The Academic Preparation and Education Program (APEP) Committee
Minutes
Wednesday and Thursday, September 2 and 3, 2015
Office of the Chancellor – Room 410

Called to Order at 10:57 am on Wednesday, September 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), Mark Van Selst (Psychology), Sean Walker (Fullerton)

Liaisons:
- Ken O’Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement
- Eric Forbes, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Support
- Jose Aguerrebere, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor: Teacher Education and Public School Programs
- Chris Miller, Executive Committee Liaison

1. Approval of Agenda. (Walker/Chong) Approved by general consent. Several corrections to email addresses and disciplines listed in the agenda margin were noted.

2. Introductions. Committee members introduced themselves and indicated their specialization in research and/or teaching.

3. Approval of May 13, 2015 Minutes. Approval was deferred.

   a. Committee Operating Procedures: Chair Fleming suggested that the committee might best operate according to what she described as Roberts Rules “Light.” The committee agreed to this.
   b. Extended Executive Committee Report:
      o Since there often is a large overlap between what is discussed at Extended Executive Committee and at Executive Committee, Chair Fleming will not be making a separate report, and will instead let the liaison from Executive Committee brief APEP on what occurred at both meetings.
      o Senator Van Selst asked Chair Fleming whether there had been discussion at Extended Executive Committee about whether there might be any action/resolutions on Statway coming out of APEP or Academic Affairs (AA), and if so, how this might be coordinated between the two committees. Chair Fleming answered that she had discussed this with the
AA Chair. The committees will be meeting today and tomorrow and will be working toward a possible joint resolution.

c. Review of APEP Charge: Chair Fleming asked APEP members to review the charge this evening if they had not already done so.

d. APEP 14-15 Annual Report: Chair Fleming asked APEP members to review the report also this evening if they had not already done so.

5. Review and Revision of Draft Goals for 2015-2016

- Chair Fleming presented a broad overview of major issues for APEP:
  - Changes in teacher preparation standards
  - Professional development for teachers
  - The need for data to make decisions on initiatives such as Early Start
  - Importance of working with the English and Math Councils
  - Diversity and Equity

- APEP discussed issues related to the Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum (ERWC) courses.
  - How is EWRC related to Common Core? EWRC has been matched to Common Core through a revision that added additional units (especially more expository writing) to the course.
  - Is there any validity to a grade-based exemption (from having to take the English Placement Test [EPT]). The English Council has expressed concerns about such an exemption. A related issue is that, if grades in ERWC courses will satisfy the English proficiency requirement, then what should those grades be?
  - One problem that has been noted is consistency; some high schools adopt only some of the ERWC units and still call the course an ERWC course.
  - Also there are access issues in that not all high schools offer these courses.

- APEP discusses issues related to Early Start.
  - Some campuses don’t let students know that they can do the Early Start coursework at other CSU campuses. This goes further than simply ‘defaulting’ students to the destination campus.
  - Campuses offer courses in different modalities (face-to-face, online and hybrid) and at different intensities (numbers of units), but we don’t know which of these are really working or what best practices are.
  - Even though there is a Reference Guide that is supposed to contain this information, it is difficult for students and staff (especially Orientation staff) to determine what taking a course at one campus will mean if the student will be enrolling at another campus in the fall.
  - Registration for fall courses is complicated when students are enrolled in Early Start courses (especially at other campuses) that could change their English and/or mathematics placements.
  - Since all courses are denominated in units, and some courses can even count toward the 120-units for a bachelor’s degree, perhaps we should push for electronic transfer of transcripts between CSU campuses.
  - The Early Start processes run independently of CSU Mentor, but CSU
Mentor is probably the only system process with which they have familiarity. Can we leverage CSU Mentor and use it as a way to tell whether (and where) students are enrolled?

- Now that students who are conditionally proficient (via EAP/Smarter Balanced, ACT or SAT) are being required to participate in Early Start (if they have not fulfilled the requirements of their condition), students are being asked to enroll in Early Start courses before they have taken the EPT or the ELM exam. They should be directed to the highest level courses (i.e., treated as if they had just barely failed to pass these exams) but the communications that students receive from campuses don’t always make this clear.
- A concern about Financial Aid was answered; students with an Estimated Family Contribution (EFC) of less than $5000 have their Early Start fees paid through an Early Start Fee Waiver.
- In advance of APEP meeting tomorrow with AVC Forbes, Chair Filling will email him later this afternoon or evening with a list of APEP concerns about Early Start and especially the communication issues (both communication to students and to Orientation staff).

