



# Policy Brief, Vol. 1, Winter 2024

March 15, 2024



*Sacramento Regional K-16 Collaborative*

“Institutions are successful when our students are successful.”

- Dr. Aisha Lowe, Chair, AB 928 Committee (1/25/24 Committee meeting)

“It is an injustice when we continue to design systems that work for institutions but don’t work for students.”

- Jessie Ryan, Member, AB 928 Committee (1/25/24 Committee meeting)

## Table of Contents

- I. Policy Brief Overview ..... 2**
- II. The Current Ecosystem Driving Higher Education Policy ..... 2**
  - Trends in Higher Education ..... 3**
  - System-wide Initiatives in Higher Education ..... 4**
    - Governor’s Master Plan for Career Education ..... 4
    - Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education ..... 5
    - Cradle-to-Career Data System..... 6
    - Analysis and Implications for the Collaborative ..... 7
  - Initiatives Impacting the Student Experience ..... 7**
    - Consequences of the Current System ..... 8
    - Implementation of AB 705 ..... 8
    - Pathways for Students..... 10
    - Analysis and Implications for the Collaborative ..... 16
- III. Governor’s 2024-25 Proposed Budget ..... 17**
- IV. Considerations and Opportunities for the Collaborative ..... 19**
- V. Appendix..... 23**
- VI. Sources ..... 27**



## I. Policy Brief Overview

In fall 2023, the Sacramento Regional K-16 Collaborative (Collaborative) expanded Capitol Impact's contract as a technical assistance provider to the Collaborative to include research support for the workgroups. As part of this work, Capitol Impact agreed to provide a quarterly policy brief.

The primary objectives of this brief are to increase the capacity and knowledge of the K-16 Collaborative to:

- Design Collaborative strategy to be responsive to evolving state legislation and institutional policy; and
- Leverage emerging legislation and policies in support of Collaborative goals and milestones.

### Methodology

To prepare this policy brief, Capitol Impact took a two-pronged approach. First, rigorous desk research was conducted using secondary sources. Second, conversations were held with staff of institutions and organizations engaged in the K-16 education and workforce development arenas. Interviewees provided insight on their work, shared opinions about the current ecosystem, and offered thoughts about future policy development pertaining to these two areas. They were told that any of their comments included in the brief would not be directly attributed to them to facilitate candor in the conversations. Individuals interviewed represented the following:

- Governor's Office, Higher Education Policy
- Legislative Analyst's Office, K-12 Education
- California Budget and Policy Center
- Irvine Foundation
- Campaign for College Opportunity

## II. The Current Ecosystem Driving Higher Education Policy

This first section of the policy brief provides an overview of the state-level initiatives in play that will impact higher education policy. In addition, a brief overview of trends in the field offer insight into areas of concern and opportunity. Understanding the current system-wide initiatives allows for the regional projects of the Collaborative to take advantage of potential future benefits as well as attempt to mitigate any identifiable concerns.

## Trends in Higher Education

In January 2024, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) issued its [first brief](#) in a six-part series focused on higher education. The first brief focuses on student access. Highlights from the brief provide a broad overview of current trends in higher education.

- **The pool of potential applicants is shrinking.**
  - Since 2006, the college-age population in California peaked in 2016-17 and has since declined by 4.1%, roughly the same as nationally (4%).
  - The number of public high school graduates is projected to peak in 2023-24 and decline to 14% below the peak levels by 2031-32.
  
- **Freshmen applications continue to grow at UC and are declining at CSU while transfer applications are increasing or holding relatively steady at both institutions.**
  - Since 2000, freshman applications to UC have increased 26%.
  - Freshman applications to CSU have declined since a peak in 2016.
  - Transfer applications to UC are up substantially since 2000, and fall transfer admission rates since 2012 have increased at about half of the UC campuses.
  - Transfer applications to CSU have only recently started to decline yet fall transfer admission rates at the majority of campuses are above 50%.
  
- **Enrollment is shifting towards four-year institutions.**
  - Since peak levels in 2009-10, the total enrollment in higher education has decreased by 8.4% in California and 12% nationally.
  - While enrollment in most community college regions has declined, enrollment at UCs, CSUs, and private universities has increased across the board.
  
- **Latinos are becoming a larger percentage of student bodies across the board; first-generation students are less likely to attend CSU and UC; and the CCC student body is growing younger.**
  - The percentage of Latino undergraduate students across all segments grew from 31% to 42% between 2010-2021 while all other racial/ethnic population percentages decreased.
  - Between 2013-2022, the percentage of first-generation students (defined as undergraduates whose parents do not hold a bachelor's degree or higher) at UC declined from 42% to 37% and at CSU from 56% to 53%.
  - The percentage of CCC students under age 25 has grown from just over 50% in 2001 to approximately 64% in 2021.

A [September 2023 memorandum](#) from the CCC Chancellor's Office provides additional data on enrollment and demographic changes in the system over time. The memo notes the following:

- System-wide, annual enrollment has decreased by approximately 15% between the 2018-2019 and 2022-23 academic years.
- Enrollment did increase by 5% between 2021-22 and 2022-23, indicating the potential for continued growth.
- Enrollment of Black, Latino, and Native American students all increased between 7-9% between the 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years while enrollment of Filipino students decreased by approximately 6% during the same period.
- Students 19 years old and younger enrolled at higher rates, increasing by 11% between 2021-22 and 2022-23.

The data paints a mixed picture. While some of the priorities of the Collaborative are moving in the right direction statewide (i.e., Increase of Latino undergraduate students), other areas of focus (i.e., first-generation students) need continued attention.

## System-wide Initiatives in Higher Education

Currently, there are multiple high-level initiatives that are likely to impact the work of the Collaborative. Following is a brief summary of these initiatives and any recent activity that has occurred in the last two years.

### Governor's Master Plan for Career Education

**Background.** With [Executive Order N-11-23](#), Governor Newsom called for the creation of a Master Plan on Career Education on or before October 1, 2024. The Master Plan will propose actions addressing three goals:

- *Career Education* – All high school students will explore potential careers and be provided with guidance towards entering those careers.
- *Hands-on learning and real-life skills* – Students should “learn by doing” and gain real-life skills particularly through earn-and-learn opportunities.
- *Universal access and affordability* – Students should be able to access career education without incurring substantial debt and facing complicated bureaucracies.

In the Executive Order, the Governor also renamed the Council for Post-Secondary Education to the Governor's Council for Career Education. While some may interpret the renaming of the body as a shift in focus to what is known as “career education,” it seems rather that the Governor is refining the overall focus of the Council to “education for careers” through the Master Plan. Council membership can be found [here](#).

