

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
FACULTY SENATE

In Support of More Efficient and Effective Student Transfer to Enhance Access to Quality Education

WHEREAS: The California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) Faculty Senate fully support enhancing access to quality higher education by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of student transfer programs and procedures in California and especially within and between the California Community Colleges (CCC) and the California State University (CSU); and

WHEREAS: The CSUSB Faculty Senate recognize the significance of SB1440 (STAR Act, Padilla, 2010) in encouraging greater coordination and success of student transfer programs and procedures; and

WHEREAS: The CSUSB Faculty Senate equally recognize and lament the lack of faculty consultation prior to the introduction of SB1440; and

WHEREAS: The CSUSB Faculty Senate acknowledge that, in spite of diligent and often unfunded transfer design work by CSU and CCC faculty, implementation of SB1440 has not progressed in as timely and effective a manner as envisioned by its makers due, in part, to the inevitable complications of constructing a statewide program for 23 CSU campuses and over 110 community colleges; and

WHEREAS: The CSUSB Faculty Senate further recognize that activating SB1440 thus far has created significant unintended negative consequences such as threatening the quality of STEM programs and the quantity of STEM graduates and undermining the G.E. requirement for American Institutions; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the California State University San Bernardino Faculty Senate commend the diligent and thoughtful efforts in the implementation of SB1440 by CSU and CCC faculty, by their statewide academic senates, and by academic administrators in system and campus offices; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate likewise extol carefully considered proposals by faculty and administrators to constructively perfect SB1440 procedures (e.g., see attached document) in order to better reach SB1440 goals and protect educational quality for students at the same time; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate recommend that the Legislature consult with the CCC, CSU, and UC to design and pass follow-up legislation (e.g. SB440 in the current term, Padilla, 2013-14) which can facilitate the timely success of SB1440; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate ask that the Legislature encourage the continued cooperative work of all three faculty groups within the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (CCC, CSU, UC) in the perfection of this legislation and request a report with recommendations by 30 June 2014; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate also recommend that the system and campus chancellors or presidents of all three segments work with their appropriate provosts or chief academic officers to assist, coordinate, and advocate in this enhancement of transfer policies and procedures in cooperation with their faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate suggest to all involved that any immediate or later related legislation recognize that an AA transfer degree with General Education (GE) emphasis and community college certification should act as the default instrument for transfer; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate urge that the Legislature remove the 60/90 credit limits on upper division study post-transfer and that CSU/CO administration ease the exception policy on 120/180 credit limits for overall degree content in order to give students the best opportunity to graduate with meaningful and appropriate knowledge and skills in their subject/career fields and after allowing students to change majors/specialties within reasonable and normal parameters; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the CSUSB Faculty Senate distribute this resolution to:

- CSUSB President Morales, Provost Bodman, and Student Affairs leadership
- CSUSB student leadership (ASI)
- California State Student Association (CSSA)
- CSU Chancellor White and EVC/CAO Smith
- CSU campus presidents and provosts
- CSU Board of Trustees
- ASCSU and Chair Guerin
- CSU campus senate chairs
- California Community College Chancellor's Office
- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and Chair Pilati
- Academic Senate, University of California and Chair Powell
- California Senate Education Committee and Chair Liu
- Sen. Alex Padilla
- Sen. Darrell Steinberg, President Pro Tem
- California Assembly Higher Education Committee and Chair Williams
- Assembly member John Perez, Speaker
- The Campaign for College Opportunity

FSD 12-05

Approved by the CSUSB Faculty Senate, unanimously


 Jodie Ullman, Chair

April 9, 2013

Date



Academic Affairs
Office of the Provost and Vice President

March 7, 2013

Mr. Kim H. Tran
Policy Director
The Campaign for College Opportunity
1512 14th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Tran,

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the progress we have made on implementing SB 1440 and thank you also for the chance to preview the report issued by your organization. Your report on the extent of our compliance was somewhat inaccurate, but please be assured that CSUSB will be in full compliance with all applicable TMCs by the end of this academic year.

My purpose in writing is to make some suggestions on ways in which SB 1440 might be improved. As you know from our earlier conversation, I have followed the implementation of SB 1440 with considerable interest and increasing concern that it is actually not going to achieve what was intended. I want to recommend for your consideration a set of simple but critical changes that would both significantly strengthen the framework and make the opportunity for transfer accessible for all California students. These will vastly simplify the transfer framework and avoid some of the unintended consequences that derive from the imperfect drafting of SB 1440.

There is absolutely no question that a robust transfer articulation framework is needed in this state and I want to thank your organization for providing the impetus for creating it. As you know from the copy of a letter shared with you earlier, I had raised wide-ranging concerns with the CSU system about the potential difficulties in implementing SB 1440. Several of these have not been addressed and this explains, in part, why the legislation has been so problematic to implement.

