

1990-91
ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Sacramento

AGENDA
Thursday, March 14, 1991
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union

INFORMATION

1. Spring 1991 Academic Senate Meetings (Tentative Schedule)
Thursdays, 2:30-4:30 p.m.
Forest Suite, University Union (unless noted otherwise)

March 21
April 4 CLS 1003 (if needed)
April 11
April 25
May 2
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Nominations
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate
May 9
May 16
2:30-3:00, '91-92 Elections
3:00-4:30, '90-91 Senate

2. Moment of silence — *GORDON P. MARTIN*
University Librarian Emeritus
1966-1980

REGULAR AGENDA

AS 91-16/ INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES--GUIDELINES FOR
ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND ENROLLMENT
MANAGEMENT [Responds to AS 90-104]

[Refer to Attachments A-C.]

The Academic Senate recommends adoption of a policy on
"Instructional Program Priorities--Guidelines for Academic
Planning, Resource Allocation, and Enrollment Management" as
proposed by the ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocation Issues
(Attachment C).

California State University
Sacramento



The President
Sacramento, CA 95819-6022
(916) 278-7737
FAX = (916) 278-6959

September 18, 1990

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Professor Juanita Barrera
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Donald R. Gerth

I am requesting the Academic Senate to consider and recommend policy statements to me regarding: 1) academic priorities, and 2) criteria for implementing the priorities through enrollment management and faculty resource allocation.

It has become clear in the past few weeks that the Faculty Allocation Model has served its useful purpose and is no longer necessary. We are vacating the use of the Faculty Allocation Model, and thus its final use will have been last December, when faculty allocations were made for 1990-91.

It has become evident to me that there is a need to integrate two important tasks of university planning more effectively and to do so within the context of newly mandated attention to the General Education program. The two tasks needing better coordination are:

1. The establishment of priorities within the academic program that reflect the mission of the University and our collective values and decisions regarding the way in which we can best serve our students and region through instructional course offerings;
2. The implementation of those priorities through a) enrollment management, and b) faculty resource allocation.

The current system for management of enrollment and determining allocations to the instructional program does not properly take account of academic priorities, primarily because the campus has been unable to articulate clear and specific statements of priorities. As a result, we have lived for many years with the practice of student demand driving University program size, approximately, and thus the balance of academic programs within the University. Given the pressure for increased enrollment, which we can expect on this campus over the next years, it is clear that we must consider the possibility or even probability that some programs will be declared impacted. It is even more clear that there is need to maintain balance in the University's enrollment. Similarly, for the last two years an allocation model has operated without benefit of a consensus on priorities, and the results have been unsatisfactory.

In conjunction with the Academic Senate effort, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will be asking the Deans of the Schools and, through them, the department chairs and the faculty in the departments, for recommendations concerning the translation of the Academic Senate priorities policy into an implementation plan which, subsequently, the Deans will be asked to carry out.

Once academic priorities are established for the University and for schools and departments, then criteria on enrollment management and resource allocation, which I have asked the Senate to address, will be utilized.

The Academic Senate is an appropriate body to debate these issues. I ask that the statement of university academic priorities be forwarded to me by the end of the current fall semester, so the resultant policy can be used by the Council for University Planning in its discussions and by the University administration in its decisions about faculty allocations for 1991-92.

I ask that the senate respond to the request for criteria on enrollment management and faculty resource allocation no later than the end of the spring semester, so that it can be used by the Council for University Planning in its discussions and by the University administration in its decisions about enrollment management and faculty allocation for 1992-93.

The effort to address these issues will be a collaborative one involving faculty and administration alike. I look forward to meeting with the Senate Executive Committee next week to discuss an approach for grappling with these problems.

DRG/rg

cc: Vice President Burger

AS 90-103/Flr. FACULTY ALLOCATIONS AT CSUS, GENERAL PROCESS

The Academic Senate directs the Executive Committee to work with the President in defining an approach to addressing resource allocation issues. The Academic Senate further directs the Executive Committee to establish an ad hoc committee that will make recommendations about the process via which resource allocations will be made.

Carried. (September 13, 1990)

*AS 90-104/Ex. RESOURCE ALLOCATION ISSUES, ESTABLISH AD HOC COMMITTEE ON (Responds to AS 90-103)

In response to AS 90-103 and requests made to the Senate by the President in his September 18, 1990, memorandum on the subject of academic priorities and their relation to enrollment management and faculty allocations (see September 27, 1990, Academic Senate Agenda Addendum Attachment), the Academic Senate, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, hereby establishes an ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocation Issues.

Charge:

The ad hoc Committee shall develop policy proposals pertaining to the allocation of resources for the instructional program. Such policy proposals shall be submitted to the Academic Senate by November 8, 1990, for consideration in formulating policy recommendations to the President on these matters.

Specifically, the ad hoc Committee shall consider and recommend policy proposals on the following:

1. Instructional program priorities to guide resource allocation and enrollment decisions. (Note: The policy proposal should address the types of major programs offered, the desired mix of major programs and enrollment levels, and instructional course offerings that support degree programs (i.e., remedial courses, General Education, and service courses).
2. Criteria for implementation of instructional program priorities through faculty resource allocations and enrollment management, including the use of "impacted" status to limit enrollment growth.
3. The process for determining faculty allocations and making enrollment decisions.

It is the intent of the Senate that policy proposals be developed in a collegial and collaborative manner, and that the work of the Committee be informed by a knowledge of the range of academic programs currently offered and an understanding of the practical implications of the implementation of any proposed policy. Therefore, the Academic Senate has agreed to the following ad hoc Committee membership.

Membership:

Eight Instructional Faculty^a

^bTwo representatives of the Dean's Council (preferably the Dean of Arts and Sciences or designee and one Dean or designee of a professional school) appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs

^bTwo representatives of the President's senior administrative staff (preferably the Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee and the Vice President for Finance or designee) appointed by the President

The Chair of the Academic Senate, who shall serve as an ex-officio non-voting member of the Committee and convenor.

^a The faculty membership shall, if possible, include at least one current or former member of the following Senate committees: Fiscal Affairs, Curriculum, Graduate Policies and Programs, General Education and the Executive Committee; at least one current or former member of the Council for University Planning; at least two department chairs; and, at least one faculty member from each of the five schools (Note: a single member may fulfill more than one of these designated categories).

^b Subject to Presidential approval.

Carried. (September 27, 1990)

AS 90-105/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS--SENATE

ad hoc Committee on Resource Allocation Issues:

MICHAEL BALLARD-CAMPBELL
HERBERT BLAKE
SCOTT FARRAND
JAMES McCARTNEY
JESSIE MULIRA
SYLVIA NAVARI
LINDA PALMER

Carried. (September 27, 1990)

[Remaining members: Instructional faculty--ANNE-LOUISE RADIMSKY; Representatives of President's Senior Administrative Staff--JOLENE KOESTER and WILLIAM PICKENS; Dean's Council Representatives--ELIJAH CHRISTIAN and STEVE GREGORICH; Senate Chair JUANITA BARRENA as convenor.

**INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES
GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE
ALLOCATION, AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT**

POLICY PURPOSE

1 Although the immediate impetuses for the development of a policy
2 statement on instructional program priorities have been
3 underfunding of current enrollment and the need to deal with
4 enrollment demand that exceeds capacity, the intent of this
5 policy is to serve as a framework for academic planning and a
6 guide for both short-term and long-term resource allocation and
7 enrollment management decisions. This policy sets forth current
8 instructional priorities as they relate to the central purpose of
9 the institution, extant obligations to programs and students, and
10 the desired balance and mix of programs. This policy further
11 sets forth the bases for assignment of priorities among
12 instructional program categories and the criteria/factors that
13 shall be used in determining priorities within program
14 categories.

15 For 1991-92, application of criteria/factors within program
16 categories and implementation of priorities through resource
17 allocations and enrollment management shall be accomplished
18 through existing mechanisms at the department, school and
19 university levels. In future cycles, these shall be accomplished
in accordance with mechanisms defined in a separate policy
statement (in development at the time of adoption of this policy)
22 on the subject.

23 This policy supersedes the policy document titled University
24 Planning Profiles for Academic Units, adopted by the University
25 Planning Committee in April, 1980. Instructional program
26 priorities identified in this policy rather than those assigned
27 in the referenced 1980 document (to program types, generally, and
28 specific programs within school and departments), shall be used
29 for program review and resource allocation purposes. Some
30 elements of the referenced 1980 document (e.g., degree unit
31 limitations) have been retained in original or amended form in
32 other policy and procedural documents, primarily those contained
33 in the Fall 1990 policy compilation titled, Policies and
34 Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of
35 Courses and Academic Programs (a.k.a. "blue book"). Elements of
36 the referenced 1980 document (e.g., core major programs) that do
37 not appear in this or other policy or procedural documents are
38 hereby declared void.

39 Priorities defined herein derive primarily from the application
40 of existing campus and systemwide policies and State government
41 provisions that pertain to the CSU. Documents cited in this
42 policy statement or used as background information are listed in
43 a bibliography at the end of this policy statement. These
documents have been compiled in a separate volume, copies of

1 which are on file in the University Archives, Academic Senate
2 Office, and Offices of the President and Academic Vice President.

3 POLICY PROVISIONS

4 I. GENERAL FRAMEWORK

5 At the University level, instructional program priorities are
6 defined generally (i.e., by program category, see section II
7 below) and specify the desired balance and mix of programs (see
8 section III, page 3) offered collectively by the University's
9 academic departments. Criteria/factors for determining
10 priorities within category are also specified at a University
11 level (see sections IV, page 5, and V, page 13). Based upon
12 criteria specified in this policy, schools and their academic
13 departments shall establish priorities among programs and shall
14 identify how the programs offered contribute to the desired
15 balance and mix of university programs.

16 II. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITY CATEGORIES

17 The Education Code, as amended in 1989 by SB 1570 (Appendix A),
18 specifies that the "primary mission of the California State
19 University is undergraduate and graduate instruction through the
20 Master's degree." At California State University, Sacramento,
21 courses and programs that directly support and lead to the
22 baccalaureate or master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences
23 and professional fields, or the post baccalaureate credential in
24 fields of Education, shall have funding priority over courses and
25 programs that are peripheral to these purposes (e.g., certificate
26 programs, in-service programs). The categories of priority
27 programs include: undergraduate major programs, master's degree
28 and post baccalaureate credential programs, service courses that
29 support major programs, testing and remediation programs related
30 to the University's quantitative reasoning and writing
31 requirements, and the General Education Program.

32 The CSU is also authorized to offer joint doctoral programs (SB
33 1570, 1989). However, since joint doctoral programs are funded
34 categorically, and therefore, theoretically, do not compete for
35 resources, and since CSUS does not currently offer a joint
36 doctoral program (although one has been proposed), their relative
37 priority has not been addressed in this policy. However, in the
38 event that joint doctoral programs are offered and it is
39 determined that such programs do compete for resources, their
40 priority in relation to other university programs will be
41 decided.

III. DESIRED BALANCE AND MIX OF PRIORITY PROGRAM CATEGORIES

2 While CSUS is a predominantly undergraduate institution in terms
3 of the undergraduate proportion of total enrollment, a condition
4 that is to be maintained, this should not be interpreted as
5 meaning that graduate degree/credential programs have a lower
6 priority than undergraduate degree programs. On the contrary, in
7 accordance with its mission, CSUS is equally responsible for
8 offering graduate and undergraduate instruction (SB 1570, 1989).
9 Consistent with its responsibility for graduate education, CSUS
10 shall attempt to maintain graduate enrollments of at least 20% of
11 total headcount enrollment.¹ The proportion of graduate
12 enrollment may be increased above this level in response to
13 regional needs for graduate education and other factors (see
14 section IV.B on graduate programs, page 6), but shall not exceed
15 1/3 of total University headcount enrollment.]

16 Within undergraduate major and graduate degree/credential program
17 categories, priorities shall be established in accordance with
18 criteria specified in subsequent sections of this document
19 (section IV.A , page 5, and IV.B, page 6). In order to maintain
20 quality undergraduate majors and graduate degree/credential
21 programs that are most central to the mission and responsive to
22 regional needs, it may be necessary to decrease resource support
23 to low priority programs within the same or other program
24 category. That is, resource support to low priority
25 undergraduate major or graduate degree/credential programs may be
26 decreased in order to maintain high priority undergraduate major
27 or graduate degree/credential programs.

28 While CSUS offers a full four-year undergraduate program, its
29 predominant enrollment is at the upper division level.
30 Currently, lower division headcount enrollment constitutes only
31 26% of total undergraduate enrollment (Enrollment Fact Book,
32 1989), a proportion significantly smaller than the maximum of 40%
33 permitted under the Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan
34 Renewed, 1987). The maintenance of a complete lower division
35 curriculum is essential to maintaining the quality of
36 undergraduate majors and the General Education program since it
37 provides a mechanism for ensuring that upper division and lower
38 division elements of the curricula are appropriately integrated.
39 In addition, maintaining a substantial population of students at

40 ¹Graduate headcount enrollment currently constitutes
41 approximately 20% of total headcount enrollment. Graduate
42 enrollment includes students classified in graduate degree programs
43 (54%) and unclassified postbaccalaureate students (46%) who may be
44 pursuing a second bachelor's (20%), teacher credential, a
45 certificate, or awaiting classification (Enrollment Fact Book,
1989).

1 all undergraduate levels enhances the collegiate experience and
 2 contributes significantly to the intellectual and social life of
 3 the university community. For these reasons, CSUS shall, at a
 4 minimum, maintain a lower division headcount enrollment of at
 5 least 25% of total undergraduate enrollment, ~~and shall set as a~~
 6 ~~long-term goal the achievement of a proportion of lower division~~
 7 ~~headcount enrollment that equals at least 1/3, but no more than~~
 8 40% of total undergraduate enrollment.

may be increased above this level (25%) but shall not exceed

9 To maintain the minimum level of lower division enrollment
 10 specified above and achieve the long-term goal, CSUS shall
 11 implement fully systemwide policies pertaining to transfers that
 12 currently require that transfer students who were not freshman
 13 eligible complete the requisite number of units and G.E.
 14 requirements in writing and quantitative reasoning, and which,
 15 effective Fall 1991, shall require completion of the transfer
 16 curriculum. During periods when the number of eligible first
 17 time freshman and transfer applicants exceeds enrollment
 18 capacity, admissions shall be controlled in such a way as to
 19 maintain a lower division headcount enrollment of at least 25%.
 20 However, CSUS shall plan, in its enrollment projections to
 21 accommodate all eligible transfer students and to increase lower
 22 division headcount enrollment to 1/3 of total undergraduate
 23 enrollment and remediation programs.

