**Summary and Overview of Submissions by**

**Certain Four-Year Institutions in Connection with SB 25 (West)**

The over-arching consideration that governed the recommendations submitted by these Four Year Institutions was the improvement of the transferability process for Texas students. While significant progress has been made in this area over the years, more can be done to make this process more simple, transparent and predictable.

We believe these goals are best achieved by providing Texas’ institutions of higher education with the flexibility to make their own determinations over their own curriculum, subject to reasonable and responsible oversight by the State. This oversight is best provided by the twin concepts that each institution must create, designate and publish its own core curriculum, and then respect and honor that of its peers. Such a system would be easy to understand, easy to implement and requires minimal top-down management from the State. These concepts are reflected in these proposals, and would serve the State and its students well.

**Section 1:**

* Included a definition of “recommended course sequence” and clarification language that institutions of higher education (“IHEs”) may develop multiple sequences. Included language linking the recommended course sequence to the common course numbering system, where applicable.
* Modified the language concerning articulation agreements to make them permissive, removed thresholds for mandatory agreements, and added provision that allowed smaller community colleges that otherwise might not have an articulation agreement to affiliate with an existing one between an GAI and another community college. Our understanding is that the community colleges may be amendable to removing this portion of the bill. Assuming that is true, we would have no objection.

**Section 2:**

* Added language limiting the disciplinary core to 18 hours (which, in conjunction with the 24 hour general core, would keep the core curriculum at 42 hours). Added behavioral and social sciences, and a requirement that these courses be courses that are commonly required by IHEs.
* New subsections (b-2) – (b-5): Added language expressly stating that IHEs must designate which of their courses constitute “general core” courses and which areas of the core curriculum these courses will satisfy. These courses must be published and provided to the THECB. An institution’s designation of a course as a “general core curriculum” course is not subject to THECB approval. However, language has been added to the bill to make clear that these courses must meet the applicable accreditation standards.
* Added similar language as above for the disciplinary core. Requires the IHEs to designate and publish these courses. Includes a requirement that IHEs advise students about the importance of coherent sequences that align with students’ goals.
* New subsection (d-1)-(d-2). Specific and express requirements that when students transfer among institutions, courses designated by one institution in the general core or disciplinary core curriculum must be accepted and applied by the receiving institution to the receiving institution’s core and degree program requirements. These sections are intended to provide clarity, security and transparency regarding the transferability and program applicability of core courses to students, parents and institutions.
* Requires the board to make the above information available, and requires negotiated rulemaking.

**Section 3:**

No changes from SB 25 as filed.

**Section 4:**

* This language came largely from SB 1923. Changes were made to apply these sections to students who have declared a major. The rationale behind this change is that a degree plan will mean more for a student who has declared a major than it will for one who has not.
* Also, the date has been changed from the first day of the semester to sometime between the 12th day and the end of the term. This change should accommodate the various student and institutional needs and timeframes.

**Section 5:**

Includes a new provision addressing automated reverse transfers.

**Section 6:**

Includes a new provision that would create an optional additional application process to allow students who are not accepted into one institution to voluntarily agree to be considered by other IHEs in Texas.