Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee

April 4, 2008

Minutes

Office of the Chancellor: Room 410 – 10:00 a.m.

Members Present:
Otto Benavides, Fresno, Curriculum and Instruction - via conference call
Bob Buckley, Chair, Sacramento, Computer Science
Calvin Caplan, East Bay, Kinesiology and Physical Education
Kathleen Kaiser, Chico, Sociology - via conference call
Barbara Swerkes, Northridge, Kinesiology
Jim Wheeler, Vice Chair, Maritime, Chemistry

Ex Officio:
Dr. Joan Bissell on behalf of Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs, Dr. Beverly Young

Meeting began at 10:15 a.m.

1. Open Forum
   Kathy Kaiser
   a. The impact of budget cuts on $8 million science education grant awarded to Chico: As a result of the proposed budget cuts teachers may be moving to different schools and/or be teaching different grades. As a result few teachers have responded. Kathy suggested that the granting “partners” needed to be more flexible in the granting process. Joan Bissell indicated she would follow-up on this issue.

   b. Reported on concerns raised at the CPEC meeting over the impact of increased emphasis on accountability, efficiency and reducing costs and possible consequence being a move to privatize the public universities. A recommendation has been made to set-up a special commission to analyze and report on these concerns.

   Jim Wheeler indicated that a referral of issues related to the International Baccalaureate Program Exam performance and CSU GE Breadth course certification might be forthcoming from the ASCSU Executive Committee.

2. The agenda was approved as formulated.

3. The minutes of our March 7, 2008 meeting were approved as submitted.

4. Report/Update: Teacher Education & Public School Programs, Dr. Joan Bissell

Joan provided copies of the following:
• The Mathematics & Science Teacher Initiative (Report to the legislature & Governor – Part I and II)
• Data documenting various strategies for increasing the number of CC transfers interested in
teacher education is mathematics and science (LDTP mathematics and science pathways: CSUEB, SDSU, and CSULA partnership with community colleges).

Summary of Joan’s presentation (which does not do it justice): Increases in the number of mathematics and science teachers recruited and prepared, in spite of the MSTI, have not been particularly robust. The CSU has proposed undertaken seven strategies to increase these numbers:

1. Expand & diversify the pool of candidates (e.g. by placing undergraduates in compensated summer science internships).
2. Creating new credential pathways (e.g. new foundation level math credential for middle school teachers and blended programs…)
3. Internet supported delivery systems. (e.g. utilizing CalState TEACH).
4. Collaboration with Community Colleges (e.g. signing MOUs that support 2-year and 4-year pathways).
5. Financial support and incentives (e.g. utilizing Assumption Program of Loans for Education – APLE).
6. Partnerships with Federal Laboratories, Business, and Industry (e.g. partnerships with US Department of Energy and NASA as well as collaboration with IISME (industry initiatives for science and mathematics education).
7. Identifying and supporting approaches to preparing well qualified math and science teachers that could be scaled-up.

The report contained tables showing the production numbers of Math and Science teachers at each campus from 2002-03 through 2006-07. The numbers indicate that increases in the numbers of math teachers have been much greater than those in science. However, when leadership of deans and faculty are engaged in recruitment, the numbers are not significantly different. It was suggested that attritions data would also be useful in understanding the longer term effect of the MSTI efforts.

Strategy 4 above has been followed successfully with collaborations and articulation agreements developed between CSU-East Bay, San Diego State University and CSU-Los Angeles and their area community colleges, respectively. These efforts were also discussed in some detail.

5. **Report by Chair Buckley** on meeting of Standing Committee chairs with the Executive Committee - highlights included:
   a. Bob reviewed of the P-16 Council Achievement Gap Report with the committee and the apparent lack of involvement of the CSU in key issues dealing with teacher education and teacher performance.
   b. Bob raised the issue of unfunded mandates (TPA, the Accessible Technology Initiative, and Information Security). Bob suggested that a request be made to ask the Chancellor’s Office to provide guidelines as to the scope of work needed. In the absence of such guidelines, expenditures vary significantly from campus to campus. With the expectation of significant budget cuts, such guidelines would help campus prioritize allocation amounts and standardize the expenditures across the CSU.
   c. Bob suggested that a task force might be formed to provide a meaningful and useful
definition of what we mean by “academic quality”. We should be able to provide a detailed and specific answer to questions, such as, “How would we recognize academic quality – its presence or absence?”

d. Those attending the ICAS legislative day (April 2) in Sacramento reported on a statement made by the Assistant Secretary for Higher Education that “counties establish teacher education preparation programs with WASC approval in order to provide better access at local levels.” The context for the statement was unclear; however Bob volunteered to contact the Assistant Secretary for clarification.

