

Synopsis of Feedback Received - Academic Preparation

The following feedback was submitted in the development of and following the release of Academic and Student Affairs Coded Memo ASA-2017-14 regarding “Consultation on Proposed Changes in Academic Preparation Requirements.”

Policy/Decision to be made. **Areas of concern/impact in other areas.** **New thought/idea.**

Early Start: This topic generated the most comments, questions, and approaches. There is general support for the redefining of ES with caution, elimination of non-credit bearing courses, and opportunities for students to graduate faster. However, there is disparity in the “how/what” in several areas. The unit count (1 vs. 3) – primarily the need to still offer a 1 unit course and opposition of only a 3 unit requirement. Reasons for this also varied, but the most common argument for the one unit course is related to students who may need ES the most, often tend to also be the most in-need (financially) and a 3 unit requirement in the summer may impede their ability to work prior to enrolling creating a widening of equity and access gaps. There is also opposition to creating 3 unit online courses because of reciprocity. If 3 unit courses are mandatory for all students, will campuses actually practice reciprocity of the units, and if so, how would this happen. Additional issues include: questions about how students would actually be placed into ES; the use of multiple measures for ES purposes needs further explanation/thoughtful roll-out as this may create a complex, time consuming advising process; STEM Business majors may be the only students that benefit from ES and cited that stretch programs that begin in the fall do not impede academic progress for the rest of the students; Timing – the need for additional time to prepare new courses; confusion if ES will be required or not, if so, for which students - if required for all or a particular group(s) of students, CO needs to be clear on the “how” otherwise campuses may vary significantly in implementation; non-compliance by students – what are the consequences, will campus committees have overall responsibility for determining consequences. The ES section of the policy needs more clarification in a re-write. Finally, Maritime was exempt from ES – direction will be needed if that will no longer be the case.

Decisions to be made: course units; reciprocity of 3 unit courses; who would be required to participate (STEM vs. non STEM, all?); should ES be required at all in the summer; non-participation consequences.

- Remediation has been redefined, so ES need not be mandated. Is ES in effect still remediation?
- The rigor of current basic writing courses merits baccalaureate credit and the stigma associated with being placed in developmental writing will be removed and possibly result in better student learning outcomes.
- If the notion of remediation goes away from the CSU lexicon sometime in 2018, it seems that Early Start needs to be conceptualized or clarified for campuses. For instance, if all academic preparation coursework is credit bearing, students taking it will count towards state-funded FTES and should pay regular tuition fees themselves. In that case, we will be, effectively, asking students to start their undergraduate degree in summer, not in fall. How would that play out with students, their parents, and the community?
- The move to require all campuses to provide three-unit Early Start programs (ESP) has the potential to benefit fully admitted but underprepared students if fully funded. If not

fully funded, this move could exclude our low-income students who need to work during the summer.

- It should remain a firm policy of the CSU that pre-college content not generate college credit.
- There is need for significant amounts of time and human resources to create new curriculum, to seek approval from relevant faculty committees, and to implement the new program during a shortened summer in 2018.
- We support actions that help students graduate faster. That said, we believe requiring recent high school graduates to participate in one or two three-unit courses over the summer—even if college-credit bearing—works against the following:
 - Equal access
 - Warm welcome (some students see it as a punishment)
- The EO seems to be advocating for Early Start to move to a 3-unit, credit-bearing model. We have found historically, that most of our students (approximately 67%) are choosing to take the 1-unit online version of Early Start due to personal and financial hardships. We are opposed to an Early Start model that is exclusively 3 units, and we believe that it will create significant barriers to access for underrepresented and low-income students.
- We do not understand how reciprocity will be handled for ES. Although we are in support of each campus' ability to implement site-specific curricula, we are unsure how a stretch course being used at one campus will translate to another campus.
- What will be the consequences of not participating in Early Start? Language in Part V. F. conflicts with Part V. A. that notes "Early Start Program shall be offered to entering first-time students.." Shall be offered to, or will be mandatory for, students in need of additional preparation?
- It will be difficult for campuses to have in place by fall 2018. Will require the development of new courses, new skills-development support, and a process for determining the type of support for different populations of students.
- Can on-line courses be completed in advance? (e.g. If a junior in high-school completes an approved on-line course, could that satisfy the ES requirement?)
- Stretch courses will not work for Early Start, as students may not participate at the campus they will be attending in the fall.
- Would love to see the summer used for Directed Self-Placement. Not only placement into the appropriate level of English and math, but also into the appropriate major. Use Career Centers to help them to explore their interests and abilities, use programs such as ALEKS and Calibrated Peer Review to further refine students' placement and possibly move up to another level. Then have the students start in the fall, with both the campus and the students certain that they are heading down the right path.
- If the CO does not dictate how academic preparation is implemented across the CSU, we would expect that campuses will do it in a wide variety of ways. Would it therefore be preferable for the CO not to mandate Early Start but leave it for campuses to decide?
- We are strongly opposed to a 3-unit Early Start English class as the only option, given that starting stretch in summer is both disadvantageous to students and unnecessary or not feasible for the following reasons:
 - Disadvantages to students:

