



Associate Degree
for Transfer
Intersegmental
Implementation
Committee

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

Meeting 6 Minutes

September 18, 2023

10 am - 4 pm PDT

The Hub

1102 Q Street, Suite 3100

Sacramento, CA 95811

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 New Member Introductions

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, April, and June) meetings. Sova provided an overview of the September 2023 meeting objectives and agenda, and an introduction to newly appointed AB928 Committee members.

2. Consent Calendar

2.1. Review and Approval of June 2023 Meeting Minutes

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

2.2 Approval of 2024 Committee Meeting Dates

Sova reminded the Committee that they provided feedback via a doodle poll on their availability for proposed 2024 Committee meeting dates. The dates that emerged as the front runners for a total of five meetings include: January 25, 2024; March 26, 2024; June 13, 2024; September 12, 2024; and November 20, 2024.

Committee member Susan Cochran moved to approve the June 2023 meeting minutes and the 2024 Committee meeting dates; Committee member Cecilia Rios-Aguilar seconded the motion. All Committee members present in-person and virtually voted in favor of the June 2023 meeting minutes and the 2024 Committee meeting dates.

3. Information and Reports

3.1. Review of the Timeline and Process for Finalizing 2023 Recommendations and Discussion of the Committee Public Document Section Focused on Reengagement

Chair Lowe began the session and then Sova reviewed the timeline between now and the end of 2023, at which time the Committee's recommendations are due to the legislature. Key discussion points included:

- The web form accepting public comment will be open until mid-November (see <https://www.ab928committee.org/public-comment>);
- The next meeting of the AB928 Committee will be on November 30, 2023. At that meeting, the Committee will vote on its final recommendations;
- Members should expect that the November 30, 2023 meeting will run long, and the meeting time will be set for 9 am - 5 pm PT; and

- Committee members will be able to submit amendments to the final recommendations. Members are strongly encouraged to submit amendments to Sova before the November meeting by sending them to Leslie.Fischbeck2@sova.org. This will help to streamline the meeting and reduce the need to wordsmith amendments during the meeting; however, amendments will also be accepted at the November 30, 2023 meeting.

During today's session, a Committee member asked how the Committee is working to engage the students. Sova noted some key steps taken by Sova to engage the students:

- Offer to be a resource to discuss content or other questions at any time;
- Offer one-on-one orientations, including Bagley-Keene training;
- Ask the outgoing student members to be intentional about the transition, including bringing their successors up to speed about the content;
- Seek to network the student members with each other so they are building community; and
- Ensure all travel costs are reimbursed for students.

A Committee member asked if the Bagley-Keene requirements apply to students in the same way as they would for non-student members. It was noted that the Bagley-Keene requirements are the same for all committee members regardless of representation status. The Committee discussed that it would be nice if the students could collaborate on a student vision for the state. Another Committee member then suggested that perhaps the student associations could work together to craft a vision for the state and submit that via public comment.

During this session, three members arrived at the meeting and so the Committee paused and did a round-robin of introductions.

The Committee then transitioned to discussing its recommendations for reengaging ADT (Associate Degree for Transfer) earners who do not apply to transfer or do not transfer. Dr. Mike Muñoz described the data and research used and walked through the set of premises and considerations crafted to

support the Committee's work in developing recommendations (please see deck here: <https://www.ab928committee.org/meetings/september18-2023>).

The Committee then engaged in a full-group discussion. Key points included:

- It is critical to make visible the students who need to be better served so that they either stay engaged and transfer, or come back if they have stopped out of the system;
- Institutions must be student-ready. There is much work to do in terms of building the needed resources, infrastructure and investments;
- A campaign designed to reengage students should be proactive and meet students where they are, reaching out through workplaces, hospitals, churches and community organizations;
- Postsecondary segments, institutions and the Committee need better data to monitor the progress in reengaging students;
- Efforts related to both reengagement and redirection of students should not be restricted by segment, and should consider all of the options available to students, particularly in a region (e.g., online options, independent colleges, out-of-state transfer, etc.). Note: this does not mean regional preference;
- Reengagement and redirection efforts should take a strong regional focus, knowing that many students wish to, and/or need to, stay in region. It would be helpful if we had a statewide lens on regions, so that each segment does not work with its own definition;
- Consider developing a shared determination about what the agreed upon regions are in the state;
- It would be helpful to look at examples of regional partnerships around the state, such as the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium;
- Postsecondary segments, institutions and the Committee need a sharper understanding of postsecondary supply and demand regionally, as well as capacity options, to facilitate building an infrastructure to match up supply and demand.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.1. Public comments were made.