The first recommendation is to make completion of an Associate's degree the default for transfer from a community college to a CSU, effective for students entering in Fall 2013 and beyond. One of the principal goals of the legislation was to create a credential for transfer in the form of an Associate's degree. This has not really occurred. Of the 542 applicants for Spring admission to CSUSB, all of whom claimed to be SB 1440 eligible, only 14 had actually completed a transferable program. In the absence of certification of the degree, the CSUs have to review every transcript by hand to determine whether a student is eligible. One of the unintended consequences of the legislation is that it has thus placed a huge additional burden on our Admissions staff. We need a way for Community Colleges to certify degree completion, ideally coupled with the ability for all community colleges to transmit electronic transcripts.

909.537.5024 • fax: 909.537.7015

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The second recommendation is to eliminate the 60/90 credit limitation from the upper division portion of the transfer degree. One of the critical flaws in the legislation is that it automatically excludes the nineteen per cent of degree programs in the CSU that currently exceed the upper division limit (60/90 units) set in the law. Importantly, most of these degree programs are in the sciences, so that one of the unintended consequences of the legislation is to make it impossible for students in critically needed STEM fields to access the general transfer framework. This problem can be solved simply and elegantly by removing the 60/90 upper division credit limitation.

The third recommendation is to eliminate the 18/27 credits in a particular major (or area of emphasis) as a component of the transfer legislation. I understand the thinking that led to a decision to make the transfer pathways major specific, but this has two unintended and negative consequences. First, it has produced massive complexity in implementation, so that sixteen months beyond the starting date set in the legislation, we have only 24 master transfer agreements in place, despite the vigorous and successful collaborative efforts of the faculty of the two systems. There are approximately 200 major pathways yet to be specified.

Let me pose one simple question. For majors in all of the humanities and social sciences (covering the bulk of the existing TMCs), do we actually need to have preparation in a specific major at the community college? Virtually all of the humanities and social science majors are sufficiently straightforward in their major requirements that they can be completed within 60/90 upper division hours.

Rather than narrow major-specific pathways, let me recommend, instead, that we create a transfer degree that satisfies all of lower division general education requirements and then allows students to select a major once they arrive at a CSU. The reason for this suggestion is that the legislation requires a student to select a major while in the community college and remain locked into that same major when they transfer. This is a behaviorally flawed assumption, inconsistent with actual student decision-making. The national data unequivocally suggest that students change their minds frequently about their desired major. Let me illustrate the issue from the CSUSB data. Upper division transfer students are required to declare a major on entry to the university, but only 51% of the last six year cohort (2006) actually graduated in that major (and that proportion has been declining over time). One of the unintended consequences of SB 1440 is that it may trap students into a major which they no longer wish to pursue, denying students flexibility, and this again argues for a broader framework of a general education transfer degree, allowing students both more time to decide on their major and some leeway to change their minds.

A fourth and complementary problem exists in the community colleges, relating again to the requirement for major specific pathways. Your report is critical of the community colleges for their failure to implement more than the required minimum of two pathways, but you don't address why. For smaller community colleges, in particular, the implementation of SB 1440 is extremely onerous. They simply do not have the resources to offer the preparatory courses in the complete range of majors envisaged in the legislation. This is again an argument for rethinking the legislation and abandoning the highly specific major pathways in favor of a broader framework.

Your report comes close to this position when it recognizes the desirability of having a more flexible approach to "areas of emphasis" (p.12). This is, of course, an undefined term in the legislation and is thus nearly impossible to implement. You can actually make it work if you

adopt the suggestion to create an Associate of Arts transfer degree, satisfying general education requirements, for all humanities and social science disciplines.


The fifth recommendation is that you consider identifying more specific pathways in only a few areas: in STEM fields, in business, and possibly in education. This could be implemented as a specifically tailored Associate of Sciences or an Associate in Business transfer degree, which would identify the recommended pathways that would lead to greater student success. As noted earlier, one of the unintended consequences of the legislation is that it actually discourages student participation in these areas of critical state need.

Finally, I do not understand why the legislation did not include students who wish to move from the community colleges to the University of California system. Surely the intent should be to allow all students the opportunity to transfer, not just a restricted set?

As you consider changes to the legislative framework, I would strongly encourage you to involve the campuses of both systems directly in the discussions so that we could have avoided a significant number of the issues we are now trying to address after the fact. Neither system appears to have provided well-grounded advice to you in drafting SB 1440.

I would be happy to assist you, as I'm sure would others on the campuses, who want to create a workable transfer system. You should know that I have substantial experience in this area. I was directly involved in crafting two of the three major pieces of transfer legislation in the state of Washington, testifying on both, and also served on the Board of Directors of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy for six years before moving to my present position.

Yours sincerely,



Andrew R. Bodman
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, San Bernardino

Cc: Board of Directors CCO
President Tomás Morales, CSU, San Bernardino
Professor Jodie Ullman, Faculty Senate Chair, CSU, San Bernardino
Executive Vice Chancellor Smith, CSU System
CSU Provosts