- The costs of moving to, and securing housing, on campus during summer;
- loss of income from summer employment;
- financial aid impact;
- enrollment in a writing course isolated from rest of curriculum
 - students need to be enrolled in other university courses co-terminus with their writing courses so that the learning in these courses can be applied/reinforced across the university curriculum;
- Ethical implications in forcing students to enroll during summer.

Multiple Measures: The next topic that received most attention is multiple measures. While there is general support for this approach and an acknowledgement that the CSU is responding to legislative pressures requiring implementation in summer of 2018, the lack of guidance and direction coupled with lack of resources and decision making bodies has caused much angst and generated the most questions. Most of the questions centered on the use of high school transcript data; creation of an assessment rubric, and by whom; flexibility for campuses to create their own measures – and on the other side, the importance of creating uniform system-wide measures so that there will be no variance in campus application processes; the use of AP/IB courses; will pathways for different need levels of preparation be considered; timing of transcript data arriving on campuses; who will be the campus body that takes this on; and differentiating between assessment for proficiency and assessment for placement. Policy/decisions: Currently SAT/ACT is not a requirement for admission and while most students take these exams, we will need to make a policy change. Multiple measures rubrics/pathway need to be developed and decisions made as to weights will be part of the multiple measures rubrics as well as guidance on the campus body that will review and make recommendations for placement purposes. Finally, how will multiple measures be used in the “conditional status” world of EAP (i.e. fourth year QR vs. Alg II pre-req course.)

- How much autonomy will the campuses have in the use of the measures?
- High school grades, high school GPA, SAT, etc. will these be combined? You could get different assessments from the different tools. Without a standardized way of doing this, it could be different from campus to campus.
- We need to know the placements of the students early enough so that we can estimate enrollments in classes, and hire instructors, etc. If the students are going to be taking classes in the summer, in Early Start, that increases the urgency.
- CSU needs to come up with an index that sets the need for extended preparation. This will help the campus predict how much preparatory work the students need.
- Will AP scores also be used to guide course placement for students?
- What to do with the students who need different levels of preparation?
- All CSUs should use the same multiple measures. The CO should provide the campuses with these measures that are evidenced-based and how they align with retention and graduation rates.
- If each CSU campus has to develop their own multiple measures, our “high concern” students will be terribly confused. Also, campuses that have program impaction may just decide to raise their Eligibility Index cutoffs, so they will not admit students who require

Early Start. This outcome may create a two-tier system within the CSU and potentially increase the achievement gaps for those campuses that do not have program impaction.

- We need to differentiate between assessment of proficiency and placement. Many of these measures can be used to determine proficiency but will be of limited use for the determination of specific math/English weaknesses that would lead to proper placement.
- For ES purposes this approach is already an issue as many high schools do not end until middle of June and final transcripts are not immediately available to campuses.
- Once a student arrives on a campus, Early Start, ALEKS, Calibrated Peer Review, self-directed placement, and campus-based exams can be used to guide placement.
- Will SAT/ACT scores and grades in HS in the two areas be averaged somehow to come up with a figure that then determines the need for ES? This sounds onerous in comparison to using the two scores of ELM/EPT. Or will SAT/ACT scores be the most determining factor?
- Would a certain GPA range or score and/or the 4th year of math be a possibility to meet academic preparedness?
- An emphasis on high school courses/grades for placement does not guarantee competency.
- There needs to be a distinction between the dual enrollment and collegiate courses.
- Multiple measure signifies that some criteria might be more weighted than others. Will grades in math classes or specific subjects be more weighted than test scores or vice versa?
- Are we only looking at math and English measures or will other subjects such as science be considered?
- What input will local faculty have in determining these assessment and placement procedures?
- We support the idea of multiple measures; however, these multiple measures need to be available to campuses so that we can place students well in advance of their course selection for fall.
- We support the use of directed self-placement as a measure for use in determining college readiness.
- If there is a GPA component to multiples measures, we would like to advocate for this to be based on the historic baseline GPA for the individual campus and not a standard GPA given to all campuses.
- Potential new wording: “New students shall be assessed using multiple measures, including academic subjects completed in high school, grades in high school courses, high school grade point average, grades in collegiate/dual-enrollment courses, ACT scores, SAT scores, Smarter Balanced Assessment scores and/or Early Start Program outcomes. These measures, along with students’ guided self-placement activities, will guide course placement.”
- It is not clear in the wording that individual campuses will have autonomy in determining course placement procedures. Perhaps rephrasing it as “To guide course placement, campuses are free to develop and adopt placement tools that make sense with local course offerings”

