

## **AGENDA**

### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

**Meeting:**     **8:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 19, 2012**  
                  **Dumke Auditorium**

Debra S. Farar, Chair  
Peter G. Mehas, Vice Chair  
Roberta Achtenberg  
Bernadette Cheyne  
Kenneth Fong  
Margaret Fortune  
Steven M. Glazer  
William Hauck  
Lou Monville  
Jillian Ruddell  
Glen O. Toney

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 17, 2012

#### **Discussion**

1. Report on Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, *Information*
2. Recommended Amendment to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Career Technical Education; Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for California State University Admission, *Action*
3. Upper-Division General Education and Degree Completion, *Information (Amended)*
4. Update on SB 1440: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, *Information*
5. The California State University Institute for Palliative Care at California State University San Marcos, *Information*

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

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

**July 17, 2012**

**Members Present**

Debra S. Farar, Chair  
Peter G. Mehas, Vice Chair  
Bernadette Cheyne  
Kenneth Fong  
Margaret Fortune  
William Hauck  
Bob Lincheid, Chair of the Board  
Lou Monville  
Jillian Ruddell  
Glen O. Toney  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Chair Debra S. Farar called the meeting to order.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of May 8, 2012, were approved as submitted.

Public speaker David Bradfield, professor of music and digital media arts at CSU Dominguez Hills and an officer in the California Faculty Association (CFA), spoke on the proposed changes to Title 5 regarding general guidelines for graduation, and the use of extended education and special session classes to earn a degree.

**Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements, Residence Requirements, and Special Sessions Credit**

Christine Mallon, assistant vice chancellor for academic programs and faculty development, presented the item, stating that nothing in the item will change requirements for CSU students. The proposed changes were discussed with the Academic Senate CSU and campus administrators; no group opposed any changes. The first proposed amendment would remove the

mention of permitted minors from the Title 5 requirements for bachelor of arts degree programs. Of the six bachelor degree programs offered in the CSU, only the BA requirements allow that a minor be permitted. In fact, all bachelor degree programs can have a minor so this is confusing, she said. The second and third amendments update policy regarding extended education. The second amendment will clarify that non-academic extension credit cannot be applied toward the 30-unit resident requirement, but that regular academic credit earned through extended education can apply toward the resident requirement. CSU extended education currently offers 149 degree programs and the academic credits earned count toward the resident requirement so that does not change. Extension credit is offered in association with professional development certificate programs; it has never meant regular academic credit earned through extended education. The third change makes it clear that matriculated students have no limit to the special session credits that can count toward their degree. Only non-matriculated student have a limit of 24-semester units that can count toward degree completion. The three amendments facilitate students' ability to complete the degrees without misunderstanding and misinterpretation of Title 5. Trustee Bernadette Cheyne said she sent the item to her senate colleagues, asking for input and received none so she concluded that the changes were acceptable. **(REP 07-12-02)**

### **Recommended Changes to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Standard Requirements for Nursing Degree Programs**

Dr. Mallon presented the item. The Education Code requires that CSU nursing programs have a common set of prerequisites. It has been difficult in getting them adopted consistently across the system, she said. The amendment requires campuses to require no more, no fewer, and no different prerequisites than those that have been adopted systemwide. The second section brings Title 5 into compliance with the Education Code requiring that CSU campuses have articulation agreements with their local community college partners that have nursing programs.

Trustee Lou Monville asked why there were differences across the system. Dr. Mallon said the prerequisites are buried in the Education Code, so she has been making campuses more aware of them. There are two accrediting bodies for nursing, one requires chemistry and the other does not. If all programs do not require chemistry then there are unfair benefits to one program. The campuses' nursing faculty agreed to the change. Another problem is that departments outside of nursing have required that their courses be taken as prerequisites to the nursing prerequisites, which again poses problems across the system. **(REP 07-12-03)**

### **Career Technical Education (CTE) Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for CSU Admission; Recommendation to Amend Title 5, California Code of Regulations**

The University of California (UC) and the CSU system share common standards for certifying that high school courses used for eligibility for admission have prepared incoming university students to succeed in their first year in academic areas that are designated by the letters "a-g,"

Dr. Mallon said. These standards have been applied historically only to the high school courses approved by UC through a process agreed upon by CSU and UC and adopted by the state Board of Education. A new Education Code section requires the CSU to develop a separate process to review career and technical education courses for elective area “g,” but only for eligibility to the CSU. The item’s curriculum section was developed by the Academic Senate as required by statute, which also requires that the trustees adopt a policy presented by the senate. The Title 5 amendment adds career and technical education courses to the list of acceptable college preparation courses in Title 5. The item will be brought to trustees in September for action. Superintendent Tom Torlakson supported the item, stating that this track will provide a range of choices for students who determine a career focus, become motivated, stay in high school, finish and go to college. CSU Academic Senate Chair Diana Guerin said the senate had been consulted on this and prior items. The senate’s academic affairs committee worked on it and has kept abreast of it in the years since the legislation passed, she added.

### **Update on SB 1440, the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act**

Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim P. Smith said that SB 1440 provides an efficient pathway for community college students to transfer to a CSU campus and receive a bachelor’s degree by completing the additional 60 required units. The CSU has been working with the community college system for more than a year developing and streamlining this pathway to student success. Ken O’Donnell presented progress made in the past two months. The goal of SB 1440 is to help students transfer to the CSU with 60 units at the community college and then 60 at the CSU to total the 120 units needed for the degree. The 60 community college units also provide the students with an associate’s degree. The CSU expects considerable savings to the state, improved capacity and more room for students through SB 1440. The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) recently gave the CSU a favorable review of the program. They singled out the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) templates for the two-year degrees. The community colleges develop degrees based on the templates, and then the CSU fits the baccalaureate degrees around the TMCs. The LAO said the program is falling short in a few ways, especially where community colleges need to create more two-year degrees based on the templates, and more CSU campuses need to create the baccalaureate around those associate’s degrees. Mr. O’Donnell presented a chart ranking the CSU campuses as to number of degrees. The LAO report closed with a recommendation that the Legislature consider enacting a law to push CSU and the community to create more degrees. The CSU disagreed with that. About four weeks passed between the publication of the report and the CSU meeting with the legislative committee, and many more degrees were accepted. He said no commitments were made at the meeting but that the impression CSU staff received is that additional legislation is less likely.

Trustee Monville asked that any new updates be sent to the trustees on the Committee on Educational Policy, as well as to all campuses, especially those with new presidents to bring them up-to-date on progress or problems. Mr. O’Donnell said the SB 1440 committee provides reports to the Executive Council of CSU presidents. The LAO report was publically shared with campuses. Trustee Monville said the board is particularly interested in making sure it is

accountable to the Legislature, adding that if there is need for additional legislation the CSU can work with legislators on the issues.

Mr. O'Donnell said the CSU also needs to create the mechanisms for broad participation by students. Many students seeking CSU admission claim to have one of the transfer degrees but in reality do not; it is a labor intensive process to determine if they have the degree, he said. It is a long-term goal to get all the community colleges to use electronic transcripts. In the short term, the CSU has modified CSU Mentor, the website students use to apply to the CSU, in such a way that community college students have to identify a degree already approved at their particular college. Admission has been closed to all students in spring 2013 except to students who hold the SB 1440 associate degrees for transfer.

Trustee Monville was concerned that community members believe that people cannot transfer any longer. He said he tells people about the transfer degree but asked Mr. O'Donnell about counseling at the community colleges and how the CSU is getting the word out about the transfer process. Mr. O'Donnell said work on the website and collateral materials for guidance counselors continues. The CSU has been modifying language to make it more user- friendly so students understand it. Videos with testimonials from students who have been through the curriculum at the community colleges have been completed. The CSU is on track in August with the website and materials' rollout. The rollout will spend the last of the \$1 million grant from Complete College America. California was one of 10 states that awarded the funds. The materials will be used at the fall counselor conferences, which provide regular interactions with academic counselors and guidance counselors. Counselors will speak with students about any misunderstandings concerning spring 2013 admissions.

Finally, Mr. O'Donnell said that students at community colleges like to keep their options open for transfer to CSU or UC. He showed a letter from the UC Academic Senate to its system office. The UC has a handful of transfer pathways to admission, and it has added the associate degrees for transfer that the CSU has developed under SB 1440. That means the UC has opted in voluntarily since it is not covered by the law. It is a not-so-tacit recognition of the quality of the curriculum, which is a benefit because the faculties of the community colleges and CSU's were careful in developing the templates. The recognition that this is good curriculum goes a long way with students, the CSU and the community colleges, he said.

Trustee Hugo Morales asked if the transfer rate is increasing, decreasing or staying flat. Mr. O'Donnell said that the transfer rate overall will not change much under this legislation because it is a two-year curriculum at the community colleges that has to be developed, which is why there is a time lag when students attend the CSU. There are a handful of students by coincidence who have taken the courses and qualify for the transfer degrees. It will take a while to see an increase in the overall number of transfers. Trustee Monville thanked Academic Senate Chair Guerin for the senate's work on the issue. She told trustees that the senate has appointed past chair Jim Postma to continue working on SB 1440 for continuity and the leadership he provided through the past years.

Trustee Farar adjourned the meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

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

#### **Presentation By**

Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor

John D. Welty  
President  
California State University, Fresno

Ray Murillo  
Associate Director, Student Programs  
Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support

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

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

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

In March 2000, following a review of the 1998-1999 systemwide and campus data, it was agreed by CA NOW and the CSU that major progress had been made in each of the areas of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid for female athletes. In March 2000, it was determined that the consent decree had been satisfied.

