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ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison:
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Zee Cline  (Chancellor’s Office)  when Beverly Young unavailable
Eric Forbes  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: Early Start, EAP
Carolina Cardenas  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: CTE vis-à-vis a-g coursework
Barbara Swerkes  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: C-ID & SB-1440
Ken O’Donnell  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: COMPASS & SB-1440
Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: Early Start Assessment
Gerry Handley  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: ITL, GE Conference, ALEKS
Ray Murillo  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: Disability Accommodation
Nathan Evans  (Chancellor’s Office)  re: Student readiness and access
James Postma  (ASCSU)  re: SB-1440 implementation
Ken Nishita  (ASCSU)  re: C-ID
Responsibility of the Committee

1. The committee has grown into the expanded role allocated to it in 2009. The current charge of responsibilities is: (see http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/About_the_Senate/bylaws.pdf)

   **The Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee***

   The committee shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:
   (a) matters affecting and influencing the academic preparation of students prior to matriculation within the CSU system;
   (b) programs in the CSU that provide for the professional development of school teachers, administrators, and counselors;
   (c) liaison relationships with CSU Colleges and Schools of Education;
   (d) liaison relationships with community colleges;
   (e) liaison relationships with K-12 schools;
   (f) admission policies and procedures;
   (g) academic entry level preparation and testing (e.g. early assessment and remediation efforts and math and science education);
   (h) freshman level admission requirements (e.g. a-g requirements);
   (i) entry level requirements (e.g. entry level math and English placement testing);
   (j) outreach and recruitment programs;
   (k) remedial education;
   (l) transfer issues;
   (m) legislation related to the education of school personnel;
   (n) intersegmental efforts to improve teaching at all levels;
   (o) educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) programs;
   (p) state legislation having the potential impact on the CSU responsibility to educate school personnel;
   (q) state legislation and regulations concerning the requirements for credentials under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing;
   (r) policies and statewide activities affecting campus teacher education and other credential programs;
   (s) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive committee or the Academic Senate CSU.

2. We also note the bylaw modification in AS-3073-12 “Internal Actions Following the Disposition of Resolutions” which states, in part,

   All standing and special committees shall report to the senate and unless otherwise specifically directed by the senate, shall take appropriate action to follow-up on resolutions which they sponsored, and will note in their committee minutes the results of this follow-up action. Where appropriate, follow-up actions shall be carried forward to future agendas and shared with other committees and entities. Committee recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate.
RESOLUTIONS FROM APEP FROM THE 2011-2012 SESSION

AS-3037-11/AA/APEP (Rev)
Approved Without Dissent
Providing Advice and Guidance to the Development of California State University (CSU) Professional Doctorate and Ed.D. Programs (Attachment) (.pdf)

- The rationale, in part, reads “When the Ed.D. programs were first being developed, as the first professional doctorate degrees within the CSU, it made sense to have a strong formal structure to ensure the development of high quality academically rigorous programs – in 2007, a resolution, AS-2793-07/TEKR (Rev), was passed by the ASCSU in support of the establishment of a CSU Doctorate in Education Advisory Committee. More recent professional doctorate program development has used a similar model as originally adopted for the Ed.D. with senate involvement and membership for various degree program development groups. At this point, new Ed.D. programs will rely on input from existing programs across the CSU, capped by statewide CSU level review consistent with established practice (involving assent of APEP for membership and/or review processes).”

- Senators Chong, Buckley, and Kaiser particularly contributed to these efforts

AS-3041-11/APEP
Withdrawn
Call for More CSU Faculty Participation in the Development and Review of Pre-Transfer Preparation for the Major

- This self-explanatory resolution was withdrawn since it was effectively a resolution affirming prior resolutions of less than a year old. The communications suggested did not rise to the level of a resolution – it was unclear that a resolution would add a useful voice to the existing requests.

