



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

# A TRANSFER DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

*Revised July 2005*

## **Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)**

George Blumenthal, Chair, University of California Academic Senate

Kate Clark, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

David O. McNeil, Chair, Academic Senate of The California State Universities

### **AUTHORED BY ICAS 2004-05 MEMBERS**

#### **CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Kate Clark, Professor of English, Irvine Valley College

Greg Gilbert, Professor of English, Copper Mountain College

Mark Wade Lieu, Professor of ESL, Ohlone College

Mark Snowwhite, Professor of English, Crafton Hills College

Ian Walton, Professor of Mathematics, Mission College

#### **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

David O. McNeil, Professor of History, San Jose State University

Lynne Cook, Professor of Special Education, CSU Northridge

Cristy Jensen, Professor of Public Policy And Administration, CSU Sacramento

John Tarjan, Professor of Management/MIS, CSU Bakersfield

Marshelle Thobaben, Professor of Nursing, Humboldt State University

#### **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

George Blumenthal, Professor of Astronomy & Astrophysics, UC Santa Cruz

Cliff Brunk, Professor of Cell and Molecular Biology, UCLA

Michael Brown, Professor of Education, UC Santa Barbara

Joseph Kiskis, Professor of Physics, UC Davis

Arvan Fluharty, Professor of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science, UCLA

**Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates  
A Transfer Discussion Document: May 2005**

**Table of Contents**

	Purpose of this Document	1
	Executive Summary	1
I.	Introduction	3
II.	What Does Transfer Entail?	3
III.	Legislation and Legislative Intent	5
IV.	Intersegmental Transfer Participants and Programs	5
V.	Components of the Transfer Function: Essential Functions	6
VI.	Forward Looking: A Plan to Improve Transfer Functions	19
	A. Addressing Essential Functions	19
	B. Funding the Consolidated Proposal	22
	C. Accountability and Evaluation	23
VII.	Conclusion	24
 Appendices		
A.	Summary of Legislative and Faculty Initiatives	25
B.	Intersegmental Transfer Participants and Programs	32

## **PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT**

Representatives of the academic senates of the three segments of California’s public higher education—the California Community Colleges, the California State Universities, and the University of California—meeting as the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), compiled this document during the 2004-05 academic year. Our findings are based on interviews with colleagues, staff, and administrators, personal experiences, and information taken directly from websites and published materials. It is our intent that this document be used to further discussions with and among segmental faculty, staff, and administrators as we all pursue means by which to ensure—above all—the successful transfer of our students.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The three segments of the California public higher education system currently operate several programs intended to facilitate the transfer of students between the California Community Colleges and California State University and University of California systems. However, too often these intersegmental transfer programs have been established without specific, clear plans for how they will interface with other existing programs. Periodic reviews of these intersegmental transfer programs can identify whether these transfer-centered activities work efficiently and effectively and serve as a tool to ensure that resources are being allocated wisely and in line with intersegmental priorities. The faculty members of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) undertake such a review in this report and identify areas in which coordinated efforts and greater collaboration would be appropriate.

A successful program of student transfer requires informed student behaviors, college and university planning and programs, and considerable faculty efforts to identify and publicize information about appropriate academic preparation. Throughout those stages, extensive training prepares counselors, financial aid personnel, articulation officers, faculty, and others who will assist students at all points in this progression from desire to acceptance, to matriculation, and to graduation at a baccalaureate-granting institution.

Of the various intersegmental transfer efforts, some are institution-specific (e.g., counseling or advising services at each institution), some are intersegmental initiatives (e.g., ASSIST, IMPAC, OSCAR); some depend upon membership of particular groups (CIAC, ICC); and some are segment-specific and rely to varying degrees upon cooperation with other segments (e.g., LDTP, UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process, Student Friendly Services).

To evaluate the various programs, the ICAS faculty began by identifying ten functions that must be present for transfer to occur smoothly. We reviewed the initial needs for those functions, who or what program(s) currently attempt to respond to those needs, and the limitations remaining under the current structure.

Beyond that, we identified a crucial context that is often essential for successful transfer—and an area in which most faculty have little impact:

Students must be provided with accurate information about financial aid and other supportive resources available to them throughout their undergraduate career, both before and after transfer.

We then identified the following functions as essential to transfer:

Function 1: Provide students with access to current information about major preparation, prerequisites, transfer requirements at UC and CSU, and course requirements.

