The Academic Preparation and Education Program Committee
Minutes
Friday, September 26, 2014
Virtual Meeting Conducted via Conference Call

Called to Order at 11:25 am by Chair Denise Fleming

Present: Denise Fleming, Chair (East Bay), David Barsky, Vice Chair (San Marcos), Kevin Baaske (Los Angeles), Glen Brodowsky (San Marcos), Sandra Chong (Northridge), Sue Holl (Sacramento), Kathleen Kaiser (Chico), J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay)

1. Agenda: M/S/P (Kaiser/Holl) to approve the agenda.
2. (Baaske/Holl) M/S/P to approve the minutes of September 4-5, 2014, with the understanding that, if no additional corrections are submitted in one week, the minutes are final. Vice-Chair Barsky was commended on the minutes.
3. Student Success Fee, APEP has been asked to review a set of values proposed by the Academic Affairs Committee in connection with Student Success Fee Task Force. APEP members performed a scan of where their campuses stood in relation to Student Success fees.
   - Kaiser: No student success fees at Chico
   - Holl: Sacramento has passed a resolution opposing such fees.
   - Fleming: East Bay has student success fees.
   - Barsky: San Marcos has student success fees. They have been used to add library hours, increase student support services (e.g., Writing Center and math Lab), and to add additional class sections.
   - Nishita: Monterey Bay is just beginning the process of possibly implementing such fees. Last year, the Student Government expressed support for them.
   - Baaske: Los Angeles is now in its third year of these fees. Much of the funding has gone toward hiring staff advisors in the colleges and to lengthening the hours that computer labs are open for students (moving toward a 24-hour open lab). One of the Regional Student Success Forums will take place at CSULA on October 30.

In these reports, APEP members differentiated between the broader Student Success fees and specific course-based fees (e.g., lab fees) that are associated with registration in particular courses.

A central issue seems to be what constitutes “broad consultation” with students. The alternative consultation process seems to have taken place in different ways on different campuses, and this may be a reflection of different types of student bodies; some campuses have large residential populations and others have almost entirely commuter students. Requiring a vote could be problematic on
the latter type of campuses where APEP members report that student voter turnout is always low.

APEP reviewed the process by which Student Success Fees are approved. Regardless of whether a student vote is taken or the alternative consultation process is used, campus Student Fee Advisory Committees are supposed to review all evidence before making their own decisions which are recommendations to Presidents who may decide to pursue enacting the fees even if the SFAC votes against. The Chancellor gets a thick binder from the campus with data about the consultation process that he reviews before making a final decision.

M/S/P (Kaiser/Holl to endorse the recommendations from Academic Affairs Approved by general consent.

4. **Co-sponsoring resolutions.** The Faculty Affairs Committee has asked APEP whether it would like to co-sponsor the resolution on Academic Freedom that had a first reading at the September plenary. APEP discussed this and decided to decline, as it did not find this resolution to be directly related to APEP’s charge.

5. **Status of Mathematics/English Readiness Measures.** Chair Fleming framed the issue. There are currently a number of readiness measures and programs (EAP, SAT/ACT, Smarter Balance, and Early Start). Questions that we need to consider include:
   a. Should APEP be taking a position on any of these issues?
   b. Is there specific data that we want to see in connection with any of these?
   c. Should APEP be issuing a call to the campuses to ask what is happening with respect to these issues?

Kaiser provided some background: In March 2014, EAP was embedded into Smarter Balances but it was voluntary in that districts were not required to offer it, and students were not required to take it. In March 2015, we will see the first real administration of Smarter Balanced, but cut-points haven’t been set yet and because of the uncertainty, there’s been a push to get 11th graders to take the ACT or SAT.

In the ensuing discussion, APEP identified two possible areas where it might develop useful resolutions:
   o Support and encourage Outreach to encourage 11th graders to take the ACT and/or SAT for readiness purposes, and to explore fee waivers for students who qualify for free/reduced price lunches.
   o Request data on ACT/SAT and Smarter Balanced as readiness measures.
Chair Fleming will consult with our liaisons Ken O'Donnell and Beverly Young about the most effective language and whether this is a politically opportune time for such resolutions, and this will be revisited on APEP’s November agenda.

6. **Bechtel.** Sandra Chong reported that she had just participated in a teleconference toady. Campuses were responding to an RFP for $5K planning grants and proposals have been received from all campuses. There will be a face-to-face meeting of the work group on October 3, but decisions will not be made until the end of December, and the campuses are at different levels of development.

7. **Early Start.** APEP is interested in learning more about Extended Early Start. There was discussion of asking campuses directly for Early Start data. David Barsky shared that he was the ASCSU representative on the Early Start Implementation Committee, which would not be meeting until after the November plenary. APEP will discuss at its November meeting what data it would like to see systematically collected and David will take this to the Early Start Implementation Committee meeting.

8. **Course Match.** Chair Fleming reported that she had checked with Eric Forbes to clarify remarks that were reported in the May 14, 2014 APEP minutes:

   The included [Course Match] courses were those that campuses put forward; grade distributions were used to determine comparability between online offerings and on-the-ground classes at other institutions.

   Eric Forbes reported that the statement was accurate and when asked whether this was based on grade distributions being comparable, responded that this was the case. APEP discussed this in light of member experiences with widely varying grade distributions in face-to-face sections of the same course on the same campus. While APEP has serious concerns about this methodology, it does not seem to be under the purview of this committee. Chair Fleming will be bringing this to the attention of the Academic Affairs Committee.

9. **Liaison Reports.** Chair Fleming reminded committee members to submit their liaison reports.

10. **Adjournment.** APEP adjourned at 12:55pm, Friday, September 26.

Respectfully submitted,
David Barsky, Vice Chair, APEP