SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee Meeting

Wednesday, April 25, 2012 – Atrium Hotel, Irvine, CA

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	X	Robin Steinbeck
X	Douglas Freer	X	Carsbia Anderson
A	Sandra Cook	A	Sue Granger-Dickson
A	James Postma	X	Michelle Pilati
X	Andrea Renwanz-Boyle	X	Beth Smith
X	Eric Forbes	X	Linda Michalowski
X	Gregory Washington	A	Jeffrey Fang

Barbara Swerkes substituted for Jim Postma on the committee; Nathan Evans substituted for Sandra Cook; and Ron Vogel substituted for Milton Gordon.

Welcome and Introductions by the IOC Chairs

Barry Russell introduced Dr. Robin Steinback, Vice President of Instruction at Cuyamaca College. Dr. Steinback will be taking the place of Pam Deegan.

The November 30, 2011 and February 28, 2012 summary notes were approved by committee.

Progress Reports:

CCC Degree Approval and Reporting Timeline – Barry Russell

Barry Russell provided an update on the community colleges progress in submitting AA-T/AS-T degrees to the CCC Chancellor's Office for review and approval. Currently, 347 degrees have been approved and the number in the system is building every day. The CCC Chancellor's Office has contacted the college presidents of colleges that have not submitted AA-T/AS-T degrees and extended an invitation for them to appear at the next meeting of the board of governors to explain the delay in degree development.

A CCC committee member pointed out that there have been a few technical issues with the Curriculum Inventory system, which has caused some delays in the degree submission. This involved the ability for campuses to utilize the C-ID number on the system. The CCCCO, along with Jane Patton (C-ID), have hosted webinars for the colleges on all of the 18 disciplines to assist in the development and submission process.

CSU Review for Similar TMCs – Ken O'Donnell

Ken O'Donnell provided an update on the TMC degree match process by the CSU campuses. The two most recent TMC's reviewed, Music and Elementary Teacher Education, have been positively received

by the campuses. He stated that he has a conference call scheduled to answer questions and discuss some issues regarding the Music TMC, but feels that there will be wide acceptance of both of the TMCs at the end of the review cycle. A committee member asked that in future reports the CSU include the number of TMC matches in relationship to the number of majors and options offered at each campus. It is important for counselors to know the specific concentration that is similar so they can accurately advise students who have a special interest within a major. Eloy Oakley added that it needs to be explained for those students who can't get in to see a counselor. A CSU staff member suggested that in providing the ratio, there should be a contextual narrative as to why the degree or option is not considered similar by the campus.

Ken reported that the closure of the spring admission term with exception to the SB 1440 degree applicants brought a positive interest from CSU program leaders who now view TMC adoption as a way to distinguish their programs and increase enrollment.

Update on Fall 2012 CSU Admission of CCC Students with AA-T/AS-T degrees – Eric Forbes

Eric Forbes shared a set of initial survey results completed by the CSUCO. The survey asked CSU campuses about their SB 1440 processes and admission application experiences in the Fall 2012 cycle. Eric asked Karen Simpson-Alisca from the CO staff to guide the committee through the results. Karen explained most of the CSU campuses created special handling procedures, usually a manual process, to confirm SB 1440 applicants and to assure that each of the admission provisions would be met. The degree to which campuses are impacted often determines the level of concern over admission verification requirements. This can be seen in the survey results. There will be additional concerns over obligations with respect to the remaining degree requirements when final transcripts are received. At the time of the report, only 50 students were redirected to other CSU campuses, and only 40 actually required the gpa "bump" in order to be admitted.

After reviewing student petitions to graduate, many CCC campuses provided students with verification that the student was on track to graduate, which were subsequently sent by these students to the CSU campuses considering them for admission. The CSU will not have a full understanding of the various transfer conditions until data is reported by campuses at census, roughly October 2012. The various responses affirmed the need to develop a simple verification procedure.

Carsbia Anderson mentioned that the CCC members of his subcommittee recommended that the initial electronic list of potential students prepared by the CSUCO be returned to the CSUCO by each of the 113 campuses identifying those SB 1440 students on track for the degree, and in turn, the CSUCO forward each of these lists to the 23 campuses for review. He indicated that the subcommittee was told that the students need to be held accountable. Carsbia said he was not sure why we don't just hold students accountable for being honest and rescind admission as needed That proposal was deemed not workable by the CSU members of the subcommittee insofar as students apply to multiple campuses and that individual student files are created for each applicant. Not only would a procedure of this kind further delay getting information to the determining campuses, a "check-off" list does not actually confirm that students are on track for the degree. The lists could not be returned until the end of the CCC review period, after all candidates were considered, otherwise multiple copies of the same list would need to be sent. For these reasons, the CSU members rejected this proposal.