6. **Office of the Chancellor Updates and Anticipated Issues for 2007-08** (see agenda item 4, above).

7. **Update on ICAS approved participation with UC and Community Colleges** related to updates of the mathematics competency statements (deferred).

8. **Review of Second Reading resolutions:**

   AS-2849-08/APEP Assessment of EAP Performance and Consideration of Future Support. Language revisions were made to reflect (1) the input provided by ASCSU colleagues at the resolution’s first reading and (2) the insightful commentary provided by members of APEP in response to that input. Bob will work with Marshall on revisions to the resolved clauses and the rationale.

   AS-2847-08/APEP Commendation for Campus Success on Remediation Efforts at the Campus Level. Language revisions were made to reflect (1) the input provided by ASCSU colleagues at the resolution’s first reading and (2) the insightful commentary provided by members of APEP in response to that input.

   Bob will make the revisions to both resolutions and circulate the new version to committee members before the May plenary.

9. **Issues/concerns for discussion and possible Senate resolutions.**

   a. In keeping with the Committee’s change in name and charge, members discussed the need for a liaison relationship with the Admissions Advisory Council. The Committee will discuss the importance of liaison relationships with other CO committees and councils as well as CO administrative areas.

   b. Campus based enrollment data for programs offered by Colleges and Schools of Education. Enrollment in credential programs appear to be declining although the apparent need for new teachers continues to grow. In order to more precisely understand these changes and recognizing the significant role and responsibility that the CSU has in educating K-12 students, the Committee agrees that campus-based data should be available, as well as an analysis of the state of need in California. Accountability data submitted by each campus may provide some if not all of this information. The Committee suggested the possibility of having someone familiar with this data meet with the Committee in May.

   c. California P-16 Council: “Closing the Achievement Gap”. The scope and importance of the role and responsibilities of the CSU in K-12 education is absence from the Council’s report. In addition, while the report discusses teachers, curriculum and instruction, the role and responsibility of CCTC is also omitted. The Committee expressed the desire to have Allison Jones (or Jim Blackburn) meet with the Committee in May to provide some
additional context to the efforts being undertaken by the P-16 Council and the State Department of Education. A draft resolution expressing concerns over the omissions stated above will be considered in May.

Bob distributed copies of excerpts from the 2007 report (appended to the end of the minutes).

d. Barbara discussed an issue related to LDTP course descriptors approved by CSU faculty. For certain courses, prerequisites have been specified for the course offered at the Community College when such requisites are not required of the equivalent course offered at the CSU campus. Barbara agreed to prepare a draft resolution that could address this issue (to be considered in May). The Committee will decide on whether a resolution is warranted at its meeting in May.

10. **Tracker-scout reports on APEPC related issues** (deferred)

11. **Meeting was adjourned at 2:15 pm.**

**Addendum:** Excerpts from the “P-16 Council Closing the Achievement Gap” Report.
The achievement gap is a pervasive issue in many, if not all, of California’s schools. Californian’s achievement data clearly tell a story that is not easy to talk about. Here is how State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O’Connell described the gap in California’s schools (2007 State of Education Address).

“Now, to paint a picture of the challenge we face, I’d like to take you on an imaginary field trip to a fourth-grade classroom – a classroom that reflects the student population of California…”

Class of 32 students:
- 16 are Hispanic
- 9 are white
- 3 are Asian
- 3 are African American
- 1 is Filipino

16 come from families that are considered low income by the Federal government
3 have special education needs
13 go home and speak a language other than English

Likely futures:
- Asian and white – 67% chance of being academically successful
- African American or Hispanic – 33% chance of being academically successful

Graduation rates:
- 6 of 16 Hispanic students will graduate (38%)
- 3 or 3 Asian student will graduate (100%)
- 7 of 9 white students will graduate (78%)
- 1 of 3 African American students will graduate (33%)