In spring 2000, the CSU chancellor and the CSU presidents made the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring of the former CSU/CA NOW consent decree to continue to monitor progress in the area of female athletes' participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid. The 2010-2011 academic year report is the 12<sup>th</sup> annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

### **2010-2011 Report Summary**

The CSU report for 2010-2011 includes data taken from the NCAA/Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) 2011 reports submitted January 15, 2012, to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. During 2007, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The corrective action plans are listed in Part V in this report.

The CSU currently has 20 NCAA-member campuses and two non-NCAA member campuses. CSU Monterey Bay became the 20<sup>th</sup> NCAA member campus in 2006-2007.

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

**Participation:** Participation by female and male athletes on each campus will be within 5 percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible women and men undergraduates on that campus;

**Expenditures:** Expenditures will be within 10 percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible female and male undergraduates, with the deduction for non-comparable expenses for two men's and two women's sports; and

**Grants-In-Aid:** Grants-in-aid will be within 5 percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible female and male undergraduates.

### *Systemwide Impact*

At the CSU systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics has increased from 1,862 in 1992-1993 to 4,034 in 2010-2011 on the 20 NCAA-member campuses, an increase of 116.6 percent over the past 18 years. During the previous year, 168 fewer females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year decrease of 4 percent.

In 1992, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 34.7 percent, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5 percent. As of fall 2010, the CSU had a female undergraduate

student enrollment of 56.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 54.9 percent resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 1.3 percent.

Overall, CSU expenditures for women's athletics increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$99.7 million in 2010-2011. This represents an increase of 790 percent over the past 18 years. The total increase above the previous year was \$4.5 million, a 4.7 percent increase.

Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$18.3 million in 2010-2011. The increase in grants-in-aid the past year was \$920,123 for a 5.3 percent increase.

### *Campus Impact*

Participation - During 2010-2011, 18 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in participation.

Two campuses did not meet their target goal: San José: -1.0 percent; Sonoma: -1.0 percent

Expenditures - Nineteen campuses met their target goal in expenditures for women's athletic programs.

One campus did not meet its target goal: San José-0.5 percent

Grants-In-Aid - Fifteen campuses met or exceeded their target goal in grants-in-aid.

Five campuses did not meet their target goal: Chico: -1.7 percent; Fresno: -1.4 percent; Sacramento: -0.2 percent; San Diego: -1.3 percent; and San José:-2.1 percent.

### *Campus Challenges in Achieving Target Goal for Grants-In-Aid*

Five campuses experienced difficulty in achieving the target goal for grants-in-aid. The contributing factors impacting the campuses' ability to achieve compliance are the CSU enrollment increase in female student undergraduates from 1992 to 2010 and the NCAA grants-in-aid maximum limit for each sport.

The CSU female undergraduate enrollment increased from 147,566 females in 1992-1993 to 195,697 in 2010-2011. This reflects a 33 percent increase for female undergraduate students compared to an 18 percent increase for male undergraduate students during that same time period. The rise in female undergraduate enrollment results in campuses increasing female student athlete grants-in-aid at a faster pace.



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

*NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target goals for Two Consecutive Years (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)*

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

**Participation:** One NCAA-member CSU campus did not meet its target in participation for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
Sonoma	-0.3 percent	-1.0 percent

**Expenditures:** There were no NCAA-member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

**Grants-In-Aid:** Three NCAA-member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years:

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
Fresno	-1.5 percent	-1.4 percent
San Diego	-2.5 percent	-1.3 percent
San José	-2.7 percent	-2.1 percent

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

## **2010-2011 Final Report**

The following pages include the full report on the Voluntary Self-Monitoring of Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Students, which was publicly issued on September 1, 2012.

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

Annual Report  
2010-2011

September 1, 2012

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary

Summary of 2010-2011 Data – System Level

Summary of 2010-2011 Data – Campus Level

Part I: Report for Academic Year 2010-2011: NCAA Campuses

Part II: Report for Academic Year 2010-2011: Non-NCAA Campuses

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

Part IV: NCAA Member Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two  
Consecutive Years (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)

Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for  
Results in 2011-2012 Reporting

Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee

Table 1: NCAA Eligible Men and Women

Table 2: Athletics Participants by Campus 2010-2011

Table 3: Expenditures by Campus 2010-2011 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 3a: Expenditures by Campus 2010-2011 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

Table 4: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2010-2011 (NCAA Campuses)

Table 4a: Scholarships/Grants-In-Aid 2010-2011 (Non-NCAA Campuses)

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

High School Participation Numbers & Most Popular Sports

## **Executive Summary**

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

## **The California State University 2010-2011**

### **Background Information**

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

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

In spring 2000, the CSU chancellor and the CSU presidents made the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring of the former CSU/CA NOW consent decree in order to continue to monitor progress in the area of female athletes' participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid. The 2010-2011 academic year report is the 12<sup>th</sup> annual report issued following the decision to implement voluntary self-monitoring.

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

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

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

The CSU report for 2010-2011 includes data taken from the NCAA/EADA 2011 Reports, submitted January 15, 2012, to the NCAA with a copy to the CSU. Beginning with the 2007-2008 reporting, the CSU Monitoring Committee agreed to a recommendation made by CA NOW to require campuses to submit the current year corrective action plan with the NCAA/EADA report. The corrective action plans are in Part V in this report.

The CSU currently has 20 NCAA-member campuses and two non-NCAA member campuses. CSU Monterey Bay became the 20<sup>th</sup> NCAA-member campus in 2006-2007.

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

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

### **Summary of 2010-2011 Data – CSU System Level**

The system-level data are the cumulative totals of participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid from NCAA-member campuses. Beginning in 2006-2007 the data represent 20 NCAA-member campuses. Reports from 2005-2006 and earlier years included data reported by only 19 CSU NCAA-members.

#### **1. Participation**

At the systemwide level, the number of female participants in intercollegiate athletics within the CSU increased from 1,862 in 1992-1993 to 4,034 in 2010-2011 on the 20 NCAA-member campuses, an increase of 116.6 percent over the past 18 years. During the previous year, 168 fewer females participated in intercollegiate athletics, a one-year decrease of 4 percent. During this same 18-year period, male intercollegiate athletic participation decreased 11.2 percent from 3,733 in 1992-1993 to 3,316 in 2010-2011. During 2010-2011, 15 more males participated in intercollegiate athletics than in 2009-2010, a one year increase of 0.5 percent. The 2010-2011 athletics participants by campus can be found in table 2.

The data also indicates that 54.9 percent of all intercollegiate athletic participants within the CSU in 2010-2011 are female, compared to 34.7 percent in 1992, the year before the CSU entered into the consent decree with the California National Organization for Women (CA NOW). In 1992, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 53.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 34.7 percent, which resulted in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 18.5 percent. As of fall 2010, the CSU had a female undergraduate student enrollment of 56.2 percent and a female student athlete participation of 54.9 percent resulting in a female enrollment/athletic participation difference of 1.3 percent.

Community college comparison data supplied by the California Community Colleges (CCC) Athletic Association were updated in 2010-2011. The 2010-2011 data reflect participation rates at 65 percent for male athletes and 35 percent for female athletes. See table 5 for the six-year comparison data.

The California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) administers a biennial CIF participation survey of high school athletes. The 2011 survey results were made available in August 2011.

The 2011 CIF participation survey is included in this report. The 2011 high school participation numbers for male and female athletes are included at the end of the report. The participation for high school male student athletes is 59.8 percent and for female student athletes is 40.2 percent.

## **2. Expenditures**

Expenditures for women's intercollegiate athletic programs on the CSU's 20 NCAA-member campuses increased from \$11.2 million in 1992-1993 to \$99.7 million in 2010-2011. This represents an increase of 790 percent over the past 18 years. The total increase over the previous year was \$4.5 million, a 4.7 percent increase. During this same period, expenditures for men's athletic programs grew from \$33.4 million to \$100.5 million, an increase of 201 percent. The total increase over the past year was \$6.4 million, a 6.8 percent increase.

In October 2004, the CA NOW and the CSU Gender Equity Voluntary Self-Monitoring Committee agreed to a revision in the calculation of non-comparable expenses as discussed in the background information section earlier in the report. The expenditures reported above are the adjusted totals, which are total expenditures minus the non-comparable expenditures. The total non-comparable expenditure for women's athletic teams is \$1,683,343, and the total non-comparable expenditure for men's athletic teams is \$14,262,507. The 2010-2011 expenditures by campus can be found in tables 3 and 3a.

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

Funds allocated for grants-in-aid for female athletes on the CSU's 20 NCAA-member campuses increased from \$2.5 million in 1992-1993 to \$18.3 million in 2010-2011, an increase of 632 percent over an 18-year period. The increase in grants-in-aid over the past year was \$920,123 for a 5.3 percent increase. Grants-in-aid for male student athletes during the same period increased from \$4.6 million to \$16.8 million, an increase of 265 percent. The increase over the past year was \$1,084,680 for a 6.9 percent increase. The 2010-2011 grants-in-aid by campus can be found in tables 4 and 4a.