AS-3042-11/FGA (Rev)
Approved Unanimously
Public Access to and Continued Collection of Intersegmental Education Data (.pdf)

- Committee minutes suggest that this was to be (October minutes), and was (November and December minutes), co-sponsored by APEP. The resolution supports the need to maintain and continue to collect the higher education data previously collected and housed by CPEC.

AS-3047-11/APEP
Withdrawn
Educational Program Advisory Processes

- The original version of 3047 formed the basis of the rationale and re-structure for AS-3037-11. AS-3047 was focused on the specific concerns of Educational Programs and the statutory need for the involvement of outside constituency groups vis-à-vis the Ed.D. programs. After the initial reading AS-3037 was modified to both reflect the development of ASCSU perspectives and to incorporate these concerns.

- Senators Chong and Buckley particularly contributed to these efforts

AS-3052-12/APEP (Rev)
Approved Unanimously
Action in Response to Education Code Section 66205.8 Regarding the Applicability of High School Career Technical Education Courses Towards CSU Eligibility (Attachment 1), (Attachment 2), (Attachment 3), (.pdf)

- At this point (May, 2012), the Chancellor’s Office is preparing an agenda item for the Board of Trustees which is believed to meet the requirements of the identified Education Code section. The existence of this item was directly induced by this resolution. The item, in its current form, conforms to that requested by AS-3052-12. It formalized the consideration of CTE courses in the existing UC/CSU joint process for consideration of a-g courses. As a side benefit, UCOP and the CSU CO are working to further formalize a previously “understood, but informal” process of how
high school courses get reviewed against the UC/CSU criteria for a-g courses (which reflect development and approval via faculty action of the appropriate curricular governance processes).

AS-3072-12/APEP
Approved Unanimously
On California State University “Courtesy Recommendations” to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

- This resolution addresses a concern about the increase in graduates from non-CSU teacher preparation programs to request, of the CSU, an examination and statement of approval that their non-CTC accredited teacher training background is equivalent to that offered by the CSU. Executive Order 1077 (see http://www.calstate.edu/oe/EO-1077.html), Teacher Education Preliminary Credential Programs, provides the chancellor’s office response to the concerns enunciated in the resolution. The critical components of the revision to the executive order are that “The conveyance of a “courtesy recommend” to the CTC shall (generally) not be granted by CSU campuses. This practice, defined as granting program or subject matter completion by comparison of transcripts from a non-approved, non-CSU program to an approved CSU program, shall (generally) not be allowed.” And further, that “When warranted by the circumstances of an individual case, the appropriate campus authority may grant a courtesy recommendation as an exception. The campus shall limit the number of exceptions to no greater than five percent of the number of students recommended to the campus teacher education program in the current or previous academic year.” These parameters are consistent with AS-1032.

- Senators Chong and Davis particularly contributed to this resolution

AS-3077-12/APEP
Passed without dissent
CMS-Implementation of a Data Collection Survey to Include Self-Identification of Disability and LGBT Status.

- This resolution requests that LGBT status be added as a voluntary self-identification item in questions that are asked of the student after admission but prior to enrollment. As a matter of efficiency in having the CSU meet the needs of its constituents, the resolution also requests that disability status and a request for parental advocacy communications be included into the same survey. The resolution was partially motivated to addresses concerns in compliance with Assembly Bill 620 (Block), which adds gender expression to the definition of gender as it pertains to the Equity in Higher Education Act.

- Senator Kaiser particularly contributed to this resolution

AS-3078-12/APEP/AA
Approved Unanimously
Resolution on C-ID Split Decisions

- This resolution highlights concerns that in the C-ID course approval process, that current implementation allows for a submitted course to be awarded C-ID status even if one of the segments has not agreed that the course meets criteria. The resolution calls for a set of procedures to be developed that clearly define how both segments can come to a mutual agreement in the case of a split decision. There are concerns since the C-ID designations are currently used for describing the coursework within SB 1440 transfer model curricula for AA-T and AS-T degrees and thus their inclusion should contain a mutually understood warrant of content.