Function 2: Provide counselors, advisors, transfer center directors, and others with current information about existing and new articulation agreements and major preparation.

Function 3: Provide a venue for faculty from across the segments and disciplines to discuss curricular and transfer-related issues.

Function 4: Provide Articulation Officers with access to new information about changes in major requirements so they might support new articulation agreements and faculty's creation of new or revised curricula.

Function 5: Provide a mechanism for ongoing certification of courses meeting the common general education curriculum (IGETC/CSU GE Breadth, and SciGETC)

Function 6: Provide a mechanism for assigning course identification numbers and verifying that courses actually qualify for the assigned number.

Function 7: Provide for statewide dissemination of curricular recommendations and decisions (e.g., agreement on course identifier descriptions, findings of discussion groups regarding major preparation, essential changes in course content).

Function 8: Provide students with assurances that the courses they take will transfer to a four-year university.

Function 9: Provide transfer students with UC/CSU advising linked to confirmed acceptance of units from their community colleges, their declaration of a major and development of their personal graduation plans.

Function 10: Provide a process whereby all transfer initiatives are reviewed by the faculty who are ultimately responsible for effectuating them.

This ICAS report concludes with recommendations concerning the viability of several existing services, some new directions given CSU's recent withdrawal from CAN, and the continuing need for intersegmental faculty discussions concerning the lower division preparation of transferring students.

In addition, to accomplish the last function, this report strongly recommends that there be an annual ICAS review of all the transfer initiatives. This commitment by ICAS will provide a

yearly faculty perspective, from an intersegmental point of view, of the quality of the transfer programs and where they might be improved.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The three segments of the California public higher education system have jointly undertaken a number of initiatives to facilitate the transfer of students between the California Community Colleges and California State University and University of California systems. Other initiatives have resulted from legislation, which has sometimes been imposed without funding. These efforts have not always interfaced efficiently with other initiatives, and there has not been regular review of their efficiency or effectiveness as a group. Such review would identify areas in which coordinated efforts and collaboration amongst programs might be appropriate.

Recent faculty led-initiatives including IMPAC, LDTP, SciGETC, and streamlined articulation highlight faculty interest in facilitating the transfer process. Additionally the need for a new system for identifying similar courses has arisen. The success of all of these will depend upon enhancing intersegmental communication, collaboration, and leadership. These new programs create motivations and opportunities for intersegmental faculty organizations to be consolidated and simplified so that their effectiveness is enhanced.

**II. WHAT DOES TRANSFER ENTAIL?**

For various reasons, many students who have the potential to eventually succeed at a university do not enter community college with transfer as a goal. Some students who underperformed in high school may underestimate their true capabilities. Others may come from an environment in which college graduation is not viewed as an expectation or even as a realistic possibility. Information should be available for students, especially low-income, first generation college students to understand that transfer is possible and the financial cost should not deter them. Thus, even prior to transfer, secondary and post-secondary systems and communities at large must collaborate to establish college-going attitudes and experiences; as students plan to enter college, they must be made aware of the many resources available to them—including transfer planning and counseling, financial aid assistance and workshops, and academic advisement. While those elements are not examined as part of this report, we acknowledge the efforts of many—including GEAR-UP projects of K-12, the community colleges’ [icanaffordcollege.com](http://icanaffordcollege.com) media blitz, and other strategies that enable students to consider college, transfer, and graduation as realistic goals: this is the first context we acknowledge.

Students’ transfer process is complex, affected by their academic preparation, their personal and family demands that may lengthen the time needed for completion of their educational goals, and their mobility (or lack thereof). A successful program of transfer would entail numerous activities by the main players in the process. Ideally, for a student to transfer from a California community college to a California public university, the following would occur:

Students must:

identify transfer as a potential goal  
seek counseling, completing appropriate courses for transfer and major preparation  
identify a potential major and potential receiving institution(s) and make those intentions clear to counselors at the time they seek academic assistance.

Community colleges must:

provide opportunities for ongoing counseling and career exploration, as many students change majors and academic goals several times and may need assistance in formally declaring a major  
offer a wide range of services through transfer centers, including campus tours, college fairs, workshops, financial aid assistance, and catalog libraries  
offer sufficient courses for students to complete preparation for transfer in a timely fashion (dependent upon external funding)  
provide adequate on-campus training to ensure uniformity of information to counselors who directly assist students seeking to transfer.

