The Academic Preparation and Education Program (APEP) Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, September 14, 2016
Office of the Chancellor – Room 410

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), Otto Benavides (Fresno), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Kate Esposito (Dominguez Hills), Sue Holl (Sacramento), Barry Pasternak (ERFA), Ann Schulte (Chico), Ann Strahm (Stanislaus), Mark Van Selst (San Jose)

Liaisons and Guests:
- Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives and Partnerships
- Eric Forbes, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Support
- Carolina Cardenas, Director, Academic Outreach and Early Assessment
- Ed Sullivan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research & Resources
- Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs
- James Minor, Senior Strategist, Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence
- Kevin Baaske, Executive Committee Liaison

0. **Introductions.** APEP members introduced themselves to the rest of the committee.

1. **Approval of Agenda.** (Holl/Pasternak) Approved as amended (additional item for development of resolutions) by general consent.

2. **Approval of May 2016 Meeting Minutes.** (Holl/Schulte) Approved by general consent. Senator Chong has already sent a number of typographical corrections to Vice Chair Barsky. Following past practice, Vice Chair Barsky will wait one week to collect any additional minor corrections.

3. **Chair’s Report.**
   - We have a new liaison regarding the Education Programs part of the APEP charge: Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, who is the incoming Assistant Vice Chancellor for Teacher Education and Public School Programs.
   - Update on what has happened regarding Quantitative Reasoning since the May meeting:
     - The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) has completed its report. Executive Committee will be bringing a resolution to the plenary that accepts the report and thanks the Task Force for its work.
An important contextual issue is that a meeting was held with officials from the U.S. Department of Education took place on May 31. At that meeting it was strongly suggested that the CSU could possibly face legal action arising from perceived inequities related to the mathematics proficiency requirement. In elaborating on this last point, Chair Fleming pointed out that students who enter the CSU as freshmen are effectively held to the standard of the ELM subject matter, while students transferring from community colleges are held to an intermediate algebra standard. The CSU was asked on May 31 by the Dept. of Education to set goals for September: Delivery of the QRTF Report was promised.

There are a range of possible resolutions that APEP can draft regarding the QRTF report and its recommendations. Bringing these as first reading items would allow senators to take these back to their campuses for discussion along with the report.

• Extended Executive Committee discussed the fact that the interim October meeting will precede the November meeting by only two weeks, and Chairs have been asked to assure their committees that the October interim meetings will indeed take place.

• The Senate Office has requested that, in order to minimize confusion, all official committee business (e.g., resolutions) from the committees should come through a single designated individual for each committee. In the case of APEP, that individual will be Chair Fleming.

• Chair Fleming encouraged new members to review the committee charge, which in shorthand could perhaps be summarized as “All things teacher-prep and pre-transfer/pre-enrollment.”

• Members were asked to contribute $35 (or, if so inclined, $40) for the ASCSU socials. Senator Holl agreed to collect the contributions.

4. Liaison Report (Assistant Vice Chancellor Marquita Grenot-Scheyer; time certain for 11:30).

• APEP members introduced themselves to AVC Grenot-Scheyer who is starting her fifth week in this position. AVC Grenot-Scheyer is a product of Cal State LA (BA, MA, credentials and joint-Ph.D.) who has held faculty (lecturer and tenure-line) and administrative (Associate Dean and Dean) positions at CSU Long Beach, and she also was a public school teacher in LAUSD earlier in her career.

• AVC Grenot-Scheyer attended her first Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) meeting, as a commission member, last week. She reported on three developments at CTC:
  o A change to Title V. CSET scores will remain valid for 10 years, instead of the current 5-year period. This will be helpful for students who experience temporary set-backs in the process of completing a teacher credential program.
Another change to Title V: Re-authorization of Elementary Subject Matter Programs. When students complete ESMPs that have been approved by the CTC, they will not be required to take the CSET.

An update on the redevelopment of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA). This is work that the CTC has commissioned, and CSU faculty have been working on this project for over a half year. The basic question being posed is: How do we create an assessment that is meaningful. The draft CalTPA should be ready sometime over the next few months. APEP members welcome the opportunity to be able to choose an alternative to the edTPA. In the ensuing discussion, it became clear that (at least) three different TPAs are in use at various CSU campuses: edTPA, PACT (Performance Assessment for California Teachers), and FAST (Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers).

