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

Meeting 9 Minutes

March 28, 2024
10 am - 4 pm PST
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, New Member Introductions, and Roll Call of Committee Members**

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

    The Committee roster, including titles and appointing/designating entitles, can be found at https://www.ab928committee.org/committee-membership

    Chair Lowe welcomed a new member and the committee provided a round of introductions. She then provided an update that she has accepted a new role as Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning, Research, and Institutional

Effectiveness with the Los Rios Community College District and will conclude her time as Chair of the Committee at the end of April 2024.

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

Sova provided an overview of the March 2024 meeting objectives, agenda and arc of the work for the 2024 meetings (scheduled for January, March, June, September, and November). Since the January meeting, Sova and Student-Ready Strategies (SRS) held 1:1 meetings with Committee members to advance the work, and will continue to do so. Sova and SRS will bring findings and draft recommendations stemming from those meetings back to the full Committee at subsequent public meetings. Draft recommendations will be posted for public comment and discussed during the full Committee meetings, with a final vote at the November 2024 meeting.

2. Consent Calendar

2.1. Review and Approval of January 2024 Meeting Minutes

Ginni May proposed an amendment to the January 2024 Meeting Minutes based on input from Marci Sanchez, California State University Chancellor's Office (CSUCO) and Krystinne Mica, Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, who were presenters at the January 2024 meeting. May proposed to add, "The CSUCO is looking at ways to update the public TMC information related to removals of similarity" to the Key Discussion Points on page 6.

Committee member David Ramirez moved to accept the consent calendar with amendment; Committee member Laura Massa seconded the motion. One Committee member, James Steintrager, abstained and the remaining Committee members present voted in favor of accepting the consent calendar.

3. Information and Reports

3.1. Election of the New Chair for the AB928 Committee

Chair Lowe introduced the session. Then, Sova reviewed the 2024 election process for a new Committee chair, based on the legislative requirements, and

presented the nominations to date: Yvette Gullatt and Rose-Margaret Itua. Sova asked the Committee if there were any additional nominations today and there were none. Dr. Itua withdrew her nomination due to recent increases in responsibilities in other areas of work. Dr. Gullatt confirmed that she accepted her nomination and spoke for a few minutes to share her interest in and qualifications for serving as Chair.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.1. No public comments were made.

Sova then conducted a vote for the election. All Committee members present voted in favor to elect Dr. Gullatt as the next Committee chair.

3.2. Expert Input on Current Articulation Processes

Chair Lowe began the session and then Sova provided an introduction of the articulation panel, which included:

- Academic Senate California Community College (ASCCC) representative:
    - Michelle Plug, Articulation Officer/Counselor, Citrus College
- California State University, Chancellor's Office (CSUCO) representative:
    - Alison Wiles, Associate Registrar of Transfer Credit & Articulation Officer, CSU San Bernardino
- University of California, Office of the President (UCOP) representative:
    - Molly Thompson, Transfer Articulation Coordinator and former Articulation Officer, UC Santa Cruz
- Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) representative:
    - Craig Means, Director of Transfer Admissions, Saint Mary's College of California

Sova facilitated the discussion with a series of questions for each panelist, and the Committee was provided an opportunity to ask additional questions. Because articulation is so complex, this panel focused on course-to-course articulation within major preparation, but there are different protocols for different kinds of curriculum. Key discussion points included:

- Course-to-course articulation is a complex process that is highly reliant on the individuals involved and their relationships with each other.
- There is no central repository at this time for capturing the history of articulation requests and decisions. The request and approval process takes place mainly via individuals' emails. The panelists recommend a technology solution in this area. For example, could Assist.org be leveraged to capture course history and include articulation tracking capabilities?
- Due to heavy workload and limited capacity, Articulation Officers have to prioritize which course articulation requests they can accommodate. There are times when they either cannot review a course for articulation, or there is great variability in response timeframes, with some requests having to wait many months.
- Policies differ from institution to institution in areas such as: whether faculty are involved in reviewing each course articulation request; whether the standard for course equivalency is based upon a course covering the same content, or a course adequately preparing students for success; and whether student outcomes data is consulted if a course is going to be rejected as equivalent.
- When a California Community College (CCC) submits a course for articulation, it can be accepted or rejected differently by the various receiving institutions. At this time, there are no objective standards in place for acceptance or denial of major preparation courses.
- A UC representative noted that "floating topics" on course outlines of record create issues within articulation as it is unclear whether a floating topic was actually covered in the course taken.
- The impact of Common Course Numbering on technological needs, including Assist.org and degree audit databases, was suggested as an opportunity to address standards for consistent data inputs throughout the state's postsecondary education infrastructure.

