Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
April 29, 2024, 11:00 am – 12:00 pm via Zoom

1. Welcome & Introductions
May welcomed the workgroup and called the meeting to order. See Table 1. Transfer Alignment Project Advisory Committee Members for attendance. A round of introductions took place for University of California Office of the President guests Molly Thompson – Transfer Articulation Coordinator, and Chase Fischerhall – Director of A-G and Transfer Articulation.

2. Approval of Agenda & Prior Meeting Minutes
The meeting agenda and March 4, 2024, meeting minutes were approved without changes.

3. Announcements/Reports

Branding and Project Awareness
Demé updated the group regarding Transfer Alignment Project (TAP) branding. She noted the creation of a logo as part of developing a visual identity for the project. In support of ensuring greater awareness of the work of the project, Demé and May presented at the California Intersegmental Articulation Council Conference in Palm Springs and then shortly thereafter presented with Dolores Davison, Krystinne Mica, and Carrie Roberson at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) 2024 Spring Plenary session in San Jose. Further alignment awareness opportunities will take place at the ASCCC Curriculum Institute in July, through continuing work on the Work Plan, and with the creation of a standalone TAP website.

ASCCC Spring 2024 Plenary Resolutions
May put forth two resolutions at the ASCCC Spring 2024 Plenary that have, in part, come out of the work of the TAP.

102.02 S24 Explore Opportunities and Challenges of a Modified Cal-GETC Subject Area 5
Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to explore the opportunities and challenges of a modified California General Education Transfer Curriculum¹ Subject Area 5: Physical and Biological Sciences that would require two courses from different academic disciplines where at least one course includes a lab instead of specifying one course from each area.

102.03 S24 Partial Cal-GETC Certification for High-Unit STEM Majors
Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support that students have access to an equitable college experience whether beginning their college education at a 4-year institution or beginning at a California community college and transferring to a 4-year institution;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the Academic Senate of the California State University, the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, the California State University

Chancellor’s Office, and the California Intersegmental Articulation Council to establish protocols for partial California General Education Transfer Curriculum\(^2\) certification;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office and the California State University Chancellor’s Office to permit partial California General Education Transfer Curriculum\(^2\) certification for high-unit science, technology, engineering, and mathematics associate degrees for transfer provided that the California State University has similar majors that could be completed in 60 units after transfer; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work with the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to permit colleges to award an associate degree for transfer to students that receive a partial California General Education Transfer Curriculum\(^4\) certification.

Chalfant noted that the University of California (UC) is taking a similar discussion to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) next week that would accommodate a Cal-GETC deferral as well. It is a matter of equity. The UC does not ask a 4-year student to do this, why put a more difficult constraint in place for transfer students.

Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)

Providing an additional opportunity for UC collaboration, May will attend the May 23rd ACSCOTI meeting at the invitation of ACSCOTI Chair Jim Chalfant.

4. **AB 2057 (Berman, 2024)**

May reviewed a draft document with notes and suggested edits to the most recent version of AB 2057. The suggested edits have been provided to the ASCCC President and Executive Director for their advocacy efforts in conversations with Assembly Member Berman or his Legislative Director, Ellen Hou Green. May indicated that each of the three systems of public higher education will likely have some concerns with the bill language.

- A correction is needed from the original language about the Intersegmental Curriculum Council (ICC) which is still displayed as the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup.
- Clarification and greater transparency are needed related to the mention of an Intersegmental Coordinating Committee.
- As a new item, the bill maintains that the 60-unit lower division maximum would be retained with an exception for high-unit STEM majors, and that the AB 928 Intersegmental Implementation Committee (AB 928 Committee) would determine which STEM major pathways are high-unit. The TAP Advisory Committee (TAP AC) members agreed that it should be discipline faculty, not AB 928 Committee members, who should make that determination. Only three academic senate members are currently on the 16-member AB 928 Committee. May encouraged the group to bring this information back to their groups and that the information has been shared with the ICC. Both ASCCC and ACSCOTI members noted this language was not included at the time their respective bodies met with Assembly Member Berman’s staff.
- Included language states TMC drafts need to be in place for admission for both California State University (CSU) and UC. It needs to be understood that if this bill is made law in its current iteration, within 18 months of TMC availability, California Community Colleges (CCCs) will need to create an ADT for each adopted TMC. Currently, CCCs must only adopt an ADT if they already have the program offered by their college.


• There are places where the term “ADT” is used where it should say “TMC” due to a lack of understanding about this process.
• AB 2057 has detailed what ASCCC, ASCSU, and both the CCC and CSU Chancellor’s Offices will need to do regarding FDRGs and other intersegmental curriculum groups, etc. It is concerning that these fine details may be legislated. These detailed processes were not included in the recommendations from the AB 928 Committee to the legislature in December 2024.

May again encouraged bringing awareness to AB 2057 and what it seeks to accomplish so others are ready to advocate on our behalf. AB 2057 includes implementation components based on the AB 928 Committee recommendations. It is important to keep in mind that some recommendations may originate from a few specific AB 928 Committee members rather than the full body.

Chalfant noted the recommendations have misunderstood UC process and UC will not as a system indicate whether a TMC will meet admission requirements. For UC, it will be a campus-by-campus, major-by-major process. UC does not have uniform transfer-admission requirements, across all majors, so almost surely a TMC will meet the requirements of at least some majors, but perhaps not all. As a result, a UC system response typically cannot be reduced to a simple yes or no. He indicated the intent is to write UC procedures for transparency.

