

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Meeting of Wednesday, November 7, 2018 (11AM-5PM)

Minutes (Approved/Final)

PRESENT:

David J. Barsky, Chair (djbarsky@csusm.edu), Sue Holl, Vice Chair (sueh@csus.edu), Denise Fleming (denise.fleming@csueastbay.edu), Richard Ford (rford@csuschico.edu), Shahin G. Shahi (sshahi@exchange.fullerton.edu), John Tarjan (jtarjan@csu.edu), Mark Van Selst (mark.vanselst@sjsu.edu), Marquita Grenot-Scheyer [Chancellor's Office Liaison] (mgrenot-scheyer@calstate.edu), Ed Sullivan [Chancellor's Office Liaison], (esullivan@calstate.edu), Simone Aloisio [ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison] (simone.aloisio@cusci.edu); Scott Waltz (swaltz@csu.edu).

MINUTES:

1. The meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m. by Chair Barsky.
 - a. There was some discussion of how best to ensure our virtual meetings are productive. Perhaps there is some training available and some pointers on "netiquette." For future virtual/interim meetings, Chair Barsky will send reminders in advance of the meetings so we can be more productive.
2. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Senator Waltz added his membership on CAP to the list in item 6 (APEP membership on other committees). Approved of the agenda as amended by General Consent
3. Approval of October 2018 meeting minutes (M/S/P) [Holl/Barsky]
4. Chair's Report
 - a. Report from Extended Executive Committee
 - i. We will all participate in an unconscious bias workshop led by CFA members on Thursday from 8:45 to 10:45 a.m.
 - ii. There was discussion about public records requests that include associating specific course data (grades, etc.) with particular faculty members. Steven Filling has asked that campuses follow a model used at CSU Stanislaus which notifies employees when records are released.
 - iii. The Board of Trustees will be making a large request for funding of infrastructure repair projects. We have \$4 billion in deferred maintenance.
 - iv. APEP has a referral about Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs). We are asked to review the CSU requirement of tenure for reviewers. The Executive Committee already has a list of faculty recommended as reviewers, however there is not an ASCSU policy for appointment of reviewers. There is an additional request from the CCC to allow the review group to be less than six members (at this time the review group is three from the CCC and three from the CSU) to address the backlog of requests for course and program review.
 - v. The Executive Committee has asked us to begin thinking about requiring SAT or ACT as an admissions requirement.

- vi. APEP may work with AA on the FDRG issue and the use of standardized tests in admission.
 - b. Brief report on the WestEd Implementation Studies Project (ISP) meeting that was held before the APEP meeting. (Report at the end of these minutes)
5. Old Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
- a. The C-ID/FDRGs issues were discussed together. The most urgent is getting C-ID reviewers approved; the goal is to keep the process moving. We would like to develop a strong pool of reviewers for the C-ID and have robust lists for the FDRGs to review the TMCs that are being developed by the CCs.
 - b. Three resolutions were developed in parallel to address the particulars of each of the issues. The C-ID one is the only one that needs a first-reading waiver. The qualifications required of reviewers from the CSU will be defined based on the qualifications listed for reviewers in the CSU issued document (2016) soliciting subject matter reviewers, "Course of Record Evaluators". There was significant discussion about how best to establish and maintain a strong pool of reviewers. The verification of the qualifications is up to the Executive Committee.
6. New Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
- a. Requirements for Appointment to be a Course Outline of Record Evaluator (CORE) for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process; Academic Affairs is co-sponsoring this. We will ask for a first-reading waiver.
 - b. Requirements for Appointments to be a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) Member for the California Course-Identification (C-ID) Process; Academic Affairs is co-sponsoring this.
 - c. Creation of California State University Disciplinary Councils
 - d. Resolution expressing thanks to the S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation for its support over several years for the Next Generation was discussed but deferred to the next plenary.
7. APEP Members' External Committee Assignments and Opportunities to Observe/Report (September - November) - **no reports**
- a. Graduation Initiative Work Group Closing Convening (September 21): David Barsky, Rick Ford, Mark Van Selst
 - b. EO 1110 Promoting Continuous Improvement meetings (SoCal, September 28; NorCal, October 5): Anyone?
 - c. Graduation Initiative 2025 Symposium (October 17-18): Mark Van Selst
 - d. Math Council (October 26): Rick Ford
 - e. The Mathematics of Opportunity Conference (November 5): Rick Ford
 - f. CAIQR Council of Faculty Liaisons (November 6): David Barsky
 - g. GEAC (November 6): David Barsky, Mark Van Selst.
 - h. CAIQR Advisory Board (November 15): David Barsky
 - i. Admission Advisory Council: Rick Ford, Sue Holl (Sept. 12, Nov. 14)