**Recent Activity.** On January 24, 2024, the Governor’s Office held a webinar to kick off the Master Plan process. Included in the webinar was a presentation of [four key concepts](#) that will be addressed by the Master Plan:

1. Create state and regional coordinating bodies that are informed by statewide data systems and supported through technical assistance networks;
2. Align regional and state K-12, postsecondary, and workforce pathways using a skills framework;
3. Create incentives and improve coordination to provide work-based learning opportunities for K-12 students and adult learners; and
4. Accelerate the use of public benefit programs to make education and training affordable and improve universal access.

**Upcoming Activity.** In March and April, the Governor’s Office will hold regional meetings to gain additional input from stakeholders. The meeting for the Greater Sacramento area is scheduled for March 22, 2024, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. at CSU Sacramento. Following the regional meetings, five advisory groups (Students & Families, Educators, Workforce Development Entities, Labor & Industry, and Policymakers & Advocates) will be created to shape the Master Plan’s recommendations within the four key concept areas. The process seems to provide multiple opportunities for stakeholders to get involved including attending regional meetings, joining an advisory group, providing written comments, and inviting Governor’s staff to meet with communities and organizations.

## Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education

**Background.** Until 2011, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) provided analysis and advice on a range of higher education issues. CPEC was criticized as being ineffective. In its [2019 report](#), the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) cites the following as problems faced by CPEC: lack of clear goals, lack of a clear mission due to the conflicting roles established for the body, and its design as a consensus body rather than a leadership entity. Currently, California is the only state in the nation without a high-level coordinating body for higher education.

**Recent Activity.** AB 1142 (Low, Fong, Newman 2023) would create a Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education. The legislation establishes the Commission as an independent state agency and tasks it with the oversight, coordination, and planning of the state’s higher education system. The bill passed the Assembly unopposed; was first read in the Senate on January 25, 2024, and is currently pending with the Senate Rules Committee for Committee assignment.

On February 7, 2024, the Senate Education Committee and Assembly Higher Education Committee held a joint hearing on “The State of Public Higher Education Coordination and Collaboration.” Representatives from California Competes, Campaign for College Opportunity,

the three segments (CCC, CSU, UC), the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the three segments' academic senates made presentations about current efforts to coordinate and collaborate and the challenges faced in doing so. Most of the presenters supported the creation of the Commission, calling on legislators to use the many lessons learned from the CPEC and from other states as well as to fully resource the Commission.

The exception came with the representatives from the three segments' academic senates who generally communicated that the needed coordination is already happening within their respective faculty senates and through the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). They believe that if better resourced, the ICAS could do more coordinating work.

The speakers shared how many of the reforms occurring around transfer pathways are faculty-driven (i.e., Cal-GETC) and being done without any additional funding. The systems in place currently could serve the roles intended for the proposed Commission. While speakers did not explicitly oppose the creation of a high-level coordinating body, their overarching message was around the importance of including faculty perspectives and voices in the development of the coordinating work, particularly to avoid unintended consequences.

Senator Newman (Senate Committee Chair) and Assemblymember Fong (Assembly Committee Chair) acknowledged both perspectives including the need for additional resources regardless of whether a new body is created. Senator Ochoa Bough raised concerns about the urgency to improve the coordination and collaboration. Based on conversations with employers, her sense is that the higher education system is not meeting the entire needs of the California workforce.

## Cradle-to-Career Data System

**Background.** In 2019, the Legislature called for the establishment of a statewide, longitudinal data system. After an 18-month planning process, AB 132 (Postsecondary Education Trailer Bill 2021-22) was signed into law in summer 2021 creating the Cradle-to-Career (C2C) Data System and the Office of C2C Data. The C2C Data System is intended to be a user-friendly tool that helps students reach their college and career goals and provides timely and accurate information on education and workforce outcomes. It will connect data from early education, K-12 schools, higher education, social services, and employment systems; support planning and transitions for students; facilitate the understanding of factors that impact education and career outcomes of students; and bring information closer to the ground for communities and families. Other initiatives managed by the C2C office include eTranscripts California aimed at streamlining the sharing of transcripts across educational institutions, the expansion of CaliforniaColleges.edu to all 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> graders, and the implementation of an annual student experience audit. The C2C Data System initiative is led by a [Governing Board](#) and two Advisory Committees (Data & Tools and Community Engagement).

**Recent Activity.** The first data installment from data partners was received in October 2023 resulting in one billion data points. In 2024, C2C will collaborate with the Employment

Development Department to integrate employment and earnings data. The C2C Data System is projected to be fully operational by 2025-26.

## Analysis and Implications for the Collaborative

As the Collaborative's work moves forward, systemic changes will take time to implement and have an impact. As a result, there are two implications of note.

Design and implementation with institutions rather than to institutions. The system-wide initiatives in progress all directly impact the Collaborative, but the Collaborative can also directly impact the system-wide initiatives. In the case of the Master Plan, if the Collaborative does not share ideas and recommendations and/or provide feedback, the Master Plan may not speak to the Sacramento Region's needs. Collaborative members can actively engage in the opportunities offered to influence the Master Plan: attend regional meetings, join the advisory groups, and/or speak directly with the Governor's staff.

With regard to the C2C Data System, it is understood that the Collaborative is already obligated to participate in the system. The C2C Data System clearly must complement the efforts of the Collaborative in creating a shared data platform and speak to the Collaborative's other needs particularly when it comes to the data needed for evaluation purposes. As the Collaborative develops its own shared data platform, it can ensure the design is not duplicative by comparing its proposed data points with [the C2C Data System data points](#). If not already done, the Collaborative can also map the indicators identified to measure progress towards its stated goals to the C2C Data System's design both in collecting information and in providing useful reports for the Collaborative. Now is the time to make the request for design elements that will ultimately benefit the Collaborative.

Function over form. While there may not be consensus on whether a state-level coordinating body should be created, there will be times when the Collaborative's regional-level work is impeded by state-level barriers. It is at those times when the Collaborative needs a high-level channel to effectively elevate the need to dismantle these barriers regardless of whether the Coordination Commission for Postsecondary Education is created. If other regions are bringing the same concerns to light through the same channel, the possibility for systems change only increases. Whatever form that channel takes, the Collaborative will benefit from its existence.

## Initiatives Impacting the Student Experience

This section of the brief attempts to capture the various systems in place that impact a student's higher education experience and the efforts aimed at improving both the student experience and student outcomes.



## Consequences of the Current System

A student's journey on her educational pathway can be an exciting one particularly as she approaches the end of high school and sets her sights on the next chapter of learning. Unfortunately, as has been well documented, she will potentially face a myriad of barriers and obstacles along the way, particularly if she comes from a community of color, is low-income, plans to remain in her current place of residence, and is interested in starting at a community college before moving on to a four-year university.

To set the table for the next section of this brief, it is helpful to restate what many already know: the [primary barriers](#) this student will face when, by choice or by circumstances, she embarks on a transfer pathway.