3.2. Discussion of the Committee Public Document Section Focused on Goals

Chair Lowe began this session, and then Dr. Yvette Gullatt provided an overview of the considerations developed to support the Committee in shaping its recommendations for Goals (please see deck here: <https://www.ab928committee.org/meetings/september18-2023>). The Committee then engaged in a full-group discussion. Key points included:

- The recommendations should include a description of what is possible, painting a picture of the good things that can accrue to California and its residents if the state meets the 70% postsecondary attainment goal;
- Due to the lack of good baseline data, the Committee made a good-faith effort to look at the best-available data, estimate some of which cannot be known and set aspirational, developmental goals aligned to what would best support equitable student success;
- The California Community Colleges (CCC), University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems and members of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities are already committed to efforts designed to close equity gaps. While all segments have initiatives and strategies underway, it will be helpful to analyze them holistically to ascertain if those strategies and initiatives, taken together, will accomplish the goals of the state. In addition, efforts to close equity gaps should not focus on the postsecondary sector alone, with keen attention to alleviating equity gaps earlier in students' educational pathways (e.g., early education, K12, dual enrollment, etc.);
- There are many ways students transfer. Many students transfer regardless of meeting requirements for the ADT, but too few students transfer overall;
- Meeting the 70% credential attainment goal is not the work of the in-state postsecondary segment alone. Partnerships with industry can offer non-degree certifications. Online accredited, non-profit institutions offer valuable, accessible offerings. The goal related to achieving a 70% attainment rate should take these additional opportunities into account and position the goal as a statewide effort;

- The Committee discussed whether it's realistic to meet the 70% goal. There was agreement that it is important to be aspirational, and that the state needs increased postsecondary opportunities;
- Efforts to meet the 70% attainment goal should be intentional about calling for equity gaps to be closed and identifying current baseline attainment data. Data should be monitored to ensure gaps are closing;
- The Committee's work needs to call for more intentional understanding of student affordability and collaboration with entities such as the California Student Aid Commission;
- The postsecondary segments need a funded infrastructure for improved collaboration and coordination;
- The postsecondary segments need to understand supply and demand better. At the moment, in the absence of the Cradle to Career data system, the Committee members do not have access to the data they want and need, and ongoing monitoring and accountability will be impeded without better data; and
- Data by race and ethnicity need to be appropriately and finely disaggregated, for example supporting improved analysis of subgroups within the "Asian American" population.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.2. Public comments were received.

3.3. Review of Committee Public Document Section Focused on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM)

Chair Lowe introduced the session, and Dr. Alison Kadlec provided an overview of the considerations developed to support the Committee in shaping its recommendations (please see deck here:

<https://www.ab928committee.org/meetings/september18-2023>). Other study group members also weighed in. The Committee then engaged in a full-group discussion. Key points included:

- The Committee is focusing initially on the high-unit STEM pathways of Engineering, Chemistry, Physics, Environmental Science, and Math;

- The Committee members do not want this effort to be a box-checking exercise. The Committee members hold high aspirations for improving transfer student outcomes, and that means difficult work will be required;
- The 2023 body of work focused on STEM requires data on STEM pathways that is not available. The Committee is making a good-faith effort to make recommendations without the data it would have liked;
- At the moment, the STEM ADTs that exist prepare students for most STEM pathways for transfer to CSU, but not to UC;
- If UC institutions feel students are not prepared by the ADT, some Committee members wonder whether UC should be offering them co-requisite supports to ensure they can succeed without taking additional courses and taking far longer to graduate;
- To fully explore STEM pathways, discipline faculty from all of the segments must work together to examine existing ADTs and build them to ensure they prepare students for transfer to both UC and CSU. There are existing mechanisms for this type of collaboration, such as the Transfer Alignment Project; and
- At the moment, ADTs are structured to complete general education in the first two years. The Committee and other engaged stakeholders may need to make hard choices about when general education should happen to ensure students can focus on more major preparation courses in their first two years. The Committee discussed whether legislation needs to change to support a modified structure of the ADTs, and there was agreement that existing legislation does not prohibit the type of flexibility needed for shifting around the timing of general education courses. There was also agreement that a Cal-GETC for STEM is not needed, because it is possible to create STEM pathways with gen ed flexibility under current legislation;
- In addition to efforts to reduce units to completion in STEM pathways, additional work is needed to ensure that faculty and staff are diverse and representative of the student body by race and ethnicity, and that faculty receive professional development in culturally responsive pedagogy; and

- The real work here is building Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) across the segments, with the goal of facilitating students being able to easily transfer from one community college to all participating colleges and universities in the state (aka “1 to all”). The Committee engaged in a brief discussion of tradeoffs to this approach, with one member noting that when it comes to building a “1 to all” approach of STEM pathways we should recognize that for some majors this will mean that some students may be required to take courses that they don’t need, because if all students are to be held to one standard it will need to be the higher standard set by UCs. This raised the question about whether this would raise an unfair bar for transfer students, the majority of whom transfer to the CSUs.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.3. Public comments were received.

3.4. Review of two Sections of the Committee Public Document: “Draft Outline of Final Report Elements” and “Potential Overarching Findings and Considerations”

Due to lengthy and robust discussion of the other agenda items during the day there was not sufficient time to address this agenda item on its own; however, Chair Lowe and the Committee members determined that the discussion throughout the day often related to the emerging potential overarching findings and considerations. As facilitator, Sova will draft the next version of the report. Committee members who would like to see revisions should reach out to Sova to discuss.

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. Public comments were received.

5. Adjournment