

SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee Meeting
Monday, March 17, 2014
Holiday Inn, Sacramento, CA

X	Ephraim Smith (co-chair)	X	Erik Skinner (co-chair)
X	Leroy Morishita	A	Eloy Oakley
A	David Dowell	A	Kuni Hay
A	Douglas Freer	X	Toni DuBois-Walker
X	Sandra Cook	X	Helen Young
X	Jim Postma	X	Beth Smith
X	Mark Van Selst	X	Linda Michalowski
A	Eric Forbes	A	Julie Bruno
X	Sarah Couch	A	Nicholas Alexander Behney

Meeting Summary

Nathan Evans (sitting in for Eric Forbes), Taylor Valmores (for Nicholas Alexander Behney), Diana Guerin, and Ken O'Donnell.

Staff support: Bob Quinn, Stephanie Ricks-Albert, Julie Adams, Michelle Pilati, Campaign Staff, Koney Austinn, and LAO staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by co-Chairs Ephraim Smith and Eric Skinner.

Welcome and Introductions by the IOC Chairs

The chairs submitted the October 21, 2013 meeting summary notes to the committee for approval. Helen Ward and Toni DuBois-Walker requested that the minutes be corrected to reflect that they were present for the meeting. The committee, with those minor revisions, approved the meeting notes.

Recap of CCC Board of Governors Meeting with Chancellor Harris, Chancellor White and President Napolitano— Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's Office

Erik Skinner summarized the March 3 CCC Board of Governor's meeting that included a discussion by the three segment Chancellors. All three Chancellors shared policy initiatives they are interested in pursuing, and President Napolitano further shared her interest in promoting transfer between the UC and CCC systems. A discussion by the committee then followed regarding the need to analyze student transfer past applicant volume where demand exceeded capacity at either the CSU or UC systems. Co-chair Skinner distributed a report, *Student Success Scorecard, 2013 State of the System Report*, to demonstrate the gap between transfer applicant and admission capacity. It was noted that while Marketing and Outreach is important, the other necessary component is sufficient admission capacity for qualified applicants at the baccalaureate institutions.

Discussion:

Early Student Identification Process— *Toni DuBois-Walker, Vice President for Student Services, Fullerton College*

Toni DuBois-Walker expressed concern regarding the late notification to the community colleges of CSU Mentor self-declared AA-T/AS-T degree intended students for the fall 2014 admission into the CSU. Because of the two-week delayed notification, Toni's college incurred approximately \$6,000 in over-time to meet the deadline. Other neighboring colleges were not able to complete the applicant reviews. Nathan Evans responded that in fall 2013 11,000 students self-reported, but only 1,000 actually enrolled. Nathan alluded to soon to be released online verification tool, and while it is an improvement over the current paper process, college audit time is still necessary. 18,000 applicants self-declared for the fall 2014 cycle. Nathan also shared that this spring the CSU is working to identify applicants who only applied to an impacted campus, to actively communicate to them early in the process regarding other CSU University options. Linda Michalowski suggested the Early Identification Sub-committee reconvene and further work on streamlining the process, in addition to data analysis to determine student enrollment results against the applicant pool. One member asked about degree audits at the community colleges, and recent legislation. Erik responded that there was recent degree audit legislation that passed, and work has begun in that area but it will take time. Toni noted that even with colleges with degree audits in place an evaluator will still need to review the applicant due to the complexity of the student's course taking history.

Toni shared a memo from CSU Fullerton referencing changing gpa requirements for the upcoming fall semester, to make the point that the communication to CCC transfer centers is an opportunity for improvement. Co-chair Smith noted the letter will be amended to disallow a service area change. Sandra Cook noted each CSU university does it slightly differently, and she described San Diego State's process. Impaction was further discussed. Some members stressed the need for verification data and activity beginning in December.

Progress Reports

SB 1440 Application, Admission, & Enrollment Update/eVerify Tool – *Nathan Evans, Director, Enrollment Management Services and Student Academic Support, CSU Office of the Chancellor*

Nathan Evans demonstrated for the committee a new online degree verification tool developed by CSU Office of the Chancellor staff. The tool is an adaptation of software first developed by San Diego State. The online tool allows an evaluator at a community college to provide an electronic audit result for each student. The status for each student can be selected by the evaluator, such as degree completed, degree in-progress complete by spring 2014, degree in-progress complete by summer 2014, student not pursuing an AA-T/AS-T. If a community college student applied to more than one CSU university, the result would be distributed by the tool to each CSU university the student applied. Committee members were pleased with the tool and hopeful that it would assist the verification process workload at the colleges. The tool is currently being piloted by several community colleges with a planned winter/spring admission cycle release.