1. Transfer pathways are not standardized across California's higher education systems.
2. Transfer pathways are not standardized across campuses within systems.
3. Current transfer tools cannot simplify this complex process enough for students to navigate independently.
4. Limiting credit mobility significantly impacts costs for a student and the state.
5. There is no unified process across systems to help students map a complete path to a bachelor's degree with financial aid.

The impact of these barriers can manifest in different ways. This student may take 13 more units than required at her community college. She will realize that she cannot plot her course through ASSIST.org without the help of a counselor because ASSIST.org was created as a back-office function and not meant to be student-facing. She will have a challenging time getting an appointment with her counselor as the current statewide average of [counselor-to-student ratio is 1:508](#). She may be unable to plan her financial aid across the four years she is a student.

It has taken decades for each of these barriers to be erected by a variety of players, and today, there are champions committed to tackle each of them with multiple efforts underway. Certainly, progress has been made, and there is still work to be done.

## Implementation of AB 705

**Background.** In addressing issues of access and equity, the implementation of AB 705 (Irwin 2017) has been a game-changer, particularly in the former area. Passed in 2018, the legislation requires all community colleges to place entering students into transfer-level math and English classes. Practices put into place by campuses to support the new requirement have focused on placement, corequisite models, student supports, and faculty professional development.

**Research.** Since its passage, this policy reform has had a significant positive impact across the system. A [PPIC research brief](#) published in October 2023 reports that between Fall 2018 and

Fall 2022, the share of first-time English students starting in transfer-level college composition increased from 68% to 99% and in transfer-level math from 40% to 96%. Course completion rates reflect the same positive trajectory since the legislation's implementation. In the Fall 2022 semester, the one-term completion rate in transfer-level college composition was 59% (versus 47% in the Fall 2018 semester) and 51% in math (versus 24% in the Fall 2018 semester).

Furthermore, [a November 2021 brief](#) issued by the USC Pullias Center for Higher Education stated that, as of the Fall 2019 semester, Black and Latino students were no longer underrepresented in college composition course enrollment whereas in 2015 the data showed enrollment at 24% for Black students and 30% for Latino students. The report notes that a key implementation strategy at some campuses was the establishment of enrollment in transfer-level English and math classes as the default for all students.

[Another study](#) published in December 2023 by UC Davis Wheelhouse used a causal analysis to demonstrate that AB 705 increased both transfer-level course enrollment and passage. However, the study also notes the legislation's positive effects were lower for students with low academic preparation.

Unfortunately, equity gaps have persisted in the area of successful completion of transfer-level courses. In the same 2023 PPIC report referenced above, the one-term course completion rate in college composition for White students was 22 points higher than for Black students and 16 points higher than completion rates of Latino students. Math completion rates were no different with the White-Black spread being 22 points and White-Latino spread 17 points.

The [November 2021 brief](#) cited above and developed after a December 2020 convening at University of Southern California continues with the authors suggesting that, to maximize the impact of AB 705 on inequity, its implementation must address structural racism. Their recommendations include accelerating and enforcing implementation by, for example, supporting legislation that "closes the loophole" allowing for continued remedial placement; facilitate learning about other campuses' innovation such as bridging gateway math and English composition into discipline-specific courses; address faculty mindset and the classroom experience through cultural change that, for example, calls for all faculty and staff to hold a "learning mindset" for students; and tackle other factors that may undermine AB 705.

An often unheralded group key to the implementation of AB 705 is academic counselors, as they are responsible for placing and guiding first-time students in course selection. [A November 2022 research brief](#) issued by UC Davis Wheelhouse shared the results of interviews focused on the law's implementation with 30 counselors across 16 Hispanic Serving community colleges. The recommendations in the brief are rooted in the factors positively impacting AB 705 implementation as cited by the interviewees. Some of the recommendations presented included using data to show faculty that students can succeed in transfer-level classes, strong communication and collaboration across departments, understanding student needs and context that may hinder successful course completion, and dedicating institutional resources to support student academic and non-academic needs.

**Recent activity.** A step in the right direction occurred in 2020 when the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) issued a memorandum that required all campuses to submit student placement data, disaggregated by race and ethnicity, through an "Equitable Placement Validation of Practices" template. The CCCCCO also created an Equitable Placement Toolkit. This action was later followed by the submission of an AB 705 improvement plan by every community college campus in March 2022.

More recently, AB 1705 (Irwin, Medina 2022) was signed into law to address several of the implementation barriers and unevenness of implementation across campuses. It requires colleges to 1) not only place students in transfer-level classes but also ensure they enroll in the class and 2) provide access to academic support to students who need or want it. The legislation also allows campuses to require student enrollment in additional concurrent support courses if determined that the additional support will increase the likelihood that the student will pass the transfer-level class. A one-time \$64 million was appropriated in the 2022 Budget Act to support the legislation's implementation. Given the short time that has passed since the passage of AB 1705, there has been no research investigating the impact of its implementation.

## Pathways for Students

This section of the brief will review the major areas of transfer pathway reform.

**Background.** California stands out in the nation with regard to community college enrollment. [The state enrolls the largest share of recent high school graduates in community colleges than any other state](#), deepening the dependency on viable transfer pathways and the urgency of system reforms to lower the barriers that students face today.

**Research.** In its August 2023 report, ["Strengthening California's Transfer Pathway,"](#) the PPIC analyzes current transfer trends and finds that:

- Wide variation across racial and ethnic groups in transfer rates exist, and the majority of students who intend to transfer never do.
- While there have been dramatic gains in transfer rates among underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, a persistent equity gap remains in place.
- A similar gap in transfer rates exists across regions.

### Common Course Numbering

**Background.** To maximize credit mobility, AB 1111 (Berman 2021) requires a student-facing common course numbering system (CCN) across the community colleges be implemented on or before July 1, 2024. The CCN system will assign the same course number to comparable courses across all California community colleges in order to ["streamline transfer from two- to four-year postsecondary educational institutions and reduce excess credit accumulation."](#) The CCN system

will strengthen equitable transfer and student success and requires high-level coordination and engagement of all system stakeholders.

Currently, the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) has 479 descriptors across 58 different disciplines. Descriptors are intended to encourage wider articulation and to expand the lower division curricular offerings. The C-ID is a critical element in several pathway components including the CCC Model Curriculum, Intersegmental Model Curriculum, Cal-GETC, Transfer Alignment Project, and Associate Degree of Transfer, all of which are discussed later in this brief.

**Challenges.** One of the main challenges in moving the work forward more quickly is capacity. Progress in the C-ID work is faculty-dependent. When one new descriptor is approved, all 116 community college campuses will submit a course they believe corresponds to the descriptor, and each submission requires review. Faculty volunteer to engage in this work in addition to their current jobs, and the compensation is small.

