

eTranscript California Task Force Report Out

Overview

The Office of Cradle-to-Career Data convened the eTranscript California & Career Passport Task Force for the purpose of: 1) providing concrete, actionable recommendations for how to leverage eTranscript California to reduce administrative burden for students; 2) clarifying complementary systems and processes that are necessary to attain the concept of a Career Passport that would support skills-based hiring; and 3) documenting specific steps that various entities are ready to take in the next three years to advance this vision.

The task force is made up of representatives from the Association for Independent California Colleges & Universities (AICCU), The Wonderful Company (representing California Chamber of Commerce), California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), California Department of Education (CDE), California Department of Rehabilitation (DOR), California Federation of Teachers (CTA), California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), California State Board of Education (SBE), California State University Chancellor's Office (CSU), California Volunteers, Governor's Office of Business & Economic Development (GO-Biz), University of California Office of the President (UC), and a student.

February 15, 2024 Meeting

After learning about the difficulties that dual enrollment students experience getting credit for early college course taking, the task force considered two potential solutions: integrating transcript requests into college applications and creating a California postsecondary transcript standard.

Application Integration

The task force considered three foundational issues:

- Colleges require an official transcript from the community college(s) where dual enrollment coursework was taken, but students lack streamlined ways to report dual enrollment
- Inconsistent transcription processes may impact admissions decisions
- Current data structures make it difficult to track dual enrollment coursetaking

Based on the successful model already in place, whereby the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI) passes high school transcripts to CSU and UC as part of the

application process, the task force considered the following potential solutions:

- Send CCC coursework data from eTranscript California to CCGI to create a unified high school transcript that includes dual enrollment information
- Populate the CCC, CSU, and UC admissions applications with CCC coursework data to reduce manual entry
- Automate transcript requests within admissions applications so that final transcripts can be sent to the colleges where students are admitted, without cost

Task force members were supportive of having an option in the CCC, CSU, and UC applications to send transcript data via eTranscript California, with several task force members underscoring that the proposal would address equity gaps.

When implementing this solution, task force members stressed the importance of eTranscript California providing information on coursetaking across CCCs, such as when community college students take online courses offered by other institutions through California Virtual Campus, in addition to sharing information back to high schools on dual enrollment.

One task force member noted that when dual enrollment information is shared back with high schools, it will be important to have clarity about how those courses are noted in high school transcripts. The new California High School Transcript and Student Record Portability Standard (described below) will help to address this issue.

Some task force members noted that students might not want to share information on prior college coursework, so they should be able to proactively choose whether they want to send a comprehensive college transcript. Students should be made aware that for financial aid purposes, they must provide all college course records, even if they did poorly in a course. They also need to understand that dual enrollment courses will count toward their overall postsecondary units and be part of their college record. One task force member suggested creating toolkits for sharing this information to different audiences, such as students, parents, and counselors.

Some task force members expressed concern about whether the technical infrastructure would be able to deliver the high volume of transcripts during application season, and flagged the importance of having a robust and secure solution with clear

data governance. One member expressed concern that the cost might be significant for this type of solution, including technical, personnel, and professional development expenses. Clear roles and responsibilities would help to ensure smooth operations.

Another concern was providing adequate support to students related to using eTranscript California data to populate their prior coursetaking in the application form. Given that many students submit their applications close to the deadline, support would need to be in place to handle a large volume of support needs, at all hours of the day and night.

In addition to using eTranscript California to share dual enrollment course information back to high schools, some task force members felt it would be valuable to provide a definitive flag for whether specific dual enrollment courses meet a-g requirements (the sequence of courses high school students must take to be eligible for CSU and UC). Currently, there is no statewide "source of truth" for the a-g status of dual enrollment courses. If course crosswalks are created, there will need to be a mechanism for keeping this information up-to-date, with clearly defined roles and appropriate resources.

One task force member noted that while eTranscript California will help to share information on dual enrollment courses at community colleges, it will also be important to establish mechanisms for sharing information on dual enrollment courses taken at CSU, and identifying the a-g status of those courses.

Another task force member indicated that when communicating about the integration of eTranscript California into the college application forms, it would be important to address whether this change would impact the number of people employed by college admissions and records offices. The CSU representative clarified that the integration of CCGI's transcripts into CSU Apply had not changed the number of staff, but rather allowed those staff to focus more on personalized advising to students.

Finally, task force members flagged that any solution should be fully accessible for people with disabilities. The CCC representative verified that this would be part of the minimum specifications.

