



Associate Degree
for Transfer
Intersegmental
Implementation
Committee

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

Meeting 3 Minutes

Meeting held virtually: January 26, 2023, 10 am - 3 pm PST

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. Call to Order and Roll Call of Committee Members

The Chair called the meeting to order. Sova conducted roll call and documented member attendance. A quorum was present.

1.2. Welcome from Chair, Reminder of the Arc of the Work, and Review of Agenda and Meeting Objectives

The Chair provided a welcome to Committee members. Sova gave an overview of the arc of the work including a recap of the key elements of the October and December 2022 meetings, an overview of today's January 2023 meeting objectives, and a forward look at the April and Fall 2023 meetings.

2. Consent Calendar

2.1. Review and Approval of December 2022 Meeting Minutes

The Committee did not have any questions or changes to the December 2022 meeting minutes.

Committee member Susan Cochran moved to approve the December 2022 meeting minutes; Committee member Cecilia Rios-Aguilar seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of 13-0.

3. Information and Reports

3.1. A National Example of Streamlined Transfer

Sova introduced Dr. Tristan Denley, the Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs and Innovation at the Louisiana Board of Regents. Prior to his role in Louisiana, Dr. Denley served as the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer for the University System of Georgia and as Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at the Tennessee Board of Regents. Dr. Denley began his career as a mathematician and math faculty member. He has held faculty positions in Sweden, Canada, and the US.

Dr. Denley discussed his experience with streamlining transfer at institutions and systems in Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and Georgia, and key lessons he has learned across those differing postsecondary governance approaches and political contexts. He spoke about how initial steps in undertaking this work include: determining equivalent courses, identifying how to match similar courses, reviewing institutional approaches and understanding of transfer, and using data to support faculty in making decisions. He elevated the importance of utilizing institutional discipline experts to determine sequences of learning. He noted the importance of students understanding the journey they are undertaking and correct course selection that leads to degree completion.

The Committee had an opportunity to ask Dr. Denley questions and provide comments which included topics such as:

- The importance of state structures and space for decision making in the form of transfer and articulation councils;
- Engagement of key partners such as non-profit organizations and independent colleges;
- The critical role of data in informing transfer policies and practices;

- Considerations for articulation of high-unit community college majors (e.g., 34+ credits);
- The need to analyze data about what proportion of students intend to transfer, how many actually transfer, and whether they changed their minds about their intent to transfer, or their trajectories were changed because of the barriers they faced;
- The need to design an educational ecosystem built on equity and student-centeredness that allows students to begin their studies at local institutions and matriculate to institutions throughout the state;
- The need to explore whether fundamental policies—such as the Master Plan for Higher Education—are in alignment with the goals and work of the AB 928 Committee; and
- The moral imperative of this work to better serve students.

A period of public comment was provided.

3.2. Discussion of the Study Groups, the Existing Knowledge Base about Transfer, and the Opportunities and Barriers for Students

The Study Group Lead Facilitators (Dr. Yvette Gullatt, Dr. Rose-Margaret Itua and Dr. Mike Muñoz) provided updates on the status of their study groups and how the groups will approach the work in the coming months. Committee members had an opportunity to ask questions and provide suggestions which included topics such as:

- Consideration of other state approaches from various regions of the US;
- The importance of understanding student experiences across segments;
- Support for the Student Ready Strategies (SRS) data gathering process and the need for data sharing memoranda of understanding (MOUs) across all public and private segments to connect the data;
- The opportunity for the Committee to share insights about data gaps with the developers of California’s Cradle-to-Career Data System; and
- Financial aid and its role in the student transfer process.

Sova introduced SRS, a research and technical assistance organization with decades of experience working in postsecondary education at both

institutional and state levels. SRS is providing data capacity for the committee and conducted a broad landscape scan to understand what is known about the transfer student experience and outcomes in California.

Key points from the SRS presentation included:

- Importance of qualitative and quantitative analyses and intentionally infusing student voice into data;
- Complexity of the current transfer process for students and a lack of transparency about how or if credits will transfer;
- Lack of clear communication to students regarding how to transfer, and an acknowledgment that communications can only be straightforward if the underlying system is also straightforward;
- Barriers posed by price differences between 2- and 4-year institutions and a lack of financial aid alignment between 2- and 4-year institutions; and
- Barriers posed by conflicting or incorrect information from advisors or other institution staff and faculty, the differing requirements for each sector, and redirection to institutions students are unable to attend.

Committee members had an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments which included topics such as:

- Multiple barriers to transfer student success currently exist and appear consistent with the SRS presentation;
- An interest in understanding more about course-level data and course alignment, sequences, and credits;
- A desire to connect information from Dr. Denley's and SRS's presentations related to transfer articulation development;
- An aspiration for the Committee to think big. The Committee has an opportunity to innovate and do things differently;
- Reflections that current pathways for students, and tools to support students, are outdated and were designed for other purposes (e.g., managing enrollment), not for supporting today's students; and
- The need for thoughtfulness around capacity issues such as impaction so pathways are clarified and sound.

A period of public comment was provided.

3.3. Update on the Lower Division General Education Pathway

Sova introduced the Academic Senate leaders from each of the three segments of public higher education in California: Virginia (Ginni) May, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; Beth Steffel, Chair, Academic Senate of the California State University; and Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate of the University of California. The Academic Senate leaders provided an update on their work to “establish a singular lower division general education pathway.”

Note: This was an update only and the Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee is not engaged in establishing or approving the pathway.

The Academic Senate presented: the AB 928 requirements; progress made to date; next steps leading up to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates statutory deadline of May 31, 2023; and progress on system vetting by the California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California.

Committee members had an opportunity to ask questions and comment, which included topics such as:

- The Committee has heard many concerns about the pathway not requiring courses in Area E – Lifelong Learning & Self-Development;
- Committee members discussed the need for an impact analysis to understand how proposed pathways might affect student outcomes but funding and capacity for an impact analysis remains a challenge; and
- The need for additional opportunities for public discussion about the proposed pathway within the existing timeline.

A period of public comment was provided.

3.4. Advancing the Work and Discussion of Agenda Items for Future Meetings

Sova's Cristen Moore led the discussion on defining two key terms as part of advancing the work: equity and student-centered. Moore shared sample definitions from California and around the country. In follow-up to this meeting, a short survey will be disseminated to the Committee for input and feedback on sample definitions. Working definitions will be shared at the next Committee meeting.

To support advancing the work, Sova invited Committee members to weigh in on agenda topics for future meetings. Committee members suggested a panel discussion with articulation officers from across the state to help connect today's meeting to the next phase of work.

A period of public comment was provided.

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