

**Academic Preparation and Quantitative Reasoning
Steering Committee
6-9-2021**

In Attendance

Lande Ajose, Marty Alvarado, Mary Barlow, Alma Barreras (for Tony Thurmond), Fred Wood (chair), Robert Collins, Linda Darling-Hammond, Nathan Evans, Wenda Fong, Alondra Esquivel Garcia, Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, James Minor, Romey Sabulous, Ilene Straus and Edward Sullivan

Welcome

Dr. Fred Wood welcomed participants to the third meeting of the Academic Preparation and Quantitative Reasoning Steering Committee. He thanked members for their time and expertise, and outlined a brief agenda focused on updates on existing efforts. Dr. Wood stressed the importance of providing transparency and allowing the opportunity for the committee to ask questions and share their feedback on these items. A new committee member, Dr. Christopher Nellum, was announced and will be welcomed formally at the next meeting.

Research Study Update

Dr. James Minor provided a brief update on the status of the research study by MDRC, updates that were made in response to feedback provided by the steering committee. The scope of the study has been expanded to include fall 2020 data which amounts to approximately 400,000 students. The intention of this addition is to capture information on the potential impact of the pandemic on student learning. In addition, the qualitative aspect of the study also has been expanded to nearly double the original number. Dr. Minor shared one concern voiced by MDRC, which is the challenge of having individuals participate in the study. He invited committee members to share ideas of how to best communicate to stakeholder groups and encourage them to speak to MDRC. In closing, Dr. Minor shared that the timeline for the study has been extended to accommodate these changes. A final report is planned for February 2022, followed by a presentation to the CSU Board of Trustees in March 2022.

Questions/comments from the committee included:

- Is there a way to encourage participation from districts or will it impact the study?
- A similar study was sent out and superintendents added a message to school districts and California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA).
- Can you clarify what the MDRC study participant number is now? Who is in the educator group? Who is in the family group?
 - The number is 80: 30 educators and 50 students, family members and some community members according to contractual revisions made with MDRC.
 - Educators could include district administrators, principals, school staff and CDE leaders.

- Sampling strategy for a state as big as California is challenging. A focus was placed on URM students in high need school districts, but with a cross section from various communities across the state.

Teacher and Course Capacity Update

Dr. Marquita Grenot-Scheyer provided an update on CSU efforts to support course and teacher capacity. She referenced previous committee updates which focused on the five challenge grants, and shared that co-directors continue to work with these campuses. Other initiatives created to build capacity related to quantitative reasoning include: Cal State Northridge work with Los Angeles Unified School District to address teacher challenges in Algebra 1 instruction; Cal State Teach's K-8 math literacy project designed to increase proficiency and confidence of teachers in math, starting in earlier grades based on feedback by the steering committee; and promoting the use of math diagnostic programs. Dr. Grenot-Scheyer also provided an update on the math and science teacher initiatives which was launched in 2005 and described a downward trend in numbers. Dr. Grenot-Scheyer and Dr. Uy met with MTSI directors to emphasize the importance of using proven best practices and increased accountability, trying to provide the right amount of support and pressure to increase number of teachers. Enrollment in teacher preparation programs has increased, and campus deans are reporting advisors are sharing that students applying are speaking to the need to give back to communities and to address issues of social justice.

Questions/comments from the committee included:

- How has COVID and retirements impacted recent teacher numbers?
 - The retirement of teachers will have an impact. We can continue our work with district partners to retain teachers. We will continue to work on all parts of the pipeline, not just recruitment.
- What about working conditions and salaries for teachers? With more money coming into the system, how do we use the resources to create the condition teachers want to teach and salaries they deserve?
 - Nine out of 10 positions to fill are a result of people who left. The Governor's proposal around testing will allow course work options so people with a major in a related field can enter rather than taking three subject matter tests. Fifty percent of people who enter California who want to teach math are weeded out because of the tests.
- What kind of pressure can be used to encourage the increase of teacher production?
 - There is a need for both pressure and support. In the past, there was less scrutiny on the actual production of teachers. In the past, we gave campuses the freedom to develop and implement best practices. In the last year, we took a deep dive into practices as they relate to actual production and some campuses are seeing a decline in number of candidates despite level of funding. We are working closely with MSTI project directors to revise their plans to use demonstrated best practices.
- What is the actual percentage of increased enrollment? And what is the projected number if they become math and science teachers?

- Enrollment is up 15 percent. We can look into what percentage are math and science teachers.
- Can we fuse culture competence with STEM? Is there a way we can collaborate in outreach?
 - We will continue to explore ways to incorporate practices of culturally responsive pedagogy with our efforts to increase STEM teacher production.

Facilitated Brainstorm: K-12 Partners Outreach

Dr. Nathan Evans invited committee members to share ideas and insights on how to continue to communicate with educators and teachers, with an eye to fall 2021. He suggested the focus of the outreach could encompass not just quantitative reasoning but academic preparation and career planning writ large. For example, how can we leverage channels such as counselor conferences, social media, statewide forums and more? And what new professional learning spaces and venues should we explore?

Questions/comments from the committee included:

- The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) is a great avenue to have this discussion. The annual summit is in January.
- The fall summit is in November in San Francisco. There is a call for presenters, might be an opportunity. Everyone is talking about college and career prep.
- CCSESA hosts an annual symposium in February which draws instructional leaders from across the state.
- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) receive feedback from faculty to ensure students are prepared and college ready. Bridging faculty expectation and student effort is important to ensure true college preparedness.
- What about welcome back efforts and engaging directly with families? What onboarding conversations are happening?
- California School Boards Association (CSBA) – early December meeting.
- How is the CSU structuring courses available for high school students in settings for dual enrollment credit progressing?
 - We can share with you what campuses have dual enrollment and what the courses are so we have a starting point. Our efforts have not recently been focused on increasing courses, but we can look at increasing in coming year.
 - Trustee Steinhauser has discussed work by Long Beach City College and Cal State Long Beach and what that can look like at a greater scale. We may have more to share at the next meeting.
- How to weave ethnic studies with quantitative reasoning? With our students who want to give back and who also want to be culturally competent. Is there a way to enable this fusion?
- Do you have a sense of an implementation timeline for the proposal?
 - The board must first take action on the proposal, something that is expected to happen after they have had the opportunity to review the report submitted by

MDRC. The board, according to its January 2020 resolution, will consider a Title 5 change by Spring of 2022 and an effective date of fall 2027.