Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency- Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.

Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education 2535 Capitol Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95833 P.O. Box 980818, West Sacramento, CA 95798-0818 P (916) 431-6959 F (916) 263-1897 www.bppe.ca.gov





Task Force Meeting Minutes Tuesday, December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015

# Department of Consumer Affairs First Floor Hearing Room 1625 North Market Blvd, Sacramento, CA 95834

## Task Force Members in Attendance:

Shawn Crawford, Chair Liz Simon John Carreon Kim Thompson Rust

Committee Members Absent: Marie Roberts De La Parra

### Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (Bureau) and DCA Staff in Attendance:

Joanne Wenzel, Bureau Chief Norine Marks, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs Mina Hamilton, Legal Counsel, Department of Consumer Affairs Benjamin Triffo, Legislative Analysis for Bureau for Private Education this is his classification – do we want his job title so we know what he does?

### Call to Order

Mr. Crawford called the meeting to order at 10:36 am.

#### Agenda Item # 1 – Welcome, Roll Call, and Establishment of a Quorum

Mr. Crawford welcomed the Task Force, and the public, followed by introductions of the individual Task Force members that were present.

### Agenda Item #2 – Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda

There was no public comment.

#### Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Minutes- October 29, 2015

Mr. Carreon motioned to approve the minutes, Ms. Simon seconded. (Ms. Thompson Rust: Aye; Mr. Crawford: Aye; Ms. Simon: Aye; Mr. Carreon: Aye). The motion passed.

### <u>Agenda Item #4 – Review and Modification of Task Force Draft Report, Mandated by</u> <u>California Education Code (CEC) section 94880.1</u>

Mr. Crawford began by stating that a thorough page-by-page turn may be the most effective way to review the draft report. The Task Force followed by having Ben Triffo from the Bureau review the report with them.

The Task Force began by reviewing the draft report's Executive Summary, in particular, the component addressing job openings and growth. Ms. Simon noted that it may be beneficial to provide specific statistics in this section.

The Task Force continued to review the report line-by-line when Mr. Crawford mentioned that it may be more beneficial to address substantive changes to the report, and provide grammar/word choice edits to Mr. Triffo at a later time. Norine Marks, DCA Legal Counsel, stated that substantive items that are agreed upon during this meeting can be edited and that there can be a delegation for a member(s) to provide a final review of the report and any edits for non-substantive items (e.g. grammatical) without the need for an additional Task Force meeting. Upon an approved motion (see approved motion below), Mr. Carreon and Ms. Simon will provide this final review and editing of the report.

Mr. Carreon asked if there is any intent language for Senate Bill 1247 that can be provided in the Executive Summary that speaks on why the bill was drafted and developed. Mr. Triffo stated that he was not aware of any intent language; however, there are various bill analyses that have been conducted. Mr. Crawford recommended that SB 1247 be included in the appendices.

While reviewing the Disclosures section of the Executive Summary, the Task Force recommended that "time commitment" be added to the recommendations surrounding program rigor. It was also recommended that there be a page reference to where in the report there is additional information on each Task Force recommendation. The Task Force also pointed out that in regards to "career guidance services" there should be a mention of institution and student expectations.

The next portion of the Executive Summary that was reviewed was the Reporting of Student Outcomes. While reviewing this section of the report, the Task Force recommended adding additional information to recommendation four, in particular, details around the use of Base Wage File data. While details are available later in the report, it was noted that additional context may provide more clarity.

Next the Task Force moved to the State Steps component of the Executive Summary. The Task Force began by reviewing the language in recommendation six. They noted that the term "shift the burden of responsibility" should be replaced with language speaking to industry validation.

While continuing the review of the State Steps section of the Executive Summary, the Task Force moved to recommendation seven which discusses outreach efforts. The Task Force recommended additional context around this recommendation, including what these outreach efforts may look like in action. Ms. Thompson-Rust recommended that there be an additional recommendation that speaks directly to partnering with Community Colleges in regards to temporary locations for High Technology Programs. Mr. Triffo recommended that the Task Force draft the language for recommendation eight during the meeting so there are no discrepancies with the final draft of the report. Accordingly, the Task Force drafted language for recommendation eight, as well as revised recommendation seven.

After finishing their review of the Executive Summary, the Task Force began to review the remainder of the report. Mr. Carreon and Mr. Crawford both made recommendations for the section titled Student Complaints. It was noted that there were not just negative comments, but positive remarks as it pertained to High Technology Programs as well. It was recommended that this section should be reshaped to represent all student perspectives.

The Task Force also recommended modifying the Guest Speakers section of the report; in particular, revising comments regarding potential guest speakers from various governmental offices that did not end up speaking to the Task Force.

Ms. Simon and Mr. Carreon recommended that the Summary of Institution Testimony in the Disclosures section of the report should be revised to read more as a narrative, with an emphasis on the admissions process being selective.

The Task Force also noted that in the second section titled Student Complaints that there be notation that complaints were reviewed from both approved and unapproved institutions.

Next, the Task Force reviewed the Reporting of Student Outcomes section of the report. In regards to the Summary of Institution Summary and Graduate Testimony sections, minor word changes were recommended along with some revising of language.

While reviewing testimony from Mr. Patrick Perry, Senior Research Associate at West Ed, in regards to the program Salary Surfer, the Task Force asked that there be mention of what sources of income the program uses. In particular, they requested that it be stated that all reported earnings are included in the methodology, and to remove mention of using wages that were earned in a field related to the student's area of study.

The Task Force continued with their review of the draft report, and began to look at the Summary of Bureau Testimony section. Ms. Simon noted that the summary speaks to what the backlog period is for the Quality of Education (QEU) review, but there is no note on the backlog of initial applications. The Task Force agreed that this information would be beneficial, along with information regarding the results of Licensing Workshops that the Bureau has been conducting.

Continuing through the report, the Task Force began to look at the recommendations that fell underneath the State Steps category. In particular, the Task Force reviewed recommendations surrounding the use of a Program Advisory Board and Evaluator Reports to supplement the QEU review. The Task Force ultimately settled on a recommendation that uses Evaluator Reports in conjunction with the approval to operate application, and a Program Advisory Board that is used as an ongoing quality assurance mechanism.

The Task Force finished their review of the report content, and next reviewed the appendices and attached documents. There were minor recommendations and edits made to these documents, the greatest change being the elimination of one sample Evaluator Report.

Mr. Crawford moved to approve the report subject to revision of the items discussed during the meeting. Mr. Carreon seconded the motion. (Ms. Thompson Rust: Aye; Mr. Crawford: Aye; Ms. Simon: Aye; Mr. Carreon: Aye). The motion passed.

Mr. Carreon moved to delegate final review and non-substantive edits of the report to Mr. Carreon and Ms. Simon with transmittal to the Advisory Committee by the January 1, 2016 deadline. Ms. Simon seconded the motion. (Ms. Thompson Rust: Aye; Mr. Crawford: Aye; Ms. Simon: Aye; Mr. Carreon: Aye). The motion passed.

There was no public comment.

#### Agenda Item #5– Possible Action to Approve Transmittal of Report with Findings and Recommendations to the Advisory Committee for its Approval

All members of the Task Force present at this meeting stated that they planned to attend the February Advisory Committee meeting.

There was no further public comment.

### <u>Agenda Item #6 – Adjournment</u>

Meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.