6. **GEAC Meeting and Statway**

GEAC met yesterday and made a recommendation concerning Statway and related courses. To understand that decision, APEP began by reviewing the context:

- One issue in mathematics remediation is that while students can pass individual remedial courses, many students (especially in the community colleges) start college at a point where they will need to pass a sequence of these courses, and there is ‘leakage’ between those courses.
- Executive Order 1100 describes the material Statway provides a contextualized approach to remediation. Instead of requiring Intermediate Algebra (which is supposed to be an explicit prerequisite for Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning “B4” General Education courses), Statway courses directly address some material (statistics) that meets the B4 requirement with just enough just-in-time algebra.
- Statway is a fluid curriculum, that can vary from implementation to implementation, but there is a common basic structure to all of these implementations. The curriculum was developed by the Carnegie Foundation.
- The original version of Statway did not include very much algebra beyond the level of Algebra 1 (Beginning Algebra), but there are some indications (based on very small numbers of students) that students who pass a Statway course are able to continue and pass a higher-level statistics course.
- There are currently seven community college districts offering Statway courses and, as a pilot program, those courses have been considered to meet the B4 requirement for transfer to the CSU, even though they lack the Intermediate Algebra prerequisite.
- There is data showing that Statway reduces Under Represented Minority (URM) and gender achievement gaps.
• Last year, the University of California Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (UC BOARS) changed its position and decided that it would accept transfer students who had taken a Statway course as their community college mathematics/quantitative reasoning course. It is likely that this is less of an issue for the UC than for the CSU because their students tend to have higher overall GPAs.

• Funding is currently available through AB 770 to community colleges that redesign their curricula to get more students through transferable B4 courses. This funding stream is expected to last for three years.

• The Math Council released a statement last Spring that had been working on for a year in which it suggested replacing the requirement that all B4 courses have an Intermediate Algebra prerequisite with requirement that students have mastery of the Entry Level Mathematics subject matter (roughly 1/3 each of Numbers and Data, Algebra, and Geometry). APEP members referred to this more compactly as an Algebra ½ requirement.

• What is the basis of the Intermediate Algebra requirement? APEP members checked that it is not in Title 5, but it is in EO 1100 (and prior Executive Orders on GE). Common Core requires Intermediate Algebra, but using that to justify an Intermediate Algebra requirement at the university might be engaging in circular reasoning in that Common Core includes Algebra 2 because universities require it.

• GEAC learned at its meeting yesterday that another statistics curriculum, promoted by the California Acceleration Program, has been issuing systemic waivers from General Education transfer rules.

• One concern about relaxing the algebra requirements is that this might lead to bifurcated standards in the community colleges where some students would be tracked into statistics courses that foreclose the possibility of majors that require mathematics courses that build upon algebra, e.g., STEM majors and other disciplines such as Business Administration and Economics that require calculus.

The text of the GEAC recommendation was shared. The recommendation was to

• Extend the Statway pilots for three years,
• Invite other community college districts to submit similar proposals for statistical pathways, and
• Call for a committee to examine whether a prerequisite bar was needed for mathematics/quantitative reasoning.

Both Academic Affairs (AA) and APEP are discussing this issue today: AA from the General Education angle, and APEP from the transfer perspective. An outline that Chair Fleming received from AA Chair Nelson of a possible joint resolution was shared with APEP. The main point of the AA resolution would be to call for the creation of a task force and possibly provide criteria for the evaluation of Statway.

APEP identified several issues that it might address in a resolution or resolutions:
• (Like AA) Calling for a task force to review the mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement
• Determining whether there should be “a bar” (a set of material that must be a prerequisite or else included in any course that counts in area B4)
• Establishing expectations for the data to be used in evaluating Statway
• Exploring the implications of bifurcating B4 according to how mathematically prepared students are.

Before beginning to draft a resolution, APEP examined the implication of requiring that ELM content have to be a prerequisite for or included in any B4 course.

Arguments for:
• It is aligned with the Math Council
• It would guarantee that all CSU graduates would have achieved a certain degree of competence regardless of choice of major or point of entry to the CSU
• Presumably all current CSU B4 courses would meet this requirement

Arguments against:
• Statway and CAP say that requiring this would undermine their programs

APEP also considered pro and con arguments for Statway and CAP as they currently are offered in the community colleges.

Arguments for:
• These courses reduce URM and gender achievement gaps, and increase access
• Students are mastering material that meets the definition of mathematics/quantitative reasoning in every way except for the prerequisite
• Students are able to take and pass further statistics courses

Arguments against:
• Students get tracked
• Pathways that circumvent algebra might lead to a lower-value degree
• Concerns about the validity of the student achievement data, especially concerning the small numbers of students followed into subsequent courses

APEP then began drafting a resolution with the essential features of the resolution approved on Friday, September 4. This resolution calls for the ASCSU to establish a task force to determine what the foundational knowledge set for B4 courses should be, and whether students need already to have these proficiencies prior to taking the course or can obtain them in the course. The resolution also defines the task force membership. Out of concern that the ASCSU only had a limited window of time in which to clarify the B4 situation before GEAC might be swamped with requests to approve other statistical pathways
Senator Van Selst and Vice Chair Barsky worked with Senator Eadie of AA to reconcile the APEP resolution with the resolution outline proposed originally by AA. These negotiations largely dealt with how the general situation was portrayed in the Rationale and led to the resolution being offered jointly by the two committees. Perhaps the most substantive change was that a suggestion that requirements in mathematics versus quantitative reasoning in the original draft resolution was moved to the rationale.

