict or expand enrollment to hit their targets.

However, the board's point about admission priority and its theoretical implications is well taken and the CSU will continue to monitor its enrollment balance as participation in the program grows.

From the available early evidence, the new Associate Degree for Transfer program is unlikely to materially change the overall mix of transfer students in the CSU who enter from community colleges or from other colleges or universities. Nor will there likely be a growth in the total number of transfer students. By definition, these ADT students have completed their lower-division curriculum and are better prepared than other transfers to complete the remaining 60 units in their degree programs. Similar to the effects of transfer impaction, the academic preparation of these students should prove to be a sound protection of the CSU's capacity to receive additional transfer students in the years ahead. Consequently, the growth in admission of ADT students resulting in a natural reduction in the admission of other transfer students is a significant opportunity. With our colleagues in the community colleges, the CSU is committed to continue to attract students to these programs and anticipates that the system transfer ratio may reach upwards of 30 percent or more.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The California State University Graduation Initiative Update

Presentation By

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Ed Sullivan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Research and Resources

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

Summary

The first phase of the California State University (CSU) Graduation Initiative began in 2009 with a commitment to raise overall six-year graduation rates by eight percentage points, and to cut in half the difference in those rates between Under-Represented Minorities (URMs) and other students. (For the purpose of this initiative, URM students are African-American, Latino, and Native American.)

The six-year timeframe will end with commencement in spring 2015, and the Graduation Initiative will report to the board next fall on the official, final tally. In the meantime, available evidence suggests the CSU will achieve the first goal of dramatically raising the overall rates, but without reaching the second goal of closing the gaps. Because all student groups are now performing better by approximately equal intervals, the difference in graduation rates has stayed the same.

With the first phase nearing completion, the chancellor challenged the system in January of this year to redouble its efforts, especially with respect to closing achievement gaps. The new goals define gaps in both ethnic and socioeconomic terms, add targets for four-year as well as six-year graduation rates, and include transfer students as well as freshmen. The target graduation date is 2025, keyed to a seminal finding by the Public Policy Institute of California. It concluded that California will face a shortfall of a million degree holders by 2025 unless the state can undertake

dramatic changes all along the educational pipeline. The new systemwide goals, if met, will close the CSU's share of the shortfall.

This October the chancellor convened a systemwide summit on the Graduation Initiative, to launch its 2025 phase. Attending from each campus were the president, provost, vice president of student affairs, and faculty senate chair. The meeting had two purposes:

1. To establish specific 2025 targets for each of the 23 campuses. Researchers at Education Trust prepared a written analysis for each university, taking into account performance by peer institutions, the university's own historical trajectory, and the system-level goals to which the CSU was already committed.
2. To launch the CSU Student Success Dashboard. Participants used it in real time to work with the targets derived by Education Trust, compare them to displays of their own historical and projected campus data, and develop a sense of how hard each of the six goals will be to reach.

National research into student success emphasizes that the real differences come from institutional culture rather than any single policy or intervention. Fostering such a culture seems to rely mostly on a sustained, very long-term focus, and ready access to meaningful and timely data about student performance and persistence.

For the rest of its initial phase and through 2025, progress on the Graduation Initiative will be labor-intensive, and subject to short-term setbacks from economic and demographic swings. But the pivot from the first phase into the next during this reporting period positions the initiative well for continued success.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Student Success and Completion Initiatives

Presentation By

Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

President Joseph Sheley
CSU Stanislaus

President Leroy Morishita
CSU East Bay

President Mildred García
CSU Fullerton

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

Summary

During the report from the Committee on Finance at its September meeting, the board asked Chancellor's Office staff to describe how the California State University (CSU) evaluates spending on student success and completion initiatives, looking in particular for more detail on the \$38 million allocation in the 2015-2016 support budget request. The evaluation of efforts funded by this allocation is especially appropriate in the context of other urgent spending priorities, including deferred maintenance, consistent compensation increases, and continued enrollment demand.

