

AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Meeting: 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, September 10, 2014
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

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

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 22, 2014

Discussion

1. The Alliance to Accelerate Excellence in Education at California State University San Marcos, *Information*
2. The Graduation Initiative: Completion and Student-Athletes, *Information*
3. eAdvising Update, *Information*
4. California State University Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) Update, *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 22, 2014

Members Present

Debra S. Farar, Chair
Margaret Fortune, Vice Chair
Talar Alexanian
Rebecca D. Eisen
Steven M. Glazer
Lillian Kimbell
Lou Monville, Chair of the Board
Gavin Newsom, Lieutenant Governor
Steven G. Stepanek
Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Trustee Farar called the meeting to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 20, 2014, were approved as submitted.

The State of Higher Education in California: Opportunities for Policy and Institutional Change

Trustee Roberta Achtenberg introduced the item saying that for the past 10 years she has wanted to have the Campaign for College Opportunity present their work to the board. Led by Executive Director Michele Siqueiros, the Campaign for College Opportunity is a California nonprofit organization co-founded in 2003 by a unique alliance of prominent organizations including the California Business Roundtable, Community College League of California and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF). Their mission focuses on preserving the historic promise of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education to provide every eligible student in California an opportunity to attend college and succeed in order to strengthen the state's workforce and economy, she said. The Campaign has produced more than 200 reports and fact sheets about the complexity of college attendance and the importance of investing in higher education. Trustee Achtenberg said the Campaign has been an important advocate influencing legislators, governors and other policy makers making the case for improving educational attainment and success in California.

Ms. Siqueiros presented a PowerPoint presentation explaining the information covered would include an overview of important and relevant demographic data for California and more specific statistics as they relate to the California State University (CSU) system. She mentioned the information presented in the item is available from more detailed reports on the Campaign website (<http://collegecampaign.org/>). She showed a diagram representing the return on investment the California higher education systems provide back to the state. The investment in human capital yields a return of \$4.50 for every dollar invested in higher education, and the state receives approximately \$12 billion back from graduates of the CSU and University of California systems through various tax revenues. According to their research, students who earned a college degree earn on average \$1.3 million more over the course of their lifetime. She also noted the state saves on other costs, such as incarceration and social services, as college graduates are less likely to be incarcerated or require additional social services.

In November 2013, the Campaign launched a new series of reports on the state of higher education in California to bring attention to the critical challenges facing higher education and the opportunities for solving them. *The State of Latinos in Higher Education in California* was the first report in this series, followed by *The State of Blacks in Higher Education in California*. The series also included an analysis by gender and race and a first of its kind analysis on the real cost of college based on time-to-degree for CSU graduates. Ms. Siqueiros said the focus of the Campaign's research is to help inform higher education policy reform as well as advocate for policies that are in the best interests of students and the state. She presented a graph depicting demographic data for California's population noting that Latinos represent the largest ethnic minority group (38.2 percent), with a large proportion made up of young people. African Americans represent 5.7 percent of the population in California and one-third of the population in Los Angeles County. The data was further broken down to represent the approximate 500,000 high school graduates in California in 2012. She explained the graph of high school graduates by race that showed, despite California's diversity, there was a significant gap in graduation rates for Latinos and African Americans compared to the national average. In California, fewer than 3 in 10 Latino and Black high school graduates completed the A-G requirements for college eligibility making nearly 30 percent of these students unable to even apply to a 4-year institution, she said.

Reviewing the representation of the 18- to 24-year old college going population in California, she presented a chart illustrating that Latinos and Blacks are underrepresented in the three higher education systems, with the exception of Blacks slightly overrepresented in the California Community Colleges. Data on remediation rates from the CSU's 2007 entering freshman cohort compared to the 2013 cohort revealed the percentage of Latinos and Black students needing remediation has decreased though still represent a greater proportion of the entering cohort requiring remediation in math and/or English. She acknowledged the CSU's progress in reducing the remediation rates of underrepresented minority students citing the importance of how remediation rates relate to graduation rates. The six-year graduation rate for the 2007 cohort is approximately 53 percent for all students entering as proficient, though there is a gap in graduation rates when compared to Latinos and Blacks who are proficient at entry yet graduate at

a lower rate. The data also reviewed effects of the economic recession beginning in 2008 that disproportionately impacted underrepresented minority enrollments in the CSU, with Black students having been particularly affected. Although four- and six-year graduation rates are improving overall, the graduation gaps remain persistent for Latino and Black students.

In July 2014, the Campaign released reports about the real cost of college including factors such as the cost of extended time-to-degree and loss of potential earnings. Looking at the median time to degree, she said, CSU graduates in 2011-2012 took 4.7 years to complete the baccalaureate degree. The data also revealed students took an average of 135 semester units. Ms. Siqueiros reminded the board that these numbers are medians meaning that half of the students were taking more units and even longer to graduate which is problematic. She provided a hypothetical example of a student attending California State University, Long Beach to illustrate the additional costs incurred if they took longer than four years to graduate. According to their formula, it would cost the student an additional \$26,000 in added costs plus potential forgone earnings. She noted that students receiving financial aid would not incur costs necessarily out of pocket but would still be at a loss in terms of delayed entry into the workforce and potential earnings. However, recent CSU policy to decrease the amount of units required for programs as well as the Associate Degree for Transfer (SB 1440) will help to improve time-to-degree in the future, she added. Students and parents can go online to <http://www.realcostofcollegeinca.org> and use a tool that helps determine the cost of college based on various factors such as full-versus part-time status, major selected and work load. She said by reducing the overall average credits students earn by just 1 percent, the state could save approximately \$12 million for students and could reinvest the savings to provide more capacity for prospective eligible students. She noted, however, there are many factors that contribute to increased time-to-degree including capacity issues, remediation needs, financial aid, credits attempted but not earned and many others. It will take collaboration, partnership, leadership and accountability of all stakeholders in California to prioritize and invest in higher education in order to serve more students and close the persistent achievement gaps. Ms. Siqueiros said the data presents systemwide analysis which is important, but it will take individual analysis at the campus and even program level to more accurately understand the achievement gap challenge and how to formulate policy that best meets the needs of our students and state.

