



Academic Senate CSU

*The Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee*

**10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Friday, February 18, 2011**

TELECONFERENCE: (877) 322-9654

HOST CODE: 372303

PARTICIPANT CODE: 481505

**1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Friday, February 18, 2011**

TELECONFERENCE: (877) 807-5706

HOST CODE: 266653

PARTICIPANT CODE: 707110

**MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT: [Otto Benavides](#), Bob Buckley, [Sandra Chong](#), [Christine Miller](#) (vice), [Saeed Monemi](#), , [Kathleen E. Kaiser](#), [Robert Land](#), [Steven Stepanek](#), [Mark Van Selst](#) (chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Harold Goldwhite (hosting a distinguished lecture series on his campus)

GUESTS / LIAISONS:

Chancellor's Office Liaisons

(see <http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/bios/index.shtml>):

- Eric Forbes, Director: Enrollment Management Services
- Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs

ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison

- Susan Gubernat

Other Guests:

- Jim Postma (re: Early Start)

TIME CERTAIN:

Eric Forbes: 11:00 – 12:00 and 1:00 – 2:00

Senator Gubernat: 1:00 – 2:00

Jim Postma: 1:30 – 2:00

---

**1. Approval of Agenda**

a. Additions/ Subtractions/ Changes

i. Item 5 b iv and item 8 were removed

- ii. Item 11 (a-d) was added
- iii. Items were renumbered as appropriate
- b. Approved

## **2. Approval of minutes from January 2011**

- a. December minutes (final) have been posted
- b. Draft January minutes are posted (now approved)

## **3. Campus Updates and Communications**

- a. Campus updates
  - i. Kathy Kaiser
    - 1. Reports Chico's reorganization is going fairly smoothly.
    - 2. Chico believes that it can handle likely budget without layoffs
    - 3. Online task force is very timely given campus activity around agricultural education programs
    - 4. New campus enrollment targets were distributed
    - 5. Chico is unfolding an MA in Agriculture Education as a part of an R1 consortium (quarter vs. semester course content needs to be addressed). The degree will be awarded by Chico but students may be taking courses across a variety of R1 institutions as well as Chico.
  - ii. Stephen Stepanek / Sandra Chong
    - 1. April 22<sup>nd</sup> upcoming event "CSU: The Next 50 Years" with Chancellor Reed as Keynote speaker.
    - 2. 108 new faculty searches continue
    - 3. New campus enrollment targets were distributed
  - iii. Bob Buckley
    - 1. Budget presentation from budget advisory committee: everybody is in limbo but continual changes in FTES targets (new ones just released) are problematic. There is a question of when things are bad enough to use campus reserves to cushion budget blows.
    - 2. Online task force: should involve ATAC – collaboration and consultation between ITAC and ATAC has decreased. Technology issues should not guide academic direction.
  - iv. Saeed Monemi
    - 1. Cal Poly Pomona is evaluating a move from a quarter to a semester system: There will be a special session for all faculty and staff to discuss this issue. March will be second reading for this potential change in the senate.
  - v. Robert Land
    - 1. Campus will be moving to quarters, faculty and lecturers voted against but senate voted for (25/19).
  - vi. Mark Van Selst
    - 1. SJSU endorsed a resolution opposing the mandatory nature of Early Start
    - 2. Presidential search still underway

3. A CFA bargaining update on campus seemed to suggest that the CFA considers the 1/3 set aside for financial aid to be “on the table” vis-à-vis expenditures.
- b. Communications from ASCSU Executive
  - i. Online task force
  - ii. Task force on bylaws
  - iii. Inadequate funding for ASCSU
  - iv. Enrollment targets established for 11/12 (328,000 which is +1%)

