

California Community College Chief Instructional Officers Executive Board Meeting

Approved

Wednesday, March 31, 2009

1:00 to 4:00 P.M.

Balboa Room

Holiday Inn Sacramento Capitol Plaza
Sacramento, California

1. Call to Order – *Lori Gaskin*
2. Agenda Modifications – *Lori Gaskin*
3. Consent Agenda
 - a. Minutes of January 21, 2009 Meeting (attachment 1) – *Linda Berry*
Minutes approved by consensus with minor corrections.
 - b. Treasurer’s Report (attachment 2) – *Dave Bolt*
CIO group has a healthy bottom line. Our \$100,000 CD matures soon, and Dave will check rates. It was agreed that Dave will be entrusted to make decision about investment of \$100,000 in a CD. [see attachment]
4. President’s Report – *Lori Gaskin*
 - a. **Assessment and Placement APG**
Enhanced graduation requirements led to BSI and other strategies to enhance student success. The concept of college readiness and the manner in which we assess and place students is being addressed, particularly in communicating the message to students that we are colleges and will provide support for college readiness. Success rates of students have been criticized externally with has led to the Action Planning Group for Assessment and Placement. The system fails at encouraging students to remediate early in order to be ready for college level work.
Five Recommendations for Title 5 changes:
#1 - Change Title 5 to only require content review for validation of a pre-requisite. Eliminates need to go through revalidation every 6 years. Will there be a hold-harmless for any drops in enrollment for populations needing to remediate? Eg. Chaffey implemented reading requirement and took about 18 months to recover from the drop in enrollment. Gradual implementation would be best, and establishing an advisory may assist the implementation of an enforced prerequisite. Needs to provide explicit description of “content review.” Perhaps looking at models in other states that require students to complete remediation prior to enrolling in college-level courses would be useful. There is a proposal to design a state-wide model that everyone would follow. Standardization may be a criticism, but may also prevent students from “shopping.”
Recommendation #2: Phase-in over time by rolling out courses at the same time state wide. Address courses that meet the same IGETC requirement in order to reduce student “shopping.”
Recommendation #3: Support ongoing system efforts to increase matriculation funding and improve counselor/student ratio.
Recommendations #4 & #5: Investigate reasonable % for 50% law compliance. Remove non-counselor loads from denominator so their non-teaching loads will not be counted against the 50% law. The recommendation is supportive of what might assist system in hiring more counselors and librarians.
Patrick Perry: suggests centralizing assessment and the acquisition of a handful of assessment instruments. Can locally control cut scores. Some colleges make decisions about who to assess based on funding. [see CCC Assess: Test Consolidation and Centralized Assessment Delivery Services].

b. Noncredit Re-enrollment

Title 5 Part II: establishes limits on re-enrollment in non-credit. Lori is representative on work group. Researched 10 non-credit areas and reasons for re-enrollment. Report not ready, but rough draft given to Chancellor's Office.

State level data: 6% of revenue comes from non-credit. DOF concerned about repetitions. 30% of students in system take a non-credit course. Non-credit re-enrollment = 1 of 3 which is 1.8% of apportionment in system. Top 3 areas for re-enrollment in non-credit: Citizenship for Immigrants; Persons with Substantial Disabilities; Courses for Older Adults.

College level data: ESL generally does not have large re-enrollments – there is a pathway to credit ESL. Older adults: mission of lifelong learning, long-term taxpayers, and bond approvers. Local determination is preferred.

c. Concurrent Enrollment

External pressure to broaden notion of what we mean by concurrent enrollment and to be more inclusive. Manipulation in basic skills areas – research studies on California's concurrent enrollment policies imply that they are more exclusive by focusing on academically advanced programs for high school students. Serious concerns about opening the pipeline in terms of funding. Premise is solid – creating a culture of college-going young people. But this topic is controversial at many institutions. 87% of ftes generated by 9-12 concurrent enrollment is in academic, degree applicable courses. Difference is expanding it into basic skills.

TBA Record Keeping: Documentation/record keeping for TBA. Came to an agreement – the audit test is to remove apportionment for all students who did not attend any lab hours. Attendance in lab is considered in same light as attendance in lecture. Will present recommendations to CIOs in business meeting at Conference.

5. Conferences

- a. CSSO CIO Conference Details
- b. 2009 Fall Conference, October 21-23, 2009, Dana on Mission Bay, San Diego
Will be held at the Dana on Mission Bay. Note the earlier date.
- c. 2010 Joint Conference with CCCAOE, March 17 – 19, 2010, Hilton Inn Financial District, San Francisco
- d. League Convention, November 19-21, 2009, Hyatt Regency, SFO “Turning Challenges into Opportunities”
 - i. Brainstorm Presentation Topics

6. Members' Reports and Issues

- a. TTAC Report 2/25/09 (attachment)
See attachment.
- b. SACC Update – *Randy Lawson*
Credit modules of Program and Course Approval Manual – wonderful work of Stephanie Low. Non-credit module still to come. Separated tracking of Ws from tracking of course repetitions. Academic Senate is routinely bringing big items to SACC that have impact on curricula after Plenary sessions. One issue is AA/AS degree definition. Goes to BOG in May.
Coding of courses - CB 21: prior to college-level courses, and ill-defined throughout system.
CB 8: degree-applicable. A subcommittee was formed that included faculty and was led by Janet Fulks.
Meeting minutes from SACC will be posted on Chancellor's Office website.
Top 10 Reasons that Delay Approval of Credit Program Applications – hand out to regional group members.
- c. CSU Transfer – *Irene Malmgren and Lori Gaskin*
Preferential regions for CSUs. Where do students from rural colleges go? Heard that CSUs are dumping CC students for out-of-state students – driven by fiscal parameters. Morgan Lynn will be meeting with CSU and UC leadership, and is chairing a transfer task force.

7. Regional Issues

- a. Joint Conferences, Conference Sessions, High School Partnerships in Fall – *Melinda Nish*
Concurrent enrollment – topic at joint conference? Issue of reassigned time. Have regional meetings with CSSOs to explore joint topics.
- b. Other

Next meeting: May 20, 2009, Chancellor's Office, 3rd Floor Executive Meeting Room