Trustee Hugo Morales asked if the research confirmed a gap in high school graduation rates by race, for Latinos and Blacks, and gender. Ms. Siqueiros said there is a gap by gender in every ethnic group where more women than men are attending college. She added that a gap also exists within the same gender group by race where, for example, Latinas and African American women are enrolling in college at a lower rate than White women. There is also extensive national research that reveals that more drop off occurs the longer it takes to graduate, with ethnic gaps likely to exist within the data, she said. Trustee Rebecca Eisen asked for clarification regarding the median time-to-degree reported for the CSU of 4.7 years. Ms. Siqueiros explained the figure reported represented 2011-12 graduates that earned a degree and then worked backwards to when the students enrolled to determine the median time-to-degree. The other data referred to the four- and six-year graduation rates tracked by the CSU system. Ken O'Donnell, senior director

for student engagement and academic initiatives and partnerships, added both datasets are important and the focus is on decreasing overall time-to-degree. He added parallel efforts, such as the Associate Degree for Transfer and limiting total program units to 120/180, will help decrease time-to-degree without disadvantaging other students who may require more than four years to graduate. Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom asked if the data had been disaggregated to focus on graduation rates of student athletes by the Campaign or by the chancellor's office. Ms. Siqueiros said they had not and Chancellor White explained that, on average, athletes across the system graduate at higher rates than the student body in general. He added that schools with marquis sports programs, such as football and basketball, may have lower graduation rates though on the whole CSU student athletes perform better academically and the data could be provided to reflect that.

Trustee Steven Glazer mentioned the ongoing challenge of the California Community Colleges system to increase their offering of Associate Degrees for Transfer and asked for comment on why this delayed progress may be persisting. Ms. Siqueiros said the ongoing efforts between both systems, in collaboration with both systemwide academic senates, have created 26 Associate Degrees for Transfer that are currently available to students, though there was concern regarding uneven implementation. There has been recent change in leadership at the system level and within the community college districts but Senator Alex Padilla, who sponsored SB 1440, remains committed and considerable progress is expected in the next year with clear deadlines for implementation by 2015.

Chair Lou Monville asked if the data on the cost of college was compared to financial aid data to determine if there is any impact on time-to-degree. That particular cross-analysis was not performed, but Cal Grants did keep pace during the recession as tuition and fees increased, she said. Trustee Monville added the importance of continuing to review the relationship between robust financial aid awards and potential impact on time-to-degree within the context of graduation rates and serving both current and prospective students. Ms. Siqueiros said Stanford University is launching an analysis of Cal Grant aid as it relates to the challenges raised by Chair Monville and she would update the board as the research develops.

Trustee Achtenberg asked to reiterate the distinction between an investment in higher education as opposed to a mere expenditure and why that is important to note. Ms. Siqueiros said two major research reports analyzing California's return on investment for every dollar spent to produce college graduates, and calculating potential earnings, found that by age 38 students would have repaid every dollar invested in higher education by state taxpayers. Through a combination of higher income taxes, higher purchasing power due to higher income levels and savings in social services and costs associated with incarceration, the state receives a high rate of return on their investment in higher education, she said.

Trustee Morales asked what areas of research the Campaign would like to focus on that had not been done either due to lack of resources or access to data in order to further serve the mission of the organization. Analyzing time-to-degree for transfer students, workforce demand in STEM

and health related fields and strategies to continue to close the achievement gaps are all areas of tremendous interest and focus of the Campaign. She thanked the CSU for their partnership and transparency providing important data that supports their continued efforts to serve students and the state of California.

The California State University Graduation Initiative Update

Ken O'Donnell, senior director for student engagement and academic initiatives and partnerships, presented the update saying the initiative has and will continue to improve access, quality and persistence to degree completion by focusing on programs such as Early Start and reducing bottlenecks. He recapped the information shared with the board at the May 20, 2014, meeting and showed a diagram mapping out the pathways to graduation for students entering as freshmen or transfer students. The Graduation Initiative represents an overarching focus on student success that governs many of the programs aimed at closing the achievement gap, he said. Working with faculty leadership, the CSU has continued to define success not only in terms of degree completion, but also as the attainment of a quality education through engaged learning and the use of high-impact practices. He said a fundamental premise of the Graduation Initiative is that students persist and succeed when the curriculum is relevant and engaging through the use of high-impact practices such as learning communities, undergraduate research and service learning. Referencing Trustee Achtenberg's comments in the previous item on the work improving campus climate around lower division curriculum over the past 15 years, Mr. O'Donnell said that work is paying off in terms of graduation rates. Moving forward, the Graduation Initiative will continue to focus on closing the achievement gap between underrepresented minorities and others with an expansion of Early Start, freshmen learning communities and other high-impact practices shown to particularly benefit underserved populations.

The initiative has two primary goals: (1) to improve graduation rates and (2) reduce achievement gaps. The gaps are not decreasing as the graduation rates are improving at the same rate which remains a challenge, he said. All 23 campuses helped set the system goals as well as individual campus goals which were to raise the six-year graduation rates to the top quartile of national averages among their peer groups. Mr. O'Donnell explained that campuses determine strategies to meet their target rates, a critical component to achieving the success of meeting both the campus and systemwide graduation targets. As 2015 approaches the CSU anticipates that campuses will likely hit the overall target of 54 percent, which is an 8 percent increase from the baseline graduation rate of 46 percent. At his State of the CSU address in January, Chancellor White charged the CSU to further improve overall six-year graduation rates by 10 percent to nearly 60 percent by 2025. The initiative aims to also improve both four- and five-year graduation rates by 2025 but that with each point added to the target it becomes more challenging, he added.

