

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

Need: Prospective transfer students need accurate information to prepare themselves for successful transfer. Such information includes advice about major preparation, academic experiences, recommended electives--and any changes in this preparation that UC and CSU faculty identify. This information will reduce the time to degree because students will not need to repeat courses at the upper division and will focus more quickly upon the courses relevant to their chosen field of study. Community college faculty acknowledge and respect the authority of discipline faculty in baccalaureate-granting institutions to make the final determinations about such preparation; and they concur that UC and CSU departmental faculty may legitimately have varying expectations of students who enter their upper division programs. Thus community college faculty seek reassurances that their students who complete the identified transfer courses or patterns will be assured acceptance of those courses after students transfer to a four year institution.

Responses to the Need:

UC Transfer Admission Agreements (TAA)

Various UC campuses offer students a Transfer Admission Agreement (TAA), a formal, written agreement that outlines the courses students must complete and grade point average they must earn before transferring from a community college. These TAAs are written a year before the students plan to transfer and lists specific requirements for selective majors and guarantees admission to UC in the major they choose. Once the TAA is written, students sign the agreement together with a community college counselor and a UC representative. These signatures guarantee that students will be admitted to UC in their first choice of major, for the specified term, provided they complete the terms of the agreement and apply for admission during the open filing period.

CSU Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG)

The CSU has a similar program for transfer students. The Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program was designed to assist students who begin their baccalaureate preparation at a community college before entering the university. The TAG agreement outlines the community college coursework necessary to guarantee later entry into a specific CSU, as well as the minimum number of units and grade point average needed. Combined with early advising, the program helps to ensure the completion of coursework for admission, general education, and lower-division major requirements. For most campuses, the TAG agreements must be initiated no later than one year prior to intended entry into CSU. Once a TAG agreement is completed, students are ready to apply and be admitted to CSU for a pre-selected term of entry.

CSU Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP)

SB 1785 called for transfer agreements between CCC students and specific CSU campus departments. Students may enter into a single agreement with a CSU and meet the stipulated requirements for general education and for major preparation (defined system-wide) and then the 15 additional units defined by that local campus/department. In addition, impacted campuses or major programs on any campus may impose additional

criteria that must also be met. According to published statements, a signed contractual agreement will afford a student a guarantee of priority consideration at the time of admission; these details have not yet been finalized by the CSU system.

Current Limitations:

At present, UC continues to honor its TAAs; however, following the launching of the LDTP, CSU will phase out TAGs and institute the transfer contracts called for in SB1785. Clearly stated contractual obligations, TAAs and TAGs have been very popular with students and community college counselors; curtailing these agreements has not been seen in a positive light by either community college faculty or students. As the LDTP contracts have not yet been initiated, and as they are only one pathway for transfer, it remains to be seen whether they will garner the widespread support that earlier TAGs enjoyed. Both the nature and promise of the various LDTP agreements between a student and a single chosen campus remain to be finalized.

Function 9: *Provide transfer students 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.*

Need: Admission to the UC or CSU is a major step in the transfer process. However, once accepted, students have a new set of needs which, if not given necessary attention, will create barriers to students' success at the university. Students need the following guidance and support: 1) confirmation, through a timely transfer credit evaluation, of the units accepted and requirements completed with an explanation of any remaining graduation requirements; and 2) advising in the major to confirm the students' declaration of a major and the development of their personal graduation plans.

Responses to the Need:

Both UC and CSU are engaged in efforts to strengthen the support to transfer students. Recent CSU Board of Trustees action urges campus presidents and faculty to take specific steps to facilitate graduation, including working with transfers to clarify requirements for an early declaration of major, development of personal graduation plans, and completion of the degree. Some campuses are considering mandatory orientation for transfer students. Others have established first semester transfer seminars that seek to reinforce the new relationships at the baccalaureate institutions.