24 The undergraduate degree program consists of two principal
 25 components: the major and G.E. These programs shall not be
 26 viewed as competing since they contribute equally to the degree
 27 objective. Rather, they shall be viewed as interdependent
 28 programs. Undergraduate enrollment shall be limited by the
 29 University's ability to provide a general education program that
 30 allows students to complete the degree program in a timely manner
 31 (see section IV.E, page 12, on G.E.). Since total undergraduate
 32 enrollment may be limited, priorities must be established within
 33 the undergraduate major program category to ensure an appropriate
 34 balance and mix of major programs (see section IV.A, page 5, for
 35 discussion of priorities within the undergraduate major program
 36 category).

37 While the University is obligated to devote sufficient resources
 38 to the G.E. program to meet the needs of students admitted to the
 39 University, the amount necessary is a function of admissions
 40 policy. Specifically, if admission of lower division students is
 41 increased, resources necessary to support lower division courses
 42 in the G.E. program must also be increased. Admission of
 43 transfer students who have not completed lower division G.E.
 44 requirements also increases G.E. resource requirements. Current
 45 systemwide policy pertaining to transfer students requires
 46 completion of quantitative reasoning and writing requirements
 47 prior to transfer. However, to date, this policy has not been

implemented fully at CSUS. The policy shall be implemented fully to reduce resources needed to support the G.E. Program and remediation programs.

The place of remediation programs among University priorities is perhaps the most complex to address. The nature and extent of the University's involvement in providing remediation programs are dictated by a variety of systemwide policies and institutional goals (detailed in section IV.D, page 9, on remediation). While the University is obligated to provide remediation and has identified selected remediation programs as high priority programs, the University shall limit the extent of its involvement in offering remediation, and shall work actively at the campus, system and intersegmental levels toward decreasing student need for remediation.

IV. PRIORITIES WITHIN PRIORITY PROGRAM CATEGORIES

A. Undergraduate Major Programs

The University has a commitment to offering a variety of undergraduate majors in the traditional liberal arts and sciences disciplines and selected majors in the professional fields of business, engineering and health and human services. Undergraduate degree programs cannot, however, all receive equal levels of support. Specifically, priority shall be accorded to degree programs that:

1. are responsive to regional employment needs
2. for which there is sufficient student demand
3. respond to the unique characteristics of our location
4. contribute to an educated citizenry
5. are of high quality as evaluated by program reviews
6. are structured efficiently and derive appropriate levels of benefits for their cost
7. contribute to balance among programs
8. serve a unique function

Note: Priorities among undergraduate degree programs shall be determined in accordance with mechanisms defined in a separate policy statement (in development at the time of adoption of this policy).

When the University decides to offer an undergraduate major program (or concentrations within major programs) certain minimum levels of support are, however, mandated. Since the University currently requires that all undergraduate programs have at least five common core courses included as part of each degree program, each of the core courses must be taught (regardless of enrollment) during every four-semester time period. In addition, a "reasonable

1 complement" of other required courses and electives must be
2 offered on a specified schedule to allow for completion of
3 degree requirements.

4 The definition of "reasonable complement" is problematic
5 because of variability from degree program to degree program
6 concerning the number of required units. Difficulty is also
7 created by the large number of undergraduate majors that
8 have not just formal concentrations, but "emphases." These
9 "advanced areas of study" are often structured with
10 groupings of courses from which students can select a
11 specified number of courses. Thus many courses in a
12 departmental curriculum have been described as critical
13 because they can be taken to satisfy in degree program
14 requirements. However, the commitment to offer an
15 undergraduate major does not mean unlimited support of all
16 courses in a departmental curriculum or even courses that
17 are among those that can be selected by students in order to
18 fulfill degree requirements or those specified in "emphases"
19 or "advanced areas of study" groupings.

20 Rather, support is only assured at certain minimal levels.
21 Departmental requests and University decisions to offer
22 courses beyond those levels does not necessarily assure
23 additional support. The school Dean, in consultation with
24 departmental faculty, will determine the number of courses
25 critical to the major and their schedule of offerings. For
26 the core courses and those courses identified as critical,
27 enrollment in the class will not be the prime consideration
28 for offering the course. Conversely, high enrollment demand
29 for courses other than core courses and courses identified
30 as critical, does not guarantee that they shall be offered.

31 **B. Master's Degree and Postbaccalaureate Credential**
32 **Programs**

33 The University is committed to offering graduate programs
34 leading to the master's degree or postbaccalaureate
35 credential in selected disciplines to prepare students to
36 pursue doctoral studies and to enter advanced professional
37 training programs and career fields. Graduate study is
38 integral to the mission and responsibility of California
39 State University, Sacramento. Graduate programs that
40 identify the university, articulate its mission and identify
41 the special strength/contribution of CSUS within higher
42 education in California, inherently constitute priorities.
43 These include:

- 44 1. K-12 Teacher Preparation Credential programs in
45 Education;
- 46 2. Applied/professional masters programs that are required
47 to meet the regional needs of recognized professions;

- 2 ◇ 3. Master's degree programs, in a variety of disciplines
3 that prepare students for doctoral studies and/or
4 advancement in an occupation or profession, including
 careers in community college teaching.

5 While all graduate programs add to the collective strength
6 of CSUS, not all current or potential graduate programs can
7 receive equal levels of support.

8 Decisions regarding the mix, size, and level of resource
9 support for all graduate programs shall be based on an
10 assessment of factors related to program need, program
11 quality, and program cost benefit. (Order of listing does
12 not imply relative importance).

