

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3481-21/APEP (Rev)
March 18-19, 2021

CONCERNS ABOUT DUAL ADMISSIONS LEGISLATION

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) appreciate the legislative attention to admissions and standards for the California State University (CSU) and in the success of our incoming transfer students from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to the CSU, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the Legislature provide additional funds for existing CSU/CCC-driven joint efforts on student preparation and transfer rather than proposing new such structures; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU draw the attention of the Legislature to the fact that the CSU has, in academic year 2020/2021 (despite the ongoing pandemic) educated a record number of students with, for the first time ever, the majority of students who transfer from the CCC using the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathway; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge limitations within existing advising structures for ADT programs, but find that the proposed solution is unworkable given fiscal and logistical constraints, pedagogical requirements, and student needs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the CSU and the CCC continue to work together within existing intersegmental structures to ensure that the preparation for transfer from the CCC to the CSU is both appropriate in content and structure and that the requirements are clear to our potential future students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Governor, Legislature, Department of Finance (DOF), Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), CSU campus Presidents, CSU Vice Presidents of Finance/ Chief Financial Officers, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU Vice Presidents of Student Affairs, Campus Senate Chairs, California Faculty Association (CFA), CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA), CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Office of the Chancellor, California State Student Association (CSSA), and the California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor.

***RATIONALE:** There has been an increasing trend for legislative proposals to attempt to address academic governance. Legislative proposals to encourage "dual*

admissions” structures have been discussed for at least 20 years. These proposals have not achieved their goals for one or more of several reasons (typically included in the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) analysis and/ or prior ASCSU feedback):

- 1. The program creates an obligation for the CSU but fails to address adequate funding to ensure program goals are met in the future (i.e., does a reduction in state funding for the CSU ‘cancel’ the admission? Is there a multi-year state commitment to support the continuation criteria for any particular cohort of students?).*
- 2. Some proposals have been presented as cost-saving measures but do so by redirecting native CSU freshmen to Community Colleges despite the student having met CSU entry requirements (which traditionally results in fewer of these students graduating with a baccalaureate degree).*
- 3. The programs typically attempt to address impacted programs (cf., Nursing admissions), sometimes with a regional focus, but fail to account for the fact that a guarantee of admission will yield an exceptionally high (i.e., conservative) continuation requirement (e.g., GPA- and time-based restricted continuation) in order to protect the limited instructional capacity of the program (potentially yielding a ‘failure’ experience for students who would otherwise have transferred successfully).*
- 4. The programs are not responsive to the different missions and expected student preparation across the three segments of California public higher education.*
- 5. Non-impacted programs already accept all qualified candidates (if they cannot do so, they become impacted).*
- 6. Traditional students demonstrably change their intended majors with some amount of frequency – the constraints of a dual-admission program may make success in transfer for these students decrease rather than increase given capacity demands and the future-oriented planning that any such program would require.*
- 7. At the extreme, having the student formally “enrolled in” a CSU (or UC) during their community college course-taking (i.e., a true ‘dual-admission’) could have the consequence of potentially doubling (or more) the defined student body as used for negotiating library access fees and/ or software licenses – with a chilling effect on a campuses ability and willingness to provide such services unless otherwise reimbursed.*

The ASCSU generally opposes legislative intrusion in curricular and academic matters. The primary focus of the proposal – successful transfer from the CCC to the CSU – is a laudable and an appropriate system goal. Existing transfer pathways have seen increasing success and these programs would become even more successful if transfer advising structures (clarity in course taking patterns and criteria) were supported more robustly. The underlying logic of the proposed model to address success

in transfer could be recast as addressing both academic and “belongingness” – that is, to increase both the psycho-social concerns about imposter syndrome and to increase the visibility of transfer pathways. As per the LAO analysis (<https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/4336>) moving to a “dual admissions” model could, paradoxically, increase the complexity of student transfer.

The CSU, and to some extent the UC, have a long history of balancing the local (regional) needs with student desire to attend the ‘best’ program available for them. The tension, traditionally met with a weighted local area preference (at transfer and/or freshman admission), is that some campus programs could be entirely filled by local applicants (or those that become local applicants through high school or community college attendance) and thus could ‘lock out’ other students from across the state. Some CSU campuses are impacted, offer majors unique to their campuses (or not widely offered throughout the system), and/or have impaction in specific majors. To make a regional ‘guarantee’ of admission would be to exclude fully capable students from what might be the ‘best’ programs for them (and likely drive these students from California publicly funded higher education into private colleges for their degree completion). For the CSU, the prior use of local “Transfer Admission Guarantee” (TAG) agreements has been largely replaced by the use of ADT-based admissions. To some extent, the current efforts reflect an unwinding of the system-focus of transfer to replace it with a more local requirement set. The CSU and CCC responded to SB 1440 by inserting the realities of impaction and transfer by moving to a system-wide approach (later instantiated into legislation via SB 440). The current effort to create a “dual admission” program may work to encourage students to tailor their studies to their local institution, without regard to the impaction of programs and their ability to successfully transfer elsewhere.

Dual admissions: governor’s trailer bill: <https://esd.dof.ca.gov/trailer-bill/public/trailerBill/pdf/295>

Approved – May 13-14, 2021