Called to Order at 11:00 am on Wednesday, March 2 by Chair Denise Fleming

Present: Denise Fleming, Chair (East Bay), David Barsky, Vice Chair (San Marcos), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Mary Ann Creadon (Humboldt), Steven Frye (Bakersfield), Sue Holl (Sacramento), J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Ann Schulte (Chico; by phone), Mark Van Selst (San Jose)

Liaisons:
- Ken O'Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement
- Eric Forbes, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Support
- April Grommo, Director, Enrollment Management Services
- Carolina Cardenas, Director, Academic Outreach and Early Assessment
- Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research & Resources
- Sharon Russell, Systemwide Director, CalState TEACH
- Chris Miller, Executive Committee Liaison

1. **Approval of Agenda.** (Holl/Barsky) Approved as amended (additional item on discussion of Teacher Shortage added following Chair’s Report) by general consent.

2. **Approval of April 2016 Interim Meeting Minutes.** (Holl/Barsky) Approved by general consent.

3. **Chair’s Report.**
   GEAC met yesterday. The two main issues of discussion were on-line Oral Communication courses and the Chancellor’s Office decision to allow a grade of C- for the so-called Golden Four courses (oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning). A resolution will likely be presented from the Academic Affairs Committee in the plenary.

4. **Teacher Shortage.**
   Chair Fleming reported that the Executive Committee was asking APEP to discuss this issue. APEP recommends advocating for funding for
   a. APLE Loan Forgiveness (Assumption Program of Loans for Education) program, which was not funded this year, and
   b. Restoration of the GTF (Governor’s Teaching Fellowship) program, which has not been funded since 2002.
5. **Roundtable with Liaisons (Eric Forbes, April Grommo, Ken O'Donnell, Ed Sullivan, and Carolina Cardenas).**

   a. AVC Sullivan discussed the CSU Undergraduate Outcomes Report that had been submitted to the Department of Finance and the California Legislature. (This report was also forwarded to the ASCSU by Chair Filling.) This report contains a lot of descriptive statistics and a modeled approach to what the CSU could do to improve student outcomes. The Legislature is still mostly looking at 4-year graduation rates. Discussions with the Legislature will likely focus on:
   - 4-year graduation rates,
   - Bottleneck courses, and
   - Super Seniors.

   b. AVC Forbes and Director Cardenas updated APEP on discussions that were taking place in light of the ASCSU having passed AS-3244-16/APEP (Support for Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to the California State University). Conversations were taking place with both the California Department of Education and the University of California. There does not appear to be opposition from state Department of Education. The CSU has asked the UC to report on what high schools are already offering in Area G that could be used to fulfill the 4th year requirement. Director Cardenas reported that they were looking very carefully at data, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, on the possible impact of an additional year of mathematics. AVC Forbes pointed out that closing the achievement gap really needs to be started before students get to college.

   c. In describing what students might/should take in their senior year, Senior Director O'Donnell characterized the direction in which the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force was headed as wanting students to know more about how to make good use of a shorter, more basic list of mathematics topics instead of being able to do little with a longer list of more advanced topics. He argued that a 4th year course that was simply “more topics” was probably not going to improve the situation.

   d. AVC Forbes stated that the CSU was looking for funding to develop an ERWC-like course for mathematics. One possibility was that such a course would have a core consisting of what has been termed Algebra 1.5 or Algebra 1+, with a collection of additional modules (e.g., financial mathematics). Once a funding source is secured, a call will go out to faculty for faculty who want to be involved in developing such a course.

   e. APEP members noted that there was a Center for the Advancement of Reading that supported CSU faculty working with English teachers, and wondered whether it might be appropriate to develop a resolution calling for an equivalent center that would support this mathematics analogue to the ERWC course. Senior Director O'Donnell was very supportive as (a) the CSU would likely be looking for grant money to get the center funded and if such a resolution were to be endorsed by the ASCSU, then that would remove
concerns that the establishment of the center might get snagged on shared governance issue, and (b) the center might help to add clarity about what it would mean for “students to do fewer things, but better.”

f. APEP members discussed the timing of possible resolution in support of establishing the center for mathematics, and weighed three options:
   i. Bring a resolution to the May plenary with a request for a waiver of the first reading.
   ii. Bring a resolution to the May plenary without a request for a waiver of the first reading, but signaling that a similar resolution was likely to return in September.
   iii. Waiting until September for the first reading.

APEP members were supportive of beginning to write the resolution now, and so the third option was eliminated. The decision between the first two was deferred until after lunch (see item 7 below).

g. APEP outlined four functions that the center could serve:
   i. Coordinate development of an ERWC-like course for mathematics,
   ii. Professional development,
   iii. Scaffolding down to lower grades, and
   iv. Policy alignment issues.

h. Motion: (Frye/Van Selst) Draft a single, simple resolution calling for the Center and citing the March resolution on the 4th year of mathematics in the high school. Approved.

