

A C A D E M I C S E N A T E

AGENDA - ADDENDUM

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, October 24, 1984

2:00 p.m.

Student Senate Chambers, University Union

Regular
~~CONSENT~~ CALENDAR

AS 84-49/Ex. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

University Resources and Planning Council:

MICHAEL BALLARD-CAMPBELL*	17
EUGENE SAHS*	15
ELIZABETH MOULDS	22

*Staggered two-year terms; for this initial appointment one of the two, determined by lot, will serve a one-year term.

ACADEMIC SENATE

AGENDA

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, October 24, 1984

2:00 p.m.

Student Senate Chambers, University Union

*Mani Motion
Carried.*

AS 84-45/AP, Ex. REPORT ON THE ADMISSION OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN
[Postponed on October 10, 1984, to this special meeting.]

*Kelly (M)
Figler (S)
Carried
man.*

The Academic Senate approves ~~the~~ ^{the} concept ~~the~~ ^{that} of enhanced admission requirements ~~as stated~~ in "The Report of The California State University Admissions Advisory Council on the Admission of First-Time Freshmen," dated February 9, 1984 (Attachment) and forwards the following comments and recommendations pertinent to this document to the CSU Academic Senate and the President:

1. While the revised admission standards for the CSU system ideally will have a positive impact on the educational quality of CSU's curriculum and on the quality of education obtained by our students, we believe that the impact of these requirements will be an increased demand for well qualified teachers. If these new requirements are to be effective in achieving their goals, particular attention will have to be directed toward recruiting for the teaching profession.
2. The CSU, Sacramento Academic Senate believes exceptions to admission standards must be equitable and applied consistently throughout the system and within each institution in the system. ~~Additionally, we believe that attention should be directed to evaluation of the impact that special admissions may have on the quality of the general education curriculum. That is, if large numbers of special admissions occur at the freshman level, this may have a serious negative effect on the curriculum.~~
3. Specific college preparatory courses used to meet the requirements for entering freshmen should be the same for the CSU and UC systems.
4. Although the Admissions Advisory Council's report suggests that "(Transfer students should be held to similar subject area preparation, as well as

*Scott (M)
Maxwell (S)
Carried
man.*

satisfactory college-level performance)," we would like to push this point further. So as not to have two classes of citizens at the junior level of the four year universities, we would like to strongly recommend that community college transfers be held to the same or equivalent academic preparation, not just satisfactory GPA in community college courses, before being accepted as transfers to either the CSU or UC systems.

Alexander (M)
Radimsky (S)
Carried

5. There should be ~~some~~ articulation between high school and colleges as to the appropriate content of courses taught to satisfy these admission requirements. ~~For example, the content of the third year of mathematics should be different for those students who will only take three years and not four years of mathematics. Under a three years of mathematics situation, the third year mathematics course might contain instruction in algebra, trigonometry, solid geometry and other advanced topics and not deal in depth with advanced algebra.~~
6. Clarification is needed regarding the content of the "Visual and Performing Arts" requirement mentioned in TABLE II of the Admissions Advisory Council's report before the requirement can be evaluated.

AS 84-48/UARTP, Ex. ARTP - STUDENT EVALUATIONS

The Academic Senate approves amendment of campus ARTP policy as follows [see Attachment C, 10/10/84 Academic Senate agenda]:

"A minimum of two (2) classes annually for each faculty unit employee shall have written student evaluations. Student evaluation shall be conducted in classes representative of the faculty unit employee's teaching assignment."

AS 84-49

AS 84-45

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

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

Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
(213) 590-5709

RECEIVED
AUG 13 1984
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SACRAMENTO
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

AUG 13 1984

Academic Senate Received
453

Code: ESS 84-27

Reply by October 15, 1984

Date: August 10, 1984

To: Presidents

From: William E. Vandament
Provost and Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Admissions Advisory Council Report on the Admission of
First-time Freshmen

Enclosed with this memo is a copy of the subject report. I would appreciate it if you and other appropriate personnel on your campus would review it and send us your comments by October 15. In view of the subject matter, it is particularly important that local senates have an opportunity to address it as well.

