The Academic Preparation and Education Program Committee  
Minutes  
Friday, December 4, 2015  
Virtual Meeting Conducted via Zoom

Called to Order at 11:00 am by Chair Denise Fleming

Present: Denise Fleming, Chair (East Bay), David Barsky, Vice Chair (San Marcos), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Steven Frye (Bakersfield), J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Ann Schulte (Chico), Mark Van Selst (San Jose), Sean Walker (Fullerton)

Liaison: Chris Miller (Sacramento), Executive Committee Liaison

1. **Agenda.**
   - Approved by general consent.

2. **Approval of Minutes.**
   - Some comments on the draft minutes have already been forwarded to Vice Chair Barsky by Senators Chong and Van Selst. Vice Chair Barsky will send updated minutes to all of APEP, and if no further calls for corrections are received by Friday, December 11, those minutes will be considered approved. Agreed by general consent.

3. **Chair’s Report.**
   - ASCU Chair Filling reported in conversations with EVC Blanchard on
     o Honorary Degree Policy
     o Background Check Policy
     o Shared Governance
     o Academic Freedom Policy
   - ASCSU Chair Filling has also been observing at the factfinding stage of the bargaining process between the CFA and the CSU.
   - Chair Filling (and Senator Van Selst) reported on the November LearningWorks conference that took place in Oakland in November:
     o Other ASCSU senators and administrators in attendance included Catherine Nelson, Tom Krabacher, Bill Eadie, Ken O’Donnell and Ed Sullivan.
     o Major foci of the conference were assessment and placement processes in mathematics. An underlying theme was that community colleges could do a better job in remediation, but participants seemed exceptionally partisan, and many arrived with a particular agenda already in mind:
There was a general sense that assessment tools are overly conservative, and unnecessarily slow student progress.

There were reports of success with students following Directed Self Placement.

There were questions about whether Algebra II is really necessary.

- In the ensuing discussion, APEP members expressed concern about STEM majors who have transferred from community colleges (without formal statistical pathways through remediation and quantitative reasoning) who need to go back (as upper division students) and take the college algebra course (and perhaps more) that they should have already taken while they were lower-division students. This seems to be a matter of a lack of advising in the community colleges; it was noted that student-to-advisor ratios are much higher at the community colleges than they are in the CSU. A lot of community colleges are working off of a ‘transfer checklist’ that may not be particularly nuanced, instead of the pathways outlined in the Transfer Model Curricula. It was suggested that – if a decision is eventually made to accept Statway – that a condition of acceptance might be that students are advised in advance that this pathway is not suitable for STEM (and perhaps some other) majors. It was pointed out, though, that this is not just a "Statway-issue," as we have learned of other pathways that included even less algebra than Statway. A fear was articulated that in at least one STEM discipline (Biology), so many students are arriving from community colleges having fulfilled the mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement with statistics, that there may be calls to revise major requirements to make it possible for students to graduate using a statistics course instead of a more algebraic mathematics course.

- The UC is holding a pair of North-South articulation meetings on mathematics (Friday, February 26 at UC Irvine, and Wednesday, March 2 at UC Davis). The theme is “Aligning Math Together,” and the keynote will be Kyndall Brown (California Mathematics Project). UC is inviting representatives from K-12, the CCC and the CSU. Bill Eadie will be attending the southern meeting and Ken O’Donnell will be attending both meetings.
  - Alternative proficiency models such as Statway are less of an issue for the UC than they are for the CSU because the transfer students accepted by UC generally fall into one of two categories: either their mathematical/quantitative reasoning skills are perfectly fine, or they have other compensating academic strengths.
- The post-GEAC Math Meeting that APEP was hoping to hold would not duplicate the work of the B4 Task Force, but it could inform their work. When one considers the lead time involved in preparation of catalogs, any changes that might come out of the work of the task force would need to be
acted upon by ASCSU this coming Spring in order to have a chance of showing up in 2017-18 catalogs.

- If we proceed with the January meeting, it would be good to have someone from the English Council attend to provide a perspective on how the GWAR (Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement) works.
- APEP suspended its conversation on this item in order to welcome ASCSU Vice Chair Miller.

5. Executive Committee Liaison Report by ASCSU Vice Chair Miller:
   - The Background Check resolution was rejected by the Chancellor's Office, but Lori Lamb has indicated a willingness to study the issue. Executive Committee has named Deborah Roberts (Faculty Affairs) and Praveen Soni (Chair of the Campus Chairs) to review the information that is being gathered on the policy implementation.
   - The Sustainable Financial Model Task Force did not make a presentation to the Board of Trustees in November as had been previously planned. The task force will be meeting again next week.
   - The Chancellor's Office has responded to the (September) proposal made by the Academic Conference Planning Committee, and has asked the committee to go back and revise the proposal. The main issue had been that the original proposal had been tied to Maritime Academy’s “Day on the Bay,” and this was deemed not to be ideal. A proposal revision is currently underway, and it will still probably be held at Maritime Academy and include a reception on the Golden Bear (but the ship won’t leave the dock).
   - There is movement on the CSU Academic Freedom Policy. General Counsel has taken the position that CFA needs to be involved in conversations on Academic Freedom. A group has been appointed that will be discussing this. It includes three representatives from CFA and three from ASCSU: ASCSU Chair Filling, FA Chair Foroohar and Senator Norman. If this goes well, Intellectual Property might be handled similarly.
   - Chair Filling has spoken with campus Senate chairs about tenure density and trying to get some metrics to measure this.
   - The B4 Task Force:
     o Executive Committee is thinking about possible additions to this Task Force: UC, K-12 and perhaps industry. APEP member voiced strong concern about their being a single designated “industry” voice because different sectors could lead to very different skill sets being presented as necessary.
     o The outcome of the meeting that took place this morning between Executive Committee, EVC Blanchard and State University Dean Van Cleve was that EC will forward a list of Task Force members to EVC Blanchard for his review. Getting a CO “blessing” of the group in advance should minimize the chances of this being considered “just one voice” out of many. Currently, instead of identifying particular
faculty, EC is planning to name the Chairs of GEAC, AA and APEP as members with the understanding that each Chair may then in turn name a designee. The exception is that EC would like to honor the recommendation that it received from the Math Council in which specific individuals were named.