6. Liaison Report from Sharon Russell (for Joe Aguerrebere, time certain 1:00)
   a. CTC approved new standards for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials in December 2015. Program standards may appear to have reduced the emphasis on working with English Learners, but this is because this attention has now been poured into the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs).
   b. Director Russell led APEP through highlights of the changes.
      i. Standard 1 is probably the most important of the standards.
      ii. Standards 2, 3 and 4 place a greater emphasis on outputs than inputs.
      iii. A major change is that there now is a floor in terms of field experience requirements: 600 hours. This should not have much impact on CSU programs, but could have a large impact on credential programs at some private institutions.
      iv. Programs will need to think about how to handle the portability of 10 hours of guidance from program, to become a master teacher.
      v. Programs will be required to disaggregate data.
      vi. Standard 5 looks very different from the others; it addresses documentation to support a recommendation for a credential.
      vii. Standard 6 includes provisions to ensure that candidates get formative feedback from their mentors.
   c. Director Russell distributed copies of draft TPEs, annotated with her comments. She remarked that three new features are
      i. Inclusive instructional practices (UDL – Universal Design for Learning, and MTSS – Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports);
ii. Integrating the arts into the curriculum; and
iii. Using technology to teach.

7. **Work on Resolution (Call for a Center for Strengthening Instruction in Mathematics).**
APEP members discussed the merits of bringing the resolution to the plenary as (a) a first reading item without a request for a waiver of the first reading (for the purpose of alerting the Senate to the likelihood of seeing a similar resolution in the Fall) or (b) with a request for such a waiver. Two arguments in favor of the first alternative were that this would give senators a chance to share the proposed resolution with colleagues back on their respective campuses, and that it would still be possible for Chancellor’s Office staff trying to obtain external support for the institute to point to the first reading resolution as an expression of faculty interest. When APEP discovered that Senate practice was to only bring new resolutions to the plenary if they were coming with a request to waive the first reading, APEP decided to pursue the request for the waiver.

The wording developed at APEP differed only from that of the resolution adopted at the plenary in that the title was changed to “Call for a Center for Advancement of Instruction in Mathematics,” and "strengthen” was changed to “support” in the first resolved clause.

8. **Liaison report (Executive Committee): Chris Miller (time certain: 3:30).**
   a. The May revise targets $25M for the CSU if it can develop a plan by September for raising 4-year graduation rates.
      • Three ASCSU members will be a part of these efforts over the summer: Jodie Ullman, Mark Van Selst, and whoever becomes the next ASCSU Chair.
   b. Executive Committee and the Chancellor have agreed to hold a structured conversation during his visit to the plenary. There will be three topics, each of which will be discussed for approximately 20 minutes:
      • Shared Governance/Shared Leadership
      • Student Success
      • General Comments/Concerns/Issues/etc.
   c. Quantitative Reasoning Task Force
      • The next meeting is scheduled for May 31. This will be a two-part meeting.
         i. The morning session will focus on national issues related to quantitative reasoning with visitors from the U.S. Dept. of Education.
         ii. The afternoon session will be a meeting specifically for the task force.
      • The final Task Force report is expected to be out by September.
   d. Government Relations
      • ASCSU will be trying to synchronize its advocacy efforts for next year with the Chancellor’s Office and with CSSA
e. Addressing senators who might need to leave the plenary early, for graduation ceremonies, etc.: Please remember to fill out the forms regarding committee preferences for next year before leaving.

f. Executive Committee is wondering whether APEP is still working on a Resolution on the Changing Student
   • APEP suspended its work on this resolution after the first reading. It should not be included on the agenda for this plenary.

APEP developed the following list of topics that deserve attention in 2016-17:

a. Follow-up on the “Fourth Year of Mathematics” Resolution
b. California’s teacher shortage
c. Ongoing liaison with Bechtel Foundation
d. Monitoring data on academic preparation of incoming students
e. Obtaining student success data on Early Start (going beyond student participation data)
f. Examining Smarter Balanced Assessment data
g. SAT revision
h. Monitoring changes at CCTC regarding accreditation and TPEs
i. TPAs
j. ADT “catalog rights” issues
k. CalState TEACH
l. Literacy preparation issues (Reading comprehension across the disciplines; Writing transfer pedagogy)
m. GWAR and implications for intrasystem transfer
n. Other credentialed programs
o. ERWC and development of a related course for mathematics
p. Placement exams
q. CTE
r. ASSIST
s. CSU Mentor
t. Liaison with CSU Deans of Education

11. Adjournment.
APEP adjourned shortly after 5pm.

Respectfully submitted by
David Barsky, Vice Chair, APEP