



Associate Degree  
for Transfer  
Intersegmental  
Implementation  
Committee

## **Assembly Bill No. 928: The Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee**

### **Meeting 5 Minutes**

**Meeting held virtually: June 12, 2023, 10 am - 12:30 pm PDT**

The agenda, materials, and slide deck for this meeting are available at this website:

<https://www.ab928committee.org/>

### **Order of Agenda**

#### **1. Standing Orders of Business**

##### **1.1. Welcome from the Chair, Call to Order, Determination of Quorum, Housekeeping and Roll Call of Committee Members**

The Chair provided a welcome to Committee members and called the meeting to order. Sova conducted roll call and a quorum was present.

##### **1.2. Reminder of the Arc of the Work, Review of Agenda and Meeting Objectives, and Description of Summer Work for the Committee**

The Chair provided an overview of the arc of the work and recapped the key elements of the 2022 (October and December) and 2023 (January and April) meetings. Sova provided an overview of the June 2023 meeting objectives, a forward look at the fall of 2023, and an overview of the process and timeline for the Committee's work over the next several months (e.g., obtaining stakeholder feedback).

## **2. Consent Calendar**

### **2.1. Review and Approval of April 2023 Meeting Minutes**

The Committee did not have any questions or changes to the April 2023 meeting minutes.

Committee member Yvette Gullatt moved to approve the April 2023 meeting minutes; Committee member Jessie Ryan seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 10-0 with one abstaining.

## **3. Information and Reports**

### **3.1. Examples of Streamlined Transfer in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) and Discussion of AB928 Committee Recommendations for STEM**

Chair Lowe welcomed the speakers and described the criteria and process used to identify the examples of STEM pathways, such as:

- Talking to a number of leading STEM researchers and practitioners inside and outside of California;
- Focusing on the legislative requirement that the Committee streamline units in STEM pathways, with a focus on pathways that are at or near 126 units; and
- Discussion with potential speakers of the hard trade-offs they had to make to ensure today's discussion is honest and transparent about the challenges.

The Chair introduced and thanked committee member Dr. Rose-Margaret Itua who led the discussion with the panelists.

Dr. Itua set the context for the discussion, covering points such as: describing the importance of the work in terms of California's continued leadership, especially in ensuring equity and accessible education for students; providing background on the importance of California having STEM degree-holders; and discussing data related to current inequities in STEM student outcomes and the importance of the Committee's work to create more streamlined STEM

pathways that support on-time degree completion. Dr. Itua emphasized that current outcomes make clear that STEM pathways represent an equity issue that needs to be fixed.

Dr. Itua further elaborated that STEM fields have different barriers to student entry and progression and different patterns of student under-representation. All too often, students struggle to navigate STEM program requirements.

Dr. Itua provided a reminder of AB928 legislative language related to STEM (see presentation slides), and then introduced the speakers to share their experiences, successes, challenges, and ongoing work with STEM pathways. The speakers were:

- Dr. Carolyn Gentle-Genitty (Indiana University: Assistant Vice President for University Academic Policy and Professor of Social Work);
- Dr. Jeffrey Watt (Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis [IUPUI]: The M. L. Bittinger Chair of Mathematics Education; Chair and Professor, Department of Mathematical Sciences; Purdue School of Science, IUPUI); and
- Christopher Anderson (University of Colorado Boulder [CU Boulder]: Senior Director of Academic Success and Transfer Pathways, College of Engineering & Applied Science).

The panelists described their work to bring clarity for students starting at community colleges and transferring into STEM disciplines, including what spurred the panelists/states to do the work, how they approached the effort, and who was involved. Additionally, the discussion explored hard trade-offs, mind-shifts, and the work required to move through compromises. Notably, Indiana has legislation driving their process. In Colorado, an initial workgroup disbanded because they thought that existing state policy would not allow them to make the needed changes. Ultimately, a smaller group in Colorado felt it was achievable, regrouped, and was able to develop collective agreement over several years of work. All panelists agreed that communication, clarity, and collaboration were essential, as was involving faculty throughout the process.

The Committee asked the panelists questions and provide comments on topics such as:

- The panelists were asked to elaborate on how they navigated academic quality. Indiana prioritized identifying course learning outcomes which created the ability to streamline clearly aligned courses. In Colorado, the community colleges and universities focused on revamping the overall curriculum. Representatives from both states discussed the need to clarify math requirements.
- Committee members asked how these states navigated having the same course offerings at multiple community colleges for the same degree, and how courses are designed to support students who stop out and return. Colorado has a common course numbering system for community college to university as well as community college to community college. Indiana has one community college, which makes it easier (though every campus has a general education requirement that may be different). Additionally, once general education is completed at any campus, it is considered done. However, there are limitations and extra courses that may be required if a student changes their major or Transfer Single Articulation Pathway (TSAP).
- The Colorado panelist was asked about the state's approach to general education. Colorado's general education development took over two years and included feedback and agreement from several institutions and the state. Ultimately, students have a 30-hour GE requirement and flexibility in what they can take.
- Committee members asked about how independent colleges and universities have been engaged. In Indiana, the initial discussion was with public institutions but independent institutions are now involved. In Colorado, the independent institutions are not engaged as they do not offer the specific programs related to this work.
- Committee members asked the panelists about the length of the process. In Colorado, it took about 3 to 3.5 years (with COVID in the middle) to map out the transfer degree. In Indiana, it took much longer but a panelist noted that, given lessons learned, they think it could be completed in about six years.

Following the panel, the Committee dove into their thinking about how to streamline STEM pathways in California. The Committee discussion included key points such as:

- There should be consideration for the role of the Transfer Alignment Project and what that means for this work.
- This work should be aligned with student and workforce needs.
- Additional legislation might be needed to move this type of change (as was needed in Indiana).
- Incremental progress has occurred but success for this work would be full scale implementation.
- There is interest in creating a STEM Cal-GETC and cutting down on general education units.
- The current Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) structure poses some challenges for STEM disciplines and needs to be revisited.
- There is a need to identify where there is already alignment with the ADTs and where there is potential for alignment to cut down on duplicative efforts. There was also discussion of analyzing the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMCs) that have major science curriculum in their core requirements, as well as University of California transfer pathways to identify pathways that are already well-aligned, working well, and meeting the unit threshold of 126 units or below.
- The recommendations must focus on achieving equitable student outcomes.
- Though complex, ultimately Committee members believe this work can be done.

Sova facilitators emphasized key questions for the work: What does it mean to bring the faculty into the work? What are the structural changes needed for the ADT? How can the recommendations be strengthened?

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.1.

#### **4. Public Forum**

##### **4.1. Public Forum on Non-Agenda Items**

Members of the public wishing to comment on subjects not on the agenda were provided two minutes each to share comments.

#### **5. Adjournment**