**Recent activity.** A Common Course Numbering Task Force was formed in 2022 to develop an implementation plan. In [its 2023 report](#) outlining the plan, the Task Force included a proposed extension of the implementation timeline to 2027. The requested extension is pending approval.

## **CCC Model Curriculum, Transfer Model Curriculum, and CAL-GETC**

### *CCC Model Curriculum*

**Background.** The CCC model curriculum (MC) is a collection of courses that have been selected by faculty to prepare students for transfer into a baccalaureate degree program or to transition into the workforce. Falling outside of legislative requirements for the Transfer Model Curriculum (SB 1440 and SB 440), community colleges are not obligated to develop degrees or certificates aligned with a MC. Each college may determine if the model curriculum is appropriate for their program and students.

There are two types of model curriculum:

- *CCC Model Curricula (CCCMC)* are developed by discipline faculty working in collaboration with industry to create career technical education (CTE) programs that help ensure that students will have the necessary skills to move into the workforce and that will allow students to easily transition from one college to another without having to restart their program of study.
- *Intersegmental Model Curricula (ISMC)* are developed in transfer disciplines that are not able to comply with the 60-unit limit restriction of the Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs).

Currently, there are [18 CCCMC](#) in place. At this time, there are no additional model curricula in the process of being vetted. Six ISMC exist in the disciplines of engineering, information technology, and nursing. While these pathways are viable avenues for a student to transfer, they require more than 60 units to complete, and thus, could pose a larger challenge for a student

hoping to transfer quickly or to lower their costs of attendance. However, for students interested in the disciplines that have an ISMC, the transfer pathway is much smoother today than prior to the ISMCs' creation.

### *Transfer Model Curriculum*

**Background.** In response to SB 1440 (Padilla 2010), the Academic Senates for the CCC and CSU initiated a faculty-led effort to identify course content for the new Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT). Through the C-ID infrastructure, a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) is being created for each of the most common transfer majors. The creation of a TMC can take between 12-18 months with multiple stages including approval by the appropriate discipline group and then by an intersegmental oversight group consisting of representatives from the community college and CSU Academic Senates. Currently, there are 40 approved TMCs available to students. TMCs for ethnic studies (one general and four that are ethnic-specific) and for graphic design have been drafted but have yet to be approved.

**Challenges.** Like with the CCN process, the primary barrier to moving the TMC process along more quickly is capacity. The TMC process is faculty-driven and depends on faculty volunteers to participate in the development and approval of TMC. The compensation for faculty is a \$500 stipend once the entire process is completed.

**Recent Activity.** At the January meeting of the AB 928 ADT Intersegmental Implementation Committee (AB 928 Committee), some members expressed frustration at the length of time it has taken to create TMCs. They raised questions about oversight of the TMC process and pressured for CSU campuses declare similarity once a TMC is completed and for transparency around articulation and the series of events that occur if a course in a TMC or a TMC itself is removed.

A Committee member asked about the message to and the amount of pressure placed on campuses to declare alignment. The member was particularly concerned because AB 928 requires that all community college students who declare an intent to transfer in a major with an ADT be placed on an ADT pathway on or before August 1, 2024. According to the CSU representative, the message to CSU campuses is, "If you want students to come to [your campus], you need to be accepting [TMCs]."

In addressing the challenges around capacity in the creation of TMCs, the Committee Chair noted that the Committee's 2023 recommendations include adding resources to support the TMC process. The Chair went on to request from staff that an analysis of the amount needed to fully resource the TMC process be undertaken and brought back to the Committee for review.

Finally, recognizing that CTE is not usually found among the TMCs, a Committee member stated that CCC will be looking at CSU for a TCM in some CTEs in the future. This could be a significant step in efforts to ensure that students who are interested in CTE are on a pathway that also gives them a choice of continuing on to earn a bachelor's degree.

## Cal-GETC

**Background.** With data showing that community college students often do not transfer in a timely manner (or sometimes not at all) and often accrue more credits than necessary to transfer, AB 928 requires community colleges to utilize a new single lower division general education framework that ensures students will meet academic eligibility and gain sufficient academic preparation for transfer admission to both the CSU and the UC commencing by the Fall 2025 semester. The new framework is called “Cal-GETC,” and the responsibility for its development lies with the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS).

While CSU and UC will accept Cal-GETC as fulfilling general education requirements, neither institution requires that Cal-GETC coursework be completed for transfer. Students often choose to take all the general education classes at a community college to keep their cost of attendance as low as possible.

**Recent Activity.** Version 1.0 of the Cal-GETC standards has been approved. In 2024, the focus will be on determining the requirements for each general education area, and version 2.0 of the standards should be completed by December 2024.

## Transfer Alignment Project

**Background.** In fall 2019, the CCC Academic Senate initiated the Transfer Alignment Project (TAP) aimed at aligning the TMC with the UC Transfer Pathway (UCTP) where feasible. The UCTP creates a transfer pathway in 20 of the most sought-after majors at any of the nine UC campuses but does not require an associate degree for transfer nor does it guarantee admission to UC. Currently, only two TMCs (political science and sociology) align with UCTP pathways.

A separate program – the UCTP Guarantee Pilot – allows students to complete lower division requirements at a community college, be guaranteed admission to a UC, and be fully prepared to achieve a baccalaureate in two years. This program only applies to majors in chemistry and physics currently.

## Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT)

**Background.** The Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) was created by SB 1440 (Padilla 2010), and the legislation’s intent was deepened through SB 440 (Padilla 2013) which included additional accountability measures and increased choices for students. The ADT is the tool to help some students transfer to CSU by completing no more than 60 units at a community college and no more than 60 units at CSU to earn a baccalaureate degree. ADT students are given guaranteed admission to the CSU system but not to a specific campus or for a specific major. Currently, there are 40 majors offered in the ADT pathway.

**Research.** The [PPIC's August 2023 report](#) found that the proportion of transfer students through an ADT has slowly been growing. In the 2015-16 academic year, one third of associate-earning transfer students did so with ADT, and in the 2021-22 academic year, the percentage grew to nearly 70%. Moreover, the authors report that [recent research](#) shows that an ADT-earner is 10 percentage points more likely to earn a bachelor's degree than students who transfer in other ways. When comparing ADT-earners from academic years 2015-16 to 2021-22, successful transfer doubled for all racial groups, with Latino students' transfer rate increasing from 25% to 53% and Black students' rate increasing from 14% to 36%.

**Recent Activity.** While there is always movement in the ADT arena, there are two areas of recent activity to note.

### *Implementation of AB 928*

The Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (STAR), also known as AB 928 (Berman 2021), has played a significant role in the development of ADT pathways. As previously mentioned, it mandates that all community college students who declare an interest in transferring be placed in an ADT pathway if one exists in their intended major and if the student has not opted out. The mandate must be met by fall 2025.

