UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATES

Tuesday, December 4, 2009
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Crowne Plaza Hotel, Santa Barbara Room
Los Angeles International Airport

AGENDA

Action	Item		Enclosures
Information **10:00-10:05**	**I.**	**Chair's Welcome & Announcements** ▪ **Chair Henry Powell**	
Action **10:05-10:10**	**II.**	**Consent Calendar** A. Approval of the Agenda B. Approval of September 1, 2009 Meeting Notes	**Encl. 1** **(p. 5-11)**
Information **Discussion** **10:10-10:35**	**III.**	**Report from the Master Plan Subcommittee** ▪ **Dan Simmons, UC Senate Vice Chair** Simmons will report on the deliberations of the Master Plan Subcommittee with the aim of developing agreement among the segments and informing Assembly member Ruskin of ICAS' perspective on the currency of the Master Plan.	**TBD**
Information **Discussion** **10:35-11:00**	**IV.**	**Report from the Advocacy Subcommittee** ▪ **John Tarjan, CSU Senate Chair** Tarjan will report on the deliberations of the Advocacy Subcommittee. What advocacy efforts can be planned for Spring 2009? How can the Senates collaborate in advocating for higher education? How can ICAS partner with students in its advocacy efforts? A report with recommendations for action will be distributed, as well as a draft brochure and draft talking points for use in advocacy efforts.	**TBD**

Discussion 11:00-12:00

V. California Master Plan for Higher Education/Joint Committee on the Master Plan

- **Chair Powell and Assembly Member Ira Ruskin**

2010 will mark the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan. Assembly Member Ruskin is Chair of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, established by ACR 65, which will review the Master Plan and make recommendations before the end of 2010. Assembly Member Ruskin will discuss his goals for the Joint Committee and ICAS members will contribute their perspectives on the essential elements of the Master Plan.

Discussion/ Action 12:00-12:30

VI. American Diploma Project **Encl. 2 (p. 12-19)**

- **Bill Jacobs and Sue Wilbur, UC Director of Admissions**

The American Diploma Project is an initiative that seeks to align high school coursework with college readiness. One proposal under consideration is to use the Early Assessment Program (EAP) as a college readiness test by all three higher education segments in California. The EAP originally was developed by CSU to enable students to place out of remedial writing and mathematics courses at CSU and some Community Colleges. It is given to 11th graders. UC has concerns about whether EAP is an adequate measure of readiness for UC coursework. .

Action requested: **Determine next steps.**

12:30 -12:40

Break and lunch service

Discussion 12:40-1:10

VII. Working Lunch - Reports from Senate Chairs

- **Jane Patton, President, Academic Senate, CCC**
- **John Tarjan, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU**
- **Henry Powell, Chair, Academic Senate UC**

Discussion/ Action 1:10-2:00

VIII. Discussion

Members will engage in a follow-up discussion on issues raised during consultation with Assembly member Ruskin, and will discuss: 1) how the Master Plan can be used in advocacy efforts; 2) Ideas for marking its 50th anniversary.

Action requested: **(1) Endorse draft memo from the Master Plan Subcommittee; (2) Endorse the draft brochure and talking points from the Advocacy Subcommittee and adopt an advocacy plan.**

Information Discussion 2:00-2:20

IX. Transfer Issues

- Final Report of the Community College Transfer Task Force– *Jane Patton & Michele Pilati, CCC, John Tarjan, CSU*
- C-ID & LDTP Updates – *Michele Pilati, CCC & Barbara Swerkes, CSU*

Encl. 3 (p. 20-47)

Information 2:20-2:45

X. Intersegmental Pathways for Online Courses

- **Carl Bellone, AVP, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, California State University-East Bay**
- **Glen Perry, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Management Systems, California State University-East Bay**

Encl. 4 (p. 48)

AVP Bellone and Perry will describe a pilot project to create pathways between online courses and degrees at participating community colleges and online degree completion programs at Cal State East Bay.

Discussion/ Action 2:45-3:05

XI. IGETC Standards

- **Richard Mahon, Chair, IGETC Standards Committee**
- **Ken O'Donnell, Associate Dean, Academic Programs and Policy, CSU Office of the Chancellor**

Encl. 5 (p. 49-51) Encl. 6 (p. 52-53)

Mahon will report on meetings of the IGETC Standards Committee. The Committee asks ICAS the following questions regarding the *IGETC Standards* document, over which ICAS has authority: 1) Is it desirable to permit the combining of 3-quarter unit composition courses to meet the IGETC composition requirement? (Current language requires a *minimum* of 3-semesters of 4-quarter unit courses). 2) Should the ICAS IGETC Standards committee develop language to broaden the range of acceptable pass-through courses? (CSU appears to be willing but UC's position is less clear.). The relevant sections are highlighted in the attached minutes.

***Action requested*: Determine positions on the issues noted above.**

Information/ Discussion 3:05-3:20

XII. Demonstration of New ICAS Website

- **Julie Adams, CSU**

The ICAS website, maintained by the CCC Academic Senate, has been restructured. It now highlights the key concerns and responsibilities of ICAS such as competency statements, IGETC, and transfer issues. It also provides historical documents. This presentation will demonstrate the ICAS website. Members will be invited to provide feedback on the new structure and on what documents should continue to reside on the site.

Discussion/ Action 3:20-3:45

XIII. Future Meetings

- **Henry Powell, Chair**

Members will discuss a proposal to hold future meetings of ICAS in Sacramento and will schedule dates for the remaining meetings.

Action requested: **Determine meeting dates and locations**

Discussion/ Action
as needed

XIV. New Business

Agenda Enclosures:

1. Draft minutes of ICAS meeting on September 1, 2009 (p. 5-11)
2. Notes on UC Involvement in the American Diploma Project and its recent meetings (p. 12-19)
3. Final Report of the Community College Transfer Task Force (p. 20-47)
4. Description of the Online Pathways Project (p. 48)
5. October 23, 2009 IGETC minutes (p. 49-51)
6. November 24, 2009 draft IGETC minutes (p. 52-53)

Important Meeting Information

Location: The December meeting will convene in the Santa Barbara Room at the Crowne Plaza Hotel at Los Angeles International Airport, 5985 West Century Boulevard. Telephone: 310-642.7500; Fax: 310.342.7010.

If you are flying into LAX, there is a free hotel shuttle bus. Or you can walk (it takes 10 minutes). Parking is available at the hotel.

Assistance: For assistance on the day of the meeting, please call Clare Sheridan at 510-590-0092 or Jackie Shelton at 510-987-9143.

Minutes of ICAS Meeting

September 1, 2009
UCOP - Oakland

Members present. CSU: John Tarjan, Bernadette Cheyne, Catherine Nelson, Barbara Swerkes. CCC: Jane Patton, Richard Mahon, Michelle Pilati, Beth Smith, Ricahrd Tahvildaran-Jesswein. UC: Harry Powell, Jonathan Alexander, Sylvia Hurtado, Dan Simmons, Keith Williams.

Staff present. CCC: Julie Adams. UC: Martha Winnacker, Clare Sheridan.

Absent. CSU: Diana Guerin

I. Chair's Welcome and Announcements

Chair Powell welcomed ICAS members. He noted that collaboration among the segments is crucial at such a difficult economic time. The 50th anniversary of the Master Plan is an opportunity to think prospectively about higher education. To that end, he invited Todd Greenspan, UCOP's expert on intersegmental issues, and John Douglass from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at UC Berkeley, to discuss the Master Plan. Douglass is the author of *The California Idea: Higher Education in California from 1850 to the Master Plan* and more recently, *Conditions of Admission*. Later today Catherine Candee will join us. She is UC's Director of Publishing and Broadcast Services, is involved with the California Digital Library, and is interested in open educational resources. She worked on several projects with Martha Kanter, who is now the Undersecretary at the federal Department of Education and formerly was Chancellor of the Foothill-de Anza Community College District. Finally, UC's Interim Provost, Larry Pitts, who is a past chair of ICAS and of the UC Academic Senate, also will join us.

UC Senate Director Martha Winnacker stated that she will post future agendas on the ICAS website, which will be going live this month at http://www.icas-ca.org/ thanks to the efforts of Julie Adams, Senate Director at the CCC.

II. Consent Calendar.

1. Approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved with minor changes, including that Barbara Swerkes, not John Tarjan, will discuss the Community College Transfer Task Force.
2. Approval of the minutes. The minutes were approved with a minor change.

III. Reports from Senate Chairs

Jane Patton, President, CCC Academic Senate. *Structure.* Patton noted that the CCCs are very different from the other two segments. First, the CCC is not a system; it consists of 110 colleges in 72 districts, with separate boards that make local decisions. The Academic Senate is committed to the multiple missions of the CCCs. Transfer is not the only mission—occupational education, basic skills learning, and adult education are also missions. A final difference is that

the CCCs have open access, so there are no admissions issues. The Academic Senate operates with a 14-member Executive Committee which meets monthly. Each college has its own local Academic Senate and members represent their colleges at bi-annual plenary sessions. Faculty often have to fight for participation in governance.

Budget. The CCC is facing $830 million in budget cuts, including a $192 million shortfall in apportionment funds, and a $193 million cut to "categorical programs," which are set-asides for student services such as counseling, matriculation, and transfer support. Colleges also are now being allowed "categorical flexibility," meaning that administrators can move money from one set-aside category to another. The Senate is concerned that some high-cost support services, such as support for disabled students, will be further curtailed. They also expect mid-year cuts. In the past four years, the CCCs have enrolled nearly 400,000 more students (a 15.9% increase). But due to budget cuts, 235,000 students will not be able to take the classes they seek. For example, the San Diego district reduced 600 class sections across four colleges. The Senate is concerned that as more UC-eligible students turn to the CCCs, they will push out those students who are most needy, and is disturbed about the social and economic consequences of class and enrollment cuts. The number one issue for the CCCs is capacity. The Academic Senate, with the Chancellor's office, is forming a task force to examine the future of the community colleges. The Senate's budget will be cut by between 32 and 62%.

Issues. Patton stated that a Senate priority is to address the issue of establishing prerequisites; in the past, they were forbidden to apply prerequisites and many students who are not prepared enrolled, resulting in the need for remediation. She noted that they already have made progress on this issue.

John Tarjan, Chair, CSU Academic Senate. *Structure.* CSU has 23 campuses, and each campus is represented by 2 Senators (7 of the larger campuses have an additional representative). There are four standing committees, and the Senate conducts five plenary sessions annually, held the week before the Board of Trustees meet so that it can give advice to the Board in a timely manner. The Executive Committee is comprised of five members serving three-year terms. The standing committees are Academic Affairs, Academic Preparation (admissions, transfer, remediation, etc), Faculty Affairs, and Fiscal and Governmental Affairs. There also is a General Education Committee (though it is not an official standing committee). Members receive a ¼ reduction in teaching time to conduct Senate business. There has been a 16% budget cut for Senate over the past few years, and it has cut staff from 4.5 to two. Parallel structures exist on the campuses. There is tension between the California Faculty Association union and the Senate. The CFA is responsible for "work conditions" and the Senate is responsible for academic policy. The terms and conditions of tenure are under the purview of the Senate, but the CFA handles any disputes. Any furlough policy is likely to be decentralized.

Issues. Tarjan noted that CSU's Early Start initiative is in the planning stage. It aims to ensure academic success and readiness for transfer students. It may require students to take summer school at CCCs to boost proficiency. This may divert more students to the CCCs. He also mentioned that the Lumina Project is working on programs to improve the number of BAs earned. Finally, he stated that CSU is hoping to reduce the student body by 40,000.

Henry Powell, Chair, UC Academic Senate.

Budget. Powell noted that during the Great Depression, between 1931-1939, UC experienced a 26% cut, while just last year its budget was cut by 20%. He stated that there has

been great controversy over UC's decision not to allow furloughs on instructional days. Many faculty feel that this undermines the University's research mission.

Issues. Powell noted several Senate accomplishments last year—approving honorary degrees for World War II internees whose education was cut short, and the passage of eligibility reform. He stated that the UC Commission on the Future is forming working groups and that faculty will constitute a majority on these groups, even though the Commission, itself, has few faculty representatives. It expects to produce a report by March of this academic year, and the Senate will review its recommendations.

IV. California Master Pan for Higher Education/ACR 65

Chair Powell introduced John Douglass of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley. He noted that California was in the bottom 10% in degree production prior to the financial crisis and that the magnitude of cuts in California is significantly worse than in other states. California was the first state to create a coherent structure of higher education dating back to the 1920s, prior to the Master Plan. He argued that many of the defining features of the Master Plan are not in the statute, but are a result of agreements among the segments. The key question is how the segments can create a formal process to balance their own interests in the service of the whole. State legislative reviews do not produce such agreements and ultimately are not productive. The segments must be involved in any discussion of the future of the Master Plan. Otherwise, its coherence will further disintegrate. Further, enrollment cuts in one segment impact the other segments, which impacts economic and social mobility. Douglass suggested holding a major international conference examining the question of how specific policies of the various segments affect educational attainment in the state.

