



**SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee  
November 2, 2010 Meeting Summary**

**Call to Order**

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

**Committee Member Attendance**

X	Ephraim Smith (co-chair)	X	Erik Skinner (co-chair)
	Milton Gordon	X	Eloy Oakley
X	Donald Para	X	Pam Deegan
X	Douglas Freer	X	Carsbia Anderson
X	Sandra Cook	X	Daniel Nannini
X	James Postma	X	Jane Patton
X	Andrea Renwanz-Boyle	X	Michelle Pilati
X	Eric Forbes	X	Linda Michalowski
X	Allison Jones		
	Christopher Chavez	X	Sarab Sarabi

**Welcome and Introductions**

*Co-chairs Erik Skinner and Ephraim Smith*

The co-chairs opened the meeting and welcomed members and guests. The chairs recognized the significance of the historic SB 1440 legislation and the hard work ahead for all of participants.

Allison Jones commented this was his last day with the CSU Chancellor’s Office and Eric Forbes will assume CSU’s staff role on the committee.

Miles Nevin attended as a California State Student Association representative in place of Christopher Chavez.

**Welcoming Remarks**

*Megan Moret, Legislative Aide, Office of Senator Padilla*

Legislative Aide Megan Moret shared Senator Padilla’s appreciation for convening the SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight committee meeting. Ms. Moret remarked that 14 senators co-

authored this legislation, that transfer is a priority for Senator Padilla, and a priority for all state legislators as well. Ms. Moret offered the senator's office as a resource as needed. Committee member Linda Michalowski commented that the Senator's bill stayed very true to its initial intent, and thanked Megan for her work and dedication to see it through.

Co-Chair Skinner acknowledged the role of the Campaign for College Opportunity, and the CSU and CCC student organizations for their contributions to enacting this legislation.

### **Overview of Committee Charge**

*Co-Chairs Erik Skinner and Ephraim Smith*

Co-Chair Ephraim Smith introduced the topic to review the charge (handout). There were no member questions regarding the charge.

### **Review SB 1440 and AB 2302 Provisions**

*Members Allison Jones and Linda Michalowski*

Allison Jones summarized the SB 1440 legislation (handout). Mr. Jones overviewed key points of the bill and noted this is a public policy bill intended to alleviate the anticipated shortfall of baccalaureate degree demand in California by 2025. Both the California Community Colleges (CCC) and the California State University (CSU) provisions within the bill were discussed. Mr. Jones mentioned campus impact within the CSU system, but also noted a recent budget augmentation will help to alleviate some admissions constraints. Mr. Jones shared where the priority admission falls within existing California education code 66202 and Title 5 regulations. Specifically, Mr. Jones pointed out that the priority is first given to continuing enrolled students, then to CCC transfer students who have completed an approved transfer program, then other students prepared for transfer. Mr. Jones mentioned the priority difference between TAG/TAA students and SB 1440 students may need further discussion, and that transfer-ready veterans move to the top within all priority admission categories.

Member Linda Michalowski provided an overview of AB 2302 (handout). The legislation requests the University of California (UC) faculty to consider the applicability of associate degrees for transfer to UC, and begin an analysis of opportunities to streamline transfer to the UC system, followed by a report to the legislature on progress. A member asked whether there are plans for the CCC Chancellor's Office and the UC Office of the President to collaborate on the legislation. Co-chair Skinner confirmed yes, and added that UC representation could be included at future SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee meetings. Member Michalowski suggested that it may be beneficial to reconvene the UC-CCC Transfer Advisory Board to facilitate discussion of AB 2302. Possible approaches will be discussed with the UCOP.

A member pointed out that there are 120-unit majors that have pre-requisites or sequence requirements which may result in students earning more than 60 lower division units, and if in those instances the CCC could include more than 60 units. A CSU member stated that the CSU accepts up to 70 transfer units and will continue to do so; therefore, students will not lose any additional units if needed for inclusion in an SB 1440 degree. Local CSU campuses will decide

how to use those units as electives toward the remaining 120-unit requirement for the BA/BS degree. If this is not achievable, then the additional units will transfer and affect the g.p.a. but will not be applied to the degree requirements.