- The January meeting that APEP would like to hold could serve as a Town Hall that would give outsiders a "voice" without the responsibility/authority to propose changes. It is getting late to convene this meeting, but if APEP would like to request it, a request detailing what support is needed and what outcomes are anticipated should be sent immediately to Chair Filling so that Executive Committee can review this.
  
  - The CO is looking at safety and security structures for students of color.
  - The CO will be reporting soon on successes and challenges regarding the graduation initiative.

6. **Elementary and Secondary Act revision announcement.**
   - APEP members have only briefly reviewed this, so no discussion took place.

7. **Request for ASCSU Support of January Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning meeting.**
   - APEP drafted and revised the following request, which was submitted to ASCSU Chair Filling (with copies to GEAC Chair Eadie and Academic Affairs Chair Nelson) by Vice Chair Barsky:

     On behalf of APEP, I am sending this request for ASCSU to sponsor a Town Hall at the Chancellor’s Office that would lead to a broad discussion of the “Math Arc” from K-12 through college graduation looking at how all of the pieces fit together (integrated K-12 mathematics, Smarter Balanced assessment, the mathematics/quantitative reasoning General Education requirement, and mathematics as a core competency). This meeting might help to lead a CSU-centered discussion about the Mathematics/Quantitative reasoning and inform and broaden the discussions that the B4 task force might pick up. Some overlap with the B4 Task Force is expected, but this would be a separate meeting fulfilling a different purpose.

     We anticipate the ASCSU commitment to be:
     - Sending the invitations (via email)
     - Lending credibility to the meeting
     - Minimal financial cost (coffee and cookies at the meeting; although it would be nice if ASCSU would cover the additional night of lodging for Senators participating who
Potential brainstorming ideas include:

- Discussion of balancing access versus quality. Are there options which increase access while still preserving options for students in terms of choices of majors?
- How does mathematics/quantitative reasoning interface with other efforts: alternative curricula, Early Start, etc.?
- Discussion of the possibility of requiring a fourth year of high school mathematics for students who are not yet college-ready in mathematics; students with Smarter Balanced scores that indicate that they are already college-ready would not be held to this requirement. The CSU might develop an ERWC-like mathematics course that it would share with the high schools for use as the “4th year” course. This proposal dovetails with one of the key goals for 2015-16 identified by APEP at its May 2015 meeting (Exploring the possibility and implications of a state high school graduation requirement of three years of mathematics).

There are several Chancellor’s Office staff that we would like to invite to this meeting: Eric Forbes, Carolina Cardenas, Ken O’Donnell and Ed Sullivan. This would also be a venue to which we could invite external representatives from Statway, the California Acceleration Program, LearningWorks, etc. to be able to hear these external (to the CSU) perspectives. We would also hope that members of GEAC who are already in Long Beach for the GEAC meeting would attend.

8. Reports on Committees and Councils.
   a. General Education Advisory Committee
      i. No recent meeting
      ii. Oral communication subgroup discussion is in development (Ken’s email from last week)
      iii. Clean up of language on CLEP
         1. Reducing language units from CLEP
   b. English Council
      i. Earlier summary noted English Council 1x per year versus 2x per year
      ii. Support for discipline council resolution (CO contact = Gerry Handley) should be reinvigorated.
   c. Math Council
      i. No recent meeting
   d. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
      i. CTE council is now looking for 2 higher education folks – should be shared with College of Education Faculty
         1. Q: who is currently serving for the CSU? A: unknown,
likely so (Joe Aguerrebere still listed as interim)

ii. California Academic Partnership Advisory Council

1. 3.5M budget; primarily to high schools and their relationship with K-16; 800K was available but CAP is extending grant to high school districts that are already funded for their partnership project.

2. Smarter Balanced
   a. Commitment to standardizing how to roll out new support mechanisms

3. CCC report strong state support for additional student support services

e. Other Reports of Interest to APEP
   i. Early assessment
      1. No recent meeting

9. Discussion of Possible Action Items
   • APEP did not feel that it was ready to discuss either of the proposed action items on the agenda:
     o Reformulation of the CAHSEE
     o Smarter Balanced Test Results

    • We need to get information about the SMARTER BALANCED CUT SCORES and what they might look like. What is the process for establishing these and who actually does this? We used to get updates from Dr. Beverly Young. No recent update.
    • Support for a resolution in support of public teacher higher education (versus private/for profit) – email from Senator Schulte
    • Senator Chong will send out a summary of the BECHTEL efforts to share their goal updates

    • Senators Chong and Nishita will purchase the refreshments.
    • All other APEP members will be responsible for set-up and clean-up.

12. Other Business. None

13. Adjournment. APEP adjourned at 1:56 pm on Friday, December 4, 2015.

Respectfully submitted
With acknowledgment of valuable contributions by Mark Van Selst, David Barsky, Vice Chair, APEP