We have discussed the contents of this proposal briefly in the Executive Council. Thus, I believe you are aware that the Chancellor's initial reaction has been favorable. In addition, you should know that it was presented to the Statewide Academic Senate by its representatives on the Council and was endorsed. An article in the May issue of School and College Review has brought the proposal to the attention of public school personnel. Finally, we have had some discussion with the University of California and California Community Colleges staff concerning the common core college preparatory concept. In general, feedback concerning all aspects of the proposal has been limited, but positive.

We hope to present a proposal to the Board of Trustees in November similar to that included in the Advisory Council Report beginning on page 12. In effect, Trustee adoption

Distribution: Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Academic Vice Presidents
Deans of Students
Deans/Directors Admissions
Chairs, Campus Senates
California State Student Association (CSSA)
Chancellor's Staff

August 10, 1984

ESS 84-27

Page Two

of such a resolution would constitute a statement of intent with ample latitude for adjustment if experience so suggests.

One major concern, noted in the proposed resolution, has to do with the impact upon educational equity. We are planning a major study of a sample of schools with high minority enrollment to be conducted this fall. In addition, we would very much appreciate campus observations and findings on this topic as part of your response to this particular request.

If you have any questions, please direct them to Associate Vice Chancellor Robert O. Bess at (213)590-5711 or 635-5711 (ATSS).

WEV:js

Enclosure

REPORT
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
ADMISSIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON
THE ADMISSION OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN

February 9, 1984

This report deals with the question of need for further changes in regular admission requirements for first-time freshmen. It first sets forth several conditions or assumptions which we believe must govern any changes. It then goes on to describe the status quo. The heart of the report is a proposal for adding a third year of mathematics and a pattern of other college preparatory subjects to existing requirements. Readers should bear in mind that so-called "regular" requirements do not constitute the sole basis for freshman admission. Provisions exist and should be continued to use alternative means to select nontraditional students, those who have been educationally disadvantaged, and individuals with particular talents. Indeed, the report suggests that as a next step in its work, the Admissions Advisory Council should examine existing alternatives as well as possible new approaches.

It is difficult for some to understand why further changes in admission requirements should be considered before recently adopted changes are fully operative. However, the Council believes that circumstances surrounding this critical area are such that a long-range plan is essential to the successful implementation of changes which potentially affect the majority of California's high school graduates. The "lead time" inherent in this plan should ensure that students have adequate opportunity to meet new requirements, and that schools and colleges have the time necessary for the development of the details so necessary if changes are to have the desired positive impact upon educational quality. Experience associated with the implementation of previously adopted requirements as well as that gained from the early phases of this plan may suggest the need for future modification, even after a "plan" has been adopted. Notwithstanding this possibility, it is desirable to adopt and announce such a plan as a framework for constructive interaction with K-12 and other segments of California education. This approach should be especially beneficial in addressing the complex task of realizing improved access for students from underrepresented groups.

Preconditions for Change

In developing this plan, the Council tested its ideas against a number of conditions or assumptions. These may be summarized as follows:

1. Admission requirements must be consistent with the mission of the CSU to provide undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts and science, in applied fields, and for preparation for the professions.
2. Changes in admission requirements should contribute to the improvement of education for all Californians, either directly or indirectly. They should not serve only to provide CSU with better prepared students.
3. Changes should be designed to contribute to better student preparation.
4. Changes should be consonant with affirmative action efforts to increase the level of academic preparation of students from groups which are underrepresented in the University.
5. The CSU will continue to select primarily from the top one-third of California high school graduates.

