Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Minutes (Approved/Final)
Friday, December 1, 2017
10:00am-2:00pm

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/apep/index.shtml

Present: David Barsky, Mark Van Selst, Sandra Chong, Bill Eadie, Kate Esposito, Denise Fleming, Barry Pasternack,

Absent: Sue Holl, Jeffrey Reader

Liaisons: Chris Miller [ASCSU], Eric Forbes [CSU CO], Marquita Grenot-Scheyer [CSU CO]

Guests: Rick Ford

1. Agenda approved

2. Approval of November 2017 meeting minutes
   a. Delayed to end of meeting

3. Chair’s Report
   a. No feedback from resolutions from November
   b. What we need re: shared governance and our actions within this committee to ensure that we have a common understanding (e.g., authentic collaboration on initiatives) with our liaisons.
   c. EO 1100, EO1110 unlikely to be walked back despite problematic etiology and timeline
   d. Discussion at Extended Executive Committee about a possible tuition increase and how this is being represented in terms of a small slate of possible options being presented, and how this could be construed as a result of the faculty contract.
   e. In-person interim meetings. Participation in virtual meetings does not seem to be a major problem for APEP; there are concerns that the money could be better spent by adding an additional Senate work day to the beginning or end of some other necessary travel (plenaries or the Academic Conference) rather than a stand-alone one-day meeting. The possibility of weekend interim meetings was floated, but it sank.
4. Old Business:
   a. AS-3311-13/APEP An Alternative Process for C-ID Course Review
      i. What is trigger
      ii. Is C-ID based articulation widely used?
      iii. Are CCC chairs willing to do this?
      iv. Would this fix curricular drift?
      v. What happens to a problematic course?
      vi. Modality question – outcomes not mode
      vii. Is this a good idea
      viii. There are not that many subject areas where a lack of reviewers seems to be a major problem: number of subject areas with unsupported reviews is low and tend to be “low impact” (a question of whether many of the courses should even be C-ID articulations per a cost-benefit analysis)
      ix. **ACTION: do not move forward on this resolution**

5. New Business: Discussion and Possible Resolution Items
   a. Recommendations from the Drafting Team of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force
      i. A Call for Productive Engagement on Quantitative Reasoning
      ii. Guiding Principles for Quantitative Reasoning
      iii. A Proposed Implementation Plan for Reforming General and Remedial Quantitative Reasoning in California
   b. Math council resolution on proctoring of online courses
      i. APEP Generally supportive of the idea
      ii. **ACTION: possible referral to Academic Affairs Committee**
   c. Possible Tuition Increase

6. Updates (relevant to APEP) from Members with External Committee Assignments
   a. Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Course Development Workshop (David Barsky, Mark Van Selst)
      i. Well worthwhile in terms of developing a better understanding of what EO1110 implications are (e.g., what is and is not permissible; the role of summer 2018 pilot experiments)
      ii. It was suggested that APEP could investigate building a QR rubric to guide assessment of submissions to the new standards
      iii. **ACTION: possible January Resolution: subcommittee of Mark, David, Rick will communicate with GEAC chair Kevin Baaske**

7. Executive Committee Liaison report: Chris Miller (12:00 time certain)
   a. Delayed response from CO to ASCSU resolution response
   b. Catherine Nelson was unavailable (catch-up of instructional time due to fires that closed campus)
   c. Started discussions/meetings with CSU CO w.r.t. shared governance
   d. Trustee selection process recommendations will be forthcoming

8. Chancellor’s Office Liaison Meetings
   a. AVC Eric Forbes (On jury duty; called into meeting at 12:30)
i. Early Start programming (placement) ongoing into CMS for EO1110

ii. B4 course will be doubly impacted this year because students from 2016-2017 who undertook remediation will be in B4 and students from the 2017-18 cohort with concurrent proficiency development will both be taking B4 in 2017-2018.

1. QUESTION: how will early start category be represented in PeopleSoft? Hard-code or dynamically assessed? ANSWER: either are possible. The ability to track student progress is desirable.