Mr. O'Donnell reminded the board that when this report was given in May 2014, it prompted trustees to reference a recent *New York Times* article about the University of Texas at Austin also

struggling to close the gap and increase graduation rates. Building on research from Stanford University, the article discussed current efforts in student success that focused on dispositional learning, attributes like resilience, grit, and determination, suggesting that a few small interventions in these areas can have a profound benefit for students. He said that many of the campuses have been discussing the efforts highlighted in the article, particularly those around dispositional learning, as not having to be long-term or expensive strategies. The CSU has a tradition of working in these areas, he said, noting Summer Bridge programs as one of the built-in places to explore dispositional learning. To address the persistent achievement gap in race and ethnicity, one area the CSU is focusing on is in remediation as underrepresented minority students tend to be disproportionately in need of remediation in either math and/or English. Building on the Early Start Program, four CSU campuses are testing an “Extended Early Start” program which takes the socializing and cohorting benefits of the summer experience and extends them into the regular academic year. Extended benefits include arranged peer mentoring, faculty interaction and continuous shared enrollment into credit bearing general education courses. He said the pilot program is supported by a special allocation from the chancellor’s office that also requires robust evaluation and research on the efficacy of these practices, especially with respect to closing the achievement gaps. The Graduation Initiative will continue to report to the board on the progress and potential scalability of these pilot interventions.

Trustee Margaret Fortune mentioned that there has been considerable conversation in the school reform community surrounding the approach to creating resiliency in students, as opposed to a no-excuses model, that focuses more on high accountability and also high-touch. She asked if this philosophy has changed the mode of operations with regards to the Graduation Initiative efforts, and if so, in what way. Mr. O’Donnell said the work with the pilot interventions is too early to say whether that philosophy has had an effect on the operational aspects of the initiative. The efforts have focused on providing students with opportunities for high-impact practices, especially in experiential learning, where and whenever possible. He said many of the high-impact practices, such as learning communities and service learning, are not new to the CSU and have been around as early as 1998. However, the language around dispositional learning – grit, determination, etc. – and the attributes they bear on students is new. The CSU will gauge, as the dialogue continues, if and how to operationalize this philosophy into future strategies.

The California State University Affordable Learning Solutions Initiative

Gerry Hanley, assistant vice chancellor for academic technology services, presented the update, saying that affordability affects access to education but the California State University (CSU) system can help keep education within reach by reducing the estimated \$1,000 per year students pay for course materials. Dr. Hanley referenced the 2012 Florida Student Textbooks survey that sampled over 20,000 Florida students. The survey, funded by the Department of Education, found the high cost of textbooks had caused students to, frequently, occasionally, or seldom: not purchase the textbook (64 percent); not register for a course (45 percent); take fewer courses (49 percent); withdraw from a course (21 percent); or, fail a course (17 percent). Like Florida students, students in California confront significant challenges in achieving academic success

when they cannot afford the course materials required for their learning, he said. The CSU's Affordable Learning Solutions initiative (AL\$) has been at the national forefront of reducing the cost of course materials, by partnering with faculty, libraries, bookstores, publishers, technology companies and other higher education institutions to build innovative capabilities to improve the affordability of course materials for CSU students.

Dr. Hanley outlined three guiding principles of the AL\$ initiative that included (1) choice for both students and faculty of the quality content and format that best achieve their learning and teaching goals; (2) affordability through innovative business strategies and technologies; and (3) accessibility for all CSU students, including those with disabilities. The CSU is achieving these cost reductions, he said, by providing students and faculty with a "one-stop-shop" to explore alternative quality content that is available at low- or no-cost through the systemwide AL\$ website (<http://affordablelearningsolutions.org/>). By developing and delivering reliable tools and technologies, and significant marketing resources and collateral with training and funding through campus grants, campuses are able to adapt, adopt and implement affordable learning solutions programs that are well aligned with their campus culture, needs and capabilities. Dr. Hanley provided examples from California State University, Chico highlighting their Textbook Alternatives Project (TAP) and the Cougars Affordable Learning Materials (CALM) program at California State University San Marcos. He also mentioned Sacramento State's program in partnership with their academic technology and creative services department and noted Cal Poly Pomona's affordable learning solutions program that has been integrated into the campuswide communication plan. Dr. Hanley said that with 23 campuses it was difficult to share all the innovative programs throughout the system and he acknowledged and thanked all the presidents for making great strides implementing AL\$ programs on their campuses.

The CSU's leadership on the AL\$ initiative was recognized with a combined \$2 million grant from the state of California, the Hewlett Foundation and the Gates Foundation to design and deliver the California Open Online Library for Education (COOL4Ed). The grant will be funded over a 2-year period to provide low- and no-cost access to course material in collaboration with the California Community Colleges and University of California systems. Dr. Hanley said this partnership will also work closely with academic senate leadership of all three systems. This summer faculty from all three systems will identify and peer review a collection of free and open etextbooks and create ePortfolios showcasing how faculty use these etextbooks in their courses.

Dr. Hanley noted the CSU's leadership in Affordable Learning Solutions has also extended nationally. The State University of New York (SUNY) system, the University System of Georgia, the Tennessee Board of Regents and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education have all adopted and adapted the CSU-MERLOT AL\$ technology platform and services to meet their state system's needs. The CSU's Affordable Learning Solutions initiative continues to lead the state and nation in developing and implementing strategies that are significantly reducing the costs of content for students across the country, he said. In 2014, priorities will focus on deployment in four key areas: (1) expanding campus AL\$ programs to provide high quality, no- and low-cost alternatives; (2) scaling shared services through systemwide collaboration; (3)

streamlining technologies and collaborative innovations; and (4) improving accountability strategies to measure and manage outcomes. As the initiative moves forward the guiding principles of choice of quality content, affordability and accessibility will remain at the forefront as new strategies for enabling student success are developed.