Current Status

Some 80 percent of lower division students are admitted on the basis of a weighted combination of grade point average earned in grades 10-12 (excluding physical education and ROTC) and the score on either the Scholastic Aptitude Test or the American College Test. Admission is offered to those presenting an eligibility index which places them in the upper one-third of California high school graduates.* Such students are commonly referred to as "regular admits."

*Nonresidents must be among the upper one-sixth of California high school graduates. Students who have completed some college must also present a satisfactory record in such work (e.g., a 2.0 g.p.a. for residents and a 2.4 g.p.a. for nonresidents). The remaining 20% of entering lower division students are admitted by a variety of provisions ranging from exceptions for the disadvantaged and others who fail to meet these criteria to special provisions for older adults, gifted high school students, veterans and those with particular curricular needs.

In January 1981 the Board of Trustees added to the foregoing a requirement that first-time freshmen complete four years of college preparatory English and two years of college preparatory mathematics, effective for fall 1984 entrants. Complementary changes in transfer requirements were adopted by the Board in May 1983. Numerous activities are underway to implement the Board's action, particularly to ensure that required courses contribute significantly to the improvement of student readiness to undertake college study.

On a related front, the system has implemented a testing program intended to assess basic entry-level skills in the English language and mathematics. The English Placement Test (EPT) has been in place since fall 1977. The Entry Level Mathematics Test (ELM) was first required of fall 1983 entering students. These are not admission tests, but they will reinforce efforts to strengthen preparation in these foundation areas in at least two ways: They will motivate students to be prepared in order to avoid required remediation; they will provide feedback to the schools to aid in evaluation of curriculum.

The Plan Summarized

No later than 1990, regularly eligible entering freshmen should be required to meet the following conditions. (Transfer students should be held to similar subject area preparation, as well as satisfactory college-level performance): 1) An earned grade point average and test score placing them among the upper one-third of California high school graduates (current), 2) Completion of the equivalent of sixteen year courses in college preparatory English, mathematics, science, social science, foreign language, and visual and performing arts. Statements concerning standards for required college preparatory courses should be reinforced by criteria statements comparable to those developed for the new requirements in English and mathematics.

The Upper One-Third

The Master Plan for Higher Education recommended that the CSU select from among the upper one-third of California high school graduates and the University of California from among the upper one-eighth. Community colleges were to remain essentially open-door institutions. These provisions have been reaffirmed several times. It was left to the segments to determine the means of selection, but CPEC periodically conducts validation studies. The most recent such study, underway at this writing, will provide important baseline data for assessing the impact of both recently adopted and

newly recommended changes. The two previous CPEC studies have shown that CSU selection procedures have remained within 1.5 percent of that required to select from the upper one-third. As the degree of course specificity is increased, the index yielded from grades and test scores will need to be recalibrated in order to assure that new requirements improve the quality of students in the admissions pool rather than reduce their numbers.

A Third Year of Mathematics

The Council believes that a strong foundation in mathematics is second in importance only to the development of a high level of competence in written and oral expression and reading. It is important both in terms of general education and preparation for specialized study. Most degree programs anticipate computational skills which build upon three or even four years of high school mathematics. A majority of CSU students pursue programs which require calculus and/or statistics. Failure to enter college with at least three years of preparatory mathematics frequently contributes to delay in program completion. Finally, the frequency of major changes and subsequent career changes suggest that few, if any, students would be ill-served by a third year mathematics requirement.

The sequential nature of mathematics curricula strongly suggests that most students would complete this requirement by taking additional algebra. However, the Council recommends that thorough study be given to the matter of providing additional options. We do not, however, believe that so-called "computer literacy" requirements should be viewed as an alternative; although attention to this need could be incorporated into mathematics courses. We take this position based upon a belief that familiarity with basic computing processes is not a substitute for the foundation mathematics study which is essential to so many fields including many computer programming languages.

