1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of 3.10-11.04; 4.2.04
4. Announcements
5. Times Certain: Liaison Report: L. Roth
6. Items of Business
7. Transfer Issues:
   i. Proposed 45/15 pattern:
      - Resolution: AS-2645-04/AA Support for a Systemwide Core/Campus Specific Transfer Pattern by Degree Program in the California State University
      - Proposed resolution (revised 3.28.04)
      - Proposed resolution (revised 2.26.04)
      - Resolution: AS-2651-04/AA Response to SB 1785 (Scott and Alpert): Public postsecondary education: dual admissions education
      - Summary of findings from transcript study.
      - Draft of *Diminishing Access to the Baccalaureate through Transfer*
   ii. Process for reaching consensus on systemwide and regional course requirements: Integrated Teacher Preparation Program, proposed 45/15 pattern, etc.
      - Resolution: AS-2648-04/AA Principles for Reaching Consensus on Regional and Statewide Program Alignment in the California State University
   iii. Intra-CSU transfer
      - "Excess" units:
        1. Resolution: AS-2646-04/AA Definition of Sanctionable Units
        2. Ideas for fewer units:
           - Self-support MA programs: see EO802 for possible suggested revision of section C.1 on page 2 of the EO http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-802.pdf
           - AB1932: CCC baccalaureate degree
           - SB1415: Common CAN
           - Possible revision of addendum to EO365. See: http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-365.pdf (Awaiting draft changes from Jo Service.)
8. Reports
9. Other
1. What is the perceived problem?
Both native and transfer CSU students graduate with more credits than are required to complete their degrees, native students with an average of 142 semester units and transfer students with an average of 141. These students take up seats that could provide access for new, eligible students who now may be denied admission. Initiatives to facilitate native students' progress to degree are being developed or implemented on each CSU campus. Yet a significant issue remains as two thirds of CSU graduates are transfers from the California Community Colleges (CCC). For these students the growing impaction of CSU campuses means that they may not be admitted to the campus of their first, or even second, choice. These students need clear information about what courses to take in both general education and their degree program, especially courses that will meet major degree requirements regardless of which CSU campus admits them.

2. What is the goal?
The goal of both the statewide academic senate and the CSU administration is to provide access to the baccalaureate for a greater number of students. Reducing the number of units taken beyond those needed for the degree is a necessary strategy given budget reductions. Beginning fall 2005 Title 5 requires at least 60 semester/90 quarter units for upper-division transfer, and the CSU, with few exceptions will no longer accept lower-division transfer students. Transfer students who enter the CSU with 60+ units applicable to their degree program will take fewer units beyond those needed for the degree.

3. What do transfer students’ extra units result from, students’ actions and behaviors at the CCC or CSU?
Both (according to a chancellor’s office study of 1,952 of transcripts of CCC transfer students who graduated from the CSU in 1999). Transfer students take an average of 76 semester units after transfer; part of the reason for the high number of units may be to make up for units taken at the CCC that do not count toward the degree.

4. What are possible actions the CSU can take in response to the problem of excess units accrued by transfer students?
Two responses have been considered: dual admission or a systemwide core/campus specific pattern of for each major. Dual admission would likely address the problem and may be the preferable solution, but it has been attempted in the past and was not supported by the CCC. Dual admissions can apply only to students who were CSU-eligible at high school graduation and will not affect transfer students who establish their eligibility for transfer based on their work in community college.

6. What makes up the systemwide core/campus specific pattern and why is it thought to be workable?
The systemwide core/campus specific approach facilitates transfer through a systemwide 45-unit common transfer pattern by degree program while retaining flexibility for local campuses to maintain a unique campus identity for their degree programs through the remaining transferable units and, of course, the required upper-division courses in the major degree program.

The pattern includes:
1. As of fall 2005, students must complete 60 semester/90 quarter units before transfer.
2. Students must declare a degree program/major as soon as possible and no later than the point of application to the CSU. This will help to ensure that units students take will count toward their CSU degree and that students receiving financial aid will still be eligible for the most semesters after transfer.
3. The 60/90 transferable are grounded in a common core for each degree program of 45 semester/68 quarter units acceptable at all CSU campuses. That is, the core may vary by degree program and the program transfer core may differ from program requirements for native students. For many programs the transfer core will include lower-division general education requirements and coursework applicable to the degree program, which may be prerequisite to the major. Programs are not limited to 45/68 units of agreement.
4. For high-unit or high-preparation programs, such as those in business, science, engineering, nursing (and some other programs), students may need to focus more on prerequisites and delay some general education courses until arrival at the CSU campus. For majors without lower-division courses or prerequisites, the pattern of coursework should resemble that required of native students so as not to disadvantage transfer students.

5. Campuses may specify the additional units which will be acceptable at that campus.

6. Students must commit to a major degree program and a specific CSU campus and will be given the highest admission priority in order to take additional units applicable to the degree program at the specific CSU campus.