- This is a significant undertaking for the staff and university. Staff will need to look at all the courses on a student's transcript to determine proficiency. This will require knowledge and understanding of all high school transcripts in California. Will guidelines and training be provided to complete this review in a timely manner? Not all students take the ACT and/or SAT. Most do but not all, will these assessments now be required?
- Increasing the number of SAT and ACT test centers for the 2017-18 test year may not be possible since most testing agreements are signed in January so that the websites and bulletins can be finalized.

Timing: Timing received the third most comments. Timing issues fall into two categories: timing for response to the draft EO and timing for implementation of draft EO policy. All comments regarding timing were negative and some raised suspicion as to the release of the draft EO at the end of the academic year when faculty would have limited time for careful consideration and response. As such, many campus academic senates passed resolutions requesting an extension for comment with varying deadlines. The issues related to implementation are specific to the lack of time for course review, assessment of courses that may need modification, courses that may need to be developed, and approval of courses by internal academic processes. There is also a connection with multiple measures – because there is a lack of guidance on how multiple measures will be implemented/used, campuses find it difficult to know how/where to change or develop courses. Again, there is support for changes in academic preparation, however, the lack of time for thorough assessment and implications, the “rush” approach to meet legislative pressures, and lack of a message to students has made everyone wary. Campuses feel that the lack of a set plan for the use of multiple measures will create more confusion for high school personnel and incoming students. Decisions need to be made regarding allowing time in the fall for faculty consultation; multiple measures rubric and implementation plan including needed resources and technology for campuses to put in place (multiple measures decision will help drive course assessment and development; phase in/staged approach an option vs. full 2018 implementation).

- We first request that the deadline to respond be extended until October 16, 2017 to allow faculty time to properly review the draft, as well as our recommendations
- Recommend waiting at least another year for HS counselors to understand the impact of the new SAT before making another significant change to their process. Experience tells us when high school counselors are confused, the students nor the university are well served.
- Recommend the changes be phased in over a few years. That way, the CSU faculty and staff have time to prepare the courses and systems necessary to adapt these changes and the high schools have time to better prepare students in the selection of courses for CSU bound students.
- Release of memo in May is suspect as faculty are done and not required to return until Fall 2017 so there will be lack of responses

- The proposed creation of new courses to assist students needing developmental support in English and Math, the new assessment measures for determining college readiness, and the determination of which Early Start courses will satisfy degree requirements in English and Math all require sufficient time for campuses to assess their readiness to accommodate such changes in policies. Each campus must assess how their current practices align with the suggested changes, must allow for time to consult faculty in English and Math, campus advising units and the appropriate Senate committees. Campuses need time to collect sufficient data to consider new forms of assessment to replace the current English Placement Test and Entry Level Math exam. Time and effort must be given to understand the correlation between grades in high school Math and English courses with the exiting scores to see how well grades substitute for current assessment. We propose that all campus senates be directly consulted in fall 2017 with at least the semester to prepare informed and necessary feedback for shared governance.
- Let us make it clear, the current system is unacceptable, and there are positive things in this executive order. The spirit is positive, but what about the logistics? The timeline and implementation are tough. Must we start in summer 2018? We are very worried about the effect on the students.
- The timeline is scary. What are the students being told? They will get information in the fall after we meet with the high school counselors. We need a detailed timeline on how we're going to interact with the high schools
- Other potential for problem with deadlines. The catalog has a deadline at the end of fall on many campuses. Curriculum and Early Start will take time to develop. We should offer more details to reinforce this concern, what this really looks like.
- Campuses are going to be hard-pressed to have everything in place by summer 2018. Some will have pilots in place by then, but will not be ready to accommodate all entering undergraduates.
- In the future there is a wish for the CO to not send these requests at this time of year. For many, this is the time for finals exams, graduation, and few people have time to review material of this kind. Many faculty complained about this.
- Too much too soon. The CO's desired implementation timeline of 2018 fall is too soon for such drastic changes. It is more prudent to roll out the proposed changes in stages, allowing time for pilots and assessments.
- Until we are given these "new overall assessment standards and objectives" and "guidance on a set of practices to be followed", we are limited in what we can practically accomplish at this time.

Quantitative Reasoning: Quantitative reasoning/math also received a fair number of comments related to how the CO would move forward with implementation of multiple measures for math placement; lack of communication that prospective students need now; pedagogical differences in the approach; the impact on the 120 unit baccalaureate cap; the ethical/social responsibility to students who need additional academic preparation in quantitative reasoning; and, are we creating an environment that will instead widen the gaps. Decisions to be made include the consequences of going over the 120 unit bac cap which concerns mostly the STEM/Business majors; is a math/English practitioner meeting still being planned?

