

## SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Atrium Hotel at Orange County Airport

Tuesday, March 1, 2011

### Call to Order

Co-chairs Erik Skinner and Ephraim Smith called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

X	Ephraim Smith (co-chair)	X	Erik Skinner (co-chair)
A	Milton Gordon	X	Eloy Oakley
X	Donald Para	X	Pam Deegan
X	Douglas Freer	A	Carsbia Anderson ( <i>Lynn Neault substituting</i> )
X	Sandra Cook	X	Daniel Nannini
A	James Postma ( <i>Barbara Swerkes substituting</i> )	X	Jane Patton
X	Andrea Renwanz-Boyle	X	Michelle Pilati
A	Christopher Chavez ( <i>Miles Nevin substituting</i> )	X	Alex Pader
X	Eric Forbes	A	Linda Michalowski

### Welcome and introductions

*Co-chairs Erik Skinner and Ephraim Smith*

### CSU Report on Similar Degree Review of Psychology, Sociology and Communication TMCs and discussion of Identifiable Issues

*Ken O'Donnell, CSU Academic Programs and Policy (APP)*

Ken O'Donnell distributed copies of his report detailing the results of the survey of CSU campuses' review of the first group of TMCs, which included Psychology, Sociology and Communications. CSU has reviewed three finalized TMCs and for Psychology, 18 campuses have identified at least one major that is similar; for Communication Studies, 16 campuses; and for Sociology, 17 campuses. CSU San Luis Obispo and Fresno's responses are pending. Both campuses requested an extension in the review submission date.

CSU Campuses were asked to evaluate the TMC with the following criteria "*Would students who finish this TMC prior to transfer be adequately prepared for upper division work in the major, so they could complete the given degree in 60 semester units (or the equivalent in quarter units)?*"

A committee member noted that San Diego State University (SDSU) identified all three of the TMCs as not similar due to the number of units a student would need to complete after transfer and suggested that this could be an early sign that SDSU has opted out of SB 1440 process. Ken O'Donnell responded that SDSU faculty has been participating in the review process. The SDSU discipline faculty provided detailed documentation that the TMC models did not provide enough units for the transfer student to complete the campus degree major, the CSU American Institutions graduation requirement and SDSU's foreign language graduation requirement.

It was suggested that in these cases locally developed AA degrees may be a better fit than the TMC developed degrees for local CSU degree requirements. A member pointed out that while the TMC approach may not work at all campuses such as San Diego State University, the solution of locally developed degrees that can meet the campus' transfer requirements, will meet some of the objectives of the legislation. Another member countered that the degrees created today need to reflect statewide

policy in line with reducing excess units, and not be developed specific to individual campus requirements.

The committee was reminded that this is the first phase of the TMC development and review process. The results of the CSU reviews of the TMC should be taken back to the TMC curriculum groups for consideration.

**Introductions and approval of February 2, 2011 Summary Notes:** Agenda item was not addressed.

### **Announcements**

**AB 1056 Electronic Transcript** (handout - copy of legislation):

*Eric Forbes, Member representing CSU Office of the Chancellor*

*Eric Forbes* provided a copy of AB 1056 and a brief summary noting the benefits of this bill may have to the implementation procedures of SB 1440. AB 1056 calls for the electronic receipt and transmission of student transcripts by January 1, 2012.

### **Communication News**

*Michael Uhlenkamp, CSU Office of the Chancellor and Terri Carbaugh, CCC Chancellor's Office*

The joint public affairs staffs presented the committee with samples of the AA-T/AS-T logos and tag lines that are being tested throughout the state. The focus groups are comprised of college students between the ages of 18-24 and 24-31. The resulting logos and tag lines from the focus group will be presented at the next IOC meeting and then used in the development of the joint SB 1440 website and communications materials

A committee member expressed concern over the term "guarantee" in the tag lines presented. The public affairs staff indicated they would explore substituting the phrase "high priority" in the focus group testing.

### **Admission Priority Proposal:**

*Co-Chair Ephraim Smith & Member Eric Forbes, representing CSU Office of the Chancellor*

As a follow up to the February 3, 2011 discussion on local area and impacted admission for SB 1440 transfer associate degree applicants, member Eric Forbes presented a CSU proposal for priority admission.

Non-local applicants with the AA-T or AS-T degrees who apply to an impacted campus would be given a .20 GPA bump during the admission review process. By assigning a .20 GPA bump for AA-T or AS-T applicants, many would be admitted early in the admission cycle resulting in a better transition to the CSU. A "tie-breaker" approach at the cutoff GPA would be used to assign admission priority for AA-T and AS-T students who apply to impacted programs.

The CSU suggested that it could offer course registration priority for admitted AA-T or AS-T transfer students, provided that the CCC grant registration priority to these students as well. While several members were pleased with the introduction of course registration priority, the CCC indicated that it

would need to be explored further. As the CSU continues to have issues regarding the CSU American Ideals and Institutions graduation requirement, its place in the SB 1440 design will need to be addressed. The item was returned to the parking lot for consideration later.

During the meeting, a chart was created to help better understand the CSU priority admission proposal.

CCC members asked why the CSU did not include the .20 index increase for the AA-T or AS-T students seeking admission to impacted programs. The CSU representatives described the absence of a local area for these students, capacity issues in impacted programs, and how the "tie-breaker" arrangement would work in practice. CCC members stated that the proposal was not adequate and would not attract students to pursue the AA-T or AS-T degrees.

After considerable discussion, co-chairs Skinner and Smith agreed to arrange a meeting between the two Chancellors and themselves in order to review the elements in this proposal and to reach agreement on what can be accomplished.

### **CSU Mentor Update**

Member Eric Forbes reported that changes are being made to CSUMentor for Fall 2012-13 Cycle which begins October 1, 2011.

**Report of Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup and Catalog Language** were deferred for the next meeting.

**High Unit Majors** Topic was removed from agenda.

### **Recap of Decisions, Action Items, and Parking Lot Items:**

1. Members representing the faculty were asked to take the CSU campuses' TMC reviews and comments from the CSU campuses' similar degree reviews and report to the C-ID Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG) developing the TMC degrees.
2. The Public Affairs staff will report at the next IOC meeting on the results of the focus groups on the logos and the tag lines.
3. A subcommittee will be formed to discuss the CSU American Ideals graduation requirement in relation to SB 1440 and report back to the committee.
4. The CSU will investigate the implications of the CCC recommendation to add the additional index points to the transfer associate degree students applying to impacted programs and report back to the committee.
5. Member Patton asked for modification, removing "*developed by the joint action*" in item # 1 of the **Priority Proposal Discussion Draft** document, since the development of the degree is a CCC faculty activity and not a joint process. Member Patton also asked that "all CSU campuses" be include in item #2 and #4 of the same document for clarity.

**Next Meeting:** Date to be determined.