

The Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee

MINUTES

Phone Meeting
Friday October 7th, 2011
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

MEMBERS:

Mark Van Selst , Chair	San José
Sandra Chong , Vice Chair	Northridge
Jacinta Amaral	Fresno
Bob Buckley	Sacramento
Karen Davis	Monterey Bay
Harold Goldwhite	Professor Emeritus, Long Beach
Antony Hasson-Snell	Maritime
Kathleen Kaiser	Chico
Carole Kennedy	San Diego
Steven Stepanek	Northridge
Chancellor's Office Liaison	Beverly Young , Assistant Vice Chancellor: Teacher Education and Public School Programs (Will be unavailable, <i>Zee Cline</i> will phone in lieu of Dr. Young)
Executive Committee Liaison	Christine Miller , Member at large, ASCSU (Sacramento)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Amaral, Buckley, Chong, Davis, Kaiser, Kennedy, Snell, Stepanek, Van Selst

MEMBERS ABSENT: Goldwhite (Campus Commitments)

GUESTS / LIAISONS:

Chancellor's Office Liaisons:
Zee Cline
ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison:
Chris Miller
Other Guests
none

TIMES CERTAIN:

12:00 – 12:30 Liaison from ASCSU Executive: Chris Miller

12:30 Early Start and SB 1440 implementation (no person available
[meeting time conflicts])

1. Approval of Agenda

- a. Sandra Chong will take minutes/notes for this call

2. Chair's Report

- a. Note that Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi will meet with APEP re: assessment of Early Start on the Wednesday of the November APEP Meeting.

3. Approval of minutes from Sept 2011

- a. email distribution from Sept 30; now posted online
- b. http://calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/apep/documents/APEP_Sept_2011_MINUTES.pdf
- c. no changes to minutes as posted

4. Campus updates

- a. SAN JOSE: no new report
- b. NORTHRIDGE: Campus selected two faculty to serve on the Presidential Election Advisory Committee. These names have been forwarded to the campus President, who will then forward to the CO/BOT. In regard to GE, double counting is observed all over GE courses.
- c. FRESNO: Campus beginning to implement IBS student evaluations. Faculty concern regarding this has to do with increased burden on staff; senate office has already received boxes and boxes of forms; dept meetings discussion about administrative assistance for distribution of boxes—IBS student evaluation process not thought through well.
- d. SACRAMENTO: Using unit caps as enrollment management tool, and advisement issue with enrollment management noted. Campus is moving to increased double counting of GE—concern that it is driven in part by a need to decrease time to graduation, not increasing student success.
- e. MONTEREY: no new report. Campus went through graduation reform and was an early adopter.
- f. LOS ANGELES: --
- g. MARITIME: No new report. Wants to know about how other campuses are doing double counting of units.
- h. CHICO: Due to budget cuts, campus is in the process of reorganizing; all involved in examining where efficiencies can be achieved. A lot of spurring of faculty comments around this issue. Campus allowed double counting in GE.
- i. SAN DIEGO: no new report.

5. Review/Updates of Prior Senate Action

- a. FIRST READING: http://calstate.edu/AcadSen/documents/09-2011_first_reading_item_packet.pdf
 - i. *AS-3037-11/AA Support for the Establishment of a CSU Professional Doctorate Advisory Committee*
 - a. This resolution is largely in the domain of AA, APEP was asked to address the EdD. APEP resolved to keep the EdD separate from any potential global doctoral advisory committee as presented in the first reading item by AA.
 - b. There were some questions about the charge of any such global doctoral advisory committee.
 - c. Without a defined charge it is hard to evaluate the need for such a committee.
 - d. There was discussion of whether external accreditation (beyond WASC) would suffice for doctoral program oversight.
 - e. There was continued support for collapsing EdD advisory functions into one committee. This will require investigating the legal requirements set up when the EdD was authorized as well as existing ASCSU guidance on the issue (previous advice may need to be explicitly modified).
 - f. **Chong and Buckley will investigate and report back (potentially in resolution format).**
 - ii. *AS-3038-11/AA Support for Establishment of California Community College (CCC) General Education (GE) Pattern and Nursing Prerequisite Courses to Match the CSU GE Breadth Requirement*
 - a. No action
 - iii. *AS-3040-11/FGA Maintaining Quality in the California State University (CSU)*
 - a. No action
 - iv. *AS-3042-11/FGA Maintenance of Public Access to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) Data*
 - a. Data related to K-12 is housed at CPEC.
 - b. CPEC is relatively independent of the segments.
 - c. Maintaining public access to CPEC data is critical.
 - d. **APEP wants to co-sponsor**
 - e. No action
 - v. *AS-3043-11/FGA Presidential Compensation in the CSU*
 - a. No action
- b. Final Resolutions from September: <http://calstate.edu/AcadSen/>
 - i. No action.

