I. Minutes: Approval of the November 26, 1986, Executive Committee Minutes. Attached Pgs. 2-7.

II. Announcements:
   A. Board of Trustees action on entrance requirements. Attached Pgs. 8-11.
   B. Use of Lottery Funds. Attached Pgs. 12-13

III. Reports
   A. President/Provost
   B. Statewide Senators

IV. Business Items:
   A. Catalog changes for GE&B 1988 - George Lewis (Ch. GE&B Com)
   B. Resolution on Lead Time for Consultation - Kersten
   C. Nominations and appointment of the Senate Governmental Affairs Specialist John Culver has resigned this appointed position because of overload. Please bring in names of nominees. John has recommended Joe Weatherby.
   D. Nominations and appointment of a non-voting Senator to represent temporary faculty during Winter '85 and Spring '85. Appointments are quarter by quarter. Sauny Dills is the incumbent and willing to serve.

V. Discussion Items:
   A. Mission and/or Collegiality Statements - Kersten
   B. Status of Admission Quotas - Provost Fort (Time certain 1630 hrs)

VI. Adjournment:
Ed. Pol.
Agenda Item No. 1
November 12-13, 1985

The Chancellor's Office initiated in 1984 an expanded enrollment reporting system that provides, in addition to data on enrolled students, information of all applicants for admission. The expanded database will facilitate monitoring the effect of admission requirements on the applicant population. Additional information about eligibility and participation rates will be garnered from further CPEC high school eligibility studies. The CSU supports the projected CPEC study of the 1986 high school population.

Implementing Regulations

If the Board approves the proposed resolution, the Chancellor will prepare proposed amendments to Title 5, California Administrative Code, for the Board to consider at its January 1986 meeting.

Undergraduate Transfer Requirements

Upon the adoption of a comprehensive pattern of subjects as part of eligibility requirements for first-time freshmen, the CSU will then review what changes may be necessary in undergraduate transfer requirements. In that review, the Chancellor will seek the advice of the Admissions Advisory Council and will consult with the appropriate CSU constituencies. Consultation with colleagues in the California Community Colleges will be an important part of that process. Undergraduate transfer admission requirements will be reviewed with the aim of ensuring that transfer students entering the CSU have essentially the same subject matter preparation as required of first-time freshmen.

The Chancellor now expects to report to the Board on this issue in November 1986, as part of the annual reporting to the Board on the implementation of admission requirements.

Chancellor's Recommendation

The Chancellor now recommends to the Board that the following resolution be adopted.

Resolved, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that effective with fall 1988 terms the admission requirements for first-time freshman applicants shall be based on placement in the upper one-third of California high school graduates as measured by the CSU Eligibility Index (weighted combination of high school grade point average and a score on a college entrance examination) and the completion of a comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects; and be it further
Resolved, That the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements shall include four years of English, three years of mathematics, one year of social studies (U.S. history or U.S. history and government), one year of laboratory science, two years of foreign language, one year in the visual and performing arts, and three years of electives from specified fields of study; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chancellor may authorize conditional admission provisions for applicants otherwise admissible but who are deficient in one or more units of required subjects; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chancellor report to the Board of Trustees in January 1986 on steps taken to implement the provisions of this resolution.
Historical Summary of Freshman Admission Standards:

The California State University
1862-1985

1862 California State Normal School established (evolved from the Weekly Normal School founded 1857 by the San Francisco Board of Education).

Females 15 years of age or over and males 18 years of age or over entitled to admission upon declaring in writing their intention to engage permanently in teaching in the common schools of the state.

1899 Admittance limited to high school graduates possessing recommendations from their principals attesting to their good character, personal integrity, and academic ability.

1921 "Normal Schools" changed to "Teachers Colleges."

(Admission requirements remained essentially unchanged through the mid-1930s)

1935 "Teachers Colleges" changed to "State Colleges."

1937 Statewide requirements eliminated; each State College autonomous.

1948 Strayer Report: Recommended that the State Colleges admit high school graduates and other applicants possessing equivalent preparation upon showing evidence of fitness to profit from college instruction, such fitness to be shown by previous academic records, by evidence of good moral character and personal qualifications, and by a satisfactory score on a standard college aptitude test.

1951 Admitted with 10 semester grades of A or B in the last three years of high school or with a score at the 20th percentile on a college entrance test.

1954 Admitted with 14 semester grades of A or B in the last three years of high school in subjects other than physical education or military science; or

with 10 or more semester grades of A or B in the last three years of high school as above and a score above the 20th percentile on an entrance examination; or
may be admitted with promise of being able to succeed in the judgment of appropriate authorities.

1960 Master Plan recommendation that "the state colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third ... of all graduates from California public high schools." Continuation of existing special programs involving exceptions to the rule authorized subject to the approval by the board. Master Plan Survey Team recommended that all, or almost all, of the recommending units for admission be in college preparatory courses and that the application of such a requirement be studied.


1963 Interim standards: 14 or more recommending units (with A or B grades) in the last three years of high school in subjects other than physical education and remedial courses, at least six of which were in college preparatory courses and five specified fields. Alternatively, 10 or more recommending units in subjects other than physical education and remedial courses and a score at least equivalent to the 30th percentile on national college freshmen norms of a standardized college aptitude test.

1965 High school graduates admitted on the basis of an Eligibility Index (weighted combination of the high school grade point average, grades 10-12, exclusive of physical education and military science, and a score on either the American College Test or the Scholastic Aptitude Test) that placed them in the top one-third of California public high school graduates.

Eligibility Index monitored in relation to upper one-third; adjusted as required and approved.

1972 State Colleges system designated as "The California State University and Colleges."

1982 State University and Colleges system designated as "The California State University."

1984 Subject requirements added to the Eligibility Index standard: 4 years of college preparatory English and 2 years of college preparatory mathematics.
To: President Warren J. Baker

From: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
      Academic Senate

Subject: Use of Lottery Funds

December 29, 1985

Regretfully, my counsel is forwarded to you with a minimum of desired consultation with faculty. However limited my sample, there was a surprising unanimity of expression. Incidentally, Vice Chancellor Dale Hanner’s use of the Holiday break coupled with his lack of sensitivity for lead time is expected to result in a resolution of concern from our Academic Senate.

My listing of desired applications of lottery funds recognizes that we are working with soft money and as such, uses dependent upon continuing commitments are to be avoided when possible. This poses a particular problem with respect to the absolute need to increase the time allocated to department heads/chairs to administer their departments. This certainly belongs under my category of professional development but is omitted because it would be most difficult to withdraw following implementation.

Because of lack of adequate consultation, no prioritization is implied in the following listing:

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
   - Instate and Out of State Travel
   - Conference Fees
   - Sabbaticals
   - Staff in support of a Women’s Center
   - Discretionary funds at department level to be used with consensus of faculty and consistent with broadly defined objectives. This is key to developing initiative and innovation within departments.
2. FACULTY SUPPORT
   - Student Assistance
   - Operating Expense
   - Graduate Instruction

3. MATURING EXPERIENCES FOR STUDENTS
   - CO-OP Education
   - Internships

Prior to receiving request for this counsel, I had already set in motion plans to achieve faculty input and Senate debate. These plans will be accelerated and results forwarded to you. I do not believe that Dr. Hanner's timetable is the last word. Our campus deserves the best which consultation can provide.

Discussion and explanation of the recommended uses for lottery funds is needed. I stand available as needed insofar as your time permits. Best wishes in your discussions with the Executive Council on January 7.