7. What would be some of the complications in implementing such a plan?

   Complications include:
   1. The success of any program to facilitate progress to degree depends on effective communication and, especially, timely and accurate advising at a time when assigned time for advising is being reduced or eliminated on CSU campuses.
   2. The transfer pattern does not take into account the relationship among “excess” units, minimum coursework requirements for financial aid, and lack of available courses applicable to the degree program.¹
   3. Even with attainment of the priority status, students may not gain admission to the campus(es) they commit to; the priority may or may not apply at another campus.
   4. Community colleges may not offer some of the necessary courses.
   5. A small number of students may game the system by taking majors with lesser requirements, then changing majors upon arrival at the CSU.
   6. Program costs may rise for the CSU with a decline in larger enrollment, lower division general education and prerequisite courses as students take more upper-division courses which are more expensive to staff.
   7. The timing of major declaration and transfer application and admission may not allow students to know the final 15 units required for priority admission at a given campus.
   8. Majors, especially "low visibility" ones, may be affected differentially by a requirement for major declaration by the end of the freshman year, since students may select majors such as communication, anthropology, or health sciences only after taking a general education course in that area.
   9. Implementation may lead to upper-division CSU courses, including those in the major, being designated for CCCs to teach in the lower division with certification of lower division courses "covering" the same material?

8. To what extent would the systemwide core/campus specific pattern reduce the number of excess units taken at the CCCs by transfer students?

   The pattern would presumably reduce difficulties in advising for CCC students and counselors caused by campus variation in requirements for lower-division major and major prerequisite courses and would encourage focused, purposeful student behavior by offering preferential admission status.

9. How will we know if the pattern has made a difference?

   A. The CSU will track and compare progress to degree to see whether a substantial number of transfer students attain the new admission priority status and whether those students then graduate with fewer units.

¹ The federal government requires that Financial Aid Offices monitor a student's time to degree, GPA, and yearly units completed in determining aid eligibility. Each college or university sets its own requirements caused by campus variation in requirements for lower-division major and major prerequisite courses and would encourage focused, purposeful student behavior by offering preferential admission status.
The AAC was supportive of the 39+6+15 as a means of setting up a priority for admitting transfer students to the campus/major of their choice. The "priority admission" concept was the key factor and the discussion did not go beyond supporting the proposal other than for priority admissions purposes only. The 60 unit limit proposal was not discussed since we were told by Ray that there had been a rethinking of that item.

Everyone at the table, admissions people, presidents etc. acknowledged that there would be many, many implementation issues to address including common agreement of the 6 units of major core prep, extensive retraining of admissions personnel and added time to process applications by major instead of by general requirements. *No doubt CMS/Peoplesoft will be able to handle these complex processes with ease ;)*

The AAC also questioned as to how a priority for admission could transfer to a second choice campus when the campus' specialized 15 hadn't been met and/or if the student hadn't applied to a second campus and their second choice was closed.
After a thorough discussion, the Admission Advisory Council supports the following components of the proposed Statewide-45/Campus-15 unit academic road map transfer policy:

- Completion of 39 semester units of General Education rather than the current minimum of 30 semester units, subject to high unit majors and other unique major requirements;
- Completion of a minimum of 6 semester units (equivalent of about two courses) of lower division major prerequisite courses. (Note the use of the word “minimum” which provides flexibility for a campus major to designate additional lower division major preparation courses as part of the remaining 15 units.);
- Completion of 15 campus-specific semester units which recognizes the campus’ unique qualities and individual strengths; and
- Expectation that a student identify a major and election of a campus by the time the student has completed 30 to 45 units.

The support for these component parts of the Statewide-45/Campus-15 unit academic road map is conditioned upon a clear understanding, as stated in the Academic Affairs Committee’s briefing document, that students who complete this road map will be given the highest priority for admission among transfer enrollment categories. In addition, the Admission Advisory Council recognizes that several operational issues will need to be addressed if the policy is implemented.
Summarized Findings of the Study of CSU Graduates Who Transferred from a California Community College to the California State University

The study evaluated transcripts of 1,952 students who transferred from California Community Colleges and graduated from CSU in spring 1999. The samples were drawn to be statistically representative of CSU enrollment.

1. California Community College (CCC) transfer students complete an average of 141 semester units for the baccalaureate degree. This compares favorably with students who begin freshman year study at the CSU and graduate with an average of 142 units.

2. The average number of total transferable and non-transferable CCC units completed prior to transfer to CSU is 81.5 semester units.

3. The average number of non-transferable, non-baccalaureate CCC units (e.g. remedial or vocational courses) is 8.8 semester units or approximately 3 courses.

4. The average number of transferable CCC units completed in excess of 70 (semester) units allowed by Title 5 is 6.9 semester units, or approximately 2 courses.

5. The average number of CCC units transferred to CSU is 65.4 semester units.

6. More than one third (39%) of the students who transfer to CSU attended more than one CCC prior to transfer, and some students also attend four-year colleges.

