



ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges
LEADERSHIP • EMPOWERMENT • VOICE

Transfer Alignment Project
Work Group Meeting
February 22, 2022
11:30a m – 1:00 pm via Zoom

MINUTES

Members: Ginni May (chair), Cheryl Aschenbach, Elizabeth Atondo, Karla Kirk, Krystinne Mica, LaTonya Parker, Eric Wada, Miguel Rother, Robert Collins

Guests: Jim Chalfant, ~~Mary Guavain~~, Hilary Baxter

1. Ginni welcomed everyone. Brief introductions followed.
2. Agenda approved (Collins, Parker MSC)
3. Action Plan for 2021-22 reviewed and updates discussed:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EvIq-wvLgxy7ZnebSnfn66FGE7KWmDRO-y6R3l689PI/edit>
 - a. Krystinne volunteered to update the document based on suggestions
 - b. Suggestions:
 - Integrate info on timeline document into action plan
 - Include link to tracking document shared by Miguel
4. Proposal – Tracking document on website for discipline progress in Transfer Alignment Project – Miguel drafted a tracking document. The document will be included on both the C-ID website and the TAP website.
5. Updates:
 - a. Timeline (Miguel) – review and update timeline
Miguel said that the FDRG for Geography requested they be added to Phase II. Jim Chalfant and Hilary Baxter shared that there is currently no UCTP for Geography, so an aligned UC/CSU pathway is not possible. Krystinne clarified that the Geography FDRG request falls outside this project because there is no UCTP. Eric Wada asked all to consider what a UCTP would look like for Geography. Ginni suggested this inquiry could be an item to include in Phase III if there are enough transfers in that major at UC.
 - b. Phase II: Disciplines reports/progress: Biology, English, Political Science (Miguel, Eric, Ginni)
Biology and English would like to discuss whether revisions to UCTP are possible. Political Science can move forward but needs CCC and CSU members

on FDRG (only 1 of each currently; Rob Collins reported that more CSU members had volunteered and are being trained). Eric reported that a survey for Political Science has gone out; feedback will be reviewed by a (hopefully) complete FDRG.

6. Phase III: Disciplines where a single TMC pathway is not feasible (Ginni, Eric, Miguel)

- a. Explore possibility of re-examining UCTP – **bring proposal ICAS**
Ginni will draft a proposal to be reviewed by TAP members in preparation for March 8 ICAS meeting.

- b. Proposal to ICW for possibility of changing rule, “one TMC per discipline” – **need proposal drafted for April 26, 2022 meeting**

As has been discussed at past meetings, disciplines at UC and CSU are not necessarily consistent with disciplines at CCCs, and there are multiple career paths embedded within each discipline that may require different preparation. Ginni, Eric, and Krystinne as ICW members will get a draft started to be completed by the end of March.

It was also suggested that we ask ICAS to revisit its letter of two years ago calling for additional funding to support C-ID and faculty collaboration across all three segments. As a side note, Jim Chalfant shared that UC will likely be able to better support a joint request if it’s written in such a way that UC is supportive of the CSU & CCC C-ID efforts rather than being directly involved with the budget request since UC academic senates don’t make legislative or funding requests.

- c. Remaining disciplines for consideration
Eric Wada shared with Communication that they might want to take a look at UCTP as they do their 5-year review. It’ll likely go to Phase III because it doesn’t currently align. Ginni suggested Engineering could also be included in Phase III as the potential for a TMC/ADT now exists with AB928 allowing additional units (60-unit restriction may be investigated for the potential of 66 lower division units)

7. Next meeting: schedule TBD

8. Adjourn