Called to Order at 11:06 am by Chair Denise Fleming

Present: Denise Fleming, Chair (East Bay), David Barsky, Vice Chair (San Marcos), Kevin Baaske (Los Angeles), Glen Brodowsky (San Marcos), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Sue Holl (Sacramento), Kathleen Kaiser (Chico), J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay)

Liaisons and Visitors:
- Sharon Russell, Systemwide Director, CalState TEACH
- Carolina Cardenas, Director, Outreach and Early Assessment
- Julie Chisholm, Executive Committee Liaison

1. **Agenda.** Motion to approve (Holl/Chong). Approved by general consent.

2. **Approval of Interim Meeting Minutes (9/26/14).** Motion to approve (Holl/Kaiser). Approved by general consent. If committee members find anything that needs to be corrected within the next week or so, they should contact Chair Fleming and Vice-Chair Barsky by email.

3. **Chair’s Report.**
   - Status of Request for Minutes from VP and Provost meetings. The request for these minutes has been made, but there has not yet been a response.
   - *Faculty-to-Faculty Newsletter.* Chair Fleming has made a report on what APEP has accomplished so far this year; these reports are now in a new format. The newsletter has not yet come out, in part perhaps because of attention required by the Academic Conference.
   - Academic Conference. The venue has been moved entirely to the Chancellor’s Office. The schedule is being adjusted because the Board of Trustees agenda is rather long.
   - Liaison Reports. APEP members are asked to fill these out and return them to Chair Fleming and Vice-Chair Barsky.

4. **Clarification of Readiness Measures: ERWC Grades, Exemption Status.** ERWC (Expository Reading and Writing Courses) provides a way in which students can demonstrate proficiency in English prior to entering the CSU. The Chancellor’s Office has rejected recommendations that the criterion for demonstrating proficiency be a grade of B in such course, and has instead adopted a grade of C as the cut-off grade. There are situations known to APEP members in which
students who have passed an ERWC course with a grade of C have taken and failed the English Placement Test (EPT). APEP want to encourage as many students as possible to attain proficiency, but is concerned that, when students are not really proficient, calling them “proficient” can harm them by keeping them from being able to enroll in the remedial/developmental courses that they will need when they arrive to the CSU. APC will discuss this issue with Carolina Cardenas when she visits APEP.

5. Liaison Report from Director Sharon Russell (for Assistant Vice Chancellor Beverly Young).
   i. Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). The Commission has approved a fourth model: EdTPA. (The first three models are CalTPA, PACT [developed by Stanford and the UC], and FAST [developed by Fresno].) EdTPA is a streamlined version of PACT developed by Stanford and Pearson with modifications for the California market: scorers are from California and are familiar with state requirements. The assessments are scored centrally, and Pearson charges $400/student. Fee waivers were given last year when EdTPA was being piloted; in the future the cost will be borne by either the students or the institution, with this to be decided campus-by-campus. Currently there are no plans to mandate at the system level that EdTPA (or one of the other models) be used by all campuses. In response to a question about whether a cost-analysis comparison of the different models had been conducted, Sharon Russell stated that FAST was the least expensive; FAST is homegrown and relies on volunteer work.
   ii. Accreditation.
      a. Academy for Excellence in Teacher Preparation. This is the product of the Commission, members of the CSU, and CAPE (Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education). It will create a Blue Ribbon Certification through the CCTC for programs:
         • Bronze for programs that meet many of the advanced standards;
         • Silver for programs that meet most of the advanced standards; and
         • Gold for programs that meet all of the advanced standards
         Examples of the advanced standards were shared with APEP
      b. CAPE is moving to requiring that institutions require a 3.0 GPA for candidate admissions. CSU Education deans oppose this since such an admission requirement would remove much diversity in CSU credential programs and does not seem to have any research basis. In response to a question, Sharon Russell stated that whereas Chancellor Reed had wanted all CSU Education programs to be nationally accredited, Chancellor White has said that CAPE accreditation will be a decision made individually by each campus.
   iii. Approval of Subject Matter Programs. There is a backlog of programs awaiting approval. The Commission is working with subject matter faculty to get these reviewed and approved.
iv. Bechtel Workgroup. An RFP will be coming in December with funds to be distributed in January. Sandra Chong serves on this workgroup and can brief APEP on further details.