- 13 1. **Program Need:** the need for new or existing programs,
14 enrollment levels, and level of resource support shall
15 be determined using the following combination of factors
16 (order of listing does not imply importance):
17 a. Centrality to mission
18 b. Centrality within discipline
19 c. Labor Market--present and projected
20 d. Student demand--present and projected
21 e. Comparative Advantage--
22 1) Locational/Regional Advantage
23 2) Uniqueness of the Program--is it offered/not
24 offered by other institutions in proximity to
25 CSUS;
26 2. **Program Quality:** the quality of existing programs, or
27 the projected quality of new programs, shall be
28 evaluated in program reviews. Criteria for assessing
29 quality shall include:
30 a. curriculum strength
31 b. Quality of Faculty--currency, degrees held,
32 scholarly activity, teaching effectiveness,
33 c. Quality of library holdings
34 d. Quality of support facilities (and equipment as
35 appropriate)
36 3. **Program Cost/Benefit:**
37 a. Formula generation/actual expenditures relationship
38 b. Other sources of income for program support
39 c. Degree production rates (i.e., is the program
40 producing an acceptable number of graduates and is
41 the average time to degree within acceptable limits
42 for the discipline).
43 d. Developmental Costs
44 e. Secondary effects (i.e., does the program benefit or
45 detract from other programs)
46 f. Cost efficiency (e.g., are program components
47 necessary or replicative of components in other
48 programs)

1 As in the case of undergraduate majors, a decision to offer
2 a Master's degree or postbaccalaureate credential program
3 does not guarantee support for all courses offered as part
4 of the program simply because they can be used to satisfy
5 program requirements or because they are included in non-
6 official "emphases" or "subspecialties." Rather, certain
7 minimal levels of support necessary to maintain program
8 quality and ensure student progress toward degree completion
9 can be expected. Under current University policy (Policy
10 Relating to Undergraduate and Graduate Degree Programs in
11 Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review
12 and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs, 1990), most
13 Master's degree programs are limited to a total of 30 units
14 and must include a minimum of nine units that are common to
15 the degree program (exceptions must have formal approval).
16 The above referenced policy further specifies the minimal
17 level of support as follows:

18 "To maintain program viability, graduate programs are to
19 be scheduled so that enough courses are offered to
20 insure completion of a 30-unit program within two
21 academic years. As a standard, graduate programs shall
22 offer each year the nine units common to the degree
23 program and at least nine units of degree applicable
24 course work. Over a two year period, 18 units of 200
25 level courses shall be offered, exclusive of supervisory
26 units, and these units shall not include repeated
27 offerings of the same course. The offerings should be
28 varied enough to allow, and the scheduling pattern
29 should permit, students to take at least 27 units of
30 degree applicable course work, exclusive of supervisory
31 units, over a two year period. Consideration shall be
32 given to the diverse nature of programs and courses when
33 evaluating program and enrollment viability."

34 The minimal level of support for programs granted exemptions
35 to the unit limitation and/or 9 unit core requirement shall
36 be based on the same principles applied above. In each
37 case, regardless of total units required or whether the
38 program includes a nine unit core, the School Dean, in
39 consultation with departmental faculty will determine the
40 number of courses critical to the program and their schedule
41 of offerings. Enrollment demand (low or high) shall not be
42 the sole determining factor for deciding whether a course is
43 to be offered.

44 *C. Minors*

D - C. Service Courses

45 Approved undergraduate major and graduate degree/credential
46 programs often require coursework in other disciplines
47 (service courses) to support the major discipline program.

2 In some cases, the coursework taken outside the major
3 discipline is substantial (and may be concentrated
4 sufficiently in a single discipline to earn the distinction
5 of a minor). The University is committed to offering a
6 sufficient number of service courses to ensure completion of
approved programs.

7 **E.D. Testing and Prebaccalaureate Remediation Programs**
8 **related to Quantitative Reasoning and Writing**
9 **Requirements**

10 **1. CSUS Policy on Remediation**

11 Currently, CSUS has determined that it is necessary to
12 provide remedial instruction to ensure that students
13 admitted to the University, but who are not prepared for
14 baccalaureate level courses in writing and quantitative
15 reasoning, have the opportunity to redress these
16 deficiencies. The fact that, systemwide, approximately
17 50% of regularly admitted students require at least one
18 semester of precollege level coursework in math or
19 English to meet placement standards for G.E. courses in
20 writing and quantitative reasoning provides compelling
21 evidence that remediation programs are needed (see
22 Appendix B for systemwide data). However, in accordance
23 with recommendations of the Commission for the Review of
24 the Master Plan (The Master Plan Renewed, 1987), CSUS
25 shall establish and maintain clearly defined academic
26 floors below which remedial courses will not be offered,
27 set other limits on remediation programs, and shall work
28 toward the goal of decreasing the need for remediation
29 at CSUS.

30 The principles articulated in the following excerpt from
31 The Master Plan Renewed (pp. 26-27) shall form the basis
32 for CSUS policy on remediation.

33 "Retention has become a major issue for the
34 universities, both in terms of educational equity in
35 preparing citizens of the state for future economic
36 changes.. A variety of factors contribute to
37 retention rates, and some are beyond the influence
38 of the institutions. However, there are both
39 ethical and economic implications to relatively low
40 retention rates, and these must be addressed by the
41 system. Students, of course, must bear some
42 responsibility for their own success, but the
43 educational institutions share responsibility for
44 the students they admit, including students who are
45 admitted as exceptions to a regular admission
46 criteria...Remediation is essential to
retention...Remediation has been necessary in the

1 four-year institutions not only for those admitted
2 as exceptions to the regular admission requirements
3 but also for large numbers of regularly admitted
4 students. Many otherwise qualified students are
5 inadequately prepared in English or mathematics, or
6 both. In addition... developing English as a Second
7 Language for immigrants new to California is
8 critical to the state's future success...The
9 principal solution to the problems is to improve
10 preparation in the public schools, but that will
11 take time. In the meantime, remedial instruction
12 and instruction in English as a Second Language will
13 be necessary in the four-year institutions to
14 guarantee that otherwise qualified students, once
15 admitted, have an opportunity to succeed. Remedial
16 education is not, however, a primary role. It must
17 be held to a minimum and it must not be credited
18 toward fulfilling baccalaureate degree requirements.
19 The limitations will prevent remediation from
20 overtaking and supplanting the more fundamental
21 functions of each segment."

22 *Consideration*
23 **2. Priority Placement of Remediation Programs in
24 Relation to other University Programs**

25 Consistent with the principles articulated above,
26 remediation programs shall be accorded the following
27 priority placement in relation to other university
28 programs.

29 a. Remediation programs shall receive higher priority
30 than:

- 31 *3/21/91*
- 32 - ~~Majors in low priority undergraduate majors and~~
33 ~~low priority graduate degree/credential programs~~
 - 34 - Course offerings in discipline minors
 - 35 - Low enrollment electives for majors
 - 36 - Institutes and centers
 - 37 - Certificate programs
 - 38 - General Education Critical Thinking requirements
 - 39 - General Education second-semester writing
40 requirement

41 b. Remediation programs shall receive lower priority
42 than:

- 43 - Required course offerings in high priority
44 undergraduate majors, and high priority graduate
45 degree/credential programs
- 46 - Priority course offerings in GE.

47 **3. Priorities Within the Remediation Program Category**

48 The University currently offers a variety of course
49 offerings and programs that serve a remediation
50 function. Among these, the following courses/programs
51 shall be accorded highest priority.

~~shall be accorded highest priority.~~

- Prebaccalaureate Level I and II (see Appendix C for remediation taxonomy) courses designed to remediate student deficiencies in math and English, in which students are placed by approved placement exams (EPT, ELM, EDT).
- ILE courses to the level that they are supported by systemwide funds.