Todd Greenspan, UC's Director of Academic Planning, stated that a key task is to reestablish what the Master Plan means according to each segment, identifying areas of agreement and disagreement. He noted that some of the changes made in the '70s and '80s are not being followed. For example, the segments have ignored CPEC in recommending new programs. Do we need a more effective coordinating agency? Is there a coherent, rational plan, or does a market-based economy for academic programs exist, requiring a different form of regulation? He argued that legislative term limits have damaged the Master Plan. There are no legislators who can serve as brokers. He also noted that it is important for the governor to be engaged in higher education.

A member stated that the 50th anniversary provides a window of opportunity for the state's institutions of higher education to (in Clark Kerr's words) do something before something is done to us. The higher education community needs to think through new challenges such as the use of technology in instruction, the rise of for-profit providers, and demographic shifts. Another member argued that UC's quality is a result of ensuring a quality faculty, whereas the legislature is interested in low cost education and greater access, which may not dovetail with the faculty's interest in maintaining quality.

Chair Powell said that ICAS should work to identify unity among the segments; it impresses Sacramento when the segments have a common purpose. The 50th anniversary of the Master Plan

can be used as a framework to publicize the crisis in higher education. It is an “educational emergency.”

A member noted that while the Master Plan's separation of function was successful, it did not visualize how the segments should work together. All three segments should advocate for investment in the higher education system. Members also noted the urgent need to engage in advocacy for structural change in the political arena.

V. Interim Provost Pitts

Interim Provost Pitts stated that President Yudof believes it is important for UC to have a good working relationship with the other segments and to band together to advocate for public higher education. We must seek the greatest efficiencies across the system. He noted that the budget challenge presents an opportunity for people to focus on making changes. For example, the segments need to find a way to make it easy for students to pass through the system.

VI. Open Education Resources – Intersegmental Collaboration

Chair Powell introduced Catherine Candee, UC's Director of Publishing and Broadcast Services. She stated that the Open Educational Resource (OER) movement is centered at the CCCs. The UC College Prep initiative was invited to join the OER effort and Hewlett-funded Open Textbook Project. Candee serves on its steering committee. She stated that the cost of textbooks has become an access issue in that students avoid courses with expensive texts. The Open Textbook Project has three aims: to identify existing open textbooks, to encourage their adoption, and to establish standards for open textbooks. She stated that 21 courses comprise 50% of the coursework required for transfer and asked what contribution UC can make to the effort to address textbook affordability and access. She noted that several Academic Senate committees are separately addressing elements of it and that President Yudof also is interested in the topic. Furthermore, there are $6 billion in federal funds for online instruction, $50 million of which is earmarked for open textbooks. The Open Textbook Project's idea is to examine IGETC courses (which are “gateway,” high-enrollment courses) to see if there is a discrete list of textbooks and courses that could be made available online to benefit the greatest number of students. The solution requires the cooperation of all three segments. Candee asked for the support of ICAS and of the faculty in this effort.

Members generally were supportive of reducing the cost of textbooks for students. One member asked about academic freedom and when the choice of textbook becomes the driver. She also noted that an online class does not necessarily require the use of use an OER. Candee replied that an OER is a general category of any instructional materials. Members inquired about open educational resources other than textbooks. Candee replied that publishers are looking for ways to partner with universities and that this project is an opportunity for the segments to speak with one voice. One member expressed the reservation that students essentially rent the textbook and are given access to it only for a defined period of time. A member noted that much of the desire for distance education is driven by access to federal dollars and asked how the costs of such courses would be sustained over time. A member noted that UC’s position in the past has been that OER is not appropriate for articulation unless it is comparable to a traditional textbook.

Richard Mahon, Chair of the IGETC Standards Committee, a subset of ICAS, stated that he submitted an article to an Academic Senate publication making the point that electronic texts are not a barrier to articulation. Candee noted that the universities must be clear about what they want to outsource to the publishing industry. Chair Powell said that UC's Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination unit is investigating establishing a pilot program on distance education.

VII. ICAS Advocacy Efforts

Members discussed whether to frame the annual Legislative Day in April by the Master Plan and the state's "educational emergency." A member noted that "educational emergency" is a social justice argument, but that social justice for college students is less of a priority for legislators than social justice for the truly needy. Members discussed the form and timing of the legislative efforts, including a joint lobbying day with faculty and students from all three segments, inviting staff of key legislators to ICAS meetings, dramatizing the enrollment issues via the media, discussing higher education issues with all major candidates for governor, crafting a specific common message, particularly one about the role of higher education in economic recovery, and involving the California Faculty Association (a CSU union).

UC Vice Chair Simmons stated that he sees any advocacy effort as built upon a discussion of the key elements that made the Master Plan successful: access, affordability, and a tripartite mission for the higher education segments. Advocacy should be based on maintaining the system that has made higher education in California great.

ICAS members decided to establish two subcommittees—one which will focus on the 50th anniversary of the Master Plan, and another which will examine the immediate advocacy effort that ICAS needs to undertake. Dan Simmons volunteered to chair the Master Plan subcommittee, and John Tarjan volunteered to chair the Advocacy subcommittee. Members agreed to the following charges.

Master Plan Subcommittee: The subcommittee will review the basic elements of the Master Plan, ascertain on which points the segments agree and disagree, and identify which elements should be used as a basis for future collective advocacy by ICAS.

Advocacy Subcommittee: The subcommittee will develop an advocacy theme for the year, identify a strategy (including a time line and events) to communicate the theme to the legislators, the executive branch and the public, and identify partners to join ICAS in its advocacy efforts.

VIII. Updated Mathematics Competency Statement

ICAS is responsible for facilitating and creating the competency statements expected of high school students. A subcommittee has reviewed the mathematics statement for the first time since 1997 and has recommended changes. ICAS must agree to send the changes to the segments for discussion and approval and adoption. They will be returned to ICAS for final approval. A member asked about the rationale for the recommendation that calculus students should take the AP test, since no other subfields recommend taking specific tests. The member was concerned

that ICAS appears to be recommending or encouraging students to take the AP test. Julie Adams stated that she will ask the chair of the committee for an explanation, but requested approval to send the document to the segments once this issue is clarified.

ACTION: The motion to send the competencies to the segments for approval, pending the clarification noted above, was unanimously approved.

IX. Transfer Issues

A. Intersegmental Community College Transfer Task Force. Jane Patton and Michele Pilati reported that the three university presidents formed an intersegmental Community College Transfer Task Force. Part of their concern is that California is struggling to produce BAs; community college transfer rates are not high. Each segment is represented by six members, and the Task Force has met three times. It is examining what can be done with no funding. The report under development is modest and focuses on existing initiatives or projects that are not too expensive, in recognition of the budget crisis. Another committee should be convened in the future to address systemic issues. The recommendations include creating a common message to high school students about transfer as a viable route to the BA, and support for ASSIST, the C-ID project, and the Early Academic Assessment Program. It also focuses on strategies to accelerate time-to-degree and recommends transfer enrollment goals to ensure capacity and access. Finally, it suggests exploring online education as a way to expand access and common academic calendars to facilitate transfer.

B. ASSIST. UC Director of Admissions Sue Wilbur reported that ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer) is an online tool for articulation information. University leaders recently agreed that it will be funded co-equally by the three segments beginning in 2009-10. The segment leaders supported exploring a new version ASSIST, but want to see a business plan and the projected savings of a rebuilt ASSIST. She plans to present a business plan by the end of this academic year. ASSIST also is planning an RFP for the new version, which is being funded by the CCC Chancellor. An ASSIST Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for September 24.

C. C-ID. Michele Pilati reported that the C-ID (course identification) project is currently developing descriptors, which will be approved by individual campuses. The campus articulation officers were brought together to discuss issues over the summer. One question is whether a course must have articulation in place in order to get a C-ID descriptor. Any course that matches a descriptor now automatically is granted articulation. This will help to ensure that if a student goes to multiple community colleges, their courses will be accepted. This is especially important as students are pushed out of courses in their geographic areas due to course and budget cuts.

D. LDTP. Barbara Swerkes reported on discussions about how to merge descriptors for LDTP (Lower Division Transfer Preparation) and C-ID so there is one system instead of two. LDTP was a CSU project intended to provide a direct path for community college students to the BA by identifying courses that will be accepted by all CSU campuses. She stated that the hope is that UC will join this project. A second UC representative is needed for a meeting in late October

focusing on math, biology, nursing, kinesiology, anatomy/physiology, and a discipline within the business area.

A member mentioned that the WASC accreditation process requires campuses to which establish student learning outcomes, which essentially are descriptors. He suggested that it may be worthwhile to recruit UC faculty who have participated in WASC accreditation for LDTP because the process will be more familiar to these faculty than to most UC faculty.

X. Intersegmental Enrollment Management

John Tarjan reported that more cooperation on enrollment management and messaging is needed. As one segment takes action, it affects the others. For example, CSU will be tightening up on the "forbidden four" (students seeking a second BA, unclassified graduate students, lower division transfers, and students who have not completed composition, speech, critical thinking and mathematics). Enrollment cuts will take place de facto through attrition and competition for classes. There are more students for fewer seats and the underserved students will become more underserved. Jane Patton stated that the CCC tries to balance its multiple missions, but the scale is tipping in favor transfer students and lower division courses.

XI. Compass Project. Discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm

Minutes by Clare Sheridan, UC Senior Policy Analyst
Attest: Henry Powell, Chair

Notes on UC Involvement Achieve/American Diploma Project (ADP)

Prepared for ICAS December 4, 2009 Meeting

Prepared by UC participants in at the October 26-28 ADP meeting,
Jan Frodesen, Bill Jacob, Robin Scarcella, and Sue Wilbur

This note has three sections. The first section is a summary including background on the ADP, its impact on UC, and some concerns. It is supported by details in the third section. In the second section points are raised for ICAS to consider, including suggested actions. The views and concerns expressed in this documents are those of the UC Senate representatives at the recent ADP/Achieve meeting. Sue Wilbur has provided critical input to the document as well. We are interested in the views of our ICAS partners and hope this will foster further collaboration.

I. Background and Summary. The stated goal of the Achieve/ADP is to help states more effectively prepare high school students for college and career readiness. While most states (35) are focusing on aligning standards with college readiness expectations, Achieve has opined that the California content standards are at a substantially high level and the majority of their work here has focused on *CSU's Early Assessment Program* (EAP) role in assessing a student's readiness for college and career, which (at this point of the discussion) equates to student's readiness for non-remedial, credit-bearing work college work in mathematics and writing at CSU. The primary question on the table is that of expanding the use of the EAP. Already, because of SB 946, pilot efforts to use the EAP to identify students who are ready for non-remedial work at some Community Colleges are underway.

Impact on UC. The adoption of the EAP as a common indicator of readiness for non-remedial, credit-bearing college-level at UC would have essentially no impact in mathematics where most students have completed four years of area (c) mathematics and readiness for Calculus (not College Algebra) is the central concern. However, use of the EAP in place of the AWPE for freshman writing placement could alter the landscape. At the moment, the proposal has no implications for UC access, eligibility, or admissions. Along the same line, the proposal would have relatively small impact on the CCC, where the performance of most students falls well below the levels measured by the EAP, and the need for additional placement assessments and "basic skills" coursework would remain. Achieve nonetheless argues that reaching agreement on a common indicator of readiness for non-remedial, credit-bearing college-level work would help over time to structure alignment and coherence in the policy chaos that now surround "readiness" at all levels of California's education system, and that it would allow all segments of the system to communicate clearer and more effective messages to students about what they need to do to be ready for college, careers, and citizenship.

UC Senate Views Prior to the October 26-28 Meeting. UC Senate members believe that use of a single test to "assess college readiness" is inappropriate. In California, UC and CSU have closely aligned a-g requirements that are supported by a course review process and by ICAS adopted Competency Statements to indicate the level that the curriculum and instruction that college preparatory courses should attain. The California Community Colleges also have as a goal to support this process through the development of a strong system of aligned preparatory courses that provide access to their UC/CSU transferable courses. In short, curriculum and instruction needs to be at the forefront of discussions of college readiness—not a test. UC believes that the ICAS Competencies need to be disseminated far more effectively than is currently done.

The UC Senate has no objection to the use of the EAP as one among many course placement tests as long as it is advertised as such (and not labeled as college readiness). In addition, the use of the EAP to encourage students to take EAP aligned senior year English and Mathematics courses developed in collaboration with CSU may lead many students to take college preparation more seriously during their last year, which is good. However, UC has some concerns that a false low score may lead some students to take a less rigorous curriculum than they should (the EAP English courses meet area b but the EAP Math do not meet area c), and this needs to be monitored.

There is tremendous concern across the UC campuses that the pressure to use the EAP could result in UC setting aside the AWPE. UC faculty do not believe the EAP is anywhere near an adequate replacement for the AWPE and stand firmly behind the AWPE.

