AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee
Considerations related to Transfer Model Curricula
Pre-Read and Discussion Guide, June 2024

This document is being publicly released in June 2024 in preparation for the AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee’s (hereafter “AB928 Committee”) public meeting on June 13, 2024.

The AB928 legislation states the following (the following indented section is fully excerpted from the legislation¹):

(h) On or before December 31, 2024, the committee shall achieve all of the following:

(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. In doing this, the committee shall develop a plan to establish reporting and accountability requirements to ensure that transfer model curricula are aligned with the [Associate Degree for Transfer] ADT.

(2) Develop a plan for the periodic analysis and creation of additional transfer model curricula for the 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. The plan shall establish venues for professional collaboration in

consultation with academic senates and appropriate discipline faculty on degree production, major alignment, and workforce- or industry-specific relevance.

This document responds to these areas of the legislation based upon a combination of one-on-one meetings with Committee members and discussion held by Committee members during public meetings on January 25 and March 28, 2024. Agendas and materials for the AB928 Committee are available at this website: https://www.ab928committee.org/

What follows also seeks to align to the AB928 Committee’s Recommendations #1 and #2 from its 2023 Final Report and Recommendations, which stated:

**Recommendation 1.** 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. This infrastructure would include incentives for the full participation from and leadership by faculty, and active membership of students to provide input, from the California Community Colleges (CCC), the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU) and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) member institutions to maximize the potential of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) and its guarantee of admissions at participating four-year institutions.

**Recommendation 2.** Permanently establish within state structures, and resource with ongoing funding, a Higher Education Intersegmental Council.

---
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**GLOSSARY:** A glossary³ of key terms, such as “Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)” and “Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC),” can be found in the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) Handbook (Fall 2022 Revision) available for download at: [https://c-id.net/page/1](https://c-id.net/page/1)

---

³ Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (Fall 2022 Revision). C-ID Handbook. Retrieved December 8, 2023, from [https://c-id.net/page/1](https://c-id.net/page/1)
SECTION I: DRAFT GUIDING PREMISES

The following reflects points made by the AB928 Committee and its members in its 2023 Final Report and Recommendations, in one-on-one meetings, and in public meetings on January 25 and March 28, 2024.

- Overarching processes related to articulation and the development of C-ID Descriptors, TMCs and ADTs:
  - The AB928 Committee’s 2023 Final Report and Recommendations called for “a new vision for transfer and articulation in California that supports students in transferring from ‘one to all,’ meaning the infrastructure for faculty to design pathways would seek to provide students with maximum clarity and simplicity, ideally being able to easily and seamlessly transfer from one college or university to all of the California public and independent institutions.”
  - The Committee seeks to keep that vision centered in its work. For example, during the January 2024 Committee meeting, discussion items included:
    - “Chair [Aisha] Lowe began the session by challenging the Committee members, in 2024, to think about the totality of the systems, processes, and infrastructures in place for transfer, and to be innovative and daring as they work to improve these structures and processes.”
    - “There are already processes in place to conduct many of the tasks called for in the 2024 legislative language. However, there are also opportunities for more cohesion across the segments, and there are gaps and issues that need to be improved. This is about creating overarching systems and structures where none exist.”
  - One intent of the AB928 legislation is to ensure a more seamless ADT pathway development process for the benefit of students. There are some narratives (including some misconceptions) about those processes, but there is limited data available to prove or disprove those narratives.

---


5 AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee. (January 25, 2024). Meeting 8 Minutes. Retrieved May 10, 2024, from https://static1.squarespace.com/static/63294b64e06c61627d6b28e/t/662700adaabe6d2317fe0019/1713832109483/ab-928-committee-meeting-%23238-meeting-minutes-a11y.pdf
○ There is significant overlap between, and confusion about, the development of C-ID Descriptors, TMCs and ADTs and the current processes of articulation. The Committee’s discussions, and these draft premises and considerations, seek to establish clarity through better transparency and accountability measures that will benefit students as well as the intersegmental faculty and other professionals engaged in the process.

○ Course-to-course articulation is a complex process that is highly reliant on the individuals involved and their complex, intersegmental relationships with each other. There is no central repository at this time for capturing the history of articulation requests, decisions and rationale. The request and approval process takes place mainly via individuals’ emails.

