

July 18, 2011, 2011

TO: Matriculation Advisory Committee Members

FROM: Kimberly McDaniel, Coordinator Matriculation

SUBJECT: MAC Meeting June 13, 2011 Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the following Matriculation Advisory Committee:

June 13, 2011
Chancellor's Office

If you have received this notice and are no longer representing the MAC, please pass this information along to the appropriate individual.

CONTACT:
Kimberly McDaniel, (916) 323-0799, kmcdaniel@cccco.edu

**Matriculation Advisory Committee
Summary of Meeting
June 13, 2011**

Participants:

Marcia Biller, San Diego Continuing Education – Non Credit
Joi Lin Blake, San Diego Mesa College – Region 10
Phyllis Braxton, Los Angeles Pierce College – Region 7
Chuen Chan, CCCCCO
Tara Cooper, American River College, Student Success Task Force Member
Renee DeLong Chomiak, Cerritos College – Region 8
Debbie DiThomas, Norco College, CSSO
Anna Garza, North Orange County CCD – Non Credit
Jannie MacKay, Long Beach City College – Counseling Faculty/Academic Senate
Kitty Moriwaki, City College of San Francisco - CCC Assessment Association
Kimberly McDaniel, CCCCCO
Ken Meehan, Fullerton College – Research & Planning Rep.
Sonia Ortiz-Mercado, CCCCCO
Mark Samuels, Southwestern College – CCC Assessment Association
Debbie Sheldon, CCCCCO
Brenda Thames, American River College – Region 2

Absent:

Aiden Ely, Folsom Lake College – CCC Matriculation Professionals Association
Ruth McMullen, Santa Rosa College – Region 3
Kevin O’Rorke, Shasta College - Region 1
JoAnna Quejada, Mt. San Jacinto College – Region 9
Melissa Raby, Columbia College – Region 5
Margery Regalado-Rodriguez – Region 4
Mary Kay Rudolph, Santa Rosa College - CIO
Jasmine Ruys, College of the Canyons – Ca. Association of Comm. College Registrars & Admissions Officers
Steve Schultz, Porterville College – CSSO
Peter White, San Diego City College – CSSO

Handouts: Agenda; Instructions for Completing Travel Expenditure Claims; CCCCCO Budget Update June 9, 2011 9 (e-mail from Vice Chancellor Dan Troy); Update on State Legislation Related to Matriculation June 10, 2011; Invitation to California Community Colleges Early Assessment Program (EAP) 101 Training; Student Success Taskforce Summary of Student Service Scenarios Discussion May 2011; Student Success Proposal Letter (dated June 2, 2011); Outcomes-Based Funding: Incentivizing Access and Success, May 2011; Concerns About Performance-Based Funding and Ways that States are Addressing the Concerns, May 18, 2011; Equity Indicators: June 13, 2011 (DRAFT); Characteristics of California’s Community College Students (Draft 6/8/2011); Matriculation Strategic Plan Research Studies, Reports & Databases on CCC Student Characteristics; Matriculation and the Persistence of First-Time College Students, Fall 2001 to 2004; Matriculation Outcomes: A Statewide Study (Martinez); Matriculation Services and Student Success (Karpp & Price); Matriculation Outcomes: A Local and Regional Study (Martinez); Matriculation Handbook Table of Contents (Draft); Matriculation Program Plan and Instructions for Completion revised July 2011 (Draft); California Community Colleges Matriculation Program Proposed Budget Plan 2011-12 (Draft); Matriculation Program Proposed Year-End Expenditures (Draft)

CCCCO Updates:

- **State Budget** – The budget trailer raised fees; the May budget revision projected 6.6 billion dollars in additional revenue; making the budget gap smaller. No cuts have been proposed to Matriculation or the other categorical programs, but flexibility was extended for an additional two years through 2015.

The CCCCCO will be able to get a clearer picture of how Matriculation cuts have impacted each of the colleges through the new budget and year end reporting forms (to be reviewed and discussed later in this meeting).

- **Legislation - Key legislation related to Matriculation**
AB 743 – Common Assessment. The Legislature is considering supporting the off-the-shelf version without customization. If the legislature approves this would be for the interim until 2 years from now. The bill is now off of suspense file. Majority voted for the bill. Those who voted against it did so because they wanted it mandated. It should fly through the senate.