2. QUESTION: Can we differentiate category 4 by degree of development required? ANSWER: unclear, will have to follow up to see about continuous versus categorical data.

iii. CalState Apply increased over last year in terms of applicants (many last minute applications just before deadline)

1. Now working to improve the system (campuses have been asked to contribute their top 20 requests for needs/wants of the system)

iv. The CSU has responded to trailer budget language from 2017:

1. Redirection of eligible students will be within CalState Apply
2. Local area preference has been implemented
3. Multiple measures have been accommodated via EO1110

v. COMMENT: can CSU and/or C-ID induce reviewer incentive for high-need areas? (e.g., $250 after first four reviews in high need areas)

1. ACTION: This likely does not rise to the level of ACTION via resolution but should be pursued in future APEP meetings and/or with exec.

b. AVC Marquita Grenot-Scheyer

i. Time certain: 11:00-12:00

ii. Positive comments on commendation

iii. Math Development Center Steering Committee

1. Developing Math Modules

iv. CTC (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing): Shared the December 2017 agenda and presented information on item 1-H, Study Session on the Education Specialist Credential. Described the importance of this work, the context that the agenda item describes, and the task force reports supporting collaboration between teacher education and special education programs.

1. A special task force on education specialist credential will be presenting models of education specialist credential program for Commission review and approval. This proposed model points all teacher prep programs—Multiple Subject and Ed Specialist—to share a common set of competencies. If approved and adopted, it will have a significant impact on the way California prepares education specialists.

2. The crux of the newly proposed model reflect the importance of common areas of competencies for all teachers, directly reflecting the new TPEs. For example, SPED Ed teacher will need also need to be able to demonstrate competencies in this common area of
teacher competencies, e.g., subject area content knowledge (see email attachment of the document Marquita sent.)

3. Marquita asked input from COE deans and faculty across CSU on the task force’s proposed models (specifically on pg 14 of the attached document), and also encouraged them to provide testimonies at the next commission meeting in December.

4. Newly proposed special education program models will reflect two levels of education specialist credential; TK-8 prep & 8-12 prep.

v. CMRCI (California Mathematics Readiness Challenge Initiative) meeting was held at the CO: The CAIQR (Center for the Advancement of Instruction in Quantitative Reasoning) is facilitating and supporting collaboration among five projects funded by the 2015-16 State Budget Act. Each project is developing and collecting evidence for statewide use about new high school fourth year math approaches and professional development (ede.ca.gov/fg/fo/r12/cmrci16results.asp). CAIQR will facilitate a meeting with these CMRCI project directors as well as CSUN’s TCMS (Transition to College Math and Statistics) Leadership. CMRCI participants include faculty from both Math Departments and Colleges and Schools of Education who have been instrumental in the transition from K-12 to higher education.

1. Several CSU campuses received the CRM funding, CSUMB, SDSU, SAC STATE, SAN BERNARDINO, & UCLA; each received $1+ mil. (Northridge did not receive CRM funding, but has some other funding; Kate Stevenson has been invited to join the CMRCI collaborative.

2. Purpose of funding is to support campuses to develop 4th year math readiness courses (Initial grant funding was 2015; another grant cycle may become available)

3. Marquita indicated that Project directors will be brought together to get updates on their project progress.

vi. The search process for the new Director of the Teacher Ed Public Schools Program looks really good. There is an excellent candidate pool.

vii. CSU Faculty Workshops co-sponsored by CAIQR and ITL: the workshop were well received by faculty in attendance. APEP members who attended concurred that there was great value in having colleagues come together to engage with one another and that the presentations were useful. Zee has been working closely together with faculty to ascertain what faculty PD needs are in relationship to teaching developmental courses. Suggestion to guide the development of future workshops included the following:

1. The need to be mindful that the pool of instructors is ever changing; thus will need to develop future workshops to accommodate.
2. Some faculty may prefer workshops during the summer, intercession, or during May break, while others would prefer workshops during the academic year.

3. Online learning modules might be a very useful way to deliver content; these could be updated on a regular basis.

viii. Questions to Marquita from APEP members include the following:

1. Request for an update on AB 169 O’DONNELL – teacher credential teacher recruitment: Golden State Teacher Grant Program.

2. When asked what Marquita has been hearing from the K-12, if any, about the 4th year math requirement, she noted that she met with the K-12 school districts and they generally like the idea of adding the 4th year math, but the serious concerns are around support to develop 4th math courses, staffing needs, faculty PDs, course scheduling needs, etc. She is hoping the new Center Director, once hired, will help CSU move the Center work forward.

3. What can CSU/APEP do to get the word out to the K-12 about the 4th year math? Marquita noted that an advisory group for the Center will be formed and she hopes APEP membership on the board will be prevalent.

4. Are there any grants out there to help develop 4th year math?

5. There was a brief (positive) discussion on the need for strong consultation, communication, collaboration, & joint involvement in decision-making with CO administration (largely revolving about early involvement in initiatives and being explicit about consultation and curricular consequences).

9. Draft January Agenda and Action Items
   a. ACTION: APEP is responsible for hosting the social at the January plenary

10. Other Business
   a. As incorporated above

11. Adjournment

Minutes Approved: January 24, 2018