- The proposed EO suggests that there will not be remedial courses in math, that all courses will be college level. What data is there that we can use to place students? Is there evidence based research that the CO can share to establish standards? Can the CSU do some analysis? Should the analysis determine foundational proficiency? GE math level? Supplemental support?
- Classifying students by requiring only students who plan a career in STEM to take courses requiring algebra will only serve to broaden the gap between those who are math literate and those who are not.
- Placing students who are not ready for a college level mathematics course with only supplemental material to remedy deficiencies, will not serve the purpose for which these courses are being created. Instead, it will widen the gap because poorer prepared students (who tend to be economically poorer) will flunk the college level courses. Therefore, instead of improving retention and graduation rates, enforcement of the provisions of the EO will serve to increase drop-out rates.
- Yet to be determined is how bac credit courses taken to address student skills that are found to need additional academic preparation will be reflected within the 120 bac unit cap set within existing majors. Hopefully majors will not be mandated to replace existing bac units for our coursework with units associated with the additional academic prep revealed by student skills assessments. The exemptions to be afforded to STEM and business curricula need to be detailed.
- We should eliminate barriers, especially when we are aware of the effect the barriers have on historically underrepresented minorities. I don't know if there is a civil right involved. The CSU proposal to provide developmental needs of students while they take the college math class and earn a bac credit is a move in the proper direction. We need not limit the career options of students simply because they currently cannot complete IA. We should provide them with the assistance necessary so that they can complete the GE math course and possibly pursue a career in STEM or not. Perhaps they will decide to major in a social science or humanities major where IA is not required, but we know many students change their majors and we should not force students to make a career decision their first semester on a CSU or CCC campus.
- The observation of just about everyone in the trenches is that numerous students are already placed into "college-level" math classes and achieve "passing" grades in those classes, but remain woefully inadequate in their quantitative skills. We already have far too many students who are in STEM majors and really ought not be there but we pass them along because of the political pressures on us. I oppose this draft executive order in the strongest possible terms.
- The draft EO is oddly silent on the adoption of the definition of Foundational Proficiency as recommended in the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force final report. This definition has been unanimously endorsed by all stakeholder groups and should be formally adopted in the EO.
- We expect CO to provide guidelines on how to determine the math readiness level of the incoming students now that ELM will be discontinued. Most probably this will be some composite measure including Smarter Balance test (11th grade), SAT scores, high school

GPA, success in high school math courses etc. It is desirable that instead of getting just a score we also receive the "raw" data on student background. Ideally, instead of ready/not ready, more options will be provided so that we can make our own recommendation to the student supported by clear reasons.

- The brick-and-mortar version should be retained as is, i.e. as ESM 60 and ESM 70, with no college credit because the sole purpose of ESM is to fill gaps in pre-college level math. ESM should not be optional; the CO should either require it or eliminate it. The CO should not insist on a 1-unit option.
- What about the rumor of using ALEKS?
- Math faculty believe that we should be careful not to grant college credit for pre-college coursework.
- If quantitative reasoning replaces the math requirement, we may be depriving students of the opportunity to gain knowledge/skills that makes them intellectually agile for job and career changes. This potential lowering of expectations may actually contribute to the disparity/gap for URM and Pell students.
- Try to take this moment to do something with GE that ensures that all CSU students would mature and grow in their abilities in this quantitative area rather than fussing about the ELM or anything we should look at our curricula.

EAP: Since its inception, EAP has been one of the foundational markers the CSU uses for academic preparation. As such, there was response as to the lack of acknowledgment of this and the overall embeddedness of EAP in the CAASPP/SBAC language. There is a request to make EAP a centerpiece of the 11th grade preparation benchmark the CSU is touting. The conspicuous lack of the EAP reference has made campus EAP folks nervous and others take it as an opportunity to re-purpose funds.

