

**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 subsidies 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

Appendices:

- A. Task Force Charge and Membership
- B. Meeting Agendas: April 20, May 18, June 15, 2009
- C. *Facilitating Community College Transfer: A Master Plan Mandate*  
Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates April 2009
- D. *California Community Colleges: Current Trends in Transfer* – a presentation by  
Patrick Perry, Vice Chancellor of Technology, Research and Information Systems,  
Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges

## 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, Executive Vice Chancellor, 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<sup>1</sup>; 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<sup>2</sup>; 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 from detailed information that provides greater clarity on how to best plan for, secure and utilize available financial aid to ensure

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> Conley, D.T. *The Challenge of College Readiness*. Educational Leadership, 2007.

demonstrated college-level math readiness.<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

## 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:
  - o are transfer-ready,
  - o are offered and accept transfer, and
  - o 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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

**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](http://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, CCCCCO

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

## 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%

## 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

## 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

## 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

## Pipeline

- ◆ Coming Out The Other End:
  - Transfer Pool Proxies

## 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