○ California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO) is responsible for reviewing and approving all local transfer degrees developed to align with the TMC. They publish any new TMC templates on September 1 and February 1. Community Colleges must create an ADT within 18 months of the template posting, if they currently have a corresponding program.

● Determinations of similarity:

○ Currently, after a 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.

○ According to long-standing practice and consistent with the intent of the law, CSU campuses determine similarity based on the review of the TMC, not the individual ADT at each college. As such, the process to declare similarity by CSUs can commence once TMCs are finalized and decisions can be made by the time CCCs create the ADTs based on TMCs.

○ A key intention of AB928 is to ensure that there are reporting deadlines established for CSUs to accept TMCs as similar, as some say that process can feel like a “black box.”

○ Not all CSU campuses will have a major that program faculty will determine is “similar” to every TMC. At this time, this is determined by program faculty at each campus without transparent criteria or systemwide parameters.
What level of guidance can the CSU Chancellor's Office (CO) engage to oversee determinations of similarity? CSU CO encourages campuses to determine similarity and they do encourage all to do a thorough examination of how the ADT can fit within the current 60-unit pathway. The CSU CO cannot force the faculty to determine a pathway is similar, but they do encourage the effort.

**TMC reviews, updates and labor market alignment:**

- According to the CSU CO, “Faculty initiate the request to develop a new TMC based on four criteria:
  - Minimum of four CSUs have to offer the “similar” bachelor’s degree
  - Minimum of 100 CCC students are transferring into the major annually, or indication of significant growth for the major in the last three years
  - Regional diversity of CSU and CCC campuses offering the degree
  - Limit of five new TMCs per academic year, unless mandated by law or regulation.”

- A 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.

- TMCs are reviewed in a distinct five-year review process to make sure the curriculum is up to date.
- Key Skills Assessments (KSAs) are an important source of information for TMC development.
- Revising the review process would provide community colleges with more influence over calling for new TMCs if they can present a case that they are needed.

**Removals of similarity:**

- 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.
- The current nature of when a CSU withdraws from a TMC/ADT similarity determination contract, which is communicated periodically to the CCCCO, is seen by many as unilateral and concerning.

---

○ The CSU CO is looking at ways to update the public TMC information related to removals of similarity.
○ 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 compensation:**
  ○ Faculty should be compensated for engaging in these processes, unless it is already considered part of their contracts or compensation. In addition, the Committee discussed that it would like to consider incentives beyond financial compensation. For example, how can this type of service be represented via promotion and review processes?
  ○ C-ID is working on an analysis of adequate compensation for faculty to engage in the FDRGs and C-ID reviews.
SECTION II: DRAFT CONSIDERATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

Consideration 1. Require reporting with some key metrics related to TMC and ADT development.

Background: As noted, there are some narratives (including some misconceptions) about processes related to the development of TMCs and ADTs, but there is limited data available to prove or disprove those narratives. In addition, the legislation calls for the Committee to “develop a plan to establish reporting and accountability requirements.”

Potential metrics for Committee discussion include:

- How many requests are there each year for a new TMC?
- From the moment a new TMC request is made, how long does it take to create the TMC?
- Are there times when a TMC cannot be established? If yes, what are the reasons?
- How often are DIGs/FDRGs convened each year? How long does it take to identify the faculty and convene the DIG/FDRG? Are there differences by discipline?
- Once a TMC is created, what process do CSUs use to identify if a TMC is similar to a major (e.g., steps taken by CSU CO, steps taken by each CSU, timelines, justifications, reporting requirements).
  - What process (if any) do UCs, AICCU member institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities that have signed MOUs with the CCCCO (hereafter “HBCUs”) use to identify if a TMC is similar (note: UCs, HBCUs, and AICCU are not mandated by law to participate)?
- Once a TMC is created, how many institutions declare similarity and on what timelines (by CSU, UC, HBCUs, and AICCU members)?
- For existing TMCs, where have CSUs not declared similarity? What criteria/information should trigger a review outside of the existing five-year review process?
- How often does an institution declare a TMC is no longer similar? Are there differences by institution? Discipline? Region?
- What process is used to determine labor market need, if any?
What process is used to invite feedback and enact continuous improvement related directly to ADT and TMC development?

Discussion questions:
- Who should be responsible for conducting this reporting?
- How often should the reporting be undertaken, who is the primary audience, and to whom should it be delivered?
- Are these the right metrics? What is the right balance between requiring information that helps to clarify processes, and adding a burdensome administrative process?