6. Review of APEP charge

7. Committee Liaison updates from committee members

- a. Review of Committees (+ verification of existence, who will track, etc.) (and reporting out)
- b. Committee Liaison
 - i. Admissions Advisory Council (Kaiser, Stepanek)
 - a. Admissions appeal – it was represented to APEP that the CSU is already doing the actions requested by the new law.
 - b. Next meeting is at 12/16 at Fullerton.
 - c. Agenda items include: Early Start, Impaction, SB 1440, Application Fees, **and verification of transfer degree (post-registration) [potential action item for APEP].**
 - ii. California Academic Partnership Program (Amaral [Chong as backup])
 - a. RFPs out from CAPP grant and the Grant Review Panel have reviewed proposals submitted and will meet on 10/10 at the CO's office to select four top ranked proposals to be forwarded to the Advisory Comm which will meet on 10/27-28. Chong served on the review panel; Amaral will attend the Advisory Comm mtg.
 - iii. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
 - a. After a discussion of the importance of CCTC to APEP; **Chong was nominated to and verified by the ASCSU executive to be the person to track CCTC meetings for APEP.** The potential for in-person presentation or participation was discussed; it was suggested that CCTC webinar format might improve to allow possible remote participation/questions to be asked.
 - b. CCTC new executive director is Mary Sandy
 - iv. CCC-CSU Transfer Advisory Committee
 - a. STAR committee (SB 1440) replaced this group
 - b. The handicapping of functional involvement was discussed under the SB1440 item
 - v. California Postsecondary Education Committee – (Ornitowski) ends in Dec
 - a. **Kaiser will summarize concerns in a resolution for distribution prior to the November meeting.**
 - vi. Chancellor's Doctoral Incentive Policy Advisory and Applicant Selection Advisory Committees (Guerin, Klink)
 - a. What is the charge?
 - b. Should this be the same committee?
 - c. When does either committee meet?
 - d. What are the charges, should committees be disbanded or combined if they are not functioning as intended?
[Potential action item for APEP]
 - vii. CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee
 - a. No meeting; no report

- b. Collapsing EdD advisory Committee and Board was discussed **[Potential action item for APEP]**
- viii. Early Assessment Program Advisory Committee (Davis, Gubernat)
 - a. Davis notes a lack of communication (she had sent an email introducing herself but has not heard anything back). She will follow up with committee chair.
 - b. APEP feels it would be advantageous to have this committee meet as K-12 has asked for EAP participation.
 - c. It was recommended that APEP actively encourage this committee to have a meeting; potentially on the same day as, but following, GEAC meetings (November meeting).
 - d. It was noted that there does not appear to be a good feedback loop established for EAP developments and activities with APEP and/or committee representatives
 - e. **Davis has been asked to draft a one-page summary/request asking ASCSU executive to request that the EAP Committee meet (requesting info including who is involved, what the charge is for the committee; Davis will consult with Kaiser so as to include appropriate background information shared with APEP at this meeting). The request will ultimately be to Eric Forbes to convene a meeting and to report back to APEP. Agendize for November APEP. [ACTION]**
- ix. General Education Advisory Committee (Van Selst, etc.)
 - a. No meeting; next meeting Nov. 1; no report.
- x. Institute for Teaching and Learning Board (Goldwhite)
 - a. No report (Goldwhite not available)
 - b. GE meeting in Berkeley to discuss assessment (October)
- xi. C-ID meeting (October 14 (south) or 28 (north), 2011) [Van Selst]
 - a. The C-ID group is focused on the C-ID courses (only); it is separate (and separable) from global SB 1440 functions.
- xii. SB 1440 implementation committee [Postma?]
 - a. Neither Postma nor Forbes was available.
 - b. No report was available to APEP.
 - c. "Testing out" for AS-T and AA-T degree requirements as pass-along was discussed.
 - d. Concerns were mentioned about the inclusion of Social work as a SB 1440 discipline were presented (not a transferable degree program), it was suggested that individual participating CSU faculty be contacted and made aware of these concerns **[Action: Kaiser to follow up with relevant CSU / FDRG faculty]**
 - e. A draft resolution (Van Selst) on asking for further faculty involvement was discussed and discounted – the requests

are already in prior resolutions and it is now really about execution rather than policy.