Receiving universities must:

engage in student outreach using websites and orientation meetings  
post information about major preparation and any course identifiers for use by students, counselors, transfer center directors, and articulation officers  
provide adequate training opportunities (e.g., Ensuring Transfer Success) for articulation officers and counselors who directly assist students seeking to transfer  
Provide timely transfer credit evaluations, major advising and degree audits to ensure clear path to degree.

Intersegmentally, these activities must occur:

Intersegmental and interdisciplinary faculty discussions should ensure comparability of lower division preparation at sending and receiving institutions  
Intersegmental planning groups will set goals, objectives, and timelines for transfer programs and policies/practices that facilitate transfer  
Articulation officers must codify articulation for those courses among and between institutions  
Designated groups must assign a common number or course identifier to major-preparation courses meeting specific criteria; those numbers must, in turn, be posted by colleges and universities for student use  
Financial aid information must be made available so students can understand how their academic choices shape their eligibility  
Information should be available for **all** students, especially low-income, first generation college-attending students to understand that transfer is possible and that the financial cost should not deter them.

Extensive intersegmental training is necessary to prepare counselors, financial aid personnel, articulation officers, faculty, and others who assist students at all points in this progression. External groups, organizations, and mechanisms are available to help

students proceed as smoothly as possible. We identify many of those groups and their responsibilities in the transfer mission below.

**III. LEGISLATION AND LEGISLATIVE INTENT**

The 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education established community college transfer as a priority for California colleges and universities. Since the late 1980s, the Legislature has introduced or passed several legislative and education system initiatives to establish the current framework for implementing transfer and articulation in California. One emphasis of this legislation focused on accomplishing a “seamless” transfer system through the adoption and incorporation of a common course numbering system among community colleges and CSU campuses, and requested participation among the UC and independent colleges and universities. With the adoption of a common course numbering system, many believed that an effective and efficient progression of students within and among the higher education segments would be promoted and would minimize duplication of coursework. In addition, reducing the duplication of coursework would save students unnecessary expense while encouraging more efficient use of resources within higher education institutions. Appendix A contains a summary of measures initiated by the Legislature or by segments; as the documentation reveals, faculty have been leaders in devising and conducting initiatives in advance of legislative mandate.

**IV. INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS**

As noted above, transfer is very complex, with many groups working towards improving transfer for individual students. Among the frustrations expressed by students, faculty, administrators, and legislators is the appearance that many transfer initiatives, at first glance, seem to be doing the same work. Once we understand who these participants are and what their central mission or purpose is (see Appendix B), we may then ask other significant questions about presumed duplication.

Transfer Initiatives have their origins in the following four areas: within specific institutions, as intersegmental efforts, as initiatives proposed by groups with discrete membership, and by individual segments.

Institution Specific

- University Outreach and Admission (UC/CSU)
- Faculty Advisors (UC/CSU)
- Advisement and other Counseling Staff (UC/CSU)
- Counseling Faculty (CCC)
- Transfer Transcripts Evaluators (UC/CSU)

Intersegmental Transfer Initiatives

- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)
- Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST)

Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)  
Science General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC)  
Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC)  
Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review (OSCAR)

Member Initiatives

California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)  
Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC)  
Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)

Segment-specific Initiatives

General Education (GE)

CSU:

- Lower-Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP)
- Fall Counselor Conferences
- CSU Mentor Transfer Planner

UC:

- Ensuring Transfer Success Conferences
- Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process

CDE:

- Student Friendly Services ([californiacolleges.edu](http://californiacolleges.edu))

An informational summary about the above named groups, including their funding and oversight structure, is provided in Appendix B: Intersegmental Transfer Participants and Programs. We recommend that the reader review this extensive list before proceeding.

Given the limited influence and collaboration of intersegmental faculty over the success of most institution-specific, member- or segment-specific initiatives, **the following analysis will focus primarily on the intersegmental transfer initiatives, the functions they strive to address, and their inherent strengths and limitations as presently configured.** We will consider how they can better work together and how their resources can be used more efficiently while improving the transfer experience for our students.

V. **COMPONENTS OF THE TRANSFER FUNCTION**

Many of the transfer elements (pp. 3-4) are dependent upon the resources of individual institutions (e.g., transfer centers, advisors and faculty or staff counselors, course offerings). Key behaviors and activities (selecting a major and transfer institution, seeking counseling or using resources to determine transfer requirements) are student-

specific, although institutions have devised strategies, programs, courses, and services to aid students along that path.

