I. Approval of the agenda and minutes  
*Action Taken:* The agenda and minutes were approved 8-0-0.

II. Sacramento and Transfer  
*Alex Braunstein, Senior Policy Analyst, Office of Legislative Analysis*  
*Tyler Aguilar, Legislative Director, State Governmental Relations*  

Mr. Braunstein explained that he and Mr. Aguilar work on state bills in the admissions area. He came to talk about AB 928 and the Sacramento context around transfer issues. Mr. Braunstein and Mr. Aguilar had AB 928 in their portfolios during the 2020-21 session. UC took an “oppose” position on this bill registering both policy objections and budget objections. Mr. Braunstein added that there was a lengthy process of meetings with Sacramento staff, and the Senate was very involved. There is an ADT implementation committee in the bill and a third policy facilitator has been engaged to coordinate the segments.

Mr. Aguilar noted that AB 928 was problematic for a number of different reasons, and there was a lot of frustration with the bill. His team had difficulty explaining some of the finer details of transfer to Sacramento. However, they have recently made some headway in that arena. Advocates in Sacramento, said Mr. Aguilar, are probably largely to blame for the confusion at the capitol.

The committee discussed the recent UCLA stipulation and other factors affecting transfer including the dearth of counselors at the community college level.

III. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs  
*Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions*  
*Chase Fischerhall, Associate Director, A-G and Transfer Policy*

- Articulation Status of Pathway Courses
- Legislative Issues Update

Executive Director Yoon-Wu discussed the transfer referral process, in which students who are eligible for transfer, but do not get into the campus of their choice, are given other options within the UC system. The pool is typically around 3,000-3,500 students. A very small percentage of students opt in and enroll at a campus to which they did not originally apply. She added that the referral campuses also overlay their own selection criteria - such as GPA threshold, etc. UC cannot guarantee admission to the entire transfer referral pool.

Associate Director Fischerhall shared transfer data, discussed ways his office can support the efforts of ACSCOTI, and gave an overview of the plans to integrate transfer data into ASSIST.

Mr. Fischerhall discussed the data and answered questions from the committee.
IV. Physics Pathway

Chair Chalfant told the committee that some faculty contacts for the Physics majors that have pathways had been identified and seemed interested in participating. He explained that Physics has some features that other majors don’t, notably the associate degree based on the UC Transfer Pathway, and that he would report back in March on the conversations with these faculty. This group would be looking to see if requirements had changed since the pathway was originally developed. Chair Chalfant said that he hoped to review all 20 majors by the summer and asked members to consider shepherding a pathway review.

Vice Chair Narayan discussed different options and aspects to consider for the Physics pathway.

V. Consultation with the Academic Senate

Susan Cochran, Academic Senate Chair
Monica Lin, Academic Senate Executive Director

- AB 928 Update
- ICAS Update

Academic Senate Chair Cochran said that there had been a meeting of the Assembly on February 8, and it approved revisions to SR 610 and 630 to require undergraduates to complete at least six in-person units per term for at least one year in order to graduate from a UC campus. This will allow campuses to experiment with online majors and minors and will also ensure that all students will have access to the campuses.


The Senate leadership and the GUEA transfer group have been meeting with Seija Virtanen with SGR; there are tremendous politics this year around transfer. Associate Director Virtanen has been working to learn about transfer so that she can share information effectively with legislators. In the process of meeting with her, they have been trying to strategize about how to create a transfer path that will be acceptable to the legislators; the deadline is mid-March.

The Governor's budget asked for UCLA to offer transfer admission with a TAG and an ADT or lose $20M. The focus has now shifted to include all UC campuses.

Chair Cochran explained that she serves on the AB 928 Intersegmental Coordinating Committee. It is meeting regularly to try to design simpler pathways to meet the needs of transfer students. This sixteen-person committee is chaired by the CCC Chancellor's Office and is comprised of representatives from the administration of all three higher education segments and other higher education entities, such as the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, the State Department of Education, representatives from student government, and three additional political appointees from educational equity and social justice organizations. She also sits on a subcommittee that is charged with developing recommendations for an ADT for STEM with a maximum of 66 units.

Chair Cochran observed that Californians are coming from a personal place with transfer, not from an intellectual place. They want to know how to get their children into the schools of their choice. UC’s messaging needs to speak to those concerns.

The committee discussed transfer issues with the Senate Chair.
VI. Miscellaneous Topics
- Non-Pathway ADTs
- Adding Majors to Existing Pathways
- March Regents’ Item on Transfer
- Guarantees

The committee discussed how to move forward with pathways and ADTs.

Chair Chalfant provided an overview of the Regents’ Item on transfer and told the committee that the March meeting would include a recap of the Regents’ meeting and a progress report on the work on the Physics pathway.

The committee also agreed to language in a one-sentence description of a systemwide transfer guarantee, to share with BOARS.

The committee adjourned at 2:01 p.m.