Requirements such as that proposed in mathematics are frequently criticized as unfair to students wishing to pursue degrees in visual and performing arts. The Council believes that such criticism overlooks the fact that the major constitutes only a portion of baccalaureate study, that CSU policy requires that all students have a solid foundation in reading, writing and computational skills, and that the general education-breadth expectations are pertinent regardless of choice of major. Moreover, there is and should continue to be provisions

for admitting the unusually talented individual whose preparation is uneven but adequate overall.

Although the arguments in support of an increased mathematics requirement strike the Council as compelling, it is sensitive to the problem such a requirement would present to the schools. At present slightly more than one-half of the CSU-bound high school graduates complete intermediate algebra. The addition of such a requirement will contribute to a significant increase in demand for high school mathematics study. Unless the supply of mathematics teachers is increased, either this demand will not be met or the opportunity of some students for even more advanced study will be diminished. It should be assumed that the institution of such a requirement by the CSU would influence the enrollment behavior of roughly one-half of the high school students. Adequacy of public school finance and the availability of qualified teachers must be addressed satisfactorily before such a requirement can work. A number of school personnel with whom we have consulted have suggested that this is a problem which is more likely to be resolved if the demands of postsecondary education are made more explicit.

To provide reasonable opportunity for adjustment, a third year mathematics requirement should be applicable to students entering in fall 1988 and thereafter. Efforts to assist the schools in meeting the added demand for mathematics classes should be intensified. As with recently adopted requirements in English and mathematics, provision should be made for admission of students who are unable to meet this requirement for reasons beyond their control.

While it may be argued that there is no higher correlation between one specified pattern of college preparatory subjects and success in university study than with any other set of college preparatory courses, the Council believes there is merit in prescribing a single pattern of preparatory study in academic subjects. First, it would assure that prospective students are exposed to the areas of study which will constitute their collegiate general education-breadth experience. Moreover, this approach will support improved academic preparation and simplify the task of communicating both requirements and expectations. The very existence of this approach to preparation for college would communicate, to parents and students alike, the importance of proper preparation.

In the past we have been hesitant to become so prescriptive, due largely to concerns about impact upon limited public school resources. Circumstances, however, have changed

dramatically with the statutory establishment of graduation requirements for all California high schools. As a consequence, it appears that a pattern which builds upon these requirements and the longstanding University of California course requirements known as the "A-F pattern" are not only practicable, but could well ease resource problems over the long-term by defining a less extensive range of offerings in contrast to the array of elective characteristics of the American high school of the 70's.

The California State Legislature has established the following requirements for students who graduate from high school in 1987 and thereafter: English (3 years), Mathematics (2), Science (2), Social Studies (3), Fine Arts or Foreign Language (1), Physical Education (2).

Model graduation requirements recently adopted by the State Board of Education and recommended to local school boards for adoption consist of: English (4 years), Mathematics (3), Social Studies (3), Science (2), Foreign Language (2), Visual and Performing Arts (1), Computer Literacy ($\frac{1}{2}$). The recommendations are far more specific in nature than the statutory requirements. They provide for algebra and geometry, biology and physical (or earth) science and particular social science courses including economics. Coupled with the two-year physical education requirement they equate to 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ one-year courses.

University of California required courses for admission have undergone modification recently. Effective in fall of 1986 applicants will need to present a pattern consisting of at least 16 year courses including 15 college preparatory courses in English, mathematics, laboratory science, social science, foreign language, and fine arts. This constitutes an increase from 11 specified college preparatory courses. The particular pattern of required courses will be: English (4 years), Mathematics (3), Government and/or U.S. History (1), Laboratory Science (1), Foreign Language (2), college preparatory electives (4), (including the above fields other than history and social science and visual and performing arts).