- a. Potential Resolution: AS-3034-11/APEP “*Call for more faculty participation in the development and review of pre-transfer preparation for the major*”
 - b. Elected no action [**Action (no APEP action)**]
 - f. **APEP would like to have an APEP representative on SB 1440 Committee (per APEP charge) [Action: Van Selst (to ASCSU executive)]**
- xiii. Early Start
- a. Other campuses are waiting for Chico’s Early Start implementation (impacted to freshman, most students are transfer and thus students either have to take early start elsewhere OR take online from Chico)
 - b. For Marsha Hirano-Nakamishi’s informational presentation in November, APEP would like to know which campus use (entirely or partially) online Early Start approaches and which showed more and less successful evidence across various modalities and approaches? As context, it was presented to APEP that online success rates appear to be fairly low. [Action: Van Selst (to the attention of Marsha)]
 - c. Online vs. in person early start --- population of WHO takes each; result of each at Fall (post-early start).
 - d. **APEP would like to have an APEP representative on Early Start Committee (per APEP charge) [Action: Van Selst (to ASCSU executive)]**

8. ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison Reports (Christine Miller)

- a. Plan for November
 - i. Wed APEP
 - ii. Thurs at 8:30 onward
 - iii. Friday (Nov. 4th) 8:30 onward
- b. APEP passed along request to add Early Start and SB 1440 representation from APEP to those respective committees.
- c. Miller reported that a resolution will be coming from Goldwhite in November re: best strategies for writing resolution around distribution list so as not to waste plenary mtg time.
 - i. ASCSU agrees that delegating distribution lists to committee chairs and the ASCSU Executive Committee (i.e., much as rationales are treated) makes sense.
 - ii. APEP suggests a distribution list in bullet form at the end of resolution template became a laundry list rather than a resolved-style distribution list.
 - iii. Van Selst noted that a potential concern in implementation is that with the variability of the Exec Committee membership from year

- to year, this task may end up falling on the staff, which would be inappropriate due to lack of context and/or expertise.
- iv. This resolution will be coming from the floor; not a purview of any committee.
 - d. SB 1400 – discipline interest group meetings are happening; Kaiser requested not to have AA in Social Work.
 - e. Professional Doctorate Advisory Committee Resolution
 - i. Van Selst asked about streamlining and if a resolution to keep EdDs separate from a global advisory committee was advisable.
 - ii. Kaiser noted 3 applied doctorates are so distinctly different that one oversight comm may seem inappropriate
 - iii. It was presented that if accreditation beyond WASC is there, no oversight board may be required.
 - iv. The value of a discipline-based oversight committee was discussed.
 - v. The need to foster a doctoral culture was discussed.
 - vi. **See 5(a)(i)(f) [Action]**

9. Chancellor’s Office Liaison Report (Beverly Young [**Zee Cline**, substitute])

- a. EAP and Community Colleges
 - i. Half of the CCCs accept at least one EAP (Math or English)
 - ii. Evidence for EAP/SAT correlation? CCCs are doing mini studies on how the students’ performances correspond with their math and English backgrounds.
 - iii. Math EAP is NOT diagnostic, it is a line in the sand on ready/not ready.
 - iv. It was reported that about half of the CCCs accept EAP; however, it is inconsistent across CCCs as some accept English and some accept Math only. There were Questions around how EAP can be assessed as being effective or not. There appears to be no real assessment from the CSU. The CCCs are doing their own mini studies on effects of EAP.
 - v. CCCs do not generally offer freshman composition classes —that is, remedial reading and writing are separated, so issues around whether the EAP is counted toward reading or writing were also noted as areas of concern.
 - vi. Cline notes that communications around EAP has generally been much better than historically.
 - vii. Kaiser noted issues with “ACCU-placer” and variability in subsequent placement of the students within their CCC.
 - viii. It was suggested that the EAP assessment report does not report what the students’ strengths and weaknesses are; it just determines whether or not students are ready or not.
 - ix. There were further concerns about how high schoolers are informed about EAP results and the presentation of information to

this group about what to do with the results once they do get them.