Finally, the UC Senate is concerned that too many students fail to complete a-g for two reasons: many are placed in non Area b English courses in grade 9 and the failure rates in Algebra 1 are high. Contrary to Achieve's claim that the CA Standards are rigorous, Achieve's own analyses illustrate a major problem, where they found key standards introduced too early and written in such a way that they lack conceptual depth. Clearly, there are serious problems with the standards-based instruction in CA. The UC Senate is concerned that too much focus on the development of a single assessment of college and career readiness will in fact push curriculum and instruction in the wrong direction and that key instructional issues that should be addressed prior to grade eleven (where Standards revision is badly needed) will be set aside.

The October 26-28 Meeting. During the recent Achieve/ADP meeting in San Francisco (October 26 – 28), it was clear that none of the signatories to the project regards the EAP as sufficient to the challenges they face in assessing students' readiness for college and/or careers. Gary Hoachlander (Director, ConnectEd) was explicit and eloquent about the essential knowledge and skills that EAP does not measure, and the CSU and CCCs will both continue to face huge challenges as they seek to place students appropriately in entry level college courses. The challenges that UC faces, as described below, are different but analogous to the challenges faced

by the other higher education segments, i.e., EAP does not and cannot by itself provide sufficient information about a student's "readiness". The question is whether the segments can agree that the EAP represents a robust indicator of *necessary* skills and knowledge in English and mathematics that students must have to be ready for entry-level coursework in two- and four-year colleges.

II. For ICAS to Consider. (1) It would be very helpful if ICAS could articulate faculty views to the signatories related to the issue of testing as a method of measuring college readiness. Do the other segments agree with the UC Senate members of the ADP team that the EAP can play an important role as long as we are clear that its role is as *a placement test for non-remedial, credit-bearing work college work in English and Mathematics courses at CSU and some Community Colleges*? Do the words "college and career readiness" in California need to be understood as completing a rigorous curriculum (such as a-g courses aligned with ICAS competencies), not passing a test?

(2) ICAS should consider endorsing continued efforts of the ADP team relating to disseminating a clear vision of College and Career readiness in CA, and as part of this encourage the group to initiate work with CDE on disseminating ICAS competencies widely so that K-12 understands what is needed in curriculum and instruction to ensure college and career readiness (perhaps as appendices to state curriculum frameworks). Further, to the extent that the ADP can encourage Standards reform in California to help schools deal with problems of a-g access caused by the narrowing of the curriculum resulting from the standards and testing it would be helpful.

(3) ICAS should encourage the ADP to get involved in promoting development of rigorous Career Technical Education (CTE) courses. If properly done it is hoped the courses can contribute to reducing dropout rates and increasing a-g access. Also with CSU now required to honor CTE courses in area g, the more rigorous they are will lead to stronger preparation.

III. More Details about the October 26-28 Meeting. The sessions on October 26-27 included presentations by the Achieve leadership team, panels of California educators discussing the EAP, student achievement, and CTE, and a breakout session for UC to learn about and share its thoughts on the EAP analysis by Achieve. Key points that came up were:

- Student achievement on the EAP is somewhat depressing with 17% passing in English Language Arts (out of 79% 11th grade students that take the test) and with 5% of Algebra II students and 21% of those enrolled in higher math (out of 36% of 11th grade students that take the test) passing at a level to place out of CSU remedial math.

- The CSU effort on the development of the EAP is extensive and includes far more that test development. It includes senior level course curriculum development with aligned professional development that is well received by schools. Allison Jones

(Assistant Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs at CSU) regards this aspect of the project as a major achievement that counterbalances the fact that students perform poorly on the test. It needs to be kept in mind that students subsequently enroll in courses during their senior year and the summer after this year that prepare them for the placement exams they will take upon arrival to CSU or the CCC. Research findings on the instructional aspects of this program (the senior-level and preparatory courses and instructional services as well as teacher professional development) are forthcoming.

• Achieve analysts reported their findings on the EAP test items, some of which do not reflect positively on the test. While some of these objections could be interpreted as the price of giving a standardized assessment, other objections, e.g., the lack of more detailed information on the reliability and validity of the assessment and its development should be considered, as their analysis might serve to strengthen the assessment.

• Presentations dealing with high school achievement, college going, and Career Technical Education raised critical issues that are far beyond the scope the EAP. The notion that curriculum is crucial to defining college readiness seemed to be agreed on by the participants at the meeting and the main point of the last panel appeared to be that the ADP needs to focus its attention of the full breadth of the grade 7-12 experience as a means to improving college readiness.

The perspectives of the UC faculty who attended the meeting. The faculty expressed the following concerns about using the EAP as a standard measure of college readiness in California.

• An approach that favors standardized assessment over improvements in teaching and learning is suboptimal. It is the responsibility of instruction to prepare students for college. UC and CSU have 'a-g' course requirements; while improvements are always possible, for the most part the message of what these requirements entail is communicated well to college-intending students, parents and their schools.

• The faculties of the three segments have defined college readiness via the ICAS Competency Statements. These include *Academic Literacy: A Statement of Compentencies Expected of Students Entering Public Colleges and Universities* (2002) and *Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students* (1997). The ICAS Academic Literacy statement includes a number of intellectual practices important to developing college level reading, writing and speaking meant to guide curriculum and instruction in addition to assessment. These practices include such abilities as being able to see other points of view, to challenge one's own beliefs and to ask provocative questions. The ICAS Mathematics statement addresses both the dispositions of well-prepared students toward mathematics and aspects of mathematics instruction that foster student understanding and success. As Achieve's careful analysis of the EAP shows, such intellectual dispositions, or habits of mind, are not ones that can be assessed within a multiple-choice format. Nor could we expect them to be covered in a direct writing assessment; UC does not

use its AWPE as the sole measure of college readiness in English. At best such assessments provide a method for course placement—again, it is the responsibility of instruction to prepare students for college.

• Although there is an entire system in place supporting the California State Content Standards, we recognize that there is considerable national and statewide support for improving them. If the standards were to be revised, we suggest that they be streamlined, so that they realistically reflect the content knowledge students need to be college and employment ready; we also suggest that they include the conceptual skills and academic literacy knowledge, skills and behaviors referenced in the ICAS Competencies. In particular, in mathematics because the standards push procedural skills at early ages at the expense of conceptual development, students fail to develop the essential number sense essential for success in high school mathematics. In English, while the content standards do indeed incorporate reading and writing across a range of subject areas, there is far too little effective academic reading and writing instruction across the K-12 curriculum to prepare students for college adequately.

• In principle, rather than a single readiness assessment at grade 11, it is critical that a system of formative assessments provide appropriate feedback to students as students progress through their grades. These assessments need to be linked to competencies that go well beyond the procedural assessment items in the CST-Mathematics and the reading and writing assessment items of the CST-English Language Arts.

• Related, a real obstacle to college readiness in California are the high failure rates in 8th grade Algebra I (and in subsequent years when students try again), and the significant number of students not placed in non area (b) English in grade 9. If the ADP is serious about improving college and career readiness then these are critical issues to start with, presumably with an emphasis on standards reform.

• Another obstacle to college readiness is the absence of teachers who are prepared to teach all students, particularly English learners, academic literacy in such subjects as mathematics, English, social studies, and science. But this is beyond the realm of the ADP's charge.

• Achieve's review of the EAP shows that, for mathematics, the cognitive demand of the questions is too low for measuring mathematics readiness for UC (by cognitive demand we mean the nature of the questions, the test is focused at the Algebra II level, roughly what we expect in a-g). As for the EAP English test, while Achieve's analysis shows similarities in the evaluation rubrics of CSUs EAP and UCs AWPE, it also points out some important differences: namely, the length of the reading passage (60-180 words for the EAP vs. 700-1000 words for the AWPE) and the time students have to read and write (45 minutes for the EAP vs. 2 hours for the AWPE). Achieve notes that including EAP multiple choice items, the time for the EAP is roughly the same as that for the AWPE; however, what is at issue is the difference in writing samples produced for these two direct assessments. We are concerned that

the brief time for the direct writing disadvantages English learners under-identifies students requiring English language instructional support, and does not provide enough data for the identification of students requiring instructional support and their appropriate placement into instructional services.

Achieve's analysis identified a number of problems with the reading questions. Specifically, of 25 reviewed reading items, 15 were found to be text independent; that is, the test taker could answer the question without even reading the passage. Of the text independent items, Achieve's review of cognitive demand showed that of four categories (recall, infer, analyze and critique), only 7% involved analysis and none required critique. Of the text dependent reading items, while there were analysis questions, none fit into the category of critique and there were no items concerned with logical relationships. The analysis also determined that 28% of the reading items had no match with the California Content Standards for reading. It should be noted that none of the multiple choice items added by CSU as augmentation to the CST items were analyzed for this review since they were not written to address the standards. One further problem Achieve noted was that in the test form they reviewed, all but one reading text consisted of period pieces (three from the late 19th century and one from the mid 20th century.

• Achieve's analysis of the EAP indirect writing items (multiple choice questions intended to assess writing strategies and conventions) showed that the majority of the items analyzed (56%) did not match any of the content standards. Only one of the ten items concerned with writing strategies was evaluated as consistent with the standards. Those that clearly matched the standards all had to do with writing conventions (e.g., control of grammar, diction, sentence structure). As Achieve concluded, these findings indicate the difficulty of assessing instructional content standards concerned with writing performance through multiple-choice items. Items Achieve examined assessed students' ability to recognize text elements rather than evaluating their mastery of composing skills. These findings underscore the need to examine more carefully EAP's direct writing assessment, including student responses to the test and the actual scoring of this part of the exam.

As was made evident at the October 27 meeting, the faculty also realizes that "the train has left the station in terms of general support for an EAP approach – and despite concerns of the CCC faculty regarding the applicability of this assessment to meet their needs, the CCC is joining with CSU in using the EAP at a few campuses. Although UC is perceived as not on the train at the moment, and the goal of the first phase of the Achieve effort to identify a common definition of what it means to be ready for college across all higher education segments was not obtained, all of the original signators are "still at the table."

Purpose of the October 28 meeting. The project belongs to the nine signators to the Achieve effort, including UC President Mark Yudof. Phase one of the effort is drawing to a close and we are at a logical stopping point. If the signators think this

work matters, there are a number of next steps that might constitute a second phase of the work, including:

- Further discussion of what would define readiness for college and career in California.
- Further exploration of a number of assessment issues, including but not limited to
    - ° Intersegmetnal discussion of writing programs and assessments that are used by the higher education segments and k-12 for purposes of placement and preparation
    - °Differential use of EAP, i.e. the creation of 'cut-scores' that could be used by each higher education segment
    - ° A discussion of the advisability of including EAP as part of the state's accountability system. To what extent would this inhibit and/or encourage clarity on student preparation for college and careers?
- The development of common definitions of readiness.

Recommendations to UC. UC should continue to participate in the statewide discussion with the goal of influencing future directions in a way that is good for teachers, K-12 schools and higher education. Possible UC actions include but are not limited to:

- Acknowledging the EAP as a course placement test for CSU and CCC, but limiting the discussion of the EAP to "course placement in credit-bearing college work at CSU/CCC" and reserve the phrase "college readiness" to a-g completion with solid grades in ICAS competency aligned courses;

- Commending CSU for its work in the area of curriculum development and instruction in the area of college readiness;

- Expressing interest in continuing to work with the ADP on access, curriculum and instruction in grades 7-11 as a means to improve college and career readiness. This would involve encouraging curricular integration (for example, writing across disciplines), and the involvement of CDE as a central part of this effort would help teachers provide EL students with effective instruction in academic literacy in all content areas;

- Supporting efforts to enhance 12th grade instruction in English and mathematics for students with low scores on the 11th grade EAP, but with a cautionary note: placement in such courses must be carefully considered to ensure competitive eligibility of students for UC is not compromised by their being pressed into less challenging curriculum on the basis of a single test;

- Continuing to press for the importance of the ICAS Competency Statements and to work with CDE on more effective dissemination, perhaps by ultimately including them in the State Curriculum Frameworks as well as Current and Confirmed Research for SB471, SB 472 and AB430 Providers, Disseminated through English Learner Professional Development.

• Continuing data analysis on both the CST and the course trajectories of students in math and English that is pertinent to the above noted obstacles to a-g completion;

• Supporting efforts to review and strengthen the EAP made by Achieve (e.g., raising cognitive level in mathematics, strengthening indirect writing and reading assessments, and possibly increasing direct writing time and the length of the reading passage for response). One of Achieve's recommendations for future work on the English EAP is the following: "Consider convening faculty representatives from the UC and the CSU higher education systems with Community Colleges to conduct a cross-sector analysis of the assessment of direct writing and identify opportunities for alignment." We strongly support this recommendation, which would include analysis of anchor papers. We have seen only one sample reading passage for the EAP direct writing assessment and no samples of the student writing generated during this exam.