- EAP is not at all referenced in this memo. EAP personnel across the system have high level skill-sets and many connections already established in the local school districts and community. I think this is a perfect opportunity for the CO to proactively consider how to utilize the EAP in implementing the changes outlined in this memo.
- At minimum, **the memo should reference the role that the EAP will play in helping to implement these new measures.** Here are three ideas for how to incorporate EAP into this memo.
 - One solution could be adding a whole sentence that refers to what EAP will do as part of this new framework; i.e.,
 - *The Early Assessment Programs at each campus will be responsible for communicating these various options to becoming college ready for the CSU to local school and district personnel, high school students and parents, and other key stakeholders.*
 - Another option would be to add the entire definition and purpose of the EAP so the link can clearly be seen before then adding the above sentence
 - *The EAP is an academic preparation program designed to... The Early Assessment Programs at each campus will be responsible for communicating these various options to becoming college ready for the CSU to...*

- Finally, a third option could be just to add an asterisk in the memo to the phrase, making it **Smarter Balanced Assessment*, and then noting elsewhere that Smarter Balanced results are also referred to as Early Assessment Program results by CSU campuses. However, this merely connects the EAP to the Smarter Balanced Assessment only, and is thus not the best solution
- The EAP is already responsible for communicating the entire gambit of methods to avoid remediation and become “college ready” for the CSU to administrators, teachers, and counselors at the secondary level, as well as to students and parents. There is an infrastructure in place to generate greater awareness and understanding of these changes.
- EAP should be mentioned in this memo, **specifically the role that the EAP will play in helping to implement these new measures**. If EAP has been shown to result in more students moving up than Early Start, why are we continuing to invest resources and time to expand Early Start? Why not allow stretch experiences across the fall and spring instead of mandating a summer experience? Will there be more investment into EAP efforts across the CSU?
- It seems that EAP is implied in this EO and the Memorandum. When EAP is implied it will be lost to the audience that does not fully understand the multi-layers of a CSU system. Is there any way that EAP can be either written in and/or included with Smarter Balance Assessment and CAASPP on all EO and Memorandums? For example, Smarter Balance Assessment/Early Assessment Program or CAASPP/EAP.
- While the memo states, "*Further guidance on a set of practices to be followed by each CSU campus will be provided after the issuance of the final executive order*", I wonder if there is not an opportunity to include the EARLY ASSESSMENT PROGRAM, somehow in these documents? I also viewed the Board of Trustees meeting which included 30+ minutes of Dr. Blanchard's presentation on what to expect with these changes. Unfortunately, in those 30 minutes there was no mention of EAP.
- We cannot undervalue the importance of making EAP more visible, as we are the feet on the ground, we are the folks that will do the work of getting the word out about this change that will take place within a year. It is an important role that should be recognized and valued. This is not a task that will take place on its own, and will take substantial planning and a strong concerted effort to make it a success for the entire system.

Stretch Programs: Comments specific to this topic includes aversion to creating math stretch courses on the one hand and support of the policy on the other; characterization of stretch courses as a deficit model; reciprocity; 120 credit bac cap; stretch courses for English are not analogous to math and the similar stretch strategies may not be a smart approach; and equity. These comments could be coupled with the Early Start comments above. Decisions to be made include the 120 unit bac cap; ES stretch at service area campuses vs destination campuses; and reciprocity of service area participants in ES; should stretch begin in summer or fall.

- We have concern over the deficit mentality implied in the terminology of providing students with “skills-development support” through “credit-bearing courses” such as Stretch. Framing Stretch in this manner mischaracterizes the learning goals.
- Potential new wording: “For students who would benefit from additional academic preparation, campuses shall offer college-level, baccalaureate credit-bearing courses that provide appropriate developmental support through pedagogical approaches, curricular modifications, and innovative instructional approaches. These may include co-requisite, supplemental instruction or “stretch” courses that fulfill requirements by expanding the number of instructional contact hours across multiple courses or contiguous terms.”
- Giving units for a co-requisite class or expanding the units of an existing GE course or stretching it to two-semester would have the effect of giving college credit to high school mathematics, which has not been the policy of the CSU up until now.
- These seem to circumscribe the use of Directed Self-Placement as practiced for some time. DSP is intended to help students make an informed choice on placement, not to cordon off particular students to particular courses.
- Is the plan for a circumscribed, defined, system-level assessment regime or is the plan for valid assessment that may vary at the local level?
- What about the impact of requiring students in a full 120-unit degree program to take Stretch? This reads to me as an admission that adequate support and instruction is more key to student success than having the normative 120-unit degree closely held to and monitored.
- Math is not analogous to English and there should not be an assumption that stretch for math will be the same as stretch for English. They are not the same.
- Stretch English cannot be started in the summer.
- Can Stretch Math be started in the summer? This will be more of a mess than what we currently do. How will students navigate all this?
- If we started stretch in the fall, what would Early Start look like? Just let the students start in the fall.
- We have discussed putting stretch course in GE Area E Lifelong Learning by building in lifetime benefits of literacy; same could be done for math class (4R) by building in the lifetime benefits of financial literacy. In this way, students who need these stretch/R courses could earn useful credit towards graduation, instead of simply empty units.
- It is not clear how reciprocity for math stretch courses would successfully be articulated when students take the first half of the sequence at one campus in the summer and the second half of the sequence at another campus in the fall. Essential foundational sequential course content may be missed when splitting the stretch sequence across two campuses.
- Equity issues still exist. Stretch courses can work for the students in the middle, but not for the students at the bottom.
- Could students start with taking math in other courses? It would be nice to have start up time to experiment.

