

Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Meeting of Friday, October 12, 2018 (10AM-2PM)

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 (jtaran@csuub.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), Alison Wrynn [Chancellor's Office Invited Guest] (awrynn@calstate.edu)

ABSENT:

Scott Waltz (swaltz@csumb.edu).

MINUTES:

1. Quorum achieved at 10:22a.m.
 - a. Prior to achieving quorum, there was a discussion of the need to ensure that time be protected/reserved for senate functions despite the online format of the meeting that seems more vulnerable to competing campus requirements.
 - b. For future virtual/interim meetings, Chair Barsky will send a "save the date" reminder in advance of the meeting.
2. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Approved as amended (re-ordering the "New Business" items and adding items under "Other Business") by General Consent
3. Approval of September 2018 meeting minutes (M/S/P) [Tarjan/Van Selst]
4. Chair's Report
 - a. Report from Extended Executive Committee
 - i. The April 19 meeting, which is on the ASCSU calendar as "ASCSU Advocacy/Committees/Plenary" in Sacramento will be a 'regular' virtual/interim meeting.
 - ii. A resolution on the "Tenets of Shared Governance" document is expected to be introduced as a first reading item in November, with the second reading expected for January.
 - iii. ASCSU will be receiving some data soon on the number of students graduating with excess units. There is some concern from Sacramento that the CSU is meeting growth targets though unit growth instead of headcount growth.
 1. AVC Sullivan points out that the system is currently enrolling students at more than 6% above state targets. The disconnect is that the Legislature thinks of access in terms of headcount, but funding is in terms of FTES.

- iv. Academic Affairs is working on a resolution in support of using quantitative data in decision-making, a white paper on the impact of artificial intelligence on the curriculum, and the issue of discipline councils and TMC oversight.
 - 1. APEP will be meeting with IAVC Wrynn to discuss discipline councils and TMC oversight before AA is scheduled to take up these issues.
 - v. Executive Committee will be discussing the issue of the public records request for grades by course section and instructor rank.
 - b. Possible use of Smarter Balanced in admissions
 - i. The Chair reported on a phone call in which he had participated (primarily as an observer; the same could be said of CSU Fresno President Castro, who represented AAC) on Friday, September 14. On the phone call from the Chancellor's Office were Nathan Evans, April Grommo and Carolina Cardenas and Kathleen Chavira from Sacramento. This was an exploratory effort on the part of Michael Kirst (Stanford; Smarter Balanced) and Lark Park (Governor's Office) to determine whether it would be possible to use Smarter Balanced, and what steps would need to be taken.
 - 1. Nathan Evans explained how admission changes like this would take place, and the role of both APEP and AAC.
 - 2. One of the interesting things pointed out by April Grommo was that the legislation authorizing the EAP specifically precluded the use of the EAP (which has been succeeded by Smarter Balanced) as an admission factor: AB 484-2013.
 - c. Scheduling APEP subcommittee meetings on the WestEd Implementation Studies Project (ISP)
 - i. The Chair has been in discussion with AVC Minor and they have agreed that, beginning with the November meeting, Associate Director Chenoa Woods and WestEd representatives will meet with an APEP subcommittee prior to the start of the formal APEP meeting.
 - ii. All APEP members are invited to participate
 - d. EO 1099 (Revised) Extended Education: Self-Supporting Instructional Courses and Programs
 - i. The revision of this executive order came out earlier this week. The Chair reviewed it, and although it does contain specific sections on Teacher Credential Programs, these do not seem to have changed in any significant way from the corresponding sections that were in the previous version of the executive order. The Chair has confirmed his interpretation with AVC Grenot-Scheyer.
5. Old Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
- a. None.
6. New Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
- a. Use of standardized test scores in admissions
 - i. The ASCSU has been reassured that the LA Times writer was not correct when it was reported that the Chancellor "had asked academic leaders to study whether the SAT and ACT are valid predictors of student success."