j. CAP: Scott Waltz

8. Chancellor's Office Liaison Reports

a. AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer (11:00 time certain)

i. Teacher Prep programs and Colleges of Education

1. Teacher Prep programs are being criticized publicly. In a recent article the author discusses why the US ranks so low in educational effectiveness (*Education Week*, 11/2/2018, "Teacher's Colleges – The Weakest Link"). He says that curriculum doesn't provide students with the knowledge they need and teachers don't know how to use their knowledge effectively. He posits that American education is suffering because teachers are coming from a group that are not well prepared. AVC Grenot-Scheyer affirms that the author's assertions are not true and do not apply to the CSU.
2. We must counter this type of assertion with narratives about what we do well. The CSU has a "teachers made in the CSU" page; effort can be made to make sure the media know what we really do. The CSU Education Deans are trying to put together a 1-2 page piece on what CSU programs really accomplish.
3. There was general discussion about recruiting the the best students to go into teaching. At this time it is tough to get math/science teachers for middle and HS when they get paid only 1/3 of what they could make elsewhere. We have a lack of regard for teachers/counselors and in some cases we are asking teachers to take a "vow of poverty."
4. A question about long-term retention of teachers was raised. Teachers stay because of leadership – to feel valued and to grow without having to leave the classroom. There is an emerging category of "teacher/leader" specialists who do not have to totally leave the classroom to advance in their career. It was reiterated that people don't quit jobs, they quit bosses so retaining good teachers will also mean ensuring good leadership.
5. We need to raise the awareness of why public education is so critical to our success. We (the CSU) can provide that narrative about impact both in little/individual ways and in big policy ways. We can to assert a positive message from the CSU; we are doing something that isn't happening elsewhere. Marquita will share some of the good practices occurring on the campuses with us at our next meeting.

ii. The report on the impact of requiring a 4th year of quantitative reasoning as an admission requirement for first year students in the CSU was discussed.

1. She is sharing this with a variety of groups with a plan of presenting it to the Board of Trustees in Spring 2019.
2. All efforts will be made to ensure that there is not a differential impact on students of color or in lower income areas. We will continue to focus on how this requirement will add value to and add opportunities students' lives.
3. Many of the approved courses will be in Area G (electives) and this will have significant overlap with the UC proposal of requiring a 3rd

year of science for admission to the UC, however we will need to make sure students/teachers/counselors know that the students will need a QR course in their senior year of HS. We need additional research indicating that eliminating the “gap” year of QR leads to increased student success.