EPT/ELM: Clarity on the decision to eliminate EPT/ELM is still needed. While there is support for the elimination of the tests, there is support for a phase out approach as opposed to eliminating them immediately, and there is some support for keeping them; EPT supports some campuses' decisions for DSP; what is being used in lieu of EPT/ELM; concern over no longer providing one last opportunity for the neediest students to demonstrate proficiency; what becomes of test offices and role of test officers; use of EPT by area high schools as a guide will limit valuable resource for high school teachers; need for time to adjust communication to external community of the change; and there is a belief that these will be replaced by something else. The EPT/ELM faculty development committees and the Math and English Councils have submitted separate statements. **Decisions to be made include whether or not to adopt the recommendation for a phased in/staged approach; campus flexibility to allow development of local assessments; and, role of test offices and test officers.**

- Removal of EPT/ELM is a positive step since it not always places students appropriately
- The English department supports the continued use of the EPT as a placement tool as it has been highly effective for this purpose on our campus.
- **The department strongly objects to the recent use of the EPT as a de facto admissions test requiring fully admitted students to attend in summer or lose their fall admission status. The EPT was never designed to be an admissions test.**
- The new English composition program, approved for semesters, had planned to use to the EPT to determine which students would be eligible for directed self-placement (DSP) and which students would be required to do stretch. **Now we will need to develop local placement assessments and determine which multiple measures/cut scores will be used to ensure that students receive appropriate instruction and support to meet their needs in the areas of academic literacy competencies.**
- Given the complexity of developing accurate placement measurements, the stated implementation date of summer 2018 is not reasonable nor will it serve the best interests of students who deserve a thoughtful and effective approach to placement in their first-year college writing class.
- No longer required, or no longer going to be used as a tool? They are not in the list at the top as possible measures. If they are truly going away, just say so.
- Would we be able to offer the test if we wanted to?
- In lieu of the EPT/ELM, the Testing Office will offer the ACT and SAT as needed. As of now, we offer the ACT Residual exam but will have to add SAT to the tests we offer.
- What does this do for the testing office, testing officer, and other employees of that office?
- In general, English faculty support the elimination of non-credit bearing courses and the elimination of the EPT, as both practices promote deficit thinking about students and have not been shown to be as effective as more innovative, research-based methods of education and placement.
- The EPT/ELM offers students who have not demonstrated college readiness through other methods an alternative to do so and at the same time try to get out of attending courses during the summer. While many students may not be successful in passing the test(s), they have “one more chance” to prove their readiness and it’s a choice for them.

- Perhaps instead of retiring the EPT/ELM we consider alternate uses for the tests. Late and out-of-state admits (i.e., athletes, international students) or as an alternative choice for the students who have not demonstrated readiness.
- Area school districts still use the EPT as a guide for college preparation (for better or for worse); the loss of the EPT will eliminate that guide. What will replace our communications to the school districts? We will need extra resources for the “re-education.”
- The English department also supports the EPT committee response to the coded memo and would like to emphasize their requests for a longer phase out period for the EPT, a more reasonable timeline for developing three-unit ESP courses, and access to comprehensive data and analysis of alternative measures (e.g., high school grades, SBAC, SAT, ACT) promoted by the Chancellor’s Office to replace the EPT.
- Draft EO includes a very aggressive timeline for eliminating the EPT and ELM without direction as to what will be used in their place.
- How will students (and their high school counselors and teachers) know if they have sufficiently improved their skills between EAP and high school graduation?

Communication: There is great concern over how the system will communicate these changes internally and externally; a need for all to be on the “same page” will be difficult if a message about these changes needs to be in place by the start of annual high school counselor conferences in mid-September and that deadline is fast approaching; campus publication deadlines are also fast approaching; and, too many changes over the last few years for high school personnel who are already confused about recent changes. **Decisions are needed on the above policies and procedures before a comprehensive communication strategy, plan and campus team trainings are put into place. Campus EAP teams meet in July, Outreach teams in Early August, and CO Enrollment Management teams go “public” with CSU messages at the end of September.**

- Communication is going to be a challenge. We need a communication plan, and timeline. We need all of the campuses to be on the same page
- The time to produce effective and good communication has now passed
- This means that the Executive Order would impact the incoming first-year student cohort that starts fall 2018. This then only allows summer 2017 to communicate or share out with K-12 folks and students. Especially seniors from local high schools who start August 2017 their senior year. Counselors and teachers are accustomed to stressing that students need to take ELM/EPT. **What communication plan does the Chancellor office have and what marketing materials will they share with respective campuses?**
- In the past few years the CSU has had numerous changes to the “exemptions” and while attending EAP workshops with our area high school counselors, they are often frustrated and confused when changes happen too fast to keep track. They find it difficult to track the changes and keep information straight in order to properly advise their students. The most recent changes with the new SAT cut scores caused confusion and frustration.
- Recommend waiting at least another year for the counselors to understand the impact of the new SAT before making another significant change to their process.

