



SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee (IOC) Meeting

Thursday, May 24, 2012 – Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza, Sacramento, CA

Call to Order

The Co-chairs called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. The committee agreed to modify the agenda to include an update from the Counseling Resources work group.

Committee Member Attendance:

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| X | Ephraim Smith (co-chair) | X | Erik Skinner (co-chair) |
| X | Ron Vogel (interim) | | Eloy Oakley |
| | Donald Para | X | Robin Steinbeck (by phone) |
| X | Douglas Freer | X | Carsbia Anderson |
| X | Sandra Cook | | Sue Granger-Dickson |
| X | James Postma | X | Michelle Pilati |
| X | Andrea Renwanz-Boyle | X | Beth Smith |
| X | Eric Forbes | X | Linda Michalowski |
| | Gregory Washington | | Jeffrey Fang |

Welcome and Introductions by the IOC Chairs

The April 25, 2012 summary notes were approved by committee.

Discussion:

Discussion of Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) report [Reforming the State's Transfer Process: A Progress Report on Senate Bill 1440](#) – Paul Steenhausen and Judy Heiman

Paul Steenhausen and Judy Heiman from the LAO provided an update on the recently published LAO report regarding SB 1440 implementation progress. Paul reminded the committee that the statute resulting from SB 1440 is an important initiative for the 120 members of the legislature and shared that LAO’s roles, in addition to helping the legislature understand current issues, is to help implement enacted legislation. Paul thanked members of the committee for their help with providing input to the report authors, and expressed that he has been impressed with the dialogue, progress, and respectful tone of the IOC. However, he emphasized that there is still much work to be completed. Paul reported that he has briefed the bill’s author, Senator Padilla, and suggested to the committee that now is the time to clarify any vagueness in the original statute as well as to establish the need for funds to support the infrastructure surrounding the continued implementation of SB 1440 in the future. Judy added that the report reflects a point in time and that work has progressed since the report was first drafted. She

also indicated that it is too soon to measure some aspects of the implementation, such as the admission priority point system, which the LAO will continue to watch and monitor.

Committee members discussed the topic following the report overview provided by Paul and Judy. One member emphasized that it is important that curriculum not be legislated, which could have a negative effect on progress. Another member offered that it was the legislation that brought the two higher education segments to the table, yet agreed there is a balance to consider in terms of legislating curriculum. Paul suggested that additional legislation could help in certain areas, such as defining the intent for the number of degrees and incorporating the goal of colleges providing AA-T/AS-T degrees for 100 percent of programs offered. There was a discussion that more time was needed prior to any attempts at additional legislation and that faculty processes take time. A member reported that funds are necessary to support the SB 1440 infrastructure, and reminded the committee that it was fortunate there was an existing structure (the C-ID project) for the initial SB 1440 implementation work to fit within. Paul re-emphasized the advantage of planning and identifying future costs now, well ahead of when money might become available. A staff member shared that she would have liked the report to have expanded on the additional areas where students require support, and address the challenges in reaching the degree, such as students beginning in basic skills courses. Paul responded that the LAO has written about that in the past, and he is currently working on a report regarding adult education, but that the scope of this report was purposely narrowed to make the content manageable.

Paul concluded the discussion by sharing his personal list of issues to watch: open questions of how lower demand majors would become part of the TMC process; which majors should not be part of the process; how universities are treating students who do not have a TMC-related degree; the acceptance of the degrees by the CSUs; and whether there is a collaborative opportunity between community colleges to offer shared courses on a TMC.

Communications Update – Paul Feist

Paul Feist reported that usability testing of the prototype web site, www.ADegreeWithAGuarantee.com, is scheduled for the following week. Parents, students, faculty, community college counselors and high school counselors will participate. Paul explained that each participant will be forwarded a hyperlink to an online test script which will take approximately ten minutes to complete. The primary purpose of the test is to identify navigation issues. Paul provided examples of web site pages planned for a mid-to late-July launch, and reviewed basic features with the committee. Paul also updated that, along with the web site, collateral material will be distributed including mini-posters and tear pads. He also reported that the CCC/CSU Communications Team is in the process of interviewing spring 2012 community college graduates who are receiving an Associate Degree for Transfer, and those students' stories will be captured on the "success stories" section of the web site. A committee member asked whether the poster and tear pad examples shown appropriately depicted the target age group. Discussion resulted and various opinions were offered. Paul reminded the committee that the test group data collected next week will be informing as well.