### **Summary of 2010-2011 Data – Campus Level**

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

**Participation:** Participation by female and male athletes on each campus will be within 5 percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible women and men undergraduates on that campus;

**Expenditures:** Expenditures will be within 10 percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible female and male undergraduates, with the deduction for non-comparable expenses for two men's and two women's sports; and

**Grants-In-Aid:** Grants-in-aid will be within 5percentage points of the proportion of NCAA-eligible female and male undergraduates.

#### **1. Participation**

At the campus level, during the 2010-2011 academic year, the report indicated that 18 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their target goals in the area of women's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

#### **2. Expenditures**

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

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

In the area of grants-in-aid, 15 of the 20 NCAA-member campuses met or exceeded their goals for scholarship and grants-in-aid to female student athletes.

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

Fourteen campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid during the 2010-2011 academic year.



**Part I: Report for Academic Year 2010-2011 – NCAA-Member Campuses– Based on the NCAA/EADA Report for 2011, submitted to the NCAA on January 15, 2012**

---

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

Fourteen campuses met their target goals in all three areas: participation, expenditures and grants-in-aid during the 2010-2011 academic year.

Bakersfield	Monterey Bay
Dominguez Hills	Northridge
East Bay	Pomona
Fullerton	San Bernardino
Humboldt	San Francisco
Long Beach	San Luis Obispo
Los Angeles	Stanislaus

Six campuses did not meet at least one of the three target goals:

Chico	San Diego
Fresno	San José
Sacramento	Sonoma

**Participation**

Eighteen campuses met their target goals in participation in 2010-2011.

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

Two campuses did not meet their target goal for participation:

San José	-1.0 percent
Sonoma	-1.0 percent

### **Expenditures**

Nineteen campuses met their target goals in expenditures in 2010-2011.

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

One campus did not meet its target goal for expenditures:

San José	-0.5 percent
----------	--------------

### **Grants-In-Aid**

Fifteen campuses met their target goals in grants-in-aid in 2010-2011.

Bakersfield	Northridge
Dominguez Hills	Pomona
East Bay	San Bernardino
Fullerton	San Francisco
Humboldt	San Luis Obispo
Long Beach	Sonoma
Los Angeles	Stanislaus
Monterey Bay	

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

Chico	-1.7 percent
Fresno	-1.4 percent
Sacramento	-0.2 percent
San Diego	-1.3 percent
San José	-2.1 percent

**Part II: Report for Academic Year 2010-2011 – Non-NCAA Member Campuses–  
Based on Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report**

---

**Participation – 2010-2011**

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

**Expenditures – 2010-2011**

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

**Grants-In-Aid – 2010-2011**

Maritime Academy	Target met
San Marcos	Target met

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

---

The following information provides an overview of the number of NCAA-member CSU campuses that met their target goals in one or more areas over the last 12 years:

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

1999-2000: 9 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 7 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 6 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 10 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 11 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 11 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 13 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 13 of 20 campuses  
2008-2009: 16 of 20 campuses  
2009-2010: 16 of 20 campuses  
2010-2011: 14 of 20 campuses

#### **Expenditures**

1999-2000: 17 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 13 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 12 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 19 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 18 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 17 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 18 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 19 of 20 campuses  
2008-2009: 20 of 20 campuses  
2009-2010: 20 of 20 campuses  
2010-2011: 19 of 20 campuses

#### **Participation**

1999-2000: 12 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 10 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 7 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 12 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 17 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 18 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 16 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 17 of 20 campuses  
2008-2009: 20 of 20 campuses  
2009-2010: 19 of 20 campuses  
2010-2011: 18 of 20 campuses

#### **Grants-In-Aid**

1999-2000: 13 of 19 campuses  
2000-2001: 11 of 19 campuses  
2001-2002: 13 of 19 campuses  
2002-2003: 13 of 19 campuses  
2003-2004: 14 of 19 campuses  
2004-2005: 15 of 19 campuses  
2005-2006: 14 of 19 campuses  
2006-2007: 17 of 20 campuses  
2007-2008: 15 of 20 campuses  
2008-2009: 16 of 20 campuses  
2009-2010: 17 of 20 campuses  
2010-2011: 15 of 20 campuses

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

**Part IV: NCAA Member CSU Campuses Not Meeting Target Goals for Two Consecutive Years (2009-2010 and 2010-2011)**

---

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

**Participation:** One NCAA-member CSU campus that did not meet its target in participation for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
Sonoma	-0.3 percent	-1.0 percent

**Expenditures:** There were no NCAA-member CSU campuses that did not meet their target in expenditures for women's athletic programs for two consecutive reporting academic years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

**Grants-In-Aid:** Three NCAA-member CSU campuses did not meet their target in grants-in-aid for women's athletic programs during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years:

<b>Campus</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
Fresno	-1.5 percent	-1.4 percent
San Diego	-2.5 percent	-1.3 percent
San José	-2.7 percent	-2.1 percent

## **Part V: Corrective Action Plans from Non-Compliance Campuses for Results in 2011-2012 Reporting**

---

Campuses that did not meet their target goals for two consecutive years (2009-2010 and 2010-2011) were required to submit a plan to the Office of the Chancellor indicating how the campus plans to meet its target goals in the future. Below are the corrective action plans from those campuses that were out of compliance for two consecutive years as reported in this annual self-monitoring report.

### **2010-2011 Reporting**

<b><u>Fresno</u></b>	<b><u>2009-2010</u></b>	<b><u>2010-2011</u></b>
Grants-In-Aid	-1.5 percent	-1.4 percent

As in past years, the institution meets the participation and expense targets of CA NOW. The new women's sports of lacrosse and swimming and diving were added to the sports roster at Fresno State in 2008-2009. The institution completed the implementation of scholarships levels for these sports in 2010-2011. That said, the CA NOW athletic grants-in-aid comparison for that year is 5.85 percent from the target, which exceeds the "acceptable" standard by 0.85 percent. As during any year, there is some aid that is not given for various mitigating circumstances including: mid-year graduation, committed recruits who at the last minute did not matriculate, and/or early departure for professional league.

The institution has made significant progress meeting the "acceptable" standard in the area of grants-in-aid for CA NOW voluntary compliance. Fresno State continues to report athletic financial aid outcomes to the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) in compliance with an agreed-upon resolution. The OCR methodology is somewhat different than the CA NOW requirements setting an acceptable standard of within 1 percent of the unduplicated male and female representation in the student-athlete population for grants-in-aid comparisons.

Fresno State is committed to providing equitable athletics financial aid to its student-athlete population both male and female and will continue to actively monitor this area annually. Should changes be made (e.g., NCAA legislation adding increased dollars to the definition of a full grant-in-aid, adjustments in scholarship limits for football and women's basketball), the institution will implement as appropriate and in such a manner as to maintain our equitable distribution of athletic financial aid.

<b><u>San Diego</u></b>	<b><u>2009-2010</u></b>	<b><u>2010-2011</u></b>
Grants-In-Aid	-2.5 percent	-1.3 percent

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

As stated in the plan submitted in January 2010, the university has added women's lacrosse with competitions starting during 2011-2012 fiscal year. The coaching staff has been hired and has assembled a squad of 25 student-athletes. The 12 grants-in-aid will be phased in beginning with approximately seven equivalencies awarded during the 2011-2012 fiscal year and 12 equivalencies awarded starting in 2012-2013 fiscal year. The team will play a full schedule of games beginning in February 2012. With the addition of women's lacrosse, the grants-in-aid total would be compliant with the target goal.

In addition, as the university continues to review the addition of women's sand volleyball, which the NCAA recently approved, it can meet the target relying on a three-part approach as follows:

1. Addition of Women's Lacrosse, with the progress outlined above;
2. Regulation of the number of out-of-state scholarships awarded to men and women athletes such that the budget targets are met; and
3. Recognition that the percentage of female students in the enrolled population has declined such that the university will be able to meet or exceed our compliance target.

<b><u>San José</u></b>	<b><u>2009-2010</u></b>	<b><u>2010-2011</u></b>
Grants-In-Aid	-2.7 percent	-2.1 percent

San José State University Athletics Department continues to be fully committed to gender equity and the 1993 CA NOW consent decree. San José State University has been in compliance with the decree until 2007-2008 in regards to the grants-in-aid category. After historical Academic Progress Rate (APR) penalties and subsequent enhancements to CSU academic policies and procedures, all of the programs continue returning to maximum levels of NCAA allowable scholarship allocations. Unfortunately, the penalties were in multiple men's sports compared to only one women's sport, which also lends to the target not being met. The following plan is an addendum to the 2009-2010 plan submitted. In 2010-2011 after successfully going through NCAA certification in which the department was certified without visit, a number of plans and policies were set in place that directly affect the three prongs noted in this report. Those results will show in the 2011-2012 CA NOW report due to the timing of this report compared to subsequent NCAA reporting timelines. SJSU is confident that the plan submitted for prior years as well as the initiatives listed below will result in SJSU being compliant within all prongs of the decree.

Under the guidelines established by the President's Monitoring Committee, SJSU submits an addendum to the current plan of action to meet the financial aid levels (off 2.1 percent as allowable) established under the CA NOW consent decree.

- A. After NCAA Certification (2010-2011) and the reformation of the Gender Equity and Diversity in Athletics Committee on campus, SJSU took the opportunity to fully review the addition of a women's sport which delayed the department a year. The updated plan is to announce in March 2012 that SJSU athletics will be adding women's track. A head coach will be hired in April 2012 and competition will begin in 2013-2014.
- B. In continuing to address the inequity in grants-in-aid expenditures, SJSU athletics implemented a policy in spring 2011 that any/all women student athletes would be given the opportunity to attend summer school and winter session. SJSU currently projects a one-year increase of more than 1,300 percent in women's summer school and winter session expenditures compared to a 79 percent increase in men's summer school and winter session expenditures.

