

SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee (IOC)
Tuesday, February 28, 2012 Meeting Summary

Call to Order

The Co-chairs called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

Committee Member Attendance:

X	Ephraim Smith (co-chair)	X	Erik Skinner (co-chair)
A	Milton Gordon	X	Eloy Oakley
X	Donald Para	A	Pam Deegan
X	Douglas Freer	X	Carsbia Anderson
X	Sandra Cook	X	Sue Granger-Dickson
X	James Postma	X	Michelle Pilati
X	Andrea Renwanz-Boyle	X	Beth Smith
X	Eric Forbes	X	Linda Michalowski
A	Gregory Washington	X	Jeffrey Fang

Ron Vogel substituted for Milton Gordon. Miles Nevin substituted for Gregory Washington.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes:

A review of the minutes was postponed until the next meeting to allow members more time for review. Comments regarding the drafted minutes may be forwarded to member Linda Michalowski.

Status Updates:

CCC Degree Approval and Timeline for Reporting (Barry Russell)

Barry Russell distributed copies of a report that details the number of transfer associate degrees approved to date, the number of degrees in review, and the number of degrees returned to the colleges for revision and/or additional information. At this time 310 degrees are approved and 68 are in review status.

Barry informed the committee of the typical curriculum development and submission cycle at community colleges. The handout also displayed areas, in black, where colleges have communicated they have no immediate plans to offer a degree for a particular major. A committee member suggested that if the community college currently offers an associate degree in that major, the college should work to transition that particular program to an associate degree for transfer.

CSU "Similar" Degree Approval Report (Ken O'Donnell)

Ken O'Donnell reported on 16 published TMCs. Ken's handout displayed community colleges with a degree in a major, and listed each CSU campus that had made a similar determination in at least one area of emphasis for that major. A member asked if the list applies to one area of emphasis or all at a campus within a major. Ken explained that it only applies to one area of emphasis. The member commented that communication to students will have to be clear to ensure students select a transfer pathway not only in a similar major, but also for an area of emphasis that is similar. Another member added that if the more popular areas of emphasis are not deemed similar, the pathway is not as strong for that major to a CSU campus. Ken shared that there are some majors he is watching for that scenario, such as with mathematics and business administration. An attendee suggested that the number of CSUs offering each program be

listed so a measurement can be made against the number of CSUs with at least one area of emphasis deemed similar. Ken also introduced a new measurement, termed “institutional combinations” which calculates the total transfer pathway options for each major by multiplying the number of community college degrees for a major times the number of CSU campuses with at least one area of emphasis deemed similar.

Intersegmental Curriculum Work Group (ICW) Update (Michelle Pilati / James Postma)

Michelle Pilati updated the committee that 25 TMCs are on track for completion, of which 18 are approved to date. The ICW is planning a two-day meeting this spring to plan out its work. Michelle shared that Teacher Preparation (now referred to as Elementary Education) and Music were recently approved TMCs and will be available for CSU to review for similarity soon.

Discussion Items:

Goals for 2012-13

Expectations for TMC Development

Michelle reiterated the goal of establishing 25 TMCs for popular majors and that those TMCs would be published by September 2012. A member asked whether there would be additional TMCs beyond the 25. Jim Postma responded that disciplines not included at this time can always establish a need for a TMC; however, the priority is with the implementation of the 25. Jim also shared that ICW is in the early stages of discussing the possibility of multiple TMCs within one major, and Jim used the example of the Kinesiology major, which has a popular physical education area of emphasis as well as a physical therapy area of emphasis, with each emphasis having distinct curriculum requirements. A CSU member advocated the need for local degrees, and was asked to clarify the need. The multiple TMCs for one major topic led to a discussion on TMC aligned and non-aligned (local) degrees, and majors that do not quite fit the SB 1440 framework. A member offered that SB 1440 may work best as a TMC only approach. Another member asked whether it would be possible to build into the existing model transfer paths for non-aligned TMC degrees that still provide the upper division benefits SB 1440 provides. A member shared that one challenge of allowing local degrees is fulfilling the system wide admission guarantee. For example, if the student is not admitted at the local level but has an associate degree for transfer that is only accepted locally. Michelle suggested the local degree topic requires more discussion and is planned within the ICW.

An attendee asked for clarification regarding the process to re-direct a student who applied to several CSU campuses but did not get admitted? A CSU member explained one of the CSU campuses will re-direct the student to another campus where they will be eligible for admittance. Another alternative would be to share a list of CSU campuses where the student would be admitted, providing the student with choices. A member suggested that the student’s intended area of emphasis should also be considered when re-directing.

An attendee asked for clarification regarding the process to re-direct an applicant who applied to several CSU campuses but did not get admitted to any. A CSU staff member explained that one of the CSU campuses will re-direct the applicant to another CSU campus where the applicant will be eligible for admittance. The member suggested that an alternative would be to share a list of CSU campuses where the student would qualify for admission into that major, providing the student with choices. A member suggested that an applicant’s intended area of emphasis should also be considered when re-directing.