#### 4. Committee Liaison Reports

- a. California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC): Senator Ornatowski (+ Senator Kaiser)
  - i. Meeting in the near future, March 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>.
  - ii. CSU progress report on student success will be provided
  - iii. CSU report on impact of increasing number of students
  - iv. “delta cost” project on controlling college costs and improving productivity
  - v. LAO will report on distance education to enhance access to higher education and create efficiencies
  - vi. Teacher quality improvement program (grants)
  - vii. Educational bills (legislation)
  - viii. Position on state budget
  - ix. Student mental health services (presentation by higher education staff from CSU, UC, CCC, and the privates)
  - x. STEM
- b. Early Start (Postma) – see item 5 b ii
- c. Admissions Advisory Council: (Stepanek).
  - i. New targets are continually produced.
  - ii. The intention is to have a meeting before the end of the semester.
- d. California Academic Partnership Program: (Senator Kaiser) – no meeting till mid-spring
- e. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: AVC Young, Senator Land
  - i. CTC accreditation: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/pdf/PR-2010-12-10-main.pdf>
  - ii. There will be a meeting on March 3<sup>rd</sup>.
  - iii. Approval of the “course route” for the new Foundational Science credential is on the March agenda. This is to establish the means by which a candidate can demonstrate subject matter knowledge by taking university courses, not just by passing the CSET. The state has now bifurcated both math and science credentials (by subject level, not grade, but generally at the point of up to middle school versus after middle school).
- f. CSU Transfer Advisory Committee – on hiatus
- g. Chancellor’s Doctoral Incentive Policy Advisory and Applicant Selection Advisory Committees – (Senator Miller)
  - i. Recently held an E-meeting; The group is currently surveying cohorts of CSU Doctoral Incentive recipients to see how the program is working and

tracking those who have completed the program. There is discussion of how or if the program should change. One key area of inquiry is whether the recipients are inculcating diversity (which is one of the goals of the program).

- h. CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee – on hiatus
- i. Early Assessment Program (EAP) Advisory Committee
  - i. See 5 b ii
- j. General Education Advisory Committee [Van Selst, Kaiser]
  - i. No meeting
- k. Institute for Teaching and Learning Board.
  - i. Senator Goldwhite not present: no report
- l. C-ID updates/discipline action
  - i. Psychology – Senator Van Selst.
    - 1. Officially the statewide transfer plan is available. Course descriptors are being approved.
  - ii. Computer Science – Senator Stepanek.
    - 1. Meetings are scheduled to start shortly.
  - iii. Sociology – Senator Kaiser.
    - 1. Officially the statewide transfer plan is available. Course descriptors are being approved.
- m. CSU Summit on Teacher Education (with Sandra Chong, Otto Benevides, Robert Land, and Judith Lessow-Hurley)
  - i. Monday Feb 14 at National Academy of Sciences
  - ii. N=270 (virtually all who were invited & RSVP-ed attended)
  - iii. Very positive response
  - iv. Chancellor Reed was present and actively engaged throughout
  - v. Scope and depth of presentations impressive
  - vi. Very effective speakers, panel presentations, and break-out groups.
  - vii. Interesting & energetic conference; well-organized and set-up
  - viii. Linda Darling-Hammond (lunchtime presentation) spoke to very large issues in K-12 education -- recommended viewing for APEP members since K-12 consequences trickle up to the CSU.
  - ix. A very interesting break-out on success in high risk schools; The session included an interesting presentation of study findings on the pedagogies that worked well for these various schools.
  - x. The Chancellor's 5 summation points may be a good starting point for considering committee action
    - 1. Collaboration across all sectors including the privates and the legislators
    - 2. Systematic and comprehensive approach to reform
    - 3. Expanding on what works
    - 4. Integral connections of teachers?
    - 5. New innovative approaches to teacher preparation.
  - xi. Partnerships with all sectors, including privates and the legislators seem to be prevalent themes.

- xii. To make the clinical model work we need to focus on diversity of P-12 action.

## 5. CO Liaison Reports

- a. Beverly Young

- i. SB 724 report

- 1. The joint CSU/LAO/CCC Ed.D. report to the legislature was submitted in January.
    - 2. It was a very positive report.
    - 3. LAO made site visits to four campuses (and was very interested in examining relevant site-based data)
    - 4. LAO separately (from collaborative report) suggests that the funding for the CSU Ed.D. currently relies on redirected funding from colleges of education (understandable given that there is no ‘growth’ money); the LAO further suggested legislative approval of direct funding could be required prior to implementation of other doctoral programs—this may be applied to nursing and physical therapy doctorates.
    - 5. It’s a bit premature to report on the EdD graduates’ impact on student achievement, but CSU will have an anecdotal report which may include some of the candidates’ dissertation topics and address student achievement. CSU will report out in five years on the impact of CSU Ed.D. graduates.