APEP members asked questions in two areas:

- How technology should be used in credential programs. AVC Grenot-Scheyer stated that she was interested in hearing more from APEP about what CTC should be requiring.
- A draft Coded Memorandum on unit limits in teacher credentialing and related bachelor’s degree programs. This generated considerable discussion about connections between credential programs and master’s programs, and “the two-year problem.” AVC Grenot-Scheyer stated that there was a great need for teachers in California, and that the CSU should be offering lots of ways for students to get into credential programs.

APEP discussed the QRTF.

a. Overview of the recommendations in the report:
   - ASCSU already went on record last year as supporting recommendations III (AS-3244-16/APEP (Rev): Support for Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to the California State University) and IV (AS-3253-16/APEP: Call for a Center for Advancement of Instruction in Mathematics).
   - Recommendation I proposes a definition of Quantitative Reasoning.
     i. Vice Chair Barsky thought that the definition was reasonable.
     ii. Senator Pasternak reminded the committee that the corresponding area of General Education is not Mathematics, but Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning, and so it is important to have a definition of Quantitative Reasoning.
   - Recommendation II separates the dual uses of the current Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) requirement (ensuring that students will be sufficiently prepared to take a Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning course as part of meeting graduation requirements, and that there is some common baseline of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning
expectations for CSU graduates) by dividing these into two separate requirements.

i. Vice Chair Barsky described the proposed Foundational Quantitative Reasoning Requirement as being reasonably close to the current Entry Level Mathematics subject matter standards, but that this would offer community college transfers the opportunity to meet the same standard as students who start in the CSU instead of being held to higher intermediate algebra standard.

b. Some of the broad themes of the report include:
   • Equity
   • Tracking
   • Quantitative Reasoning in GE versus the Quantitative Reasoning in majors
   • Timelines
   • Statistical pathway preparation programs such as Statway
   • Integrated actions
   i. Senator Van Selst stressed that without the third and fourth recommendations, the second recommendation would just be a weakening of current standards.
   ii. In answer to a question about what the fourth year course might be, other committee members offered a number of examples:
      o Repetition of a course already taken;
      o Courses off the “road to calculus” track – although STEM-intending students who would already be taking additional mathematics courses would be well served by going on to calculus; and
      o Personal Finance

c. Additional implications.
   • Senator Van Selst pointed out that there are potential AB 1440 issues since several of the old Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) implicitly assumed competency in intermediate algebra.

d. Next steps
   • Call for focused feedback from departments throughout the CSU and from schools/colleges of Education. A first reading resolution might serve as a vehicle for drawing attention to the report and its recommendations.

   a. Highlights from the liaison respective “shops.”
      • AVC Sullivan reported that he had been working on the Graduation Initiative, and that this would be part of a joint presentation (along with Loren Blanchard and Jeff Gold) to the ASCSU Plenary tomorrow.
      i. Senator Van Selst, who served on the Graduation Initiative Advisory Committee commented that this work had been essential for data-based decision making.
      • AVC Forbes reported
i. Having provided background support to the Quantitative reasoning Task Force over the summer;
ii. CSUMentor will become CalStateApply.edu;
iii. Working on some significant enrollment management problems, and

- Director Cardenas has sent a summary of her report to Chair Fleming via email (Chair Fleming forwarded this to APEP). Two key points:
  i. EAP 2016 results show an improvement in student readiness in both English and mathematics:
     o 3% more students are “ready” and/or “conditionally ready” in English than was the case for EAP 2015, and
     o 4% more students are “ready” and/or “conditionally ready” in mathematics than was the case for EAP 2015.
  ii. New SAT cut-scores have been set.
     o The CSU ready cut-score in English for the EVBR (Evidence Based Reading and Writing) SAT will be 550; it had been 500 for the SAT.
       - The conditionally ready band becomes 510-540; it had been 460-490.
     o The CSU ready cut-score in mathematics for the SAT will be 570; it had been 550.
       - The conditionally ready band becomes 520-560; it had been 490-540.

