The Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Minutes
Friday, October 12th 2012
11:10 AM – 1:15 PM

Members Attending: Bob Buckley (Sacramento), John Tarjan (Bakersfield), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Andreas Gebauer (Bakersfield), Kathleen Kaiser (Chico), J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay), Steven Stepanek (Northridge)

Visitors: Glen Brodowsky (Executive Committee Liaison), AVC Beverly Young

1. Chair Buckley welcomed the committee and convened the meeting at 11:10

2. The agenda was approved.

3. Extended Executive Committee Report (Buckley)
   a. There was extensive discussion of the paperless plenaries. We will continue to operate without paper copies.

4. The September 13 meeting minutes were approved without changes.

5. Potential Committee Recommendations
   a. A resolution that “resolves” that administrative initiatives and policy intended to change student behavior be better informed as to the impact that such seemingly well intended proposals will have on our students
      i. This is in response to the new fee policies for students taking more units than needed for graduation, high loads during a term and repeating courses.
      ii. The Board is likely to act on these recommendations at the November meeting. They deferred action at the last meeting.
      iii. Kimberly and Bob will bring an item to the committee.

   b. A resolution to recommend the establishment of a STEM TMC pathway to specific CSU STEM majors that would NOT carry the 120 unit guarantee but would facilitate entry of community college transfers into STEM majors
      i. The committee should coordinate with Barbara Swerkes.
      ii. Bob Buckley and Steven Stepanek will develop some supporting materials and draft a resolution for the committee to consider in November.

   c. Resolution to establish a model uniform set of academic standards (the specific criteria) for high school career technical courses (CTE), …for the purposes of recognition for admission to the California State University.
      i. The law states that the criteria will be based upon the CDE model curricular standards. We will need to adapt them for the inclusion of courses in area g. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has published standards for public review.
      ii. We need to get copies of these standards for review and identify faculty from majors across the system for which these courses could be considered preparatory (e.g. construction management, applied topics at CA Maritime Academy).
      iii. Eric Forbes needs to be involved in the conversation.
         a. To identify majors/faculty in appropriate CSU majors.
b. To coordinate feedback to CDE.

c. To coordinate with UC/BOARS where these standards and maintained and
applied.

iv. Once we have a faculty response, we should pass a resolution in support (or not) of the
proposed standards.

d. Resolution to collaborate with Academic Affairs in the assessment of early start programs (to
include the development of the process and identification of data to be used).

i. Eric Forbes will be invited to share data with us.

ii. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi will be invited to share her work on assessment of Early Start.

e. Resolutions to provide communication of and support for the state’s adoption of the
“common core” curriculum (Smarter Balance) in collaboration with Assistant Vice
Chancellor Young

i. AVC Young feels that CA is ahead of the rest of the nation in moving towards
implementation of the standards.

ii. Testing will be associated with these new standards, in development by the Smarter
Balanced national Consortium, and will replace the current California Standards Tests
(CST).

iii. CDE and California’s designated higher education leads to the Smarter Balanced work
attended the last ICAS meeting and talked about the new assessment system that will be
implemented. Learning objectives are still being identified. Faculty will need to be
involved in the process of adopting the college readiness descriptors. There are
implications for EAP, EPT and ELM content.

iv. We are in the process of getting more math and English faculty involved in the
discussion.

v. Dr. Young provided us with more information (see report below).

f. IGETC STEM curriculum.

i. ASCSU passed a resolution (AS 2678) 8 years ago in support of this approach.

   i. Major-specific completion pattern for the transfer GE curriculum.
   
   ii. Deferral (not waiver) of some I.d. GE course requirements until after transfer.
       This would allow for more focus on pre-major coursework prior to transfer.

ii. A proposal in front of us would allow students to defer up to 4 courses in
social/behavioral sciences (2) and arts and humanities (2) until after transfer.

iii. We uphold the principle that students would not be required to complete more units in
I.d. GE after transfer they have reserved.

iv. John Tarjan distributed a draft policy to potentially be included in a resolution.

   i. Discipline faculty be allowed to develop a major-specific completion pattern.
   
   ii. Deferral of up to 4 courses spread across Areas C,D and E (GE Breadth) or 3 and
       4 (IGETC).

   iii. GEAC to provide advice on approval of the patterns.
   
   iv. Students not be required to complete more units after transfer in I.d. GE than they
       would have if completing the GE pattern prior to transfer.

v. The committee agreed with the points included in the draft policy.

vi. It may be more appropriate to mention “discipline-specific” rather than “major-specific”
disciplines.

6. Executive Committee Liaison Report: Glen Brodowsky

   a. He shared a draft commendation for Chancellor Reed. The committee is not opposed to a
resolution recognizing the service of Dr. Reed.

b. There may be some problems in distributing the new ASCSU faculty newsletter. A strong suggestion was made to have it posted on a URL and to then distribute the URL rather than an electronic copy.

c. There is a call out for faculty to work on the development/approval of new TMCs.

7. AVC Young Report
   a. The Smarter Balanced assessment was adopted by the state.
   b. This will affect our 11th grade testing (EAP).
   c. Groups are developing Achievement Level Descriptors (ALD) for entering freshmen.
   d. Our faculty need to be involved with developing expectations for college readiness.
   e. ICAS has been one faculty contact point. Each of the systems will likely need their own process for engaging their respective faculties in this effort.
   f. One faculty member per state was invited to work on the Smarter Balance achievement level descriptors. However, we successfully argued for an addition of another faculty member from CA. One committee member is from the CSU and one from CCC.
   g. AVC Young is on the Executive Committee of the effort.
   h. Common core standards are all about HS standards. K-12 drives these efforts so we have to be proactive to stay abreast of developments.
   i. CA was committed by the Governor, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education to participate.
   j. Concerns were expressed about how this will affect our EAP program.
   k. It was recommended that the committee review the report “Excellence by Design” just released by Supt. Torlakson about teacher preparation. It has a number of important recommendations.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 1:15.