



# BACHELOR'S DEGREE PROGRAM

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**Friday, January 24, 2020**

**4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

## **Meeting Notes**

**Roll Call:** ASCCC, CCCCCO, Antelope Valley, Bakersfield, Cypress, Feather River, Foothill, MiraCosta, Modesto, Rio Hondo, San Diego Mesa, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, Shasta, Skyline, Solano, West Los Angeles

**Absent:**

### **LAO Report Edgar**

Edgar explained report happened last minute and apologized for short notice

He took the first 30 minutes to briefly go over each section of the report explaining the background and data reported starting on page 5.

Highlights:

- Enrollment increased 17-18, 18-19, dropped a little in 19-20
- Size of programs vary— 6 programs average less than 6 students
- Programs are adjusting to accommodate students, i.e., fully online, partially online, etc.
- Demographic data—information regarding students in pilot higher proportions of white and Asian students, less likely to be Latino
- Students enrolled fee waiver—two-thirds of students receive financial aid
- Outcomes graduation rates: ten programs that began in 2016-17 overall three-year graduation rate is 75%
- Lack of official data on labor market outcome--could not verify need for the programs
- Did not see clear workforce connection where bachelor's degree is required--no evidence students are getting jobs because of the programs.
- Application process and acceptance of applications (did not allow for time for consultation with CSUs)

- Concerns programs dental hygiene fields—removed associate degree programs, closing degree options
- No evidence of a need for programs because of accreditation standards—no clarity students entering programs would be able to get a job
- Biggest preference noted for students was cost of program,
- Concerns regarding pathways to CSU—students going to CSU will have to change major etc. and take more classes
- Quality, programs are well thought out, accredited, graduation outcomes
- Area concerns: small size of program, not much demand, not want for long-term basis, programs are more expensive, take from general fund
- Financing, more development of guidelines and rules how things should be counted,
- Pointed out theme expressed cost of operating upper division than lower division programs, lower division have more technical, lower student faculty ratio, questioned if the supplemental fee is necessary
- Reviewed options presented in report. LAO does not have a hard recommendation.
  - Mixed assessment, concern around lack of ability to demonstrate workforce needs,
  - pathways for legislative to take: look at alternatives,
  - 7 college directly impacting workforce needs
  - Overlap in content noticed—i.e., management leadership,
  - Recommend stronger alignment with other programs.
  - Must keep associate degree program
  - Suggest CSU roles should be clarified.
  - Develop more detailed fiscal accounting guidelines clarity for CCCCO to develop regulations

#### Questions/Comments:

1. Mike from Rio Hondo: Page 2, another option to improve alignment with CCC and CSU (associate degree for transfer). Mile pointed out this is part of our mission—we have been doing for a long time, it's already being done

Asked for clarification regarding recommendation to develop more programs like Tri-County Nursing partnership between Riverside City College and CSU campuses

Edgar: Variety ways to do it—funding in budget for CC and local CSU to develop these partnerships, other ways to encourage alignment, one option we should consider

2. Mike inquired about enrollment targets, workforce needs. He explained the only way we can get our programs through for approval and receive funding (Perkins) is through verification of these standards and graduation requirements are determined by Governing Boards. He expressed concern that Edgar does not understand community college systems as a whole. Additionally, the section in the report regarding the application process was a slap in the face of the Chancellor's Office. Ended by saying the cover looked nice.

Edgar did not respond

3. Antelope Valley—confused with the statement on page 11 regarding upper division coursework not as costly as the lower-division coursework. The equipment for some of the upper division courses at her college is very expensive. This statement does not seem accurate. aspect upper division not as expensive

Edgar explained it is difficulty to generalize the findings. This statement is applicable to most of the colleges.

4. Antelope Valley—mentioned the need to note tthe timeline for the report was moved up Edgar clarified it is in the beginning of the report. He also state the legislators know they changed the date.
5. Judy Minor inquired about the section comparing lower division and upper division costs, She noted funding with CSU is not compatible, take exception to some of the basis

Edgar did not respond

6. Pam Luster: referred to page 6 regarding the ethnicity of students. She said it feels inaccurate, making assumption about academic preparation of Asian students, 75% of students of color does not accurately reflect student population

She also reiterated the statement made that we have very strict guidelines how we approve programs. She said she has other comments she will put in email.

Edgar responded they presented the data as neutral as possible

7. Hai (Mesa researcher): stated 75% students belong to special population, section #8, understanding foundation for conclusion of report. Definition of workforce objectives,

He also reference workforce needs: page 9, said it is hard to believe no students reach wage premium for obtaining bachelor's degree

Edgar: State perspective view workforce needs—not aligned with master plans. He agreed the community colleges know labor market data. However, there is no evidence for wage benefit for students graduating from the programs. He used the dental hygienist program as an example—they cannot find evidence for wage benefit for bachelor's degree and the programs are meeting need that is not being met.

Students graduate and move into better positions, salary increase, why is this bachelor's degree adding value?

8. Constance: concern page 11, supplemental fee does not appear warranted. She mentioned programs have changed teaching load and the colleges did not receive state funding, fee is the only way to support the programs.

Additionally, she mentioned instructional equipment funding limited. She asked Edgar why they feel the fee is not warranted

Edgar: Provide information on assessment, fiscal information difficult to make a conclusion regarding additional funding necessary. Referred back to general statement that upper division coursework less costly, many courses are offered online and equipment costs are not as needed.

Constance responded equipment cost only part of the cost, all kinds of other costs were not considered in the report

Jennifer from Santa Monica explained they have spent a lot of money on counselors, marketing, recruitment, etc.

Edgar responded: fiscal data provided made it impossible to make conclusions

No other questions. Edgar told everyone to email him if we have follow-up questions