Transcript Standards

CCGI shared a process that was used to develop the California High School Transcript and Student Record Portability Standard, which will be used to streamline and align information exchanges between CDE, CCC, CSU, and UC. The task force then considered the possibility of developing a postsecondary transcript standard that can be used to share transcript information among CCC, CSU, UC, and independent colleges. eTranscript California currently uses a California-specific transcript standard for community college courses, but this standard is not applied to four-year institutions.

Creating a more comprehensive postsecondary standard would provide an opportunity to address updates needed to the existing eTranscript California Transcript Standard such as new Cal-GETC standards for general education requirements and documenting credit for prior learning. The standards would support further integration of data sets, including providing dual enrollment data (for both CCC and CSU) to populate CCGI's eligibility tools and with ASSIST to certify whether specific courses meet general education requirements.

One task force member flagged that the transcript standards will require a data element dictionary and detailed specifications for colleges to implement. Another noted that it would be important to identify how data from ASSIST would be included, given that it is the source of truth for whether course credits may be transferred to a CSU or UC, and if they count as electives or toward a specific major.

Task force members noted that it would be important to determine what the minimum transcriptable unit should be, such as potentially establishing a standard for documenting skills or competencies. This determination could help to clarify what information should be exchanged through eTranscript California (for academic purposes) and what should be integrated into the Career Passport (for employment purposes). One task force member suggested looking at ways that UC San Diego is currently documenting skills. Another noted that the adoption of competency-based education might further complicate the distinctions between academic and employment domains.

One task force member suggested creating potential use cases for sharing transcript data to inform the content of the standards. For example, in addition to Cal-GETC,

implications for associate degrees for transfers (ADT) should be considered. Another suggested that it would be important to understand whether the standards might affect curriculum either directly or indirectly. One task force member wondered how AP, IB, and CLEP scores might be integrated into the standard.

Several task force members wondered how information on credit-for-prior-learning would appear in the transcript, particularly related to how different types of credit should be noted (including as for course credit, as an elective that can be transferred to a CSU or UC, or as a course that will count toward a specific CSU or UC major). A clear policy is needed for how those credits are recognized.

The task force agreed that a subcommittee should develop a draft standard, which builds upon the existing eTranscript California standard, for review by the task force. This subcommittee should solicit input from the existing eTranscript California steering committee. CCC, CSU, UC, and AICCU representatives (particularly admissions staff, registrars, and articulation officers) should also be consulted, as well as students.

March 14, 2024 Meeting

Task force members learned about two tools that support student advising: college eligibility tools provided by the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI) and the CSU Transfer Planner. They then considered these two use cases to identify ways that eTranscript California could improve advising tools and discussed the feasibility of using the ASSIST data system to track CSU/UC college eligibility (a-g) status of dual enrollment courses.

CCGI Eligibility Tools

The task force considered four key issues:

- UC and CSU have different criteria for determining whether students are eligible to apply, including which courses they will accept. CCGI's tools leverage high school transcript data to provide individualized guidance about progress towards application requirements while students are still in high school, so they can prepare for the college of their choice.
- CCGI uses the Course Management Portal (CMP), which is managed by UC, to determine whether specific courses count toward a-g requirements. However

CMP does not include information on dual enrollment courses. As more students take dual enrollment courses, it will be harder for counselors to advise them on whether they are on target to apply to their chosen college.

- Students have to manually enter information about the a-g status of their dual enrollment courses as part of the CSU and UC college application process. Currently, both CSU and UC direct students to ASSIST (a database describing whether community college courses meet general education requirements and if they are accepted for transfer within a major) to determine a-g status of dual enrollment courses. However, ASSIST does not explicitly list the a-g status of dual enrollment courses.
- If students misunderstand whether a dual enrollment course fulfills a-g eligibility requirements, or if they enter the information incorrectly on their application form, they may be denied admission. Therefore, it would be helpful to have an official source of truth about the a-g status of specific dual enrollment courses that could be appended to the planned eTranscript California/CCGI data integration.

CSU Transfer Planner

The task force considered two key issues:

- The CSU Transfer Planner helps community college students understand whether they are taking the right courses to transfer to a specific CSU campus in a specific major. However, because student transcripts are not available to CSU until a student applies for transfer, the CSU Transfer Planner requires students to select which community college courses they have taken from a list generated from ASSIST.
- If eTranscript California were integrated with CSU Transfer Planner, and students gave permission to share their course data each term, the tool would provide more comprehensive and reliable information on transfer preparation, particularly regarding how courses fulfill CSU requirements.