6. APEP Member Reports on Liaison Assignments
i. Bechtel (Sandra Chong)
   • The work group held a two-day retreat brainstorming the meaning of “New Generation of Educators”
   • Campuses responded to the initial RFP asking for 5-page proposals ($5K in funding was available). The RFP was non-prescriptive and each campus could address it in ways that made sense for that campus, so the proposals that were received were quite varied. Most were funded for the second level and a webinar was held to give direction to the proposal writers.
   • Another webinar is scheduled for next Monday on how to create a Logic Model (a required component of the proposal) and what it should/must contain. Senator Chong explained to APEP members that a logic model contains the timelines for the project and shows how the activities are linked to the outcomes and the budget.) APEP members were invited to join the webinar.
   • Bechtel staff have been present at all of the meetings and they were delighted with the commendation from the Academic Senate last October.

ii. Boosting College Readiness (Kathleen Kaiser)
   • Wayne Tikkanen has made his final report as the ITL Director; he expects that a new director will be in place by January.
   • There will be a February conference at CSU Sacramento. A preconference (on Thursday, February 12) will be on STEM, and it will look at a common minor that would link community colleges to the CSU. (Butte College and CSU Chico have such an intersegmental minor.)
   • Clovis Center is linking a program from high school to community college to pharmacy school.
   • MiraCosta College and Grossmont College are both looking into block scheduling.
   • Independent and private colleges seem to think that the rate of flow into the teaching pipeline is shrinking.
   • Shasta College has asked whether geography might be a factor that could be used to determine that a bachelor’s degree that it wishes to offer might be considered “non-competitive.” No one currently knows what program Shasta is asking about.
   • Community colleges are expecting to turn the SB 1440 Associate’s Transfer degrees into the main pipeline form the community colleges into the CSU.

iii. GEAC (Kathleen Kaiser)
   • Highlights of GEAC discussions are the following:
7. **Liaison Report from Director Carolina Cardenas** (for Associate Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes).
   i. Early Start. Early Start data is currently being collected.
   ii. Applications for Fall 2015. The numbers are down statewide. It seems that this is largely due to a data problem in the LAUSD, and a solution is in place.
   iii. English Learner data. Director Cardenas provided APEP with data from 2012, 2013 and 2014 on how English Learners performed on the EAP readiness assessments in English and mathematics; sub-reports were provided that disaggregated students who had been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than 12 months (less than 1500 students in each of the three years) and those who had been enrolled for a year or longer (approximately 37,000 in 2012 and 2013, but less than 30,000 in 2014).
   - In each year, and for both the groups of English Learners who had been in U.S. schools for less than a year and for longer than a year:
     - 1% of students were assessed as being English-ready for college;
     - 1-2% of students were assessed as being **conditionally** English-ready for college; and
     - 96-98% of students were assessed as being **not** English-ready for college.
   - There were larger year-to-year differences in the mathematics readiness rates, since there was another disaggregation according to whether students took the Algebra II or the Summative High School Mathematics’ version of the EAP. Over three-quarters of students took the Algebra II version. For these students,
     - 2-5% of students who had been in U.S. schools for a year or longer, but 17-30% of students who had been in U.S. schools for less than a year were assessed as being mathematics-ready for college;
     - 6-12% of students who had been in U.S. schools for a year or longer, but 19-24% of students who had been in U.S. schools for less than a year were assessed as being conditionally mathematics-ready for college; and
o 84-92% of students who had been in U.S. schools for a year or longer, but 46-63% of students who had been in U.S. schools for less than a year were assessed as being not mathematics-ready for college.

iv. The EAP for the 2015 year will just be the Smarter Balanced assessment; no items added and all items used. (Note that EAP served as the model for Smarter Balanced.) There will be four Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD): 1, 2, 3 and 4. ALD 4 corresponds to proficient/ready/exempt, and ALD 3 corresponds to conditionally proficient/ready/exempt. The cut-scores for the ALDs will be voted upon tomorrow.

v. APEP asked Director Cardenas whether it was the case that the CSU system has adopted a grade of C in ERWC as the cut-off signifying proficiency, even though the faculty who developed this course recommended that the cut-off be a grade of B. Director Cardenas responded that EVC Smith had made the final decision to use the grade of C after internal discussion out of concern that it would be difficult to explain to students the difference between admissions criteria and proficiency criteria. In the discussion that ensued, Director Cardenas mentioned the difficulty in making certain that counselors (in both the CSU and the high schools) were correctly relaying to students the difference between the two criteria, and that grade inflation may play a role. Several APEP members expressed strong disagreement with this decision (and with the process by which it was made); this serves students poorly of it tells them that they are ready for college-level work when they are not, and it further keeps them from being able to enroll in the developmental courses that they need. APEP members also pointed out an inequity associated with having ERWC be a fourth route for establishing proficiency (after EAP/Smarter Balanced, SAT and ACT) in that it is not available at all school sites. Director Cardenas concurred and added that, even at sites where ERWC courses are offered, they are not always available to all students who want to enroll in them.

vi. APEP members asked whether there was system policy prohibiting campuses from accepting second baccalaureate students who are returning for a STEM major. Director Cardenas replied that while system policy is to deny admission to applicants who already hold a bachelor’s degree, that policy has exceptions for nursing and other fields of critical need, which should include STEM majors.