- ii. Thoughts on streamlining the Ed.D. oversight committee structures

- 1. There are two statewide committees. One is composed of CCC, ASCSU, Colleges of Education, Presidents, K-12, etc. The other is an “internal” group. The internal advisory group was active when the Ed.D. programs were initially being set-up. It was suggested that it might make sense to expand faculty representation on the external group and eliminate the internal group (note: faculty curricular processes in oversight of doctoral programs should typically expand beyond the campus review [see AS-2716-05/TEKR/AA: *Faculty participation in the development of applied doctoral degree programs* and AS-2793-07/TEKR: *Establish a CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee*]).
    - 2. It was suggested to Beverly Young that there could be a potential resolution to broadly address the issue of how to unfold new doctoral programs. This would likely be the purview of AA. The doctoral level program review (after the campus level) could start with an internal CSU committee, and then later adopters could get advice from 3+ (ASCSU designated) program directors? This would be in addition to “big picture” (non-curricular) guidance from external stakeholders.
      - a. It is not clear what guidance mechanisms are in place (e.g., from prior ASCSU resolutions) for the DNP and DPT. This should be referred to AA for their consideration.

b. Eric Forbes

i. Comment from Senator Kaiser On “Testing requirements for pre-university students”

1. EPT/ELM: having such tests moved up “earlier” to provide results to students such that they can affect student choices would be desirable.
  - a. It is noted that ETS administers the EPT.
  - b. The Spring offering of EPT means that it is more difficult for the data to influence school plans for the following year (unless staffing needs are generally stable across years); however, the correlation with prior testing is very high so the schools already “know” who will need grade 12 interventions.
  - c. In the first year of the pilot, about 45-50 CCCs are using the ELM/EPT in the manner that the CSU uses the data. CCCs have only really begun to use EAP data; it will take more time to see full statewide implementation. *Can we move the EAP assessment to the fall such that it provides earlier feedback?* Answer: **no**. Especially for math, students need to have algebra II before the EAP otherwise the students have not yet had the course content on which the assessment is based.
  - d. There is consternation regarding the cost, replicative content, *and timing of the large amount of K-12 testing performed.*

ii. *Early Start*

1. See new business on ERWC
2. Campus plans were extensively reviewed
  - a. The campus submissions were generally strong
  - b. A common shortcoming was how a campus would handle a non-remaining student doing early start at that campus over the summer (i.e., non-native student).
3. A proposed model for those campuses offering ‘stretch’ courses was shared; the model indicated which students would have to engage in which activities; the ideas are preliminary and thus the handout shared with APEP is not available for posting at this time.
4. Cross-campus tracking of early start remains an issue.
  - a. ETS may end up being the one to “house” this; It would be accessible across campuses.
  - b. Such a solution would be consistent with the explicit request of the Math Council that Early Start outcomes would be equivalent across campuses.
  - c. If the infrastructure is not built correctly Early Start may not be sustainable (e.g., collapse under the weight of tracking mechanisms)

5. Compliance and enforcement of student (non-)involvement in Early Start, as well as financial aid issues, remain of concern.
6. The recurrent question of ‘How do we systematically reduce the remediation issue?’ relates to the second reading item AS-3008-11/*APEP Comprehensive strategic plan for reducing remediation needs to negligible levels for entering California State University students.*

iii. SB 1440

1. Local priority versus statewide priority
  - a. EVC Smith (CSU) and Erik Skinner (CCC) will meet to discuss.
2. Curricular “transfer model programs” have been distributed.
3. Campuses are to be responsive to identify which (if any) program(s) link to the TMC by Monday
4. What changes need to be made to CSU Mentor (CSU is currently examining the addition of a self-report of participation in a transfer AA to CSU Mentor).
  - a. Request for CCC to expand use of electronic transcripts.
  - b. Concern that the transfer student may not realize which programs line up with their transfer degree (example given was BS vs BA in Psychology at SJSU – one lines up with a transfer AA, the other does not). Failure to recognize the difference could potentially lead to non-acceptance of the student.
5. LAO report (see new business)

**6. Updates /Discussion of January Resolution Packet**

- a. AS-2979-10/**APEP** Commending the California State University for Hosting a National Teacher Education Summit AS-2980-10/**APEP** Recognition and Commendation for Efforts that have Increased Rates of Proficiency in Reading and Writing for Entering Freshmen
- b. AS-2995-10 **APEP** Assessment and Reporting of Results of Early Start Programs.
- c. These and other resolutions at: [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/documents/01-2011\\_resolution\\_packet.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/documents/01-2011_resolution_packet.pdf)

**7. Updates/Discussion of January First Reading Items**

- a. AS-3001-11/AA/**APEP** Support for a Three-Year Pilot Program of the Statway Curriculum as an Alternative for Establishing Proficiency in Quantitative Reasoning
  - i. The committee produced some minor changes; Bob Land will do the expansion of the group names in rationale [with Saeed] and then forward to Chair Van Selst for propagation to Academic Affairs)
- b. AS-3008-11/**APEP** Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Reducing Remediation Needs to Negligible Levels for Entering California State University Students.