AS-3082-12/APEP
Passed Unanimously
Support for Early Degree Progress Assessment and Efficient and Effective Electronic Transfer of Transcripts

- The resolution is consistent with an Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges resolution (06.04 E-Transcripts [Spring 2011]) that similarly encourages Community College Districts to investigate workload efficiencies and potential benefit to students that could accrue as a result of adopting electronic transfer of transcripts. The resolution further notes that movement
towards electronic transcripts will also facilitate the success of SB 1440 in moving towards making earlier degree progress reports available to future transfer students. Many CCC districts do not currently have the ability to electronically transmit transcripts.

### RELEVANT NON-APEP RESOLUTIONS FROM THE 2011-2012 SESSION

**AS-3038-11/AA (Rev)**  
Approved Unanimously  
Facilitating Transfer to California State University (CSU) Nursing Programs by Establishing a Common General Education (GE) Pattern in All California Community College (CCC) Associate Degree in Nursing Programs (.pdf)  
- This resolution is included in this annual report for its direct relevance to pre-transfer preparation (in this case for nursing degrees). The referral from the ASCSU Executive Committee was to AA (given the chair’s expertise) rather than APEP. APEP meeting notes indicate that APEP did not find the content objectionable but was not provided sufficient context to warrant action to co-sponsor the resolution.

**AS-3039-11/AA (Rev)**  
Approved Unanimously  
Support for Initiatives in General Education: The Compass Project and the “Assessing General Education Under EO 1033” Conference (October 2011) (.pdf)  
- It is unclear why this resolution was not co-sponsored by APEP. The COMPASS project (especially COMPASS II) has a focus on encouraging successful transfer and many of the projects are at least partially sited at California Community Colleges. APEP meeting notes indicate support for both the COMPASS project generally and AS-3039 in particular. The resolution is largely a commendation for those responsible for organizing the conference.

**AS-3045-11/Floor (Goldwhite)**  
Failed  
Distribution Lists as Part of Senate Resolutions  
- The APEP committee has a history of believing in (a) only resolutions that have a purpose that will likely yield either a desirable result or deliberate message, (b) short resolutions with “RESOLVED”s that are actually resolved rather than tortured “WHEREAS”es, and (c) distribution lists that are actually easy to read lists rather than tortured “RESOLVED’s. This resolution attempted to have the ASCSU, as a body, adopt the “DISTRIBUTION LIST:” format rather than re-writing distribution lists into the “RESOLVED” format. The item was brought to the plenary by Senator Goldwhite but did not muster enough votes to pass.

### FOLLOW-UP ON APEP RESOLUTIONS FROM PRIOR ASCSU SESSION  
(re: 2010-2011 Session)


**AS-2972-10/APEP**  
Call for the Formation of a Joint CCC-CSU SB 1440 (Padilla) Implementation Task Force on Transfer AA Degrees  
- The SB-1440 Committee is a functioning entity.  
- It is unclear if it will be absorbed into the Student Readiness Access and Success Committee or if it will maintain a separate charge.

**AS-2978-10/APEP/AA**  
Meeting General Education Requirements Using College-Level Approved Examination Program (CLEP) Tests
• It was previously noted that “this resolution could be highlighted in the coming year, very likely via the articulation officers list-serve (may occur through GEAC interactions).” There are large efficiencies to be found via CLEP testing and progress to degrees for some programs and students. Ongoing efforts continue.

AS-2979-10/APEP
Commending Trustee Carter and the California State University for Initiating a National Teacher Education Summit
• N/A

AS-2980-10/APEP
Recognition and Commendation for Efforts That Have Increased Rates of Proficiency in Reading and Writing for Entering Freshmen
• N/A

AS-2988-10/APEP
Public Sharing of Campuses’ Early Start Program Plans

AS-2995-10/APEP
Assessment and Reporting of Results of Early Start Programs
• In May 2009, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted a requirement for Mandatory Early Start programs (as now codified in Executive Order 1048). This resolution requests that benchmarks be established to assess the cost/benefit of the various approaches to achieving proficiency. The intent is to allow systematic data-driven assessment of the effectiveness of the Early Start interventions. The decisions, executive order 1048, and other “early start” information is available at: http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/EarlyStart/index.shtml (“Early Start Initiative”). The follow-up to evaluate and determine best practices in early start is continuing. This statement is supported both by adopted policy and ASCSU Plenary and Board of Trustee reports from CO staff.
• Senator Buckley continues to monitor this for APEP