This report examines the different transfer initiatives within the context of the ten components of transfer to understand what is necessary to ensure that students transfer successfully. The following section considers these questions: What need does each function respond to? Which of those transfer functions are currently being addressed and by whom? What are the strengths and limitations of those responses as presently configured?

Function 1: *Provide CCC students with access to current information about major preparation, prerequisites, transfer requirements at UC and CSU, and course requirements.*

Need: Because California's community college students often self advise and do not seek the advice of counseling faculty, they need ready access to a variety of sources that provide current, accurate information about major preparation, prerequisites, transfer requirements at UC/CSU and course requirements for their chosen major. Students also need assurances that the courses they take in preparation for the major will transfer to a four-year university and be applicable to their chosen major (e.g., CSU GE Breadth, IGETC, or SciGETC).

Responses to the Need:

The Student Friendly Services website (californiacolleges.edu), sponsored by the California Roundtable and developed with funding from the California Department of Education (CDE), continues to be overseen by the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) of the Round Table. This website was envisioned as a single portal to all public and independent institutions by providing students, parents, and educators with needed information about major preparation, transfer requirements, and various college and university options. The website includes a freshman planner linked to UC Doorways and a transfer planner linked to ASSIST so that students have some assurances of accurate articulation information. Additionally, Student Friendly Services, UC Pathways and the CSU Mentor are available to provide information on system-wide and campus specific major requirements, courses that meet GE and IGETC (and now SciGETC) requirements. ASSIST provides similar comparative information and will soon post, as an extension of its mission, the CSU LDTP recommendations from each campus and each major.

Current Limitations:

Given the increasing numbers of students seeking to transfer, and understanding the limitations for hiring counseling faculty in the community colleges, it is not surprising that community college students glean information from a variety of sources, including on-line resources. While web resources can be tools as valuable to counselors and advisors as to students, all users are subject to the adage, “garbage in, garbage out.” The adequacy and accuracy of this information depends upon (1) the clarity students have about their academic goals and transfer objectives; and (2), the accuracy and currency of on-line or published information. At present, the “Student Friendly Services,” website

remains incomplete and lacks the intersegmental commitment or processes to ensure its viability and usefulness. For example, to date, the CDE staff has relied upon the published *Peterson's Guides* to colleges and universities as the source of their data for the site; however few community colleges submit data to that resource, and thus the information on this "single portal" is woefully incomplete and inadequate for any student use. Most community college faculty would prefer that their system not be visible in this CDE project until the processes for maintaining the currency and accuracy of data are defined.

Web-based portals have other limitations as well; they are useful to students who know what they want, but the direct contact with counselors is often needed to help students explore realistic options and answer questions beyond the ability of the web-based portals noted here. For first-generation college students, as an example, counselors can offer personal encouragement, and explain the nuances of selecting a major, applying for financial aid, and exploring career options compatible with students' academic aptitudes and interests. Finally, because community college students transfer to independent and out-of-state institutions as well as to in-state public sectors, we need to ensure that students fishing for information have tools that enable them to cast a very wide net.

While the UC- and CSU-maintained websites are more accurate than the Student Friendly site, they are updated only periodically, and community college counselors may easily miss emails or notices sent out throughout the year about changing admissions requirements or deadlines that are "effective immediately." Moreover, both sites refer students to ASSIST, the recognized official repository of articulation agreements. ASSIST has the advantage of posting changes in articulation agreements nightly; however, if senior universities do not submit materials or changes to ASSIST, the information may not reflect campus understandings or practices. Furthermore, ASSIST's mission does not include an electronic transfer planning mechanism. In all instances, the information available to students is only as accurate and current as the information institutions provide.

UC and CSU also acknowledge an expanding demand for the training they offer to college faculty, transfer center directors and articulation officers. In an effort to provide current information, UC conducts its spring Ensuring Transfer Success conferences and CSU its Fall Counselors' Conference; however those wishing to attend far outstrip the capacity of these gatherings to accommodate them, and many are turned away or dissuaded from attempting to register. As a result, many more counselors at those colleges—and their students—do not benefit from the most current information. The on-line notebooks and conference proceedings are a pale substitute, from their perspective.