4. AVC Nathan Evans and AVC Grenot-Scheyer met with State Board of Education Michael Kurst. He endorsed the proposal and suggests thinking of other allies. AVC Grenot-Scheyer will continue to work on this.
5. We need to make the information about approved courses accessible. We continue to build capacity in courses. We should provide a comprehensive “menu” for schools. There may be some interest from vendors to create courses to meet this requirement.
6. Some contend that adding a 4th year QR requirement will overburden the under-resourced schools. We might use this argument as leverage to get those resources allocated so that no student in CA will be allowed to be unprepared. In any case, we should have answers for providing access.
7. Groups who are opposed to this requirement may have access to the media and to others of influence. We (the CSU) might consider leading with an information campaign to support our effort focusing on the requirement as an equity issue – we need to make sure we provide all the support we can for all our students to be fully prepared.
8. In order to offer the right number of courses in the appropriate subjects there might need to be more professional development to re-train the faculty. We also may need to provide additional supplemental authorizations.
9. There is generally an understanding of the importance of doing this no matter how difficult it is going to be. And that we need to do it now to help all our students have the best opportunity to get a quality CSU education.
10. Many thanks to Marquita for the thorough report and for taking the lead on doing what APEP asked two years ago.

b. AVC Ed Sullivan

- i. AVC Sullivan presented data on placements for first-year students in credit bearing English and math courses.
- ii. Multiple measures placements provides comparable placements to previous years, but the Group IV are now in credit bearing courses instead of remedial courses.
- iii. There is a strong correlation between placement in Group IV in English and math We don’t get good data from all campuses (e.g. sometimes they don’t update the senior year after the student is admitted and that is all that

is reported to the system.) Each of the campuses reviews their individual data.

- iv. Placements are more stable than last year. There are some minor fixes that will have to be done. That will be part of the package that will be delivered to the campuses.
 - v. Discussion of the results of the new course/updated courses included pass rate for those who started in group III or IV and success in subsequent courses. Some campuses may see high through-put and others not; there may be significant variation within a campus.
 - vi. In addition to providing his report on implementation of EO 1110, AVC Sullivan participated throughout the meeting and added insights on many issues.
9. Executive Committee Liaison report: Simone Aloisio (4:00 – 4:30 time certain)
- a. Resolution for adopting the tenets of shared governance as a first reading item. Unchanged from before
 - b. Unconscious bias workshop tomorrow. Please be prepared. There may be follow up in Spring.
 - c. Should we have our photographs in the ASCSU directory?
 - d. The ASCSU is definitely saving money by using Reem to book our hotel rooms. If she is not already doing this for you, please consider it.
 - e. There was general discussion of more open Presidential searches, making our virtual meetings more effective, moving on from EO 1100 and EO 1110, units to degree, campus autonomy, and raising the stature (perceived) of the ASCSU.
10. Adjournment at approximately 5:45p.m.

Chair Barsky's Report on the WestEd meeting (10:15-11:15)

We “early started” by getting an update on the EO 1110 Implementation Study Subcommittee meeting with AVC James Minor, Assoc. Dir. Chenoa Woods and (via Zoom) the WestEd Team. We heard about review team visits to some campuses last summer, and visits which are underway this semester. The Fall visits are conducted over two days by three individuals (I believe that Fresno is being visited today), and while not all campuses are being visited, WestEd is trying to balance these in a number of ways: region of state, campus size, campus setting, etc. The teams are asking “process” questions: Where will classes meet, and when will this be known; how (and when) are faculty assignments made; when are students who are required to participate in Early Start being notified of this; how are the co-requisite support courses aligned with the GE Area A2 and B4 courses; how is demand for different courses in these areas changing, etc. We were gratified to hear that the advice APEP offered last Spring about who the visit teams should try to meet with when visiting the campuses. APEP identified additional issues that the teams should be considering: the effect of block-scheduling of students, which departments in which the support courses are located, and a possible acceleration of the so-called ‘summer melt’ which might be an effect of Category 4 students choosing to attend a community college instead of a CSU campus because the minimal one-unit course option will no longer be available. We also suggested that as WestEd develops a taxonomy to describe the range of approaches, that it might approach campus curriculum offices for the more detailed information usually submitted in the course approval process instead of just relying on the (much shorter) catalog descriptions. APEP did emphasize that looking at pass rates of various A2 and B4 courses without taking into account the student learning outcomes and how these are being assessed is likely to be of only very limited utility.

Minutes Approved: December 7, 2018