To implement this mandate, the Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee was created and charged with the oversight of the ADT until July 1, 2025. A list of the Committee members can be found [here](#).

In the current legislative session, AB 2057 (Berman) was introduced on February 1, 2024, and, if passed, would extend the operation of the Committee indefinitely. The bill will be heard in the Assembly Higher Education Committee in March.

In December 2023, the Committee, as legislatively mandated, issued [its final report and recommendations](#) with the 18 recommendations grouped into four categories: overarching needs for AB 928 implementation, goal-setting, STEM, and re-engaging ADT-earners.

At its January meeting, the Committee discussed [its 2024 legislative requirements](#) which include the following: 1) developing a timeline and reporting deadlines for review of declaring or matching TCMs with CSU majors, 2) a plan for analysis of evolving workforce needs and the triggers for the consideration of new TCMs to respond to those needs, 3) a student-centered communications plan, and 4) feedback around updates needed in the ADT website.

A portion of the Committee's meeting was focused on communication with and outreach to students. [Student-Ready Strategies](#) and [The RP Group](#) made presentations to lay the groundwork for the development of the communications plan. The overarching theme was "communication can only be as simple as the complexity of the system."

The information shared included the following:



- *Results of the presenters' attempts to develop a higher education plan online without assistance* – Because there is no systemic collaboration around communicating with students and no one student-facing “super tool” that is a doorway to all systems, the attempts came with challenges. Key takeaways from this exercise were that 1) the segments provide good and accessible information about admissions but not about course-taking; and 2) students cannot navigate a system that requires the input of information that they do not know at that time.
- *Results from student focus groups* – Students were asked to describe the major barriers they face(d) in their higher education experiences, particularly when considering transferring. Their feedback only confirmed what the field knows well: university affordability, lack of a support network, pathway navigation (including non-academic requirements), and school-life balance.
- *Additional factors to consider in the creation of the communications plan* – Presenters added the importance of ensuring students receive accurate and timely information to avoid missteps in course-taking that negatively affect students and the need to hire academic counselors who reflect the student body and who make students feel “directed, focused, engaged, connected, valued, and nurtured.”

The Committee chair reminded the group that the legislative directive is not specific to online tools; rather the Committee should investigate what students need beyond online tools (particularly for those who do not have reliable internet). Presenters concluded with the Committee’s next steps: 1) pinpointing structural changes (that are politically feasible) to make communicating with students about transfer easier and 2) identifying the most important messages for aspiring transfer students to hear across the entire system.

### *ADTs and the UC*

Up until now, the transfer pathways into the UC system included [Transfer Pathways](#), [Transfer Admissions Guarantee](#), and [Pathways+](#). None of these pathways accept the ADT. With the signing of AB 1291 (McCarty 2023), the UC will establish a new ADT pilot program at UCLA. The legislation requires that the pilot program begin in fall 2026 and include at least eight majors. Students with this ADT will be guaranteed admission to the UC system but not to a campus of choice, a point of contention for statewide student associations at UC and community colleges. By fall 2028, the pilot program must expand to at least 12 majors with four being STEM majors.



## Analysis and Implications for the Collaborative

This section of the brief will speak to each of the Collaborative workgroups. However, with the interconnectedness of each workgroup's scope, the analysis presented below is certainly not limited to the particular workgroup addressed.

**Data Workgroup:** As efforts to improve data sharing are underway, there are opportunities to enrich the work of the Collaborative as a whole. Understanding that data sharing agreements focus on privacy and technical concerns, this workgroup should keep in mind that the data sharing agreements are only as good as the shared data itself. This workgroup could consider the following questions:

- What data is needed to monitor the implementation and impact of AB 1705 on the successful completion of transfer-level math and college composition classes?
- What data will reveal the impact of the pilot ADT program with UCLA?
- What, if any, additional data will assist in closing the persistent equity gap across all work of the Collaborative?
- How will, if at all, the delay in full implementation of Common Course Numbering impact the Collaborative's work?

**Dual Enrollment Workgroup:** With dual enrollment emerging as a promising strategy for strengthening credential attainment and for supporting students' transitions into higher education, there are several questions for the workgroup to consider:

- How can information about opportunities offered by transfer pathways be integrated into dual enrollment programs?
- What barriers do students face that may prevent them from participating in a dual enrollment program that connects them to a transfer pathway in the career of their choice?
- What steps need to be taken to ensure that dual enrollment programs provide the highest-quality educational experience for students?
- What standards might be adopted to ensure high-quality dual enrollment programs (e.g., [Linked Learning Gold Certification Standards](#))?

**Priority Student Populations Workgroup:** While issues of equity straddle the entire Collaborative's work, this workgroup is well-positioned to specifically tackle them. In addition to the additional student supports needed in the implementation of AB 705 and ADT programs, this workgroup's potential scope could influence the following areas:

- Communication and outreach with students by ensuring the design and delivery of messages, information, and support is student-centered, culturally-competent, and steeped in a "no wrong door" mindset;

- Intra-system workforce development through professional development for faculty and staff around equity mindsets, deepening the diversity of applicant pools for campus positions that interact directly with students, and considering the student population itself as potential peer workers/counselors/mentors; and
- Addressing a student's full cost of attendance by seeking strategies that integrate student supports beyond financial aid into the pathway framework.

These considerations also fall within the final recommendations from the AB 928 Committee. As such, it would be important for this workgroup to leverage the work of the AB 928 Committee as it implements its 2024 legislative mandates.

**Transfer Pathways Workgroup:** Efforts to streamline and strengthen transfer pathways are making progress at the systems level. At the regional level, there are opportunities to address some of the challenges now that will take time for the larger statewide system to effect change. Some examples include:

- Compensation for faculty working on the CCN, creating TMCs, and supporting the advancement of Cal-GETC;
- Assessing whether regional pathways align with regional workforce needs particularly in high-demand, high-wage jobs with upward mobility as students may be more willing to engage and persist in pathways that lead to these kinds of employment opportunities;
- Monitoring the AB 928 ADT Intersegmental Implementation Committee's legislative requirement around student communications to minimize duplicative work; and
- Hiring a diverse group of students to conduct participatory action research to better inform the workgroup's deliverables.

**Engineering and Computing Pathways/Healthcare Pathways Workgroup:** Although this workgroup is focused on distinct careers, some areas to explore are applicable to both. These include the following:

- Engaging priority student populations by seeking pathways that allow them to transfer not only within major but also within region as this student population tends to be more place-based; and
- Adopt policies, such as priority course registration for pathway participants, increasing the likelihood that learners can complete their lower division courses within two years.

### III. Governor's 2024-25 Proposed Budget

The Governor's proposed 2024-25 budget was released in mid-January. To balance the budget the Governor relies on reserves, referrals, and reductions (primarily to one-time costs) to balance. The [California Budget and Policy Center's budget analysis](#) notes that the Governor does

not propose any new significant tax policy to increase revenue and that it seems the Governor is protecting funding for the education system.