- Experience tells us when the high school counselors are confused, the students nor the university are well served.
- Recommend the changes be phased in over a few years. That way, the CSU faculty and staff have time to prepare the courses and systems to adapt these changes and the high schools have time to better prepare students in the selection of courses for CSU bound students.
- Campuses are required to have a written policy/procedure that is published on their websites or other appropriate places. Deadlines have come upon us for this.

Other: The following areas also prompted comments. Although not to the extent as the ones mentioned above: **GWAR; Admission Practices;** clarity on **Guiding Principles** section; Role of the **Admissions Advisory Council;** role of **Online Courses;** clarity on **Purpose and Authority** section; **International Students; Working Groups; Financial Impact/Financial Support** for students and campuses; and **Other.** Decisions to be made/next steps: are we keeping or eliminating GWAR; outline how multiple measures impact the placement and admission process; expansion of the representation of the AAC; processes for international, out of state, special population students (athletes, veterans, etc.); wide distribution of working group roles; analysis of financial impact for campuses; and how to best use online courses.

GWAR

- What is the fate of the GWAR? **Need to review all of the feedback about EO 1100 before a decision is made. Right now, it is still in place.**
- SFSU's Committee on Written English Proficiency strongly opposes the elimination of the GWAR mandate in EO 665. We reject the assumption that GWAR slows students on their path to graduation. More importantly, even if this assumption were true, we question the efficacy of the proposed solution: shortchanging core academic skills in order to speed students toward graduation does a disservice to students and undercuts our educational mission.
- The portion of EO 665 that addresses upper-division writing offers our campus crucial institutional support for our GWAR program. We ask that this portion of the EO remain unchanged.
- Do you have a timeline for when we might hear an update on changes to the GWAR? It will have a more direct impact on my office budget and I want to be prepared.

Admissions

- Particular attention to the implementation of changes in admission requirements needs to occur (i.e. need for resources to permit campuses to work collaboratively with local schools to develop and improve curricular offerings that ensure students have access to four years of appropriate mathematics instruction to meet proposed CSU admission requirements).
- How do we voice our questions/concerns, an example is in the area of the potential implementation of a fourth year of math as an admissions criteria.
- Prospective students and CSU Admissions staff should have a "multiple measures" chart in order to see what exactly determines "proficiency" into college-level courses.

- Additionally, a sentence should be added to (A) indicating that this assessment/multiple measures will NOT be utilized to determine Admission into the university.

Guiding Principles (communication, timeline, committees)

- This is wonderful, providing it comes to fruition; otherwise it is an unfunded mandate.
- Historically, programs created to improve students' college readiness in math and English have had mixed results. More importantly, they can create obstacles for students from underserved communities and block them from attempting the college-level course work to which more privileged students have immediate access.
- We believe we should trust students in their own self-assessment and make any support optional and only required after students demonstrate they can't succeed at college-level courses. For this reason, we object to Early Start if it is a mandated program only for students who are deemed "not college ready". We believe that this type of program further perpetuates the deficit model of traditional remediation. Forcing some students to attend summer school, which can be a significant personal and financial hardship, is not a welcoming or academically supportive approach.
- Although we need a system that creates access for students, we need a design that reduces complexity. Our current system has too many rules and pathways, making it difficult for students to understand despite our best efforts to offer clear communication to our K-12 partners and our incoming students and their families.

Admissions Advisory Committee

- Few faculty on this committee yet curricular decisions being made; add math and English council and APEP chairs.
- How will the committee be used? Only for extraordinary consideration? Who will define extraordinary?
- Is the Admissions Advisory Council meeting? Who is on that committee? Are their academic folks on it?
- Concern over the role of the committee vs the role of the professional CO staff
- Committee presence - may be a good idea to include a counselor level who works directly with the students for input.
- Of particular concern is that future oversight, multiple measures rubrics and placement standards development, approvals of innovative courses and policy interpretation and implementation be provided by expert content faculty and not by the Admissions Advisory Council.
- Do you have any committee operating documents that spell out the voting rules etc.? Is this a senate committee or a Chancellor's committee?

Online Courses

- This puzzles me. Are you referring to online courses offered outside of the CSU? Are there policies in place that would prevent a student from satisfying a remedial course (or college level course) requirement with an online course? And, again, since students can attend Early Start at a campus different than their home campus, which campus policies take precedence?