The following charts show the range of proficiency on the California Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program – 2006:
Excerpts from the Council’s Report

“Four subcommittees of the Council examined the following areas:

Access. How do all students gain access to what is needed to succeed? Access includes rigorous instruction, highly qualified teachers, extra learning opportunities that supplement the education provided in a typical school day. [Member: Horace Mitchell, President, CSU Bakersfield]

Culture and climate. How can schools offer the best learning environment for all students? Is school a safe place for students to learn? Is it an environment that promotes learning and
a sense of belonging for students, parents, and school staff? Do effective school-family-community partnerships exist? [Member: Maria Pacheco, CSU, Fresno Student]

No representatives from CCTC.

“Recommendation 2: Better Align Educational Systems from Pre-kindergarten to College.

The Council therefore recommends that the state better align the K-12 and higher education systems. In doing so, the state should focus on:

- Developing an open enrollment policy for entrance into rigorous courses
- Scheduling students into rigorous course offerings based on the students’ need
- Better aligning high school standards and assessments with the knowledge and skills required for success after high school
- Implementing an increased relevancy factor into the curriculum being taught so that students are able to incorporate real life experiences and have success after high school
- Streamlining an assessment system in which tests taken in high school also serve as readiness tests for college and work

Aligning the expectations of the K-12 system with the world of work and higher education will ensure all that all students are better prepared for success in life.”

Expectations. Are high expectations for all students and teachers truly held? Are these expectations evident in the curriculum, instructional practices, and the school’s communication to students, parents, and school staff? Is student progress measured through data-driven decision making and effective instructional strategies?” [Members: Lionel (Skip) Meno, SDSU and Allison Jones, CO]

“Recommendation 8: Focus on Academic Rigor. The State Superintendent should develop a system of identifying rigor in high school courses that will address the expectations for skills and knowledge held by employers and colleges and universities… The Council believes that California needs a more consistent way of recognizing rigorous courses regardless of whether one uses the a-g framework or not. The question remains whether the a-g sequence is the best way to provide academic rigor or whether something else needs to evolve…

Strategies. What practices have proven effective for closing the achievement gap? Strategies should address improving the quality of instruction, differential instruction, increasing instructional time, teacher collaboration time, reconsidering how to differentiate school by grade level…” [CSU not represented]

Concluding Remarks

Implementation Plan…comprises three phases.

Phase I – completed…

Phase II – Begins the actualization of the Superintendent’s recommendations. Activities include conducting policy meetings to discuss recommendations; implementing the CDE’s
recommendations applicable to developing and passing legislative packages and approving regulatory changes; collaborating with the Governor’s Office as well as the Legislature for budget appropriations; partnering with the University of California (see below), and conducting further research as needed.

**Partnership with University of California**

In the process of continuing its work on the Initiative, the Council and the California Department of Education undertook an unprecedented research partnership with the higher education community specifically to address the achievement gap. Coordinated by the Office of the President for the University of California system (UC), the partnership is intended to form an effective partnership and a permanent relationship between a university system and a state's K-12 system. The partnership would also serve as a national model for collaboration. The Council will coordinate and direct an extensive information-gathering process, including scholarly research and practitioner expertise. To begin this partnership, the Council commissioned a series of research papers that will help further the Council's recommendations and explore additional options for closing the achievement gap. In their work, researchers are to review and synthesize empirical studies, best practices, meaningful cross-site comparisons, and other materials on aspects of the achievement gap. It is anticipated that up to three background papers will be prepared for each of the four major themes. The topics for the ten papers are as follows:

- Overview: Closing the multiple achievement gaps in California
- Understanding, measuring, and analyzing the achievement gap at the state and local levels
- Successful state-level strategies and policies for closing the achievement gap • Getting access to high-quality instructional strategies
- Organizational strategies, resources, and opportunities that appear to have the greatest impact on improving student learning and closing the achievement gap • Using resources wisely
- Aspects of teacher preparation, knowledge, and skills that contribute to the success of all students, particularly culturally and linguistically diverse students
- The role of a positive school climate in student achievement and how it is fostered
- Features of high school that are successful in raising expectations and closing the achievement gap
- School parent and school-community supports that can contribute to closing the achievement gap”