- i. Senator Guerin’s comments were considered. Questions were raised as to the (lack of) specificity in the resolution. Bob Buckley will take the lead on revisions and bring to the next APEP committee meeting).
- c. AS-3009-11/**APEP** Renewed Call for Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses
  - i. Chair Van Selst will review this resolution unless somebody else volunteers to take over; revisions to be brought for the next APEP meeting).
- d. These and other resolutions are at:
  - [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/documents/01-2011\\_first\\_reading\\_item\\_packet.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/documents/01-2011_first_reading_item_packet.pdf)

**8. “ACHIEVE” (re: Alison Jones)**

- a. There is an outstanding request for faculty involvement
- b. There was discussion of the use of the ERWC course by ACHIEVE, for dissemination to PARCC member states.
- c. The core idea of ACHIEVE is to develop a set of standards that would identify levels of competence that would unarguably define “college ready” across states and IHEs. These standards could then be used to provide feedback (in K-12) via purpose-built testing mechanisms to illuminate college readiness.
- d. It was noted in committee that outcomes for disadvantaged students should be explicitly examined.
- e. APEP has not solidified a response to these proposals yet. It was of concern that the multiplication of testing for K-12 students could serve to detract from the desired engagement in learning.

f. .

**9. ASCSU Proactive Strategic Planning Actions (re: A2E) – no action.**

- <http://www.calstate.edu/accesstoexcellence/>
- a. Professional development (Research Support)
- b. Flavor requests vis-à-vis the strategic plan?
- c. Requests for legislative action?

**10. Review of Board of Trustees Agenda/AA Memo/EO – no action.**

- a. <http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/>
- b. <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedMemos/>
- c. <http://www.calstate.edu/EO/>

**11. New Items**

**a. ERWC**

- i. The curriculum and structure of the ERWC is desired to be shared by the CSU with other states vis-à-vis ACHIEVE. To expand the reach of ERWC across the state to allow fuller adoption within California will require resources for additional training. At the recent ERWC meeting it was mentioned by John Edlund (Cal Poly Pomona) that Chancellor Reed

had agreed to share ERWC within the context of ACHIEVE. There are problems here in that there are CSU faculty who have dedicated a large investment of time and energy into the development of the ERWC curriculum.

- ii. There is a discussion of how the ERWC might be a component of developing a “conditionally exempt” status for English, in the same way that we currently have such a status for math. Within a specified score range, students who complete ERWC in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade as a full year course, taught by a CSU-trained teacher, using the specified course and materials, and receiving a “B” or better, might then keep the exemption status from taking the EPT upon CSU admission. This is still in the early stages of discussion, and will be on the English Council agenda in April for their consideration and recommendation.

**b. Common reporting requirements for early start.**

- i. Chair Postma concurred on the need for evaluation tools to be in place to determine the relative effectiveness of various remediation strategies.
- ii. The committee discussed common reporting requirements as a means of providing the metrics for assessment.
- iii. This may produce a resolution (Bob Land, Sandra Chong)

**c. Local area guarantee (re: LAO report)**

- i. CSU response led by Marsha Hirano Nakanishi. Eric Forbes has noted that having the Senate Executive review this response before release (and/or in development) would seem to be appropriate.
- ii. The LAO report is about impaction and alleges that the issue is not about whether resources are sufficient, but rather about the distribution of resources. The CSU is providing a response to the LAO by March 4<sup>th</sup>. The report argues that there is an implicit notion that campus admissions are supposed to be regional, and that impaction serves to undercut service to the local area.

**d. Online Degrees**

**i. Likely more AA than APEP; nevertheless**

"We do not claim that our results are definitive. Our experiment was only conducted one time, in a large course with significant internet resources available already for students taking live-instruction classes. We were not able to randomly assign all students to live versus internet delivery settings, and were forced to rely on voluntary participation in the experiment, so while internal validity is high, the results may not generalize to the student population as a whole. Furthermore, the institution is a major, very selective university. That said, our strongest findings in favor of live instruction are for the relatively low-achieving students, male students, and Hispanic students. These are precisely the students who are more likely to populate the less selective universities and community colleges. These students may well be disadvantaged by the movement to online education and, to the extent that it is the less selective institutions and community colleges that are most fully embracing online education, inadvertently they may be harming a significant portion of their student body." p.22

Cite:

IS IT LIVE OR IS IT INTERNET? EXPERIMENTAL ESTIMATES OF THE EFFECTS

OF ONLINE INSTRUCTION ON STUDENT LEARNING  
David N. Figlio Mark Rush Lu Yin  
Working Paper 16089 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16089>  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH 1050 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138 June 2010

## **12. Adjournment**