Expectations for Degree Development

Barry Russell stated the goal that community colleges system wide will have created TMC-aligned degrees for 100% of the majors each college offers by December 31, 2014. Barry shared that an interim goal is to have an 80% creation rate at each community college by December 31, 2013. Barry explained the curriculum development timeline at colleges and the process lead times necessary to adequately identify and develop curriculum. A member asked that consideration be given regarding how students in the pipeline now would be advised so a student can prepare today for a degree planned to be introduced one to two years out. A CSU member suggested that the degree creation goal timeline take into consideration CSU admission cycles and the timelines when CSU must make a determination to include a community college's degree within the CSU Mentor online admission application. Another member suggested inserting additional milestones prior to the 2013 and 2014 goals deadlines to ensure all community colleges are on schedule.

Expectations for Similarity of CCC Degrees to CSU Degree Programs

Jim Postma reported that when a TMC for a major is published by the ICW, the CSU campuses have two-weeks to respond with similarity determinations. And, in instances when the campus has indicated the TMC is not similar, the campus is asked for further detail regarding the non-alignment. Ken O'Donnell stated that the goal is to have 100% of the CSU campuses (that offer the major) identify at least one area of emphasis as similar by the end of the spring 2012 for each TMC published. A member suggested that as things proceed the goal should be revisited to confirm that the areas of emphasis deemed similar reflect student transfer patterns and demand.

At the conclusion of the goals discussion a member suggested the goals representing the three groups be merged onto a common calendar. Julie Adams, from the ASCCC, volunteered for this task. Members from both CSU and CCC commented that they are working toward fine-tuning the synchronization of posting degrees available and similarity matching. The plan at this time is to post updated information on both monthly. An attendee informed the committee that 27 students at CCSF are on track to be awarded an AA-T degree in Psychology this semester.

Preliminary Evaluation of Pilot to Identify CSU Fall 2012 Associate Degree for Transfer Applicants (*Carsbia Anderson*)

Carsbia Anderson reported that the early student identification subcommittee introduced a process in January to facilitate the needs of the CSU to identify eligible students for the fall 2012 admission cycle. Carsbia recognized CACCRAO and the CSSO organizations for their help with defining the pilot process. Carsbia summarized the process in which in January the CSU sent each qualified applicant a letter requesting the applicant petition their community college by February 15th for a degree award. Community college staff was asked to prioritize the evaluation of these petitions, and to provide a response to each petitioner by March 15. Students were then instructed to update their application status with the CSU campus(es) regarding their evaluation results. Approximately 2,600 applicants were sent letters.

Reflecting on the pilot process, Carsbia stated that the subcommittee will review the value of the process, how the filters were applied to identify qualified applicants, how many of the 2,600 applicants actually received a degree for transfer and transferred, and evaluate the workload impact at the community colleges. Another member commented that it would be helpful to understand how many students benefited from the admission priority consideration grade point average bump.

A member asked community college attendees for their feedback regarding their experience implementing the pilot. The City College of San Francisco attendee shared that the process was coordinated through the transfer center, and a primary contact within Admissions and Records was identified to ensure the petitions received priority review. The American River College attendee stated that approximately 50 students received the letter, and per the established petition process, all must schedule an appointment with a counselor. Of the 50, approximately 10 were qualified to receive the degrees. The Chabot College attendee reported that their TMC-aligned degrees available included some new courses, so it was assumed no students would be prepared for graduation. No one person at the college organized the effort, thus the process was fragmented.

Carsbia suggested that in the future having the applicant's email and date of birth alongside the applicant's name would assist with record matching. A member commented that the current process is not sustainable, especially as program popularity increases. Another member suggested a program similar to UC's Data Sharing program that identifies CCC students who have applied to UC campuses. An attendee requested that TMC-related degree curriculum appear on www.assist.org. Staff responded that a new application for ASSIST is in-progress and TMC degrees are a consideration for the new application, but not the current application.

Updates

Update on the Complete College America Grant (Ken O'Donnell/Barry Russell)

Barry reported that he travelled to Dallas last month with Ken and Jane Patton to visit with the grantor and report on progress. Of all the states awarded this grant, California was the only grantee to use the funds to focus on transfer. Other grantees are focused on remediation. Ken felt that overall the grantors were pleased with how the funds are being put to use and noted that there is a data reporting element due at the end of this month to the grantor.

Other Updates

Erik Skinner reported that some changes are coming to California's electronic transcripts known as eTranscript California that will help the associate degree for transfer program. Those changes will be reported out at a future meeting. It was also mentioned that, related to degree audit systems, the Student Success Task Force identified the need for advancing technology in this area. Michelle Pilati updated that at a recent ICAS meeting, University of California representatives reported they are evaluating how an associate degree for transfer prepared student could possibly matriculate into the UC system.

Action Items

Julie Adams (ASCCC) will insert the goals determined above onto a common calendar.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 25 in southern California. Members identified possible agenda items: update on communications and marketing campaign, e-transcript presentation, ongoing report of first wave of students, a merged goals calendar, and counseling resources.

Members suggested that in addition to the April meeting that one additional meeting be scheduled prior to the summer break.