• Opposing discussion of adding the EAP to the State Accountability system at this time for the reasons identified above.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER TASK FORCE:

Findings and Recommendations Aimed at Strengthening the Community College Transfer Process

An Interim Report to:

California Community College Chancellor Jack Scott
California State University Chancellor Charles Reed
University of California President Mark Yudof

September 2009

September 9, 2009

To: Chancellor Jack Scott
Chancellor Charles Reed
President Mark G. Yudof

From:

Jeri Echeverria, Co-Chair
California State University
Chancellor's Office

Morgan Lynn, Co-Chair
California Community College
Chancellor's Office

Christopher F. Edley, Jr., Co-Chair
University of California

We are pleased to submit the findings and recommendations of the Community College Transfer Task Force, which you charged in March 2009 with examining strategic opportunities to increase the number of California Community College students who successfully transfer to the California State University and University of California.

California's Community Colleges, with their broadly diverse student population and multiple missions, are critically important to advancing economic and social opportunity in California. Yet today, dramatic cuts to higher education budgets and significant enrollment pressures, combined with fee increases, threaten to sharply reduce college access for many of California's students. First-generation and low income students who use community colleges as the gateway to economic and social advancement are particularly at risk in this environment. To accelerate the number of these students who successfully transfer and earn a baccalaureate degree requires an unprecedented partnership among California's public post-secondary institutions.

The complexity of the transfer process, and the obstacles that many students face as they attempt to navigate the transfer pathway, are well documented. The goal of the task force was not to replicate this existing work, but to identify collaborative strategies that can improve the transfer pathway for more of California's students. This report offers eight recommendations, plus a request that the Task Force continue its work in order to coordinate implementation and continue to explore related areas for collaboration and program improvements.

Task Force members held three extended meetings, beginning on April 20, 2009 and concluding on June 15, 2009. These meetings provided a forum for members to examine transfer-related issues in some depth, particularly with an intersegmental perspective. Though productive, the conversations were constrained by the current fiscal challenges facing all three segments of California's public higher education system. The participants were concerned about the feasibility of the Task Force's work given present circumstances. Ultimately, members agreed that the dialogue was so important and the opportunity to come together to address shared interests so timely, that the work must be pursued. However, in recognition of the complexity of the challenge and the limited resources currently available to address long-standing issues, Task Force members agreed to present an interim report that would identify a limited set of modest, low-cost, collaborative activities to which each institution could immediately commit. Thus, we believe the following recommendations represent a short-term, realistic agenda upon which the segments can build as resources permit.

These findings should not be considered exhaustive — in fact, they are just a beginning. Task Force members acknowledge that there are many significant, long-standing systemic issues that deserve serious attention. They expressed the strong desire to reconvene when the current

budget crisis subsides to address the serious challenges associated with strengthening the transfer pipeline in California.

We wish to acknowledge the active, thoughtful engagement of the Task Force members, and express our thanks for their service. Their commitment and contributions over the last five months were remarkable, particularly in light of the intervening fiscal turmoil. In addition, we wish to thank the many staff members from all the segment offices who organized this undertaking, who assembled background information and relevant data, and who supported the development of this interim report.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this report with you in detail and to answer any questions you may have.

cc: Members of the Task Force

Table of Contents

Findings and Recommendations

Background

The California's Community College (CCC) system is the largest higher educational system in the nation, comprised of 72 districts and 110 colleges with over 2.6 million students per year. The state's economy depends on California's Community Colleges for basic skills education, career technical training, and workforce and economic development. Today the system represents the state's largest and most dynamic workforce development engine, opening doors of economic and social opportunity and increasing the skills and competitiveness of the California workforce in the global economy.

The vast majority of college students in California begin their higher education at a California Community College, and these colleges provide a robust transfer-preparation function for the state's four-year institutions. In 2007-08, nearly 55,000 CCC students transferred to the California State University (CSU) system and another 14,000 transferred to the University of California (UC). In 2008, over half of the bachelor's degrees issued by CSU and 30 percent of the bachelor's degrees issued by UC went to students who began their higher education in a California Community College. These outcomes were preceded by a considerable investment in resources and effort on the part of all three public segments of the state's higher education system. It is worth noting that the unique academic needs and personal ambitions of each transfer student had to be coordinated and aligned to transfer opportunities that are vast and differentiated among 23 unique CSU campuses and 9 distinct UC undergraduate campuses – each with multiple and specialized major programs.

In March 2009, California Community College Chancellor Jack Scott, California State University Chancellor Charles Reed, and University of California President Mark G. Yudof established the Community College Transfer Task Force (see Appendix 1). The Task Force, co-chaired by Morgan Lynn, Executive Vice Chancellor for Programs at the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges Jeri Echeverria, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer at the California State University Chancellor's Office and, Christopher F. Edley, Jr., Dean, UC Berkeley School of Law and Special Advisor to the President of the University of California, was charged with examining strategic opportunities to achieve an increase in the numbers of community college students who transfer to four-year public universities in California. The initial idea for the Task Force grew out of President Yudof's desire to "… be actively involved, working in partnership with the other institutions of higher education, to help students pursue the transfer option and understand that [transfer] is achievable and affordable." Providing additional impetus were a number of recent reports citing California's impending shortfall in the supply of college-educated workers and the importance of the community college in preparing California and nation for global competitiveness.

California's community colleges matriculate a broadly diverse population and serve as a major entry point for students aspiring to earn a baccalaureate degree. Over 40 percent of California's community college students are African American, Latino or Native American. Many community college students are the first in their family to pursue higher education. In establishing the task force, President Yudof noted that improved community college transfer will help reduce costs of obtaining a four-year degree for greater numbers of students, will increase access to four-year institutions for underrepresented and educationally disadvantaged groups, and will recognize the fact that many students prefer to begin their college education at an institution close to home. And beyond the benefits of advanced education that accrue to the individual student, it is widely acknowledged that an effective transfer pathway holds great promise for addressing critical workforce and societal demands.

Today, dramatic cuts to higher education budgets and significant enrollment pressures, combined with fee increases, threaten to sharply reduce college access for California students. This is

particularly problematic for the state's most fragile populations – students who are lower income and first in their families to attend college – whose primary path to the bachelor's degree is the community college. Thus, the value of an intersegmental effort intended to improve the efficiency of the transfer pathway is particularly timely. In the words of California Community College Chancellor Jack Scott, "This is a great opportunity for all of public higher education to work together to serve the future of our state economy and help more Californians achieve their dreams...." California State University Chancellor Reed underscored this point saying, "A smooth transfer process is critical to [transfer] success, and a plan developed by the three segments holds great promise." All three leaders affirmed that California's historic commitment to the transfer of students from two-year colleges to four-year institutions must be sustained and invigorated, both for individual student opportunity and for the economic well-being of the state.

The Task Force held its first meeting on April 20, 2009 and met a total of three times, concluding meetings on June 15, 2009 (see Appendix B for meeting agendas). At the initial meeting, task force members decided to focus their work on strategies likely to increase the number of California Community College students who:

- are transfer ready;
- are offered and accept transfer; and,
- subsequently succeed in the receiving four-year institution.

Discussion at the first of the three meetings focused on identifying the greatest barriers to enhancing student transfer (such as coordination, funding, technology and staffing) and strategies for addressing these barriers. These fell into the following areas: developing a college-going culture that views community colleges as a cost-effective and attractive means of accessing a four-year degree; identifying and supporting transfer interest; advancing affordability; strengthening the articulation process for colleges and students; promoting access; and bolstering transfer student success.

Among the challenges considered by the Task Force were the complexity of transfer preparation; balancing of the desire to enroll more transfer students with severe funding constraints; the greatly increased competition for admission to 4-year campuses and programs; and the need to improve communication with potential transfer students regarding admission and enrollment. Potential transfer students often lack information about strategies for financing their education, including the importance of timely application for financial aid; the benefits of full-time versus part-time enrollment; and the true cost and value of a four-year degree. In addition, structural barriers exist. For example, current financial aid application and appeals processes often do not serve transfer students well, particularly independent students who have achieved high earnings from working while attending community college only to find their economic status dramatically different once they transfer and attempt to attend a four-year institution full time. The task force also considered the myriad challenges a student faces upon transferring, such as new or different regulations, policies, processes, calendars, deadlines and expectations. The work of the Task Force at this initial meeting was aided by strong presentations from segmental experts who focused on transfer preparation and access issues, and by the review of an April 2009 white paper by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which detailed the complexity of the transfer process (see Appendix C).

The second meeting focused on current trends in student progress and transfer, and challenges posed by the current fiscal environment. Of particular interest was a presentation by the CCC Chancellor's Office Vice Chancellor for Technology, Research, and Information Systems, Patrick Perry. In this presentation, he shared current trends in transfer behavior and pointed to the dramatic rise of transfer student enrollment in for-profit, online proprietary institutions over the last decade (see Appendix D). This led to a broad discussion about barriers to access including the need for academic remediation that affects time-to-transfer, challenges associated with course planning and transfer, challenges associated with the impact of fee increases, and concerns over students' ability to successfully understand and negotiate the financial aid process. These

challenges are well documented in the very substantial body of policy research devoted to improving transfer processes and outcomes.

The final meeting focused on identifying specific strategies each segment would address in the near term to strengthen the transfer process. Because of the current fiscal challenges all three segments are experiencing and the complexity of many of the issues identified, Task Force members agreed to create an interim report that would identify a limited set of modest, low-cost activities that each segment would work on immediately. Thus, the forthcoming recommendations represent a short-term view of what each institution is able to commit to at this time.

At the same time, taskforce members acknowledge that there are significant, long-standing systemic issues that deserve serious attention. Members expressed the strong desire to reconvene when the current budget crisis subsides to address the challenges associated with strengthening the transfer pipeline. These challenges include, but are not limited to, the complexity of the transfer process for community college students[1]; the fundamental need for the state to provide greater support for all segments of California public higher education so that the enrollment growth funding aligns with the demand for college access[2]; and the critical need to provide substantially more support for the CCC system, given their significant responsibilities for remediation and basic skills education. Task Force members recognize that the state is facing unprecedented economic and fiscal challenges; they also are keenly aware that without adequate funding, the net loss in college opportunity and the associated impact on baccalaureate degree production poses a serious threat to California's long-term economic health.

Findings and Recommendations

The members of the Community College Transfer Task Force propose the following recommendations as near-term measures to strengthen community college transfer rates to CSU and UC. Task Force members believe that these proposed initiatives hold much promise for increasing transfer rates and baccalaureate degree completion.

Finding/Recommendation 1: Shared Messaging on Transfer as a Viable Pathway for Post-Secondary Education

Problem: There is little or no coordination among the three public segments of higher education regarding a common, shared statewide public message about transfer as a strong and viable option for post-secondary education.

Recommended Solution: California students and families will benefit from a coherent set of clear, shared messages regarding post-secondary education options that include transfer. These messages must include strategies for efficiently and effectively negotiating the transfer pathway. A student who enters any segment of California's public higher education system should be viewed as a student belonging to higher education – not simply as a CCC, CSU or UC student. The development and use of a coherent set of strong, informational messages offers greater promise to influence student academic preparation, access and success. For example, the financial aid process from community college students is considerably different than the financial aid process for student at four-year institutions. Students will benefit form detailed information that provides greater clarity on how to best plan for, secure and utilize available financial aid to ensure

[1] Moore, C., Shulock, N., et al. *Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California: Lessons from Other States*. Sacramento, CA: Institute of Higher Education Leadership and Policy, 2009.

[2] See *Ready or Not, Here They Come: Community College Enrollment Demand Projections, 2009-19*, California Post-Secondary Education report, September 2009.

that adequate support is available throughout the undergraduate experience. Well-crafted guidance, clearly and consistently conveyed by each segment, should be an integral part of the student outreach activities.

Next steps: The segments will agree on a common set of shared messages supportive of student transfer. Representatives from the segment offices, or their designees, will meet to jointly develop these messages. Each segment will commit to integrating these messages into existing outreach efforts and materials and will identify other venues for incorporating these messages. The segments will begin to communicate these messages during the 2009-10 year.

Finding/Recommendation 2: Support for California's Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST)

Problem: ASSIST, the intersegmentally-supported information system that serves as the official and only repository for CCC to CSU and UC lower-division course articulation, serves 110 community colleges, 23 CSU campuses and 10 UC campuses. The current system, built in 1985 and updated in the early-1990s, is cumbersome, inefficient, and does not map easily to a number of more recently-developed systems that rely on ASSIST for essential articulation data. Articulation officers find entering and updating articulation data unnecessarily complicated. Although end users, including faculty and students, can find useful information to assist in course planning, ASSIST is not intuitive, and there are limits to its utility. Because of its dependency upon outdated technology, at some point ASSIST will no longer work.

