



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

Meeting 4 Minutes

April 25, 2023

10 am - 3 pm PDT

Long Beach City College, Liberal Arts Campus
Building W – Room 201
4901 E. Carson Street
Long Beach, CA 90808

The agenda, materials, and presentation 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 documented member attendance. A quorum was present.

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

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

2. Consent Calendar

2.1. Review and Approval of January 2023 Meeting Minutes

The Committee did not have any questions or changes to the January 2023 meeting minutes. All committee members present in-person and virtually voted in favor of the January 2023 meeting minutes.

3. Information and Reports

3.1. A National Example of Streamlined Transfer: Lessons from New York

Sova introduced Dr. Alexandra (Lexa) Logue, a Research Professor in the Center for Advanced Study in Education of the Graduate Center of The City University of New York (CUNY), and former CUNY system Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost. She runs systemwide transfer work for CUNY that is frequently elevated as some of the best work in the country. Dr. Logue's work is known for being rooted in deep experience, rigorous research and student voice work, and for thinking outside of the box and pulling on tools ranging from technology to transparent data.

Sova reminded the Committee that the barriers identified by Student Ready Strategies (SRS) in the January 2023 meeting continued to elevate as areas of focus for the committee's work. Dr. Logue discussed how the CUNY system identified a similar set of barriers for students, and how CUNY has worked to address them through a set of important policy and practice solutions.

Dr. Logue discussed challenges faced by students in vertical transfer, including how vertical transfer is an equity issue (see presentation slide deck), and how a team is seeking to address those challenges at CUNY through what they refer to as Associates to Bachelor's Degree Transfer, also known as A2B.

Dr. Logue described some of the strategies CUNY implemented including 2013 policies put in place to help with transfer so that credits could transfer with degree applicability. In addition, a new tool—the Transfer Explorer website, nicknamed T-Rex—is a public resource that shows how credits transfer within the CUNY system. Dr. Logue noted that while T-Rex is already in use, the developers are also planning to continue to add functionality.

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

- Do we know the “why” behind what makes transfer difficult? Dr. Logue indicated there are many reasons—including student finances, family care responsibilities, and work commitments—but also that a lot of students who do not apply to transfer have very good academic records, and research shows that lost credits in transfer reduce students’ likelihood of completion. She stressed that supporting students who are juggling life responsibilities is all the more reason to make transfer as efficient as possible.
- Data show that students required to attend full time have a better success rate and Dr. Logue shared an example of a program, CUNY’s Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (ASAP), that supports the full time associates that has had great success.
- New York has one of the biggest independent sectors and Committee members wanted to know in what ways CUNY has partnered with the independent colleges. Dr. Logue indicated that the independent colleges are very interested in what CUNY is doing and there is opportunity for enhanced collaboration.
- Dr. Logue emphasized that making accurate data public to everybody is critical (please see presentation slide deck for details).

3.2. Update from the Governor’s Office

Sova introduced Mr. Ben Chida, Chief Deputy Cabinet Secretary for the Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, where he has served as Senior Policy Advisor for cradle to career.

Mr. Chida shared his remarks with the Committee, including his own experience with education starting at a community college and the difficulties associated with taking courses that he did not know at the time were non-transferable. He was discouraged by the process and almost gave up since he did not find himself on the education pathway he anticipated; he understands how students can become discouraged and have a hard time returning and

re-engaging. Mr. Chida acknowledged that he is mindful of the core work of the committee, with a focus on institutional and intersegmental policies.

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

- The Governor’s budget and whether the May Revision will include a requirement that the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) create a transfer guarantee program. Mr. Chida is not able to share what is in the budget until it is released;
- Mr. Chida shared the perspective of the Governor’s office, such as how they seek to outline strategic objectives while providing resources. The Governor’s office seeks to outline “what” to prioritize and “why” to do so, but they also understand the need for experts and key stakeholders –such as representatives of the education systems–to figure out “how” to make changes;
- Mr. Chida shared several strategies on how to help students make it to the front door of getting a degree: 1) Dual enrollment; 2) Career pathways to encourage students to be inspired and dream, and have a way of systematically thinking about where they might be going and what is available for where they can go; and 3) Utilizing tools like California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI), so that high school students have access to data that can allow them to plan their educational experiences.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda items 3.1 and 3.2.

