

Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee

Minutes

December 6, 2007

Office of the Chancellor - Room 210, 10:15 a.m.

Members Present:

Otto Benavides, Fresno, Curriculum and Instruction (*by conference call*);
Bob Buckley, Chair, Sacramento, Computer Science;
Calvin Caplan, East Bay, Kinesiology;
Marshall Cates, Los Angeles, Mathematics;
Kathleen Kaiser, Chico, Sociology;
Barbara Swerkes, Northridge, Kinesiology;
Jim Wheeler, Vice Chair, Maritime, Chemistry;

Ex Officio:

Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor Teacher Education & Public Schools Programs

1. **Open Forum** (time for announcements and to raise issues or make requests not related to items on the agenda – time limited).

Bob related the request for TEKR to meet with Academic Affairs after lunch to discuss the draft report from the UC Academic Senate **Board Of Admissions & Relations with School (BOARS)** subcommittee on proposed criteria for approving Career Technical Education (CTE) courses for inclusion in area G. Jim Blackburn, Student Academic Support, and Rochelle Kellner, co-chair of the Admissions Advisory Committee, will lead the discussion.

Kathy Kaiser reported on discussions at the campus senate chairs meeting regarding the cost of administering the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). The discussion included a suggestion about charging teacher candidates a fee to cover the cost of the assessment. Beverly Young explained that TPA and Stanford's Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) were two assessment approaches that satisfied SB 1209 requirements and that roughly half of the CSU campuses had adopted TPA and the other half PACT. SB 1209 specified that these assessments were to implemented beginning July 1, 2008. Campuses have been in preparing for implementation. The Chancellor's Office has estimated that the cost will be approximately \$400 per candidate and has included in the CSU budget request that the state fund this mandate and that implementation would be contingent upon such funding. Some of the campuses have already expended University funds to develop and implement these assessments. The costs, evidently, vary widely from campus to campus. The committee suggested that the system might get the campuses together to standardize the process and the cost.

Kathy also reported that the Governor had met with K-12 Education leaders to discuss the state's budget deficit and possible cuts to Proposition 98 funding.

2. The agenda was approved as amended, to include an 11:30 time certain for the committee to discuss

Career Technical Education (CTE) and the certifying of A to G courses in preparation for the meeting with Academic Affairs after lunch.

3. The minutes from the November 6th, 2007 meeting were approved as presented.

4. Updates/Ongoing Business

A. Office of the Chancellor Update(s)

Beverly reported on the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) and CSU membership. The intent of the project is to undertake a national effort to strengthen the education doctorate. First wave campuses were asked if they wished to take part in the project – all responded affirmatively. Those campuses with joint EdD programs also expressed an interest in participating.

Beverly also reported on a meeting of group members at Vanderbilt in which Lee Schulman, CPED director, spoke of the development of a “signature” pedagogy for EdD programs; one that is context based and represents the best way to “teach” in these types of programs. Programs at other group member institutions seemed to embody much of the criticisms that had been made about the quality of EdD programs.

Beverly also discussed CPEC’s response to CSU’s EdD programs. Their response appears to be more of an attack, both unwarranted and inappropriate given the legislative role that CPEC is charged to perform. Their apparent attack were the basis for their recommending that 1) both the CSU and UC undertake statewide planning process for all doctorates, 2) that outcomes assessments be defined for all doctorates, and 3) that all doctorates be required to use these standard outcomes assessments. CPEC has also attempted to intervene with individual campuses. Statute indicates that CPEC communications are to be with the system and not individual campuses. At a hearing in which Vice Chancellor Reichard testified, the communication on the part of CPEC was both arrogant and disrespectful. Both the Legislative Analyst’s Office and the Department of Finance agree with the position of the CSU in dealing with CPEC.

Bob distributed a copy of the address by John Mockler at the 2007 Resource Forum entitled “Are Californians Getting Their Money’s Worth from Their Public Schools?”

(<http://www.edsource.org/pdf/Mockler.pdf>). Mockler provides data that refutes much of the political punditry regarding the alleged failure of California’s public schools.

