



ACADEMIC SENATE CSU

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee

Minutes

April 18, 2019

(Meeting via Zoom)

Present: David J. Barsky, Chair (djbarsky@csusm.edu), Sue Holl, Vice Chair (sueh@csus.edu), John Tarjan (jtaran@csub.edu), Scott Waltz (swaltz@csusb.edu), Mark Van Selst (mark.vanselst@sjsu.edu), Shahin Shahi (sshahi@exchange.fullerton.edu), Marquita Grenot-Scheyer [Chancellor's Office Liaison] (mgrenot-scheyer@calstate.edu)

Chair Barsky called the meeting to order at 10:05 am PDT

1. Approval of Agenda – Holl/Barsky - approved
2. The minutes of the March 2019 meeting were approved as presented – Barsky/Holl - approved
3. Chair's Report
 - a. There is no subcommittee meeting on the WestEd Implementation Studies Project (ISP) scheduled.
 - i. A 10:15-11:00am on the ISP will take place before the next APEP meeting (May 15).
 - b. The Chancellor's Office responses to the March ASCSU Resolution: **AS-3367-19/APEP/AA: Supporting CSU Mathematics and English Council Requests for Flexibility in the Implementation of Early Start Program Changes** was reported and discussed. The CO will not delay Early Start implementation. APEP may want to respond with another resolution.
 - c. Report from Extended Executive Committee
The May Plenary will be very full and we need to complete the business of the 2018-19 ASCSU by noon on Friday. Mostly the discussion focused on the GETF report; there were two first reading resolutions at the March plenary and they may be combined. There was discussion of AB 1460 in which the legislature dictates that all campuses will require 3 units of Ethnic Studies as a graduation requirement; there was significant discussion occurred including why only some faculty are designated as appropriate to teach these important topics as this ignores the breadth of diversity of faculty we have on campuses. It is essential to push back to make sure the legislature understands that faculty know best how to create and implement curriculum changes, that there is

**ASCSU 2018-2019
Academic Preparation and
Education Programs (APEP)
Committee**
apep@lists.calstate.edu

David J. Barsky, Chair
Mathematics
djbarsky@csusm.edu

Sue Holl, Vice Chair
Mechanical Engineering
sueh@csus.edu

Richard Ford
Mathematics
rford@csuschico.edu

Shahin G. Shahi
Electrical Engineering
sshahi@exchange.fullerton.edu

John Tarjan
Management & Marketing
jtaran@csub.edu

Mark Van Selst
Psychology
mark.vanselst@sjsu.edu

Scott Waltz
Education
swaltz@csusb.edu

Marquita Grenot-Scheyer
Chancellor's Office Liaison
mgrenot-scheyer@calstate.edu

Ed Sullivan
Chancellor's Office Liaison
esullivan@calstate.edu

TBD
Executive Committee Liaison



already a mechanism (through the ASCSU) to address and evaluate curricular issues, and this could be initiated at the Board of Trustees level.

4. Chancellor's Office Liaison Reports

a. AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer

The timeline for the proposed 4th year of QR admission requirement was discussed. Since the presentation had been sent to APEP previously Marquita asked for comments.

The discussion focused on data. It would be useful to have a sense of how many CA high schools can meet the requirement (or how many cannot). The issue should be framed differently to ensure that it is clear the CSU is not trying to limit access but is working to ensure student success in post-secondary education. The public will not see this as increasing access and success the way it is being presented; we need to emphasize that by implementing this requirement we are going to be able to advantage those students who have not had access to the same high school courses as more advantaged students. An important factor is not whether a high school has a course that meets the requirement, but if they will have sufficient sections/seats; schools may have the offering but because of teacher limitations and scheduling issues they may not be able to offer enough seats for all students to have 4 years of QR. The selection of courses that will qualify is diverse and there will be exceptions allowed. The new implementation date is Fall 2025. APEP will go forward with the second reading and will re-frame the March resolution to emphasize that this requirement is to ensure opportunities and increased success for students. Another resolution of support will be drafted for Fall after the proposal is formalized. The timeline is to have the proposal voted on by the BoT in November 2019.

5. Old Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items

a. Recommending A Four-Year Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Requirement for Admission to the California State University: Towards a Responsible and Responsive Policy – discussion of feedback from March to present as second reading

- i. The resolution words are probably adequate but the rationale needs to be strengthened and focused.
- ii. We need to be careful about our choice of words and specifically explain our use of “data driven.”
- iii. We need to make sure to emphasize this is aimed at ensuring increased opportunities and success for HURM students.
- iv. We need to make sure to clarify that we are supporting “four years of QR” in high school, as opposed to “requiring QR in the 4th year” of high school, as we had used in the past.
- v. Senator Tarjan reported that at the March BoT there were lots of speakers from outside groups speaking against the idea, mainly due to equity concerns. Trustee Steinhauser, superintendent of the LBUSD spoke in favor. He indicated that he initially resisted the part of the agreement with CSULB that guaranteed admissions to their LBUSD graduates, but they have seen that there was tremendous success in getting



minority/underserved students into CSULB (and CSULB is impacted).