Trustee Hugo Morales asked how issues of copyright are addressed and if there are challenges for students in rural areas, for example, accessing the internet and online content. To answer the first question, Dr. Hanley said open textbooks have a particular type of license called a creative commons attribution license. The license allows authors to grant permission to use their material as long as the content being used is attributed to the author. This allows material not only to be free, but also open and usable material; what makes an etextbook an open textbook. He said this was a particular requirement of California Senate Bill 1053. Responding to the second question about internet access, Dr. Hanley said there are still some differences in the way students have access to technology but that campuses are providing equalizing environments through libraries, academic technology services and other resources to provide the necessary infrastructure to support accessibility of online content to all students. Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom complimented the efforts and engagement of the CSU leadership having an impact across the state and nationally. He remarked that this is a profoundly important initiative because it has real, tangible impact on students and again lauded the successes achieved commenting that more had been accomplished than he had expected at this point.

Dr. Hanley said that CSU bookstores saved students more than \$30 million in 2013-14 through a variety of programs, such as print rental programs, used book programs, digital textbook programs and buy-back programs. The strategies also extended to implementing business models for publishers' etextbooks that encourage students to purchase or rent online content versus foregoing the necessary materials due to prohibitive costs. He gave the example of the CSU's Rent Digital program that negotiated a 60 percent discount on rented digital textbooks, which students can print if they choose. When the program began in fall 2012, the four etextbook distributors/publishers provided 5,000 etextbook titles at this discounted price. In spring 2014, more than 50,000 etextbook titles from nine distributors/publishers were available to students and faculty.

California State University Partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service AmeriCorps*VISTA Program (Volunteers In Service To America)

Ken O'Donnell, senior director for student engagement and academic initiatives and partnerships, introduced the item stating that engaged learning practices, such as undergraduate research and learning communities, can be challenging programs to organize and implement. He said the California State University (CSU) Partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service AmeriCorps*VISTA Program (Volunteers in Service to America) is an exciting innovation to enhance engaged learning practices. Kristina Barger, CSU VISTA program manager, presented the item explaining the VISTA program had been founded fifty years ago by Sargent Shriver as a way to lift people out of poverty. Ms. Barger said VISTA, often referred to

as the “domestic Peace Corps,” recruits individuals who commit one-year of service in some of America’s most impoverished communities. VISTA members are typically recent college graduates, with a variety of skills and knowledge, that are tasked with supporting nonprofit or government agencies through capacity building efforts that empower and inspire community members and leaders to build pathways to prosperity. In 1997, through state campus compact offices, VISTA volunteers began serving at institutions of higher education to better engage the campus with the community. Most placements were in service-learning and community engagement offices designed to support student learning and leadership development in civic engagement while also addressing community needs and being responsive to local and national issues.

Ms. Barger said in the coming academic year, the Corporation for National & Community Service and the CSU Center for Community Engagement will embark on a new systemwide partnership, the first of its kind in the country. This statewide, coordinated approach is expected to improve the ability of both VISTA and the CSU to deliver on their shared goals of quality, outreach and equity. In each case, the work will be specifically focused on supporting nine science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) departments, colleges and institutes. VISTA members will serve as liaisons between STEM students, faculty, staff and community partners to develop long-term solutions for bolstering the number of underrepresented students (particularly low-income and minority students) who pursue and obtain STEM degrees. Ms. Barger mentioned the critical importance of producing graduates in STEM fields for the state’s economic and civic health, as well as the importance to the students who earn these degrees. She added that the CSU will play a central role as the need for graduates in STEM is constant.

Through community partnerships with nonprofits, industry leaders and K-12 schools, the CSU STEM VISTA program will consist of 15 members who will build the capacity of the CSU STEM host sites and community partner organizations to more deeply engage students in STEM and provide more opportunities to participate in mentoring and academic support programs. She said engaged learning experiences, such as service learning, internships and undergraduate research, will not only make lasting, positive changes in local communities, but will also expand the CSU’s ability to give students the skills and knowledge needed to be successful in their majors and obtain STEM degrees and job placement, thus in turn, building a sustainable STEM workforce. Ms. Barger said the CSU’s investment to prepare graduates who are engaged, knowledgeable and civically-minded has already yielded high returns. She noted that 10 out of the 15 CSU STEM VISTA members are CSU alumni. The 15 CSU STEM VISTA members reflect not only the demographics of California, but also that of the CSU, she said. Sixty-seven percent are CSU alumni representing six campuses; 60 percent are female and 40 percent are male; 60 percent are minorities and 40 percent Caucasian; 67 percent are bilingual with eight different languages represented; and 93 percent had experience with at least one high-impact practice as an undergrad. She stated that CSU students will see themselves in the VISTA volunteers strengthening the capacity to foster sustainable and successful partnerships.

Trustee Lillian Kimbell asked for examples of the types of work CSU STEM VISTA members would be conducting. Ms. Barger said the CSU STEM VISTA program is complex and unique

Ed. Pol.

10

as it relates to other familiar volunteer programs because the focus is on indirect service. The CSU STEM VISTA volunteers focus on building capacity to increase opportunities for high-impact practices, including internships, service learning and undergraduate research, for underrepresented minority students. This is largely achieved by developing community partnerships and implementing the systems and structures needed for high-impact practices to take place. Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom asked if the CSU partnership was engaged with the University of California and California Community Colleges systems. Judy Botelho, director of the CSU Center for Community Engagement, said she was familiar with the VISTA program at the University of California, Los Angeles but that no other systemwide program similar to the CSU partnership existed.

Trustee Farar adjourned the Committee on Educational Policy.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

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

Presentation By

Karen S. Haynes
President
California State University San Marcos

Patricia Prado-Olmos
Director of the Alliance

Summary

In July 2013, with financial support from the Price Family Charitable Fund and the David T. and Doris E. Staples Foundation, California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) President Karen Haynes announced the launch of the Alliance to Accelerate Excellence in Education. Known simply as "the Alliance," this program provides strategic direction for and administrative oversight of the university's 10 guaranteed admission programs with local school districts spanning both San Diego and Riverside Counties. In its inaugural year, the Alliance has created the foundation upon which to build a seamless step-by-step framework for students, families, teachers, faculty and community service providers to work together on improving college readiness and closing the achievement gap for the region's most educationally at-risk students. This item will provide an update on the Alliance's programmatic progress during its first year and share plans for continued growth and outreach.