Taskforce members brainstormed on how connecting data sets could improve advising tools, core considerations for implementation, required supports, and other opportunities to improve advising.

Task force members were supportive of integrating data sets, noting that doing so would provide more seamless access to information to support student planning, decrease confusion for students while increasing transparency of eligibility requirements, provide a more coherent picture of the courses students are taking to prepare for college while in high school (including repeated courses), and support dual enrollment students as seeing themselves as actively making progress toward a four-year degree--particularly in fields they may not have considered.

The task force also listed some additional functionality that this technical integration could create, such as recommendation engines that alert students to similar majors and what-if scenarios where students can see options based on their prior coursetaking or courses they are considering. In addition, UC's transfer planning tool (which also leverages ASSIST data) could integrate information from eTranscript California to provide similar functionality to CSU Transfer Planner.

When considering implementation considerations, task force members reprised an issue raised at the February meeting: the concern that students will not want to share information with colleges about their dual enrollment courses. They underscored the need to support students and counselors in understanding how dual enrollment counts toward both CSU/UC eligibility and transfer, particularly when the grade received in the course is taken into account.

The group also highlighted several technical issues, including establishing the appropriate technical infrastructure, data standards, and protocols. A workflow process should be defined for batch sending and updating transcript data to CCGI and CSU Transfer Planner, so that data are up-to-date and timing will work for advising and application timeframes. Ideally, students would give permission to share transcripts as a first step, so that information can be passed between institutions as needed. Task force members also reiterated the importance of ensuring that requirements are fully accessible to people with disabilities. This workflow should take into account existing integrations for sharing transcript data with CCGI and CSU. Ideally, ASSIST data would be appended to eTranscript California so that courses are tagged with information needed by four-year institutions to evaluate prior course-taking (both in the case of a-g and more generally).

In addition, an analysis should be done to understand the cost of implementation at the local level. Special attention should be paid to smaller institutions that may not have

staff capacity to support changes to existing processes. A staggered implementation could be considered, such as providing the service to an initial cohort of students.

Documenting a-g Status in ASSIST

The task force reviewed a proposal to use ASSIST to document the a-g status of dual enrollment courses, which would address the current challenge of missing dual enrollment designations in CCGI's advising tools and improve ASSISTS' current public website so that it documents how dual enrollment courses count toward both high school and college requirements. Currently, [CSU](#) refers students to the ASSIST website to inform how to fill out college applications related to the a-g status of dual enrollment courses and [UC](#) states that one criterion for whether a dual enrollment course counts toward a-g is if it is transferable to UC (which is documented in ASSIST).

In addition, the task force discussed the possibility of crosswalking a-g to other designations that are already recorded in ASSIST, such as general education requirements like Cal-GETC, to address the challenge of having UC personnel review each dual enrollment course to determine its a-g eligibility. Currently a team of three people is assigned to review each course submitted for a-g approval and to apply criteria established by faculty to determine its a-g designation.

Task force members expressed concern that ASSIST is not currently conceptualized as the place to learn about a-g requirements--it generally is used to understand whether community college courses will be accepted by CSU and UC for transfer. One person wondered if this would change the scope of the information that would need to be included in ASSIST. For example, if dual enrollment courses offered by CSU are included, would ASSIST now document whether UC accepts CSU courses? How should dual enrollment courses be treated that are not accepted for transfer?

One task force member noted a technical consideration: the importance of including course codes in ASSIST (rather than just course titles).

Another person noted that if data documentation were limited to dual enrollment courses that are developed through an MOU between a local education agency and a community college, then perhaps CMP might be a better location to store

information. However, another task force member pointed out that this would still put the onus on students who participate in dual enrollment through other mechanisms to identify and correctly describe individual articulation agreements between community colleges and specific four-year institutions. Another person expressed concerns that different LEAs have different standards for what is counted as an a-g course. Finally a task force member noted that the state needs to ensure there is capacity to swiftly review and update the a-g status of courses.

Returning to the idea of crosswalks, one task force member proposed that an initial mapping could be done based on all courses that are currently accepted for transfer, as well as the three sets of general education requirements (Cal-GETC, IGETC, and CSU-Breadth). Another person noted that technology could be used to identify courses that are highly likely to be eligible for a-g, so that effort can focus on courses that are less clear. Several task force members recommended that determinations about whether a dual enrollment course meets a-g requirements should be based on consultation with faculty.

Finally, one person wondered whether gaining an a-g designation might drive demand for specific dual enrollment courses.

The group agreed to create a subcommittee that will bring a proposal about how to map dual enrollment to a-g requirements to the full task force in June.

