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

Meeting 7 Minutes

November 30, 2023
9 am - 5 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 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

    The Committee members present in-person were: Laura Massa, Susan Cochran, Yvette Gullatt, William Chao, Rose-Margaret Itua, Aisha Lowe, Ginni May, Mike Muñoz, David Ramirez, Jay Doherty, Jessie Ryan, Samantha Alvarez Chavarria, and Beth Steffel.

The Committee members participating virtually were: Tanaz Arteaga and Cecilia Rios-Aguilar.

The Committee members absent were: Peter Callas.

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

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, June, and September) meetings. She shared a reminder of the AB928 legislative purposes and the charge of the Committee, and provided an overview of the November 2023 meeting objectives and agenda.

2. Consent Calendar

2.1. Review and Approval of September 2023 Meeting Minutes

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

2.2 Approval of Select 2024 Committee Meeting Dates

Sova shared with the Committee that the March and November meeting dates selected in the previous Committee meeting needed to be revisited due to conflicts. The new dates proposed include: March 28, 2024 (replacing March 26, 2024) and November 21, 2024 (replacing November 20, 2024). The unchanged 2024 meeting dates are: January 25, June 13, and September 12.

Committee member Ginni May moved to accept the consent calendar; Committee member David Ramirez seconded the motion. All Committee members present in-person and virtually voted in favor of accepting the consent calendar.

3.   **Information and Reports**

3.1.   **Staff Report: A Look Ahead to 2024 and Discussion of the Committee's 2023 Recommendations and Final Report**

Chair Lowe began the session and then Sova reviewed the 2024 election process for a new Committee chair, based on the legislative requirements. The new chair will serve a two-year term from July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2026. Sova reviewed the overall timeline for chair nominations, voting, and transition from the current to the newly elected chair.

The Committee had questions on workload, support, and financial aspects of the role. Chair Lowe provided some preliminary information and indicated she would share more details in the January 2024 meeting.

Sova then provided a reminder of the AB928 legislative language related to the four 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."

(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,

---

[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

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."

Sova encouraged the Committee to prepare for the January 2024 meeting by reviewing the 2024 legislative requirements and considering some key questions such as what data and experts will be needed.

Sova then provided a staff report on the Committee's 2023 work, the public documents released to date (April, August, October, November 2023), and public comment opportunities (virtual via website and in-person/zoom at all meetings). Sova shared a more detailed explanation of how the discussion of the Committee's recommendations and the associated voting process would proceed in today's meeting. The draft recommendations that the Committee discussed are included in the document entitled, *AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Committee, Draft: Final Report (Version: November 2023),* available on the Committee website at https://www.ab928committee.org/resources. Following this meeting, Sova will finalize the report and submit it to the Legislature, as required.

Discussion points during this agenda item included:

- The AB928 Committee will need data to support its work in 2024, but in the absence of an intersegmental data system, or a robust Committee budget for data work, the Committee will have to be resourceful in its approach to obtaining data. Members discussed calling upon research partners such as the RP Group and the Public Policy Institute of California, and being willing to support data requests made of institutions and segments. The Committee also acknowledged that the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)

is structured and resourced differently than the public segments, and does not have access to all of the data that public segments do.

- A request was made to move AB928 Committee meetings around the state, with requests made for being in the Los Angeles and Inland Empire regions, and asking an AICCU member to host.

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

3.2. Review of the Committee's Recommendations

Chair Lowe began this session, reminding the Committee of the four areas of the public document entitled *AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Committee, Draft: Final Report (Version: November 2023)* that would be discussed:

- **Goals**: Draft Recommendations 1 through 4 (Page 5);
- **Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Degree Pathways**: Draft Recommendations 5 through 12 (Pages 5 - 6);
- **Reengaging ADT Earners**: Draft Recommendation 13 (Page 7); and
- **Overarching Needs to Meet the Intent of AB928**: Draft Recommendations 14 through 17 (Pages 7-9).

The Committee discussed each area of recommendations, as well as the individual recommendations therein, and offered revisions that were tracked by Sova in real time and displayed for the Committee and participating members of the public. The final recommendations can be found in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*, available at https://www.ab928committee.org/resources

Vote 1

A motion was made by Laura Massa and seconded by Jay Doherty to accept Recommendation 1; Recommendation 2, as amended; Recommendation 3; and Recommendation 4, as amended.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 1; Recommendation 2, as amended; Recommendation 3; and Recommendation 4, as amended,** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.

> Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, these recommendations are now **Recommendations 6-9** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*.