3/21/91
~~Within the remediation program category, courses/programs providing assistance in satisfying University graduation requirements (e.g., writing proficiency requirement) will be accorded lowest priority.~~

4. Enrollment Priorities in Remediation Courses

Since resources may not be sufficient to satisfy demand for remediation courses, enrollment priorities shall be established as follows:

- For prebaccalaureate courses in math and English, freshman shall have highest priority and transfer students shall have lowest priority.
- For prebaccalaureate courses in English, transfer students who have not completed the G.E. course requirement in writing shall have priority over transfer students who have completed the requirement.
- For all remedial courses, ^{and} including English 109 (preparation for the WPE), students enrolling for the first time shall have priority over students who are repeating the course (Note: A small percentage of seats in prebaccalaureate courses may be reserved for students who have taken the course and have been assessed as making progress but are not yet prepared to advance to the next level).

5. Policy Considerations Regarding Remediation Programs

While the University is committed to meeting its obligation to provide remediation programs, the extent of that obligation must be reduced. To accomplish this end, the University shall take steps to:

- 3/21/91
- a. ~~Limit enrollment in remedial courses to students who have not completed the G.E. writing requirement;~~
 - a b. Work with the community college system to decrease the proportion of ESL transfer students who have completed the G.E. requirement in writing but still require remedial coursework;
 - b c. Establish and maintain clearly defined academic floors below which remediation courses shall not be offered. Specifically, CSUS should not offer courses below pre-college level 2, except in

1 exceptional circumstances, and then only in the case
2 of special admission students or ESL students who
3 have not completed the G.E. writing requirement and
4 have been assessed by the EDT for placement below
5 level 2;

6 d. Implement fully systemwide policy that requires that
7 transfer students complete GE courses in writing and
8 quantitative reasoning prior to transfer;

9 e. Limit the number of times that students may repeat
10 remediation courses.

11 F. General Education/University Graduation Requirements

12 General Education and other University graduation
13 requirements are established to ensure that all
14 undergraduate students are provided the foundations of a
15 liberal education. Resource support for the G.E. Program
16 shall be sufficient to allow students to complete G.E.
17 requirements in a sequential and timely manner.

18 As the University accepts first-time freshman eligible and
19 transfer students with various portions of their general
20 education programs completed, the priority for each category
21 of general education shall be based on total student need
22 for coursework in the category. The priority for upper
23 division vs. lower division general education courses shall
24 be based on total need for upper division vs. lower division
25 general education courses.

26 The University has a responsibility to offer a general
27 education program that is accessible to its students.
28 Courses in the G.E. program must also be offered in a mode
29 that is pedagogically sound. Student need for courses must
30 be met within each GE category, although possibly not in
31 individual courses, or possibly not in the semester of the
32 student's choice.

33 Within the G.E. program, highest priority shall be accorded
34 to:

- 35 1. providing a sufficient number of sections of
36 quantitative reasoning and written communication courses
37 to comply with campus and systemwide requirements
38 regarding the timing of completion of these
39 requirements;
- 40 2. providing a sufficient number of sections of other Area
41 A courses to comply with sequencing requirements;

42 Among G.E. courses in categories where a variety of courses
43 may be used to satisfy the same requirement, the following
44 courses shall be accorded priority

- 45 1. courses that also serve a service function (see Section

IV.C, page 8) in accordance with the priority of the program that the courses serve;

2. courses in the 1983-1992 G.E. program that also meet the requirements of the new G.E. program to be implemented in 1992 (i.e., include a writing component, satisfy the race and ethnicity requirement, are infused with multicultural content);
3. courses that are in the "foundation" subareas of Areas B and C.

V. LOW PRIORITY PROGRAMS

The instructional program includes courses and programs, which, although valuable and appropriate to the mission of CSUS, do not directly support or lead to a degree. Courses and programs in this category include minors, certificate programs, elective courses, centers and institutes, and intercollegiate athletics.

IV.C A. Minors *move to high priority - Carried*

A minor is a pattern of coursework similar to a major, but less comprehensive. As noted previously, selected major programs require a minor in another discipline. A minor which supports a different major will be accorded the same relative priority as the major it supports. Most minors are offered by departments that also offer a major program and the minor consists of courses that are also included in the major. In these cases, the minor, unless specifically required by another major, shall receive no special consideration for resource support. In cases where a minor is not associated with a major program, resource support shall be determined on a case by case basis, using the same criteria established to determine the priority of undergraduate major programs.

B. Certificate Programs

Certificate programs in and of themselves shall receive no special consideration for resource support. Courses offered as part of a certificate program, shall be accorded priority only if they are critical to a major program or are accorded priority as a service or G.E. course.

C. Non-Critical Elective Courses

The University shall make an effort to offer a variety of elective courses that allow faculty to teach in their area of interest and special expertise and provide students the opportunity to take a variety of courses. However, the number of non-critical electives offered shall be subject to resource availability. The University may have to reduce

1 the number of non-critical electives offered, even if
2 student demand is high, in order to offer courses in the
3 high priority categories (see Section IV.A and IV.B, pages
4 5-8).

5 **D. Centers and Institutes**

6 Centers and Institutes may be established in accordance with
7 PM 87-04 to enhance and extend the University's academic
8 programs. Although courses are not normally offered by
9 Centers and Institutes, they may receive start up funding
10 from instructional resources to the extent that resources
11 are available. University policy specifies that Centers and
12 Institutes are expected to become self-sufficient within 2
13 to 3 years following their establishment. Unless otherwise
14 agreed to at the time of establishment of the Center or
15 Institute, University support shall be discontinued after
16 the third year.

17 **E. In-Service Courses**

18 In-service courses shall receive no special consideration
19 for resource support.

20 **F. Athletics**

21 Intercollegiate Athletics is evaluated for priority relative
22 to academic programs, as it is a program that offers
23 courses, employs faculty, and otherwise derives resources
24 from the academic budget. Unlike many academic programs,
25 however, Athletics also serves as a support program for
26 students by attracting scholarships, contributing to the
27 quality of student life, and offering an opportunity for a
28 college education to nontraditional students. In addition,
29 Athletics has a community relations role. These benefits
30 notwithstanding, Athletics is a low priority program
31 relative to the criteria:

- 32 1. Educational goals;
- 33 2. centrality of mission;
- 34 3. regional employment needs; and,
- 35 4. cost/benefit.

36 Intercollegiate athletics shall be supported contingent upon
37 the availability of resources, following adequate support
38 for academic programs.

prior.rai

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. University Planning Profiles for Academic Units. Adopted by the University Planning Committee, CSUS, 1980.

This policy document set forth instructional program priorities for the University, generally, and assigned specific priorities for schools and departments. The document further set forth various policies pertaining to degree programs, some of which have been carried forward, in original or amended form, to other policy documents, some of which have been superseded by adoption of other policies.

The document has been included in the compilation of background documents solely for its historical significance. With the adoption of this policy on Instructional Program Priorities, the 1980 document shall no longer serve as a policy reference.

2. Policies and Procedures for Initiation, Modification, Review and Approval of Courses and Academic Programs, CSUS, 1990.

This compilation includes a variety of policies and procedures on the specified subjects, including program review procedures, policies pertaining to initiation of new programs and revision of existing programs, and policies pertaining to degree programs (e.g., unit limitations).

3. SB 1570, "Mission" Bill, Introduced by Senators Nielsen, Bergeson, Cecil Green, Kopp, Morgan, Seymour, Torres, and Watson, March, 1989.