April 11, 2024 Meeting

Credit for prior learning (CPL) is the process that colleges and universities use to evaluate the college-level knowledge and skills an individual has gained outside of the classroom for college credit. Task force members learned about two efforts that support providing CPL: the Mapping Articulated Credit initiative (MAP) and Credential Engine. They then considered four potential strategies to support CPL as part of efforts to adapt and scale eTranscript California.

CPL Concerns

The task force learned about three key challenges:

For students:

- Students may not be alerted about CPL after they enroll and don't know that some colleges offer more CPL opportunities than others.
- When students become aware of their CPL options, it takes time to gather required documentation and meet with college staff to have their requests evaluated. This can have a significant impact on a student's educational planning and time-to-degree, particularly if they have already enrolled in courses that could have been satisfied through CPL.

For educators:

- Students can bring in a variety of work and learning experiences, making the process of CPL evaluation time-consuming for college faculty. In addition, California's colleges and universities provide learning opportunities that are not typically captured and shared on academic transcripts, such as digital badges, work-based learning, noncredit and extension courses, and portfolios.
- Many prior learning qualifications have not yet been evaluated for articulation, so the burden falls on colleges and faculty to understand the types of artifacts that are being submitted to determine if they represent equivalent forms of learning.

For documentation:

- Institutions have developed a variety of processes for documenting participation and outcomes, and share information in several different forms.
- There is no statewide, endorsed solution or interoperable set of platforms that allow individuals to continue to collect their learning throughout their lifetime in a format that ensures verified, secure data that can be easily used by receivers.

Mapping Articulated Credit (MAP)

The task force heard a presentation from Samuel Lee from MAP, which is an initiative sponsored by the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. After hearing about the significant economic benefits of CPL for learners, task force members learned how the initiative:

- Uses a faculty-led process to align prior learning with specific college courses
- Is creating a repository of CPL opportunities, so that colleges can see where CPL has already been granted, to inform their own decisions

- Has a public portal that allows students to search for CPL opportunities and allows students to upload training and certification documents that can be sent to colleges for evaluation for CPL
- Is coordinating with other statewide course documentation efforts such as common course numbering, C-ID, and the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory
- Is being integrated with student advising tools such as Program Pathways Mapper and the California Virtual Campus Exchange
- Is coordinating with Credential Engine to ensure information could be passed to colleges in other states
- Would benefit from integration with eTranscript California to document CPL that has been granted to individual students

Credential Engine

The task force heard a presentation from Scott Cheney from Credential Engine, a nonprofit that is helping to document credentials and their associated competencies. They learned how Credential Engine:

- Has created an open-source common language about the features of credentials, credentialing organizations, competency frameworks, and quality assurance, which allows records to be "interoperable," meaning that records can be shared across numerous systems
- Is working in 26 states to provide information for tools like e-transcripts, credential libraries, and creating learning and employment records
- Is coordinating with other national entities that are documenting transfer recommendations, competency frameworks, and course equivalencies, so that information can be more easily connected and shared

Potential Solutions

Taskforce members considered four potential actions that would support CPL as part of efforts to adapt and scale eTranscript California:

- Leverage MAP and tools like Credential Engine to build a statewide library of CPL opportunities
- Enhance the use of existing college planning tools by embedding CPL opportunities

- Build awareness and expedite evaluation processes by capturing CPL information at the point of application
- Establish consistent approaches for documenting and sending CPL-related credentials

Task force members were asked to vote on the action that is most important, but votes split across all four items. The group then brainstormed challenges, considerations for implementation, and policy/organizational changes needed to support CPL so that it is recognized for transfer, academic awards, and employment.

Task force members stressed that faculty must be the ones to approve CPL, as it is a form of articulation. This includes validating that students have mastered learning outcomes and ensuring that credit will conform with accreditation standards (Samuel Lee clarified that this is the process used by MAP). For example, some forms of learning that are documented in Credential Engine might not be accepted for academic credit by California's higher education institutions. This will be particularly true for courses used to meet CalGETC requirements, especially given differences in how CSU and UC recognize CPL.

Task force members recommended that CPL review include learning that is gained in contexts other than earning a certificate. For example, skills can be gained in apprenticeship programs, noncredit coursework, prison training programs, and community service (such as when working with people who are unhoused).

Several noted the value of engaging employers in reviewing potential CPL, building off of existing practices in industries like automotive. For example, employers could validate high-value skills in instances where there are no certifications that document core competencies or in industries that are evolving rapidly. Having a shared skills taxonomy would help to make this more possible.