Discussion points included:

- The AB928 Committee is intentionally setting bold goals because the state of California needs bold action to deliver equitable opportunity and meet the goal (set by Governor Newsom) that 70% of the adult population, ages 25-64, will have a postsecondary credential–college degree, certificate, industry-recognized certification, or other credential of value–by 2030.[2]
- The AB928 Committee members reflected on having engaged in rigorous discussion and analysis, and consulted with key experts such as the Public Policy Institute of California, RP Group and WestEd, as they developed these recommendations.
- The Committee's executive summary provides a brief summary of its recommendations, but Committee members want to ensure that readers understand that there is in-depth documentation in the Full Report, Section II: Research and Rationale Supporting the Recommendations. The final report will make this clear.
- The Committee discussed that some small community colleges do not have the capacity, or the demand (in terms of sufficient numbers of students), to offer every ADT.

- The Committee recognizes that online options, and improving access to California's independent institutions, are critical strategies for expanding transfer access.
- When discussing goals, the Committee reflected on the difference between setting aspirational goals, and building the infrastructure for strong implementation. The Committee wishes to be bold and aspirational in its goal-setting efforts.
- The Committee discussed the difference between having regional admissions preferences (which it is not calling for), and providing placebound students with equitable access (which it is calling for).

Vote 2

A motion was made by Susan Cochran and seconded by David Ramirez to accept Recommendation 5, as amended.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 5, as amended,** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.[3]

> Note: The Committee voted again later in the afternoon on a different version of this recommendation, thereby **replacing this version** of the Recommendation. **See Vote #10 below**.

Discussion points included:

- Currently, faculty are not well-compensated for participation in transfer and articulation efforts (e.g., the development of Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)). The existing infrastructure is also not truly inclusive of all of the segments. Building an Intersegmental Course Articulation and Pathways Development infrastructure will require resources, including incentives for faculty participation.

---

[3] The version of Recommendation 5 that was first passed, and later replaced, read: "Resource an Intersegmental Course Articulation and Pathways Development infrastructure, building upon existing structures, to oversee and facilitate the process of course review, pathways development, and determinations of similarity, with full participation from and leadership by faculty from CCC, CSU, UC and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) member institutions to maximize the potential of the ADT and its guarantee of admissions at participating four-year institutions."

- Faculty leadership is critical to ensure faculty feel responsible for the hard work of transfer and articulation and ensure it is completed in a timely and student-centered manner.
- Student participation and active input are also critical and must be incentivized.
- Key terms and acronyms such as "ADT," "TMC," and "similarity" need to be defined in the Committee's final report. The C-ID Handbook has a useful glossary that should be leveraged.[4]

Vote 3

A motion was made by David Ramirez and seconded by Cecilia Rios-Aguilar to accept Recommendation 6, as amended; Recommendation 7, as amended; Recommendation 9, as amended; Recommendation 10; and Recommendation 11.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 6, as amended; Recommendation 7, as amended; Recommendation 9, as amended; Recommendation 10; and Recommendation 11,** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.

Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, these recommendations are **now Recommendations 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations.*

Discussion points included:

- Right now, if a California State University (CSU) campus determines a TMC is not "similar"[5] enough to a baccalaureate degree at that campus, it is interpreted by many as that campus not "accepting" the TMC (and any ADTs created under the parameters of that TMC) for guaranteed

---

[4] Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (Fall 2022 Revision). *C-ID Handbook.* Retrieved December 8, 2023, from https://c-id.net/page/1

[5] Currently, after a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) template is created or revised in a major, each CSU campus determines if there is a baccalaureate degree in a similar major to the TMC. This determination of "similarity" ensures that students who earn the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), that is created under the parameters of that TMC, are guaranteed admission in that similar major at one of the CSU campuses offering that major and will be required to complete no more than 60 units after transfer to earn the baccalaureate degree that is deemed "similar" to the major of the ADT if the student stays on that ADT pathway.

admission to that major. While it may be more correct/precise to describe that event as the CSU campus deeming the TMC to not be "similar," many nonetheless still speak of this as the CSU campus not "accepting" the ADT.

- Many Committee members believe that retaining the 60-unit maximum requirement for ADTs will be enormously beneficial to California Community College (CCC) students.
- The Committee discussed whether it is feasible that TMC drafts will be in place for the fields of Engineering, Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Environmental Science, Physics, and Computer Science pathways that prepare students for transfer to both the CSU and UC systems by the end of the 2023-24 academic year. It was suggested that this will be feasible.
- Once a TMC is created and agreed upon, ADTs can be created.
- In many STEM bachelor's degrees, it is critical to allow for flexibility for when lower-division general education occurs, so that students can be fully prepared for third-year major requirements. While AB1440 already allows for general education flexibility, many do not know this to be the case and it is valuable to clarify.
- The Committee discussed to what degree it feels it is appropriate for the legislature to require operational procedures (e.g., require transparency related to membership) of other organizations.
- The state has invested quite heavily in postsecondary education in recent years, but the economic forecast for California suggests a budget deficit, and many assume funding for postsecondary education will not be plentiful this year.