The 2015-2016 budget requests the following student success priorities totaling \$38 million:

- Faculty Hiring \$11 million
- High-Impact Practices for Student Retention \$9 million
- Improved Advising \$7 million
- Student Preparation \$5 million
- Data-Driven Decision Making \$4.5 million
- Course Design \$1.5 million

This funding will allow the CSU to allocate much needed resources to restore critical measures of student success that move the CSU closer to meeting each of our state mandated performance measure goals, as well as our own Graduation Initiative 2025 goals, most importantly, shrinking and closing the achievement gap for under-represented and low-income students.

Spending on initiatives and programs that increase student success and completion is vital to the university's overall success in graduating a prepared workforce for California. The CSU cannot just admit more students in order to produce more graduates. We must also provide the best possible support to our current students so that they can make continued and efficient progress toward degree.

In his January State of the CSU address, Chancellor Timothy White committed the CSU to a focus on student success initiatives through the prospect of restored state funding. He said:

“With the pressure of these demands [from record-high applications for admission, and the state's growing demand for educated workers], we cannot simply replace what we had in the past... we must redesign with a new focus on our greatest areas of need.

“And that doesn't mean rebuilding in the sense of replacing old broken windows lost with the economic storm with identical new ones. It means re-designing and revitalizing the core of our mission.

“Our top priority must be to firm up our fiscal and policy commitments to access, persistence to degree, and degree completion – to improve the educational experience and degree attainment for all students, and to enable students to earn a high-quality degree in a shorter amount of time.”

The chancellor made another critical observation at the September board meeting as trustees asked how the CSU is evaluating the effectiveness – and cost effectiveness – of this emphasis on student success. As the chancellor observed, many of these systemwide and campus-based programs are in their first year, and although details of how the evaluation will be structured are known, it may be too early to provide hard evidence of efficacy to the board at this time.

However, early evidence of the value of high-impact practices is promising. Researchers in the CSU and elsewhere have used the National Survey of Student Engagement to identify strong correlations between participation in high-impact practices and positive educational outcomes such as deeper learning, improved persistence and graduation rates, and narrower achievement gaps.

Although encouraging, research to date has been derived mostly from student surveys. The CSU is now leading national efforts to develop more reliable and robust evaluations of high-impact practices, derived not from survey responses but from institutionally validated student academic

records. Current work is funded in part by a grant from the Gates Foundation, and was the subject of the latest meeting of the National Association of System Heads.

In the meantime, the CSU can rely on the experience and conviction of faculty and campus leadership, and locally originated evidence of effectiveness, as it resolves to support those efforts more dependably and systematically. During the presentation of this item, the board will hear from three presidents whose campuses have made recent and noteworthy strides in measuring the benefits of student engagement, and who are leading the CSU's efforts to bring such measurement to a statewide scale.

- **CSU Stanislaus** has recently won praise from Education Trust for its work raising graduation rates and closing achievement gaps. Campus leadership attributes these gains in part to its commitment to engaged learning for all students, reflected in the recently won Carnegie designation for community engagement, and a Title V grant to support expansion of its successful First-Year Experience. Because they arise from peer review, such grant awards and third-party recognition provide some of the strongest **qualitative** evidence that these programs improve not only student success metrics, but also the depth and quality of the educational experience.
- The student engagement programs and high-impact practices in effect at **CSU East Bay** have won repeated recognition in national publications, and qualitative evidence of their efficacy has been strong for years. However, campus leadership have been frustrated that these programs have failed to result in acceptable six-year graduation rates. Last year the university proposed spending part of the chancellor's \$7.2 million allocation for Academic and Student Success Programs for a program called Gaining Access 'N Academic Success (GANAS), targeting first-year persistence for Latino students in particular. Early **quantitative** evidence of the program's success and cost effectiveness is extremely strong, prompting the institution to add to its own match to the chancellor's support.
- At **CSU Fullerton**, institutional commitment to engaged learning is unusually explicit. The university's strategic plan commits it to providing at least 75 percent of its students with at least two high-impact practices by 2018 – a scale of delivery that will reach tens of thousands, and may be the first of its kind in the nation. To operationalize this commitment, the university has had to create administrative structures in enrollment management, IT, and business practices that other CSU campuses are learning from, in a Gates-funded project called "Preparing to Bring High-Impact Practices to Scale." This **forward-thinking**, systematic approach to making engaged learning available to all students on an equitable basis is cutting edge, yet also epitomizes longstanding values of the CSU, as articulated by Chancellor White in his remarks last January.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Preparing Educators for the Common Core State Standards

Presentation By

Beverly Young, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

This information item provides an overview of the major reform initiatives of the California State University (CSU) in advancing implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English/Language Arts (CCSS-E/LA) and in Mathematics (CCSS-M) and the aligned Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). CSU has contributed markedly to the implementation of the CCSS in California, among the most successful of any state, and is recognized as a national leader in preparing educators for the new standards and in contributing to the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC).