In [its analysis of the proposed budget's higher education expenditures](#), the LAO states that the Governor's proposal will only worsen out-year budget deficits for the state's higher education institutions. It recommends that the Legislature build a more "prudent budget" that includes holding all higher institutions' expenditures flat and pulling back on one-time expenditures and temporary funding that has not been disbursed. In [a more detailed budget and policy post](#) about the latter, the LAO, after setting aside disbursements and the related proposals in the Governor's budget, estimates that the Legislature has broad authority to reduce the following one-time and temporary spending amounts that impact K-16 education:

- FY23-24: \$602 million
- FY24-25: \$1.195 billion
- FY25-26: \$1.109 billion

Beyond education, the Governor's proposed budget impacts other areas that touch students such as financial aid. The 2021-22 budget included a proposal to reform Cal Grants, but only if there were sufficient revenues in spring 2024. As it stands, the Governor has not included any budgetary actions tied to the plan's implementation. In addition, the proposed budget eliminates a planned, one-time increase to the Middle Class Scholarship Program. Cuts to areas such as CalWORKS supportive services and the lack of additional investment in food security programs and childcare will also have impacts on students' ability to complete their education.

The Collaborative should also note that the proposed budget impacts workforce systems and supports and includes spending delays in healthcare worker investments, California Jobs First, the Apprenticeship Innovation Fund, and the California Youth Apprenticeship Program as well as cuts to the Emergency Medical Technician training program and to the Women in Construction unit at the Department of Industrial Relations. The proposal to eliminate the Student Housing Revolving Loan Fund also has a detrimental impact on the ability to address one of students' most pressing needs.

On a positive note, the Governor's proposal includes an increase of \$60 million to expand nursing programs and Bachelor of Science in nursing partnerships through the community college system. The proposed budget also includes an ongoing increase of \$5 million to support the C2C Data System.

In [a post](#) on February 20, 2024, the LAO revised its budget deficit estimates based on recent revenue collections data. The revised estimate increases the projected 2024-25 budget deficit by \$15 billion to \$73 billion. The LAO states, "The actual increase in the state's budget problem will depend on a number of factors, including formula-driven spending changes, **most notably Proposition 98 spending requirements for schools and community colleges.**" The LAO adds that changes in revenues are unlikely to significantly impact other state major formula-driven spending requirements.

While a clearer picture has yet to emerge, staff from the California Budget and Policy Center believe that, given the LAO's recent update, the indicators are pointing in the wrong direction with regard to the deficit situation. At the same time, the staff noted that the language used in the Governor's proposal sends somewhat of a positive signal in that the use of the term "defer" when describing budget proposals indicates more of a commitment to previous agreements versus the term "delay" which usually results in a cut in the final budget.

On February 21, 2024, the Assembly Budget Committee #3 held a hearing where some hints of the Legislature's interests regarding the Governor's proposed budget were revealed through the questions asked. The hearing included presentations by a student from each of the three segments, staff from the Governor's Department of Finance, a Legislative Analyst Office representative, the Chancellors of CCC and CSU, and the President of UC. Committee members raised questions about Cal Grant reform; the Governor's performance expectations regarding compact agreements despite the deferral of payment to the following fiscal year; in-state student admission expansion at UCLA, UC San Diego, and UC Berkeley; and the Student Housing Revolving Loan Fund. Assemblymember Muratsuchi sent a positive signal when he stated, "I am a big fan of the dual enrollment program." Also working in the Collaborative's favor was Assemblymember McCarty's comment that increasing in-state student admissions at UCLA, UC San Diego, and UC Berkeley is a "top priority," and "We should do everything we can to continue that legacy [of increased in-state admissions]."

The Governor's May revise is several months away. In the meantime, Collaborative members could consider keeping their respective state elected officials, particularly if they serve on the budget committees of their respective chambers, apprised of the Collaborative's work and how the Governor's proposed budget may either support or hinder continued progress.

## IV. Considerations and Opportunities for the Collaborative

As the Collaborative's work continues to move forward, there are several considerations and opportunities for the group to contemplate. The below reflects an initial high-level exploration of themes that emerged through the research and conversations conducted.

### From Student Access to Student Success to Employment

Over 10 years ago, the trajectory of policy change to streamline pathways began with a focus on student access. More recently, policy change has focused on student success in the pathways. Looking ahead, as student success improves, the K-16 system should turn attention to employment. That is, institutions of higher education should not consider graduation as the terminus of the relationship with students. Rather, they could extend their connection to students after they exit the system.

Ensuring successful transition from education to employment is certainly not the responsibility of postsecondary institutions alone and requires strong partnerships with workforce systems such as WIOA, labor unions, and other state-funded initiatives. Ironically, AB 359 (Holden), which would offer more flexibility for community college districts to enter into College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnerships in the service area of another community college district, contains language that would eliminate the requirement to consult with, and consider the input of, the local Workforce Investment Board (WIB) for CTEs provided in CCAP agreements. Moreover, the Governor's current budget proposal contains several cuts to workforce development programs.

The Collaborative includes some strong employer partners. What is missing is the engagement with the higher-level workforce systems that can support students as they move into the world of employment. Locally, one of the largest opportunities to do so is [Aggie Square](#). With UC Davis taking the lead on the project, the Collaborative is well positioned to build stronger relationships across education and workforce systems so that students can ultimately obtain long-term employment with upward economic mobility.

## Putting Student Needs at the Center

It is clear that the Collaborative is keenly focused on using student-centered approaches throughout its work. As efforts to increase student supports move forward, the larger system seems to be moving backwards in many areas. The Collaborative could buck some of the trends described below.

- The Cal-GETC does not include the CCC curricular Area E, Lifelong Learning and Self-Development, which is currently part of Cal Breadth at CSU. Courses in this focus area could include student success strategies, human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, information literacy and social relationships – critical skills that would help students succeed in school and in their lives beyond. Although it seems that Area E will not be re-introduced into the Cal-GETC, CCC could require it for local associate and/or baccalaureate degrees. Such a move would also address concerns around loss of faculty jobs.
- As previously mentioned, the Governor's proposed budget does not include budgetary action around Cal Grant reform and eliminates a planned one-time increase to the Middle Class Scholarship Program (MCSP). While there are technically no decreases in funding for these two sources of financial aid, the Collaborative could consider engaging with the appropriate elected officials to push for Cal Grant reform and MCSP expansion. On the latter front, should the Legislature keep the one-time increase in the approved budget, and although the increase is one time, it could put the Legislature in a more difficult position in 2025-26 to reduce the allocation to the 2023-24 levels.