Counseling Work Group Update - Jane Patton

Jane Patton reported that several months ago, at the request of the CCC Chancellor's Office, she convened a group of community college counselors and transfer center directors to identify and develop resources for counselors that are specific to SB 1440 implementation. The group has met several times since, and Jane shared that in August four "Train the Trainer" workshops will be held in different regions of the state. The objective of the workshops is to train one counselor or transfer center director from each college who will return to their college and train local counselors and transfer center staff. The workshops will provide attendees with flash drives that include materials to take back to the campus, such as PowerPoint slides for transfer workshops and new student orientations, a glossary of terms and a detailed FAQ document. It was also noted that this fall CSU counselor conferences for community college attendees will include an SB 1440 related session delivered by counselors familiar with the implementation.

Progress Reports:

CCC Degree Approval – Barry Russell

Barry Russell reported that 383 degrees have been created (up 40 from last month), and approximately 100 are in progress at either the colleges or the Chancellor's Office. Barry noted that he expects to see an increase in submissions this June and July as campuses finish up spring tasks. Co-chair Erik Skinner shared that Chancellor Scott published a letter to the field last week communicating next steps and that the California Community Colleges Board of Governors has adopted a goal of each college having AA-T and AS-T degrees approved by Fall of 2013 in 80 percent of the majors they offer in which there is a TMC and in 100 percent by Fall of 2014.

CSU Review for Similar TMCs – Ken O'Donnell

Ken O'Donnell provided a report that showed similar matching progress. The report, by university and major, listed where a university has declared at least one area of emphasis for a major as similar, those universities that have not, and those that do not offer that major where a TMC exists. A member asked whether the scenario was possible where none of the available TMC majors were considered for spring 2013 CSU admission. A CSU member responded that admission scope was entirely driven by the size of state budget forthcoming this summer. A discussion followed regarding admission constraints in today's higher education system. A staff member commented that it would be helpful for counselors if Ken's report indicated area of emphasis information. A CSU committee member stated that when a student is admitted into a university with a degree in the same major where the university has identified at least one area of emphasis as similar, all the benefits of the new statute carry over, except the 60-unit guarantee if a student is admitted with the degree in a similar major, but chooses a non-similar area of emphasis. The member claimed that no universities admit by area of emphasis, so students are admitted based on a major. However, another CSU member pointed out that many CSU campuses do, in fact, admit by options. Eric Forbes will craft a statement on CSU practices on this subject for the next meeting.

Work Group Reports:

Intersegmental Curriculum Work Group (ICW) – Michelle Pilati/Jim Postma

Michelle Pilati reported that TMCs are completed for twenty popular 120-unit transfer majors, and nine disciplines are currently under development in addition to nursing and engineering majors, and eight new disciplines are scheduled for discipline faculty discussion this fall. She noted that as funding becomes available there is an additional list of eight possible disciplines for spring 2013 evaluation and an ICW subcommittee is discussing options for disciplines beyond spring 13. Michelle shared that as lower demand majors are considered, a process must be established to help evaluate the need for a statewide TMC and, if determined, how best to develop TMCs in those majors.

Jim Postma added that last year there were approximately 60,000 transfer students and 208 CSU majors. A handout was provided that showed the link between those majors and TMCs, and how many transfer majors are now covered by TMCs. The handout demonstrated that TMCs and CSU similar declarations will cover 75% of the transfer student demand by this fall. It was noted, however, that the handout did not consider whether those students would select the area of emphasis deemed similar. Jim also pointed out the eighth most popular CSU transfer major is “undeclared.”

Early Student Identification – Carsbia Anderson

Carsbia Anderson reported that the Early Student Identification subgroup met following the last committee meeting, and shared that as the program increases in popularity a more efficient method of identifying and tracking students must be developed. The subgroup is scheduled to participate in a demonstration of a UC Transfer Admission Guarantee (UC TAG) online application with the intent of determining whether the approach developed by the UC system can be used in some manner to support early student identification of AA-T/AS-T students. Carsbia also reported that the subgroup agreed upon degree evaluation date ranges for colleges for the upcoming spring semester, pending information from colleges on the quarter system. Jane Patton reminded the subgroup that a clear calendar is needed, particularly for the August counselor “Train the Trainer” sessions.

Next Meeting:

The co-chairs will poll members to determine a date for a late June meeting in Southern California.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30pm