UC campuses currently offer orientation programs that specifically address the needs of new transfer students. The campuses also provide a variety of support services specifically for transfer students, some of which include academic and career advising, workshops, mentoring and tutoring. Many of the UC campuses have also established facilities, such as resource centers, designated for transfer student use.

Current Limitations:

Although orientations for transfer students have included referral to the normal array of advising and student academic support services, it is only recently that UC and CSU have given concerted attention to “sealing the deal.” New efforts now underway will require time and resources. As these efforts are evaluated, CSU and UC will better understand the most important steps their institutions can take to ensure a successful transfer process, persistence toward a degree, and a timely graduation.

Function 10: *Provide a process whereby all transfer initiatives are reviewed.*

Need: Currently, transfer initiatives are created by individual groups or segments and then funded by the Legislature either through general fund allocations or specific grants. There is no single body that oversees these initiatives, reviews their progress, or is held accountable. A review process should be developed to assist in identifying programs that have become obsolete or ineffective or that require further development or additional future funding. Such an annual report will provide an intersegmental faculty perspective on the effectiveness of California’s transfer programs. **The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) is prepared to undertake this review and sees this report as an initial effort in that direction.**

VI. FORWARD LOOKING: A PLAN TO IMPROVE TRANSFER FUNCTIONS

Particularly in this climate of budget constraints, it is imperative that the state uses its funds in a resourceful and economical manner. Faculty share the views of legislators and outside observers that work done on behalf of transfer and articulation should not be duplicative. It is faculty who are often called upon to be involved in such work. As a result, ICAS has examined the work currently being performed by a number of initiatives and the funding presently allocated to them. To continue the funding and services provided by key groups, we recommend some consolidation of transfer efforts. This final section will look at

- (a) the most essential transfer functions discussed in Section V, asking: how can current transfer initiatives be reconfigured to address continuing limitations and be more effective than at present? and how are existing structures positioned to assume functions or responsibilities of initiatives slated for elimination?
- (b) a general suggestion for annual review to ensure accountability.

A. Addressing Essential Functions

Below we suggest how four important and essential transfer functions would be addressed in any consolidation proposal: faculty-to-faculty dialogues, course identifier numbers, qualification of courses, and dissemination of information.

- **Faculty-to-Faculty Dialogue**

Since faculty members are responsible for curricular development and decisions, this proposal begins with faculty-to-faculty dialogues.

IMPAC's Venue for Faculty Discussions and Dissemination of Information

Under any consolidation plan, IMPAC would continue the necessary faculty-to-faculty work; assist in creating course identifier numbers and descriptors, and disseminate information for curricular discussions. These discussions are critical for all segments; it is critical given the work of LDTP which intends to disseminate information for curricular discussions through the IMPAC Project and post final decisions through their own mechanisms. IMPAC currently has the infrastructure to continue to coordinate any further faculty discipline review meetings, as well as regional and statewide meetings as necessary. In addition, IMPAC currently has 32 discipline listservs, representing more than 20,000 faculty, which it uses to communicate with faculty in specific disciplines in all three segments of higher education. It is the largest intersegmental statewide, coordinated effort fostering communication among faculty within and across disciplines.

Supporting Segment-specific Initiatives

As mentioned above, departmental faculty at the baccalaureate degree granting institutions determine requirements for lower-division, major preparation of transfer students; hence they are responsible for developing and updating their own curriculum regularly. These universities must provide full information about the curriculum to students, community college faculty, and articulation officers. Segmental efforts must also address two essential transfer functions by providing articulation officers with access to current information about major requirements and providing students with assurances that the courses they take will transfer to a four-year university.

IMPAC meetings can be used to further the segment-specific initiatives noted elsewhere. IMPAC faculty can, for example, advise CSU on the capacity of community colleges to offer courses and suggest improvements for course descriptors established by LDTP faculty. Because LDTP transfer patterns will periodically need to be reviewed and updated, the IMPAC Executive Committee might work with LDTP to determine how best IMPAC could contribute to this process. The additional presence of UC faculty in the IMPAC discussions as the LDTP findings help community college faculty develop courses of value to students who may transfer to either UC or CSU.