Carsbia Anderson further inquired as to why the CSU is intent on requiring verification of degree progress in the admission cycle, rather than follow the same procedures routinely used for freshman

applicants, i.e. self-reported applicant data. He indicated that there were 60 or more students on the list he received but only 4 were eligible to complete the degree in time for the Fall 2012 admission cycle. Eric Forbes pointed out that while self-reported data is used for high school students, most campuses require these students to send preliminary high school transcripts as well as final ones. These transcripts are used to verify satisfaction of completion of the A-G courses, gpa requirements, etc. Nevertheless, for SB1440 students, the CSU is bound to admit these students over other fully qualified, eligible students. The issue is particularly acute at campuses that are impacted or at campuses with impacted programs. The CSU cannot be placed in the position of wholesale admission of students based on self-reported data only to be forced to rescind a large number of admission decisions. Solid verification, prior to completion of the AA degree, enables the CSU to be confident in its admission determinations, and there will be fewer students with the need for admission rescission when final transcripts are received.   The ratio of 4:60 reported by Carsbia is sufficient reason to require verification. The most efficient way to achieve what is needed here is for both segments to develop the electronic transmission of transcript and student data.

Jeff Spano asked that we at least consider whether an interim electronic method of sharing CSU applicant names and CCC verification of graduation readiness might be feasible until such time as both segments have e-transcript and data sharing capabilities. Although we are considering the current process as a temporary one, we could be in this temporary state for several years and the number of students transferring with an AA-T/AS-T degree will likely increase. Erik Skinner indicated that that there are two dimensions of the process that have to be considered: the delivery of the response as well as an evaluation of potential workload. He indicated that he would talk with the e-transcript presenters the following day at TTAC to see what they could come up with.

A staff member from the CSU shared that a recommendation was made from the community college counselors that the CSU provide them a verification form that can be downloaded and completed electronically or manually and returned to the student; this would be a system wide solution to the verification format.   A member stated that instead of a common form, the verification committee could consider a common format for the verification response from the colleges. Carsbia indicated that the CSSOs have discussed this option and do not support the process of utilizing a common form; he will bring back the idea of a common reporting format to the CSSO group for consideration. Linda Michalowski indicated that it is the admission folks who primarily deal with this and that we need their input as well, particularly if we talking about a change to the process they had input into.

Update on Spring 2013 CSU Admission – *Eric Forbes*

Eric Forbes asked Nathan Evans, Director of Enrollment Management, to provide a summary of the admission procedures for the SB 1440 applicants. Nathan informed the committee that for both the winter and spring terms, the CSU proposes that a similar timeline be used for degree application and verification.   The CSU would request an extract of SB 1440 reported applicants within Mentor by September 7th. The CSU would filter the list, removing all of the applicants who are clearly not eligible and forward the list to the community colleges and CSU campuses by mid-September with a date of returning forms to students by mid-October.   The CSU is working with CSU Mentor to develop a few enhancements that would reduce the number of false positives of eligible applicants.

The committee discussed the challenges of communicating admission opportunities to students. The members agreed there is a need for a searchable site that students can access to search for similar programs between the CSUs and the CCCs.

Work Group Reports:

Intersegmental Curriculum Work Group (ICW) – *Michelle Pilati*

Michelle Pilati shared that the members of the ICW are considering the limits of the TMC development process, such as the number of TMCs for each major, the level of commonality for developing TMCs, and other criteria such as high labor demands for the major. They expect to make the determination at their next meeting. The ICW has estimated the 25 majors they have identified for TMCs that will be completed by the Fall 2012 term will address the needs of 79% of the transfer population.

Michelle reported that the Journalism and Geography TMCs are complete and will be sent to the ICW subgroup for acceptance. The TMCs for Philosophy and Spanish are ready for the online vetting process. Michelle also reported that the Academic Senate of the Community Colleges have passed a resolution based on the ICW's recommendation that for degrees that have TMCs , there should not be independent degrees developed by the community colleges.