7. Half of the CCC students transferred with general education fully certified under either the IGETC program or the CSU GE-Breadth program.

8. Slightly more than one third (39%) of the students in the study completed an associate degree or technical certificate prior to transfer to the CSU.

9. The average number of units that do not apply to requirements in an upper division transfer student’s degree at the time of graduation is 9.9 semester units, or approximately 3 courses.
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Introduction: A Shift in the Landscape of California Higher Education

California policymakers are facing their biggest challenge in financing public higher education since the adoption of the Master Plan in 1960. Starting with the denial of qualified transfer applicants by the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) in 2003-04 and continuing with the planned redirection of UC/CSU-eligible freshmen to the California Community Colleges (CCC), the state is no longer meeting its commitment to admit students according to the eligibility criteria laid out in the plan. This paper highlights the threats to the transfer function posed by the severe fiscal crisis and the policies that it has fostered. We focus in particular on underrepresented minority students because their educational attainment is critical to the economic and social health of the state in the coming decades. This is just one of the many worrisome higher education issues that are deserving of heightened attention.

As the Legislature and the Governor consider how best to target scarce state subsidies for postsecondary education, they should be fully aware of the likely consequences of their policy decisions throughout the whole postsecondary system. There appears, however, to be an implicit assumption in the Governor’s Budget, as well as in the Legislative Analyst’s recommendations, that limitations on access to UC and CSU are manageable because the community colleges provide a safety net that can be called upon to serve everyone else. This paper challenges that assumption by describing how recent trends and proposed new policies are straining the capacity of the community colleges and reducing the viability of the transfer function that is the mechanism by which the promise of the Master Plan is delivered.

California has recently proposed a set of state goals to drive policy decisions for higher education, like several states before us have done. These goals include achieving participation and completion rates across the population sufficient to sustain the social and economic benefits that Californians expect. Raising barriers to the completion of a baccalaureate education by the state’s growing populations of color will prevent the state from achieving these goals.

California’s Poor Record of Educational Achievement

A few facts call attention to the sobering challenge facing California policymakers:

- California is below the national average in the percent of adults, ages 25-34, that have a bachelor’s degree;
- California is in the bottom one-third of states in the percent of high school graduates that earn a bachelor’s degree within six years;
- California is dead last among states in the percent of bachelor’s degree completers that are Latino and African American compared to their share of the 18-year-old population.

The following table further illustrates this last point. It shows that California loses far more Latinos and African Americans along the path to the baccalaureate, in relative terms, than do other states.
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Table 1
Percent that is African American/Latino at Various Stages of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of 18-year olds</th>
<th>% of High School Graduates</th>
<th>% of First-Time Freshmen</th>
<th>% of BA Completers</th>
<th>Total Drop-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>- 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National avg.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>- 16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data are alarming from both a social equity and an economic development perspective. The California economy depends more than other states on a highly trained workforce.¹ We should be educating more, not fewer, of our young adults and we should ensure that Californians from all racial/ethnic groups are educated for the new economy.

Importance of the Transfer Function in California

California’s 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education reserved four-year college attendance for the state’s most well prepared high school graduates but promised all students, regardless of preparation, a chance to pursue a baccalaureate degree by first attending a community college. Students who successfully fulfilled a minimum set of requirements at a community college were guaranteed a place at one of the public four-year institutions.

Community colleges were designed to be a more substantial part of the higher education system in California than in many other states. Community colleges enroll approximately 75 percent of California’s college students, while the national average is less than 40 percent.² Community colleges play an even greater role in the education of California’s underrepresented minority students. Nearly 80 percent of African American and Latino college students in California are enrolled in the community colleges.³ With the Latino population ages 15 to 24 projected to increase by 54 percent between 2000 and 2010⁴ the reliance of the state on its community college sector will likely grow. A functional transfer process is therefore essential to providing equitable access to the social, economic, and civic benefits of a baccalaureate education.

Maintaining the Master Plan promise of access to the baccalaureate for community college students requires that the colleges have adequate support and capacity to prepare students for transfer and that the state’s public universities have the capacity to accommodate all students who meet the requirements and seek to transfer.⁵ Policymakers should be alerted to recent developments that are threatening these basic conditions for an effective transfer function.

Threats to Access for Community College Students

California’s promise of access to the baccalaureate through the community college transfer function is under threat from:

1. reductions in state appropriations for higher education institutions;
2. increasing eligibility requirements above those set forth in the Master Plan;
3. decreasing college affordability; and
We discuss each of these in turn.

(1) **Reduced Appropriations to Higher Education Institutions**

After increasing steadily over the four-year period between 1997-98 and 2001-02, expenditures on the three public segments of higher education leveled off in 2002-03, then fell by nearly seven percent overall in 2003-04. The Governor’s proposed budget for 2004-05 includes no funding for enrollment growth at UC or CSU, and imposes substantial cuts to both systems – a seven percent reduction for UC and an eight percent reduction for CSU. The Governor proposes modest increased enrollment funding for the Community Colleges that is not nearly commensurate with likely enrollment demand. Cuts in state appropriations to UC and CSU are only partially offset by increased student fee revenue, more so at UC than at CSU.