3.3. Updates from the Study Groups

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. Their updates included: an overview of the legislative language applicable to their study group, study group membership, the information gathering process and research used, and draft recommendations. Each update was followed by facilitated discussion with the Committee on that study group’s draft recommendations to solicit feedback.

Committee members had an opportunity to ask questions and provide suggestions. Discussion for each study group included topics such as:

Goals

- While the legislation outlines the goals of the AB928 Committee in a particular order, the study group has decided to prioritize first and foremost closing equity gaps by race and ethnicity;
- The data partner, Student-Ready Strategies, has developed a modeling tool that allows the Committee to consider scenarios for increasing credential production;
- When considering how to close regional opportunity gaps, it will be important for the recommendations to be nimble and designed for the students of today and their workforce realities. Goals should align to workforce demand in the region and statewide, and not be limited by the region's current workforce demand, for example;
- It is important for the goals to promote real action, and allow current leaders to see their ability to influence the goals, thereby supporting both action and accountability; and
- When considering Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) offered by region, the AB928 Committee will need to consider how to support small and rural colleges that don't have the capacity to offer a lot of ADTs.

STEM

- The study group started with a focus on High Unit Majors (see presentation slide deck for list);
- The ADT dictates credits in the first two years, limiting flexibility to have students take prerequisite courses before transfer;
- Is there a possibility of a CalGETC for STEM?;
- One of the key takeaways is that something needs to change for STEM students. On average, they are transferring with too many credits and then have to retake courses. The negative impact on students is real;

- Many models of STEM transfer pathways exist, both within and outside of California. The Committee would like to hear from exemplars to help understand how others have made progress in this area; and
- The study group is committed and wants to reduce units for STEM students, but more flexibility in the ADT structure may be required. There is concern that the current structure will put community college students at a disadvantage.

Re-engagement

- The ADT is supposed to be “a degree with a guarantee,” but evidence shows that is not the case. The study group is concerned about encouraging students to transfer and getting them excited, and then not having an admission slot for them to transfer;
- The study group wants to better understand the students who completed their ADT and never applied and ADT earners who apply but never enroll;
- The study group is conducting its analysis through many lenses, including: race and ethnicity; intersectionality between many student characteristics (e.g., race and gender); and the unique needs of adult students;
- The study group offered there must be institutional ownership but also clear leadership from the Chancellor’s office in order for the processes to be consistent and sustainable and plan to outline recommendations for specific groups for clear ownership of the work;
- The reality is there is not just one factor that affects why students are not actively persisting as ADT earners or that can increase re-engagement. Based on the RP Group’s data it is clear there are many reasons (e.g., finances, lack of accessibility to desired location, life events such as the birth of a child/illness, etc.) so the solutions and recommendations must be multi-faceted.

Overarching themes emerged as well. All of the study groups are struggling to access good data, and there is an emerging discussion about the Committee making some overarching recommendations related to the need for better data. In addition, there is a heavy focus on the three public segments

(California Community Colleges, California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC)), and the full Committee would benefit from elevating the independent segment more as well.

A period of public comment was provided.

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

Sova indicated that any additional thoughts from Committee members on the study group recommendations presented in Agenda Item 3.3 could be shared via poster boards in the room. Those notes included the following comments:

- Re-engagement
 - Consider automatic CalGETC completion certification for ADT earners
- General comments
 - What would a central clearinghouse for articulation look like?
 - Should there be a recommendation on a GPA requirement for UC ADTs? Is that something we should be incorporating in our goals?

Sova explained that study group lead facilitators presented early drafts of their groups' recommendations. There is much work still to be done, and the study groups will continue to meet virtually over the next several months before the Committee meets in-person again in the fall. This work will include sharing draft recommendations with constituents, obtaining feedback from constituents, and revising recommendations.

Sova discussed advancing the work through defining key terms that have stood out to the Committee. A survey was provided to the Committee prior to this meeting and was used to solicit feedback on the terms "equity" and "student-centered." Based on the feedback received, definitions for both were developed and provided (see presentation slide deck for working definitions).

To further support advancing the work, Sova invited Committee members to weigh in on agenda topics for future meetings.

Committee members suggested topics such as:

- A discussion of overarching recommendations, which may not be required in statute but may be beneficial and needed;
- Presentations from guest speakers related to STEM and streamlined pathways; and
- The need for an additional meeting in the summer prior to finalizing recommendations in the fall.

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