Recommended Solutions: A modern ASSIST that can effectively and efficiently support a variety of provider and end-user needs is necessary. ASSIST should be a system that (1) contains complete articulation data; (2) supports the articulation business process; and, (3) interfaces effectively with users who rely on its data for a variety of purposes. The goal of a new system should be to sustain current functionality while enhancing course articulation and meeting the requirements of campus systems that rely upon articulation data. An updated, modern ASSIST will better facilitate the articulation process; provide greater opportunities for data sharing in support of segmental initiatives; provide prospective transfers with the tools to determine courses most applicable to their degree completion; and will benefit users through the provision of more intuitive interfaces.

Next steps: Much of the initial work essential for the replacement of the ASSIST application software has already been done. At a May 2008 meeting, representative members of the CCC, CSU and UC systems met to identify key guiding principles and overarching requirements for an essential system upgrade. The CCC Chancellor's Office has generously provided funding during the 2009-10 year to support the hiring a consultant to identify the business needs, write a statement of requirements, and investigate possible solutions for the replacement through an RFP process. The ASSIST Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet in September 2009 to advise on next steps.

The Executive Sponsors[3] have requested a business plan for systems development, including projected cost as well as expected benefits and efficiencies, no later than January 2010. This, in turn, will inform whether funding can be secured to initiate the project in the near term or if there is a need to hold back on the RFP until the current budgetary environment stabilizes. While this systems development can be put on hold if resources are not available to begin the project, new or added functionality to address long-term issues and pent-up demand for identified process improvements also will be postponed until a new ASSIST is in place.

[3] Executive Vice Chancellor Morgan Lynn (CCCCO), Executive Vice Chancellor Jeri Echeverria (CSUCO), and Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts, UCOP

Finding/Recommendation 3: C-ID Project (Course Identification/Numbering)

Problem: Currently, CCC students experience challenges in identifying which community college courses are accepted in lieu of lower division major and general education requirements at each potential transfer destination. Since 2004, there has been no forum for intersegmental disciplinary faculty to discuss curriculum and to develop a shared vision for courses that commonly transfer. Students, classroom and counseling faculty, and others who advise students will benefit from a course identification system that is vetted and used by all segments.

Recommended Solution: The Course Identification Number System (C-ID) project is a community college-funded intersegmental initiative that is providing a needed forum for faculty to develop descriptors which will be the basis for articulation. Built on past intersegmental efforts, C-ID utilizes a faculty-driven process to facilitate the identification of comparable lower-division, transferable courses. In creating a "supranumbering" system, C-ID provides a simplified one-to-many approach to articulation that will ease the transfer and articulation burdens in California's higher educational institutions. Community college faculty have determined that this approach is more cost-effective than a system that mandates true "common course numbering" since that approach would impose a cost on every college throughout the state. C-ID respects local numbering schema, simplifies articulation, and facilitates identification of courses that are comparable. In addition, it creates efficiencies by minimizing time spent articulating courses.

By providing an efficient mechanism for increasing articulation, C-ID maximizes student opportunity for efficient and successful transfer. C-ID simplifies not only movement from community college to receiving transfer institution, but student movement between community colleges (i.e., "swirling"). This is particularly important as limited course offerings and reduced transfer opportunities push more students to colleges outside their local areas.

Next steps: During 2009-2010, course descriptors for the most common lower-division transfer courses will be finalized, and community college course outlines will be submitted for C-ID numbering consideration. C-ID will continue to work with administrators and faculty from all segments, ensuring awareness of the program and encouraging participation in the process. Support and participation by CCC, CSU and UC discipline faculty is critical to C-ID's success.

Finding/Recommendation 4: Lower Division Transfer Preparation (LDTP)

Problem: CSU developed the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) in response to SB 1785 (Scott). LDTP is intended to provide community college students with a direct path to a baccalaureate degree by identifying the courses that will be accepted by all CSU campuses offering the major for which the student is preparing. For each LDTP major discipline, both a statewide and campus-specific component has been identified.

In total, 44 statewide patterns are available with over 1,000 campus-specific patterns. Teams of faculty have identified 111 course descriptors for statewide programs. These patterns cover approximately 90 percent of the majors selected by community college students transferring to a CSU campus. Despite these efforts, however, the LDTP patterns best serve the needs of community colleges transferring to CSUs out of their geographical area, which comprises a relatively small portion of the total number of transfer students.

Recommended Solution: The CSU will post LDTP patterns for the majors with the largest number of transfer students in fall 2009. CSU also will work with C-ID program faculty leaders to share the work conducted to develop the CSU course descriptors and potential articulations with the intention that this work can help to inform C-ID development. Going forward, CSU will

deemphasize LDTP with the expectation that C-ID in conjunction with ASSIST will be a more effective strategy.

Next steps: In the light of the significant reductions in the CSU budget, CSU is considering some transitions for LDTP and looks forward to working more closely with CCC on a revised and increasingly useful transfer plan. A comprehensive statement of interim actions and CSU plans for collaborating with the community colleges of California to facilitate successful student transfer is forthcoming this fall.

Finding/Recommendation 5: California State University Early Assessment Program (EAP) Implementation and Assessment

Problem: In cooperation with the California Department of Education and State Board of Education, the California State University (CSU) developed the EAP to provide high school students with a voluntary testing program to provide students, their families and high schools with early signals about their readiness for college-level English and mathematics. The EAP test identifies a student's need for additional preparation in these areas while still enrolled in high school. The test provides college-bound students with the opportunity to acquire additional instruction during their senior year in high school. Since the first year of the program (2006), the number of high school juniors taking one or both EAP exams has grown to approximately 356,000, a growth of around 53,000 in three years; in 2008, 79 percent of all the high school juniors in California completed one or both of the EAP exams. With the growth of the program, and somewhat encouraging improvement in math-readiness over the past three years, it is time to conduct a full assessment of the EAP program and its effectiveness.

Recommended Solution: The CSU is initiating a validity study of the English Placement Test (EPT), the Entry Level Mathematics test (ELM), and the EAP exams to determine the extent to which students are placed appropriately in remedial or baccalaureate-level classes upon matriculation to the CSU. The results of the study will be available in 2010. The full assessment of these texts may result in a streamlined, more cost effective use of the EAP program with improved tracking of student progress through the CSU academic programs.

Next Steps: CSU plans to design and implement the validity study and address the construction of an effective tracking mechanism to measure EAP's utility for retention and graduation from the CSU. CSU also plans to share best practices with colleagues in the CCC system as it implements its first year of EAP testing, and with faculty at UC for informational purposes. UC will incorporate language in its Transcript Evaluation Service (TES) communications with high school students and families that encourages students to participate in EAP testing (currently optional); UC also will explore the feasibility of incorporating EAP outcome information in individual student TES records.

Finding/Recommendation 6: California Community College Early Assessment Program Implementation

Problem: Numerous reports and studies have noted the "disconnect" between the high school curriculum, standards and assessments, and the realities of what it takes to succeed in college. Many students are confused about what it takes to prepare for college (Conley, 2007).[4] As noted in the previous recommendation, state data on high school student participation in EAP show that 79 percent of California's 11th grade students (356,000 students) opt to take the EAP. Of these, 17 percent demonstrated readiness for CSU college-level English coursework and 13 percent

[4] Conley, D.T. *The Challenge of College Readiness*. Educational Leadership, 2007.

demonstrated college-level math readiness.[5] The need for remedial education is even more severe for students entering California's community colleges. Recent data shows that over 70 percent of CCC students require some level of basic skills remediation in math and/or English in order to succeed in college-level English or math coursework. The lower the remedial starting point when a student enrolls in a community college, the less likely the student is to ever reach the point of attempting a transfer-level basic skills course. CCC Chancellor's Office data show that students who begin basic skills math at the arithmetic level have only a 10 percent survival rate to transfer-level math. Students who begin basic skills English at the reading fundamentals level have only a 25 percent survival rate to transfer-level English.

Recommended Solution: Sharpening the focus on college readiness while students are in high school can help to increase the numbers of students who enroll in college, increase the rates of academic success and persistence, and ultimately increase the number of students who transfer to four-year institutions. The passage of Senate Bill 946, which authorizes the Chancellor's Office of the CCC and local community colleges to implement the Early Assessment Program (EAP), presents an opportunity for community colleges to work collaboratively with local high schools, students and parents, and to develop strategies for early intervention. As an early signal of a student's college preparedness, the EAP informs students of their level of college readiness and provide support through outreach and resources. This, in turn, assists students in making the most of their senior year by addressing subject deficiencies. Given that nearly one-third of California's high school graduates enroll in a community college after leaving high school, efforts that support student readiness for college are important to students and the state.

Next steps: In spring 2010, California's community colleges will begin implementing the Early Assessment Program in all 110 community colleges as part of a broader college readiness initiative to 1) communicate to K-12 students and families what it means to prepare for college; 2) to develop interventions to help students to prepare academically if needed; and 3) to foster curriculum and standards alignment between secondary and postsecondary education.

A CCC Early Assessment Program Implementation Advisory Committee met for the first time on September 1, 2009 and will meet at least quarterly to guide CCC EAP implementation efforts. The CCCCO is actively seeking grant funds to support CCC EAP implementation.

Finding/Recommendation 7: Exploring Opportunities for Expanding Distance Education

Problem: Students preparing for transfer can encounter difficulty enrolling in lower-division courses critical for transfer admission, for completing general education requirements, or for completing lower-division prerequisites for their intended major. The required gateway courses may be oversubscribed, or required courses for a particular major may not be offered at the student's community college. Community colleges are using online courses to address these and other issues. In addition, the California Community College system, through its "California Virtual Campus (CVC)" program has stepped up its efforts to create a seamless undergraduate transfer curriculum for community college students. Recently, CVC was approached by representatives from CSU-East Bay to help identify and create an undergraduate CSU transfer-preparatory online curriculum that would articulate and transfer fully to CSUEB's most popular majors.

Efforts are currently underway to advance this concept, although it seems unlikely that a single community college campus could provide all the course offerings necessary. This challenge is further magnified as most CCC districts are already "over-cap" in enrollment, so expansion into distance education programs is difficult. However, the concept of having a single distance education portal for the CCC system that students experience as seamless – while actually being

[5] California State University. EAP 2008 Test Results. Data from the CSU online database: http://eap2008.ets.org/Viewreport.asp.

enrolled at multiple CCC institutions simultaneously – is a desired goal and one CVC is actively pursuing with its CSU partners.

Likewise, UC and CSU are currently exploring options for delivering online courses in a virtual university setting, separately from CCC and each other. CSU currently offers 30 distance education programs and is preparing a funding proposal to further expand the number of offerings. UC is in the early phase of exploring distance education options to meet a broad variety of needs, including driving pedagogical innovation and expanding access to critical lower-division course work.

Recommended Solution: Expanding opportunities for online education has the potential to: 1) facilitate access to required transfer courses; 2) reduce cost for potential transfer students; 3) provide course scheduling flexibility for CCC students; and 4) ease problems of articulation by assuring that CSU and UC-designed (or approved) courses are available to CCC students. This delivery strategy may prove particularly important for students interested in pursuing impacted majors, and for students requiring flexibility (e.g., part-time students). Put succinctly, online education can increase California bachelor degree production. Joint UC, CSU and CCC online educational endeavors have been very limited thus far; none involve collaboration of all three segments. However, CSU and UC are actively exploring options, and should now do so in close communication with the CCC.

Next steps: With some coordination, these efforts within CCC, CSU and UC could make an important contribution to transfer preparation and timely baccalaureate completion. The task force recommends that an intersegmental group be designated by the system leaders to explore available options for programmatic collaboration as well as providing support for individual system initiatives, including the identification and pursuit of joint funding opportunities.

Finding/Recommendation 8: Common Academic Calendars

Problem: Transfer students experience a variety of problems when attempting to transfer between colleges with different academic calendars. While most of California's public higher education institutions operate on a semester calendar—100 of the 110 Community College campuses, 20 of the 23 California State University campuses, and two of the nine undergraduate campuses of the University of California system – others employ a quarter system calendar.

Recommended Solution: Task force members agree that the academic preparation, access and success of prospective transfer students will be enhanced if the community colleges, CSU and UC campuses all employ similar, semester-type academic calendars. Standardizing on a semester calendar, which might vary slightly in length and/or start date from institution to institution, offers the potential to provide substantial benefits to students. From the student-perspective, a common semester system will: simplify articulation between institutions because courses will be packaged in the same "sizes"; ease mid-year transfer, simultaneous enrollment, and special programs (e.g., Education Abroad, Summer Session); and, alleviate the challenges associated with transferring to a campus with a different academic calendar. A semester calendar also: provides opportunities for more sophisticated assignments; more time for co-curricular activities and social integration; allows for summer employment and internship opportunities; reduces paperwork associated with the registration cycle; provides cost and time savings for students; and, is considered by students to be less stressful, especially for those students who are working or who have other obligations. In addition, after transitional or start-up costs, semester-based calendars have the potential for administrative and workload savings.