Declining state appropriations are all the more consequential because they have occurred during a time of sharp enrollment growth and rapidly increasing educational costs. In the three years prior to the leveling off of funding, full-time-equivalent (FTES) enrollment in the three public segments increased by an average of 7.4 percent per year, and funding per FTES fell. At the same time, state funding has not kept up with significant cost increases in health benefits, retirement, utilities, and other areas. Table 2 on page 9 shows that appropriations per FTES are down considerably at UC and CSU and for the three segments in total. The combined effect of reduced state appropriations, enrollment growth, and increased costs has been the inability of the system, collectively, to accommodate projected growth as it has in the past.

**Restricted access to community college courses.** The Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office estimates that 175,000 students were unable to find space in the community colleges this year due primarily to a severe reduction in course offerings forced by limited budgets. With open enrollment, the only means available to community colleges to bring enrollment in line with available resources is to reduce the number of course sections offered. Offerings have declined by as much as 25 percent in some districts and by about six percent systemwide. A severely constricted class schedule forces stiff competition among students for seats in classes. Those who lose this competition need additional semesters to complete the coursework required for transfer, and may be discouraged from enrolling altogether. The greatest impact on access has been felt by students who are not as savvy to deadlines, fees, financial aid, and ways to navigate the system. These students don’t know how to “play the game” of getting into “full” classes. Nor are they as likely to have the means or the schedule flexibility to take courses at multiple locations at whatever times they can find them. The three percent growth funding proposed in the 2004-05 Governor’s budget makes no accommodation for the large number of students who have already been shut out of the community colleges and could be looking to return. We should therefore expect the stiff competition for seats to continue to shut out students, many of whom will be first generation and underrepresented minority students.

**Restricted access to UC/CSU as a transfer student.** Both UC and CSU restricted the enrollment of transfer students this year in an effort to match enrollment with available resources. UC did
not accept any transfers for the winter term, returning approximately 1,600 applications submitted by students seeking to transfer.\textsuperscript{12} Many CSU campuses did not accept any transfer applications for the Spring 2004 term. Application patterns for the next academic year (2004-05) suggest that the enrollment management measures are producing pent-up demand among community college students. The number of students applying to transfer to UC for Fall 2004 reached record levels, representing a 12.9 percent increase over Fall 2003.\textsuperscript{13} With the lack of funding for enrollment growth at UC and CSU, the availability of transfer slots will be further limited. The Governor’s Budget acknowledges that “UC and CSU may need to expand enrollment growth-control measures that were initiated in 2003-04.”\textsuperscript{14}

(2) **Increasing Transfer Admissions Criteria at UC/CSU**

Unlike the community colleges, UC and CSU can adjust admissions standards in order to limit enrollment. An undergraduate program can be designated as “impacted” when it receives more applications from fully qualified applicants than it can accommodate within its instructional resources and physical capacity. In some cases, entire campuses are designated as impacted because all programs are enrolled to capacity. When a program or campus is impacted, additional requirements for transfer are imposed above those specified in the Master Plan, thereby increasing selectivity in the admissions process. If an eligible student applies to an impacted campus and is not accepted, efforts are made to redirect or refer the student to a campus where there is an opening in the student’s field of interest.

Within the CSU system, the San Diego, San Luis Obispo, and Long Beach campuses are impacted in all programs. Across the system the number of impacted programs is growing rapidly, from 30 in 2000-01 to 72 in the current year.\textsuperscript{15} As regional universities, CSU campuses offer a “local area guarantee” to transfer students who attend a community college in their region.\textsuperscript{16} Local students must be admitted to an impacted campus according to the basic CSU admission criteria; out-of-region applicants must meet the more competitive supplemental criteria. However, admission to an impacted campus does not guarantee admission to a specific program. In 2002-03, nearly 1,800 transfer applicants who met the basic eligibility requirements of the Master Plan were denied admission to the CSU system, representing a 133 percent increase over two years.\textsuperscript{17}

UC offers admission *somewhere in the system* to all transfer-eligible applicants, although the system relies more heavily than CSU on a redirection process. Many UC programs require a GPA higher than the minimum of 2.4 specified in the Master Plan, some substantially higher, and also require additional coursework for transfer applicants above the minimum criteria. Many community college students who are UC-eligible according to the Master Plan, in effect are only eligible to attend UC Santa Cruz or UC Riverside, as those are the only campuses where many programs can accommodate transfer students meeting only the minimum criteria.

