



Transfer Alignment Project
Work Group Meeting
February 5, 2024, 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm via Zoom

MINUTES

1. Welcome & Introductions

May welcomed the work group and called the meeting to order. All members were present except Curry. No introductions were required.

2. Approval of Agenda & Confirm Prior Meeting Minutes Approved

The agenda was approved without additions. Confirmed prior approval of 1/9/24 meeting minutes by email.

3. Announcements/Reports

May noted the Campaign for College Opportunity reached out for additional information on the STEM discipline work.

4. STEM Pathways & AB 928

Update on STEM TMCs

May shared that a meeting was held on February 2 with Aschenbach, Mica, Demé, and Austin Webster, (Advocate, W Strategies), following the AB 928 Committee meeting to discuss next steps. Legislation has been drafted to implement recommendations – see [AB 2057 \(Berman\) to implement recommendations of the committee](#). The most impactful recommendations are items 10 and 11 as follows:

Recommendation 10. Retain the 60-unit maximum requirement for ADTs while providing an option for up to an additional 6 units for high-unit STEM ADTs and require the submission of clear evidence and rationale for the higher units during the Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) approval process.

This recommendation, when doing STEM disciplines, will come to the Intersegmental Curriculum Council (ICC) for final approval of any extra units. Evidence supporting additional units will be required. This may include presenting unit requirements of STEM pathways from other institutions for comparison. AB 928 looked at two institutions - one in Colorado and one in Indiana - the lowest number of units found was 127 for one engineering program. It may be possible to use something like this comparison to support the inclusion of additional units.

Recommendation 11. *Require that by the end of the 2023-24 academic year, TMC drafts are 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 and other four-year institutions that choose to participate (such as members of AICCU and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)). Where a single TMC to both UC and CSU is not possible, require the provision of clear rationale and evidence explaining why separate TMCs are needed.*

There will be a call to have the TMC drafts in place. The bill in question likely won't be signed until after this year.

Based on the AB 928 committee recommendations and conversations with Webster, Aschenbach, and Mica, it was proposed that the TAP move forward in scheduling STEM Discipline Input Groups (DIGs) to follow up on the work that had taken place in late fall 2023. May continued with the rationale for the DIGs.

- DIGs are required since UC (and other faculty) were not part of the initial DIGs that drafted the TMCs. Due to the timeline in the AB 928 committee recommendations, tentative DIGs were proposed to meet 1:30-4:00 as follows:
 - Mathematics – Tuesday, March 12 (likely to align)
 - Physics – Wednesday, March 13 (likely to align)
 - Biology – Tuesday, April 2 (more difficult)
 - Engineering – Tuesday, April 9 (electrical, might align)
 - Chemistry, Wednesday, April 10
 - Computer Science, Thursday, April 11

Post-Meeting Note: Dates and times have been adjusted.

- FDRGs were proposed to be convened approximately one to two weeks after each DIG.
- Since Engineering is currently an Intersegmental Model Curriculum (ISMC) rather than a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC), ICC approval will be required for TMC development. The request will be specific to Electrical Engineering at this time.
- There is no Environmental Science UC Transfer Pathway (UCTP), so the TAP will need to work with UC to see if there is an interest in creating a UCTP and explore alignment of the TMC with a possible UCTP.
- Given the legislative scrutiny, a plan is needed to move forward the goals of TAP and address the AB 928 recommendations.

Chalfant noted that we would not be likely to hear a clamor for DIGs from the UC as they don't have experience with this type of event. He further commented that he did not feel it would be difficult to get a start on an Environmental Science UCTP.

Davison reminded the work group that the C-ID Curriculum Director usually attends the DIGs and this was the first notice she had received.

May and Mica provided input on potential policy and process differences that might exist between C-ID processes for developing new TMCs or undergoing 5-year review and the TAP

work of aligning TMCs and UCTPs. It was noted that there was a clear need to document the TAP processes and ensure appropriate parties were consulted or updated as appropriate. Mica noted the tight timeline to produce the requested draft TMCs by June 2024.

Chalfant indicated appreciation for the efforts to ensure UC input, but that the process was being handled internally. He expressed a preference for approaching the process at this point through the FDRGs. Chalfant also noted he felt the Math and Physics FDRGs had provided solid draft TMCs and that it was possible the alignment challenges posed in Biology and Chemistry might be more difficult to work through at a DIG. There were additional concerns expressed about faculty availability for FDRG meetings post-DIGs.

Mica reiterated the tight deadline imposed and that the proposed approach seeks to ensure broader feedback initially and then FDRG refinement. She expressed understanding that this whole process was new to UC. She also noted concern there could be greater ramifications from AB 2057 if we don't get this right.

The workgroup further discussed process, roles, and DIG scheduling.

Mica reiterated that there is a proposed plan and asked if the group had any other ideas to either supplement or replace this plan. The workgroup threw in ideas for DIG formatting and discussed potential resources to use to keep DIGs productive. Chalfant reiterated he would prefer an FDRG process before the DIG process. After a lengthy discussion, no clear alternative to holding DIGs was proposed that would allow the TAP to achieve the AB 928 recommendations within the required timeline. Atondo noted support for the DIG process to get the work moving forward. Chalfant closed this discussion with support for the DIG process.

ACTION: May and Demé will move forward with DIG planning, keeping the appropriate parties updated.

Update on AB 928

Given meeting time constraints, a general update was deferred, and the content focused on release of the California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) website: transformtransfer.org.

May displayed the website and inquired if the group was interested in getting more information about the website (i.e., authorship, intended audience, purpose, etc.). Atondo expressed interest in getting more information. Davison offered to bring this topic to ICC as part of a C-ID inquiry.

Chalfant noted that the only UC representation on the ICC was Gerardo Okhuysen, UCI Senate Analyst, and felt it would be helpful to have more UC input on the committee. May indicated Chalfant should speak with Okhuysen about inviting him to the meeting.

5. TAP Work Plan

There was insufficient time to appropriately address this topic.

ACTION: Work group members will review the Work Plan on their own and provide feedback and suggestions for additional strategies, etc., before the next meeting.

6. Future Agenda Items

The TAP Work Plan will be reviewed, including feedback received from the group. May reminded group members they can forward potential agenda items to her as needed.

7. Next Steps

May noted that the next meeting would be on March 4th at 11:00 am.

Action Items

- **May and Demé will move forward with DIG planning, keeping the appropriate parties updated.**
- **Work group members will review the Work Plan on their own and provide feedback and suggestions for additional strategies, etc., before the next meeting.**

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:12 p.m.