The Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) Committee
Minutes
Thursday, September 13th 2012
11:00 AM – 3:15 PM

Members in Attendance
Bob Buckley, Chair (Sacramento)
John Tarjan, Vice Chair (Bakersfield)
Jacinta Amaral (Fresno)
Sandra Chong (Northridge)
Andreas Gebauer (Bakersfield)
Kathleen Kaiser (Chico)
Kimberly King (Los Angeles)
J. Ken Nishita (Monterey Bay)
Steven Stepanek (Northridge)

Executive Committee Liaison
Glen Brodowsky (San Marcos)

Others in Attendance
Beverly Young
Assistant Vice Chancellor: Teacher Education and Public School Programs
Eric Forbes
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
Ken O'Donnell
Senior Director, Academic Programs and Policy “GE, Transfer, & Student Success”

1. The meeting began at 11:06 with a welcome from Chair Buckley. He reviewed the agenda including our liaisons/visitors.

2. Approval of Agenda—the agenda was approved with a change to move GEAC and Admissions Advisory reports earlier in the agenda to prepare for liaison visits. (These still appear in the original order in the minutes.)

3. Extended Executive Committee Report (Buckley)
   a. The major issue discussed at the meeting was the proposed Title 5 change dealing with u.d. GE.
   b. The provosts seem to believe we have made significant progress in reducing degrees to 120 units.
      i. It is difficult to keep degrees to 120 units under SB 1440.
   c. We should get agendas and resolutions into the Senate office in a more timely manner. The Executive Committee has developed a suggested timeline. We also need to increase our tracking/follow-up on resolutions.
   d. We should reinstitute the newsletter—the Executive Committee is working on it.
   e. We are moving to a paperless senate.
f. We are likely to utilize Elluminate for our virtual meetings.

4. The May 2012 minutes were approved.

5. **Review of APEP charge** *(link)*
   a. Chair Buckley reviewed the charge of the committee.
   b. Other committees appear to be considering issues that are in the APEP charge.

6. **Eric Forbes Report**
   a. Early Start
      i. He shared a report of ES participation by campus.
      ii. While we did not get all students to participate, the reports from the students and faculty were very positive.
      iii. The 3 unit experiences seem to have had a very positive impact on the students. The 1 unit experience do not seem to have had the same impact.
      iv. We need to make some adjustments, based on our data, to make the program more effective for our students.
      v. Committee comment: while the program may be worthwhile, have we improved the situation over what we did previously? Is it more cost effective and facilitating student success over what we did before?
      vi. One thing we need to do is to get student test scores back to the campuses more quickly.
      vii. We are likely to request the English Council approve wider participation (with more at-risk students) in the program.
      viii. Each campus has a compliance committee. The campuses were encouraged to explore a variety of approaches other than non-admission for students failing to participate.
      ix. AVC Hirano-Nakanishi will be invited to our committee to share assessment data on the program.
      x. Q: Did the lottery funds ($3.5m) that were used to fund the program result in negative impacts in other places?
      xi. Denial of enrollment for non-participating students is not considered denying admission under existing legislative mandates.
   b. Impaction
      i. AVC Forbes detailed the various levels of consultation leading to development of policies regarding impaction. Geographic boundaries related to impaction and local guarantees were developed. There were a lot of complex issues identifying exactly one “service” area for all students. Eric shared a map of the LA area with campus boundaries.
      ii. We may have to decrease admissions further due to budget cuts, complicating things dealing with impaction.
      iii. The legislature has shown some interest in special admits.
iv. Some institutions are in danger of missing the Cal Grant thresholds for continuing eligibility for their students. This is one reason why the special admit issue is problematic.

v. Related policies being considered by the Board to recover costs/provide incentives
   1. Enrollment of students in “excess” units before graduation (>150 units surcharge?)
   2. Surcharge for students taking more than 16 units
   3. Increased charges for course repetitions (even first time—but charged once)
   4. Increasing out-of-state tuition
   5. Trigger increase in tuition

c. Early Assessment Program (EAP)
   i. The EAP Advisory Committee has ceased meeting. It was thought that the committee’s charge and membership should be expanded (CTE, etc.).

d. Career Technical Education (CTE)
   i. There is a bit of a “dance” going on between the CDE that is developing CTE standards, our Board that is set to approve our CTE standards for a-g and CTE advocates.

7. Zee Cline Report
   a. Common Core State Standards—CA signed on to this nationwide initiative for K-12 standards.
      i. Smarter Balanced company is attempting to develop curricular standards for many states to assess the standards)
   b. EAP
      i. A year-by-year summary report was shared with the committee
      ii. At least one math professor would like word problems/more complex problems that more closely mirror the type of work required in college. The English essay portion is thought to do a better job of representing the type of work expected in college.
      iii. More high schools are adopting the ERWC curriculum.
      iv. It appears that Early Start may be having an impact on the advice HS counselors give to students relative to taking the EAP and addressing deficiencies while in high school.
   c. There was a task force on Greatness by Design (teacher education). Their report can be found on the CDE website.

   a. Student Transfer Agreement Reform (STAR) Act /SB 1440
      i. There are 3 foci
         1. Curriculum of the degrees
         2. Priority for admissions (difficult)
         3. Persuading students to complete the degrees (the most difficult)
a. Students don’t really understand the incentives for admission or curricular impressions

ii. The CO staff is working on reports on the cost savings/impacts of SB 1440.

iii. The TMCs and curricular templates are not required by the law but were implemented by the respective faculties and are a real plus of the project.

iv. It would be helpful to have a “template” of information for students explaining the guarantees for students transferring to the CSU. Campuses could be encouraged to provide this information to their students.

v. Q: Have you looked at the impact of this program on diversity and what is our obligation going forward?
   1. We are doing analyses of the students based on a number of diversity factors.
   2. It is unclear what our future obligations will be clear. A complication is that the funding cuts to the CCCs have negatively impacted the program. However, CSU impaction may provide an impetus for students to participate.
   3. We will continue to be obligated to provide priority access and unit guarantees.

9. Committee Liaison assignments:
   a. Admissions Advisory Council
      i. At GEAC, the CCC participants indicated that there is insufficient and contradictory (with other sources) information on CSU mentor regarding minimum grades.
   b. General Education Advisory Committee
      i. The Title 5 item on the Board agenda on GE was discussed.
      ii. The CCC participants were shocked about the apparent lack of consultation and shared governance in our system.
      iii. The notion of SciGETC was brought up. Our senate is on record (2004) supporting this.
   c. C-ID: CCC and CSU Meetings
      i. Each CCC campus has at least 2 transfer degrees approved—one has 17 with another in the works. Hundreds of courses are being approved for inclusion in the degrees.

10. The committee was adjourned at 3:05pm.