It is difficult to estimate the effect of increased admissions standards at UC and CSU on transfer, as we do not know how many students are discouraged from ever applying for admission by the higher requirements at their campus or program of choice. In addition, neither CSU nor UC could provide specific data on the enrollment rate of transfer applicants who are redirected to
alternate campuses, but both segments agreed that it is low. As more UC/CSU programs increase their admission requirements due to impaction, eligibility for transfer becomes a moving target and transfer becomes more elusive. Many students, particularly those who are place-bound, will find redirection to be an unmanageable barrier to transfer due to work, family, and/or financial considerations.

(3) **Reduced Affordability of College**

On top of the 30 percent fee increases that went into effect at UC and CSU in 2003-04, the Governor’s 2004-05 Budget includes several proposals that would increase students’ costs:

- A 10 percent fee increase at UC and CSU beginning Fall, 2004 (the UC Regents are considering raising fees by 15 percent);
- a reduction in the availability of the state’s need-based Cal Grant financial aid through a 10 percent reduction in the maximum allowable income for grant recipients;
- a decoupling of Cal Grant award levels from UC and CSU fee levels so that the higher fees proposed for those systems will not be accompanied by higher financial aid; and
- a reduction in the set-aside of revenues generated from student fee increases for need-based institutional aid (from 33 percent to 20 percent of the revenues).

Since student fees in California’s public colleges and universities are well below national averages, modest increases are reasonable provided they are accompanied by sufficient financial aid. The Governor’s proposals, however, will reduce the affordability of college by reducing financial aid as fees rise. This decreased affordability will deter some community college students from transferring, particularly those from lower-income and underrepresented minority populations, as research demonstrates that the enrollment decisions of these groups are often more price sensitive. In addition, more UC/CSU-eligible students could choose to enroll in a community college where they can attend at 10 or 20 percent of the cost, respectively. As we discuss below, these students could crowd out more traditional community college students for whom the colleges represent the only pathway to the baccalaureate.

(4) **Crowding Out of Traditional Community College Students**

We noted above that a fierce competition for seats in community college classrooms is forcing out less prepared or less savvy students – those said to have less “educational capital” from family and personal experiences with college. Two of the Governor’s proposed policies threaten even greater displacement of students for whom community colleges are the only viable option.

**Redirection of UC/CSU-eligible students.** The Governor proposes to redirect 10 percent of UC/CSU-eligible freshmen (7,000 students) to the community colleges as a means to reduce state costs and accommodate students somewhere within the system. This proposal assumes that the three percent enrollment growth funding for community colleges is sufficient to cover this added enrollment. However, three percent approximates the level of growth (about 50,000 students) that would be expected in the absence of other major factors. It ignores the impact on community college enrollment demand of the drop in affordability of UC/CSU and the estimated 175,000 students shut out of the community colleges this year who may try to re-enroll. With
demand far exceeding capacity at community colleges once again, we can expect the redirected students to crowd out traditional community college students in the competition for seats.\textsuperscript{21}

\textit{Reduced Cal Grant aid to students attending private institutions.} The Governor proposes to reduce by 44 percent (from $9,708 to $5,482) the amount of Cal Grant aid provided to students attending private colleges. This increased out-of-pocket cost of private college will likely decrease the use of private sector capacity and increase already severe capacity problems at the public universities. This could in turn push more UC/CSU-eligible students to the community colleges and exacerbate the crowding out of students for whom community colleges are the only route to a baccalaureate education.

\textbf{Conclusions and Policy Issues}

Budget constraints and enrollment pressures have led to a set of policy responses that are reducing access to the baccalaureate for underrepresented minority students whose educational attainment is critical to the state’s economic and civic health. The pathway to the baccalaureate for so many of these students is the community college transfer route. That pathway is narrowing due to capacity constraints at both the community colleges and the universities and reduced affordability. If present trends continue, many of the underrepresented minority students traditionally served by the community colleges will find transfer to be an unreachable goal for the variety of reasons outlined in this paper.

As policymakers consider their options in the coming months and years, they should be careful about what they ask of the community colleges. While it is tempting to view the community colleges as a safety net and ultimate guarantor of the Master Plan promise of access, that expectation can be realized only if the community colleges are assigned a manageable mission and provided with sufficient institutional capacity. What follows is a set of policy issues and related questions aimed at framing policy discussions about baccalaureate education. Even in a time of severe fiscal constraints, higher education policy and finance can be driven by conscious, considered decisions about how to balance the interests of students and taxpayers to generate the best educational outcomes for Californians. There has been a tendency in California to rest on the past promise of the Master Plan and fail to address some of the more difficult questions that may not have been vital in the past, but are certainly central to today’s circumstances.