Background

In 2006, President Haynes signed CSUSM's first guaranteed admission agreement with a local school district. Seven years later and with 10 such agreements in place, it became clear that a coordinated, systematic and comprehensive approach to administering, leveraging and growing these agreements was needed to ensure their success. Recognizing the impact of these agreements on CSUSM students (50 percent of whom are first in their family to attend college and over 50 percent of whom identify as persons of color), and their social and economic impact on the region, external donors stepped forward to fund the launch of the Alliance to provide the administrative home that these agreements require.

Building from CSUSM's exceptionally strong and long established community partnerships and relationships and drawing from existing community and school research-based practices in

Ed. Pol
Agenda Item 1
September 9-10, 2014
Page 2 of 2

college readiness and preparation, the Alliance has five focus areas that support the promise of guaranteed admission: (1) Family Empowerment Network; (2) Undergraduate Fellowships; (3) Professional Development Collaborative; (4) Student Enrichment; and (5) Assessment, Analysis and Accountability.

Academic performance data to date indicate that Alliance students typically enter CSUSM with higher high school GPAs, have higher standardized test scores, are better prepared for college, do not need remediation in any academic area, sustain higher academic performance in college and are more likely to stay in college than the general student population. The Alliance is focused on understanding the success of their students, identifying the high-impact practices that support their success, and working in partnership with regional school districts and business partners to use high-impact practices strategically and effectively for the success of all students.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The California State University Graduation Initiative: Completion and Student-Athletes

Presentation By

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

Horace Mitchell
President
CSU Bakersfield

Ray Murillo
Director
Student Programs

Summary

At its July 22, 2014, meeting, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees requested Graduation Initiative staff to review and analyze graduation rates of CSU National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I student-athletes. The analysis presented in this item includes all Division I sports at each of the nine participating CSU institutions that compete at that level.

Overall, CSU graduation rates are determined following the conventions of the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The calculation counts all full-time, first-time freshmen, excluding part-time and transfer students, and then calculates the share of those students who earned a degree within 150 percent of the expected time-to-degree (based on a six-year graduation rate).

IPEDS reporting does not distinguish student-athletes from non-student athletes. The closest comparable data to IPEDS is the Federal Graduation Rate (FGR). The FGR is compiled by the U.S. Department of Education and is used as an indicator of academic success for college student-athletes. The FGR is based on all first-time freshmen athletes who receive athletic aid, and who graduate within six years. The most recent FGR rates published by the NCAA are the four-year class averages for the 2003-2006 entering cohorts tracked over six years. When comparing the FGR averages to the IPEDS data for each Division I campus, it is important to remember that the FGR rate does not include those athletes who transfer to the CSU to play

Division I sports. Therefore, the FGR may not accurately reflect the graduation rates for the entire team. Table 1 shows the FGR rates compared to IPEDS for men’s and women’s Division I sports at each of the nine participating CSU institutions. On average, CSU first-time freshmen student-athletes (FGR) graduate at higher rates than first-time freshmen overall.

Table 1
IPEDS vs. Federal Graduation Rates (FGRs)

Campus	IPEDS Grad Rate	FGR Grad Rate
Sacramento State	41%	75%
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	72%	68%
San Diego State University	66%	63%
CSU Long Beach	57%	59%
CSU Northridge	48%	56%
CSU Fresno	48%	55%
San Jose State University	47%	52%
CSU Fullerton	51%	51%
CSU Bakersfield	39%	50%
CSU Averages	52%	59%

Another measure of graduation success for athletes is NCAA’s Graduation Success Rate (GSR). This measure is an improvement over the FGR because it includes first-time freshmen as well as transfer students, mid-year enrollees and non-scholarship students (in specified cases). Like the FGR, the GSR only includes athletes who are on athletic aid and may not reflect the graduation rates for an entire team.

The Division I GSRs are often misunderstood because of their complexity. For example, the GSRs can become skewed in those athletic programs with fewer athletes and smaller entering cohorts from year-to-year. Another confounding factor is the distribution of athletic aid, which is variable among the different sports, and is regulated by NCAA. There are many rules and regulations that influence GSRs and can impact graduation rate statistics.

The GSRs reported in Table 2 represent the most recent information available, which are the four-year class averages for the 2003-2006 entering cohorts tracked over six years. Comparing IPEDS data to GSRs is not appropriate. Therefore, Table 2 illustrates the graduation rates for all freshmen and transfer students at each Division I institution in the CSU compared to the GSR rates. Like the comparison of IPEDS data to the FGRs, GSRs are rough measure when compared to CSU system-level data and direct comparisons should be made with caution. Overall, multi-year averages can mask issues and further analysis may be required. However, the data reveals that at each Division I institution, CSU student-athletes (GSR) graduate at higher rates than first-time freshmen and transfer students.

Table 2
CSU First-time Freshmen and Transfer Graduation Rates vs. Overall Average Graduation Success Rates (GSRs)

Campus	FTF & Transfer Grad Rate	Overall Average GSR Grad Rate
CSU Long Beach	65%	81%
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	75%	75%
San Diego State University	72%	75%
CSU Fresno	60%	72%
Sacramento State	56%	72%
CSU Fullerton	62%	68%
CSU Northridge	61%	68%
San Jose State University	57%	63%
CSU Bakersfield	54%	60%
CSU Averages	62%	75%

Another measure for determining the academic success of athletes is the Academic Progress Rate (APR). The NCAA uses the APR to hold Division I institutions accountable for the academic progress of their student athletes. Teams must have a four-year class average minimum score of 930/1000 to participate in post-season championships. Some teams may score below 930 and NCAA carefully monitors those programs to determine if sanctions should be applied. Athletic programs, under the direction of the athletic director (AD), closely monitor student success because even one student can impact the APR, which is based on a point system. APR scores also have a high statistical correlation with graduation rates. According to the NCAA, an APR of 930 correlates with a graduation rate of 50 percent. Table 3 shows that the average APR score across all Division I CSU institutions is 967, which exceeds the average for all other comprehensive universities in the nation (967 vs. 965).