- ii. APEP had questions about the predictive power of these test scores, to which AVC Sullivan shared the following:
 1. The tests do seem to have some power for predicting first year success. High school GPA also has some power. The best study on this is by Kurlander, looking at UC Davis and CSU students.
 2. SAT scores come into play ‘around the margins.’ AVC Sullivan has not studied this, but his hunch is that high school GPA probably trumps SAT score when it comes to predicting student success.
 3. AVC Sullivan noted that there are gender-balance implications associated with using (or not using) test scores:
 - a. High school GPAs are historically higher for female students than for males.
 - b. Test scores are historically higher for males than for females.
 4. In a more wide-ranging discussion on admission practices, AVC Sullivan observed that the number of eligible denied students “should” drop to 0 now that, due to legislation, the CSU is required to redirect all applicants.
 - a. APEP members speculated about the possible impacts, and observed that impaction is a key issue.

b. AB 705

- i. The Chair introduced the referral, which was initiated by a request from the ASCCC that the ASCSU develop a resolution to the effect that students enrolling in the CSU are expected to satisfactorily complete all requirements for the degree.
 1. The concern in the CCC is that AB 705 effectively does away with placement tests in English and mathematics. At the same time, the CCC is moving towards performance funding, which will increase pressure to have students successfully complete transfer-level English and mathematics courses in their first year. This could lead to pressure to lower standards in those courses.
- ii. APEP discussed this at length. The following suggestions were made:
 1. Give any resolution an affirmative formulation: Reinforce the idea of ensuring that coursework is college-level.
 2. Stress the importance of students being prepared to succeed in future coursework.
 3. Call for assessment of student learning outcomes.
 4. Involve the English Council and Math Council (this would be stronger if it were given to them):
 - a. Perhaps ask them work directly with liaisons from ASCCC.
 - b. Ask the councils to develop the standards that students need to succeed in future coursework.

c. TMC Review and C-ID Maintenance

- i. See 8.c.

7. APEP Members’ External Committee Assignments and Opportunities to Observe/Report (September - November)

- 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. Additions??
8. Chancellor's Office Liaison Reports
- a. AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer (11:00 time certain)
 - i. SAT/ACT issue. There is nothing new to report to APEP; no formal request of, or referral to, APEP has been made.
 - ii. West Ed, Dana Center and EO 1110
 - 1. The Dana Center has been engaged to partner with CAIQR, ITL, and Academic Success and Inclusive Excellence in the Division of Academic and Student Affairs, to co-facilitate professional development for campus teams to support implementation of EO 1110 and student success in first-year written communication and mathematics/quantitative reasoning in the first year of implementation.
 - a. The overall goals of the professional development programming are to
 - provide venues for cross-campus sharing of successes and challenges in the first year
 - share resources for meeting challenges that arise in the first terms
 - support the establishment of processes for continuous improvement to guide the ongoing implementation
 - and provide ongoing professional learning for professionals across divisions and roles (faculty, administrators, advisors, learning support professionals, and institution researchers)
 - b. The professional development calendar (which has previously been shared) includes
 - Face-to-face, regional convenings three times this year
 - Check-Ins this fall with campus teams by Zoom, individually for the first round, in small groups of 2 to 3 campuses for the second round

- a. The CSU Foundation Board of Governor's Meeting takes place on March 7. That might be an ideal date by which to have prepared a commendation thanking Bechtel for its support of the NGEI.
- b. A commendation might also serve as a message to the Legislature about needed support,
- c. Ideas for a commendation:
 - i. Metrics that would help to quantify the impact that has been made
 - ii. Quotations
 - iii. "Lessons learned"
 - iv. Make reference to some of the reports that have been produced
 - v. Perhaps contact Joan Bissel
 - vi. AVC Grenot-Scheyer will send APEP links to some videos on the NGEI website (here's one: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QmT4TNQiYWY>)
- iv. 4th year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning
 - 1. Progress is being made. The BoT briefing and proposal are in development. AVC Grenot-Scheyer may have more to report at the next APEP meeting.
 - 2. Together with Directors Fred Uy and Zee Cline, AVC Grenot-Scheyer has developed a list of questions about the capacity of high schools in California to accommodate such a requirement.
- b. AVC Ed Sullivan
 - i. AVC Sullivan participated throughout the meeting and added insights on a number of issues (see, for example, 6.a.ii.), but did not make a formal report to APEP.
- c. IAVC Alison Wrynn (12:30 time certain)
 - i. C-ID / TMC: CSU faculty engagement as reviewers
 - 1. The CSU faculty need to engage in review of courses for C-ID.
 - a. An issue is the ASCSU decision that CSU faculty reviewers must be tenured. IAVC Wrynn suggests allowing tenure-track and perhaps full-time lecturers to review courses.
 - b. Consequences of the decision to use only tenured faculty in the CSU as reviewers are the institutionalization of a long (45 day) turn around for reviews and the CCs proposing to do all this work without CSU faculty input.
 - 2. There was general discussion of the history of the TMCs and the review process including the number of TMCs now and the compensation for participating in this extra work. Each review is done by three CCC faculty and three CSU faculty, however most of the comments on the descriptors are from the CCC faculty. There is some concern that if we don't fix this problem ourselves we will not only lose influence over the process but there may be legislation instructing us how to do our work.