\textbf{Issue \#1: The Role of the Community Colleges in Lower Division Preparation}

\textbf{Related policy questions:}

- Should the community colleges play a larger role in delivering lower division baccalaureate education to students whom we have historically defined as eligible for UC or CSU?
- Are we willing to see the traditional CCC student population increasingly crowded out of classes if more UC/CSU-eligible students attend?
- What is the likely impact on student completion, time-to-degree, and on the state’s overall degree production, of redirecting UC/CSU-eligible students to the CCC?
• How much will the state actually save by greater use of the community colleges once changes to completion rates and time-to-degree are accounted for?
• Does the state have the wherewithal to increase subsidy levels at the CCC so that the breadth of curricular and co-curricular programs can be comparable to those at UC and CSU?
• What is the impact on the undergraduate experience at UC/CSU if the ratio of upper division to lower division students increases above 60/40?
• Does the heavy workload at the CCC for remediation, basic skills, and occupational education limit their capacity to provide a larger transfer role at all campuses?

The bottom line. Policymakers need to recognize that there are potential value conflicts at play. On the one hand we resist notions of accountability and efficiency for the CCC that we more easily apply to the four-year university (i.e., completion rates, time to degree) because we see the CCC as providing much needed opportunities for many students who are not yet prepared for the rigors of a university education. On the other hand we increasingly expect those institutions to be efficient and acceptable substitutes for a university-level lower division education. It may be too much to expect from one institution, particularly one that is so poorly subsidized. This paper has described how current policies are crowding out less well prepared students. This may be a choice that policymakers are willing to accept as a consequence of having to target scarce state subsidies, but they should enact these policies without misconceptions.

Issue #2: The Capacity to Accommodate Transfer Students

Related policy questions:
• What should access mean: is access to transfer provided if a student meeting minimum requirements is admissible to just one campus? How much access is enough to provide reasonable opportunities for the more place-bound students?
• What happens to transfer applicants who are redirected to a campus to which they did not apply? What are their educational outcomes?
• What has been the effect of growing "impaction" on the underrepresented minority students who have been seeking to transfer?
• Are regional-based admission and enrollment management strategies better able to meet students’ needs than statewide, segment-based approaches?
• Should more upper division access be provided in part by reallocating enrollment funding from lower division enrollment or by finding more efficient ways to finance education?
• What are the consequences if "redirected" students opt out of the state’s public institutions?

The bottom line. More capacity to accept transfer students is needed, and not simply at one or two campuses in each system. It makes little sense to be working throughout the state to increase transfer rates when eligible transfer students are already being effectively denied admission to the UC and CSU because of a lack of capacity at all or most campuses. Increasing reliance on “redirection” of first-time freshmen to the CCC can only ease the transfer capacity problem if a formal revision of the 60/40 policy is effected.

Issue #3: The Access/Quality Trade-off
Related policy questions:

- Has access taken precedence over quality in California to the detriment of the public good?
- How can we move from the goal of access to the goal of student success without shutting off opportunities for those who are not well prepared to succeed in college?
- Is a truly open enrollment policy still viable or should the state target its limited resources more narrowly to achieve better educational outcomes for the state?
- Can we find ways to finance higher education that better account for factors that promote student success—in particular, support outside of the classroom for first-generation students and others who rely heavily on co-curricular resources?

The bottom line. The Master Plan highlights three primary values – access, quality, and affordability – but the state’s policies and practices have put access first, notwithstanding recent lip service given to the “access to what?” argument. While a focus on access is laudable in the context of the state’s diverse population, diminished quality is a real concern. UC and CSU have chosen to restrict access through enrollment management practices in the attempt to preserve quality. The CCC resist the tough discussions about whom to serve to the point where access and quality have both been diminished. Policymakers need to weigh in on the issue of who gets served by which institutions. Either subsidy levels must increase dramatically or serious, first-time discussions about where state subsidies should be targeted will have to occur. In addition, educators must work harder to document the impact on quality of variations in resource levels.