The bill amends the Education Code to state the missions of each of the segments of higher education in a single provision (Section 66010.4) and also includes revisions to the mission statement for the CSU.

4. Enrollment Fact Book 1985-1989, Office of Institutional Studies, CSUS, November, 1989.

Provides an overview of enrollment trends at California State University, Sacramento from Fall 1985 to Fall 1989.

5. Background Papers for the Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, March, 1986.

6. *see over*
These documents have been compiled in a separate volume, copies of which are on file in the University Archives, Academic Senate Office, and the Offices of the President and Academic Vice President.

6. The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, 1987.

SB 1570 (The Nielsen Bill) approved by the Governor in 1984, established the Commission for the Review of Higher Education to review the Master Plan and to formulate and submit (to the Legislature) recommendations regarding policies and the content of the Master Plan. The referenced document is the report of the Commission.

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY AUGUST 20, 1990
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JUNE 25, 1990
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 15, 1990
 AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 5, 1990
 AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 16, 1989
 AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 17, 1989
 AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 24, 1989

SENATE BILL **No. 1570**

Introduced by Senators Nielsen, Bergeson, Cecil Green, Kopp, Morgan, Seymour, Torres, and Watson
 (Principal coauthors: Assembly Members Hayden and Vasconcellos)
 (Coauthors: Assembly Members Allen, Bradley, Chandler, Hansen, Statham, and Wyman)

March 10, 1989

An act to add Sections 66010.4, 66010.6, and 70900.5 to, and to repeal Sections 66500, 66603, and 66701 of, the Education Code, relating to education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1570, as amended, Nielsen. Public postsecondary education: missions.
 Existing law defines the mission of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California.
 This bill would state the missions of each of these segments as defined in existing law in a single provision and would also authorize the California Community Colleges to conduct institutional research to the extent that state funding is

SB 1570

— 2 —

provided concerning student learning and retention, as needed, to facilitate its educational mission.
 Existing law permits the California State University to award a doctoral degree jointly with the University of California, or jointly with a private institution of postsecondary education accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The bill would revise these provisions as they relate to private institutions by permitting the California State University to award a doctoral degree jointly with one or more independent institutions of higher education, as defined, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

This bill would include, among the missions of the California State University, the broad responsibility to the public good and welfare of the state to be exercised through projects and programs aimed at regional economic, social, and cultural development. This bill would state that the primary mission of the California State University is undergraduate and graduate instruction.

This bill would include, among the missions of the University of California, the encouragement and support of public service programs, as part of the university's broad responsibility toward the public good.

Existing law delineates the functions and responsibilities of the California Postsecondary Education Commission in its capacity as the statewide postsecondary education planning and coordinating agency and adviser to the Legislature and Governor.

This bill would state the mission of the California Postsecondary Education Commission which would include serving as the key fiscal and program adviser to the Governor and the Legislature on postsecondary educational policy. This bill would require the commission to have specified responsibilities and to consult with the postsecondary educational segments and with relevant state agencies in its preparation of analyses and recommendations to the

Governor and the Legislature. This bill would require the commission to remain an independent and nonpartisan body responsible for providing an integrated and segmentally unbiased view for purposes of state policy formulation and evaluation.

This bill would state the mission of the Student Aid Commission, including administering state and federal financial aid programs, *providing policy leadership on student financial aid issues*, evaluating the effectiveness of its programs, *conducting research and long-range planning as a foundation for program improvement*, reporting on total state financial aid needs, and disseminating information to students and their families.

This bill would retitle the provisions of existing law related to community colleges as the Walter Stiern Act.

~~The bill would state that it would not become operative unless AB 468 and SB 507 are chaptered.~~

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. The Legislature hereby finds and
2 declares as follows:

3 (a) The Legislature periodically undertakes to review
4 public higher education in California. The Legislature's
5 most recent review effort is in the process of being
6 completed, subsequent to five years of examination of
7 public higher education by the Commission for the
8 Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and the
9 Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for
10 Higher Education.

11 (b) Because higher education issues tend to be viewed
12 in the narrow context of a specific situation in a single
13 higher education segment, it is difficult to view public
14 higher education in California as a single system, as under
15 the Master Plan for Higher Education. It is the intent of
16 this act to unify the philosophies and principles of the
17 mission statements of the University of California, the
18 California State University, the California Community

1 Colleges, and the California Postsecondary Education
2 Commission.

3 (c) Voluntary cooperation and participation among
4 educational entities is laudable and desirable. The
5 Legislature encourages public and private involvement
6 in that process.

7 SEC. 2. Section 66010.4 is added to the Education
8 Code, to read:

9 66010.4. The missions and functions of California's
10 public and independent segments, and their respective
11 institutions of higher education shall be differentiated as
12 follows:

13 (a) (1) The California Community Colleges shall, as a
14 primary mission, offer academic and vocational
15 instruction at the lower division level for both younger
16 and older students, including those persons returning to
17 school. Public community colleges shall offer instruction
18 through but not beyond the second year of college. These
19 institutions may grant the associate in arts and the
20 associate in science degree.

21 (2) In addition to the primary mission of academic and
22 vocational instruction, the community colleges shall offer
23 instruction and courses to achieve all of the following:

24 (A) The provision of remedial instruction for those in
25 need of it and, in conjunction with the school districts,
26 instruction in English as a second language, adult
27 noncredit instruction, and support services which help
28 students succeed at the postsecondary level are
29 reaffirmed and supported as essential and important
30 functions of the community colleges.

31 (B) The provision of adult noncredit education
32 curricula in areas defined as being in the state's interest
33 is an essential and important function of the community
34 colleges.

35 ~~(C) The community colleges shall share responsibility
36 for vocational education with programs in the adult
37 schools through explicit local agreements.~~

38 ~~(D)~~

39 (C) The provision of community services courses and
40 programs is an authorized function of the community

1 colleges so long as their provision is compatible with an
2 institution's ability to meet its obligations in its primary
3 missions.

4 (3) The community colleges may conduct to the
5 extent that state funding is provided, institutional
6 research concerning student learning and retention as is
7 needed to facilitate their educational missions.

8 (b) The California State University shall offer
9 undergraduate and graduate instruction through the
10 master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences and
11 professional education, including teacher education.
12 Presently established two-year programs in agriculture
13 are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be
14 permitted only when mutually agreed upon by the
15 Trustees of the California State University and the Board
16 of Governors of the California Community Colleges. The
17 doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the
18 University of California, as provided in subdivision (c)
19 and pursuant to Section 66904. The doctoral degree may
20 also be awarded jointly with one or more independent
21 institutions of higher education, provided that the
22 proposed doctoral program is approved by the California
23 Postsecondary Education Commission. Research,
24 scholarship, and creative activity in support of its
25 undergraduate and graduate instructional mission is
26 authorized in the California State University and shall be
27 supported by the state. The primary mission of the
28 California State University is undergraduate and
29 graduate instruction through the master's degree.