Function 2: *Provide counselors, advisors, transfer center directors, and others with current information about existing and new articulation agreements and major preparation.*

Need: If students are to have access to current information on major preparation and general education courses, then those on the front line—community college counselors, advisors, and transfer directors—require relevant and complete information about existing articulation, and any changes in major preparation and general education requirements.

Response to Need:

As noted above, ASSIST has a proven track record for offering up-to-date, user-friendly information to articulation officers, counseling faculty and particularly to students. In addition, all CSU, UC, and CCC campuses are expected to participate in ASSIST and have an obligation to submit the most current, appropriate data. Changes in agreements and information are posted nightly. The ASSIST database includes current, official articulation agreements established by 23 CSU and 9 UC campuses with all 109 California community colleges.

Articulation officers at UC and CSU gather and supply information through the ASSIST system, which is used by faculty advisers as an advising tool for prospective students and for admitting students. Evaluators who examine transcripts and determine transfer credit use the information from ASSIST or other sources to identify repeated courses, to clear course requirements, and to conduct a degree audit evaluation. This articulation data aid development of any automated degree audit systems. Articulation officers at the CCCs use ASSIST for similar purposes; however, CCC articulation officers also use the information to give advice to faculty throughout the curriculum development process, especially regarding major preparation courses.

Based on a report to ICAS in April 2004, ASSIST has information stored on over 38,500 community college courses transferable to UC for general credit at any campus. Of these, over 27,100 community courses are directly articulated with over 2,400 UC courses. There are over 100,800 community college courses transferable to CSU. Of these, over 46,500 community college courses are directly articulated with over 8,800 CSU courses.

Current Limitations:

ASSIST is often called upon by other transfer efforts to provide technological support and solutions, for example assisting OSCAR and CSU's LDTP project. These requests must be measured against ASSIST's stated mission, its funding level, and its human and technological resources, and the priorities of other segments as well.

**Function 3:** *Provide a venue for faculty from across the segments and disciplines to discuss curricular and transfer-related issues.*

**Need:** Because curriculum is dynamic and fluid, faculty from across the segments and disciplines need a venue in which to discuss curricular and transfer-related issues. Such broad-based, periodic discussions ensure that curricular decisions are communicated among the segments and that changes are discussed prior to implementation. Regardless of the mechanisms for discussion and recommendations, departmental faculty at the baccalaureate degree granting institution retain the authority to determine requirements for lower-division, major preparation of transfer students coming to their institutions. Those decisions, however, are best informed and most likely to be adhered to when they build upon intersegmental exchanges and long-range planning.

Responses to the Need:

**CSU Lower Division Transfer Pattern**

**Project**

To ensure that students planning to transfer to the CSU can earn a baccalaureate degree in the most direct manner without losing credits for courses taken at a community college, the CSU is developing a Lower-Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) of courses for each major that will advance students toward graduation at any CSU campus offering the major. At least three-quarters of the pattern is common to all CSU campuses; the remaining courses (up to 15 semester units for campus-specific major patterns) are designated individually by each department on each campus. The goal is to define a clear path to the baccalaureate degree for all community college transfer students and to guide community college students interested in transferring to the CSU in choosing only courses that bring them closer to graduation. The project intends to maximize access to CSU campuses and programs, simplify student advising, and provide a basis for community college transfer degrees and programs. To make best use of this path, community college students will need to identify a major program early and commit to a CSU campus by the time they complete 45 semester units and enter into a LDTP contract. Although the LDTP method of qualification may offer some degree of admission priority, it is only one of several paths available and will not guarantee admission to students who complete the pattern.

The definitions of the lower division transfer patterns and specific course templates for each discipline will be determined in the LDTP process by CSU faculty disciplinary representatives from the CSU campuses that offer the baccalaureate in a particular major. These representatives, as experts in the field, are empowered to speak for their campus disciplinary colleagues. Because CSU faculty are responsible for the design of curricula and majors for CSU degrees, responsibility for approving LDTP patterns resides with them. Community college faculty will be invited to participate in meetings and discussions of the CSU discipline representatives and to inform the LDTP process. CSU faculty have expressed a commitment for intersegmental discussion and continued reflection on the transfer patterns as well as standards and instructional approaches in various courses.

Current Limitations:

While the goal of the LDTP project is to ensure that students planning to transfer to the CSU can earn a baccalaureate degree in the most direct manner without losing credits for courses taken at a community college, it remains a very segment-specific initiative. To date, the LDTP project has invited the participation of only one community college faculty member per discipline and no one from UC.