The CSU LDTP and the UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Project will continue the necessary segmental faculty-to-faculty work, supported by their own systems' funding strategy. As part of their internal faculty-to-faculty dialogues, LDTP, for example will create course identifier numbers and descriptors for courses of concern to their transfer program and post their conclusions on ASSIST and their own websites. However, it is recommended that both the CSU and UC projects consider a formal role for community college faculty to participate in their separate segmental discussions, which will provide CSU and UC with information about how their decisions impact California's community colleges and their students who hope to transfer.

2. Mechanism for Defining Course Identifier Numbers

Students need clear indications of the courses necessary for acceptance at the baccalaureate-degree granting institutions of their choice such as those listed on ASSIST. The CAN System was initially developed as a course identification system for common core lower-division transferable, major preparation courses commonly taught on CCC, CSU and UC campuses.

A numbering system common to all three segments is still desirable. Building on the CAN course descriptors and articulation agreements, the CSU will define course identifiers for LDTP courses and other “supporting” courses identified by the LDTP groups. The CCCs is considering maintaining a separate numbering system built upon CAN to identify major preparation courses or sequences, and perhaps even general education or for elective courses. This segment-specific system would fulfill the charges of SB 1785 and SB 1415 to community colleges, but would likely be open to participation of UC, CSU, and independent colleges and universities.

3. Qualification of Courses

Once course identification numbers and descriptors are developed, courses must be qualified to receive this identifying number. CSU, UC and the CCCs have different methods for associating lower division courses with their appropriate descriptors and related course identifier number. One mechanism for ongoing certification of courses meeting the common general education curriculum (IGETC/CSU GE Breadth, and SciGETC) has been the IGETC/CSU GE Breadth Committee whose work will continue as presently assigned.

Within the CSU LDTP course review groups, CCC and UC faculty might be included. During its review of curriculum, this group could certify the course as warranting designation of a course identifier, and any participating articulation officer(s) would then ensure that the LDTP course numbers are posted on ASSIST.

Others have suggested that the lower division course could be certified as qualifying for a course identifier number by faculty at the sending and receiving institutions, who work with their articulation officers during the formal articulation process.

As the Community College system develops its own response to the assigning of a course identifying number in response CAN’s demise, their faculty must identify an intersegmental mechanism to review and assign their numbers, perhaps along the lines proposed by CAN prior to its termination. . As the Community College system develops its own response to the demise of CAN faculty must consider how best to disseminate information. IMPAC’s listservs to all community college chairs and deans can be one effective mechanism, as can the CIAC listserv and website

4. Dissemination of Articulation Information

Articulation officers gather articulation information from and provide data to ASSIST where it is easily accessed by students, faculty, counselors, advisors and other articulation officers in this cycle. Given the success of ASSIST’s efforts, and the preliminary work it had done to posting former CAN numbers, we propose that

ASSIST continue and expand such efforts to include the new CSU numbers for major preparation courses, lower division patterns, and for recommended electives as well; additional discussions will need to be held regarding the posting of numbers devised by the California community colleges.

Again, as the Community College system develops its own response to conform to the requirements of SB 1785 and SB 1415, the faculty must join with articulation officers, counselors and system officers to consider how best to disseminate information and respond to needs beyond those of LDTP. IMPAC’s listservs can be one effective mechanism, as can the CIAC listserv and website (<http://ciac.csusb.edu/ciac>), and other posting strategies yet to be identified.