A Final Note on Data

This report has raised serious questions about the capacity of our institutions and policies to produce sufficient and equitable learning outcomes throughout the state’s growing populations. It has set forth a challenging list of policy issues that need attention. But in addition to the will to confront these issues, the state badly needs better data – most specifically it needs a student-level tracking system that links data across the segments and their many institutions. With transfer the key to linking access to success in baccalaureate education, a student tracking system is the only way to fully understand the impact of the state’s policy choices on educational outcomes as students move through the system.
Table 2  
State Appropriations for Higher Education Have Not Kept Pace with  
Growth in Full-Time-Equivalent (FTES) Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Appropriation (in millions):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$2,715.8</td>
<td>$3,191.6</td>
<td>$3,322.7</td>
<td>$3,150.0</td>
<td>$2,868.2</td>
<td>$2,670.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$2,175.4</td>
<td>$2,429.0</td>
<td>$2,680.7</td>
<td>$2,697.1</td>
<td>$2,622.5</td>
<td>$2,409.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>$4,136.8</td>
<td>$4,510.4</td>
<td>$4,701.1</td>
<td>$4,860.5</td>
<td>$4,685.4*</td>
<td>$4,900.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,029.0</td>
<td>$10,131.0</td>
<td>$10,704.5</td>
<td>$10,707.6</td>
<td>$10,176.1</td>
<td>$9,980.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTES):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>165,900</td>
<td>171,270</td>
<td>185,304</td>
<td>196,188</td>
<td>198,628</td>
<td>199,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>281,782</td>
<td>290,554</td>
<td>316,395</td>
<td>331,353</td>
<td>334,914</td>
<td>341,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>998,297</td>
<td>1,041,829</td>
<td>1,105,000</td>
<td>1,128,954</td>
<td>1,104,030</td>
<td>1,137,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,445,979</td>
<td>1,503,653</td>
<td>1,606,699</td>
<td>1,656,495</td>
<td>1,637,572</td>
<td>1,678,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Appropriation per FTES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$16,370</td>
<td>$18,635</td>
<td>$17,931</td>
<td>$16,056</td>
<td>$14,440</td>
<td>$13,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$7,720</td>
<td>$8,360</td>
<td>$8,473</td>
<td>$8,140</td>
<td>$7,830</td>
<td>$7,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>$4,144</td>
<td>$4,329</td>
<td>$4,254</td>
<td>$4,305</td>
<td>$4,244*</td>
<td>$4,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,244</td>
<td>$6,738</td>
<td>$6,662</td>
<td>$6,464</td>
<td>$6,214</td>
<td>$5,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance Governor's Budget Summary 2004-05  
* Adjusted for $200 million of costs incurred in 2003-04 that will be paid for in 2004-05.
With the endorsement of the Integrated Teacher Preparation program, which requires systemwide and regional agreement, and with the looming endorsement of the 45/15 program (which I see as a variation on POL/IMPAC but with a stick), the question comes up: how are the faculty members forced to reach agreement across campuses if they can't do it on their own? Realistically, it looks like we won't have a campus or faction of campuses successfully holding out based on appeals to Principle 10, etc. Through approval of ITP and, perhaps, 45/15, we have bought and will again buy into the idea that campuses can be forced to conform. Two questions are: how? and, what about necessary course or program modifications the agreements might cause for some campuses? We have a recent resolution about program modifications being subject to local review processes, but I don't see how that could stand in the face of a necessary change.

Here is a draft of ideas. The process will of course more detailed, but I don't think we need to lay out the specific process. If we or the senate do not act to accept 45/15, we may still want to guide process in case it happens anyway.

*********
Principles for Reaching Consensus on Regional and Statewide Program Alignments in the California State University

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that the process for reaching consensus on regional and statewide program alignments be:

1. CSU faculty will determine, within the provisions of Title 5 and/or Executive Orders, the common courses and/or subject matter preparation acceptable statewide, within a region, and within a discipline or field for the Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs and for the systemwide-core/campus-specific transfer pattern.

2. Faculty from all campuses in the system or region will be included in decision making.

3. Faculty and staff will be provided sufficient time and support to travel, meet, confer, and reach agreement.

4. In the event that disciplines, regions, etc. cannot reach agreement, the position held by [the greatest number][a majority][at least 2/3][at least 75%] of campuses will apply to all CSU campuses within the system or region.

4. Faculty from the region or discipline will continue to meet and confer regularly until the necessary agreement is achieved.

5. All program and curricular changes must be subject to consultation with faculty governance on the local campuses, and, to the extent possible, program and curricular changes must be achieved subject to the normal approval processes of the individual campuses. [This is in conflict with our own resolution.]
6. [Once] CSU faculty [have achieved agreement on the courses in the program, they] will consult with affected parties, especially with the California Community Colleges, to achieve the most appropriate paths to degrees.

7. Faculty from the region or discipline will continue to meet periodically to review the curriculum for appropriateness, currency to the profession, content, and the effectiveness of the program in preparing transfer students to begin upper-division work in the CSU.

Rationale: Recent and pending legislation, provisions of recent changes to Title 5, and likely future changes or Executive Orders mean that campuses will be required to reach agreement, for example, on 30-units of lower-division coursework acceptable to all multiple subject integrated teacher preparation programs, 30 additional units of lower-division coursework acceptable to all multiple subject integrated teacher preparation programs in a given region, or 45 units of lower-division coursework acceptable for each degree program on a system-wide basis. To conform to legislation, Title 5, and Executive Orders, campuses will be compelled to agree on alignment. Owing to the variety in degree program requirements and courses across the system, some campuses may need to create or modify courses or modify programs. Control by local faculty governance of the local curriculum is an important standard of shared governance, and, to the extent possible, all curricular modifications should be subject to recommendation of local faculty governance (see AS26--??). After programs are aligned, it will be necessary for faculty to meet from time to time to ensure that the curriculum remains appropriate. To successfully complete such an initiative, which the state and system desire to initiate in a time of reduced budgets, requires recognition of and compensation for the additional time, travel, and expenses incurred by faculty.
Ideas for Fewer Units

**Campus-level actions:**

1. Campus-based analysis of local reasons for excess units.
2. Discourage and make difficult changes of major once a student has [75% or 85%] of the units in a program.
3. Discourage or deny multiple repetitions of the same course.
4. Discourage registration for more than a full load of courses to prevent students from loading up with courses and planning to drop several of them.
5. Carefully examine the role of so-called "gateway" classes to be certain that they are not significant obstacles--students should clearly understand that failing to make the required grade in the course signals that they should identify a different major rather than keep taking the course over and over.
6. Assess fees per unit.