<b><u>Sonoma</u></b>	<b><u>2009-2010</u></b>	<b><u>2010-2011</u></b>
Participation	-0.3 percent	-1.0 percent

The Sonoma State University Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is submitting its corrective action plan for meeting the target goal in the area of participation. In 2009-2010, SSU missed its participation goal by 0.3 percent. In 2010-2011, SSU missed the participation goal by 1.0 percent. This was attributed to unexpected attrition on several women's teams in these respective years.

In the current academic year, 2011-2012, SSU will meet the participation target and has established procedures to ensure consistent, future compliance with meeting all targets established by the CSU CA NOW consent decree, especially in the area of participation.

SSU sponsors 13 intercollegiate teams, eight women's teams and five men's teams. To ensure current and future compliance with participation targets, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics has established participation range targets for each team so that participation levels can be more accurately predicted before the competitive season commences. The administrative staff will monitor each team's recruitment progress to ensure each respective team is able to meet its participation range targets.

In 2011-12, the department committed additional funding for women's soccer, softball and women's tennis to ensure that athletic scholarship funding would be available to secure roster slots on each team to balance the attrition issue.



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

---

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

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

Dr. Ruben Armiñana  
President  
Sonoma State University

Dr. Dianne F. Harrison  
President  
California State University, Northridge

Dr. Karen S. Haynes  
President  
California State University, San Marcos

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

Dr. Mo H. Qayoumi  
President  
San José State University

**Committee Staff**

Mr. Eric Forbes  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support  
The California State University  
Office of the Chancellor

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

**NCAA Eligible<sup>1</sup> Men and Women on CSU Campuses  
2010-2011**

**Table 1**

**NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>Total Eligible</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Bakersfield	4,081	2,469	6,550	62.3%	37.7%
Chico	6,984	6,677	13,661	51.1%	48.9%
Dominguez Hills	4,414	2,689	7,103	62.1%	37.9%
East Bay	5,158	3,434	8,592	60.0%	40.0%
Fresno	8,901	6,625	15,526	57.3%	42.7%
Fullerton	13,002	9,697	22,699	57.3%	42.7%
Humboldt	3,020	3,577	6,597	45.8%	54.2%
Long Beach	15,248	10,141	25,389	60.1%	39.9%
Los Angeles	7,831	5,355	13,186	59.4%	40.6%
Monterey Bay	2,466	1,616	4,082	60.4%	39.6%
Northridge	13,082	9,971	23,053	56.7%	43.3%
Pomona	6,917	8,989	15,906	43.5%	56.5%
Sacramento	13,242	9,955	23,197	57.1%	42.9%
San Bernardino	8,719	4,961	13,680	63.7%	36.3%
San Diego	11,949	9,089	21,038	56.8%	43.2%
San Francisco	12,090	8,663	20,753	58.3%	41.7%
San José	11,717	11,121	22,838	51.3%	48.7%
San Luis Obispo	7,481	9,212	16,693	44.8%	55.2%
Sonoma	4,055	2,542	6,597	61.5%	38.5%
Stanislaus	4,581	2,506	7,087	64.6%	35.4%
<b>Totals</b>	164,938	129,289	294,227	56.7%	43.3%
<b>Non-NCAA Member Institutions<sup>2</sup></b>					
<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>Total Eligible</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Maritime Academy	112	720	832	13.5%	86.5%
San Marcos	5,375	3,466	8,841	60.8%	39.2%
<b>Totals</b>	5,487	4,186	9,673	37.1%	62.9%

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

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

**Table 2**

**CSU Intercollegiate Women and Men  
 Athletics Participants by Campus 2010-2011**

**NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>% Men</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bakersfield	259	62.3%	157	37.7%	416
Chico	177	47.2%	198	52.8%	375
Dominguez Hills	148	63.0%	87	37.0%	235
East Bay	151	58.8%	106	41.2%	257
Fresno	309	57.9%	225	42.1%	534
Fullerton	203	53.3%	178	46.7%	381
Humboldt	199	49.6%	202	50.7%	401
Long Beach	241	56.8%	183	43.2%	424
Los Angeles	131	57.0%	99	43.0%	230
Monterey Bay	138	55.0%	113	45.0%	251
Northridge	269	54.7%	223	45.3%	492
Pomona	91	43.3%	119	56.7%	210
Sacramento	294	55.3%	238	44.7%	532
San Bernardino	136	63.3%	79	36.7%	215
San Diego	321	59.1%	222	40.9%	543
San Francisco	185	62.5%	111	37.5%	296
San José	197	46.0%	231	54.0%	428
San Luis Obispo	256	44.6%	318	55.4%	574
Sonoma	154	57.0%	116	43.0%	270
Stanislaus	175	61.2%	111	38.8%	286
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,034</b>	<b>54.9%</b>	<b>3,316</b>	<b>45.1%</b>	<b>7,350</b>

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>No. Women</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>No. Men</b>	<b>% Men</b>	<b>Total</b>
Maritime Academy	31	18.5%	137	81.5%	168
San Marcos	224	60.9%	144	39.1%	368
<b>Totals</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>47.6%</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>52.4%</b>	<b>536</b>

Table 3

**Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and  
Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2010-2011**

**NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bakersfield	\$5,963,281		\$5,963,281	56.1%	\$4,675,203		\$4,675,203	43.9%	\$10,638,484
Chico	\$2,511,963		\$2,511,963	46.6%	\$2,875,190		\$2,875,190	53.4%	\$5,387,153
Dominguez Hills	\$1,643,672		\$1,643,672	58.5%	\$1,163,645		\$1,163,645	41.5%	\$2,807,317
East Bay	\$2,975,546		\$2,975,546	59.8%	\$2,003,383		\$2,003,383	40.2%	\$4,978,929
Fresno	\$13,300,429	\$376,571	\$12,923,858	52.3%	\$15,538,538	\$3,767,645	\$11,770,893	47.7%	\$24,694,751
Fullerton	\$5,167,619		\$5,167,619	49.6%	\$5,258,945		\$5,258,945	50.4%	\$10,426,564
Humboldt	\$2,706,219		\$2,706,219	48.4%	\$2,880,218		\$2,880,218	51.6%	\$5,586,438
Long Beach	\$7,665,259		\$7,665,259	52.4%	\$6,952,598		\$6,952,598	47.6%	\$14,617,857
Los Angeles	\$2,564,538		\$2,564,538	56.7%	\$1,958,724		\$1,958,724	43.3%	\$4,523,262
Monterey Bay	\$1,875,790		\$1,875,790	57.9%	\$1,363,824		\$1,363,824	42.1%	\$3,239,614
Northridge	\$5,255,584		\$5,255,584	52.4%	\$4,765,397		\$4,765,397	47.6%	\$10,020,981
Pomona	\$2,069,965		\$2,069,965	44.0%	\$2,639,154		\$2,639,154	56.0%	\$4,709,119
Sacramento	\$8,244,355	\$445,851	\$7,798,504	52.3%	\$8,474,428	\$1,356,493	\$7,117,935	47.7%	\$14,916,439
San Bernardino	\$2,237,383		\$2,237,383	58.0%	\$1,619,896		\$1,619,896	42.0%	\$3,857,279
San Diego	\$13,796,261	\$649,547	\$13,146,714	47.0%	\$22,379,342	\$7,576,141	\$14,803,201	53.0%	\$27,949,915
San Francisco	\$2,238,243		\$2,238,243	57.2%	\$1,681,198	\$9,100	\$1,672,098	42.8%	\$3,910,341
San José	\$7,626,350	\$211,374	\$7,414,976	41.5%	\$12,024,092	\$1,553,128	\$10,470,964	58.5%	\$17,885,940
San Luis Obispo	\$8,405,769		\$8,405,769	40.6%	\$12,277,882		\$12,277,882	59.4%	\$20,683,651
Sonoma	\$3,223,409		\$3,223,409	54.2%	\$2,728,019		\$2,728,019	45.8%	\$5,951,428
Stanislaus	\$2,069,396		\$2,069,396	58.0%	\$1,497,923		\$1,497,923	42.0%	\$3,567,319
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$101,541,033</b>	<b>\$1,683,343</b>	<b>\$99,857,690</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>\$114,757,597</b>	<b>\$14,262,507</b>	<b>\$100,495,090</b>	<b>50.2%</b>	<b>\$200,352,780</b>

For the purpose of calculating non-comparable costs, a campus should total legitimate non-comparable expenses for football and men's basketball and subtract them from the total costs of the men's program. The non-comparable costs for women's basketball and the other sport for which the highest non-comparable expenses are identified should be subtracted from the costs of the women's program. Once calculated, add the amended men's and women's expenses together and compute percentages for each. Total expenditures for campuses reporting non-comps are as follows: Fresno (\$28,838,967), Sacramento (\$16,718,783), San Diego (\$36,054,231), San Francisco (\$3,919,441), and San José (\$19,650,442)