b. Graduation Initiative.
- The Graduation Initiative is intertwined with the issue of student preparation.
  i. It is not the only factor. High-unit programs (e.g., Bachelor of Architecture, Integrated Credential Program and certain 5-year bachelor’s-plus-master’s programs where the bachelor’s degree is not awarded until completion of the full program, etc.) count against us. Perhaps the data corresponding to students in these particular programs need to be tracked separately.
  ii. Other strategies that the CSU can employ to improve graduation are modifying course scheduling patterns and encouraging the use of summer.
     o Senator Holl agreed that offering the courses that students need for graduation can make a significant difference and related an account of how when students are unable to get into the course that they need for their majors, they will take GE courses in excess of what is needed for graduation in order to meet the minimum course load requirements to qualify for financial aid.
     o Senator Strahm expressed concern about pushing students into taking 15 units each semester when they may be leading complicated lives that make this impractical. Senator Esposito
asked whether the CSU had metrics that captured what else (besides attending the university) our students are dealing with.

iii. Yet another factor is the radical increase in the number of students who are arriving at the CSU with AP credit. There is legislation underway that would govern how community colleges would need to treat AP credit.

c. Quantitative Reasoning.
  a. APEP asked about whether any progress had been made on the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force.
     i. Senator Van Selst argued that the entire integrated package of recommendations needed to be implemented, and that it the only action was adoption of the new definition then this would be a net loss to the CSU.
     ii. AVC Forbes and Senior Director O'Donnell replied that they were waiting to hear that the Senate had accepted the report and approved the recommendations.
     iii. Vice Chair Barsky pointed out the Chancellor’s Office already had last year’s calls from the ASCSU for both the fourth year of mathematics in high school and the Center for Advancement of Instruction in Mathematics.

7. AA Resolution on C/C- in Golden Four Courses
  a. Senator Van Selst shared a draft of the Academic Affairs resolution on Course Grading in the Golden Four.
  b. Motion to co-sponsor the AA resolution (Barsky/Strahm). Approved unanimously.

8. Liaison report (Executive Committee): Kevin Baaske (time certain: 3:30).
  a. General Education
     i. Chair Miller wrote about the developing GE situation (campuses being surveyed about GE practices, and Coded Memo ASA-2015-18 on practices concerning GE for transfers).
     ii. Additionally the trustees have been hearing different things about GE from faculty with whom they have been speaking, e.g., they are incorrectly hearing that there is no assessment of GE.
     iii. In conversations with Executive Committee, EVC Blanchard has expressed a willingness to open up Executive Order 1100 if faculty request changes, but he wants to keep the GE discussion separate from the Graduation Initiative discussions.
     iv. The ASCSU will undertake a campaign to educate faculty about GE. This will include FAQs in the next faculty newsletter.
     v. APEP members agreed that we need to do a better job of contextualizing GE courses in order build an understanding on the part of students as to why they need to take GE.
vi. Academic Affairs is writing a resolution calling for a task force to review the GE data that the Chancellor’s Office collected.

b. The venue for the Academic Conference (February 9 and 10) is being moved to Sacramento.

c. Executive Committee has been discussing whether it would be better to have committees meet from 8-9 on Thursday with Plenary beginning at 9, or to have Plenary start at 8.

i. Motion: APEP asks Executive Committee to start the Plenary at 8am. (Holl/Strahm). Passed without dissent.

9. Resolutions.
APEP discussed and worked on three resolutions:

a. Teacher Shortage Resolution

• APEP discussed this issue:
  i. The teacher preparation situation varies from campus to campus across the system; programs at some campuses lack sufficient enrollment, while other campuses are experiencing record high enrollments.
  ii. Perhaps what is needed is a systemwide recruitment campaign.
  iii. Chair Fleming will work on a draft of the resolution and recirculate to the committee a white paper prepared by the Deans of Education that was circulated to last year’s APEP by Senator Chong.

b. First Resolution on QRTF Report

• In light of the discussion with CO liaisons, APEP decided to ask the Senate to again go ‘on the record’ in support of the fourth year of high school mathematics and the center that would support this.
  • APEP developed the resolution that was transmitted to the Senate Office with the title: Implementation of Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Items Previously Approved by the Academic Senate CSU.
  • Motion to forward the resolution to the Plenary with a Request for a Waiver of the First Reading (Holl/Barsky). Approved unanimously.

b. Second Resolutions on QRTF Report

• APEP developed the resolution that was transmitted to the Senate Office with the title: Endorsement of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) Recommendations.
  • Motion to forward the resolution to the Plenary with a Request to Waive the First Reading (Holl/Barsky). Approved unanimously.

10. Adjournment.
APEP adjourned at 5pm (precisely).

Respectfully submitted by
David Barsky, Vice Chair, APEP