Consideration 2. Establish critical timelines for the TMC development process.

Background: The TMC to ADT development and approval processes are lengthy (some of the approval steps are established in regulation). In the current process:
- When a request from various stakeholders is made, it is sent to the Intersegmental Curriculum Council (ICC). If the ICC determines that the request meets its criteria, the process for TMC development is initiated.
- When TMC information is received from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office posts new TMCs on Sept 1 and Feb 1 of each year. In the worst case scenario, it can take many years for a TMC to be developed.\(^7\)
- Currently, there are no parameters around the length of time between ICC receiving a completed request to initiation or completion of TMC development.
- By regulation, CCCs must create an ADT within 18 months of the TMC posting, if they currently have a corresponding program.

The following examples present options to move items through the process by identifying specific timeframes within which a decision should occur. This would also provide data and metrics that can be used during process improvement discussions.

Milestone examples for Committee discussion:
- Identify a time parameter for the creation of a TMC.

  Consideration: From the time a completed TMC request is submitted to ICC (assuming all required supporting documentation is submitted and criteria are

---

\(^7\)See AA 17-17, issued by CCCCO, to ensure ADT development can proceed in a timely fashion if C-ID Descriptor determinations are delayed.
met), it is reasonable to expect ICC to decide whether to create a TMC by the end of the following semester of receipt.

**Consideration:** To support the decision process, due dates for requests should be developed. Requests must be received by December 1 or May 1 to guarantee it is reviewed by the end of the following semester of receipt.

- Identify a parameter for the time between initiation and completion of a TMC.
  
  **Consideration:** Once a TMC has been approved for creation by ICC, the TMC template will be completed within 18 months.

- Identify a time parameter for the determination of similarity by the CSU (and to encourage review and acceptance by the UC and members of the AICCU).
  
  **Consideration:** Once the TMC has been finalized, CSUs will declare similarity (or not) to the TMC within 12 months. 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.

**Discussion questions:**

- How can we encourage UCs, HBCUs, and members of AICCU to participate in this process?
- What do you consider the most critical milestones?
- Is it reasonable to suggest a timeframe of 12 months for CSUs to review a TMC for similarity? Is a similar time frame reasonable for the UCs/HBCUs/AICCU members?
- What happens if there is no response to a call to faculty for CCC/CSU/UC/HBCU/AICCU partners, and the process is delayed?
- What happens if the milestones are not met?
- How can we ensure transparency and communication of information?

**Consideration 3. Develop criteria and processes for determining similarity.**

**Background:** As noted in the guiding premises, 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.

**Potential approach for Committee discussion:**

For a new TMC: Develop criteria and a process for determining when a new TMC is similar or not similar, including a systematic intersegmental notification process once a
determination has been made. The notification should include a rationale/justification if the TMC is deemed to be not similar. 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.

For an existing TMC: Develop criteria and a process for how a CSU can determine a TMC is no longer similar, including:
  - Before finalizing the determination of “no longer similar,” review the TMC to determine if modifications could be made to retain similarity without impacting other existing agreements.
  - If it is determined that there is no longer similarity, that must be communicated widely and clearly to colleges, universities and students.
  - If it is determined that there is no longer similarity, an adequate transition period/teach out period must be in place to support students on that pathway.

Potential criteria for the Committee to consider for determining “similar/not similar” include:
  - If an ADT is offered in a region, a California State University campus in the region must offer guaranteed admission in a similar major.
  - Looking at student outcomes data to determine whether students can be successful in a major at the CSU with a TMC that does not match exactly what is required by a CSU, but is still “similar enough” to allow the student to be successful.

Discussion questions:
  - Who should develop and oversee the timeline, processes, etc. for determining similarity/dissimilarity? If others in addition to faculty, who?
  - What criteria would the Committee like to see?
  - How can we encourage UC, HBCUs, and AICCU members to participate in this process? What can be learned from the UCLA pilot?

Consideration 4. Supplement existing TMC initiation and review criteria.

Background: As noted in the guiding premises, a stated intent of the AB928 legislation is to ensure that TMCs are responsive to evolving workforce demands. There are examples of good labor market use by, for example, the Centers of Excellence for Labor Market Research which serve the CCCs. Each CSU and UC uses their own
resources/process to determine labor market considerations when proposing new degrees.

