The Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Minutes
Wednesday, December 7th 2012
Virtual Meeting
10:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Members Present: John Tarjan, Jacinta Amaral, Sandra Chong, Andreas Gebauer, Kathleen Kaiser, Kimberly King, Steven Stepanek

Visitors: Glen Brodowsky (Executive Committee Liaison), Carolina Cardenas (CO)

1. Vice Chair welcomed the committee at 10:10am

2. Announcements
   a. Chair Buckley is absent due to a medical issue. Vice Chair Tarjan will be chairing the meeting.

3. The agenda was approved with two additions.

4. Extended Executive Committee Meeting (8:30-9:30 am) Report
   a. John sent notes from this morning
   b. Announcements/Chair’s Report
      i. Bob Buckley has cerebral bleeding and is in the hospital.
      ii. WASC Redesign Committee has met and came up with a comprehensive report—will be distributed. Diana will compare the revised handbook to the suggestions received to date.
      iii. Diana spoke at an event at CSULB. There were many CCC representatives and a number of senate chairs there. Diana spoke about Prop 30 and some budget-related issues. She talked with the UC chair about similar issues of interest.
      iv. We need 2 more campuses to approve our constitutional amendment.
      v. SB 1052/1053 (open resources bills)
         1. Diana and the other two senate chairs, Steinberg’s chief of staff, Gerry Handley, others met to discuss.
         2. There is $5m of state funds, we do not have the $5m in matching funds yet so cannot move forward.
         3. Before texts can be adopted they must have faculty review and accessibility review. The CSU has taken the lead on this.
      vi. Senate Chairs Meeting Report
         1. Ben Quillian attended the meeting. He will be interim Chancellor until Chancellor White takes over.
            a. Cal State Online needs more seed money. ($5m?)
               i. He is awaiting a more developed business plan.
            b. SUG—there is increasing concern that the middle class is being squeezed
            c. CMS will need more resources
            d. Semester conversion—being pushed by presidents
               i. Some pushback, still alive
               ii. Also want to move to a common calendar
            e. Presidents are asking for deferred maintenance funds
            f. Difficulty in recruiting sr. faculty and administrators with PERS restrictions
               i. There may be some supplementation of executive pensions via 403(a)
g. Looking at centralized purchasing (chemicals, police vehicles)
h. Strategic enrollment management—problem with taking students over target
   i. Campuses should have more leeway on enrollments
i. Unions are demanding the CSU pick up increased benefit costs
j. 3 campuses are generating power with fossil fuels, we have to pay $3m per year under cap and trade. It would cost more to bring the plants into compliance with carbon targets. Perhaps we can have the state look at us as a system rather than as individual campuses.
k. Ben is reviewing the charges of the various CO units.
vii. We need to have a committee for Smarter Balance testing to replace EAP.
c. Standing Committee Chair Reports
   i. Academic Affairs—CS Online, etc.
   ii. Faculty Affairs—departmental voting
   iii. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs—advocacy planning, SUG
d. Baccalaureate Unit Limit
   i. There is some opposition on the campuses.
   ii. A CO representative “doesn’t think anything will change.” This begs the question about why have a Title 5 change?
e. SUGs—perhaps we need to look at all tuition, fees, other financial issues
f. New Chancellor Transition—there was a review of suggested topics for Senate leadership to raise in their first meeting with the new chancellor.

5. The draft meeting minutes were approved.

6. Carolina Cardenas Report
   a. Common Core Standards
      i. Two groups were given funds to develop assessment instruments for the 50 states—Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and PARC.
         1. CA is part of Smarter Balance
         2. Faculty across the nation have been meeting
         3. Bev Young is on the Board, also a member of CDE
      ii. This testing will take the place of CST in 2014-15.
      iii. There will be testing in 2nd-8th grades and in the junior year of HS.
      iv. We will be pilot testing in 2013. Schools are being solicited for participation.
      v. The testing will be computer interactive.
      vi. The scale will be 1-4 in each subject area. It may be comparable to what we currently do in EAP.
      vii. Faculty participation is being solicited.
      viii. Implementing a computer-based test raises a lot of issues for CA.
      ix. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi has requested pilot data to help our faculty understand how the HS results could be used for EAP purposes.
      x. There is a SmarterBalance.org website www.Smarterbalanced.org/about/
      xi. www.corestandards.org
   b. Applications—We had approx. 763,000 duplicated applications, a 12% increase. The largest increase we have had. We had 295,000 unduplicated applications, about a 10% increase.
   c. Career Technical Education—no report at this time.