#### *Issues and Open Questions Noted*

1. Minimum/maximum number of lower division units required for a 1440 degree.
2. Policy for highly sequenced, high lower division unit majors.
3. Priority difference between transfer agreement students and SB 1440 transfer students.
4. Establish a listserv to support committee communication.

#### **Presentation on Implementation Plans and Identified Issues**

*Members Allison Jones and Linda Michalowski*

Member Michalowski overviewed a list of tasks originating from a CSU/CCC August 25, 2010 meeting (handout).

Regarding high-unit majors (item 7), a member commented that at some point it would be good to discuss opportunities to modify SB 1440 degrees for high unit majors.

Related to early identification of students seeking an associate degree for transfer (item 13), a CSU member mentioned the CSU Mentor transfer planner, and plans to expand the site to incorporate the associate degree for transfer. Another member noted early identification would help with the legislation's reporting requirements. Another CSU member commented on the intent to include information about these degrees in high school outreach activities so students early on are aware of the degree pathway. Discussion followed on the need to identify the transfer degree intended student well ahead of degree award in respect to admission process timelines, as the admission decision will be made prior to degree award.

A CCC faculty member mentioned the issue of supplemental impaction criteria. The expressed concern is that supplemental admission criteria may include additional coursework beyond established transfer degree curriculum, and that there are quite a few faculty statewide that will not participate in the statewide curriculum program. The member added that CCC faculty members are asking for a guarantee that any supplemental criteria enrollment management strategy for students completing transfer degrees be grade point average based, and not accomplished through additional coursework.

Regarding local area priority (item 15), there was discussion of the challenges surrounding student behavior and requirements that all courses be taken locally. The problem is complicated because CCCs have impaction related issues too, and students are often required to enroll in a CCC course outside their area, which could re-classify the student as non-local by a CSU campus. The CSU members agreed to have further discussion and to consider a threshold of allowable out-of-area units when a course is not offered or is not available at the student's local area campus.

Regarding admissions priorities, CSU members communicated that a flow chart(s) to illustrate how students with an associate degree for transfer will be prioritized under different impact scenarios is a work in progress (item 17).

Related to the CSU requirement that students achieve a minimum 3.0 grade point average in the golden four courses (item 18), versus the standard of a 2.0 cumulative GPA in SB 1440, community college faculty members emphasized this question will be addressed by the CCC faculty, and that there will be an Academic Senate resolution introduced at the ASCCC Fall Plenary clarifying students must achieve a 'C' grade or better for each golden four course completed. A member pointed out that there may still be a legal issue that needs to be reviewed.

The program start date was discussed. It was recommended by a faculty member that fall 2011 be designated as when students can start a program. Further discussion resulted. The student members questioned whether that recommended timeline was in keeping with the legislative intent and recommended that a degree for transfer and admission priority be available to students who have started coursework prior to the SB 1440 implementation date, but are meeting the prescribed requirements to complete the degree prior to the proposed fall 2011 implementation date. It was noted that SB 1440 becomes effective Jan 1, 2011. Beginning in fall 2011, students can pursue the new degree and those applying for transfer to the CSU who have met the requirements of the degree can utilize it, affecting their actual transfer in spring 2011 or fall 2012.

#### *Issues or Open Questions Noted*

5. The CSU and CCC Chancellor's offices will prepare a high level summary communicating SB 1440 implementation status and accomplishments to date.
6. CCC Academic Senate will propose a resolution regarding golden four grades of 'C' or better to conform to the current CSU policy.
7. The CSU and CCC Chancellor's offices will clarify any legal issues regarding golden four grades of 'C' or better.
8. The CSU will discuss unit requirements for local area determination and consider adopting a policy.
9. The CSU will discuss and report back on the issue of additional supplemental course criteria for impacted majors.
10. The community colleges will discuss and report back on naming of SB 1440 degrees.
11. Consider developing a handbook for implementation – content specific for each constituent group such as AOs, Transfer Center counselors, discipline faculty, admission staff and High school counselors.
12. The CSU representatives expressed concern about the potential absence of American Ideals in the coursework completed for the transfer degree. Given the opportunities for double counting as well as the number of students who already complete this work prior to transfer, the CSU would like assurance that this work will be completed as part of the transfer preparation. The CCC representatives felt strongly that this was not part of the degree requirements outlined in SB 1440, but they indicated that they would

definitely continue to encourage double counting. There was a brief discussion, but no consensus was reached.