*Potential approach for Committee discussion:* Build upon the AB928 Committee’s Recommendation #1 from its 2023 Final Report and Recommendations, which was to “Resource an Intersegmental Course Articulation and Pathways Development infrastructure,” by developing a recommendation that authorizes and resources that infrastructure to:

- Leverage the work underway by the Master Plan for Career Education to identify aligned and trusted labor market sources that can be used by all of the segments when considering the need for new credentials, degrees and other pathways. With that aligned and trusted labor market data in hand, establish ongoing venues for professional collaboration related to review of labor market data and Key Skills Assessments (KSAs) to enable intersegmental discussion of aligned majors, credentials and degrees, involving a range of stakeholders including academic senates, system offices and appropriate discipline faculty;
- Revise criteria to request a new TMC to include responding to labor market demand;
- Allow requests for TMC review in addition to the existing five-year review process if in response to labor market demand; and
- Provide faculty members involved in DIGs and FDRGs with data on the skills needed by the workforce, through a combination of labor market data and KSAs.

*Discussion questions:*

- What do you think the legislative language is calling for when it directs the Committee to develop a plan with the following parameters?
  - “Develop a plan for the periodic analysis and creation of additional transfer model curricula for the ADT to respond to evolving workforce demands”; and
  - “The plan shall establish venues for professional collaboration in consultation with academic senates and appropriate discipline faculty on degree production, major alignment, and workforce- or industry-specific relevance.”
- Do you know of a coordinated, intersegmental source of labor market information? If not, what does that mean for the work of the AB928 Committee?
- Does the Committee wish to clarify that nursing, as called out in the legislation, is not recommended to be included in the initial conversation (e.g., because of
the complexity of nursing program admission criteria and processes, and the Board of Registered Nursing regulations)?

- Should this recommendation build upon the AB928 Committee's 2023 Recommendation #1, or is Recommendation #2 more appropriate, which was “Permanently establish within state structures, and resource with ongoing funding, a Higher Education Intersegmental Council.”

Consideration 5. Ensure faculty are adequately compensated for participation in the processes related to TMC, ADT and C-ID Descriptor development and review, unless it is already considered part of their contracts or compensation.

Discussion questions:

- The AB928 Committee addressed faculty compensation in its 2023 recommendations. Do you see the need to include an additional recommendation for faculty compensation?
- In addition to direct financial compensation, should this include ways to recognize service through faculty job descriptions, professional development, promotion applicability, consideration for evaluation requirements, and portfolio additions?

Consideration 6: Address articulation processes in support of ADT development.

Background: The Committee recognizes AB928 is focused on the TMC development process, to facilitate seamless transfer without credit loss. While articulation and related processes are not explicitly called out in the legislation, it is important to acknowledge the role and impact of the articulation process on transfer and TMC development. In addition, the intersegmental partners recognize that the complexity of the articulation process can be a barrier to transfer. Feedback from Articulation Officers during the March 2024 Committee meeting included a suggested solution around a mechanism for information sharing.

Potential approaches for Committee discussion:

A. Establish and resource a centralized process and repository of communications to track and manage each step of the articulation process, including historical references, decisions and discussion items between institutions.
B. Like articulation, C-ID has been a component of the AB928 discussions, as it is part of the process for ADT development. As AB1111 (Common Course Numbering) legislation is currently being implemented, there is ongoing discussion on how C-ID, Common Course Numbering, and AB928 recommendations will be braided together and aligned. As we move forward on various fronts, the following metrics can inform the discussion.

- How many requests are there each year for a new C-ID Descriptor?
  - From the moment a new request is made, how long does it take to create the C-ID Descriptor?
- How many requests are there each year from institutions to have their course(s) granted the C-ID Course designation?
  - From the moment a new request is made, how long does it take to grant a C-ID Course designation?
- Are there times when a C-ID Descriptor cannot be established? If yes, what are the reasons?
- How many people are assigned to work on articulation at an institution?

C. Given Assist.org is considered the official course transfer and articulation system for California’s public colleges and universities, does the AB928 Committee wish to offer recommendations related to ongoing support for Assist.org?

Discussion questions:
- Do you wish to see recommendations about articulation? About Assist.org?
- If yes, what are the right topics?
- Are there additional stakeholders to include in the conversation?
RESOURCES AND TOOLS


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