Table 3a

**Expenditures by CSU Campuses on Men's and  
Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2010-2011**

**Non-NCAA Member Institutions**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Non-Comp.*</b>	<b>Adj. Total</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
Maritime Academy	\$163,361		\$163,361	18.5%	\$463,991		\$463,991	81.5%	627,352
San Marcos	\$1,175,579		\$1,175,579	54.8%	\$794,757		\$794,757	45.2%	1,970,336
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$1,338,940</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,338,940</b>	51.5%	<b>\$1,258,748</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,258,748</b>	48.5%	2,597,688

Table 4

## Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams 2010-2011

## NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women					Men				
	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars
Bakersfield	68.08	\$1,126,177.00	\$16,541.97	61.4%	59.9%	42.86	\$754,915.00	\$17,613.51	38.6%	40.1%
Chico	19.80	\$285,270.00	\$14,407.58	46.2%	44.3%	23.06	\$359,346.00	\$15,583.09	53.8%	55.7%
Dominguez Hills	21.06	\$241,154.00	\$11,450.81	60.4%	61.7%	13.80	\$150,000.00	\$10,869.57	39.6%	38.3%
East Bay	30.90	\$429,673.00	\$13,905.28	57.9%	59.4%	22.51	\$293,817.00	\$13,052.73	42.1%	40.6%
Fresno	125.34	\$2,414,345.00	\$19,262.37	50.3%	51.2%	123.89	\$2,300,598.00	\$18,569.68	49.7%	48.8%
Fullerton	64.63	\$1,082,427.00	\$16,748.06	60.2%	56.4%	42.64	\$835,149.00	\$19,586.05	39.8%	43.6%
Humboldt	21.08	\$341,413.00	\$16,196.06	47.3%	49.2%	23.45	\$352,199.00	\$15,019.15	52.7%	50.8%
Long Beach	72.19	\$1,376,330.00	\$19,065.38	63.6%	62.3%	41.30	\$833,505.00	\$20,181.72	36.4%	37.7%
Los Angeles	38.04	\$533,648.00	\$14,028.60	55.7%	59.4%	30.27	\$364,647.00	\$12,046.48	44.3%	40.6%
Monterey Bay	19.90	\$188,472.00	\$9,470.95	64.6%	59.3%	10.92	\$129,174.00	\$11,829.12	35.4%	40.7%
Northridge	71.05	\$1,034,117.80	\$14,554.79	60.6%	57.4%	46.22	\$766,945.78	\$16,593.37	39.4%	42.6%
Pomona	13.61	\$237,617.00	\$17,459.00	45.3%	44.8%	16.42	\$292,774.00	\$17,830.33	54.7%	55.2%
Sacramento	111.41	\$1,893,246.00	\$16,993.50	51.3%	52.2%	105.61	\$1,736,710.00	\$16,444.56	48.7%	47.8%
San Bernardino	25.08	\$338,865.26	\$13,511.37	62.7%	63.2%	14.94	\$197,595.70	\$13,225.95	37.3%	36.8%
San Diego	114.96	\$2,776,419.00	\$24,151.17	48.9%	50.6%	120.09	\$2,708,301.00	\$22,552.26	51.1%	49.4%
San Francisco	10.85	\$195,100.00	\$17,981.57	58.9%	57.1%	7.56	\$146,338.00	\$19,356.88	41.1%	42.9%
San José	103.43	\$1,717,568.00	\$16,606.09	46.8%	44.9%	117.80	\$2,107,143.00	\$17,887.46	53.2%	55.1%
San Luis Obispo	80.04	\$1,515,028.00	\$18,928.39	42.4%	42.0%	108.64	\$2,095,456.00	\$19,288.07	57.6%	58.0%
Sonoma	15.11	\$289,580.00	\$19,164.79	60.5%	62.7%	9.85	\$172,435.00	\$17,506.09	39.5%	37.3%
Stanislaus	17.18	\$254,603.00	\$14,819.73	57.9%	61.0%	12.47	\$162,476.00	\$13,029.35	42.1%	39.0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,043.74</b>	<b>\$18,271,053.06</b>	<b>\$17,505.37</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>934.30</b>	<b>\$16,759,524.48</b>	<b>\$17,938.05</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>

Table 4a

**Grants-In-Aid by CSU Campuses for  
Men's and Women's Intercollegiate Athletics Teams  
2010-2011**

Non-NCAA Member Institutions

Campus	Women					Men				
	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars	# of FTE Grants	Total Dollars	Avg. Grant	% of Grants	% of Dollars
Maritime Academy	0.70	\$25,000.00	\$35,714.29	50.0%	45.5%	0.70	\$30,000.00	\$42,857.14	50.0%	54.5%
San Marcos	5.81	\$125,960.00	\$21,679.86	56.0%	57.4%	4.57	\$99,050.00	\$21,673.96	44.0%	42.6%
Totals	6.51	\$150,960.00	\$23,188.94	55.3%	53.9%	5.27	\$129,050.00	\$64,531.10	44.7%	46.1%

**Table 5**



<b>Five-Year Comparison Men's and Women's Sport Participation</b>										
<b>SPORT</b>	<b>2005-06</b>		<b>2006-07</b>		<b>2007-08</b>		<b>2008-09</b>		<b>2009-10</b>	
	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>
Baseball	2523		2613		2724		2693		2696	
Badminton		98		100		110		131		127
Softball		1144		1176		1247		1250		1285
Basketball	1349	1060	1376	1123	1400	1113	1427	1191	1392	1187
Cross Country	593	546	613	489	668	597	730	609	703	590
Football	5638		5703		5664		5921		5879	
Golf	400	124	382	123	435	148	402	164	382	160
Soccer	1668	1579	1741	1538	1881	1662	1960	1724	1978	1857
Swimming	619	643	664	611	727	594	840	763	829	815
Tennis	368	390	378	359	390	384	421	433	433	392
Track & Field	1470	805	1442	790	1567	836	1784	971	1811	1034
Water Polo	563	558	530	595	613	522	599	567	639	617
Wrestling	428		435		510		501		479	
Volleyball	184	958	201	1022	192	998	215	1071	202	1123
Totals M or W	15803	7905	16078	7926	16771	8211	17513	8874	17423	9187
Totals M & W	23708		24004		24982		26387		26610	
Percentages	67%	33%	67%	33%	67%	33%	66%	34%	65%	35%

<b>Five-Year Comparison Men's and Women's Sport Participation</b>										
<b>SPORT</b>	<b>2010-11</b>									
	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>	<b>MEN'S</b>	<b>WOMEN'S</b>
Baseball	2632									
Badminton		127								
Softball		1317								
Basketball	1366	1157								
Cross Country	726	601								
Football	5783									
Golf	367	165								
Soccer	1992	1867								
Swimming	799	727								
Tennis	402	409								
Track & Field	1813	1076								
Water Polo	612	588								
Wrestling	467									
Volleyball	217	1118								
Totals M or W	17176	9152								
Totals M & W	26328									
Percentages	65%	35%								





# CALIFORNIA INTERSCHOLASTIC FEDERATION STATE MEDIA RELEASE

4658 DUCKHORN DRIVE • SACRAMENTO, CA 95834 • (916) 239-4477 • FAX (916) 239-4478 • CIFSTATE.ORG

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**  
**August 2, 2011**

**Contact: Rebecca Brutlag, Media Relations Officer**  
**[rbrutlag@cifstate.org](mailto:rbrutlag@cifstate.org)**

## **CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL SPORTS PARTICIPATION ON THE RISE**

**SACRAMENTO** – High school sports participation in California is on the rise according to the 2011 California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) Sports Participation Survey. Up by 2.9% since the previous survey in 2009, an additional 21,006 student-athletes are competing in California high school athletic programs; 757,733 boys and girls combined.

“The increased growth and interest in high school athletic participation is encouraging even during these hard economic times when some of our schools are forced to reduce their sports programs,” said CIF Executive Director Marie M. Ishida. “Athletics is an integral part of the high school experience and as more student-athletes decide to compete, the CIF will continue to foster the best possible experiences for all participants.”

Individually, both boys (14,476 or 3.3%) and girls (6,530 or 2.2%) participation increased from 2009. Collectively, track and field experienced the largest increase (9.8%) for both boys and girls for a combined 9,122 new participants (6,233 or 12.1% increase for boys; 2,889 or 6.9% increase for girls). Additionally, cross country also registered notable growth (9.4% increase) from 2009 for a combined 4,564 total increase of boys (2,814 or 10.5% increase) and girls (1,750 or 8.0% increase) competing.

Football continues to lead the top 10 boys' sports with 103,921 participants, followed by track and field (57,922) and soccer (47,078), which increased participation by 5.3% since 2009; basketball (43,176) and baseball (42,977) round out the top five boys' sports.

For girls, track and field continues reign as the top 10 sport with 44,625 participants. Soccer participation increased by 2.4 % (42,720) and comes in a close second followed by volleyball (39,122), basketball (32,839) and softball (32,816) rounding out the top five girls' sports.

The CIF's 1,517 member schools participated in the survey as part of the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) nationwide survey that measures the number of students competing in sports in the country.