- Although the Governor’s proposed budget keeps education spending relatively intact, there are proposed cuts to – or no proposed expansion of – programs and services that many CCC students rely upon to successfully complete their postsecondary education: student housing (Student Housing Revolving Loan Fund), food assistance (no expansion), and childcare (no expansion). Other sources of funding will need to be explored to ensure that these kinds of programs and services are available to students should the Legislature accept the Governor’s proposals.

## Student Cost/Benefit Analysis

Data has shown that, for priority populations, obtaining a college degree leads to economic mobility. Yet, in a conversation with a program officer at the Irvine Foundation, it was pointed out that college-age individuals often want, if not need, the quickest way to a paycheck. The potential students cannot justify the tangible costs of attendance with the intangible future benefits from a four-year degree. The challenge facing the Collaborative is incentivizing potential students to pursue a four-year degree without dismissing the immediate needs they have. Would guaranteed employment after graduation do the same as guaranteed admission policies? At a minimum, it is important that communication with and outreach to students includes relevant messages about the potential long-term gains of a college degree.

## Points of Tension

The current ecosystem impacting policymaking in the K-16 space creates some tension for the Collaborative’s work. Some examples are as follows.

- ***Declining pool of students and meeting the California workforce shortage.*** Data shows the trends for high school graduate and college-age populations are declining while the state continues to face unmet workforce needs. Instead of competing over a shrinking pool, institutions can seize opportunities to widen the pool. One such opportunity is comebacker students, which are defined as adult learners with “some college, no credential (SCNC)”. The comebacker student population offers not only the chance to strengthen educational attainment in the region, but also a strategy that benefits the students themselves through increased economic mobility and the region through addressing unmet workforce needs. California Competes released [a report](#) in February 2024 on this topic and included recommendations for re-engaging this student pool. If not done already, the three segments should dig into the data about comebacker students tied to their institution and identify strategies that meet this population’s specific needs.

- **Expansion and institutional capacity.** The Collaborative's work will require more investments in the K-16 education system to expand opportunities to students and to ensure that the institutions managing those opportunities have sufficient capacity to do so. The Collaborative undoubtedly recognizes the tension created by the current budget climate particularly when considering sustainability beyond the life of the grant. As institutions seek additional resources for program expansion, integrating the costs of organizational capacity-building into those requests will ensure strong management and oversight as well as high-quality program design and delivery.
- **Pace of change.** The speed of industry change, particularly within the technology sector and the emerging AI field, cannot be ignored. Pathway development is too slow to keep pace with rapidly changing workforce needs. Not only does this raise the question of considering more nimble alternatives to educate the future workforce (i.e., boot camps), but also of the need to integrate more courses that teach cross-purpose skills into pathways that a student can use within and across industries.

## Advocacy

As already mentioned, the Collaborative has opportunities to engage in current policy-making. Rather than taking advantage of these opportunities as individual members with individual agendas, the Collaborative could build a unified policy agenda, particularly around the state-level barriers impeding progress, to influence these high-level discussions. Good policies are only as good as their implementation. Because the Collaborative will be charged with implementing these policies once in place, bringing the Collaborative's perspective to the policy-making table now will shape better policies that can, in fact, be well implemented.



## V. Appendix

### Other Higher Education Legislation

Additional legislation has been introduced in the 2023-24 session that, while not directly impacting the topics covered in this brief, nonetheless, touch higher education and may affect the Collaborative's work.

BILL NUMBER	SPONSOR	ACTION	STATUS
<b>TUITION</b>			
SB 916	Seyarto	Prohibits charging <b>tuition or fees for specified students who enroll in an extended education course</b> if certain requirements are satisfied, and the extended education course is being used to meet the requirements of an undergraduate degree program.	Senate Education Committee Hearing: March 20, 2024 at 9 a.m.
AB 3112	Essayli	Prohibits CCC, CSU, independent institutions of higher education, and private postsecondary educational institutions from <b>increasing tuition by an amount greater than the percentage increase in the U.S. Consumer Price Index</b> for the preceding calendar year, beginning in the 2029–30 academic year.	Introduced
<b>ACCESS</b>			
AB 2508	McCarty	Requires a <b>California Kids Investment Development Savings Account to be opened for students in grades 1-12 who are foster youth</b> if an account has not already been opened and the account to receive a one-time enhanced deposit of \$500.	Introduced
AB 2953	Alvarez	States the intent of the Legislature to enact subsequent legislation to require CSU and to request the UC to <b>reserve a certain number or percentage of admission seats or slots for eligible first-generation applicants.</b>	Introduced
SB 307	Ashby, McGuire	<b>Extends awards under the Middle Class Scholarship Program to community college students who are current or former foster youth</b> and pursuing transfer to a 4-year postsecondary educational institution, an associate degree, an associate degree for transfer, or a community college career technical education certificate and meet other MCSP requirements	Re-referred to Asm. Committee on Higher Education
<b>CAREERS</b>			



BILL NUMBER	SPONSOR	ACTION	STATUS
SB 943	Ochoa Bogh	Requires review of <b>state government employment classifications</b> and identification of classes that are compatible with <b>creating a waiver for a bachelor's degree requirement for veterans</b> by 1/1/26, and, for a class where a bachelor's degree is required as a minimum qualification for a civil service examination, requires waiving the bachelor's degree requirement for veterans by 7/1/26.	To Sen. Labor, Public Employment & Retirement Committee and to Sen. Military & Veterans Affairs Committee
AB 2097*	Berman	Requires 1) public <b>high schools to offer computer science education courses</b> within a specified timeline; 2) school districts and charter schools to <b>make efforts to increase the computer science course enrollment of students who are underrepresented in the field</b> of computer science; and 3) beginning with the graduating class of 2031, adds the <b>completion of a course in computer science as a graduation requirement</b> .	To Asm. Education Committee
<b>STUDENT SUPPORT</b>			
AB 2150	Arambula	Requires 1) a county human services agency to receive input from basic needs directors and basic needs coordinators at public higher education institutions within the county when <b>developing the protocols for engagement between the county human services agency and institutions of public higher education</b> ; 2) the department, in consultation with staff liaisons and basic needs directors or basic needs coordinators, to <b>develop trainings</b> on topics related to determining student eligibility for public social service and to facilitate trainings; and 3) the <b>creation of a workgroup</b> that, with the county department, discusses enrollment trends in public social services programs and identifies barriers to enrollment and actions remove the barriers.	To Asm. Committee on Human Services and Committee on Education
AB 2586	Alvarez	Prohibits the UC, CSU, or CCC from <b>disqualifying a student from being eligible to apply for an employment due to their failure to provide proof of federal work authorization</b> , except where that proof is required by federal law or where that proof is required as a condition of a grant that funds the particular employment position.	To Asm. Higher Education Committee
AB 1793	Ta	<b>Extends Cal Grant and Middle Class Scholarship Program</b> eligibility to students who were not a resident of California at the time of high school graduation but meet all other applicable eligibility requirements and are a child or spouse	To Asm. Committee on