8. Work on Action Items.

- APEP members revised a draft proposal brought to the committee by Chair Fleming for a resolution originally titled, “Support for Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Test (ACT) Scores as College Readiness Indicators and Registration Fee Waiver Information Dissemination.” After considerable work, this became “Support for Encouraging 11th Graders to Take the SAT or ACT as a Means of Establishing College Readiness in English and Mathematics and the Dissemination of Registration Fee Waiver Information.” A motion was made to bring this to the Senate with a request
for a waiver so that it could be voted upon in this plenary session. M/S/P (Holl/Kaiser)

- APEP briefly discussed a second draft proposal brought to the committee by Chair Fleming titled "Assessment of Proficiency Measures for Exemption Purposes." In light of the fact that Ed Sullivan has recently joined the Chancellor’s Office as Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Research and Resources, APEP decided to hold off work on this resolution to give him a chance to organize the data that APEP would like to see.

9. **Liaison Report from Senator Julie Chisholm, Executive Committee member**

- **Reports to APEP from Executive Committee:**
  - The agenda for the Academic Conference has just been finalized. The first day schedule had to be revised since it appears that the Board of Trustees meeting will run late.
  - The Executive Committee has made tentative appointments to various committees. There was not a large response to some of the recent calls that went out for volunteers for these appointments, so, in some cases, Executive Committee members are being named. APEP suggested that Executive Committee consider broadening some of the calls to allow any CSU faculty (and not just ASCSU senators) to serve.
  - The Sustainable Financial Model Task Force, which includes both ASCSU Chair Filling and Faculty Trustee Stepanek, has met. This task force will generate two reports that will be vetted through the ASCSU.
  - Executive Committee is trying to work with the Chancellor to get more face-to-face meeting time with him where student leadership can also be present.
  - An update on the Faculty Trustee Search will be made at the plenary session on November 5.
  - Members were reminded of the reception on November 5 at the Chancellor’s House.
  - The Newsletter should be coming out soon. It has been “done” for a few weeks now, but has been held up while other business was being done in the Senate office.

- **APEP reports for Executive Committee:**
  - APEP expects to bring a resolution encouraging 11th graders to take the ACT and/or SAT, and will be asking for a waiver of the first reading.
  - APEP will not be bringing a resolution asking for Early Start data because it understands that the Chancellor’s Office is already working on collecting this data.
  - APEP wants to give Executive Committee a heads-up that it is concerned about what it has learned about the decision to consider students who have completed an ERWC course to be proficient in English if they get a grade of C in this course (instead of the grade of B that was recommended by faculty experts).
10. **Review of Faculty Affairs proposed resolution on Improving Campus Response to Sexual Assault and Sexual Violence.** APEP was asked if it wanted to cosponsor this resolution. APEP discussed this and decided to decline to cosponsor on the grounds that it does not fall within the committee’s purview. Some APEP members indicated that they intended to offer amendments to this resolution when it would be discussed on the Senate floor.

11. **Graduation Initiative Targets.** APEP discussed the Graduation Initiative targets; at its October meeting APEP learned these targets were set for each campus on October 15. APEP would like to see these targets, and decided that it would be simpler to ask the Chancellor’s Office for the complete set of targets instead of querying each campus individually.

12. **Preparation for the Early Start Implementation Team Meeting.** Vice Chair Barsky asked for guidance on specific APEP Early Start concerns in advance of the Early Start Implementation Committee Meeting. It was suggested that he review last year’s APEP minutes and that some basic questions to keep in mind are
   - What is the data that is being used to make decisions?
   - What guidelines are given to campuses about what kinds of data will be collected?
   - What is known about the different approaches and methods that campuses are using with different groups of students?

13. **Adjournment.** APEP adjourned before 4pm, Wednesday, November 4.

Respectfully submitted,
David Barsky, Vice Chair, APEP