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

– more –

# **BOYS' PARTICIPATION BREAKDOWN**

SPORT	BOYS 1998	BOYS 2001	BOYS 2003	BOYS 2005	BOYS 2007	BOYS 2009	BOYS 2011
Badminton	3,387	3,572	3,627	3,521	3,512	4,036	3,987
Baseball	40,102	42,942	41,392	40,676	42,835	42,064	42,977
Basketball	39,846	42,267	41,784	42,061	44,722	42,521	43,176
Cross Country	18,668	19,593	20,465	22,782	25,790	26,766	29,580
Field Hockey	12	36	36	52	193	123	76
Football 11-player	91,301	97,236	95,504	99,079	107,916	104,224	103,921
Football 9-player	190	246	251	166	246	0	0
Football 8-player	1,280	1,263	1,129	1,623	1,784	2,507	2,241
Football 6-player	9	82	96	47	0	0	0
Golf	10,783	11,990	11,764	11,459	11,897	11,295	11,288
Gymnastics	12	19	91	3	37	79	75
Lacrosse	0	0	2,240	3,608	5,323	7,365	8,288
Skiing	390	582	414	617	761	671	707
Soccer	35,537	38,053	38,501	39,453	44,730	44,705	47,078
Softball	580	1,129	963	456	743	311	26
Swimming & Diving	14,687	15,685	15,731	17,579	18,852	21,518	22,586
Tennis	15,380	15,804	16,716	17,238	19,139	19,266	19,514
Track and Field	39,262	40,843	41,349	45,038	49,911	51,689	57,922
Volleyball	11,660	13,326	12,156	13,133	14,532	15,638	16,087
Water Polo	10,725	11,411	11,500	12,570	14,064	14,852	15,666
Wrestling	23,163	24,326	22,007	23,318	25,896	27,469	27,833
Other	0	0	1,103	1,663	1,472	1,462	6,368
<b>Total</b>	<b>356,974</b>	<b>**386,248</b>	<b>**382,108</b>	<b>**398,684</b>	<b>**437,592</b>	<b>438,561</b>	<b>**453,037</b>

Whenever a school provides only a team for boys in a particular sport, girls are permitted to qualify for the "student" team(s).

\*\*Note: As part of the NFHS survey, the CIF measures participation in all sports and activities.

The above list does not comprise all sports/activities sponsored by schools and required in the NFHS survey.

Top 10 Boys Sports	Participants	Increase or Decrease (Since 2009)
1. Football (11 players)	103,921	-0.3
2. Track & Field	57,922	+12.1
3. Soccer	47,078	+5.3
4. Basketball	43,176	+1.5
5. Baseball	42,977	+2.2
6. Cross Country	29,580	+10.5
7. Wrestling	27,833	+1.3
8. Swimming & Diving	22,586	+5.0
9. Tennis	19,514	+1.3
10. Volleyball	16,087	+2.9

# **GIRLS' PARTICIPATION BREAKDOWN**

<b>SPORT</b>	<b>GIRLS 1998</b>	<b>GIRLS 2001</b>	<b>GIRLS 2003</b>	<b>GIRLS 2005</b>	<b>GIRLS 2007</b>	<b>GIRLS 2009</b>	<b>GIRLS 2011</b>
<b>Badminton</b>	4,462	4,722	4,929	4,500	4,491	5,219	5,119
<b>Baseball</b>	412	826	662	417	385	325	83
<b>Basketball</b>	30,979	33,831	33,912	33,596	34,991	32,980	32,839
<b>Cross Country</b>	14,245	16,060	16,618	18,159	20,873	21,901	23,651
<b>Field Hockey</b>	2,111	2,629	2,170	2,952	3,654	3,925	3,255
<b>Football 11-player</b>	200	313	236	253	149	141	179
<b>Football 9 -player</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Football 8 -player</b>	0	0	0	1	15	46	73
<b>Football 6 -player</b>	1	55	3	30	0	0	0
<b>Golf</b>	1,447	4,588	5,547	5,972	6,652	7,017	7,022
<b>Gymnastics</b>	1,230	1,260	859	896	732	1,039	1,074
<b>Lacrosse</b>	0	0	1,834	2,286	3,154	4,956	5,108
<b>Skiing</b>	243	389	222	432	544	565	626
<b>Soccer</b>	30,222	34,663	35,380	37,424	40,895	41,727	42,720
<b>Softball</b>	28,979	31,992	30,118	30,055	31,306	31,801	32,816
<b>Swimming &amp; Diving</b>	25,157	24,596	23,255	24,508	25,115	26,965	27,983
<b>Tennis</b>	17,383	18,812	19,496	19,847	21,818	22,908	22,460
<b>Track and Field</b>	29,682	33,153	34,378	36,113	38,817	41,736	44,625
<b>Volleyball</b>	30,879	34,194	32,756	34,015	36,499	38,920	39,122
<b>Water Polo</b>	9,487	12,257	12,185	13,099	13,482	13,871	14,040
<b>Wrestling</b>	494	752	957	1,230	1,142	1,493	1,910
<b>Other</b>	0	0	726	756	684	631	11,863
<b>Total</b>	<b>227,613</b>	<b>**271,214</b>	<b>**270,225</b>	<b>**278,284</b>	<b>**297,911</b>	<b>298,166</b>	<b>**304,696</b>

Whenever a school provides only a team for boys in a particular sport, girls are permitted to qualify for the "student" team(s).

**\*\*Note:** As part of the NFHS survey, the CIF measures participation in all sports and activities.

The above list does not comprise all sports/activities sponsored by schools and required in the NFHS survey.

<b>Top 10 Girls Sports</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Increase or Decrease (Since 2009)</b>
<b>1. Track &amp; Field</b>	44,625	+6.9
<b>2. Soccer</b>	42,720	+2.4
<b>3. Volleyball</b>	39,122	+0.5
<b>4. Basketball</b>	32,839	-0.4
<b>5. Softball</b>	32,816	+3.2
<b>6. Swimming &amp; Diving</b>	27,983	+3.8
<b>7. Cross Country</b>	23,651	+8.0
<b>8. Tennis</b>	22,460	-2.0
<b>9. Water Polo</b>	14,040	+1.2
<b>10. Golf</b>	7,022	+0.1

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **Recommended Amendment to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Related to Career Technical Education; Systemwide Procedures for Approving High School CTE Courses for California State University Admission**

#### **Presentation By**

Christine Mallon  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

Carolina C. Cardenas  
Associate Director  
Academic Outreach and Early Assessment

#### **Summary**

This action item includes two resolutions concerning Career Technical Education (CTE). One resolution would adopt a Title 5 change, and the other would establish a related systemwide curriculum review procedure. Both are required for the California State University (CSU) to be in compliance with California Education Code section 66205.8, which specifies that no later than January 1, 2014, the CSU Board of Trustees shall adopt a procedure by which a student can use a high school career technical education course to satisfy a general elective course (area “g”) requirement toward CSU admission requirements.

A shared CSU and University of California (UC) curriculum review process is already in place; however, as the UC and CSU do not both offer the same degree programs, there is a need to institute a curriculum review process for reviewing and approving CTE courses that would satisfy CSU-only first-time freshman admission requirements. If adopted by trustees, the proposed process would codify for the system a curriculum review procedure that would be effective for fall 2014 CSU admission. To apply the area “g” CTE electives toward CSU admission, Title 5 requires the proposed amendment.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, acting under Section 89030 of the Education Code, that Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 40601 is amended as follows:

**Title 5. California Code of Regulations**  
**Division 5 Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**  
**Chapter 1 – California State University**  
**Subchapter 3 – Admission Requirements**  
**Article 1 – Construction and Definitions**

**§40601. Particular Terms**

The following terms, whenever used or referred to in this subchapter, shall have the following meanings, respectively, unless a different meaning appears from the context:

(a) The term “Chancellor” means the Chancellor of the California State University or designee.

(b) The term “the campus” means the campus to which application for admission is made.

(c) The term “appropriate campus authority” means the president of the campus or designee.

(d) The term “college” means:

(1) Any institution of higher learning which is accredited to offer work leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts or to the degree of Bachelor of Science, by the applicable regional accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education, except an institution which is accredited only as a “specialized institution.”

(2) Any foreign institution of higher learning which, in the judgment of the Chancellor, offers course work equivalent to that offered by institutions included within subdivision (d)(1) of this section.

(e) The term “application” means the submission to the campus by the person applying for admission of all documents including official transcripts of all the applicant’s academic records and information which the applicant is required to personally submit, and the payment of any application fee due pursuant to Section 41800.1.

(f) The term “eligibility index” means:

(1) For admissions prior to fall term 2004, that number derived from a weighted combination of the grade point average for the final three years of high school or of the

grade point average for the final three years of high school excluding the final year or final term thereof, and in any case excluding courses in physical education and military science, and the score on either the American College Test or the Scholastic Aptitude Test pursuant to Section 40752 or Section 40802; such weighing of grade point averages and test scores shall be determined and adjusted by the Chancellor on the basis of the probability of academic success in the California State University.

(2) For admissions commencing with fall term 2004, that number derived from a weighted combination of the grade point average for courses taken in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects during the final three years of high school and the score on either the American College Test or the Scholastic Aptitude Test pursuant to Section 40752 or Section 40802; such weighing of grade point averages and test scores shall be determined and adjusted by the Chancellor on the basis of the probability of academic success in the California State University.

(g) The term “good standing at the last college attended” means that at the time of application for admission and at the time of admission, the applicant was not under disciplinary or academic suspension, dismissal, expulsion or similar action by the last college attended and was not under disciplinary suspension, dismissal, expulsion or similar action at any institution of The California State University.

(h) The term “first-time freshman” means an applicant who has earned college credit not later than the end of the summer immediately following high school graduation or an applicant who has not earned any college credit.