**Intersegmental Major Preparation**

**Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC)**

IMPAC, the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum project, is the only faculty-run, discipline-based curricular project that has support from the three segment academic senates. IMPAC is a project of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) and was developed to facilitate intersegmental and interdisciplinary discussion among CCC, CSU, and UC faculty regarding major preparation. These faculty-to-faculty discussions within and across the disciplines have uncovered a number of barriers to transfer and encouraged faculty to address them, often on a case-by-case basis. While these discussions do not always translate into “countable” outcomes, they do produce changes across the segments that will ultimately result in a smoother transfer process for students and a deeper appreciation of faculty colleagues’ efforts across all segments. IMPAC was designed to work in conjunction with other intersegmental transfer efforts and has provided a valuable linkage to the work of other initiatives. The inclusion of articulation officers, assigned to each discipline for continuity and present at each discussion, has led to increased articulation and a greater understanding of faculty’s role in the articulation process.

Current Limitations:

Though the IMPAC project’s faculty-to-faculty dialogues are central to most transfer-related initiatives, IMPAC in its present form has several limitations. First, the faculty participating in the project usually do not have authority to make curriculum decisions at a statewide level; as a result, discussion and agreement do not immediately result in department acceptance, change or curriculum revision. IMPAC has, over the past two years, worked to improve its process by requiring that those faculty members attending the regional and statewide meetings are official department representatives, but, having said this, IMPAC’s success to date has been due largely to its broad based, inclusive and recursive relationship with the field. Second, while the participation of the UC faculty has increased over the years, UC is still not participating at the level of CSU or CCC, particularly in the social science and humanities areas. Finally, and most important, to date IMPAC participation has vacillated, resulting in questions as to the validity of some curricular agreements.

Function 4: *Provide articulation officers with access to new information about changes in major requirements so they might support new articulation agreements and faculty's creation of new or revised curriculum.*

Need: Articulation officers need access to information about changes in major preparation if they are to articulate new or revised courses or course sequences. Within the community colleges, articulation officers can greatly assist faculty to design or improve courses that respond to the expectations of CSU and UC faculty in those disciplines. In turn, they carry forth those approved courses and seek to articulate them fully with their senior partners. Finally, in the UC and CSU, articulation officers facilitate the transfer process by clarifying course transferability.

Responses to the Need:

**IMPAC, ASSIST, and LDTP**

Both IMPAC and ASSIST play significant roles in informing articulation officers, particularly through their organizational websites and the inclusion of articulation officers within their organizational structures and on-going work. Presently plans are being made to post LDTP patterns and course descriptors on ASSIST.

**UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process**

UC faculty have approved a process to streamline UC's course major preparation articulation. If four campuses articulate a course or lower division sequence of courses as preparation for a specific major, then the course or sequence of courses will automatically be articulated for the same major at all other UC campuses that do not specifically opt out of the agreement. This regulation will lessen the burden on departments willing to accept the articulation agreements worked out by departments at other UC campuses and will make the articulation information more accessible to articulation officers. Since this streamlining procedure has just been adopted, its strengths and limitations are not yet known.

**California Intersegmental Articulation**

**Council (CIAC)**

The professional association of articulation officers (see CIAC, Appendix B) also disseminates information through its member listservs and regularly scheduled regional and statewide meetings. These mechanisms can provide essential information to articulation officers and faculty prior to submission of articulation agreements.

Current Limitations:

Faculty connections to articulation officers—outside of the IMPAC project, the recent LDTP planning, or the occasional interaction faculty and articulation officers might have—are not as effective as they should be. Similarly, despite the active communication among articulation officers themselves through their member listserv, linking faculty to those working with articulation on a daily basis remains a significant challenge to any transfer initiative.

<p><u>Function 5:</u> <i>Provide a mechanism for ongoing certification of courses meeting the common general education curriculum (IGETC/CSU GE Breadth, and SciGETC)</i></p>
---

Need: Once the faculty-to-faculty dialogues lead to curricular decisions and subsequent local curricular revision, intersegmental faculty must then engage in ongoing certification of courses to be used for the common general education requirements (IGETC/CSU GE Breadth and soon SciGETC). In turn, that information must be communicated to the initiating campuses and disseminated to receiving institutions.