3. The compensation is \$25 per review at this time. There were varied opinions on this level of funding, but it is the case that raising the per-course rate or providing an incentive earned after a specified number of reviews might help with recruitment of CSU reviewers. The current rate was determined by the C-ID committee.
 4. The system-wide disciplinary councils might be a source of faculty reviewers. Perhaps we could recommend that the Chair/Convener of each discipline council be a member of the FDRG.
 5. A three part resolution was discussed. The three components would be:
 - a. Increase the compensation for reviewers (this might be funded by the CCC).
 - b. Change the CSU requirement for reviewers to “tenure-line” or lecturer with Department Chair “recommendation”/
 - c. Encourage the disciplinary councils/disciplines/”chairs of Departments of XXX” to take responsibility for these agreements.
- ii. TMC Review and C-ID Maintenance
1. There was general discussion of the history of the TMC/C-ID development process and descriptor creation. There is an on-going submission of courses for approval. The CCs continue to create ADTs.
 2. Some other issues were discussed including ensuring that there is wide dissemination of the results of these agreements so that related disciplines or programs that rely on foundational courses are not negatively impacted, and informing the legislature of the importance of this work so that there will be on-going funding.
9. Executive Committee Liaison report: Simone Aloisio (12:00 – 12:30 time certain)
- a. First reading item for Tenets document
 - b. Bylaw change re: proportion of vote to waive a first reading.
 - i. Current ASCSU By-Laws have a $\frac{3}{4}$ requirement. Asking that this be lowered to $\frac{2}{3}$ is under consideration. EC views this as a matter of balancing minority rights with a majority view, and it is not tied specifically to the Tenets issue (since the By-Laws change would not take place before the first reading of the resolution on the Tenets).
 - ii. Several suggestions were made by APEP members to avoid conflating the tenets document with the bylaw revision.
 - c. Public records request re: grade distributions
 - i. One APEP member asked whether, since the data was requested in connection with a research project, an IRB review had been undertaken. Another member pointed out that, at least at some CSU campuses, this sort of data would be exempt from IRB review.
 - d. TMC/C-ID
 - i. APEP had nothing to report at this point, as it would be meeting with IAVC Wrynn immediately following Secretary Aloisio.
 - e. Use of SAT and ACT tests in Admissions

- i. EC has had a wide-ranging discussion about this issue.
 - 1. One possibility under consideration is a resolution asking that AAC and APEP be involved in any discussions on this matter.
 - 2. EC is wondering if perhaps APEP could chart a way forward.

10. Draft November Interim Agenda and Action Items

- a. Three possible resolutions
 - i. Standards for coursework (CSU/CCC)
 - 1. Venue for pushing assessment of outcomes beyond pass rates
 - ii. TMC/C-ID reviews
 - 1. “or equivalent” reviewers
 - 2. Discipline council empowerment
 - 3. Review pay & recruitment
 - 4. Outreach to appropriate groups (users vs. donors)
 - 5. Need better support to ensure outreach for feedback on descriptors and TMCs
 - iii. Bechtel (resolution vs. commendation) – a.k.a. “not all external entities are bad” / value of effective resourcing of CSU-centered action

11. Other Business. (Note: These items were informal discussions as they occurred when there was no quorum present.)

- a. GE Task Force
- b. Tenets of Shared Governance

12. Adjournment at approximately 2:15p.m.

Minutes Approved: November 7, 2018