Task force members indicated that CPL approval should be granted broadly, rather than asking each institution to review potential CPL, especially given the lack of funding for reviewing work. Task force members noted that it would be important to flesh out what that broader review process should look like. For example, a statewide body could be designated that would develop options for colleges to consider. Several felt

that it would be vital to document how CPL will articulate, so that it will consistently count toward degree requirements at CSU and UC. Other suggestions included leveraging the Related and Supplemental Instruction (RSI) system for registered apprenticeship and the state's Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). Consistent funding would be needed to sustain the review process for CPL.

Task force members indicated that it will be important to determine who will build and maintain a statewide CPL library, and that this enterprise should be funded to ensure that it continues to provide current information. One task force member recommended that statute be used to ensure that colleges adopt a consistent standard for documenting CPL and establish an authoritative source for CPL agreements (this has been done in other states, according to Scott Cheney from Credential Engine). Others noted that any new requirements should be tested to ensure they don't conflict with existing regulations. Regulations should also include safeguards to prevent predatory for-profits from using CPL in a way that is detrimental to students.

The group also focused on the importance of advising. For example, students should be counseled to only seek CPL for courses that support their certificate and degree goals, as too many units can jeopardize access to financial aid. Several stressed the importance of making low wage workers aware of opportunities to earn CPL. For-profit colleges are already advertising their ability to provide CPL, so public institutions should make clear that they also provide pathways to credentials for those who may not have considered college as an option. One task force member felt that students should be alerted at the point of application, to ensure CPL is part of their education planning.

Task force members recommended that instructional faculty and counselors be informed about the context in which CPL can be utilized and applied to student's majors. This would help to address concerns that CPL is not allowable and clarify what types of learning have been articulated for academic credit. Colleges will need to revise business processes to ensure that CPL is taken into consideration for education and career planning.

Finally, task force members noted the importance of using CPL as a way to support hiring practices (a topic that will be explored further at the May meeting). For example, one task force member described the relatively rigid approach taken by CalHR when

evaluating non-academic factors. If learning from volunteer and lived experience could be documented through CPL, it could help reduce hurdles experienced by job applicants to secure government jobs. Scott Cheney from Credential Engine noted that other states are struggling with using non-academic records in hiring due to limitations in HR systems and reticence among employers to devote time to developing skills-based hiring mechanisms.

The group agreed that the contents of this discussion should help to inform recommendations that will be reviewed at the June meeting.

May 9, 2024 Meeting

When launching the Master Plan for Career Education, the Governor called for a "Career Passport," an expanded transcript that includes academic credentials, marketable work skills, apprenticeships, internships, or other experiences outside the classroom. The purpose of a Career Passport is to support employers to focus on the skills that an individual has when hiring, in addition to degree attainment--particularly as a mechanism to reduce bias in hiring. This idea is being developed in other states and is known as a Learning and Employment Record (LER).

Skills-First Hiring

The task force learned that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has identified three interconnected lines of work needed for employers to focus on skills as well as academic credentials when hiring:

- Ensure all learning, both in academic and non-academic settings, is accounted for as vetted data in a cohesive repository, such as an LER
- Empower learners and workers to have access to, and agency over, sharing their LER data as a means to pursue their education and career goals
- Define skills, or competencies, as a means to encourage equitable hiring practices

It was also noted that eTranscript California could transfer enhanced academic data, including dual enrollment and credit for prior learning, into an LER.

Amber Garrison Duncan, Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer at Competency-Based Education Network (C-BEN) shared early lessons from other states, including:

- Employers trust education providers to validate skills
- Employers trust LERs to provide verification that the skills data they are receiving is from a true source (i.e., college, high school, credentialing organization)

So while LERs allow people to upload their own documentation of skills, such as products they produced on the job, employers appreciate some sort of verification. Some states have developed a credential registry to provide a list of mechanisms (such as badges) to affirm someone has a set of skills.