CSU's leadership in preparing educators for the CCSS and NGSS has been recognized in major awards. As recently as this September, seven CSU campuses received \$53.7 million in federal Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grants. CSU Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo received nearly a third of all national funding for these prestigious TQP grants and will develop models for CCSS and NGSS preparation.

Last March, the S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation awarded the CSU \$3 million for the "Preparing a New Generation of Educators for California" initiative. The funding will assist campuses across the CSU system to develop and implement transformative designs equipping beginning teachers for the challenges of the new standards-based P-12 environment.

CSU began preparing educators for the CCSS-E/LA and CCSS-M immediately upon the adoption of the new standards by the state. It received a \$3 million federal grant in 2011 to provide training to practicing high school teachers in the CSU-designed "Expository Reading and Writing Course," a senior-year course well recognized for its close fit with the CCSS-E/LA. In addition, support from the Boeing Corporation and Southern California Edison was provided for the "Strengthening Mathematics Instruction" professional development, preparing high school teachers to implement the CCSS-M with strategies that better prepare students for college-level mathematics.

The table below summarizes the federal and philanthropic support CSU has received to (a) develop models preparing educators for the new standards and (b) provide statewide training for beginning and current teachers for them. The nearly \$63 million in support recognizes the unique commitment, expertise, and capacity of CSU to play a major leadership role in California and nationally in preparing teachers, administrators, and other educators for the standards.

**California State University Federal and Philanthropic Support for
 Implementing the Common Core State Standards and Aligned Initiatives
 Addressing the Next Generation Science Standards**

Funder	Title/Emphasis	Time Period	Amount
S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation	Preparing a New Generation of Educators for California	4/2014-9/2016 – Phase 1 10/2016-12/2020 – Phase 2 Systemwide Campus Grants	\$3,000,000 (\$12,000,000 <i>Projected</i>)
U. S. Department of Education	Teacher Quality Partnership Program	10/2014-9/2019–Grants to 7 CSU Campuses for Model Programs	\$53,757,322
S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation	Secondary Mathematics Teachers: CCSS-M Gold Standard Preparation	10/2014-4/2015–Project with Association of Public Land Grant Universities	\$60,000
Chevron Corporation	Pathways to STEM: Preparing New Teachers for NGSS and CCSS	6/2014-5/2015–Year 1 6/2015-5/2016–Year 2	\$700,000 \$300,000
100Kin10 Consortium	CCSS-M National Research Competition	10/2013-9/2014–Year 1 10/2014-9/2015–Year 2	\$100,000 \$45,000
U.S. Department of Education	Advancing Special Needs Students’ CCSS Success	10/2013-12/2017–4 Year Project with CTC, 2 Other IHEs	\$200,000
S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation	Undergraduate Content Preparation for the NGSS and Interface with CCSS	6/2012-12/2013–Campus Grants for Model Programs	\$175,000
James Irvine Foundation	Preparation of Educators for Addressing CCSS and NGSS in Linked Learning	12/2013-11/2015–Campus Grants for Model Programs	\$1,000,000
David and Lucile Packard Foundation	Preparation of Educators for Addressing CCSS and NGSS in TK Classrooms	03/2011-2/2015–Systemwide Training Project	\$552,000
U. S. Department of Education	Preparing High School Students for CCSS-E/LA	11/2011-10/2014–Statewide Training Project	\$3,000,000
Boeing; Southern California Edison	Preparing High School Students for CCSS-M	10/2011-9/2015–Statewide Training Project	\$65,000 \$36,000
<i>Federal and Philanthropic Grants</i>	<i>Preparing Educators for CCSS Aligned with NGSS</i>	<i>Teacher Preparation Reforms, Statewide Training Activities</i>	<u>\$62,990,322</u>