Responding to IOC members' questions, Michelle shared that the TMCs for Journalism and Geography should be available in time for the next IOC meeting and that further IOC discussions are needed regarding the process for degrees that are not included in the top transfer majors.

Ken asked what happens with the degrees such as Administration of Justice or Kinesiology that are not yet 100% accepted because they may lead to distinct baccalaureate pathways. Michelle reported that the ICW is considering those degrees.

Andrea Boyle reported on behalf of Jim Postma and expressed CSU faculty support of the ICW recommendation. If there are TMCs, the CSU faculty does not support the development of local independent versions of these AA degrees. There was discussion of the SciGETC at the ICAS meeting. The STEM TMC proposal is under discussion and review by the ICW. The ICW is exploring areas where a second TMC may be beneficial, such as Business, Kinesiology and Early Childhood Development . Andrea stated that Jim expects that the Business faculty will conclude that a second TMC is unnecessary. However, there are no final decisions from any of these groups.

In response to AB 1295, Andrea reported that the Nursing faculty workgroup is continuing to work on a TMC variant which would include 70 units of lower division coursework, and 50 units of upper division coursework at the CSU.

Communications – Mike Uhlenkamp

Mike Uhlenkamp reported that the communications committee working with the advertising agency plans to launch the website "adegreewithaguarantee.com" by mid-August, to coincide with the 2012 CSU Spring application period and in advance of the fall 2013 application period.

The committee has also designed marketing collateral pieces such as a mini poster and a tear pad. These materials will be available to the high schools and community colleges at the same time the website goes live and distributed at the CSU counselor conferences in September.

The last phase of the communication campaign includes the degree mapping website and student testimonials.

Presentation:

Electronic Transcripts – Bonnie Edwards and Tim Calhoon from e-TranscriptCA

Bonnie Edwards gave the committee a brief history of e-TranscriptCA, the electronic transcript project and its history. She informed the committee that a mini grant program was created, thanks to funding from the California Assembly, to support the AB 1056 mandate. The grant provides community colleges financial assistance to implement or further their implementation of an electronic transcript program. Colleges that have chosen a vendor other than eTranscript such as Parchment, Credentials and National Student Clearinghouse, still qualify for the mini-grant as long as they agree to comply with the California transcript data standards. The California transcript data standards include data that is required by the UC and CSU for transfer, such as IGETC, CSU General Education Breadth and SB 1440. In addition, they provide a common transcript standard across California, which is critical to automating the exchange and processing of transcripts.

Tim Calhoon stated that there are currently 78 institutions participating, 46 community colleges, 18 CSU campuses, 9 University of California campuses and 5 independent colleges that are accepting and/or sending electronic transcripts through e-TranscriptCA. The newest members are the UCs and LA Community College District. Tim explained that most of the two year institutions are sending and receiving while the four year institutions are primarily just receiving electronic transcripts. The goal is to have all of the institutions with capabilities of sending and receiving. Another goal of the project is provide colleges with the capability to integrate their college systems (i.e., degree audit system) with e-TranscriptCA.

To respond to the SB 1440 needs, Tim shared that e-TranscriptCA has added three new fields to the electronic report, which includes the degree types and student program codes that link the data from the CCC to the CSU. The unique codes identify the program status such as "in progress," "completed" and degree status such as "awarded" or "anticipated." They have also added a transfer Indicator that identifies if the degree is SB1440 or a regular associate degree. They are now in development and testing of these modifications with the PeopleSoft CMS staff at the CSU system office.

Work Group Reports Continued:

Early Student Identification – *Carsbia Anderson*
Carsbia reported that the workgroup has upcoming plans to meet and work through the student verification and identification issues. They are also negotiating the dates for the verification timeline that they can then share with counselors and other college and campus personnel.

Carsbia stated the CSSOs recently discussed the need to standardize the verification procedure and build it into their regular business practices.

CCC Counseling Materials – *Jeff Spano and Jane Patton*

Jane reported that the Chancellor's office has convened a group of community college counselors that will develop advising materials and set up four regional meetings that will take place in August. The

group has already developed a PowerPoint presentation for the counselors to use in their orientation meeting and transfer workshops. The group will continue to develop materials for counselors' use.

Jane also reported that there were a number of questions raised by the community colleges counselors who attended this initial meeting. The group will compile a list of the questions for consideration and formulate responses. The goal is to have all of the information available for counselors by fall 2012.

Next Meeting: May 24, 2012 in Sacramento

Meeting adjourned.