Next steps: As each segment examines options for filling unprecedented gaps in state funding, the Task Force recommends that the senior leadership within each segment use this time as an opportunity to consider the benefits of a common academic calendar. While not without

transitional costs, a semester-based calendar offers numerous opportunities for administrative efficiencies while enhancing services to students. In particular, a common calendar format will reduce barriers for students considering transferring to a four-year institution from a California community college.

* * * * *

In addition to recommendations above – which are all intersegmental in nature – the University of California wishes to use the opportunity of the Community College Transfer Task Force to affirm that it will continue in its efforts to prioritize, and increase if possible, new student transfer enrollment targets even during these particularly challenging economic times when state funding for enrollment growth has stopped.

Transfer Enrollment Goals and Planning at the University of California

Despite recent dramatic shifts in state enrollment funding, in January 2009 UC announced that it would seek to increase the enrollment of California community college transfer students for the 2009-10 year by 500 additional students. In pursuing this objective, the University was aided by a very successful fall 2009 transfer application cycle – California community college transfer applications increased by approximately 13 percent, from 21,221 to 23,973 students – and campuses responded by offering admission to a record number of transfer applicants. Preliminary enrollment outcomes for the fall 2009 term suggest that the University will meet the transfer enrollment target set in January 2009.

Continued over-enrollments on all UC campuses, however, combined with a lack of requisite state funding place hoped-for future increases in transfer targets at risk. At the same time, strong policy grounds and political forces support the goal of increasing both the number and proportion of UC undergraduates who enter as transfer students. Several campuses already have preliminarily signaled their intent to sustain fall 2009 transfer student enrollment targets or even increase transfer enrollments in the coming years. In general, campuses are trying to balance the sudden loss of revenue with a variety of considerations, such as access and diversity, debt obligations, curricular stability and predictability, programmatic aspirations, and graduate student support. How the goal of increasing transfer enrollments can and should be pursued in the current environment of constrained state funding for UC instructional programs and declining opportunity for all college-bound California students is a key topic of discussion within the University community. For example, the desirability of increases in transfer enrollment will be a central consideration in the upcoming discussions of the University's Commission on the Future of the University later this fall.

* * * * *

Conclusion

California's transfer pathway has fueled the state economy and provided mobility to hundreds of thousands of state residents. The California Community Colleges, California State University and the University of California affirm our state's historic commitment to the transfer pathway. Despite diminishing state support, we commit to improving the transfer process. The Task Force recognizes that the best way to maximize our resources is by working together. We commit to improving transfer by increasing the numbers of students who transfer from public two-year to four-year public institutions, and by removing the obstacles experienced by transfer students. We look forward to executing the next steps outlined in this document as a demonstration of this commitment. Going forward, we recommend that the Chancellors and President name a small intersegmental oversight group to shepherd the progress of these recommendations through the coming academic year. We are pleased to have identified viable, achievable near-term objectives, and look forward to a time when we can reconvene to make all of our transfer aspirations reality.

Appendix A

Community College Transfer Task Force

CHARGE

California's Community Colleges, with their broadly diverse student population, are critically important to advancing economic and social opportunity in California, including through their transfer mission. To accelerate the number of students who successfully transfer and earn a baccalaureate degree will require an unprecedented partnership among California's public post-secondary institutions.

With this challenge and opportunity in mind, the Community Colleges Transfer Task Force is charged to:

1. Synthesize available information regarding current transfer-related programs.
2. Identify reforms or additional strategies likely to increase the number of CCC students who:
    - are transfer-ready,
    - are offered and accept transfer, and
    - subsequently succeed in the receiving four-year institution.
3. Formulate implementation plans, including ways to improve intersegmental communication and cooperation.
4. Develop these plans with special attention to California's underserved and underrepresented students.
5. Identify and use any research relevant to this charter.
6. Identify research and policy development tasks to be pursued in the future.
7. Develop a plan to communicate critical messages about the transfer process and the integral role of community colleges in California's comprehensive approach to baccalaureate-level education.
8. Deliver an Interim Report by August 1, 2009.

March 11, 2009

Community College Transfer Task Force Members

The California Community Colleges	The California State University	The University of California
Morgan Lynn Executive Vice Chancellor of Programs California Community College (CCC) Chancellor's Office	Jeri Echeverria Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer The California State University (CSU) Chancellors Office	Christopher F. Edley, Jr. Special Adviser to the President and Dean and Professor of Law University of California, Berkeley
Jane Patton Professor West Valley/Mission College and CCC Academic Senate	J. Ken Nishita Professor of Psychology CSU Monterey Bay	Bradley Hyman Professor, Department of Biology University of California, Riverside
Michele Pilati Professor Rio Hondo College and CCC Academic Senate	Barbara Swerkes Professor, Kinesiology CSU, Northridge	Richard L. Wagoner Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education and Information Science, UCLA
Randal Lawson Executive Vice President Santa Monica College	Veril Phillips Vice President, Student Affairs San Jose State University	Judy K. Sakaki Vice President – Student Affairs UC Office of the President
Linda Lacy Vice Chancellor of Student Services and Operations Riverside Community College District	Sandra Cook Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Enrollment Services San Diego State University	Fred E. Wood Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs University of California, Davis
Linda Michalowski Vice Chancellor of Student Services and Special Programs CCC Chancellor's Office	Allison G. Jones Assistant Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs, Student Academic Support Office of the Chancellor The California State University	Susan Wilbur Director of Undergraduate Admissions UC Office of the President

Community College Transfer Task Force
April 20, 2009

University of California
Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA
Room 11326

AGENDA

10:00 a.m.	Introductions and Discussion of the Task Force Charge
11:00 a.m.	Background: What are our greatest challenges/barriers to enhancing student transfer?
	Roberta Delgado, Community College Transfer Center Director, Santa Rosa Junior College
	Sandra Cook, Assistant Vice President for Academic Enrollment San Diego State University
	Marsha Jaeger, Director, Center for Educational Partnerships University of California, Berkeley
12:30 p.m.	Working Lunch/Discussion
	What do the reading materials tell us? Summarize greatest challenges/barriers
1:15 p.m.	Discussion of approach to the work plan: transfer-ready; access; and, success
1:30 p.m.	Small Group Discussions: Identify reforms or strategies likely to increase the number of CCC students who are transfer-ready.
2:20 p.m.	Reporting back on group findings
2:40 p.m.	Reaching some consensus on transfer-ready issues
3:30 p.m.	Discussion of Next Steps
4:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Community College Transfer Task Force
May 18, 2009

Crowne Plaza Hotel at Los Angeles International Airport
5985 W. Century Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90045
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

10:00 a.m.	Opening: Introductions and Review of Agenda
10:45 – 11:30 a.m.	California Community Colleges: Trends in Student Progress and Transfer Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor of Technology, Research and Information Systems, California Community College Chancellor's Office
11:30 – 12:30	Follow-up from April 20th meeting: Discussion of the "options matrix" – Is this in the ballpark (rows and columns)? Are there major items missing from this list that cover other dimensions of the problem?
Lunch	
Afternoon	Review of fiscal and political environment; implications for Task Force schedule and mission. • Report on views of segment leaders: How bold? • Sacramento and Master Plan discussions • Implications for framing our recommendations in terms of budget, capacity, competing priorities, etc. Proposals from Task Force Co-Chairs [tentative] • Co-Chairs will present a short list of possible internal or cross-segment initiatives to be considered for detailed development. • Discussion, including coverage of LDTP, ASSIST, TES, LSMFT, and more
3:30 – 4:00 p.m.	Discussion of Next Steps/Adjourn

Community College Transfer Task Force
June 15, 2009

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
1102 Q Street, 3rd Floor Conference Rooms 3B & C
Sacramento, CA 95811
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA

Review of Agenda

Summary of emerging themes:

- Need for capacity-building in all 3 segments
- The challenge of college-readiness
- Trust and the Articulation Process
- Demographics and the Need for More Effective Marketing
- Research agenda (i.e. the Phoenix phenomenon)
- Future: Master Plan review

Review of fiscal and political environment: implications for Task Force schedule and mission.

- Report on views of segment leaders: Emerging conversations
- Implications for framing our recommendations in terms of budget, capacity, competing priorities, etc.

Follow-up from previous meetings: Status of the "options matrix" including summary of ASSIST Annual Report; AB 440 California Community Colleges (Beall); partnering with CCCs to offer the BA/BS degrees – what has been the experience?

Detailed development of proposals from Task Force Co-Chairs
(goal: develop one page summaries on key idea, including context and proposed action, limitations)

- Short list of possible system-specific initiatives
    - CSU: Review of articulation initiatives
    - CCC: Support for ASSIST development
    - UC: Update on Transfer Enrollment Planning
    - All: Messaging around preparation/readiness/reducing the need for remediation
    - All: Improved messaging re financial aid
- Are there cross-segment initiatives to be considered for detailed development?

Discussion of Next Steps/Adjourn

Appendix C

Facilitating Community College Transfer: A Master Plan Mandate
Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates April 2009

INTRODUCTION

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education established the principles of universal access and choice, employing the differentiation of admissions pools for the California Community Colleges (CCCs), the California State University system (CSU), and the University of California system (UC). The transfer function is an essential component of California's commitment to access. In order to ensure baccalaureate-earning opportunities, the UC and CSU are to establish a lower division to upper division ratio of 40:60 to provide transfer opportunities to the upper division for community college students, and eligible CCC transfer students are to be given priority in the admissions process. Since the late 1980s, the Legislature has focused on accomplishing a "seamless" transfer system, but because of the necessary diversity between and, especially, within the higher education segments, **transfer is a complex process to bring into coherence – one that defies simple or low-cost solutions**.

Some factors that make transfer complex:

- The CCCs serve a diverse body of over 2.5 million students.
- Two-thirds of all CSU students and one-third of all UC students begin their careers in a CCC.
- Each of those students' preparations and ambitions has to be coordinated and aligned to transfer opportunities via services offered at 110 different CCC colleges.
- The system of transfer opportunities is vast and differentiated: 23 unique CSU campuses and 9 distinct UC undergraduate campuses with multiple and specialized major programs across the campuses.

The population of students who enter the community colleges reflects the diversity of California. While some students are college-ready, many students who have the potential to eventually succeed at a university enter community colleges underprepared for college, and they require additional coursework and support services before beginning transfer-level courses. Also, many students do not enter community college with transfer as a clear and expressed goal. Some students who underperformed in high school may underestimate their true capabilities. Others may come from an environment in which college graduation is not viewed as an expectation or even as a realistic possibility. For others, developing the competencies necessary to complete high school may not be achieved nor may the educational opportunities available foster the development of even the most basic skills. Hence, shortcomings of the education system prior to entering higher education are an on-going challenge to postsecondary educational success, not merely transfer.

FUNCTIONS ESSENTIAL TO TRANSFER

The 2005 ICAS authored "A Transfer Discussion Document" and identified **the following functions as essential to transfer**:

> Function 1: **Provide students with access to current information** about major preparation, prerequisites, transfer requirements at UC and CSU, and course requirements.
>
> Function 2: **Provide counselors, advisors, transfer center directors, and others with current information** about existing and new articulation agreements and major preparation.

Function 3: **Provide a venue for faculty from across the segments and disciplines to discuss curricular and transfer-related issues.**

Function 4: **Provide Articulation Officers with access to new information** about changes in major requirements so they might support new articulation agreements and faculty's creation of new or revised curricula.

Function 5: **Provide a mechanism for ongoing certification of courses meeting the common general education curriculum** (IGETC/CSU GE Breadth, and SciGETC).

Function 6: **Provide a mechanism for assigning course identification numbers and verifying that courses actually qualify for the assigned number.**

Function 7: **Provide for statewide dissemination of curricular recommendations and decisions** (e.g., agreement on course identifier descriptions, findings of discussion groups regarding major preparation, essential changes in course content).

Function 8: **Provide students with assurances that the courses they take will transfer to a four-year university.**

Function 9: **Provide transfer students with UC/CSU advising linked to confirmed acceptance of units from their community colleges**, their declaration of a major and development of their personal graduation plans.

Function 10: **Provide a process whereby all transfer initiatives are reviewed by the faculty who are ultimately responsible for effectuating them.**

These functions remain essential and are currently being addressed to varying degrees. To the extent that transfer works well in California, it could be accomplished more effectively and more efficiently if the aforementioned functions were adequately funded.

Coordinated and supported intersegmental efforts are essential to the transfer function. It is only through the segments continually working together to solve the dynamic problems that naturally occur that transfer can be made the seamless process that is desired to the benefit of both our students and our institutions.

EARLY INTERVENTION

To facilitate transfer, information and guidance should be available for students, especially low-income, first generation college students to understand that transfer is possible, and the financial cost should not deter them. Thus, even prior to transfer, secondary and postsecondary systems, and communities at large, must collaborate to establish college-going attitudes and experiences; as students plan to enter college, they must be made aware of the many resources available to them—including transfer planning and counseling, financial aid assistance and workshops, and academic advisement. We acknowledge the many successful initiatives--including CSU's EAP, GEAR-UP projects of K-12, concurrent enrollment opportunities, the CCC's icanaffordcollege.com media blitz and School to College articulation initiative--to inform potential students, parents, and the public at large that transfer and graduation are realistic goals. An important context to acknowledge is that the transfer process is complex, affected by educational opportunity and academic preparation, attitudes towards college attendance, socioeconomic status, personal and family demands that may lengthen the time needed for completion of educational goals, mobility (or lack thereof), and more.

