1. Chair Buckley welcomed the committee at 11:00.

2. The agenda was approved with the addition of SB 520 and C-ID course approval.

3. The minutes of the February teleconference were approved.

4. Extended Executive Committee Report
   a. ??????

5. Eric Forbes Report
   a. ?????

6. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi Report
   a. She reviewed the Early Start report to the Board.
      i. There was more demonstrated success in math remediation than in English remediation (the students were drawn from the bottom quartile).
      ii. There may not have been enough 3 unit course experiences for the number of students desiring them.
      iii. Campus IR personnel will need to track the performance of the participants in the coming years.
      iv. There were a number of coding errors in the data supplied to the CO, making evaluation difficult in many ways.
      v. Lottery funds will be used again next summer to support the project.
      vi. We hope to continue to increase the quality of the Early Start experience for the students.

   a. Discussed the Graduation Initiative.
   b. From committee—there may be a bill authorizing CCCs to define TMCs without CSU assent.
   c. Campuses have a variety of approaches to reduce the achievement cap.

8. Glen Brodowsky (Executive Committee Liaison)
   a. ???

9. Beverly Young Report
   a. Smarted Balanced
i. Is a consortium of over 20 states to develop common standards.
ii. There is a strong emphasis on assessment.
iii. During the CA transition, there will be a phasing out of the STAR Program and a piloting of the language and math Smarter Balanced assessments.
iv. We will use SBAC ELA and math assessments for EAP.
v. Concerns were expressed about the quality of the assessments, the evaluation of teachers, etc.

b. Common Core Standards
   i. Are anchored in college content readiness.
     ii. CA is unique in the use of EAP—this will be the model for a nationwide movement towards common standards.
     iii. It is hoped that teachers, parents, students will have common expectations and that students will address college-readiness deficiencies in high school.
     iv. A potential problem is these tests assess readiness but are not designed for placement.
     v. ERWC courses a very carefully designed to prepare students for college. We do not have comparable courses for math that deal with new contents/dramatically different approaches to the material.
     vi. We reviewed ongoing discussions in GEAC about the role of algebra in the baccalaureate and quantitative reasoning across the curriculum.

c. EAP
   i. More students are taking the EAP (87% of HS students last year) and testing proficient (23%). 15% were conditionally ready.
     ii. 83% were tested in math. Only 15% were college ready. 16% were conditionally ready.

10. Board-Related Items
   a. Information for Assessing Early Start
   b. New Title 5 Language Regarding Admissions

11. Other APEP related issues and potential resolutions.

   a. Process for accepting articulation of courses approved for C-ID without approval by any CSU faculty member (John Tarjan).
   b. Program Impaction and its effect on students admitted to campuses but denied entry into their intended major.

12. Committee Recommendations

   a. Support for the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) AS-3111-13/APEP

13. Committee Liaison Reports:

   a. Admissions Advisory Council
   b. ASSIST

14. The meeting was adjourned