Votes 4 and 5

A motion was made by Jessie Ryan and seconded by Cecilia Rios-Aguilar to accept Recommendation 8, without amendments.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 8** did not pass by a vote of 5 in favor and 10 opposed.[6]
>
> Members voting in favor: Mike Muñoz, Jessie Ryan, David Ramirez, Cecilia Rios-Aguilar and Tanaz Arteaga (5)
>
> Members voting opposed: Aisha Lowe, Jay Doherty, Yvette Gullatt, Susan Cochran, William Chao, Samantha Alvarez Chavarria, Beth Steffel, Ginni May, Laura Massa and Rose-Margaret Itua (10)

Subsequently, a motion was made by Samantha Alvarez Chavarria and seconded by David Ramirez to accept Recommendation 8, as amended.[7]

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 8, as amended** passed by a vote of 8 to 1 with 6 abstaining.
>
> Members voting in favor: Jay Doherty, Aisha Lowe, Yvette Gullatt, Susan Cochran, Samantha Alvarez Chavarria, Beth Steffel, Ginni May and Cecilia Rios-Aguilar (8)
>
> Members voting opposed: Jessie Ryan (1)
>
> Members that abstained from the vote: Laura Massa, William Chao, Rose-Margaret Itua, David Ramirez, Tanaz Arteaga and Mike Muñoz (6)
>
> Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, the final approved recommendation is **now Recommendation 12** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations.*

---

[6] The version of Recommendation 8 that did not pass read: "Set a deadline that the CCCs must adopt the TMCs (as created in Recommendation 7) and create ADTs, and encourage the CSU and UC systems, and other four-year institutions that choose to participate (such as members of AICCU and HBCUs currently engaged with the CCCCO), to accept those ADTs for transfer so that students are accessing the ADTs by fall of 2026."

[7] The amended version of Recommendation 8 that did pass (and is Recommendation 12 in the final report) reads: "As already required, within 18 months of TMC approval, California community colleges will create ADTs for each TMC adopted under Recommendation 11. Subsequently, within 12 months the CSU campuses will determine similarity, and the UC and AICCU campuses are encouraged to identify those TMCs that fulfill major preparation requirements, for transfer admission."

Discussion points included:

- CCCs are already required by statute to establish ADTs once TMCs are adopted if they have that program as a local degree and there is a TMC. Thus the final recommendation includes a statement to that effect and reads, "As already required, within 18 months of TMC approval, California community colleges will create ADTs for each TMC adopted under Recommendation 11."
- Once TMCs are created, the vetting process can take a year. It is therefore likely, under current processes, that colleges would be able to write ADTs during the spring of 2025 at the earliest. Once that happens, the CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) approves the individual ADTs, and the CSU system works with its campuses on determining similarity.
- Currently, the CSU system cannot force faculty to say that a TMC is "similar."
- The Committee discussed that adding a deadline for requiring the CSUs, and encouraging the University of California (UC) campuses and AICCU members, to identify those TMCs that fulfill major preparation requirements for transfer admission adds urgency and signals to the legislature that the AB928 Committee is seeking to accelerate this work.
- The Committee did not agree fully on the right wording for draft Recommendation 8 (now Recommendation 12 in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*). Some wanted to ensure that this recommendation was strongly worded to require four-year transfer partners to respond to the creation of ADTs in a fundamentally different manner, and setting a deadline did not feel sufficient. Others felt that the original wording of this recommendation was in fact weaker than the final wording that passed, and that setting a deadline was progress.

Vote 6

A motion was made by Yvette Gullatt and seconded by Rose-Margaret Itua to accept Recommendation 12, as amended.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 12, as amended** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.
>
> Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, the final approved recommendation is **now Recommendation 17** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations.*

Discussion points included:

- AB1291[8] is new legislation, and processes to support its implementation have not yet been developed. Some Committee members voiced concerns about referencing a bill that is still so new, as it has not been fully interpreted or implemented.
- Some Committee members see AB1291 as a critical step toward streamlining transfer to the UCs.
- UC's Transfer Pathways seek to tell students which courses to take that will apply across all nine UCs.
- Given the hard work that this Committee has done to advance STEM pathways, it makes sense to leverage that work for any pathways developed for AB1291.