30 (c) The University of California may provide
31 undergraduate and graduate instruction ~~up to, and~~
32 ~~including, the doctoral degree~~ in the liberal arts and
33 sciences and in the professions, including the teaching
34 professions. It shall have exclusive jurisdiction in public
35 higher education over instruction in the profession of law
36 and over graduate instruction in the professions of
37 medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine. It has the
38 sole authority in public higher education to award the
39 doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may
40 agree with the California State University to award joint

1 doctoral degrees in selected fields. The University of
2 California shall be the primary state-supported academic
3 agency for research.

4 (d) The independent institutions of higher education
5 shall provide undergraduate and graduate instruction
6 and research in accordance with their respective
7 missions.

8 SEC. 3. Section 66010.6 is added to the Education
9 Code, to read:

10 66010.6. The missions of agencies charged with
11 coordination, administration, or implementation of
12 higher education policies and programs in California shall
13 be as follows:

14 ~~The~~

15 (a) The California Postsecondary Education
16 Commission is the statewide postsecondary education
17 coordinating and planning agency. The commission shall
18 serve as the key a principal fiscal and program advisor
19 to the Governor and the Legislature on postsecondary
20 educational policy. ~~The commission shall have~~
21 ~~responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, the~~
22 ~~following:~~

23 ~~(1) Long-range Consistent with Section 66903, the~~
24 ~~commission's responsibilities shall include, but not be~~
25 ~~limited to, the following:~~

26 (1) Analysis and recommendations related to
27 long-range planning for public postsecondary education.

28 (2) Analysis of state policy and programs involving the
29 independent and private postsecondary educational
30 sectors.

31 (3) ~~Program~~ Analysis and recommendations related
32 to program and policy review.

33 (4) Resource analysis.

34 (5) Maintenance and publication of pertinent public
35 information relating to all aspects of postsecondary
36 education.

37 The commission shall consult with the postsecondary
38 educational segments and with relevant state agencies,
39 including the Student Aid Commission, the
40 Superintendent of Public Instruction, and other relevant

1 parties, in its preparation of analyses and
 2 recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.
 3 However, the commission shall remain an independent
 4 and nonpartisan body responsible for providing an
 5 integrated and segmentally unbiased view for purposes
 6 of state policy formulation and evaluation.

7 ~~(b) The California Student Aid Commission~~
 8 ~~administers state and federal student financial aid~~
 9 ~~programs and provides policy leadership on these issues.~~
 10 ~~The commission evaluates the effectiveness of its~~
 11 ~~programs, reports on total state financial aid needs, and~~
 12 ~~disseminates information to students and their families.~~

13 ~~(b) The California Student Aid Commission is the~~
 14 ~~primary state agency for the administration of~~
 15 ~~state-authorized student financial aid programs available~~
 16 ~~to students attending all segments of postsecondary~~
 17 ~~education. These programs include grant, work study,~~
 18 ~~and loan programs supported by the state and the federal~~
 19 ~~government.~~

20 ~~Consistent with this responsibility, the Commission~~
 21 ~~shall provide, in consultation with the postsecondary~~
 22 ~~education segments and relevant state agencies, policy~~
 23 ~~leadership on student financial aid issues, evaluate the~~
 24 ~~effectiveness of its programs, conduct research and~~
 25 ~~long-range planning as a foundation for program~~
 26 ~~improvement, report on total state financial aid needs,~~
 27 ~~and disseminate information to students and their~~
 28 ~~families.~~

29 (c) The Council for Private Postsecondary and
 30 Vocational Education is the primary state agency
 31 responsible for approving and regulating private
 32 postsecondary and vocational educational institutions
 33 and for developing state policies for private
 34 postsecondary and vocational education in California.
 35 The council shall represent the private postsecondary
 36 and vocational education institutions in all state level
 37 planning and policy discussions about postsecondary and
 38 vocational education.

39 SEC. 4. Section 66500 of the Education Code is
 40 repealed.

1 SEC. 5. Section 66608 of the Education Code is
 2 repealed.
 3 SEC. 6. Section 66701 of the Education Code is
 4 repealed.
 5 SEC. 7. Section 70900.5 is added to the Education
 6 Code, to read:

7 70900.5. This part shall be known, and may be cited,
 8 as the "Walter Stiern Act."

9 ~~SEC. 8. This act shall not become operative unless~~
 10 ~~Assembly Bill 162 and Senate Bill 507 of the 1989/90~~
 11 ~~Regular Session are chaptered.~~

O

REMIEDIATION TAXONOMY

Levels of Instruction	Levels of Student	Examples of Courses	UC [ⓐ] Reg. Admit. (Top 12%)	UC [ⓐ] Spec. Admit (Exception)	CSU [ⓑ] Reg. Admit. (Top 33-1/3) (Exception)	CCC [Ⓒ] (Open Admission, Credit)	CCC [Ⓒ] (Open Admission, Noncredit)	I-12 [Ⓓ] Adult Ed. (Open Adm., Noncredit)
University Level	Students who are college-ready and likely to succeed in the freshman-level courses.	Calculus, Pre-Calculus, Analyt. Geom. (Eng. 1A)	Math 15,238 English 46,12 (8,772)	Math 35,92 (607) English 17,22 (290)	Math 55,62 (5,459) English 49,52 (6,082)	Math 20,07 (43,624) English 29,42 (64,224)		
Pre-College Level 1	(A) Students who are college-ready except for minimal specific skill deficiencies that require instruction one level below the Freshman level in English and/or Math.	Adv. Algebra Int. Algebra Trigonometry (Eng. 1A)	Math 19,42 (3,703) English 52,222 (9,959)	Math 58,22 (986) English 80,22 (1,358)	Math 38,42 (996) English 32,22 (915)	Math 25,42 (35,355) English 35,22 (77,000)		
Pre-College Level 2	(B) Students who are nearly college-ready, but exhibit serious multiple skill deficiencies that require instruction at two levels below the Fr. Level in Eng. and/or Math. (Also, E.S. college-prep students.)	Geometry Elem. Alg.	Math < 1% (98) English 1,82 (308)	Math 5,82 (42) English 2,52 (42)	Math 38,92 (1,010) English 52,12 (1,482)	Math 29,02 (63,203) English 27,22 (59,638)	5% (59,638)	2,42 (2,785)
High School Diploma Level	Non-college-ready in need of high school level skills in various disciplines (i.e. below College Prep. level)	General Math (2 yrs. required courses not specified)	(These students needing help at this level generally receive it through Learning Center services since UC indicates it offers no courses at this level.)		(There may be some overlap in remedial course content between Pre-College Level 2 and High School Diploma Level.)	Math 13,12 (28,543) English 10,02 (21,826)	25% (13,523)	22,12 (137,313)
Jr. High Level	Non-high-school-ready, in need of jr. high school level skills in various disciplines.	Arithmetic				Math 11,42 (24,869) English 5,22 (11,246)	40% (21,638)	7,52 (45,771)
Elem. Level	Non-high school-ready, in need of elem. school level skills in various disciplines.	Above				Math 5,62 (12,232) English 4,12 (9,058)	25% (13,523)	20% (125,235)
Developmental/Basic Living Skills Level	Students operating below elem. level or who need basic life and coping skills.	Counting				Math < 1% (297) English 1,22 (2,688)	5% (2,705)	48% (299,946)