AS-2998-11/AA/APEP:
Support for Intersegmental Collaboration in the Implementation of SB 1440
• The prior annual report noted that “APEP involvement and feedback into the pre-transfer elements of SB1440 were strained through 2010-11. Hopefully this will be streamlined in some manner for 2011-12.” Although relations were generally better we do note resolution AS-3078-12 Resolution on C-ID Split Decisions.

AS-3001-11/AA/APEP:
Support for a Three-Year Pilot Program of the Statway Curriculum as an Alternative for Establishing Proficiency in Quantitative Reasoning
• The recent (May 2012) math council report recommends against approving STATWAY as a university-level course. There are independent concerns that the amount of Algebra II covered in STATWAY is quite limited. GEAC will be encouraged to continue to monitor the pilot approvals.

AS-3008-11/APEP:
Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Reducing CSU Remediation Needs to Negligible Levels
• See earlier comments on “early start” resolutions and monitoring

AS-3009-11/APEP (Rev):
Commendation to the Office of the Chancellor in Responding to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses
- APEP efforts on CTE continued in 2012. See AS-3052-12 Action in Response to Education Code Section 66205.8 Regarding the Applicability of High School Career Technical Education Courses Towards CSU Eligibility and updates in the discussion of the 2011-12 resolutions.

AS-3014-11/APEP (Rev):
Common Reporting Requirements of Campuses’ Early Start Program Effectiveness
APPROVED
- See earlier comments on “early start” resolutions and monitoring

AS-3020-11/APEP/AA (Rev):
Grade Minima for CSU General Education Course in the “Golden Four”
- The ASCSU supports requiring a “C” grade (2.0) minimum in the CSU General Education Areas of English, Math, Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking for both native and transfer students and requests feedback from the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges on the desirability of such a minimum grade requirement.
- Further follow-up will be needed in 2012-13. This is likely an issue for both APEP (Community Colleges) and AA (CSU). It is noted that ASCSU Chair Postma did accumulate additional data but the current CSU status across campuses is not clear.

AS-3030-11/APEP:
The Importance of Civic Education (CSU Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution, and American Institutions) for both Native and Transfer Students
- This will be a continuing item principally for GEAC (as the de-facto AI committee) and the ASCSU AA committee. APEP will be involved insofar as encouraging SB 1440 degrees to permit and encourage AI (albeit noting restriction against requiring AI). FGA may be involved insofar as the SB 1440 legislation could be amended to include AI.

OTHER ISSUES OF CONCERN TO THE COMMITTEE THROUGH 2011-12

1. Requirement for Multiple Chancellor’s Office Liaisons
   a. The necessity of having a (informal) second liaison from the Chancellor’s Office (Eric Forbes, Carolina Cardenas, Barbara Swerkes) since the charge of the APEP committee does not line up neatly with the divisions within the Chancellor’s Office. This reality places a burden on the chair to ensure that there is a CO representative available to discuss or present details of initiatives and/or up-to-date status reports that would otherwise be unavailable to the committee.

2. The elimination of CPEC and the preservation of CPEC-type functions
   a. Competition to be the “hosting agent”
   b. Potential for egregious legislative action

3. California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP)
   a. It is a very visible failure when the ASCSU representative does not attend; timely notification of the need for replacement was discussed.

4. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC)
   a. Possibility of non-accredited coursework used to determine ECE eligibility (see letter attached)
   b. History, Background, and other context behind ASCSU action on “Courtesy Recommendation” from the CSU to the CCTC
   c. The future data collection and retention of the “CPEC data set” should remain of interest to APEP.
   d. In December, Senator Chong was appointed to track CCTC for APEP.