BILL NUMBER	SPONSOR	ACTION	STATUS
		who is a dependent of a military service member stationed outside of California on active duty but otherwise maintains their residence in California.	Higher Education
AB 2184	Davies, Chen	Requires the prorated <b>Cal Grant award and the per-student Cal Grant 2 access award amounts</b> to be no less than double the maximum award amounts provided for the 2023–24 award year.	To Asm. Higher Education Committee
AB 2348	Berman	Requires the CCC and CSU student parent internet web pages to include <b>additional information on student parent services and resources</b> , including several other federal and state tax credits, state and federal financial aid applications and programs, and the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids program and requires each campus of the CCC and CSU, and would request the UC, to, among other things, 1) develop and implement a <b>campus policy for estimating and adjusting cost of attendance information for student parents</b> , 2) establish a data field in the campus's data management information system to identify student parents for certain purposes, and 3) update its <b>campus net price calculator to include a baseline student parent cost estimate</b> .	Introduced
SB 971	Portantino	<b>Exempts from the nonresident tuition fee a nonresident, low-income student who 1) is a resident of a region impacted by war or other regional conflict</b> , 2) registers for lower division courses at a community college, and 3) has indicated that they have sought residency in California; and prohibits, in any academic year, more than 150 full-time equivalent students at a community college from being exempted from payment of the nonresident tuition fee pursuant to this exemption.	Senate Education Committee Hearing: March 20, 2024 at 9 a.m.
PATHWAYS			
SB 995*	Padilla	Requires the CSU, in consultation with the CCC Chancellor, to <b>develop a 5-year pilot program to recruit high-quality teaching candidates at 3 CSU campuses in partnership with 3 CCC campuses</b> beginning with the 2025–26 school year, and as part of the pilot program, establish a TMC and ADT at a CC campus that results in participating students being awarded a baccalaureate degree and a teaching credential in four years at CSU.	To Sen. Education Committee
AB 359*	Holden	Seeks to <b>expand access to dual enrollment opportunities for all high school students</b> while still giving priority to underrepresented student populations and <b>expands the</b>	Pending in Sen. Rules Committee

BILL NUMBER	SPONSOR	ACTION	STATUS
		<b>flexibility for community college districts in creating CCAP partnerships in the service area of another community college district</b> if that community college district has declined the request from the school district or if it does not have the courses and pathways sought by the school district.	for Committee assignment
SB 1244*	Newman	<b>Mirrors the portion of AB 359 (above) pertaining to the flexibility</b> provided to community college districts seeking to establish CCAP partnerships in other community college districts.	To Sen. Education Committee
AB 2019*	Vince Fong	<b>Expands the definition of early and middle college high schools</b> to include early and middle college programs established within a high school and <b>exempts a student</b> enrolled in an early college program, a middle college program or a CCAP program <b>from the 240-minute minimum school day</b> if the student is also enrolled in a community college, classes of the California State University, or classes of the University of California.	To Asm. Committees on Education and on Higher Education
AB 2305*	Mike Fong	Requires that, when a <b>community college applies to create a Community College Baccalaureate program</b> , 1) instead of two separate timelines for a community college to apply for and receive notification of a decision, there be only one timeline; 2) the minimum number of working days allowable to review a proposal and assess its workforce value be increased from 30 days to 45 days; 3) the number of working days that the CSU and the UC have after the proposal's submission to submit written objections with supporting evidence increase from 30 to 45; and 4) the number of working days that the chancellor has after receipt of written objections to convene with the applicant and the segment or segments that raised an objection to establish a written agreement before the program is approved be increased from 30 to 45.	To Asm. Committee on Higher Education

\* More detailed information on these bills and about the implications for the Collaborative will be provided in the Q2 policy brief.

## VI. Sources

1. AB928 Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee (2023). Final Report and Recommendations. Available [here](#).
2. Acevedo, N. (2022). Navigators of Critical Reform: California Community Colleges Counseling Faculty as Agents of Change, *The Center for Community College Leadership and Research*, University of California, Davis, 7 (5). Available [here](#).
3. Baker, R., Friedmann, E., Kurlaender, M. (2023). Improving the Community College Transfer Pathway to the Baccalaureate: The Effect of California's Associate Degree for Transfer, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 42 (2): 488-524. Available [here](#).
4. California Budget and Policy Center (2024). First Look: Understanding the Governor's 2024-25 State Budget Proposal. Available [here](#).
5. California Community Colleges. Five Barriers to Transfer for California Students: Why Coordination is the Path Forward. Available [here](#).
6. California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (2023). Common Course Numbering Task Force Final Report. Available [here](#).
7. California Competes (2024). From Setback to Success: Meeting Comebacker Students Where They Are. Available [here](#).
8. Cuellar Mejia, M., Johnson, H., Alesi Perez, C., Jackson, J. (2023). Strengthening California's Transfer Pathway, *Public Policy Institute of California Policy Brief*. Available [here](#).
9. Cuellar Mejia, M., Alesi Perez, C., Jacobo, S., Garcia, F., Ramirez, O. (2023). Tracking Progress in Community College Access and Success, *Public Policy Institute of California Policy Report*. Available [here](#).
10. Executive Department, State of California (2023). Executive Order N-11-23. Available [here](#).
11. Governor's Council on Career Education (2024). Master Plan for Career Education Core Concepts. Available [here](#).
12. Hetts, J. to Dr. Sonya Christian and Dr. Daisy Gonzales (2023, September 22). Final Spring 2023 and Annual 2022-23 Student Headcount [Memorandum]. *California Community Colleges*. Available [here](#).
13. Hollingshead, A. (2024). The 2024-25 Budget: Deficit Update, *Legislative Analyst Office Budget and Policy Post*. Available [here](#).

14. Li, A. (2023). Working as Designed: A Causal Analysis of AB 705 Shows Increased Rates of Transfer-Level Course Taking and Passage, *The Center for Community College Leadership and Research*, University of California, Davis, 8 (3). Available [here](#).
15. Melguizo, T., Cooper, S., Kurlaender, M., Bensimon, E.M. (2020). Progress and Potential: Considering the Question of Racial Equity in CA AB705, *Pullias Center for Higher Education*. Available [here](#).
16. Petek, G. (2024). The 2024-25 Budget: Higher Education Overview, *Legislative Analyst Office Brief*. Available [here](#).
17. Qing, L., Klein, I., & Steenhausen, P. (2024). Trends in Higher Education: Student Access. *Legislative Analyst Office Brief*. Available [here](#).
18. Warren, P. (2019). Coordinating California's Higher Education System, *Public Policy Institute of California Report*. Available [here](#).