The Council believes that if a single pattern of college preparatory study were "adopted" by all segments the mission of California high schools would be clarified, the task of academic counseling would be simplified and there would be far greater student and parental understanding of what one should be prepared to encounter in university study. Adoption of a single pattern might range from strong recommendations by community colleges and less selective independent institutions to establishment of requirements by the more selective

public and independent institutions. Because the overwhelming majority of college-bound California high school students plan in terms of either CSU or UC requirements, the Council recommends that agreement be sought on a common UC/CSU preparatory pattern, and that community colleges and independent institutions be encouraged to utilize it as well. We suggest the following: English (4 years), Mathematics (3), History/Social Science (2), Science with lab (2), Foreign Language (2), Fine and Visual Arts (1), and electives from these fields (2).

Table I shows the proportion of fall 1978 CSU entering freshmen who were regularly eligible who had met or exceeded the proposed course requirements.

TABLE I

PROPOSED Uniform College Preparatory Pattern and
Proportion of Regularly Eligible CSU Freshmen Meeting Each
of the Course Requirements*

<u>Course Requirement</u>	<u>Percent Completing</u>
English 4 years	45% (92% with 3 years +)
Mathematics 3 years	63% (94% with 2 years +)
Social Studies 3 years	72%
Science 2 years	67% (98% with 1 year +)
Foreign Lang. 2 years	79% (90% with 1 year +)
Fine Arts	57%

*Source: High School Preparation - College Achievement,
the CSU, Long Beach, CA 1981

These data are from a study of 1978 entrants. It is probable that a similar study conducted today would show higher percentages in English, mathematics and science. The CPEC Eligibility Study scheduled for late spring completion will provide this type of information for both CSU eligible and all high school graduates based upon a sample of approximately 15,000 1983 graduates.

Table II which summarizes the various patterns of high school study shows that statutory graduation requirements combined with existing CSU requirements constitute the great majority of the pattern which we propose. The only substantial additional requirement would be two years of foreign language.

(Table II on following page)

TABLE II

Comparison of Various High School Course Patterns

Subject	State Mandated (1987)	State Board of Education "Model"	CSU Required (1984)	UC Required (1986)	Uniform College Prep Proposal
English	3 years	4 years	4 years	4 years	4 years
Mathematics	2 years	3 years	2 years	3 years	3 years
Social Studies	3 years	3 years	-	1 year (U.S. Hist/Gov)	3 years
Science	2 years (inc biol & phys sci)	2 years	-	1 year (with lab)	2 years (with lab)
Foreign Lang	1 year	2 years	-	2 years	2 years
Visual & Perform. Arts	-	1 year	-	-	1 year
Physical Ed	2 years	-	-	-	-
Computer Lit	-	½ year	-	-	-
Electives	-	-	-	4 years* 16**	1 year + 16 ++

*From fields required above, other history, social science and fine arts.
 **Enumerated subjects total 15. One additional course required in any subject for total of 16.
 +Selected from any courses designated college preparation.
 ++Typical high school graduation requirements established by local boards total 20-22 year courses.

Although new UC requirements become effective in 1986 and statutory requirements apply to 1987 graduates, the Council recommends that the target date for implementing this pattern be fall 1988. This added year recognizes that a CSU pattern will have greater impact upon the schools because of the larger numbers of students who contemplate CSU study. The years 1988-90 would constitute a phase-in period with provisions for making exceptions where justified.

The CSU commitment to older and nontraditional students demands that their circumstances be given special consideration in this context. The current English and mathematics requirement is routinely met by most students or it can be readily made-up in a community college. For this reason, except for the phase-in period of 1984-86, the requirement will apply retroactively to earlier high school graduates. On the other hand, a pattern which prescribes as much as 80 percent of the high school program could present a significant barrier to older students returning to college after having completed high school at some earlier time. Furthermore, evidence suggests that the specifics of college preparation are less significant for those more mature students. The Council recommends, therefore, that these proposed new requirements not apply to individuals graduating from high school prior to 1988. College-level academic performance of such students should be assessed sometime after 1990 to ensure that this exemption is fully justified.