13. The CSU representatives expressed concern about the potential for substitutions and waivers of core requirements for particular students enrolled in transfer degree programs and would like to recommend that these not be permitted for any stipulated core requirements.

### **Presentation by the Academic Senates on the Degree Development Process**

*Members Jane Patton and James Postma*

Faculty member Jane Patton presented the curriculum implementation response to SB 1440 (slideshow). Faculty member James Postma co-introduced the item. The presentation outlined a planned, state-wide approach where each major would have a lower division common core consisting of a minimum six units. Additional major or area of emphasis courses may then be selected from a list by colleges as they design a degree that meets local needs and emphasis. This model was referred to as the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC). The goal of the TMC approach is to establish common major preparation, but allow for some local flexibility. This also allows students to know what is expected for each major and CSU faculty can know that students who receive priority admission have a certain level of minimum preparation. Using the C-ID process already in place ([www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net)), TMC's for five majors have been drafted (communication studies, geology, math, psychology and sociology) in the last 30 days. CCC and CSU campus discipline faculty, counselors and articulation officers are now being asked to review and provide feedback on the patterns. Nine additional discipline patterns are in the works for this winter and coming spring.

A question was asked about how the CCC as a system supports the TMC approach. A CCC counselor member suggested that some local/regional CCCs might look at both the TMC and the locally developed transfer associate degree options and decide to explore both models, keeping the locally developed degrees to satisfy their largest transfer feeder schools. A CSU faculty member added that all paths to transfer that previously existed continue to remain available for all transfer students.

### **Discussion of Issues and Tasks for the Committee**

*All*

The group discussed numerous challenges related to having degrees available to students in fall 2011, including the possible timeline and impacts on current students. Issues related to impaction and current student transitions were discussed. The committee agreed to establish two subcommittees, one related to transition issues, the second related to impaction/academic issues. Both subcommittees will report on progress at the next committee meeting. A CCC faculty member also reminded the committee of the work being done surrounding curriculum issues by both academic senates. Separate from the subcommittees, a member noted the need for system wide communication about admission to the next local CSU as a local if the student's major is not offered, and member Eric Forbes volunteered to share at the next meeting local areas and status within each local area.

*Issues or Open Questions Noted*

14. Establish a subcommittee to focus on transition issues (members Eric Forbes, Linda Michalowski, James Postma, CSSA, and Stephanie Low). Eric Forbes offered to provide the group with a possible timeline related to the transitional student.
15. Establish a subcommittee to focus on impaction/academic issues: (members Dan Nannini, Eric Forbes, Jim Postma & CCC AS member TBD).

**Discussion of Communication Plan for Internal and External Audiences**

*All*

Co-chair Erik Skinner introduced the topic. Communication needs were recognized for various constituent groups, including the public, students, counselors, internal staff, faculty, and staff such as admissions directors. It was acknowledged that communication representatives from both CSU and CCC were present at the committee meeting. Co-chair Skinner reminded the group that the [sb1440questions@ccc.edu](mailto:sb1440questions@ccc.edu) email address remains active. A member suggested a high level summary, such as an implementation status report, that can go out to the institutions is needed.

*Issues or Open Questions Noted*

16. Draft and distribute a joint high level summary, such as an implementation status report, that can go out to the institutions: CCC Chancellors Office, CSU Chancellor's Office, Academic Senates.

**Schedule Future Meetings**

*Co-chairs Erik Skinner and Ephraim Smith*

The next meeting will be held December 10 at the LAX Crowne Plaza. The CSU will host.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. by co-chairs Skinner and Smith.