**Departmental Plans:**

1. Develop departmental roadmaps for completing the major expeditiously.
2. Offer sufficient sections of required courses at least once each year.
3. Offer stipulated electives regularly.
4. For highly sequential majors, develop alternative plans for students who stray from the roadmap.

**Improved and Mandatory Advising:**

1. Expect students to declare a major before completing 40% of their degree program.
2. By completion of 40% of their program, students work with an advisor in their major to develop a personal graduation plan. If the plan is not completed by 50% of the program, a hold is placed on registration.
3. Students should be required (through registration hold) to consult with a departmental advisor each semester to be certain that their selected courses are the ones that come closest to fulfilling the personal graduation plan.
4. When students reach 75% of their program an automatic degree audit determines what requirements are missing.
5. When students reach 100% of their program, they must confer with a special departmental advisor to modify the personal graduation plan by identifying specific courses needed in the next two semesters in order to graduate.
6. Students with more than 100% of the units for their program should receive a warning every semester prior to registration that they will not be permitted to continue past 120% of the units for their program without a waiver of college regulations that can only be granted by [a campus board of some sort].
AB 1932, as introduced, Maze. Public postsecondary education: advisory committee.

Existing law establishes the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges as the 3 segments of the public postsecondary education system in the state. Pursuant to existing law, Porterville College and the College of the Sequoias are established as 2 of the state’s community colleges.

This bill would establish an advisory committee to develop and recommend to the Legislature a framework for the implementation of a pilot program authorizing Porterville College and the College of the Sequoias to award bachelor's degrees in specified fields. The bill would specify the educational officials who would be urged to participate on the advisory committee, and would specify the issues to be resolved by the advisory committee in the development of the framework for the pilot program. The bill would require the advisory committee to submit a report to the Legislature no later than July 1, 2006.


THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that will establish a pilot program authorizing Porterville College and the College of the Sequoias to award bachelor's degrees in specified fields. In order to develop a framework for the implementation of this pilot program, it is further the intent of the Legislature to establish an advisory committee to develop and recommend this framework and to make pertinent recommendations.

(b) An advisory committee is hereby established to develop and recommend to the Legislature a framework for the implementation of a pilot program authorizing Porterville College and the College of the Sequoias to award bachelor's degrees in specified fields. All of the following are urged to participate on the advisory committee:

1. The Chancellor of the California State University or his or her designee.
2. The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges or his or her designee.
3. The President of the University of California or his or her
designee.

(4) The President of Porterville College or his or her designee.

(5) The President of the College of the Sequoias or his or her designee.

(6) The Executive Director of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) College Commission or his or her designee.

(7) The Executive Director of the WASC Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges or his or designee.

(8) The Executive Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission or his or her designee.

(c) The framework developed by the advisory committee shall resolve all of the following issues:

(1) The degrees that will be awarded under the pilot program.

(2) The required qualifications for program faculty.

(3) The instructional support services that will be required.

(4) The WASC accreditation requirements.

(5) The development of a fee structure for the required coursework.

(6) The higher education official who will provide program oversight.

(7) Any other issues that need to be resolved in order to facilitate this pilot program.

(d) The advisory committee shall submit its report to the Legislature no later than July 1, 2006.
Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate CSU

Context on “Excess” Units

02/19/2004

The BoT will likely decide to penalize campuses when students take excess units. Defining *excess units* is a curricular matter to be determined by the senate through the Academic Affairs Committee in consultation with the campuses. (Once the definition is determined, a task force composed largely of administrators will determine how to deploy the definition to penalize campuses.)

**Process:**

1. The Academic Affairs Committee will develop a definition of *excess units* through its usual process, with a first reading in March and a second reading in May.
2. The Chancellor wants to give a plan to the BoT in March, but it won't be necessary to have everything in full detail at that point. The definition can wait until the senate takes action.

**Questions:**

1. What is the percentage of units to degree beyond which units are considered excess (e.g., 110%, 115%)?
2. What is the base against which the percentage will be applied (120, units in specific degree program, an arbitrary number)?
3. How is the degree program defined?
4. What about students who change degree programs (larger program, final program)? Example: engineering major who changes to philosophy. And do program-changing rates differ significantly by campus?
5. What about dual majors, second baccalaureates, special majors, and minors?
6. What about transfer students, i.e., total units v units taken at the CSU?
7. Is a systemwide policy or a set of campus specific penalty policies more effective and equitable?
8. What will happen to the penalty money?