5. STEM Pathways

Demé reminded the group that the TAP has been focused on alignment efforts for seven STEM disciplines – Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Environmental Science, Mathematics, and Physics. Since the last TAP meeting in early March, Discipline Input Group (DIG) meetings were held in Mathematics, Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Computer Science with CCC, CSU, UC, and independent institution participation. Additionally, Math, Physics, and Biology Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) were convened with CCC, CSU and UC faculty members to discuss the input received from the DIGs and the possibility of transfer alignment. For Biology, there is a possibility of more than one TMC to allow for alignment with the greatest number of UCs and the potential for increasing the number of majors that could be deemed similar by the CSUs. However, the FDRG may still have further conversations in this area. Chemistry and Computer Science FDRG meetings are scheduled to take place in the first half of May.

Once FDRG meetings are complete, the intent is to do an initial round of statewide vetting in what is left of this spring with a likely re-vetting early in the fall for Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics and Physics draft aligned TMCs. FDRGs will be reconvened in the fall once sufficient statewide input has been collected.

That leaves two disciplines – Electrical Engineering and Environmental Science. An Electrical Engineering DIG meeting was scheduled. However, the ASCCC was contacted by the California Engineering Liaison Council and asked if we could reschedule as there was a conflict with one of their yearly events and their members wanted to be able to attend the DIG meeting. Given this request, and the short time before the end of the academic year, we will be rescheduling the Electrical Engineering DIG meeting to take place in the fall.

In terms of Environmental Science, while a TMC currently exists, there is not an Environmental Science UC Transfer Pathway (UCTP). The UC is in the process of creating one, but more conversations need to take place before that discipline moves forward.

Curry inquired about the Biology FDRG call process and the determinations made. May responded that there were two TMCs discussed – one with organic chemistry and one with calculus-based physics, as well as the current TMC though it will not meet UC requirements for most majors. While two FDRG members desired only one TMC, a majority of the members supported more than one TMC. May explained there is a precedent for this approach based on Ethnic Studies and Engineering. Ultimately, the discipline faculty will determine what
recommendation should be made to the ICC based on careful consideration of input provided through the statewide vetting process.

Chalfant inquired about Davison mentioning prior activity around Elementary Teacher Education and Ethnic Studies FDRG meetings. He relayed UC faculty would likely have been interested in participating in those conversations. ACSCOTI is looking at naming three UC faculty early in the coming fall for FDRGs.

Per May, there is a plan for what we want to look at next year. As procedures and process are updated, we will bring in UC and independent institutions for these conversations.

Regarding Environmental Science, Chalfant indicated that UC is one or two campuses away from a draft UCTP for Environmental Science which then needs to go through various UC process steps.

6. Transfer Alignment Project (TAP) Concept Document (Draft)

May confirmed the Concept document is no longer considered “draft” as it was approved by the ICC at their March 27th meeting. Updates will take place as needed. One item that is missing is the definition of the term “alignment.” What does it mean when a TMC is aligned with a UCTP? This is an area where we need to work together to define what alignment means. There has been a discussion about whether having all of the UCTP required courses in the TMC Core Requirements section would meet the criteria of “aligned.” TAP will need to make a definition recommendation to the ICC.

Chalfant indicated this topic came up with May and Demé while drafting plans for the DIGs. May informed Jim that a TMC can have course choices (like List A) for students which would influence whether a student has taken courses UC might require. Were it not for those type of choice scenarios, it might have worked for alignment to mean that UCTP courses are a subset of all Core requirements of a TMC, but choice would be limited to cases like a UCTP requirement to take one course from a set of computer language requirements. If such a choice were also to be given in the Core requirements of the TMC, that would be consistent with alignment, but more generally, elective courses in the TMC cannot be counted on for alignment.

May let the group know that the ICC will be looking at definitions for various terms on the TMC like Core Requirements, List A, List B, etc. Having those definitions ready will contribute to defining alignment.

7. TAP Work Plan

Given all the DIG and FDRG activities taking place this spring, Demé advised that further Work Plan development will take place over the summer, ensuring a strong plan is in place by fall.

8. Future Agenda Items

Future proposed agenda items included:

- Creating a definition of “alignment” (May meeting)
- Justification/evidence for number of TMCS, courses included, etc. (May meeting)
- Work Plan review (early fall)

9. Next Steps

The last meeting of this academic year will be held on May 28th from 11:00 am – 12:00 pm.

May has an action item to work with the ASCCC President and Executive Director regarding advocating for recommended changes to the language of AB 2057. May and Holly will work together to schedule TAP AC meetings for the fall. With the new advisory role of this group, the meetings will likely continue to be of a similar length.
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# 10. Adjourn

## Table 1. Transfer Alignment Project Advisory Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ginni May (TAP Director)</td>
<td>ASCCC Intersegmental Projects Director, ICC Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Atondo</td>
<td>Articulation Officer, Los Angeles Mission College</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Chalfant</td>
<td>UC ACSCOTI Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Curry</td>
<td>ASCCC Area A Representative, Past Curriculum Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Davison</td>
<td>C-ID Curriculum Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Demé*</td>
<td>ASCCC Transfer Alignment Project Program Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Feer*</td>
<td>UC ACSCOTI Analyst</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystinne Mica*</td>
<td>ASCCC Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaTonya Parker</td>
<td>ASCCC Secretary/Past Curriculum Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Rother*</td>
<td>ASCCC C-ID Program Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth A. Steffel</td>
<td>ASCSU Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Support