NECESSARY STEPS TO ENSURE SUCCESSFUL TRANSFER

A successful program of student transfer requires informed student behaviors, college and university planning and programs, and considerable faculty and staff efforts to identify and publicize information about appropriate academic preparation. Ideally, for a

student to transfer from a California community college to a California public university, **the necessary supports must be available for:**

1. Students to:
   a) identify transfer as a potential goal;
   b) receive counseling and guidance for completing appropriate courses for transfer and major preparation; and
   c) identify, apply for, and receive any available financial assistance, and
   d) identify a potential major at relevant 4-year institutions and make those intentions clear to counselors at the time they seek academic assistance.
2. Community colleges to:
   a) offer sufficient courses for students to complete preparation for transfer in a timely fashion;
   b) provide opportunities for ongoing counseling and career exploration, because many students change majors and academic goals several times and may need assistance in formally declaring a major;
   c) offer a wide range of services through transfer centers, including campus tours, college fairs, workshops, financial aid assistance, and catalog libraries; and
   d) provide adequate on-campus professional development to ensure uniformity of information to counselors who directly assist students seeking to transfer.
3. Receiving 4-year institutions to:
   a) provide timely transfer credit evaluations, major advising and degree audits to ensure clear path to degree;
   b) engage in student outreach using websites and orientation meetings;
   c) post information about major preparation and any course identifiers for use by students, counselors, transfer center directors, and articulation officers; and
   d) provide adequate training opportunities (e.g., Ensuring Transfer Success) for articulation officers and counselors who directly assist students seeking to transfer.

REQUIRED INTERSEGMENTAL AND INTRASEGMENTAL ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT TRANSFER

All of these activities must occur in a coherent way across the higher education segments, and within them, requiring on-going and multi-pronged collaborations between and within the segments. Consequently, **there must be both the intersegmental and intrasegmental supports** for:

1. holding disciplinary faculty discussions to help develop and maintain coherent and 'navigable' lower division preparation requirements;
2. developing shared goals, objectives, and timelines for transfer programs and policies/practices that facilitate transfer;
3. codifying articulation for those courses among and between institutions;
4. assigning and posting common course identifiers to major preparation courses meeting agreed upon criteria;
5. making available accurate and coherent financial aid information that shows the impact of academic choices; and
6. making the right information available for **all** students, especially low-income, first generation college-attending students, so they can know that transfer is logistically possible and financially possible.

Extensive and on-going intersegmental training is necessary to prepare counselors, financial aid personnel, articulation officers, faculty, and others who will assist students at all points in this progression from desire to acceptance, to matriculation, and to graduation at a baccalaureate-granting institution. External groups, organizations, and mechanisms are available to help students proceed as smoothly as possible. We identify many of those groups and their responsibilities in the transfer mission below.

Of the various intersegmental transfer efforts, some are institution-specific (e.g., counseling or advising services at each institution), some are intersegmental initiatives (e.g., ASSIST, IMPAC, OSCAR); some depend upon membership of particular groups (CIAC, ICC); and some are segment-specific and rely to varying degrees upon cooperation with other segments (e.g., LDTP, UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process, Student Friendly Services). Still others strive to be truly intersegmental in nature, but are funded solely by one segment (e.g., C-ID). **All of these activities require ongoing state and institutional support and must be aligned cooperatively and strategically.**

California Community Colleges: Current Trends in Student Progress &Transfer

Patrick Perry
Vice Chancellor of Technology, Research, & Information Systems, CCCCO

1

CCC Transfer

- Major function of system
- High Legislative priority
- Gateway to 4-yr sector for underrepresented/less academically prepared/economically disadvantaged
- There is a potentially dangerous convergence occurring…

2

CCC Students and Transfer

- High dependence on CCC transfers in BA/BS production at CSU/UC
  - CSU: 55%...and declining
  - UC: 28%...and steady
  - 45% of all BA/BS awarded from public institutions were from CCC transferees

3

Transfer Measurement 101

- Method #1: Volumes
  - "How many students transferred in year X from CCC's to other institutions?"
- Method #2: Rates
  - "Of all the students who started in Year X, what % of them eventually transferred in X number of years?"

4

Transfer Volumes

- Very common metrics:
  - Annual volume of transfers from CCC to CSU/UC
    - CSU: ~50,000 annually
    - UC: ~13,000 annually
    - In-State Private (ISP) and Out of State (OOS): ~13,000-15,000 annually each

5

Transfer Volumes

- Annual volume of Transfers
  - CSU=somewhat volatile
  - UC=not so much
- Affected by Enrollment Management
  - 60/40, Fall/Spring admits, application deadlines
  - CSU/UC growth, FTES funding
  - CCC supply/pipeline
  - Education marketplace

6

Marketplace: In State Private

UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX	7,987
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	1,122
CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY	1,027
DEVRY UNIVERSITY-CALIFORNIA	838
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	838
AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY	571
ACADEMY OF ART UNIVERSITY	470
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY	393
UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	347
BIOLA UNIVERSITY	305

7

The Rise of The Phoenix

96-97	2,290
97-98	2,885
98-99	3,508
99-00	4,358
00-01	5,220
01-02	5,817
02-03	6,862
03-04	8,696
04-05	7,986

8

Who Transfers to Phoenix?

	CSU	U of Phx	Other ISP	UC
Asian	14.2%	4.6%	10.9%	29.3%
Black	5.2%	15.6%	7.6%	2.4%
Hispanic	23.8%	26.1%	20.8%	13.6%
White Non-Hispanic	43.6%	40.6%	46.9%	39.1%

9

Who Transfers to Phoenix?

	CSU	U of Phx	Other ISP	UC
Male	41.7%	37.7%	40.4%	47.6%
Female	57.5%	61.9%	58.9%	51.5%

10

Who Transfers To Phoenix?

	CSU	U of Phx	Other ISP	UC
Under 17	13.4%	5.3%	16.4%	31.2%
17 to 19	62.6%	45.2%	48.6%	53.3%
20 to 24	11.0%	20.7%	13.4%	8.6%
25 to 29	4.3%	11.3%	7.2%	2.6%
30 to 34	3.2%	7.7%	5.6%	1.7%
35 to 39	2.4%	5.3%	4.0%	1.0%
40 to 49	2.4%	3.8%	3.9%	1.0%
Over 49	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%

11

Marketplace: Out of State

WESTERN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	869
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-LAS VEGAS	525
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA-RENO	332
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	325
EMBRY RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY	279
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY	256
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA	240
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND-UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	224
COLUMBIA COLLEGE	220
PARK UNIVERSITY	191

12

Measuring Transfer: Rates

- "Transfer Rate" is frequently mistaken for transfer volume
- Rates are ratios---percentages
  - *"We transferred 352 people this year"* is not a transfer rate
  - *"We transferred 38% of students with transfer behavior within 6 years of their entrance"* is a transfer rate

13

CCC Transfer Rate Methodology

- All first-timers, full year cohort
- Behavioral intent to transfer:
  - Did they ever attempt transfer level math OR English
- Tracked 6 years forward
- Data match with CSU, UC, Nat'l Student Clearinghouse

14

Transfer Rates

- Transfer rates for older students are lower.
- Transfer rates for Asian, Other Non-White are above state average; for White, right at average; for Hispanic, Black/AfrAm, below average.
- Transfer Sector of Choice varies greatly by ethnicity

15

Transfer Rates

- By Ethnicity:
  - Asian=56%
  - White=44%
  - Black/AfrAm=36%
  - Hispanic=31%

16

Transfer: Sector of Choice

	% to UC	% to CSU	% to Instate Private	% to Out of State
White	17.9%	60.7%	11.0%	10.4%
Black	11.5%	51.2%	18.1%	19.2%
Hispanic	15.1%	67.7%	12.1%	5.1%
Asian	37.0%	49.9%	9.2%	3.9%

17

Transfer Rates

- What affects CCC Transfer Rates?
  - Preparedness of students entering CCC
  - Service area median income
  - % older students at college
  - Miles to nearest 4-yr institution
  - % on financial aid
    - Recent finding: "Bachelor Plus" Index (% of population in service area with bachelors or higher)

18

CCC Pipeline

- Coming in the door:
  - Early 2000's:
    - Fee increases from $11-$18-$26, now $20
    - Budget cuts
  - Pipeline issues now coming to fruition

19

The Big Pipeline Factor: The State Budget

- California has a volatile tax revenue collection history
  - Very progressive taxation
- State budgets negotiated late
  - College schedules set early
  - College CBO's need stability; State provides little

20

The Budget

- Downturns in revenue=
  - State:
    - Raising of fees
    - Enrollment prioritization
  - Local:
    - Expectation of cuts or no growth=
      - Immediately become fiscally conservative; OR
      - burn up your reserves THEN become fiscally conservative

21

Local Budget Reaction

- Fall schedule set ~6 mo. beforehand
- Budget frequently passed late, Fall term already begun
  - If budget=good, then little chance to add sections to capture
  - If budget=bad, then little chance to cut sections
- In both cases, only Spring/Summer left to balance

22

Fees

- Set by Legislature
- Lowest in nation
- Highest participation rate in nation

- Used to affect demand—not really as a revenue source
  - 40% of students getting fee waiver
- When needed, fees raised to reduce FTES
  - Creates inequities of "generation"

23

Early 2000's

- Gray Davis came out with 10% budget reduction proposal in January 02
- CCC's began creating Fall 02 schedules shortly thereafter
  - High anxiety and conservatism
  - Sections slashed
- Final budget late in 02
  - Cuts not nearly as drastic, but colleges already acted

24

Term	Sections Offered	Enrollments	Average Section Size
Fall 2001	166,735	4,564,156	27.37
Spring 2002	172,811	4,674,836	27.05
Fall 2002	170,373	4,867,043	28.57
Spring 2003	164,597	4,676,951	28.41
Fall 2003	160,573	4,684,539	29.17
Spring 2004	165,261	4,580,776	27.71
Fall 2004	165,221	4,618,651	27.95
Spring 2005	171,295	4,542,878	26.52
Fall 2005	171,248	4,630,698	27.04
Spring 2006	175,445	4,519,494	25.76

25

Headcount/FTES History

Year	Annual Unduplicated Headcount	Change		FTES	Change	Pct
2001-02	2,811,418	162,231		1,132,574.20	79,682.96	7.60%
2002-03	2,829,995	18,577		1,163,868.08	31,293.88	2.80%
2003-04	2,549,925	-280,070		1,114,291.75	-49,576.33	-4.30%
2004-05	2,516,036	-33,889		1,090,381.33	-23,910.42	-2.15%
2005-06	2,570,533	54,497		1,116,711.02	26,329.69	2.41%

26

Who Left?

- High headcount loss, not so much in FTES
  - We lost a lot of single course takers
- Enrollment priority to those already in system
  - Outsiders/first-timers-forget about getting your course
- Fee Impact burden on older students

27

Loss by Enrollment Status

Enrollment Status	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06
First-Time	961,722	961,499	830,579	824,279	806,979
Returning	498,303	489,670	440,040	465,230	501,524
Continuing	989,068	1,068,736	1,040,503	992,415	909,194
Special Admit	240,786	154,209	118,745	112,415	120,730

28

Effects

- The loss in the early 2000's will now be seen for this much smaller group moving through
  - Smaller group, but greater % of degree-seekers, younger students helps mitigate

29

Pipeline

- Coming Out The Other End:
  - Transfer Pool Proxies

30

Transfer Pool Proxies

- Transfer Directed
  - Completed Transfer Math and English
- Transfer Prepared
  - Completed 60 UC/CSU transferable units
- Transfer Ready
  - Completed Math, English, and 60 units
- These are starting to go down

31

Transfer Pool Proxies

	Directed	Prepared	Ready
1997	76,872	61,752	44,433
1998	77,599	66,316	47,976
1999	77,700	62,122	45,981
2000	75,996	63,022	46,798
2001	77,907	64,803	48,621
2002	81,796	69,375	51,842
2003	85,351	75,201	55,555
2004	83,576	77,818	56,298
2005	85,066	82,239	57,519
2006	81,863	82,462	52,873

32

Other Issues

- Course articulation
- CSU and UC raising fees
  - CCC likely to get more CSU eligible freshmen
- Remedial rates high everywhere
  - CCC an under-funded place to remediate
- K-12 grad volumes start to decline 2010

33

The Big Convergence

- Changing Demographic
  - Growth sectors have low transfer rates
- Marketplace
  - Proprietary/for-profit/distance ed sectors gaining market share
- Loss of first-timers in CCC
  - Will result in fewer potential transfers
- Participation Depressors
  - Fees/costs, K-12 pipeline, remediation failure

34

This is NOT Business as Usual

- Considerations for Public Colleges:
  - More co-location for geographically place-bound students
  - Full programs online
  - Accommodate working and PT students
  - Easier articulation
  - Market like for-profits, yet
  - Differentiate the public college experience

35

Online Pathways Project

Carl Bellone, Associate Vice President, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies
Glen Perry, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Management Systems
California State University, East Bay

The CSU and the Community Colleges are working on a pilot project to make it easier for online students at community colleges to transfer to online degrees at the CSU. The pilot project is between CSU East Bay and a few community colleges who have expressed interest in this initiative. We will formally solicit volunteer community colleges in March 2010. The project is supported by the Community College Chancellor's Office, the CSU Chancellor's Office, the California Virtual Campus, and Cal State East Bay.