Authority (Title, Delegation of Authority)

- EO 665 requires for the CSU campuses to monitor progress of students with math and English, will this new executive order no longer require monitoring of math and English progress? I think this needs to be more clear, what does this new proposed executive order mean for executive order 665?

Purpose

- There are some aspects of this that will need to be common across campuses, but I caution against too much top-down direction that prevents campuses from responding to their unique qualities and student body.
- Confusion about admitted students including transfer students

DWID/International Students (Domesitic Students With International Documents)

- Currently do not need SAT/ ACT or CAASPP scores or have high school GPAs to consider.
- How will no ELM/EPT affect the DWID/Intl population
 - Do we still hold a hold a test for them as an option?
- Can HS courses be used as preparedness gauges for this population?
- How will we determine International students' placements?

Working Groups

- We understand that there are six working groups, and that faculty are being recruited for them. One is academic preparation. We would like more information on these working groups.

Financial Implications

- What are the financial implications of this program? There are monetary considerations that everyone needs to think about. Funds for college level classes in the summer for Early Start could just be rolled into the budget.
- Also need to know more about financial aid implications for students.

General Comments/Other

- The most likely outcome of this referral will be an uptick in graduation rates accompanied by a diminution of the value of our diplomas. Then we will scratch our heads and wonder why the disadvantaged students that we serve are not sought by employers when their diplomas are not reliable indicators of basic mathematical competence. Credential inflation is a basic economic fact.
- Lots of confusion in this area writing and QR competency – I believe there was response to two versions of the draft EO.
- Consider adding a section that sets out the current requirements for context? Upon which this EO builds... I suggest this because you first make reference to A-2 and B-4 in Article VI.G in connection with transfer students. Might help a less knowledgeable person to get a quick primer on the existing expectations.

- Careful examination of the relationship between student performance in courses satisfying the new fourth year math requirement and other measures that will be used to determine placement in mathematics courses
- Even for recommending four years of math for Fall 2018, incoming high school seniors probably have their AY 2018-19 class schedule set by now. At least a two-year window should be given for students and their families.
- What happens if a student does not pass the 4th year QR course? Does the student lose his/her status as a CSU student, or is the course, being a regular college-credit course, factored in as any other first-year course?

The following groups were engaged in the consultation process during the development of Executive Order 1110:

Administrative Meetings

CSU Board of Trustees
 Presidents
 Provosts
 Vice Presidents of Student Affairs
 AVP/Deans of Undergraduate Studies
 AVP/Directors of Admissions and Records
 Directors of Outreach and Recruitment
 State University Registrars
 Directors of Academic Advising
 Test Officers
 Admissions Advisory Council

Faculty Group Meetings

ASCSU
 ASCSU Executive Committee
 ASCSU Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committee
 ASCSU Academic Affairs Committee
 General Education Advisory Committee
 Math Council
 English Council
 ELM Committee
 EPT Committee

Student Group Meetings

CSSA Executive Committee

External Meetings

California Department of Education
 California Department of Finance
 Governor's Office

**Chancellor's Office Consultation Schedule:
Academic Preparation for GE Writing and Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning
Requirements**

Date*	Constituent Group
3/16/2017	Academic Senate Plenary Presentation
3/21-22/2017	Board of Trustees
4/5/2017	Provosts
4/18/2017	California Department of Education
4/18-19/2017	CSU presidents
4/19-20/2017	Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Programs
4/20/2017	Academic Senate CSU chairs
4/21/2017	CSU Math Council
4/21/2017	Interim Academic Senate CSU committee meetings: Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee Academic Affairs Committee Executive Committee
4/24-4/26/2017	Directors of Admissions & Records; Directors of Outreach & Recruitment; State University Registrars
4/24-28/2017	Directors of Academic Advising
4/25/2017	CSU English Council
5/16/2017	Draft Executive Order (EO) distributed for comment
5/16/2017	General Education Advisory Committee
5/17/2017	Provosts and Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
5/17-19/2017	Academic Senate CSU meetings: APEP Committee Academic Affairs Committee Executive Committee Plenary
5/22/2017	California State Student Association (CSSA) Executive Committee
5/24/2017	Admission Advisory Council
6/1/2017	English Placement Test Development Committee; Entry-Level Mathematics Development Committee
6/1/2017	Governor's Office & Department of Finance
6/12-14/2017	CSU presidents
6/16/2017	Deadline for feedback on draft EO**
8/2/2017	Final EO Distributed

**In addition to feedback provided during the consultative meetings listed above, groups also provided written feedback. A synopsis of feedback can be found [here](#).*

***Written feedback was received and considered through July 21, 2017.*