



SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee Meeting Monday, June 17, 2013

Holiday Inn Sacramento

Meeting Summary

X	Ephraim Smith (co-chair)	Χ	Erik Skinner (co-chair)
Α	Leroy Morishita	Χ	Eloy Oakley
Α	Donald Para	Χ	Kuni Hay
Χ	Douglas Freer	Χ	Carsbia Anderson
Χ	Sandra Cook	Α	Sue Granger-Dickson
Χ	Diana Guerin	Χ	Michelle Pilati
Χ	Mark Van Selst	Χ	Beth Smith
Х	Jim Postma	Χ	Linda Michalowski
Х	Eric Forbes	Χ	Aaron Bielenberg
Χ	Miles Nevin	Χ	Carsbia Anderson

Call to Order

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

Welcome and Introductions by the IOC Chairs

Co-chair Skinner thanked Carsbia Anderson, who is retiring at the end of June, for his dedication and service to the committee, as well as his leadership on the Early Student Identification subcommittee.

Co-Chair Ephraim P. Smith noted that there were several new members to the committee; he asked that all of the committee members introduce themselves.

The chairs submitted the March 28, 2013 meeting summary notes to the committee for approval. The notes were approved by the committee with minor revisions.

Discussion

■ Implications of SB 440 - Erik Skinner, Deputy Chancellor, CCC Chancellor's Office & Ephraim P. Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, CSU Office of the Chancellor

Co-chair Skinner provided an overview of SB 440 (Padilla 2013) to the committee. SB 440 contains several key provisions, where if passed into law, modify California education code initially created by SB 1440. Key provisions in the legislation specify a deadline for degree development, the development of degrees in specified areas of emphasis, a requirement of determining baccalaureate degrees similar at the major level, the establishment of an applicant redirection process, and the implementation of a marketing and communication plan for the Associate Degree for Transfer program.

Both chairs emphasized the progress to date in the implementation of SB 1440, and questioned the necessity of the legislation, partially concerned that the legislation may serve to redirect time and energy away from SB 1440's ongoing progress. A member commented that allowing more time to let the campuses and faculty implement, and continuing efforts towards outreach, would be a more productive strategy. The member also shared that the ASCCC has composed a letter to Senator Padilla regarding the CCC statewide faculty position on the legislation. A committee member asked if both Chancellors Offices have met with Senator Padilla's staff, and Co-chair Skinner replied yes, and that the meetings were constructive. Both offices have shared specific concerns along with amendment suggestions, and neither segment is opposing the bill at this time. One member noted the key provisions in SB 440 are the opposite of what is needed, in their opinion, and the member is concerned that the new bill, if enacted, will require a complete re-evaluation and a possible ground-floor rebuild of the TMC methodology.

Co-chair Skinner shared community college concerns around the area of emphasis degrees, and how that could also lead to the creation of local degrees, versus the statewide TMC model. Another member stated that there is no CSU objection to the re-direction provision; however, it is something the CSU is currently working on to fully implement. A member shared with the committee that area of emphasis type degrees were initially evaluated when SB 1440 became law, and it was determined that they were too broad for the transfer element of the SB 1440 program. The member also noted that the CSU faculty has a concern with the part about declaring similar for every option within a major, and CCC faculty understand there are valid differences within a major that may not align with a TMC within the SB 1440 program. Faculty residing on the committee further noted that many TMCs, which are now final, would require complicated rework to redefine the curriculum on each TMC to satisfy all possible options within a program. Members then discussed various strategies when communicating to Senator Padilla's office, including emphasizing that support for marketing and communication to students is a critical need, and the importance that both systems work closely together when providing feedback to Senator Padilla.

Co-chair Skinner then provided a brief 2013-14 budget update, which includes an investment in student success related programs, electronic transcripts, and technology advising tools. Co-chair Skinner also mentioned that enrollment funding increases will also help facilitate the movement of students from CCC to CSU.

Progress Reports

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

Ken O'Donnell's report to the committee included slides to visually communicate the status of similar declarations between campuses and curriculum. A matrix was shared noting where at least one similar declaration has been made for a campus/program, where no CSU program exists to match, and where similar declarations have not been made, or are in progress. One member commented how SDSU on the matrix indicates a high volume of work in progress, where seven of the SDSU programs are currently being redefined to become compatible with the SB 1440 program.

Ken provided an example of progress, using the business program as an example. The business program has 195 options system wide, where as of March, 103 options were similar; however, by the end of May, 129 options were similar. Ken stressed the goal is not to reach 195 similar declarations (100 percent) in this example, as some options are very unique and not compatible with the SB 1440 program. A member commented regarding American Institutions and Ideals (AI) courses, mentioning that six units at the CSU are reserved should a student transfer without AI curriculum completed while at a community college. Thus, if a student were to arrive at a CSU with AI curriculum completed, those available six units would allow for the similar declaration of many more CSU business options, perhaps up to 80 percent of the total options. Ken shared a slide where last fall 644 associate degrees where conferred, from which 426 students applied to a CSU, and 425 enrolled (note, the one student's overall GPA was less than 2.0). Ken stated that it would be interesting to understand where the other 218 degree awarded students went who did not enroll at a CSU. A member recommended that Institutional Research at the CCCCO use the National Student Clearinghouse to identify the future university enrollment of all students who earn the ADT degrees.