Response to the Need:

**IGETC/CSU GE-Breadth Course Review**

**Subcommittee**

Jointly developed by the Academic Senates of CCC, CSU, and UC, the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is a general education pattern that community college transfer students can use to fulfill lower-division general education requirements in either the CSU or UC system without the need, after transfer, to take additional lower-division courses to satisfy campus GE requirements. This option is, by policy, accepted at all UC and CSU campuses. All courses proposed for IGETC must be transferable to both CSU and UC. All community college courses that fulfill IGETC requirements will also fulfill CSU GE-Breadth requirements in the comparable area.

Currently an intersegmental group, with assistance from the CSU Office of the Chancellor, conducts certification of courses submitted as meeting requirements of the transfer patterns and general education requirements. Course outlines, including representative texts, must be submitted for all proposed additions to IGETC lists. Using the technical apparatus of the newly developed Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation (OSCAR) for online course submission and review, CSU Chancellor's Office Academic Affairs staff and faculty appointed by the academic senates of UC, CSU, and CCC review and approve or reject new and revised courses proposed for IGETC. The same UC, CSU and CCC faculty members who review course outlines for IGETC also review course outlines for CSU GE-Breadth. OSCAR has greatly facilitated the IGETC/GE course submissions review process; it will no doubt prove useful for SciGETC approvals as well and may be a useful template as the CCC system seeks an alternative to the now defunct CAN system.

Current Limitations:

Conducting much of the review online has reduced but not eliminated faculty travel, as faculty reviewers gather for an initial orientation and training session. However, the faculty receive no compensation for doing course review, and the review of courses is, for some segments, a workload issue. Presently, the reviewers focus only on general education certification and do not address major preparation or lower division patterns. The certification processes for the latter would be very labor-intensive work requiring more reliance on faculty labor than on staff labor used presently.

Function 6: *Provide a mechanism for assigning course identification numbers and for verifying that courses qualify for the assigned numbers.*

Need: SB 1415 (2004) requires CSU and urges UC to work with the California community colleges to define and assign a common number for courses for the 20 highest-demand majors in the respective segments. Further, the legislation requires each campus of a public postsecondary educational institution to incorporate the common course numbering system in its catalogue at the next adoption of a campus catalogue after June 1, 2006.

IMPAC discussions, and particularly the SciGETC proposal, the segment-specific CSU LDTP Project, and the UC's Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process, could all benefit from a system to define and assign course identifiers that have intersegmental support and are based on intersegmental participation.

#### Responses to the Need:

##### **"Common Course Numbering"**

Early legislation called for the implementation of "common course numbering." Arguing that "a Bio 1 course is a Bio1 course everywhere," legislators and some system administrators sought to impose a common numbering system over the tens of thousands of courses offered by the 142 colleges and universities in California's systems of higher education. Assigning a common course number to all "like, similar, or comparable" courses would make articulation unnecessary, they argued. Those assertions, as demonstrated in all faculty-to-faculty discussions, are simply not the case in many disciplines.

#### Current Limitations:

Simply assuming a "common uniformity of courses" fails to acknowledge the absolute need for a diversity of approaches and ideological and methodological strategies to course content. This plan has never been implemented and given the size and complexity of California's post-secondary systems—unlike those of New York, Washington, Florida or others with whom we are often compared—it is unlikely that this plan will be agreed to by faculty in UC, CSU, and CCCs. Specifically, common course numbering systems mislead students by suggesting common transferability and applicability, commonality of course content, consistency of units, or applicability within a GE program or sequence of major courses. However, common course numbering alone cannot indicate sequentiality; cannot communicate course prerequisites, expectations or competencies; cannot indicate whether the course meets other locally-based determinations (e.g., information competency or multicultural requirements for graduation); and cannot respond rapidly to changing industry or accreditation standards: all of these elements require course-to-course comparisons and articulation. Finally, and significantly, a "common course numbering" plan denies local colleges and universities the ability to create internal coherence in disciplines and sequences through the numbering patterns they adopt. Such a requirement would pass on to colleges and universities significant unmandated costs in faculty and staff labor, in printing and publication, in training, in transcript notations, and in the need for systems to develop a taxonomy, disseminate it, and mandate compliance with it.

Additionally, although legislators and even system administrators continue to confuse a course identifying number with "common course numbering," faculty, students, and counselors remain familiar with and supportive of a cross-referenced course numbering system such as CAN might have been (below) and as LDTP assigned numbers and any emerging community college identifier system may indeed become. Those supra numbers, supplementing the number assigned by local institutions, can identify courses of comparable content, help the segments to maintain standards of academic rigor for those courses, and facilitate their transfer between and among participating institutions.