(i) The term “undergraduate transfer” means any person who is not a first-time freshman pursuant to Section 40601(h), and who does not hold a baccalaureate degree from any college.

(j) The term “full-time student” means any student whose program while in attendance at a college averaged twelve or more semester units per semester, or the equivalent.

(k) The term “resident” shall have the same meaning as does the same term in Section 68017 of the Education Code, and shall include all persons so treated by the provisions of that section.

(l) The term “unit” means a semester unit within the meaning of Section 40103, or the equivalent thereof.

(m) The term “transferable” when used in connection with college units, college credit or college work, shall mean those college units, credit or work which are determined to be

acceptable (either for specific requirements or as electives) toward meeting the requirements of a baccalaureate degree. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time to revise procedures for the implementation of this subdivision.

(n) For admissions prior to fall term 2003, the term “comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects” means four years of English, three years of mathematics, one year of United States history or United States history and government, one year of laboratory science, two years of foreign language, one year of visual and performing arts, and three years of electives from any combination of English, mathematics, social science, history, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, and other fields of study determined by the Chancellor to be appropriate preparation for California State University study.

(o) Commencing with admissions for the fall term 2003, the term “comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects” means, in each area of study, at least four years of English, three years of mathematics, two years of history or social science, two years of laboratory science, two years of foreign language, one year of visual and performing arts, and one year of electives from any combination of English, mathematics, social science, history, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, California State University-approved career technical education courses, and other fields of study determined by the Chancellor to be appropriate preparation for California State University study.

To operationalize the Title 5 change and in compliance with Education Code section 66205.8, the following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that a California State University Policy for Approving High School Career Technical Education Courses for CSU Admission is adopted as follows:

1. In satisfaction of Education Code section 66205.8, the CSU criteria for evaluating high school Career Technical Education (CTE) courses proposed for area “g” elective course requirement are the same evaluation criteria used in the shared CSU and UC “a-g” review process.
2. If a CTE course falls outside the range of courses in the established shared intersegmental UC and CSU criteria, as documented in the UC “a-g” Subject Area Requirements, the course reviewed for CSU admission must address a domain associated with a degree program offered by the CSU.

3. For courses considered only for CSU admission, if the domains of study are outside the confines of shared intersegmental “a-g” criteria, the CSU may adopt course review standards in addition to those on the “a-g” Subject Area Requirement.
4. Existing CSU course standards shall be used to determine course eligibility.
5. If no such CSU standards exist, a course may be evaluated by using standards for courses that are roughly equivalent to the proposed course.
6. Appropriate Chancellor’s Office staff will perform the initial screening. Any resubmitted application shall be considered by a subject-matter expert (or experts) approved by the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) including faculty of the CSU as appointed by the ASCSU.
7. The Chancellor is authorized to amend these procedures, based on recommendation from the ASCSU.



## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

### **Upper-Division General Education and Degree Completion**

#### **Presentation By**

Ephraim P. Smith  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer

Christine Mallon  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Academic Programs and Faculty Development

#### **Summary**

Following initial consultation with the Academic Senate, California State University (ASCSU), this amended item modifies the strategy for accomplishing a streamlining of bachelor's degrees. The senate has indicated its commitment to working with the CSU administration and campus senates to achieve the Board of Trustees' goal of providing high-quality, rigorous baccalaureate degree programs that require no more than 120 semester units or 180 quarter units wherever possible and without compromising accreditation, licensure, or professional requirements.

In July 2000, the trustees adopted Title 5 section 40508, which reduced the minimum number of units required to complete new bachelor's degrees to 120 semester units and 180 quarter units. Campuses are required to review degree programs regularly and to report annually to the board, justifying baccalaureate programs that remain above 120/180 units. By 2008, campuses reported that 80 percent of degree programs required no more than 120/180 units. In the years since then, we have seen only a one percentage point improvement, with 81 percent of programs not exceeding the minimum this year. Majors requiring more than the minimum number of units reportedly cannot reduce further because of professional accreditation requirements, pressure from advisory boards and input from employers.

As there has been insignificant improvement over the past four years (and even higher unit counts in years 2009, 2010, and 2011), it is proposed that Title 5 regulations be revised to require, wherever feasible, all four-year bachelor's degree programs to require no more than 120 semester units or 180 units to complete. This would shift the focus from the minimum number of units required for the degree to establishing also a maximum number of units allowed for the degree. Defined by their own Title 5 sections, the bachelor of architecture degree and bachelor of

## **AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 2 of 12

landscape architecture degree, the system's only five-year degrees programs, would still require a minimum of 120 semester (180 quarter) units each, and 150 semester (225 quarter) units would be the maximum allowed. Also defined in a separate Title 5 section, the bachelor of fine arts and bachelor of music degree programs would continue the 120 semester unit minimum and would carry a maximum of 132 semester (198 quarter) units. A campus may request a chancellor's exception to the maximum of 120/180 unit limit because of requirements for professional accreditation, licensure/professional preparation requirements, or similar externally imposed standards; and the chancellor may impose exceptions to degree requirements to achieve the identified maxima for degree programs.

It will be the responsibility of the campus faculty to decide on and adopt strategies that will allow four-year bachelor's programs to be completed with no more than 120 semester units and 180 quarter units, wherever feasible. Reducing the total number of units required at graduation could be accomplished in a number of ways: by reducing the number of units required in the major; campus-specific requirements; or systemwide general education (GE) requirements. Itemized degree requirements included in the minimum-unit calculations shall include required prerequisites, co-requisites, and credit-bearing campus-specific graduation requirements. The academic senate and Chancellor's Office administration will jointly develop a guidance document that will serve as "tool box" of existing policies and various curriculum planning strategies that can be incorporated into the process of reviewing and modifying degree requirements. An executive order will be issued to implement the procedures presented in and related to this item.

Currently, 508 CSU degree offerings require more than 120 semester units (180 quarter units). By reducing the units to 120/180, students in these 508 degree programs would pay for fewer semester units or quarter units, would be less likely to be assessed the proposed Third-Tier Tuition Fees (if that policy is adopted), and would reduce their total units at graduation. Reducing to 120/180 units could lower student debt levels and reduce student reliance on financial aid. Shortening the time to degree is especially valuable for students entering the CSU with required remediation work ahead of them, as those students are already obligated to take more courses than are their college-ready counterparts.

Reducing the total units required will result in increased student access, even during the budget crisis. With fewer units required in 508 degree programs, the CSU could provide access for new students who have been waiting to enter the university as freshmen or community college transfers. Degree-completion SB 1440 pathways will increase in number.

This effort is intended to improve graduation rates, protect academic quality, and support student efforts to obtain an affordable education. The proposed timeline for reducing baccalaureate unit requirements to 120/180 units is as follows:

**Degrees and Concentrations Requiring 121-129 Units (288 programs)**

*January 2013* Campuses shall submit program-by-program confirmations that each combination of degree and concentration will be reduced from 121-129 (181-192) to no more than 120/180 by fall 2013.

Campuses shall report to the chancellor a listing of each degree program and concentration that requires from 121 to 129 (181 to 192) units but for demonstrated academic, licensure, or accreditation reasons cannot be reduced to 120/180. The program's unit requirements, both before and after campus review, shall be specified, and the specific reasons for exceeding the maximum unit count shall be identified.

Campuses with programs requiring from 121 to 129 units (181 to 192) and unable to reduce counts to the maximum number of units shall submit requests for a chancellor's exception to the established unit maximum for each program.

Programs that have not been reduced to 120/180 units and have not been granted a chancellor's exception allowing higher unit counts will be subject to chancellor's action to reduce unit requirements, including:

1. double counting requirements;
2. adjusting the number of required major courses and units to achieve consistency with comparable CSU programs;
3. adjusting campus-specific degree requirements (such as languages other than English, among others); and
4. adjusting course and unit requirements for upper-division GE courses.

*March 2013* Programs reduced from 121-129 (181-192) units shall be published in the 2013-14 campus catalogs.

**AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 4 of 12

**Degrees and Concentrations Requiring 130 Units or More (220 programs)**

*January 2014* Campuses shall submit program-by-program confirmations that the remaining high-unit combinations of degrees and concentrations have been approved on campus to be reduced to the required number of units by fall 2014.

Programs that have not been reduced to 120/180 units and have not been granted a chancellor's exception allowing higher unit counts will be subject to chancellor's action to reduce unit requirements, including:

1. double counting requirements;
2. adjusting the number of required major courses and units to achieve consistency with comparable CSU programs;
3. adjusting campus-specific degree requirements (such as languages other than English, among others); and
4. adjusting course and unit requirements for upper-division GE courses.

*March 2014* All programs above 120/180 and that are subject to the new unit-maxima shall have been reduced to 120/180 units and shall appear in the 2014-15 campus catalogs.

All programs above 120/180 that have been approved by the chancellor to exceed the maximum unit count shall appear in the 2014-15 campus catalogs.

An item will be presented at the November meeting for board action to adopt the following recommended changes to Title 5.

**Title 5. Education**

**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**

**Chapter 1. California State University**

**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**

**Article 5. General Requirements for Graduation**

**§ 40405.1. California State University General Education - Breadth Requirements.**

(a) Each recipient of the bachelor's degree completing the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements pursuant to this subdivision (a) shall have completed a program which includes a minimum of 48 semester units or 72 quarter units of which 9 semester units or 12 quarter units shall be upper division level and shall be taken no sooner than the term in which the candidate achieves upper division status. At least 9 of the 48 semester units or 12 of the 72 quarter units shall be earned at the campus granting the degree. The 48 semester units or 72 quarter units shall be distributed as follows:

(1) A minimum of 9 semester units or 12 quarter units in communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communication, and in critical thinking, to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.