Ken then shared www.adegreewithaguarantee.com web site activity, which has predictably lessened proportional to advertising campaign investment. Ken noted that February 1 through April 30 had 31,937 visits. A member reminded the committee that students at a community college are there to initially explore, and many require remedial course work. Another member emphasized the importance of simplicity, whereas students and counselors need to understand the degree mapping to CSU programs. Ken shared how the www.adegreewithaguarantee.com web site will be further enhanced to display degree mappings to a CSU, and staff member Karen Simpson-Alisca added that SB 1440 sessions are also scheduled for the fall CSU Counselor conferences.

 AS-T / AA-T Degrees in the CCC – Barry Russell, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, CCC Chancellor's Office

Barry Russell provided the committee with a matrix showing college degree creation status, including degrees by major approved and in progress. As of May 29, 701 degrees are in place. Barry also reminded the committee that college courses on TMC degree submissions must indicate that a C-ID number has been awarded for the college course (where a C-ID number exists on the TMC), or the course is pending a number from the C-ID program. One member noted that for the Los Angeles CCD, which has over 200,000 students, only 16 approved degrees are in place. Barry responded that the Los Angeles district has many degrees in queue, and he is confident the district will make further progress. Another member asked if there was one activity regarding the degree submission process that could be improved upon to expedite submissions, and Barry responded that he has found the challenges vary among the colleges.

■ SB 1440 Students; Spring/Fall 2013 Admission & Enrollment – Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Services, CSU Office of the Chancellor

Staff member Nathan Evans provided an update on CSU transfer admissions and enrollment. Nathan emphasized the program is still at a phase where most students are not intentionally on this path, but that the students just happen to have had the course work completed for a degree. Nathan shared that there are some encouraging trends to date. For example, the initial selfdeclared degree applicants on CSU Mentor, compared to applicants asked for verification, was a ratio of 4 to 1 for fall 2012, whereas the ratio for fall 2013 was 1.5 to 1. Preliminary numbers indicate 275 AS-T/AA-T students enrolled for spring 2013. A member asked about the CSU Mentor validation, and Nathan clarified that CSU Mentor currently validates to ensure the CCC offers the degree the applicant is selecting, and a future step is to validate that the particular CSU campus applied to offers the similar option. A CSU member noted that due to impaction in one particular program at their campus, only students awarded an AA-T in Psychology will be admitted. Another member noted that it would be helpful to provide data on SB 1440 students who were redirected, but did not redirect for whatever reason. A member reflected on the upcoming budget, and that a 1 percent funding increase allows for 3,200 more CSU students. Additional questions were asked regarding redirection, and the process was explained. Co-chair Smith reminded the committee that 17 of the 23 CSU campuses are currently impacted. A CSU member noted that, in the future, the CSU would like to further enhance the process where a student can indicate redirection preferences, should redirection become necessary. Co-chair Skinner noted that for the community colleges Proposition 30 has helped, and the 1.66 percent budget proposal increase allows for approximately 75,000 more students.

Work Group Reports

■ Early Student Identification Subcommittee Report – Carsbia Anderson, Vice President of Student Services at Monterey Peninsula College

Carsbia Anderson provided the committee with an overview of the work the subcommittee has accomplished this past year. A verification process is in place, including quarter school accommodations, and the subcommittee has investigated long term solutions to automate the verification process. The subcommittee also developed a standardized document to support verifications, and has contributed to the counseling training workshops. Carsbia stressed it is important to continue to work to further improve the verification process, along with continuing to create transfer pathways through degree creation and similar option mapping.

■ ICW Update -Michelle Pilati, President, ASCCC & Jim Postma, ASCSUPast Chair

Michelle Pilati reported a new TMC is finalized in Film, Television and Electronic media, and that a number of TMCs are currently vetting, as well as some MCs (note, an MC, or Model Curriculum, represents majors not following the 60/60 split, such as nursing and engineering). Three MCs are in engineering, allowing for a higher unit lower division package and 60 at the CSU. Michelle reported that Nursing completed vetting, and the TMC is now re-vetting with a proposed 70/50 unit split and a 36-unit RN specification. Michelle also shared that Agriculture and Economics are still in progress. The ICW is also working out a process for non-substantive changes for a TMC. Diane Guerin clarified that Jim Postma will provide the CSU portion of the update, and Jim added that the Chemistry TMC is moving forward also, with a faculty leadership change to allow IGETC for STEM. Jim noted that the ICW is now working on majors that have a few hundred transfers or less, statewide per year. Jim asked openly what does the long term look like, and whether the program needs an IOC forever? Co-chair Skinner asked if ICW has reached the point where no further TMCs are necessary, and if so, what about students who want a program without a TMC, expressing a concern that otherwise the programs left out will lose enrollment. Jim stated that this topic has been on the ICW agenda for some time, and the ICW is close to reaching a conclusion, but still more discussion is necessary. The 120-unit constraint in the statute was mentioned, and comments were made about how the process would move more quickly if there were flexibility with the total units.

Next Meeting Dates and Locations

Schedule Future Meetings

The committee determined the next meeting should be held this fall at a southern California location. Pending the results of SB 440, the group may convene prior to this fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.