- vi. Chair Barsky has isolated the following clips from the March BoT meeting that concern this issue. The public comments were taken prior to the presentation to the Committee on Educational Policy.
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=1m30s (0:1:30 – 0:4:08; two speakers)
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=13m33s (0:13:33 – 0:17:28; three speakers)
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=21m40s (0:21:40 – 0:22:57; one speaker)
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=25m34s (0:25:34 – 0:33:56; six speakers)
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=39m24s (0:39:24 – 0:42:01; two speakers)
 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=38&v=RGvINCfBw4U#t=42m38s (0:42:38 – 1:27:01) Presentation by EVC Blanchard and AVC Minor, and follow-up discussion by Trustees
 - vii. Chair Barsky has distributed PowerPoint slides provided by AVC Grenot-Scheyer on the 4 Years of Quantitative Reasoning Proposal
 - viii. Perhaps we can include something about how the addition of a 4th year of QR in high school as an admission requirement is a good example of the way we should work together in the CSU. In all matters that involve curriculum and student access, the ASCSU first proposes something and the CO helps study and implement. In all cases curricular issues should go through the ASCSU.
- b. Use of standardized tests in admissions
Chair Barsky has inquired at the UCOP and learned that the Standardized Testing Task Force has been meeting, but has not yet released a report. See <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/sttf>
 - c. Expression of thanks to S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
Chair Barsky will work with AVC Grenot-Scheyer to craft an appropriate resolution
6. New Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
 - a. Possible co-sponsorship (with Academic Affairs) of a resolution:

Endorsement of Engineering Model Curricula for Transfer to Receive the Same Special Admission Guarantees Upon Transfer to CSU as the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)

 - i. Everyone is in favor of this. Even though not all engineering programs are using MCs they are still very good advising tools and will help students know which courses to take.
 - ii. APEP will co-sponsor with AA
 - b. Senator Ford noted difference between standards for CSU Sub-Area B4 (Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning) courses and IGETC Subject Area 2A (Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning) standards (see 2018-19 GE



ACADEMIC SENATE CSU

Reviewers Guiding Notes [October 2018]) and posed the following set of questions:

- i. *Has there always been a discrepancy of rigor and definition between CSU and IGETC standards?*
- ii. *Is that discrepancy legitimate and why?*
- iii. *Should we (APEP) propose a resolution asking to amend EO 1100 to adopt the IGETC language?*

After some discussion it was decided that APEP will recommend this topic be referred to GEAC.

7. APEP Members' External Committee Assignments and Opportunities to Observe/Report (March through May)
 - a. CAIQR Advisory Board (March 8): David Barsky
 - i. They had two meetings earlier this spring – mostly were focus groups – creating a website that has listings of HS course curricula and course options
 - b. Admission Advisory Council (April 17): Sue Holl, Rick Ford
 - i. AVC Grenot-Shreyer presented the 4th year QR proposal. It was well received. It has been presented to the Council of Presidents and the Council of Provosts; there is some concern at some campuses that this might disadvantage some students.
 - ii. AVC Grenot-Schreyer's team is presenting widely to both inform and to get feedback for improvement on delivering the message we want to send.
 - iii. The opportunity for exceptions will be emphasized
 - iv. The goal is to increase student success at college. There will be many opportunities developed and provided for Professional Development for K-12 teachers.
 - c. Math Council (April 18 & 19) Rick Ford
 - d. ASSIST Advisory Committee: John Tarjan
 - i. ASSIST is working on the new website
 - ii. It is likely that the CID for the Business major will be allowed to do an interim update to the TMC.
 - e. CAPP: Scott Waltz
 - i. There have been many comments about the 4th year QR proposal working against students. What we need is more enthusiastic, talented teachers but we continue to lack numbers in math/science.
 - ii. There are three areas we need teachers – bilingual, English, and math/science. It might help if we could get the word out that there are good jobs available as teachers and these will be especially stable in the math/science area (which would cover the 4th year QR).
 - iii. An issue is not just that we need more good teachers but that the students need to be practicing their thinking skills throughout their education until they graduate from high school.
 - iv. Perhaps with this long lead time we will actually be able to get some useful data to see if when students take the 4th year of QR matters.



- f. General Education Advisory Council (May 14): David Barsky, John Tarjan, Mark Van Selst

8. Executive Committee Liaison report: Thomas Norman
The May plenary agenda will be packed. Most of the Exec Committee time was spent discussing the budget for next year. Hotel costs are the biggest expense. Leo was asked if the budget could be increased and a case was made for the ASCSU being more productive if we stay in closer proximity to one another. Tracy is doing an analysis on the cost when we add transportation to and from the less costly lodging. Marquita and James Minor want 30 min at the plenary to present the 4th year of QR proposal. The Exec Committee is inclined to say no but wanted APEP input. APEP members spoke in favor of adjusting the agenda to make time, especially considering this is something that originated from the ASCSU.

9. Other Business –
 - a. In light of some of the issues we are aware of in the implementation of EO 1100 and EO 1110 and the decision to not allow a delay of Early Start there was discussion on the possibility of developing a resolution to reaffirm ASCSU 2820 (Distinctive Universities in a University System). The CSU has already asserted we have unique qualities. We need to make sure that this has been done.

10. Adjournment 1:05 – Holl/Waltz