She also shared principles for LER development, including

- Creating open standards so information can be shared across technology platforms and can be connected to global hiring systems (note: a global mobility standard is currently being tested by several states)
- Developing policies for privacy and security to build trust, starting with existing education and workforce frameworks
- Taking an iterative, user-centered design approach with employers, residents, and education providers that gives learners control over their data and helps to identify gaps in existing platforms
- Aligning employers, states, and local, regional, and federal agencies on the work, leveraging public-private partnerships, and providing training to navigators in education, training, and workforce spaces
- Providing mechanisms for validating prior learning

Amber Garrison Duncan noted that states have pursued several different LER strategies:

- *State Provided:* All education providers in the state issue LERs without having to purchase new technology
- *State as Aggregator:* The state provides a digital wallet so education providers can issue LERs to a common place
- *State Enabler:* The state encourages organizations to issue LERs and incentivizes adoption

With this in mind, she raised several questions for implementation:

1) *How will access be provided to residents?*

- State Provided: All residents have access to a digital wallet and LER data
- State as Aggregator: All residents have access to digital wallet, but not all LER data
- State as Enabler: LER data exists, but will be discrete digital records

2) *How will access be paid for?*

- State Provided: All residents have access for free
- State as Aggregator: All residents have access to a wallet to store records over time, but may need to pay for data to be added
- State as Enabler: Residents may need to pay to access the LER

Task force members asked whether the skills and competencies documented in federal resources such as O*NET could be used to create skills taxonomies. Amber Garrison Duncan clarified that states are finding that taxonomies are too rigid, especially given the speed with which the employment market is changing. One promising practice is to look at trends in how job descriptions are evolving to create more real-time information.

Next, James Regan, Deputy Secretary for Workforce Development at the California Government Operations Agency outlined a skills-first hiring effort underway for state jobs. This includes:

- Identifying a desired skills taxonomy, including skills needed for the future
- Evaluating state job requirements to align with skills and removing barriers to alignment
- Implementing changes to policies and assessment practices to support skills-first hiring

After hearing about how two states are pursuing the development of an LER, the group then brainstormed ways that their agencies might use an LER. They noted:

K-12

- Create a repository for certificates that students earn during K-12

Community colleges

- Share data from noncredit programs, certifications, and experiential learning

- Drive collaboration between colleges and industry/workplace trainers and certifiers
- When credit for prior learning (CPL) is approved for courses aligned to certificates and training with defined competencies, visually verify those competencies in the LER, so employers are more likely to rely upon the value of those competencies

CSU

- Provide traditional transcript data for degrees, certificates, and credentials as well as learning outcomes of each course a student has engaged
- Use when hiring new employees

UC

- Share transcript data, course completion, degree completion, experiential learning, and extension courses
- Use when hiring new employees

LWDA

- Use as a universal tool across the public workforce system, including training provided through WIOA, apprenticeship, employer-based, labor-management partnerships, and community based organizations

Organized Labor

- Empower working people in their career development
- Understand needs and positions during collective bargaining
- Promote and improve equity in hiring practices
- Make information available to researchers to track and analyze workforce data

The task force members identified key considerations for implementing an LER, including:

Design

- Build the LER around a skills framework, with flexibility and ability for ongoing adaptation, and clear identification of what skills are
- Make sure the LER is accessible and easily navigable by workers who are not connected to education
- Ensure the solution is easy to use for Californians from all demographics, including those who are multilingual, have attained different education levels, etc.
- Make self-assessment and self-attestation of skills intuitive and accessible

- Include information on soft skills gained in education settings, such as by aligning to frameworks like “durable skills”
- Reflect the fact that not all education is in service of a specific career
- Identify current technologies in use--don't require agencies to use new tools when existing tools meet their needs
- Consider building the LER outside of the education system for broader buy-in, early usage, and private sector adoption
- Consider partnerships with the private sector for adoption, such as with platforms that have existing name recognition and wide usage such as LinkedIn and Indeed
- Base the design on work that has already been done in other states and the lessons learned
- Ensure there is adequate funding to sustain the tool

Employers

- Work with employers in healthcare, financial services, or manufacturing to support skills-first hiring
- Work with large and small employers to define the problems they are seeking to solve, develop solutions, and contribute to the design of the end product
- Engage many key industries in California to ensure interest and buy-in before embarking

Benefits

- LERs could support greater alignment of curriculum with industry needs and address concerns that higher education is less relevant than industry training, especially if there was a mutually accepted competency framework in place

Finally, task force members recommended the following actions:

- Begin by clearly defining the problem to be solved and exploring options, including scanning current state projects and technologies, identifying possible funding, determining which sectors are ready to implement skills-first hiring, documenting technology requirements, and collecting stories of how specific individuals in various sectors advanced in their career journey as the result of an LER

- Ensure that an LER will not reinforce the sense that some routes to knowledge are more valuable than others and document how LERs help to address bias in hiring
- Develop a proof of concept project that reflects the design principles developed through the exploration stage

June 6, 2024 Meeting

This meeting focused on finalizing recommendations based on input gathered at prior meetings. Task force members reviewed and edited a draft document in advance of the meeting, which included specific recommendations from the subcommittees on updating the eTranscript California standard and on how to document the A-G status of courses taken through dual enrollment.