5. SB1440:
   a. APEP reiterates that SB1440 is squarely within the charge of APEP and an ASCSU member appointed to the SB1440 implementation committee should sit on APEP. We
appreciate the efforts of Chair Postma and Eric Forbes to address these deficiencies during the 2011-12 year.

b. what does “similar” mean vis-à-vis appropriate preparation for upper division coursework
c. grade minima for AA-T and AS-T degrees
d. impaction (at the campus and program level)
e. “local” campus (evolving definitions re: eligibility and preference for campus attendance)
f. TMC development
   ▪ E.g., Social Work is not really a lower division discipline
g. C-ID descriptor development
h. TMC approvals at the CCC system office
i. C-ID course approval processes
j. C-ID recertification of courses and C-ID revisitation of descriptors
k. What does an AA-S or AA-T degree mean
   ▪ “Testing out” of requirements may not transfer to CSU
l. Can a student yield multiple degrees (has CCC dealt with unique unit requirement yet)
m. Electronic transfer of transcripts
n. Tracking of degree progress at the CCCs
   ▪ Student self-reports of AA-T and AS-T status are not reliable for use in admissions

6. Student Readiness Access and Success Committee (aka "student success super-committee")
   a. The formation of a charge for this committee is crucial. There are a number of directions such a committee could take (high level policy only to addressing hands-on implementation details)
   b. EAP
      i. Structure of the test (extra 15 items to English and Math for assessment)
      ii. Timing of testing and feedback to students
      iii. Conditional status for both Math and (as pilot) English (re: Long Beach)
      iv. Note the report attached to the NOVEMBER 2011 APEP minutes
   c. ELM/EPT as placement exam (vs. diagnostic)
      i. Registration and tracking processes are improving
      ii. Placement exam versus diagnostic testing
      iii. Timing of testing and feedback to students
   d. Early Start
      i. APEP notes difficulties addressing “early start” without committee representation on APEP. We appreciate the efforts of both Chair Postma and Eric Forbes to address these deficiencies during the 2011-12 year.
      ii. Managing expectations for and documenting the initiation (and completion) of Early Start
      iii. Structure of fees for early start
      iv. CMS/ETS reporting structures for early start data
      v. Connection of ICAS standards and the question of “when is remediation done”?
      vi. Is Math + English remediation required to be “early start” or is starting only one ok? (one is ok)
      vii. Effectiveness of ALEKS (computerized math tutoring)
         1. Gerry Handley met with APEP to discuss disability accommodations
      viii. Early start as offered via CCC mechanisms (to be reported out and pursued for the future)
   e. Relation of this committee to SB1440 implementation.
   f. It is noted that Senator Davis played a large role in pushing for the EAP advisory committee to meet (and later to push for the Student Readiness Access and Success Committee to both meet and establish a charge).

7. EO 1040 and EO 665 rewrite
8. ERWC-style courses (English and Math)
   a. Concerns regarding the distribution of ERWC-training and adoption both in and out of California
   b. Development of Math ERWC-type course (Long Beach)
9. CTE in high schools  
   a. Status of UC admissions standards (BOARS) vs. CSU – the primary concern was to attempt to keep the standards as aligned as possible

10. External to the CSU Educational Standards  
    a. ACHIEVE/PARCC/Smarter Balance  
       i. E.g., smarter balance uses computer-adaptive assessment systems and is working to ensure that CA standards are included or used for Federal readiness standards.
    b. Common Core  
    c. California Alliance for Teacher Preparation: NCATE-based alliance, see *Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*
    d. Chair Postma was working with Beverly Young to ensure that faculty appointments to subject matter projects go through the ASCSU.

11. “Transfer” of disability status / testing from CCC to the CSU.  
    a. Improved mechanisms for determining/evaluating disability status  
    b. May include looking at which tests or criteria the CSU might adopt as transferable?