- Notes:
- 1 All CSU numbers and percentages are based on data on First-Time Freshman who have taken the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) test. The data indicate the number of students either passing the tests or needing one or two semesters of remediation.
 - 2 The CCC numbers and percents are projections based on a representative sample of colleges. The percentages are figured as the percent of First-Time Freshmen students. The percentages total to slightly more than 100% because students other than First-Time Freshmen are enrolled in courses at all levels.
 - 3 Math and English enrollments are shown separately for each level and segment since a given student often enrolls in both types of courses.
 - 4 The CC Chancellor's Office indicates that credit enrollments at this level consist of special courses (rather than special services) for Learning Disabled Students. Most courses and services for the Learning Disabled and Developmentally Disabled are offered in the noncredit format and are not included in these numbers and percentages.
 - 5 Courses listed under Pre-College Level 1 may not be considered remedial and are sometimes given degree credit by UC, CSU and the CCC.
 - 6 The numbers and percentages provided by the SDE are based on those of the 1.5 million Adult Education enrollments that are considered "remedial" (i.e., Elementary and Secondary Basic Skills, and ESL programs). The proportions shown above are based on these programs alone, which actually equal only 48% of total Adult Education enrollments, but have been recomputed here to sum to 100%, (as have the CC noncredit enrollments). The other 56% of Adult Ed. enrollments are in the areas of Citizenship, Handicapped Adults, short-term Job Skills Training, Apprenticeship, Older Adults, Health and Safety, Home-making, and Parenting, and cannot be disaggregated as "remedial" or "nonremedial."
 - 7 The University's numbers and percentages of students at the "University Level" of mathematics instruction represent those students in the Freshman class who are either prepared for University level math courses or who are in disciplines that do not require math beyond the level necessary for admission to UC.
 - 8 The CC Chancellor's Office indicates that noncredit enrollments are not evenly distributed across the segment, since only 15 districts offer state-funded noncredit adult education programs. The numbers are based on enrollments in Elementary/Secondary Basic Skills classes only. The distribution of the proportion of these programs across the levels of instruction are estimates only.

Source for the "Remediation Taxonomy": Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, The Master Plan Renewed, Sacramento, 1987, Appendix A-5.

Remediation Taxonomy

Levels of Instruction	Levels of Student	Examples of Courses	
		Math	English
University Level	Students who are college-ready and likely to succeed in the freshman-level courses.	Calculus, Pre-Calculus, Analyt. Geom.	Freshman Composition (Eng. 1A)
Pre-College Level 1*	(A) Students who are college-ready except for minimal specific skill deficiencies that require instruction one level below the Freshman level in English and/or Math.	Adv. Algebra Int. Algebra Trigonometry	Subject A or one course below Fr. Comp. (Eng. 1A)
Pre-College Level 2	(B) Students who are nearly college-ready, but exhibit serious multiple skill deficiencies that require instruction at two levels below the Fr. Level in Eng. and/or Math. (Also, H.S. college-prep students.)	Geometry Elementary Alg.	Courses two levels below Fr. Comp. (Eng. 1A)
High School Diploma	Noncollege-ready in need of high school level skills in various disciplines (i.e., below College Prep. level).	General Math (2 years required courses not specified)	Paragraphs, sentence structure, reading skills at 9-12th-grade level.
Junior High Level	Nonhigh school-ready, in need of jr. high school level skills in various disciplines.	Arithmetic	Basic reading and beginning sentence skills in courses at the 7-9th-grade level.
Elementary Level	Nonhigh school-ready, in need of elementary school level skills in various disciplines.		Above skills but at 6th-grade level and below.
Developmental/Basic Living Skills Level	Students operating below elementary level or who need basic life and coping skills.	Counting	Most basic English vocabulary and speaking skills.

* Courses listed under Pre-College Level 1 may not be considered remedial and are sometimes given degree credit by UC, CSU, and the CCC.



California State University, Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95819-2694

LEARNING SKILLS PROGRAM

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 12, 1991
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Robby Ching *Robby Ching*
ESL Coordinator
Learning Skills/English

California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

MAR 13 1991

Academic Senate Received
413

I would like to commend the work of the Ad Hoc Committee which produced the Instructional Program Priorities and its support for pre-baccalaureate remediation. I am, however, deeply concerned about the situation of ESL students who already have completed the G.E. writing requirement in community college. Currently, more than 90% of ESL transfer students with credit for English 1A are underprepared for university level work and 60% are two semesters or more below entrance into college level, as measured by their placement on the English Diagnostic Test.

Section D.5.a. of the report recommends that the University take steps to "limit enrollment in remedial courses to students who have not completed the G.E. writing requirement" (p. 11). Most ESL students transfer from community colleges with 1A credit. Without ESL classes at CSUS, these students will lack adequate language skills to benefit fully from their coursework and will have little hope of passing the WPE and graduating. This will be especially significant for the Schools of Engineering and Business where 50% of ESL students are clustered. If students have no way of meeting the standards we have set for writing, pressure will build to do away with those standards rather than present students with an insurmountable barrier to graduation.

Section D.5.b. recommends that the University take steps to "work with the community college system to decrease the proportion of ESL transfer students who have completed the G.E. requirement in writing but still require remedial course work" (p. 11). I agree that it appears illogical for upper-division transfer students with credit for English 1A to require remedial ESL instruction. Part of the problem is the view that ESL instruction is remedial. Instead, it is comparable to foreign language instruction for native speakers of English and is often at a much higher level. Achieving proficiency in English, especially for speakers of non-Indo-European languages, is a long process; we should anticipate that students will need language instruction throughout their education.

Undeniably, however, the major issue is articulation. Community colleges throughout the state grant credit for freshman composition to students whose writing skills are dramatically below college level. To address this issue I have hosted a series of ESL/Community College Articulation Conferences at CSUS

since 1985 and addressed a number of professional organizations on the issue of articulation. Last fall I was a consultant, along with a community college and a UC representative, to a subcommittee of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council considering the issue of ESL articulation. We unanimously agreed the problem could only be solved at the intersegmental level. The ICC response was that "ESL is too hot to touch."

Uniform intersegmental standards are probably not possible. At CSUS we can bring ESL students to an acceptable level of writing proficiency through intensive instruction by skilled ESL professionals, frequent advising, and small classes with tutorial support. These conditions are seldom available in community colleges. Instead, they have to deal with vast numbers of students, large class sizes, underprepared teachers, and inadequate advising. Because of law suits, they have been prohibited from having mandatory placement into courses, and many colleges interpret this to mean they cannot have uniform exit standards either. Law suits have also compelled them to begin taking students at the lowest levels of language proficiency who would have been sent to adult schools in the past.

The recent WASC accreditation report notes that the failure to meet the needs of ESL students indicates "a structural weakness" (p. 4) in the university. It commends the efforts of Learning Skills to address the needs of ESL students, but goes on to say that those efforts, "though essential, are but part of a needed concerted effort across all courses throughout the curriculum" (4). We cannot count on the community colleges to send us students with adequate language skills for university level work. Instead, I urge you to support language instruction for all ESL students, not only in ESL classes but across the university.