Table 3
CSU Academic Progress Rates (APRs)

Campus	Average APR
CSU Fresno	976
CSU Long Beach	976
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	975
Sacramento State	973
CSU Fullerton	969
San Jose State University	968
CSU Northridge	967
San Diego State University	965
CSU Bakersfield	937
CSU Average	967

An additional measure for examining the overall success of CSU Division I athletic programs is by comparing the average FGRs, GSRs and APRs for each sport to those of all other Division I comprehensive institutions throughout the United States. Tables 4 through 9 illustrate these comparisons for women's and men's sports.

Table 4
Federal Graduation Rates (FGRs) for CSU Division I Men's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Water Polo	83%	NA
Football	63%	50%
Swim	62%	68%
Tennis	60%	61%
Volleyball	58%	78%
Golf	55%	60%
Track/Cross Country	52%	53%
Basketball	46%	40%
Soccer	39%	59%
Wrestling	39%	51%
Baseball	28%	48%
OVERALL AVERAGE	53%	57%

Table 5
Federal Graduation Rates (FGRs) for CSU Division I Women's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Gymnastics	78%	82%
Swim	78%	79%
Crew	76%	70%
Golf	75%	69%
Water Polo	70%	NA
Volleyball	69%	65%
Tennis	69%	66%
Soccer	68%	66%
Track/Cross Country	66%	69%
Softball	64%	62%
Basketball	54%	55%
OVERALL AVERAGE	70%	68%

Table 6
Graduation Success Rates (GSRs) for CSU Division I Men's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Volleyball	82%	100%
Swim	80%	75%
Water Polo	80%	NA
Tennis	79%	83%
Golf	68%	76%
Football	66%	61%
Baseball	61%	70%
Wrestling	59%	66%
Basketball	58%	66%
Track/Cross Country	56%	65%
Soccer	56%	79%
OVERALL AVERAGE	68%	74%

Table 7
Graduation Success Rates (GSRs) for CSU Division I Women's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Gymnastics	95%	96%
Tennis	94%	86%
Crew	90%	76%
Swim	83%	89%
Volleyball	83%	86%
Soccer	82%	84%
Track/Cross Country	78%	84%
Softball	78%	82%
Water Polo	78%	NA
Golf	74%	87%
Basketball	69%	79%
OVERALL AVERAGE	82%	85%

Table 8
Academic Progress Rates (APRs) for CSU Division I Men's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Volleyball	996	NA
Cross Country	979	966
Tennis	978	965
Track (indoor)	977	952
Track (outdoor)	965	956
Water Polo	960	NA
Football	959	938
Swim	957	976
Baseball	956	957
Golf	950	964
Soccer	949	960
Basketball	938	942
Wrestling	934	959
OVERALL AVERAGE	961	958

**Based on maximum score of 1,000.*

Table 9
Academic Progress Rates (APRs) for CSU Division I Women's Sports
 Four-Class Averages for 2003-2006 Cohorts

SPORT	CSU Averages (NCAA reported data)	NCAA Averages (Comprehensives)
Swim	989	985
Gymnastics	985	985
Cross Country	984	961
Crew	978	986
Soccer	977	979
Track (indoor)	974	967
Tennis	974	978
Lacrosse	974	961
Softball	973	971
Track (outdoor)	971	NA
Golf	971	978
Water Polo	971	NA
Volleyball	970	972
Basketball	961	965
OVERALL AVERAGE	975	974

**Based on maximum score of 1,000.*

Notwithstanding the risks of drawing comparisons across data sets, CSU Division I athletic programs are performing very well. When compared to the overall CSU graduation rate of 52 percent for the same year, it is clear that we are graduating more student-athletes. This finding demonstrates that athletic aid, the socializing benefits of group interaction, intrusive advising and peer support help improve overall student retention and persistence. Thus, the data presented in this item supports the case Chancellor Timothy P. White made regarding the student experience beyond NCAA Division I athletic programs. The data further supports his comment that the CSU can improve student success by focusing on multiple means of engagement.

Within that overall pattern, some CSU athletic programs and campuses perform better than others. The Graduation Initiative and Chancellor's Office staff will share this analysis with CSU coaches and athletic directors, encouraging them to move beyond these generalizations and understand on a case-by-case basis how better to serve CSU student-athletes.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

eAdvising Update

Presentation By

Eric Forbes
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Student Academic Services

Nathan Evans
Director
Enrollment Management

Background

Through systemwide efforts surrounding the California State University (CSU) Graduation Initiative, the CSU Chancellor's Office has engaged campuses in shared investments in technologies that support student success through strong academic advising and clear roadmaps to graduation.

As part of the Enrollment Bottleneck Solution Initiative in 2013, all CSU campuses developed four-year plans to implement new technologies for students, faculty and staff to provide clear pathways to graduation, track progress to degree and offer a course schedule in line with student demand for courses necessary for graduation. For the first year, the campuses were grouped into cohorts based on their common goals, readiness and strategies related to the current status of their degree audit system. In year two, campuses identified technology-based tools and solutions which would continue to expand access to guided academic planning. With increased use of these tools, measurements of average unit load per term, average units completed at graduation and other outcomes will allow for assessment of the use of these strategies and solutions as they directly relate to student success and reduced time to degree.

Amongst the tools that campuses have implemented are enhanced degree audit systems, academic planners, course scheduling software, early warning systems and predicative analytics. Such technologies may be student-facing, providing direct services to students, or may be institution-facing, informing individual interactions of faculty and professional advisers with students. At the aggregate level, data from these tools provide critical information for class scheduling and academic planning for administrators.

Degree Audit Systems

A degree audit is a computer-generated analysis that enables the student and his/her adviser to assess the student's academic progress and unfulfilled degree requirements. The audit provides an on-demand examination of requirements for a degree compared to a student's courses completed including credit received for transfer courses, or credit received for examinations. The user is then able to view remaining requirements, requirements satisfied, or all requirements and plan their next academic term. Robust degree audit rules allow campus administrators to generate audits for entire populations of students or automate other enrollment processes such as posting of graduation.