### **California Articulated Number (CAN)**

The California Articulation Number (CAN) system was initially created as a course identification system for core, lower-division transferable, major preparation courses commonly taught on CCC, UC and CSU campuses. Ideally, students would use this separate but universal numeric identification to select courses that were inter- or intrasegmentally acceptable as comparable to lower division courses offered by UC or CSU (or other participating private institutions throughout California); the number was an immediately recognizable short hand for students, counselors, and articulation officers. However, because UC faculty could not support CAN as it was then configured, UC withdrew its contributions and retained only a nominal participation after CAN's first few years. Further, few CSUs assigned course identifying numbers to their own lower division courses, though they used the number system for purposes of articulation. At the writing of this document, the CSU Chancellor's Office has similarly withdrawn its support, as CAN was not seen as an effective tool for course identification nor for the implementation of the LDTP project.

Recently, the IMPAC project aided the CAN System in accomplishing some of its goals, demonstrating that a faculty-driven initiative can accomplish two stages once performed by CAN: the drafting of course descriptors and the dissemination of recommendations about employing common numbers. IMPAC has also been instrumental in bringing UC back into discussions about the need for a common course identifier and in drawing on UC faculty to help develop CAN descriptors and identify courses that met those descriptions and thereby warrant a supra number. Over the past three years, IMPAC faculty have reviewed more than 100 CAN Descriptors and drafted 128 new and revised course descriptors; developed one new CAN sequence; and proposed one core curriculum.

#### Current Limitations:

The most dramatic limitation is the disbanding of the current CAN system at the end of fiscal year 2004-05. Even with efforts to revitalize the CAN system in the past years, CAN lacked an effective method to assign its CAN numbers. After a number of years of discussion, a process had been proposed but not implemented. (For additional information, see Appendix B.) For the first few years of IMPAC, CSU faculty felt as though they had not had ample opportunity for review of the descriptors; more recently, the IMPAC steering committee devised processes to include a formal review of all descriptors and an approval mechanism by CSU departmental chairs.

While a limited, segmental course identifier system will result from the CSU LDTP that will be applied to a very limited number of courses, a broad-based, effective, intersegmental system remains to be crafted in the wake of CAN's dissolution.

**Function 7:** *Provide a mechanism to disseminate curricular recommendations and decisions statewide (e.g., agreement on course identifier descriptions, findings of discussion groups regarding major preparation, essential changes in course content).*

Need: In all cases, departmental faculty at the baccalaureate degree granting institution retain the authority to determine requirements for lower-division, major preparation of transfer students. Community college faculty, however, must also design their courses to meet curricular demands of vocational and certificate program needs beyond transfer. Thus, once the curricular recommendations and subsequent decisions have been made, there is a need to disseminate this information statewide.

Responses to the Need:

Once completed, CSU LDTP requirements will appear on the CSU Mentor website, ASSIST and elsewhere. The descriptors adopted for the required courses will carry implicit recommendations about course content. CSU faculty anticipate using IMPAC discussions to further share information about the content of major preparation curriculum.

The explicit results of the UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process are articulation agreements rather than curricular recommendations; however, a rejection of courses offered for articulation often prompts community college faculty to engage in additional revision and resubmission for articulation. The initial articulation by the first four campuses will be handled by current procedures. Since the UC Senate Regulation 477 has just been adopted, the procedures by which it will be administered and the communication instruments involved in the new process have not yet been developed.

Another intersegmental mechanism for the dissemination of information is the IMPAC listservs, which have over 20,000 faculty members from UC, CSU, and CCC and are updated regularly. Within the CCCs, such information can also be shared through monthly meetings of representatives of the CCC Academic Senate and the systems' Vice-Presidents of Instruction; information is also shared at the CCC Academic Senate annual Curriculum Institute and the Vocational Educational Institutes and through alerts issued by the CCC Academic Senate President or its Curriculum Committee.

Current Limitations:

While the LDTP project provides a method for CSU faculty to approve lower-division transfer patterns, there currently is no formal mechanism for the wide inclusion of community college in the decision making. Too often those needing the information most are unaware of it as they make curricular changes and revisions to their curriculum. Wide dissemination and familiarity with these web resources will become a critical component for faculty teaching and designing lower division courses in all segments.