Transcript Standards

Rena Martinez-Stluka from Fullerton College summarized the recommendations from the eTranscript Standards Subcommittee including:

- The current standards include flags to support dual enrollment, but they need to be consistently implemented
- The current standards include flags for the transfer status of courses, which would be improved if linked directly to ASSIST and could reduce the reporting burden on colleges
- Existing standards should be reviewed by entities that have developed guidance tools to make sure information can be integrated into those tools
- There are existing designations in the standards related to credit for prior learning (CPL), but they are insufficient
- Use the work underway for the Mapping Articulated Pathways (MAP) initiative, in alignment with national standards, to improve documentation of CPL in eTranscript California
- Ensure that any new standards for a Career Passport are aligned with national efforts to create Learning and Employment Records (LERs)

She noted that the subcommittee findings crystallize several ideas in the recommendations:

- Establish clear guidance about what information individual institutions need to track

- Determine what happens at the state level through data matches, versus at the local level for data tracking
- Engage individual institutions and guidance tool providers to understand implications for implementation
- Align with national efforts and standards

Task force members approved the adoption of this input into the broader set of recommendations.

A-G Status of Courses Taken through Dual Enrollment

Rebecca Farley, Associate Vice Chancellor, Kern Community College District and Omar Marquez, Assistant Principal, Valley View High School, Moreno Valley Unified described recommendations from the subcommittee on documenting A-G status for college courses.

The subcommittee recommended that ASSIST be used to document A-G status of college courses because:

- ASSIST already contains most courses taken through dual enrollment
- ASSIST will be providing other information about course characteristics to eTranscript California (e.g., Cal-GETC, transfer/major status)
- Counselors are already using ASSIST to understand other aspects of courses taken through dual enrollment to advise high school students

With appropriate funding, the technical infrastructure of ASSIST could:

- Track the A-G status of courses
- Build flags to address other requirements, including a flag for Language other than English (Area E) courses that count for two year languages other than English (LOTE) credit
- Include CSU and UC courses taken as dual enrollment

The recommendations include a list of technical considerations for changes needed to ASSIST.

Furthermore, existing faculty review processes could be leveraged to document A-G status for college courses taken as dual enrollment:

- Use existing, faculty-approved guidance on how college courses fulfill A-G requirements to create crosswalks to data elements already found in ASSIST (e.g., Cal-GETC)
- Ensure faculty affirm how guidance is translated
- Support faculty from CCC, CSU, and UC to review additional courses on an annual basis

The subcommittee recommendations include potential approaches for course evaluation.

Finally, given concerns that students might get confused about the status of courses on the ASSIST website, have ASSIST provide information to other tools to support high school students to select dual enrollment courses, such as:

- Change CaliforniaCollege.edu college eligibility tools so students and parents can find out how dual enrollment meets A-G, degree attainment, and transfer requirements
- Create resources that help students to determine why they should take a dual enrollment course, and how the course relates to potential short-term and longer-term goals
- Include information on whether courses that may be offered through dual enrollment also fulfill A-G in tools that help high school students explore majors, such as CSU and UC transfer planner tools

Han Mi Yoon-Wu of UC asked for clarification about whether dual enrollment referred to a specific type of course, given that high school students can take college courses in a variety of contexts. Subcommittee member Rebecca Farley clarified that while emphasis would initially focus on community college courses taken through dual enrollment, the intention was to expand to any course that could be taken at CSU or UC.

John Hetts from CCCCCO noted that this flexibility was desirable given CSU's intention to provide more courses that high school students might attend.

Facilitator Kathy Booth clarified that historically “dual enrollment” referred to a high school student taking college courses, but with the creation of College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) agreements, a new concept of a “dual enrollment course” has been introduced. The intention is to track information on high school students taking college courses in a variety of contexts.

Han Mi Yoon-Wu of UC then asked about the recommendation to include CCC and CSU in review of whether college courses meet a-g status, given that this has traditionally been the sole purview of UC. John Hetts from CCCCO clarified that the intention was to consult faculty from other segments before UC establishes the a-g designation. He then noted that the community colleges have been gaining insights on ways to establish course equivalencies through the process of establishing common course numbers. They have been using artificial intelligence (AI) to determine the degree of overlap between course syllabi, as well as researching the longer-term success rates of students who follow specific course sequences. This can aid faculty in determining how courses differ and whether the differences result in students not having the prerequisite skills for subsequent course mastery.