Student Access

As noted earlier, the Council is concerned that any change in admission requirements could have unanticipated impact upon system efforts to increase student enrollment from under-represented groups. Thus, while it believes that these proposals will have a long-term, positive impact, especially by improving minority student ability to persist in college once enrolled, it also recognizes that special efforts and contingency plans will be needed.

The Council wholeheartedly supports the CSU commitment to the important goals of student affirmative action. It is also committed to improving the academic preparation of entering CSU students, and believes that these objectives are not antithetical. Indeed, improved high school preparation is the most important element in expanding minority access to and persistence in higher education.

Particular attention should be given to the manner by which information about new requirements is disseminated and to assisting the schools to strengthen their efforts to prepare

students for college. For example, examinations such as ELM and EPT might be administered during the junior year so that diagnosis and proper remediation could be provided prior to high school graduation. Consideration should also be given to developing special programs whereby target students are identified at or near the beginning of high school and assisted throughout to ensure their readiness for college.

In addition to on-going monitoring of admission and retention of students from historically underrepresented groups, "field" studies should be undertaken periodically. These studies would provide a means for anticipating problems and taking corrective action before damage is done. We recommend that the first such study be undertaken promptly and that it focus upon an assessment of the response to already adopted requirements of a sample of high schools with substantial enrollment of students from groups underrepresented in higher education.

The Council believes also that the recently established but unfunded "California Academic Partnership Program" can be an effective tool for enhancing educational opportunity in a context which stresses academic excellence.

If, as implementation dates near, there are indications that proposed changes may have significant negative impact upon access, consideration should be given to other approaches such as carefully developed alternative requirements which respond to identified barriers and provide for needed "catch-up" after admission.

Other Approaches to Admission

The proposals contained in this plan address only those requirements associated with admission of first-time freshmen. Further, they do not address alternative criteria such as those for older adults and provisions for exceptions. The Admissions Advisory Council believes that such alternatives and exceptions constitute a strength and should be maintained, both to support efforts to achieve educational equity and to permit recognition of special talents. They should, however, be subjected to continuing scrutiny to ensure that they are used most effectively and to take advantage of new knowledge as it emerges. As changes in basic admission requirements and basic skills assessment occur, these should be examined for their relevance to alternative and exceptional admissions screening.

Given the specificity of the proposed program and such factors as student migration from other states, there may be need for some sort of "conditional admission" provision which would permit the enrollment of students who, while generally qualified, present limited course deficiencies. It is the intent of the Council to examine the entire range of existing alternatives and exceptions and the need for such a provision in the future and to report on them separately.

Implementation of Recommendations

The Admissions Advisory Council makes its recommendations to the Chancellor. If the Chancellor chooses to pursue them, we suggest that the following proposed resolution be referred to the campuses, the Statewide Academic Senate and others for consultation with the objective of presenting it (or a modified version) to the Board of Trustees in 1984. We believe this is a reasonable timetable given the consultation which has already occurred, the support which we have observed, and the fact that inherent in the resolution is provision for subsequent modification should circumstances dictate.

RESOLVED, by the Trustees of The California State University that steps be initiated to prepare for adoption of a comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects as an element of admission requirements for first-time freshman applicants commencing with the fall 1988 term; and be it further

RESOLVED that planning for implementation of additional subject requirements include the following:

1. Continuing attention to the content of the high school curriculum as it relates to preparation for college, including cooperative efforts to improve student performance.
2. Regular interaction with secondary school personnel to identify any problems attendant to making required courses available to all students who should have an opportunity to seek CSU eligibility.
3. Studies to estimate the impact of existing and new requirements on the State's goal of achieving educational equity and, where indicated, the development of proposals to address identified problems.

4. Preparation of implementing regulations including provision for alternatives and exemptions for consideration by this Board at the appropriate time(s).
5. Development of a proposal for corresponding modification of admission requirements for undergraduate transfers; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Chancellor shall report annually commencing in July 1985 concerning progress in planning for implementing these new requirements including the identification of problems or new information which might indicate the need for further action by this Board.