7. **Liaison Report from Senior Director Ken O’Donnell**

Dr. O’Donnell and the committee discussed some of the specifics of Tuesday’s GEAC meeting and the implication of statistical curricular pathways for GE, Area B4. He endorsed the notion of a task force to review and make recommendations regarding quantitative reasoning requirements.

8. **Liaison Report from Associate Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes**

Dr. Eric Forbes previewed a series of Early Start and readiness-related information items targeted at high school students. These materials will be presented at several conferences for high school counselors. APEP members agreed that the new materials appear to be easier for students to understand than previous versions. We requested that Dr. Forbes forward pdf files of the materials to all campuses faculty teaching or advising incoming students who may require remediation.

9. **Liaison Report from Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor**

The Committee had a wide-ranging discussion with Dr. Joe Aguerrebere, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Among the chief issues we agreed to discuss this year are continuing implications of Common Core and Smarter Balanced Assessment implementation, changes to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing’s Common Standards and Teacher Performance Expectations, and optimal ways to support CSU teacher education faculty and our K-12 counterparts in the field as they redesign curriculum and instructional delivery to meet the needs of students and teacher candidates.

10. **Work on Resolutions**

In addition to the resolution calling for a B4 Task Force, APEP members drafted two other resolutions:

- Commendation for Dr. Beverly L. Young, and
- On the California High School Exit Examination (thanking the legislature for action that allowed high school students who had completed all graduation requirements except passing the California High School Exit Examination
(CAHSEE) to graduate after the last administration of the exam was cancelled.

11. Liaison Report from ASCSU Vice Chair Chris Miller.

APEP informed Vice Chair Miller of the resolutions on which APEP was working, and that (as usual) APEP was the first committee to have all of its members pay their contributions to the ASCSU socials.

Vice Chair reported:
- Chair Filling had made an extensive report to Extended Executive Committee; this report will go to the full senate at the plenary.
- California Community College Chancellor Harris had stated that the CCC would welcome conversations with the CSU on the pilot baccalaureates, but elsewhere the CCC Vice Chancellor has reported that the CCC is proceeding to implement these programs without formal system-to-system conversations. It appears that some of the community colleges have been contacting individual CSU faculty about the pilot programs, but this is not how the CSU expected to be involved.
- ASCSU has received a budget allocation equivalent to what it received last year, and is seeking an augmentation.
- The Academic Conference is being planned for March 2017. The Planning Team (2-year members: Bill Eadie, Francelina Neto and Karen Davis; 2015-16 EC members: Praveen Soni and Chris Miller) will be meeting Thursday, September 3 to begin discussing possible venues and a conference theme.
- Executive Committee met with EVC Blanchard and State University Dean Leo Van Cleve (who will replace Ron Vogel as liaison to the ASCSU). Key discussion points included shared governance (both systemwide and on campuses) and maintaining good communication. As examples of the latter, EVC Blanchard will be regularly attending ASCSU Executive Committee meetings, and Chair Filling will be emailing EVC Blanchard tomorrow evening with a heads-up on likely discussion topics when EVC Blanchard visits the ASCSU on Friday. APEP members were asked to forward any questions that they’d like to ask EVC Blanchard to either Vice Chair Miller or Chair Filling.

Issues raised by APEP:
- Concerns about how the EAB dashboards might be misused were expressed.
- APEP asked about the status of a systemwide Academic Freedom policy. Vice Chair Miller reported that the Chancellor had agreed last year to put together a Task Force on Academic Freedom, but this was halted because of both CO concerns that this was related to collective bargaining and also because the new EVC had not yet arrived.
- Some criticisms of the draft report of the Sustainable Financial Model Task Force were offered. Vice Chair Miller noted that EVC Steve Relyea would be visiting the plenary on Friday, and he could be asked the report.
• APEP requested that EC see if the ASCSU could have access to the agendas for the Academic Council (systemwide meeting of provosts). Last year, the committee asked about minutes and was informed that no official minutes were produced at these meetings.

12. Draft October Interim Agenda Items

Throughout the two days, APEP identified the following as issues that it might address in a future resolution:
  • Electronic Transfer of Transcripts
  • Units for pre-baccalaureate coursework
  • Evaluation criteria for Statway

13. Other Business. None.