3.3. Updates from Cradle-to-Career

Chair Lowe began the session and Sova welcomed the speakers from the California Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Data System:

- Mary Ann Bates, Executive Director
- Eric Flores, Deputy Director, Legislative Affairs

Bates and Flores provided an overview of Cradle to Career and the Committee asked many questions and engaged in robust conversation. Key discussion points included:

- Over 100 public meetings were held to support the design of C2C.
- C2C links existing, validated data from existing data providers. C2C does not collect data from the public, from individual schools or colleges, etc. The data in C2C is limited to what is provided to them.
- C2C is meant to be a neutral source of data. C2C will not make policy recommendations.
- Part of the C2C mandate is to collaborate with partners on developing tools for students, such as:
  - Partnering with www.CaliforniaColleges.edu and efforts to bring it to scale across the state.
  - Revamping eTranscript California.
  - Imagining a California Career Passport.
- C2C received its first data submission last October; from here data submissions will be annual. At first, C2C will have 10 years of historical data.
- Some of the discussion that was specific to transfer and/or the AB928 Committee included:
  - How is C2C defining "eligible" to transfer? C2C will share its data dictionary to support the Committee having details as to the variables and metrics.
  - The C2C does not expect to have access to course-level data and so some AB928 Committee questions on transfer success related to course-taking patterns won't be answerable via this data set.
  - The higher education segments report data on race and ethnicity based on IPEDS categories. The Committee's request for fine disaggregations (e.g., subpopulations within Asian) will not be possible unless that changes.

- ○ The plans to revamp eTranscript could be designed to support and intersect with tools like Assist.org.
- The AB928 Committee and C2C would like to continue to interact. Ideas for how to do so included:
    - ○ Conduct a joint meeting with C2C Advisory Boards.
    - ○ Invite C2C back to an AB928 Committee meeting to support design of the Transfers Dashboard.
    - ○ Continue to share AB928 Committee ideas for transfer-specific metrics and analysis.

3.4. Discussion of the AB928 Committee in 2024

Chair Lowe began the session and reminded the Committee that the goal is not to affirm existing processes, but rather to look forward to a new vision for the state. Via this legislation, the legislature is signaling that they feel changes are needed. Sova then provided a reminder of the AB928 legislative language related to the first two key areas of work that the Committee must complete before December 31, 2024.[1] At a high-level they are:

(1) "Establish timelines and reporting deadlines for the existing regular review of declaring or matching transfer model curricula similar to the California State University majors for admissions purposes."

(2) "Develop a plan for the periodic analysis and creation of additional transfer model curricula for the [Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)] to respond to evolving workforce demands, including STEM degree pathways, and degree pathways that will aid in the economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, such as nursing and cybersecurity."

Sova's facilitator provided background on the process and information received during the 1:1s and facilitated a discussion of the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) process and its relationship to the AB928 goals (see slides at https://www.ab928committee.org/). Key discussion points included:

---

[1] California State Legislature. (2021). *Assembly Bill No. 928, Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021: Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee*. Retrieved April 18, 2023, from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB928

- Currently, there is no expectation related to how CSUs declare a TMC is not similar to a major on a campus. How that determination is made is unclear and variable by campus.
- According to long-standing practice and consistent with the intent of the law, CSU campuses determine similarity of an ADT based on the review of the TMC, not the individual ADT at each college. As such, the process to declare similarity by CSUs can kick off once TMCs are finalized and decisions can be made by the time CCCs create the ADTs based on TMCs (which must be done within 18 months by statute).
- If a course has a Course Identification Number (C-ID) and it's part of a TMC, and a CSU has declared the TMC as similar, then the CSU must accept the course.
- One intent of the AB928 legislation is to ensure a more seamless ADT pathway development process for the benefit of students. There are some misconceptions about those processes, but there is no data to prove either way. Given that lack of data:
    - It would be helpful to have data from CSUCO on:
        - The process CSUs use to identify if a TMC is similar to a major (e.g., steps taken by CSUCO, steps taken by each CSU, timelines, justifications, reporting requirements).
        - How often and on what timelines CSUs declare similarity and dissimilarity.
        - How often a CSU determines a TMC is no longer similar, in which programs, and what that process looks like.
    - It would be helpful to have data from ASCCC on:
        - How many requests for C-IDs and TMCs are made each year.
        - How long it takes from that request received to a C-ID and/or TMC being established.
        - Whether and how often C-IDs or TMCs are not able to be established.
        - What triggers a TMC review process besides the established 5-year cycle?