Legislature wants the assessment to align from the beginning with common core standards, Smarter Balance, and alignment with K-12. In 2014 there may be a new wave of assessments – EAP 2.0- more diagnostic, formative and summative, testing throughout the year, letting students know sooner.

Michael Kirst, President of the State Board of Education, spoke to the Student Success Taskforce (SSTF) and encouraged faculty engagement.

Concern expressed that centralized assessment might go after matriculation funding. Sonia indicated the goal is to bring in additional revenue, not pull from existing funding since it has already been cut. We keep looking at the number of students who are able to go through counseling, orientation, assessment without acknowledging that we are not even able to serve those who we are supposed to be serving. One of the reasons assessment was not cut is because it is tied to the curriculum and it is the first step.

The SSTF seems to have agreement about mandating assessment and orientation. If this is important to student success, how is it going to be funded? Student services are important.

AB 1056 Fong – Electronic Transcripts – not going to happen unless we get new funding. Sailed through with unanimous vote.

AB 160 – Portantino – Concurrent Enrollment - CCCCCO opposed it, because it was the wrong timing and colleges already were struggling to serve existing students. The CCCCCO was criticized for this opposition. Counselors are opposed. Thus far there has been no objection in the legislature.

- **Proposed Title 5 change on apportionment limit for enrollment in credit courses (SECTIONS 55024, 55040, 55042, 58161, AND 58161.5)**
The proposed title 5 changes would limit apportionment for enrollment in a single course to three enrollments with specific exceptions. Districts would be allowed to permit one additional funded enrollment on an appeal basis if a student needs to repeat a course due to a significant lapse of time since it was last taken, or when there are specific extenuating circumstances such as flood,

fire, or other extraordinary conditions beyond the student's control. Districts could still allow a student to enroll in the same course beyond the "3+1" limit based on local petition or appeal policies but they would not be allowed to claim apportionment for these additional enrollments.

Could Linda Michalowski send out a system wide announcement so that counselors could inform their students, when appropriate?

- The 1.5 day **New Director's Training** will be held September 15-16, 2011. If you have things you would like to be considered for inclusion or have good examples of what your college is doing, notify Kimberly or Chuen.

A planning Conference call will be scheduled and all of MAC members are invited to participate. E-mail Kimberly (kmcddanie@cccco.edu) or Chuen (cchan@cccco.edu) topics you'd like to see addressed in the training before the conference call. Volunteers for planning the training were Renee, Jannie, Debbie, Mark, Kitty, and Anna.

Topics to Consider: How Matriculation fit in with the Basic Skills Initiative; Strategies for local advocacy of matriculation; and, MIS requirements.

- **EAP 101 Workshops**

Southern CA: June 20-21, 2011

Northern CA: June 27-28, 2011

Student Success Task Force:

It is anticipated that during the July meeting the Task Force will actually start to write the report.

May meeting: Focus on student services, technology, and financial aid.

June meeting: June meeting focused on performance-based and block grant funding models.

Next steps for Task Force:

In July, the group will flesh out recommendations; in August the group will develop their recommendations; in September there will be town hall meetings; in November and December their recommendations go to the BOG for approval, and if approved, then to the legislature.

January/February is the deadline for new bills so there may be 'placeholder' legislation since the final report is not due until March 2011.

It appears that a good time to provide input to the Task Force is now and not at the town hall meetings which may be primarily focused on informing people and not on gathering input.

Assessment Workgroup:

Mark Samuels, CCC Assessment Association President, provided information about the workgroup.

The group has existed since the late 80's early 90's with the goals of reviewing test instruments, and making judgments regarding the level of approval and writing standards that tests were subject to.

The group met twice each year, in June and January. Once colleges submitted information psychometric consultants reviewed the information and would send out a preliminary report to the workgroup and request additional information, if any, from the submitter(s). The workgroup members would make the ultimate decisions about whether a test was approved. Initially, there were 20-25 members and by the end there were only 6. The assessment workgroup was a subcommittee of the MAC.