Linda asked when CSU admission data would be available that shows outcomes of the admission gpa bump, such as how was the bump applied to students at the universities, and in what instances did

the gpa increase result in an admission decision. Helen Young stated that at some point it would be helpful to understand who the admission bump benefits students, and furthermore, in what programs. That information would help counselors tasked with guiding students with application strategies. As the number of students receiving these degrees increases more data will be available.

AS-T / AA-T Degrees in the CCC – Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor, CCC Chancellor’s Office

Co-Chair Skinner provided a handout showing the status of AA-T/AS-T degrees approved by the Chancellor’s Office. The report, dated February 26, 2014, shows 1,147 degrees are available, and that colleges have reached 70% of the goal of offering AA-T/AS-T degrees in programs where a TMC for the major is available and the major is also offered at the college. A member asked whether colleges are de-activating terminal degrees when an AA-T/AS-T degree is introduced in the same program. Erik responded that the results are varied, a few colleges have chosen to do that, and others have not. Also, some colleges have chosen to provide a portion of their AA-T/AS-T degrees online for students.

Similar BA/BS Degrees in the CSU - Ken O'Donnell, Senior Director, Student Engagement and Academic Initiatives & Partnerships, CSU Office of the Chancellor

Ken updated compatible degrees to the committee. These are degrees that may fit within the 60-unit model, but are not the same major, for example, a Psychology TMC where a Sociology degree may fit the model. Some programs at the CSU have not participated at this time, hoping for a TMC of their own. Ken expects as the known TMCs to be produced are clear, more will join.

Regarding TMCs, three, including Ag, Economics, and Film, have gone out to the campuses. So far most campuses appear that it will work. Bio and Chem have not been sent out yet, pending the implementation of IGETC for STEM. By the next meeting he will have responses on the three, and hopefully also Chem and Bio. Ken also updated on Computer Science, he asked those campuses who originally said “yes” to the question of similarity whether they could still accommodate such degrees if instead they followed IGETC for STEM, deferring two lower-division GE courses until after transfer. 2/3 said they would no longer be able to answer “yes,” so he will not pursue a TMC for that major using the IGETC for STEM pattern.

Updates

Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) – Michelle Pilati, C-ID Faculty Coordinator

Michelle opened by stating that all 112 community colleges now participate in C-ID. 6,099 community college courses now have C-ID designations, and 12 CSUs have identified 1,171 CSU courses as comparable to C-ID descriptors. There are 243 C-ID approved descriptors in 31 disciplines. Michelle shared that a number of disciplines have finished vetting.

Regarding TMCs, 31 are now available for use or consideration, and 2 disciplines with TMCs in progress. There are two disciplines with Model Curricula in progress, MCs, ICT and Nursing. These majors do not fit into the 60+60 structure. Also, one discipline with 3 MCs (ISM) will soon be posted for vetting, which is Engineering.

Michelle provided status on Area of Emphasis degrees, defined as an interdisciplinary TMC that is developed to serve multiple majors at the CSU. The ICW is exploring Allied Health/Health Science, Ethnic Studies, STEM, Global studies/International Studies. Creation of these degrees are required by the recently enacted SB 440 (Padilla 2013) legislation. A balance must be reached with these

degrees. A question was asked regarding the courses for these degrees. Michelle stated that the challenge is if the area of emphasis is too broad, few CSU majors will be able to declare similar.

DIGs will occur for some new disciplines, addition studies(?), biotechnology, and EMS. Also bringing reviewers together to work on Bio, Chem, Hist, Math, and Poly Sci to further work on issues. Bio by the way is the last of the top ten transfer majors to be completed.

Work Group Reports

ICW Update, including Area of Emphasis Degrees – *Beth Smith, President, Academic Senate California Community College and Jim Postma, Past- Chair, CSU Academic Senate*

Jim Postma provided the group with a handout showing transfer majors by major, color coded to match the major to TMCs. The report also identifies majors not covered by a TMC, along with the transfer volume. In many instances transfers not represented by a TMC are so few a TMC is not cost warranted. In other instances, there are large transfer volumes not matched to a TMC, indicating an opportunity for discussion on resolving that gap. However, of 40,000 transfers analyzed, only 2,000 were in that cohort. 1,000 were self-declared, and the remaining 37,000 could be matched to TMC. A member voiced that it is important to ensure the program benefits transfers, but also does not negatively impact others who are not included. Small programs were discussed, and when is the end declared with curricula development? Faculty could be convened for the disciplines left out, to determine whether there is any room for curriculum change to allow the merge of several disciplines.

Schedule Next Meeting Dates and Locations

The committee will be polled to set the next meeting date, which will be held in the southern California area.

Recap of Decisions, Action Items and Parking Lot Items