- b. ELM and EPT—revision of Focus on English and Focus on Math documents (expansion of dissemination of the information on early start and the graduation initiative)
 - i. Cline indicated that ELM is a placement test.
 - ii. CCCs do not have access to ELM result nor do they validate ELM results.
 - iii. Students can take their ELM scores to CCC but CSU cannot send ELM scores to CCCs.
 - iv. It was noted that most students who take ELM are generally headed for CSUs; if you pass the ELM, you'd take ACCU Placer, and go on to other math at the CCC.
- c. Math course for 12th graders (development)
 - i. Cline indicated that Ephraim sent out a request to the academic senate for a representative. 12th graders need a transitional class that meet common core standards that is not pre-Cal or Calculus, and at the request of K-12, CSU is developing that transitional math course, which will be taught in the high school. Modeling after SMI, a professional development model, the course would be designed as an easy course for high schools to adopt.
 - ii. request for representatives
 - a. 3-4 math professors (math council & ASCSU)
 - b. Education professionals (K-12 contacts, ELM members, county office, etc.)
 - c. School principals
 - d. APEP suggests STATWAY involved person might be appropriate.
 - iii. Strengthening mathematics Instruction (SMI) professional development group is well versed on the needed content for such a course
 - iv. The course should be a-g compliant
 - v. Need a course that meets common course standards that is not calculus or pre-calculus (most schools go pre-calculus, calculus, or AP-statistics).
 - vi. Further APEP concerns include:
 - a. Curricular activities happening without faculty input; he requested that the statewide academic senate be consulted for its recommendation when CSU reps are being appointed.
 - b. Math Council be consulted for faculty rep. It was also noted that a quite a few K-12 math faculty, county office people, SMI group have been putting together PDs, so a group of facilitators are out there in the schools, who are also well-versed on EAP and ELM.

- c. It was suggested that a STATWAY person would be appropriate to be incorporated into this process of developing any such transitional math course.
 - d. It was noted that Long Beach Unified School District uses a course heavy in statistics as their (dominant?) transitional math course.
 - d. 100Kin10 (STEM teacher generation initiative)
 - e. Early Start
 - i. Meeting today (thus no APEP progress report)
 - ii. Implementation progresses
 - iii. Counselor conferences have been used for information dissemination – intent is to have the information going out to students (prior to?) their senior year.
 - iv. ERWC conditional status in English (new) should have an impact
 - v. ALEKS seems effective for conditional students who did not do a fourth year of math; less so for online-only non-conditional students – better with a teacher in the classroom (summer bridge or summer camp programs).

10. EAP

- a. See 9(a)

11. ELM/EPT Testing

- a. See 9(b)

12. Early Reading and Writing Course (ERWC) and “math-type” ERWC

- a. See 7(b)(xiii)
- b. See 9(c)
- c. A question was raised as to whether there is a way that students can meet the CSU “prepared” standard in the case where the teacher and/or the course as taught does not conform to CSU-sanctioned training?
 - i. YES, when such a syllabus is sent to Eric Forbes, ELM (math) course will be reviewed and may be approved. EPT (English) non proficient requires AP, IB, or ERWC... no other path (yet).
 - ii. **Action item [Van Selst]: ask Gubernat if can English competency (i.e., out of conditional status) can be met with a non-AP, non-IB, non-ERWC course (i.e, a one-off course and/or non-CSU trained instructor).**

13. Career Technical Education

- a. **Action [Van Selst]: Follow up with Eric Forbes.**

14. Teacher Credentialing

- a. **Action [Van Selst]: Request APEP representative to teacher credentialing (completed and appointed: see item 7(b)(iii))**

15.SB1440

- a. No reporter available; no report; no action
- b. See 7(b)(xii)
- c. Advisability of providing advice to CCC based on CSU experiences and policies: **[Held Over]**
 - i. CCC residency requirements?
 - ii. Multiple degrees (unique content)?

16.Early Start

- a. See 2(a)
- b. See 7(b)(xiii)
- c. See 9(c)
- d. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi. Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research will be invited to present at the October or November meeting on assessment efforts.

17.Admissions

- a. "right to appeal" (CSU admissions decisions) [new state law]

18.Ed.D. Programs

- a. Executive Committee referred consideration of a global doctoral oversight group to AA, consideration of inclusion of EdD to be considered by APEP;
- b. See 5(a)(i)
- c. Feedback on first reading (Sept) item: AS-3037-11/AA Support for the Establishment of a CSU Professional Doctorate Advisory (a.k.a. "*The rationale and charge of a sole doctoral oversight committee for all (professional?) Doctorate programs*")
 - joint programs?
 - PhD joint?
 - EdD included or not?

19.ASCSU Proactive Strategic Planning Actions (re: A2E)

- a. No action

20.Board of Trustee Agendas & Actions

- a. No action

21.CPED

- a. Consideration of a commendation
- b. No action

22.CSU Online

- a. No obvious APEP issue
- b. No action

23. Adjournment

a. 12:05 PM