- Another stated intent of the AB928 legislation is to ensure that TMCs are responsive to evolving workforce demands. Currently, not all programs statewide are crafted based upon labor market data, and TMCs do not all have to be in response to workforce demand – there is both room and need for TMCs in areas that might not necessarily show up as high-demand in labor market data. At the same time, there needs to be a process for triggering new TMCs if needed, and the legislation is calling for that change.
- The Committee discussed some areas for potential recommendations:
  - Add a timeline for when CSUs must consider a TMC and declare similarity. Note: If at first a CSU determines a TMC is not similar, the CSU should be able to re-evaluate a TMC and change that determination at any time.
  - Require a CSU to provide a rationale/justification if it declares a TMC not similar.
  - Add a process, including justifications, notifications, and timelines (including an adequate transition period for colleges and students to respond), around how and when a CSU can declare that a TMC previously declared similar is no longer similar.
  - If a CSU decides that a TMC previously declared similar is no longer similar, that should trigger a review of the TMC to determine if updates to the TMC could result in retaining similarity.
  - Faculty should be compensated for engaging in these processes, unless it is already considered part of their contracts or compensation. In addition, the Committee would like to consider incentives beyond financial compensation. For example, how can this type of service be represented via promotion and review processes?
  - The current criteria and process for triggering TMC development should be revised to include regular review of labor market data to ensure that—if the labor market calls for new TMCs—they will be developed in response to those labor market needs. However,

as noted earlier, not all TMCs must be in response to labor market demand data – there is both room and need for TMCs in areas that might not necessarily show up as high-demand in labor market data. This change would also provide community colleges with more influence over calling for new TMCs if they can present a case that they are needed.

- ○ The current process for designing and developing TMCs should be revised to include data being presented to faculty on the skills needed by the workforce, through a combination of labor market data and Key Skills Assessments (KSAs).

Sova then continued with a reminder of the AB928 legislative language related to the second two key areas of work that the Committee must complete before December 31, 2024. At a high-level they are:

(3) (A) "Develop a comprehensive communications plan and guidance on student-centered outreach to inform students about the ADT pathway and to ensure prompt and accurate information is communicated across four-year postsecondary educational institutions, the California Community Colleges, and elementary and secondary education."

(4) "Provide feedback for the regular review and identification of updates needed to the ADT internet website maintained by the California Community Colleges to ensure current information and updates are communicated to students, families, and student support staff engaged in educating students about their college options, participating four-year postsecondary educational institutions, and degree options."

SRS then facilitated a discussion of the Communications Plan process with the AB928 Committee. Key points of the presentation and discussion included:

- Key elements of a potential communications plan for this body of work would include:
    - ○ Identification and descriptions of the intended audiences for the communications plan.

- - Customized content and guidance for each identified audience:
    - Targeted messages.
    - Identification of messengers.
    - Channels for the flow of communications.
    - Templates for communications and outreach that can be customized for local contexts.
  - Implementation Support.
  - Effective outreach to identified messengers.
  - Professional development for messengers on use of templates.
  - Cadence of communications for future ADT program updates.
  - Recommendations for updating and maintaining the ADT program website.
- Additional discussion points included:
  - The K-12 representative of the AB928 Committee has not been participating, but that voice is critically needed. We need to follow up with the State Superintendent.
  - Key audiences include: Parents, guardians and networks of family care; counselors and advisors; faith-based organizations; fraternities and sororities; trusted community organizations; college access organizations; employers and correctional facilities.
  - Key messages that must be delivered to potential transfer students include:
    - Cost (in comparison to other options).
    - Length of time and units to completion (in comparison to other options).
    - Program and pathway offerings.
    - Various entry points.
    - Labor market value of a major/ program.
    - Modalities and locations.
  - Primary messengers include: other students; faculty; influencers; notable graduates and high schools.
  - Primary communications channels include: videos, social media, web sites; TV, radio and billboards; employers.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.4. No public comments were made.

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. There were no public forum comments.

5.   **Adjournment**