(2) A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

(3) A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages.

(4) A minimum of 12 semester units or 18 quarter units dealing with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

(5) A minimum of 3 semester units or 4 quarter units in study designed to equip human beings for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological, social, and psychological entities.

The specification of numbers of units implies the right of discretion on each campus to adjust reasonably the proportions among the categories in order that the conjunction of campus courses, credit unit configurations and these requirements will not unduly exceed any of the prescribed semester or quarter unit minima. However, the total number of units in General Education-Breadth accepted for the bachelor's degree under the provisions of this subdivision (a) ~~should~~

**AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 6 of 12

shall not be less than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units unless an exception has been approved by the chancellor.

(b) The president or an officially authorized representative of a college which is accredited in a manner stated in Section 40601 (d) (1) may certify the extent to which the requirements of subdivision (a) of this section have been met up to a maximum of 39 semester units (or 58 quarter units). Such certification shall be in terms of explicit objectives and procedures issued by the Chancellor.

(c) In the case of a baccalaureate degree being pursued by a post-baccalaureate student, the requirements of this section shall be satisfied if:

(1) The student has previously earned a baccalaureate or higher degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association; or

(2) The student has completed equivalent academic preparation, as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66055.8 and 89030, Education Code.

**Title 5. Education**  
**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**  
**Chapter 1. California State University**  
**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**  
**Article 5. General Requirements for Graduation**  
**§ 40405.4. Procedures for Implementing Programs to Meet General Education**  
**Requirements.**

(a) The Chancellor shall establish procedures to implement the objectives and requirements of Section 40405.1-40405.3, including provision for exceptions in individual cases of demonstrable hardship, and including periodic review of the extent to which the objectives and requirement are being met.

(b) The Chancellor may grant exceptions to the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 40405.1 for high unit ~~professional~~ degree major programs on a program-by-program basis.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code. Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

**Title 5. Education**  
**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**  
**Chapter 1. California State University**  
**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**  
**Full text of all sections at this level Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees**  
**§ 40500. Bachelor of Arts Degree: Required Curriculum.**

To be eligible for the Bachelor of Arts degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major 24 semester units (36 quarter units).

There shall be one major with a minimum of 24 semester units (36 quarter units). At least 12 semester units (18 quarter units) in the major shall be upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by the campus.

(c) Additional Units. Units to complete the total required for the degree may be used as electives or to meet other requirements.

(d) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Arts Degree, of which at least 40 (60 quarter units) shall be in the upper division credit, shall be 124 semester units (186 quarter units). For candidates for the Bachelor of Arts degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units (180 quarter units) shall be required, including at least 40 semester units (60 quarter units) in upper-division courses or their equivalent. For candidates for the Bachelor of Arts degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2014-15 academic year, a minimum of no fewer and no more than 120 semester (180 quarter) units shall be required, including at least 40 semester (60 quarter) units in upper-division courses or their equivalent.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

**AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 8 of 12

**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities  
Chapter 1. California State University  
Subchapter 2. Educational Program  
Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees  
§ 40501. Bachelor of Science Degree: Required Curriculum.**

To be eligible for the Bachelor of Science degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major 36 semester units.

There shall be one major with a minimum of 36 semester units. At least 18 semester units in this major shall be upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by the campus.

(c) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Science degree shall be 124 to 132 semester units, as determined by each campus, except that 140 semester units may be required in engineering. For candidates for the Bachelor of Science degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units shall be required. ~~The number of semester units for each curriculum shall be determined by each campus.~~ For candidates for the Bachelor of Science degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2014-15 academic year, a minimum of no fewer and no more than 120 semester (180 quarter) units shall be required.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code. Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.



**Title 5. Education**

**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**

**Chapter 1. California State University**

**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**

**Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees**

**§ 40505. Bachelor of Architecture Degree: Required Curriculum.**

To be eligible for the Bachelor of Architecture degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major 45 semester units.

The major shall consist of a minimum of 45 semester units. At least 27 semester units in the major shall be in upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by each campus.

(c) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Architecture degree shall be 165 to 175 semester units. For candidates for the Bachelor of Architecture degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units shall be required. For candidates for the Bachelor of Architecture degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2014-15 academic year, a minimum of no fewer than 120 semester (180 quarter) units shall be required, and no more than 150 semester (225 quarter) units shall be required. The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester period or equivalent.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code. Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

**AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 10 of 12

**Title 5. Education**

**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**

**Chapter 1. California State University**

**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**

**Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees**

**§ 40506. Bachelor of Music Degree and Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree: Required Curriculum.**

To be eligible for either the Bachelor of Music degree or the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major -70 semester units. The major shall consist of a maximum of 70 semester units with at least one-fourth of these units devoted to theory and content as distinguished from studio, production, and performance.

(c) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree shall be 132 semester units. For candidates for the Bachelor of Music degree and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units shall be required. For candidates for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree or Bachelor of Music degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2014-15 academic year, a minimum of no fewer than 120 semester (180 quarter) units and no more than 132 semester (198 quarter) units shall be required.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code. Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

**Title 5. Education**  
**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**  
**Chapter 1. California State University**  
**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**  
**Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees**  
**§ 40507. Bachelor of Landscape Architecture: Required Curriculum.**

To be eligible for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree, the candidate shall have completed the following requirements:

(a) General Education-Breadth Requirements. The courses in General Education-Breadth Requirements shall be distributed in the manner prescribed in Sections 40405-40405.4.

(b) Major..... 45 semester units.

The major shall consist of a minimum of 45 semester units, exclusive of those courses used to meet the General Education-Breadth Requirements. At least 27 units in the major shall be in upper division courses or their equivalent. The maximum number of units shall be determined by each campus.

(c) Total. For candidates electing, pursuant to Section 40401, to meet graduation requirements established prior to the 2000-01 academic year, the total semester units required for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree shall be 155 to 165 semester units. For candidates for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2000-01 academic year, a minimum of 120 semester units shall be required. For candidates for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree who are meeting graduation requirements established during or after the 2014-15 academic year, a minimum of no fewer than 120 semester (180 quarter) units and no more than 150 semester (225 quarter) units shall be required. The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester period or equivalent.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

**AMENDED**

Ed. Pol.

Agenda Item 3

September 18-19, 2012

Page 12 of 12

**Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities**

**Chapter 1. California State University**

**Subchapter 2. Educational Program**

**Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees**

**§ 40508. The Bachelor's Degree: Total Units.**

Each campus shall establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 semester (180 quarter) units. By the 2014-15 academic year, no baccalaureate degree programs shall extend the unit requirement beyond 120 semester (180 quarter) units, with the exception of the Bachelor of Architecture, Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Fine Arts, and Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degrees.

Note: Authority cited: Section 89030, Education Code. Reference: Section 89030, Education Code.

## **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  
Academic Affairs

#### **Summary**

Now that the fall term is underway, the California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges (CCC) have found renewed interest and energy in creating additional transfer degree programs in community colleges leading to baccalaureate degrees with no more than 60 required semester units (or 90 required quarter units) after transfer to a CSU campus.

Most recently, the CCC Chancellor's Office delivered marketing materials to high schools throughout the state referencing the advantages of the new transfer degree programs. The materials were funded by a grant from Complete College America. These materials will be followed by radio announcements about the programs that will be repeated in various online media. The website, [www.degreewithaguarantee.com](http://www.degreewithaguarantee.com), is operational and linked to other sites for easy student access.

Representatives from the CSU participated in each of the CCC's "Train the Trainer" workshops for counselors and other advisers on the various preparation, admission and program considerations in transitioning students seamlessly from one segment to the next. These well-attended workshops have helped tremendously to overcome the information lag that often follows in the wake of the implementation of any new initiative. The CSU also conducted a mandatory training session on the SB 1440 Associate Degree for Transfer program for CSU campus-based outreach staff. The CSU high school and transfer counselor conferences, which are attended by more than 6,000 professionals across the state, will each feature sessions on the transfer degree.

Ed. Pol.  
Agenda Item 4  
September 18-19, 2012  
Page 2 of 2

While it was necessary for the CSU to close applications for admission to the spring term because of severe budget cuts, 10 campuses are open for students with AA-T/AS-T transfer degrees. The number of unduplicated transfer applicants received approximated 6,100. While the CSU cannot altogether eliminate false-positive applications, it is hoped that more of these applicants will actually have completed the transfer degree than was the case for the fall 2012 term. The CSU has not received all the data nor has compiled any additional information on the number of enrolled admits with these transfer degrees. It is anticipated that information will be available for the next Board of Trustees meeting.

## **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

#### **Summary**

During the past year, Trustee Roberta Achtenberg, California State University San Marcos President Karen Haynes and a small group of experts in palliative care who have volunteered their time, have worked to develop a plan for the creation of the California State University (CSU) Institute for Palliative Care. 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. Launching at Cal State San Marcos, it will 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 institutions of higher education 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 positive 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 be a critical skill that will distinguish health care professionals trained in the CSU system.

Funding has been received from the Archstone Foundation and California HealthCare Foundation. The Institute will launch on September 20, 2012, at its home campus, Cal State San Marcos.