B. Tracker-scout reports on TEKR related issues (*no specific reports were made*):

California School Board Association (<http://www.csba.org/>) - Bob

Association of California School Administrators (<http://www.acsa.org/>) - Bob

State Board of Education (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/>) – Barbara

CPEC (<http://www.cpec.ca.gov/>) –Cal & Kathy

California Department of Education (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/>) - Otto

California CTC (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/>) -Otto

California Teachers Association (<http://www.cta.org/home.aspx>) - Lillian

CFA (<http://www.calfac.org/>) - Lillian

C. Other Reports (*none*).

5. The following three resolutions were discussed briefly in preparation for the second reading at the January Plenary:

A. AS-2823-07/TEKR Annual report on the Efficacy of CSU Teacher Education and K-12 Collaborations

B. AS-2826-07/TEKR Response to the Board of Trustees (BOT) September 2007 Agenda Item - CSU Remediation Policies and Practices: Overview and Prospects

C. AS-2824-07/TEKR Role and Responsibilities of the CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee

An initial statement as to the charge and membership of the Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee had been developed in collaboration with Gary Reichard, Beverly Young and the Executive Committee. The Committee agreed to include this statement as an attachment to AS-2824-07. Bob will include in the rationale a reference to this attachment.

6. Discussion of Career Technical Education (CTE). Bob reported that the conversion of what were the traditional vocational courses to career based courses is a national movement. The intent is to provide “career pathways” that will motivate students to complete their high school education. A facet of this movement is the development of career technical courses that ostensibly would meet pre-college requirements.

SB 1543, fall 2006, required that UC and CSU adopt model standards for CTE courses to be included in the A to G requirements by July 1, 2008. The obvious concern regarding standards for approving high school proposed CTE courses for areas A-G is whether course material is presented at sufficient depth to allow students to achieve mastery of fundamental knowledge that prepares them for University work.

The BOARS subcommittee has been using the standards for A to F course submittals to approve a number of CTE courses. However, standards for assessing CTE courses proposed for area G needed to be specified. The draft report from BOARS contains the proposed requirements for certifying these CTE courses.

“Remaking Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century: What Role for High School Programs?” is an excellent reference for understanding the CTE movement. This report was prepared for *Double the Numbers: Jobs for the Future* (supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Ford Foundation) and the Aspen Institute.

The Executive summary lists the following broad conclusions from a “review of the research...:

- CTE, while shrinking, remains a significant component of US high school experience.
- CTE appears to help less-motivated and more at-risk students stay in high school and graduate, yet graduation from a CTE program does not necessarily mean that a student is academically prepared for college level work or for today’s workplace.

- The overall rigor of vocational education at the high school level has improved noticeably: however, there is a long way to go and many obstacles to overcome to sufficiently improve the academic experience for most CTE students.
- Employers would prefer to hire students with college credential over those with only a high school diploma – and students with a postsecondary credential are more likely to secure a well-paying job than those without one. At the same time, for those who do not continue to college, jobs found with the help of career-focused programs in high school have a significant short- to mid-run labor market payoff, particularly for low-income students and those who are the most at-risk.”
- http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/ed_kazis-RemakingCTE.pdf

7. Report on the Achievement Gap Summit (Bob and Beverly). Upwards of 4,000 attended the Summit held on November 13 and 14 at the Sacramento Convention Center. After Superintendent for Public Instruction, Jack O’Connell opened the conference, Douglas Reeves, Founder of the Center for Performance Assessment spoke on “closing the systemic gap between the highest and lowest performing students.” His message was that there are no new “silver bullets” but that the approaches proposed are the right ones, but they have not been thoroughly implemented. The lunchtime speakers were Chester Finn and Richard Rothstein – their topic was the “great debate: internal versus external factors in closing the achievement gap.” Finn proposed that competition and the “market” should be used to provide for significant choices for parents. Rothstein proposed the need for socioeconomic reforms. Both positions seem unworkable with the discussion seemingly more about ideology as opposed to practicality.

A number of CSU campuses were represented with a number presenting during the breakout sessions.

Beverly attended the “Higher Education Panel” and reported on the bizarre presentation and question and answer period. The panel consisted of a representative from the community colleges, UC, CSU and the private colleges and universities. Representing the CSU was Barry Munitz. In one of the bizarre interchanges, Munitz took credit for proposing the Early Assessment Program prior to Chancellor Reed’s arrival. This was one of a number of what could euphemistically be described as misrepresentations that were made.

8. **Other Business** (new or old).

After lunch. Committee met with Academic Affairs to discuss the standards for approving proposals for CTE courses to be included in area G.

9. **Adjournment:** The Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.