Academic Planning Tools

With degree audits as a foundation, academic planners provide students with an interactive online system which utilizes information from a student's record to recommend future semester course enrollment patterns. These flexible systems allows students to adjust and personalize their recommended course schedule for multiple academic terms based on their individual needs, such as enrolling in summer courses or changing the order of courses based on credits completed before they began college or fulfilling double-major requirements. Academic planners provide the "most efficient" pathway to graduation and update automatically as additional courses are completed or credit is received.

Class Scheduling Tools

Class scheduling applications provide web-based schedule planners for use by students and/or advisers as they prepare to select courses each term. These applications automate the manual pen and paper process and present the student with every possible schedule option that has seats available and are open for registration in real-time. Students are able to indicate times they are busy with other responsibilities and the application builds a schedule of available courses around those times. These tools then provide data to the institution to help inform academic planning and classroom scheduling based on student demand and schedules.

Early Warning / Case Management Tools

"Early Warning" and "Case Management" tools provide advisers, tutors, mentors, students and administrators an array of appointment management, engagement, communication and tracking tools through web-based solutions available across the institution. These tools allow institutions to group and track students based upon academic and student success indicators, produce reports for faculty, advisers and administrators and recommend campuswide resources for at-risk students. The tools allow advisers to proactively address at-risk students by more easily

identifying and more effectively addressing areas of concern, often before the concern escalates into more severe academic issues.

Predictive Analytic Tools

Predictive analytic tools combine technology, data, research and algorithms to help institutions positively affect outcomes with at-risk and off-path students. Utilizing the wealth of academic data, such tools uncover insights about the patterns of academic success and failure. Aggregate course outcome data, academic roadmaps and other success markers are utilized to identify effective course-taking strategies and engagement opportunities with students which have the greatest correlation with success. The resulting information allows advisors and other student services professionals to prioritize students needing assistance in critical courses and inform conversations with students who may be exploring majors. Through these tools, institutions can mount communication and intervention campaigns to engage students. Data gleaned from this activity can also help inform curriculum planning and assessment.

The table below provides a plan for the continued implementation of major components of CSU’s eAdvising strategies which contribute to student success. Grouping campuses which have selected similar technical strategies will continue to allow the CSU to leverage its buying power and give campuses the opportunity to learn from shared experiences as new solutions are implemented. With academic year 2012-2013 as a baseline year before a focused strategy involving eAdvising, increases in campus adoption of multiple tools is anticipated.

Number of Campuses Implementing or Utilizing eAdvising Tools					
	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Degree Audit System	23	23	23	23	23
Academic Planning Tools	3	6	11	13	23
Course Scheduling Tools	4	12	20	23	23
Predictive Analytic Tools	0	3	6	10	15

From the expansion of eAdvising technologies across campuses, the principal objective will be to allow students to make the best choices as they plan their academic pathway with supporting guidance from faculty and professional advisers. This engagement will ultimately allow students to graduate in a timelier manner with greater understanding of the relevance of their coursework to their chosen majors and careers.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

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

Presentation By

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

Summary

This information item is an update on the California State University (CSU) Education Doctorate (Ed.D.). The first years of the program to date have been highly successful, with 14 campuses serving a total of 740 students last year, 443 preparing for P-12 leadership and 297 for community college leadership.

Background and Overview

The CSU was authorized to offer the Doctorate of Education degree (Ed.D.) through Senate Bill 724 (Scott) in 2005. Seven CSU campuses began offering Ed.D. programs in fall 2007. Currently, Ed.D. programs are offered by 14 CSU campuses. The programs are designed to serve students who are working as full-time education professionals, equipping them with the knowledge and skills to effectively lead California's public schools, districts and community colleges. All fourteen offer a specialization in PreK-grade 12 (P-12) leadership, and nine also offer community college leadership programs.

Twelve of the programs belong to the prestigious *Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate* (CPED), a national consortium dedicated to advancing excellence in Ed.D. programs and preparing outstanding educational practitioners. The CSU has the largest number of CPED programs in the nation, reflecting the commitment to the highest quality practice-based doctoral preparation.

The programs have had unusually high completion rates – approximately 92.5 percent. This high rate of persistence reflects not only the high program quality, but also the effectiveness of the cohort model of the programs, the structure meant to facilitate student completion within three years, and the focus on studying problems relevant to students' work.

This report provides a brief overview of the CSU Ed.D. programs. It includes recent data on enrollment, degree completion, places of employment and positions of graduates, and student dissertation topics focused on advancing reform efforts.

The 14 CSU Ed.D. Programs

Ed.D. programs are offered by the 14 CSU campuses listed in Table 1. In addition, two campuses, CSU San Marcos and Sonoma State, have joint Ed.D. programs with the University of California, San Diego and University of California, Davis respectively. Additional campuses are developing programs to address unmet needs in their regions, with some of these being initiated in partnership with current CSU programs. CSU Channel Islands, for example, is planning a new joint Ed.D. program with CSU Fresno. This is a highly cost-effective approach.

Table 1. The CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

Campus	Start Year	P-12	Community College
Bakersfield	2011	√	√
East Bay	2008	√	
Fresno	2007	√	√
Fullerton	2007	√	√
Long Beach	2007	√	√
Los Angeles	2009	√	
Northridge	2008	√	√
Pomona	2012	√	
Sacramento	2007	√	√
San Bernardino	2007	√	
San Diego	2007	√	√
San Francisco	2007	√	√
San Jose	2013	√	
Stanislaus	2008	√	√

Enrollments in the CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The enrollments in the 14 CSU Ed.D. programs in 2013-2014 are shown in Table 2. Of the 740 students, 60 percent (443) were enrolled in P-12 specializations and 40 percent (297) were enrolled in community college specializations. Many are first-generation college-goers, attracted by the attention of the programs to equity and diversity.