12. GE-related  
    a. COMPASS & COMPASS II  
    b. ITL Conference  
    c. STATWAY  
       i. GEAC approved pilot (year 2 of 3 now)  
       ii. Math Council was not supportive (per May 2012 report to the plenary) of considering STATWAY as university-level content

13. Access to Excellence  
    a. APEP was asked, but did not address, the question of which A2E elements are within the purview of APEP and what actions/initiatives/focused attention should be brought to engage positive movement on those items.

---

**GENERIC AGENDA (suggestion for 2012-2013 year)**

**MEMBERSHIP:**  
**MEMBERS:**  
<Alphabetic list of ASCSU members>  
ASCSU Executive Committee Liaison:  
<liaison>  
**CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE LIAISON**  
<liaison>  
**GUESTS** <with titles and time-certain>  
<informal liaison & other guests including ASCSU guest visitors>

1. Approval of the Agenda  
2. Review and approval of the minutes  
3. Chair report (includes items from executive)  
4. Campus reports  
5. Committee Reports  
   a. <go through appointments and pull out those of members relevant to APEP>  
   b. <include pertinent others: CAPP, SB 1440, admissions-advisory, GEAC, etc. even if the committee constitution did not include the relevant appointed ASCSU senator to APEP>  
   c. List ASCSU representative to each committee  
6. CO liaison report (time certain 11:00)  
7. ASCSU committee liaison reports (time certain 1:00)  
8. Review of APEP charge and year-end report (Sept. only)  
9. Review of prior ASCSU actions relevant to APEP  
10. Chancellor’s Office Response to ASCSU Resolutions  
11. Legislative Report (re: items relevant to APEP)
12. Student Readiness Access and Success Committee ("Student Success Super-committee")
   a. EAP
   b. ELM/EPT
   c. Early Start
13. Admissions-Related Content
   a. Service areas
   b. Admissions criteria changes
   c. "special admissions" processes
14. GE-Related Content
   a. American Institutions at transfer institutions
   b. Grade minima for non-"golden four" content
15. Education Content
   a. Teaching Standards
   b. K-12 related content
      i. University readiness
      ii. Common core
      iii. Career Technical Education
   c. Ed.D. Programs
16. BoT Agenda
17. Strategic Directions
   a. Access to Excellence
TO: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

FROM: Mark Van Selat

RE: Non-accredited coursework towards ECE certification

DATE: April 20, 2012

Dear Commissioners,

The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) has a concern about one of the agenda items from the Commission’s January 2012 meeting. We would like to specifically address the reports out of the stakeholder meeting regarding the potential approval of non-regionally accredited coursework for the Child Development Permit as proposed by the Montessori group. Approval of such coursework would jeopardize a core principle that underpins the high standards and quality that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing has been working to uphold in P-12 educators across the state of California through its accreditation process. Comprehensive preparation of early childhood educators is fundamental to quality early child care and education. Moreover, research highlights the relationship between well-educated, skilled educators and high-quality programs for children. Further, this same research stresses the importance of quality early education to children’s future academic success.

Historically the CCTC has held a primary function of quality assurance by setting standards and guidelines for accredited programs. The proposal to allow non-accredited coursework to count toward candidacy for ECE permits undermines the quality assurances inherent in the accreditation process. Furthermore, commission approval of such coursework will create a dissonance between the requirements for ECE certification and the eligibility towards qualification for the pursuit of further academic degrees.

At present, accredited degree programs require both depth and breadth in theory and practice in the field. It is essential that this requirement be maintained. A process has long been in place, in California, that allows non-regionally approved coursework to be assessed against approved CCTC standards by faculty of accredited institutions. This process enables individuals to receive college credit for courses, without circumventing the rigorous standards set forth through accreditation. We believe this option is an appropriate path to maintain.

Therefore, on behalf of the faculty of the Academic Preparation and Educational Programs committee of the Academic Senate: California State University, I am urging the CCTC maintain current accreditation requirements, and in so doing, maintain the rigor, breadth, and professional preparation that they represent.

Sincerely,

Mark Van Selat,
Chair, Academic Preparation and Educational Programs committee, Academic Senate: CSU
Professor of Psychology, San Jose State University