Currently there is not a website or database for online community college students who want to transfer to complete a bachelor's degree in an online format at a CSU or UC. They are confronted with going to each CSU or UC website to see what is available. This is especially frustrating to military personnel who wonder why higher education in California is not more organized for online students.

Hence the development of the pilot project to create three things. One, a dynamic database of online courses at the community colleges (software that would find online courses listed in course schedules without depending on each college to continually update the data as is the case with the California Virtual Campus). Two, online degree pathways for online majors at participating community colleges to online degrees initially at Cal State East Bay. And three, the development of an electronic degree planner that would enable a student to track their progress toward an online bachelor's degree while still at the community college.

This project will use the ASSIST database for articulation. It will not require any other articulation action or work. Hence it will avoid some of the pitfalls of other articulation projects. Since the pilot project will require the development of new technology, IT leaders at the Community College Chancellor's Office and the CSU Chancellor's Office have been heavily involved.

If the pilot project is successful, it could be expanded to all community colleges, CSUs and UCs that offer online majors. In fact, successful programming would mean that the project could be expanded to hybrid and on ground degrees as well.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS):
Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
Standards Committee
Friday, October 23, 2009 10-noon • CCC Confer • Approved Minutes

Members present: Richard Mahon (chair), Ken O'Donnell, Janet Rizzoli, Dawn Sheibani, John Tarjan

Members unavailable: Thea Labrenz, Estela Narrie, Harry Powell, Bob Quinn

Guests: Dan Simmons (ICAS, UC Senate Vice-Chair)

The meeting began at 10:00

I. The Agenda was approved by consensus; because several members were unavailable, conversation focused on two items: (1) suggestions (if any) for changes to the ICAS Resources webpage requested by ASCCC Executive Director Julie Adams, and (2) developing a list of items for the committee to address in subsequent meetings.

II. Selection of chair: Richard indicated that the committee should designate a chair for the year but that selection should take place when more members of the committee are present and indicated that he would continue to act as chair in the interim.

III. ICAS/IGETC Standards website: Members discussed the content of the IGETC Standards website and there was consensus that:

- ICAS should continue to have authority over the document.
- The IGETC Standards document should continue to reside on the ICAS site, and be available via web links from the Transfer Counselor Website (TCW) <http://www.cacctcw.org/index.htm>. There was also agreement that it would be acceptable for the Transfer Counselor Website to link directly to the IGETC Standards .pdf document.
- The roster for the ICAS IGETC Standards committee should be corrected and updated.
- The ICAS IGETC Standards webpage should provide a link to the Transfer Counselor Website with short explanatory text (the following text appears on *that* site's homepage: "The California Community College Transfer Counselor Website (TCW) was designed in June 2007, through a California Community College Chancellor's office grant, to become a one-stop website for California's community college transfer counselors. TCW contains all California college and university information and some bordering out-of-state (OOS) university information.") Dawn indicated that Ray Rodriguez at Butte College maintains the TCW.
- The Transfer Counselor site notes that ICAS is the governing body with a link to the ICAS site, but transfer professionals still go primarily to the Butte-administered site.
- The ICAS IGETC Standards page could include stronger language on the *authority* of ICAS over the IGETC Standards.
- In addition to the current .pdf copy of IGETC Standards 1.1, there should also be an indexed/bookmarked copy of the document for ease of reference.

IV. Ongoing/new issues: Ken O'Donnell summarized issues unresolved from last year's work. None of these items were subject to action but were discussed for the purpose of establishing a list of items for the committee to address this year (especially when wider participation is possible). Several of these items came from the previous working group on the ICAS standards, including Dan Nanini and Elizabeth Atondo.

1. Address the issue of 3-unit quarter courses in written communication from Oregon institutions (*Current IGETC standards require eligible courses to be at least 3 semester or 4 quarter, but Oregon has* sequences *of 3 quarter unit courses that might be an exception. Both CSU and UC are already meeting the composition requirement for these students so brining IGETC Standards into alignment with that practice should no be too difficult.)*

2. Address items that came up at ICAS meeting of 6/4/09, including:

2a. Add a section around a new area 1.5 that defines IGETC and describes all the areas in a single list. *This new section would emphasize faculty authority and the intersegmental cooperation implicit in the IGETC standards and summarize the GE areas.*

2b. Review and confirm with articulation officers that cited examples from the 1970s and 1990s (for example, on pages 4 and 13) are still relevant. These hypothetical cases make the document look dated. *The examples* do *have consequences for a significant population of students. The document might be updated to provide more current examples.*

2c. Consider satisfying composition or critical thinking with groups of courses. (Section 10.1.2a, page 13.) *The critical thinking & composition requirements are often met with a single course, which limits options for students who are good writers but didn't have a designated IGETC writing course. Do we have the best mechanism for certifying students in both composition and critical thinking?*

3. Liberalize pass-along to match GE Breadth?

It is common for CCCs to certify IGETC completion using courses taken at prior colleges, which may include out-of-state institutions. As part of current IGETC certification procedures, the CCC preparing the certificate is supposed to use ASSIST screens to identify comparable IGETC-eligible courses offered in CCCs, but this is a problem for students with courses from out-of-state schools who do not participate in ASSIST. Should the IGETC pass-along process be liberalized slightly *to allow certification of clearly legitimate courses for which there is no current CCC equivalent? Dawn noted that UC is concerned about how the originating institution applies the course.*

Rather than making the pass-along equivalent to another CCC course, could we better define what counts as an introductory general education course? It might be possible for the committee to develop a rubric. There was agreement it would be useful to make a short presentation on the question to ICAS and get some guidance before putting

much effort into changing the current practice, and Richard agreed to submit the item for the Dec. 4 ICAS agenda.

4. Clarify credit-by-exam section to exclude ACT and SAT II tests. *AP is the most longstanding area of college credit awarded for exams taken in high school, with IB coming along: other standardizes tests do NOT count and were not intended to do so. There is current language which makes this clear but there has been a suggestion that the language be re-sequenced within the section to clarify what counts and what does not.*

5. Add Defense Language Institute to ways of clearing LOTE. Dawn suggested the following additional language: "A Defense Language Institute course which is indicated as passed on the official transcript."

6. Remove IB option from Area 1A on the IGETC Certification Form (or not).

CSU and UC reviewed IB exams last year and they were added to IGETC Standards. CSU initially excluded the IB Composition exam, but it appears on the certification form implying that it is *eligible. However, the incoming CSU Breadth chair wants to reconsider that determination. Keeping CSU Breadth and IGETC in sync would be helpful. Dawn suggested the possibility that UC might contribute a couple of faculty members to the reconsideration of the question to help keep the agreements congruent.*

7. Fix the now erroneous reference to CSU EO #595 (*the Executive Order is now #1033).*

V. **New issues:** Dawn raised two new issues for the committee to consider:

(1) Intermediate algebra: Dawn indicated that UCOP has gotten inquiries about an interest in changing Intermediate Algebra and splitting it into two courses. Richard summarized the CCC system change in degree requirements and wondered if inquiries to UCOP were the result of those changes. Dawn asked that Richard follow up and provide that context to Sue Wilbur.

(2) Status of international students who wish to use foreign language courses in their presumed native language NOT to meet the LOTE requirement (for which they are ineligible), but to meet the *Humanities* requirement, which is sometimes met by higher level foreign language courses. There was agreement to agenize this issue for a future meeting.

VI. Next meeting TBD via Doodle poll for late November, early December (prior to the 12/4 ICAS meeting)

The meeting adjourned at 11:25

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS):
Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
Standards Committee
Tuesday, November 24, 2009 9-10 am • **Un**approved Minutes

Members present: Thea Labrenz, Richard Mahon (chair), Ken O'Donnell, Estela Narrie, Harry Powell, Bob Quinn, John Tarjan

Members unavailable: Janet Rizzoli, Dawn Sheibani

The meeting began at 9:00

I. The agenda was approved by consensus

II. The minutes of Oct. 23, 2009 were approved by consensus

III. Richard Mahon was selected as chair by consensus; Estela Narrie was selected document editor by consensus

IV. Richard indicated that the changes to the *ICAS/IGETC Standards* website requested by members have been made; members were especially appreciative of the new bookmarked version of the *IGETC Standards* document.

V. **Ongoing issues**:

1. **3-unit quarter courses in English communication** (e.g., Oregon & other some states): *One way to deal with this problem is to provide students with* partial *certification, leaving the student to complete IGETC by CSU/UC recognizing the sequence of 3-quarter unit courses after transfer. This would enable students to transfer smoothly with adequate counseling. The 3-quarter unit issue is addressed in Q&A #1 on the Transfer Counselor website. John Tarjan asked whether there is any compelling academic reason to* disallow *the combining of 3-quarter unit courses in English to meet IGETC requirements and permit full certification prior to transfer. Members could not identify a compelling reason and agreed the committee would recommend to ICAS that 3 quarter-unit English composition sequences may be certified by CCCs.* (The issue arises because IGETC Standards currently require a 3-semester or 4-quarer unit minimum for a course to be counted toward IGETC requirements.) *Richard indicated he would submit the item for discussion at the December 4, 2009 ICAS meeting.*

2. Add a section around a new area 1.5 that **defines IGETC and describes all the areas in a single list**. *Ken volunteered to write text and forward to Estela.*

2b. Review and confirm with articulation officers that cited **examples from the 1970s and 1990s** (for example, on pages 4 and 13) are still relevant. *Members discussed the current scenario language and agreed it continues to apply to students coming through CCCs and thus should remain.*

2c. Consider **satisfying composition or critical thinking with *groups* of courses**. (Section 10.1.2a, page 13.) *Members agreed that while it is desirable in principle to provide flexibility, trying to combine courses to meet the critical thinking requirement introduces too much*

ambiguity into the IGETC process and the potential confusion from the "solution" makes it unappealing.

3. **Liberalize pass-along** to match GE Breadth? *There was agreement at the 10/23/09 meeting that it would be useful to make a short presentation on this issue to ICAS and get some guidance before putting much effort into changing current practice. Current standards allow certification for a proposed out of state/system course only if there is a comparable CCC course; this precludes inclusion of high quality courses from out of state/system which lack a CCC system parallel. CSU Breadth does not present this problem as it is more permissive of including pass-through courses. John Tarjan indicated that CSU is becoming more liberal in its view of pass-through courses, though at our previous meeting Dawn was less confident UC faculty would be so permissive. The committee agreed to seek guidance from ICAS and Richard indicated he would submit the question for the December 4, 2009 ICAS agenda.*

4. **Clarify credit-by-exam section** to exclude ACT and SAT II tests. *The committee's recommendation would be to re-sequence the existing language on page 10, 7.4 to clarify current intent to exclude College Boards and ACT exams. Estela volunteered to work with Dan Nannini and bring back revised language.*

5. **Add Defense Language Institute** to ways of clearing LOTE. Dawn suggested the following: "A Defense Language Institute course which is indicated as passed on the official transcript." Estela suggested that a bit of further clarification of language would be helpful; she will edit and bring back for review.

6. **Remove IB option from Area 1A** on the IGETC Certification Form*? Update. CSU continues to wish to examine the issue and two CSU faculty have been identified and will be seeking UC counterparts (as Dawn had volunteered) in the hope of arriving at a joint CSU-UC practice for recognizing International Baccalaureate credit in English Composition.*

7. **Fix the now erroneous reference to CSU Executive Order** #595 (*now superseded by #1033). Estela will include this in the list of changes she is gathering for the year.*

VI **New issues:**

1. **International students** who wish to use foreign language courses in their presumed native language NOT to meet the LOTE requirement (for which they are ineligible to receive lower division transferable units), but to meet the *Humanities IGETC* requirement. *There was agreement it is desirable to allow students to use AP exams and courses to meet the Humanities IGETC requirement even though the* units *would not transfer. Estela suggested and there was agreement to that this issue be addressed in the Transfer Counselor Q&A and not in the IGETC Standards document. Committee members wanted to be sure that this discussion addressed the concern Dawn raised.*

The meeting adjourned at 10:00