Females constituted 65 percent (481) of the students and males 35 percent (259). This distribution has been relatively constant since the programs began in 2007. There has historically been an under-representation of females in educational leadership positions in both California and the nation, and the CSU Ed.D. programs are having a distinct impact in reducing this gender gap.

Table 2. CSU Ed.D. Program Enrollments, 2013-2014

Campus	P-12	Community College	Total
Bakersfield	30	18	48
East Bay	42	--	42
Fresno	29	25	54
Fullerton	55	58	113
Long Beach	36	42	78
Los Angeles	41	--	41
Northridge	22	39	61
Pomona	33	--	33
Sacramento	17	28	45
San Bernardino	54	--	54
San Diego	39	47	86
San Francisco	26	25	51
San Jose	--	--	--
Stanislaus	19	15	34
Total, 2013-14	443	297	740

Ethnicity of Students in the CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The ethnicity of the students in the 14 CSU Ed.D. programs in 2013-14 is shown in Table 3. As in each previous year, the students are a highly diverse group. These distributions have been relatively stable since the programs began in 2007. There is significant under-representation of Hispanic, African-American and Asian individuals in educational leadership roles in California and nationally, and CSU’s Ed.D. programs are having a substantial effect on this gap.

Table 3. CSU Ed.D. Program Enrollments: Ethnicity, 2013-2014

Ethnicity	P-12	Community College	Total Number	Total Percent
African-American	63	52	115	16%
American-Indian	3	4	7	1%
Asian-American	27	35	62	8%
Filipino	1	5	6	1%
Mexican-American	117	61	178	24%
Other Latino	49	24	73	10%
Pacific Islander	4	4	8	1%
White, Non-Latino	170	104	274	37%
Two or More Races	9	8	17	2%
Total, 2013-14	443	297	740	100%

Degree Completion of Students in CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The average time to completion in CSU Ed.D. programs is 3.25 years, and most students complete the program in three years. The completion rate has been high – approximately 92.5 percent. There have been more than 600 graduates to date, with 95 in 2010 and more than 110 each subsequent year.

Places of Employment and Position Changes of Ed.D. Program Graduates

Employment information for the 2013-2014 Ed.D. students is shown in Table 4. Since the beginning of the program, Ed.D. graduates have tended not to change employers, but their position levels have increased markedly. Over two-thirds of all Ed.D. graduates report promotions to positions of significantly increased responsibility. While the majority remained

with their employer upon graduation, they often moved from a school or campus to a significant district level position. Place of employment and examples of position changes are below.

Table 4. Ed.D. Student Place of Employment, 2013-2014

P-12 Students	Place of Employment
School site	73%
School district office	23%
County Office of Education	4%
Total	100%
Public School	95%
Private Schools	5%
Total	100%
Community College Students	Place of Employment
Campus	52%
District/Region	30%
Other	18%
Total	100%

Table 5. Ed.D. P-12 Students/Graduates: Position Changes

Position at Start of Program	Position After Graduation
Math Lab Teacher California Elementary School	Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator Same School District
Vice Principal California High School	Principal Same High School
Principal California Elementary School	Director of Educational Services Same School District
Counselor California High School	Vice Principal Same High School
Principal California Middle School	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction Same School District
Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, California School District	Deputy Superintendent Same School District
Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, California School District	Superintendent Same School District

Table 6. Ed.D. Community College Students/Graduates: Position Changes

Position at Start of Program	Position After Graduation
Associate Dean of Instruction Fine Arts, Performing Arts, and Communication, California Community College	Dean of Instruction Fine Arts, Performing Arts, and Communication, Same Community College
Research Analyst, Institutional Planning and Analysis, Community College Campus	Director, Institutional Planning and Analysis, Same Community College Campus
Coordinator, Special Education Programs and Services California School District	Director, Counseling, Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Community College
Director, Counseling Services California Community College	Dean of Student Services Nearby Community College
Dean of Student Services, California Community College	Vice President for Student Services Same Community College

Ed.D. Student Dissertations

One indicator of the potential and actual impact of Ed.D. programs on improving student achievement and success is a listing of the dissertation research areas of Ed.D. students. The examples below illustrate dissertations directly related to P-12 and community college reforms.

Table 7. Examples of Dissertations of P-12 Ed.D. Students

Dissertations Examining Reforms Aimed at Improving Student Achievement and Success
Advancing Minority Students' College Readiness in Mathematics
Tracking GEAR-UP Student Trajectories and College Participation
Fostering Latino Middle School Student Success in STEM
Enhancing English Learners' Language Interactions in Elementary Classrooms
Using Home Visits to Increase Parent Engagement in Inner-City Schools
Developing Strategies for Increasing Principal Sustainability in High-Poverty Schools
The African-American Experience in Linked Learning Career Academies
The Role of Counselors in Linked Learning High Schools
Transforming School Culture in Program Improvement Schools
Preparing New Transitional Kindergarten Teachers in Developmentally Appropriate Practice
Expanding After School Programs in Science in Central California Rural Communities
Introducing Leadership Coaching for Principals in California Title I Elementary Schools

Table 8: Examples of Dissertations of Community College Students

Dissertations Examining Reforms Aimed at Improving Student Achievement and Success
Examining African-American Transfer Pathways from Community Colleges to Four-Year Campuses
Increasing Effectiveness of Community College Programs and Services for Student Veterans
Supporting Educational Experiences of Undocumented Community College Latina/o Students
Increasing Summer Bridge Opportunities for Underrepresented Two-Year College Students
Implementing Outcomes-Based Student Learning Assessment in a Community College
Enhancing Educational Success of Deaf or Hard-of-Hearing Community College Students
Utilizing Course Articulation Agreements to Facilitate Transfer Success
Noncredit-to-Credit Pathways: Expanding Opportunities for Adult Immigrant Learners
Developing A Retention Intervention for African-American Community College Students
Using Peer Mentors to Improve the Persistence of Transfer Students of Color
Creating Learning Communities to Foster Underrepresented Student Success in Pre-algebra
Initiating a High Quality Service Learning Program Throughout a Community College District