7. Review and “perfection” of first reading resolutions presented at the November Plenary
   a. AS 3001 “Support for Alternative General Education Pathways for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) Transfer Students”
      i. No changes recommended.
b. AS 3003 “Importance of Considering the Unique Characteristics of the CSU Student Body and the Differential Impacts That Proposed Policy Will Have on Students”
   i. John will ask Darlene if AA is interested in co-sponsoring the resolution.
   ii. No changes recommended.

c. AS 3004 “Faculty Involvement in the Establishment of a Uniform Set of Academic Standards for the Inclusion of High School Career Technical Courses (CTE) in Area g of the CSU a-g Admissions Standards”
   i. No changes recommended.

8. Other APEP related issues and potential resolutions.
   a. The committee initiated a request for data related to Early Start. Eric forwarded the request to Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi. Bob will follow up with her.
      i. We should ask for comparison data for students who were eligible for Early Start but did not participate.
      ii. Comparison of success of students participating in Summer Bridge and other existing summer remediation programs vs. Early Start programs. Also, we would like comparison data with existing stretch courses.
      iii. We would like to get as much data now as is possible—knowing that some data will not be available until next year.

9. Campaign for College Opportunity Webinar—Kathy Kaiser
   a. CCO believes they had a seminal role in the passage of SB 1440.
   b. Ephraim Smith and Eric Skinner (CCCCO) co-chaired and both spoke.
   c. Jim Postma and Michelle Pilati and the respective Senates were singled out for praise.
   d. There is a desire for follow-up legislation to
      i. Push the timeline for implementation.
      ii. Increase the number of required transfer AA degrees.
   e. 22 TMCs are now approved.
   f. A number of CCCs and CSUs were singled out for praise and negative comment, depending upon the % of degrees implemented/accepted
   g. Implementation has been hindered by a lack of funding to offer courses
   h. There are no resources for a tracking/enrollment system
   i. www.ADegreewithAGuarantee.com is a web site for students.

    a. We discussed stretch courses, 3-unit Early Start courses
    b. (The Statway curriculum is a type of math stretch course)
    c. Should the focus be on number, scheduling of courses or the content/pedagogy?

11. Executive Committee Liaison: Glen Brodowsky
    a. They are attempting to schedule a meeting with incoming Chancellor White. Executive Committee has a list of priority items from the standing committees and will collate it and share it with the senate.
    b. Ben Quillian will be the interim Chancellor and is compiling
    c. Christine Helwick is retiring.
    d. Chancellor Reed signed a list of EOs regarding international education.
    e. We hope to have a CMS update at our next plenary.
    f. Exec is looking at a committee to investigate MOOCs.
    g. The newsletter is coming out.

12. Committee Liaisons
    a. Admissions Advisory Council—will meet on January 11th
b. ASSIST—the ASSIST Next Generation Workgroup will be having a webinar next week, December 12th

c. California Academic Partnership Program—there was a report regarding the selection of the past and new directors. There will likely be an interim appointment. Carolina will check into this and report back. John will ask what is happening at Extended Exec.

d. California Commission on Teacher Credentialing—there will be a written report to the committee shortly.

e. Early Assessment Program Advisory Committee—the committee has not met recently. There are discussions about its role given the new Smarter Balanced initiative.

13. The meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm.

14. From follow-up Exec meeting—what do we want to do to follow up on the C-ID split decision resolution?

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-3078-12/APEP/AA May 3-4, 2012
Resolving Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) Split Decisions

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) encourage the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup, the SB 1440 work group, and the C-ID Steering Committee to develop a transparent process to collaboratively resolve differences over the approval of courses evaluated against a C-ID course descriptor; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU caution that the perception of a failure of mutual agreement, following a split decision, could undermine the very good work and strong intersegmental cooperation that has been the hallmark of faculty interactions surrounding the implementation of SB 1440 (the “Star Act”); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the development of a consistent set of processes and criteria that contribute to building trust in the quality and content of the offerings provided by the educational professionals across the range of educational institutions potentially impacted by “statewide transfer” initiatives such as C-ID and SB 1440; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup, the Campus Senates, Campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Articulation Officers (CIAC), Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, Executive Committee, C-ID Steering Committee, and the CSU SB 1440 Implementation Task-Force.

RATIONALE: The approval process involves two faculty reviewers (one from the California Community Colleges [CCC] and one from the CSU) who evaluate each course against a statewide C-ID descriptor to determine if the course meets the content of the descriptor.

The ASCSU is concerned that the current C-ID approval process does not contain a set of procedures that clearly define how both segments come to agreement in the case of a split-decision.

Approved Unanimously – May 3-4, 2012