Next Steps: The plan is to establish a timeline to reconvene the workgroup and secure psychometric support. The workgroup could update the standards document, develop a user's guide to the standard document, and may also explore disproportionate impact and the new prerequisite content only regulation. The workgroup may also guide the work of the multiple measure workgroup.

- **Multiple Measures**

There was a workgroup that did some work and now more extensive expertise in this area is necessary. The CCCCO is working with WestED to conduct additional research. Ideally the assessment workgroup could serve as advisors to this project to help colleges unravel the “mystery” of how to apply multiple measures.

Thus far, the proposal includes the following:

- **1. Framework for evaluating the technical adequacy of multiple measures**

The Framework will include a list of current measures or types of measures used in community colleges to place matriculating students in courses. The measures will include both standardized tests (e.g., ACCUPLACER) and additional measures such as high school grades and student self-reports of readiness or goals for attending college.

The types of measures will be organized into categories (tiers or levels) based on their level of technical adequacy (validity and reliability, as determined by available technical studies). For each measure, there will be: a description of the measure; guidelines for use of the measure in placing matriculating students in community college courses; and a list of references or resources on the technical adequacy and/or use of the measure. This information will be organized into a comprehensive chart.

- **2. A Guide for using the Framework to evaluate the validity and reliability of multiple measures at the local level**

The Guide will provide information on ways individual colleges can apply the research provided in the Framework to validate the use of multiple measures at the local level. The information will be organized into scenarios based on variables in the contexts within which different colleges operate. Variables might include: the systems for counseling students; the availability of data on students; the resources (in time and staffing) available to conduct local research; and demographics of the student population (e.g., numbers of English learners).

- **3. A mini-study applying the steps in the Guide to available data for one college**

The mini-study will be conducted with one college, selected in consultation with the Chancellor’s Office, which has adequate data available at the state and/or college level. The CCCCO will work with the selected college to implement the steps in the Guide to analyze data on student placement and student outcomes to evaluate the validity and reliability of the multiple measures used in this one context.

Please let Kimberly know if you have recommendations for people to participate on the Assessment and Multiple Measure workgroups. Consider having a counselor on the committee to play this role of offering another perspective. For the researcher may want to consider Dan Martinez.

Review of Draft Matriculation Plan, Budget, Year-End Report, and Proposed Handbook

- **Handbook:**

An overview of the table of contents for the proposed handbook was provided. The idea is to have all of the documents in one place and to be online. The goal is to have the book for the New Director’s training in September.

- **Year-End Report:** The new form will be in Excel and formatted for calculations and will help determine how much money is spent in various areas such as assessment, counseling, admissions, etc.

The draft forms will be sent out to this Committee in electronic form for input. The target is to send the form out by the end July.

- **Budget Plan:**

The new matriculation plan includes a budget plan. This informs us on how you are planning to spend the money so we can report to the legislature.

- **Program Plan:**

Asking for an electronic plan; possible deadline of Monday, October 31, 2011.

The prerequisites section will be changed to reflect the new regulations (the BOG has adopted the new regulations but the CCCCO has not offered guidelines. Technically colleges can't adopt this until they have a plan in place, and they can't have a plan until guidelines are issued). College should not be using a content review without validation.

Strategic Plan Review

The proposed draft indicators for student equity were reviewed. All of them are extracted from the ARCC.

Goal #1 overview was provided including a list of reports that could be used to develop a profile of the CCC student. Members suggested it would be good to have a statewide template that could also be filled in with local data if colleges wanted to use it on their campuses.

Goal #2 the CCCCO is working with WestEd to conduct research.

Goal #4c – deleted.

Goal #6 had a conference call. All regional representatives should ask their regions for students that document the impact of matriculations studies. The CCCCO is going to fund Dan Martinez to conduct another state-level study.

Goal #5 ESL placement test development. Two large test banks were created (for Reading and Language); field tested 45 passages and 225 items; finished the grammar and language structure items and are field testing 312 Language items. Uncertain if there will still be funding to have the results of the Language field test analyzed. The project is on hold to make sure that is integrated with the CCC Assess project.

Matriculation Committees & Workgroups

Sonia provided an update.

Next Steps, Future Dates

Friday November 4th conference call.

Next meeting: TBD. Kimberly will send Doodle poll

Meeting Adjourned.