Mia McIver of CFT, requested that any recommendation involving AI protect the intellectual property within course materials.

The task force amended the recommendations to note a process of CCC and CSU consultation before UC determines the A-G course designation for college courses and to explore the use of AI and research to evaluate courses that do not have Cal-GETC designations.

Role of Employers

The task force then reviewed a visual that clarified how thinking about the data ecosystem needed for eTranscript California and a Career Passport had evolved over the six month span of the task force.

Abby Snay of LWDA appreciated that employers now appeared on the graphic, but noted that they were only shown as the end point for information, as opposed to being a vital player in assessing the new data ecosystem. For example, would it be possible to

create a real-time feedback loop from employers on needed skills to inform educational offerings? Or how could employers validate the information being provided through the Career Passport?

The task force amended the recommendations to include an item on creating and funding continuous improvement loops with employers regarding the Career Passport, to ensure that it is useful in a variety of employment settings. They also emphasized the need to work with employers on the design of a Career Passport.

Free Transcripts and California Unified Public Postsecondary Transcript

John Hetts of CCCCO requested that a recommendation be included regarding making eTranscript California free. April Grommo of CSU noted that some colleges use transcript fees as a flexible revenue source. The task force agreed to include a recommendation that eTranscript California be offered as a free resource for sharing information on courses taken at participating institutions and also to recommend funding to compensate colleges for lost revenue.

Next the group discussed a point of clarification from UC -- the decision to have eTranscript California be the common transcription service for CSU and UC, in addition to CCC. The facilitator clarified that this recommendation was necessary to transmit information on students participating in dual enrollment at CSU and UC and to improve advising tools like transfer planners.

April Grommo of CSU indicated that the segments would need to commit to wholesale adoption to realize the benefits of a common tool--otherwise some students would not have the benefit of stronger advising tools or streamlined applications. She noted that the eTranscript California advisory board had been contemplating this type of universal adoption for a period of several years.

The Task Force amended the recommendations to clarify that eTranscript California should be rebuilt to allow for the inclusion of CSU and UC transcripts, but that additional time be provided for CSU and UC to determine how to move forward with the capacity to send as well as receive transcripts using the platform. The recommendations note that CCC will support the universal adoption of eTranscript California to both send and receive transcripts.

Kari Steward of UC asked for an opportunity to clarify this point with colleagues before finalizing the recommendation.

Credit for Prior Learning

Several task force members raised concerns about the process for evaluating credit for prior learning. Mia McIver of CFT suggested that California regulate CPL providers, particularly as non-academic learning becomes more valuable for employment and the market may be flooded with low-quality options.

Samuel Lee of the Mapping Articulated Pathways (MAP) Initiative noted that they ensure faculty evaluate prior learning before granting academic credit, but noted that they do include information on credentials that have not yet been evaluated by California faculty. As the number of certifications and badges grow, it will be important to establish standards for what is included.

Abby Snay of LWDA noted a parallel issue with apprenticeship, which has been diluted by the creation of non-registered options. She also raised the potential value of having employers validate whether credentials include high-value competencies.

The task force added language about the need for regulation related to quality, recommended exploring ways to include employers in evaluating credentials, and amended the examples of options for CPL to specify registered apprenticeship.

The meeting concluded with an agreement that task force members will review the edited recommendations and provide written verification that they concur with the final version. Some minor revisions were made, largely to further clarify language and to provide additional exemplars.

The following task force members confirmed the updated recommendations:

- Andy Anzaldo, Chief Operations Officer of Corporate Social Responsibility, The Wonderful Company
- Todd Britton, Chief Information Officer and Vice President, Office of Information Technology, the University of La Verne

- April Grommo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Strategic Enrollment Management, California State University Chancellor's Office
- John Hetts, Executive Vice Chancellor, Innovation, Data, Evidence, and Analytics, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
- Jake Johnson, Chief Information Officer, California Department of Rehabilitation
- Michael Karavolias, Sustainable Innovation Specialist, Governor's Office of Business & Economic Development
- Mia McIver, President of the Universities Council, California Federation of Teachers
- Travon Reed, student at East Los Angeles College and Housing Navigator, Homeless Outreach Program Integrated Care System
- Laura Rodriguez, Senior Policy Director, California State Board of Education
- Abby Snay, Deputy Secretary, Workforce Strategy, California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
- Liberty Van Natten, Division Director, Educational Data Management Division, California Department of Education
- Jacqueline Yannacci, Chief Program Officer, California Volunteers
- Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions, University of California Office of the President