Vote 7

A motion was made by William Chao and seconded by David Ramirez to accept a new recommendation (Recommendation 15 in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*).[9]

> The **vote to accept the new recommendation** passed with a vote of 13 in favor (with 2 members abstaining).

---

[8] California State Legislature. (2023). Assembly Bill No. 1291, University of California Associate Degree for Transfer Pilot Program. Retrieved November 2, 2023, from https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB1291/2023

[9] Recommendation 15 reads: "Provide funding for STEM Bridge programs for first-year CCC students and students who are transferring."

Members voting in favor: Laura Massa, Tanaz Arteaga, Susan Cochran, Yvette Gullatt, William Chao, Rose-Margaret Itua, Aisha Lowe, Mike Muñoz, David Ramirez, Cecilia Rios-Aguilar, Jay Doherty, Jessie Ryan, and Samantha Alvarez Chavarria (13)

Members that abstained from the vote: Ginni May and Beth Steffel (2)

Discussion points included:

- STEM Bridge programs are designed to solve a student success issue and close equity gaps. Research on STEM Bridge programs suggests they do provide significant benefits to students.
- The Committee discussed ensuring that while its recommendations often call for fundamental structural changes, it also wants to make recommendations that deliberately center students.
- As noted earlier, the Committee discussed at length concerns about making too many recommendations that require significant resources. The state has invested quite heavily in postsecondary education in recent years, but the economic forecast for California is for a budget deficit and funding will not be plentiful this coming year.

Vote 8

A motion was made by Mike Muñoz and seconded by Jessie Ryan to accept Recommendation 13, as amended.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 13, as amended,** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.

> Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, the final approved recommendation is **now Recommendation 18** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*.

Discussion points included:

- The Committee wants to intentionally support students who are vulnerable to experiencing difficulties in transfer processes, with an emphasis on Black, Latine, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian

Pacific Islander students, as well as other disproportionately impacted groups of focus.

- The Committee discussed again the importance of having recommendations that deliberately center students.
- There is a state application platform, californiacolleges.edu, that would need to be considered for a new common transfer application platform.
- Any new platform developed should be designed to be inclusive of all segments.

Vote 9

A motion was made by Jessie Ryan and seconded by Rose-Margaret Itua to accept Recommendation 14, as amended; Recommendation 15, as amended; Recommendation 16, as amended; and Recommendation 17, as amended.

> The **vote to accept Recommendation 14, as amended Recommendation 15, as amended; Recommendation 16, as amended; and Recommendation 17, as amended,** passed unanimously by those present in-person and virtually.
>
> Note: The Committee asked for the final recommendations to be reordered. As such, the final approved recommendations are **now Recommendations 2-5** in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*.

Discussion points included:

- The Committee wanted to be sure that the recommendations were reordered such that the "Overarching Needs to Meet the Intent of AB928" would appear as the first area of recommendations.
- The Committee briefly discussed some minor wording changes to the draft recommendations, such as changing "earned course units" to "earned college course units."

<u>Vote 10</u>

A motion was made by Aisha Lowe and seconded by Laura Massa to replace the previous Recommendation 5 and to accept Recommendation 5, as amended, and move it to appear as the first recommendation of the AB928 Committee.

> The **vote to replace the previously adopted Recommendation 5 (see Vote #2 above) and to accept Recommendation 5, as amended, and move to appear as Recommendation 1** in the final recommendations of the AB928 Committee, <u>passed unanimously</u> by those present in-person and virtually.

Discussion points included:

- The Committee agreed that its highest priority, and therefore Recommendation 1 in its final recommendations, should be building an Intersegmental Course Articulation and Pathways Development infrastructure (formerly Recommendation 5 in the draft, now Recommendation 1 in the *2023 Final Report and Recommendations*).
- The Committee discussed at length the role of students and to what extent they should be engaged in leadership of an intersegmental group and curriculum development. The Committee decided on language designed to ensure that "active membership of students to provide input" is incentivized.
- The Committee discussed the critical role of onboarding students well in efforts such as the AB928 Committee, to ensure they are authentically engaged and their voices are heard.
- Under California's educational code, students have the right to have a voice in areas that directly impact them.

3.3. Discussion of the Committee's Final Report

Chair Lowe introduced the session. Due to time constraints, further edits to the report were not discussed. Sova encouraged Committee members to submit any essential edits. The Committee discussed the fact that while it was given ample opportunity to review and comment on the report, the Committee did

not vote on the report. The Committee's voting was confined to the specific tasks laid out in legislation regarding the development of recommendations.

A period of public comment was provided for agenda item 3.3. One public comment was 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**