B. Funding a Consolidated Proposal

A feasibility study, with cost estimates, is needed to provide details needed below. This study would help faculty and others assess the equity of those contributions.

| Entity and Task | System Contributions: Cash and in-kind | Accountable System |
|---|---|------------------------------|
| ASSIST: continues present work; assumes technical posting of course identifier numbers; | | UC |
| IMPAC: continues necessary faculty-to-faculty work; creates course identifier numbers/descriptors, has broad dissemination function | | CCC |
| COURSE QUALIFICATION EFFORTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersegmental committee reviews on-line submission of courses for SciGETC, GE/IGETC certification ▪ LDTP course identifier number qualification ▪ CCC course identifier number | | CSU/UC CSU CCC |
| SEGMENTAL INITIATIVES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LDTP ▪ Streamlining Course Major Preparation Articulation ▪ CCC replacement for CAN | | CSU UC CCC |

C. Accountability and Evaluation

Intersegmental programs are accountable to three large groups: students who use the services provided by these programs or benefit from their activities; the faculty who expend time and energy in designing and completing the work of the programs; and the respective system administrations, which provide the funding for the programs and are in turn accountable for using public funds wisely and in accordance with their respective missions. Because the programs are often either intersegmental or segment-specific, there is no appropriate, single administrative entity positioned to provide oversight of these programs and to evaluate the interests of all three groups of stakeholders. To date, separate accountability efforts must be undertaken by those who provide, those who fund, and those who participate.

Proposed Annual Review Process

ICAS proposes to serve as the intersegmental body that will engage in regular review and provide advice to the various intersegmental transfer programs. Because the academic senate faculty are charged with doing the bulk of the work (generating and reviewing curricula, appointing faculty to serve on review, oversight, coordinating, participating on interdisciplinary, admissions and other advisory and governance groups,) it then seems appropriate that ICAS review the accomplishments and achievements of these groups whose work is dependent almost wholly upon faculty collaboration and effort. Each group is asked to engage in self-reflective analysis, much as faculty have done in this report: examining the need for the initiative, the response being made, the inherent strengths and limitations as presently configured, and an analysis of the current limitations or unmet need.

Each intersegmental transfer program designated as a subject for this review process will submit a report to ICAS on the financial and programmatic activities of the preceding academic year. The transfer program's advisory body (e.g., Steering Committee, Board of Directors) should participate in providing information by September 30th every year. The report will include information on how well students have been served, how faculty have responded to the needs of transfer students, and how funds have been expended to accomplish the work of each program. The report might best build upon the items below, adapted as necessary to reflect the specific goals of the program:

- Description of mission, activities and programs, and organizational structure
- Description of interactions and collaborations with other intersegmental transfer programs
- Data on program usage by students, counselors, and other relevant parties
- Sources and amounts (on an annual basis) of all support funds
- Annual expenditures from all sources
- Overview of problems and areas of need, including ways in which these issues could be addressed
- Future projections of plans and resource requirements
- Any other information deemed relevant to the evaluation of effectiveness of the program
- Progress of implementation of the recommendations from the previous year's review

A committee of ICAS will constitute the review body for the intersegmental transfer programs' annual reports. The review committee should include membership from each public higher education segment and other such members as deemed relevant. The review committee will evaluate the effectiveness of each transfer program in facilitating transfer, both as an individual unit and as it interfaces with other programs. The review committee's report should make specific recommendations, if appropriate, for improvements in the mission, organization, allocation of resources, and programs and activities of the transfer programs. The review committee should also identify opportunities for cooperative planning and provide recommendations for areas in which the transfer programs should establish collaborations and/or eliminate redundancies. The review committee will submit its final report and recommendations to ICAS for endorsement and subsequent transmittal to the transfer program's advisory body. This report would also be submitted to the ICC as well as to the administrative leadership of each of the three segments, which may request additional information relevant to their respective oversight responsibilities.

VII.

CONCLUSION

At this time, articulation officers, counselors, transfer center directors, and others working with transferring students have some anxiety about the future of transfer initiatives. However, given the positive working relationships among intersegmental faculty, the coming year provides an opportunity to establish mutually respectful and collaborative mechanisms; it is conceivable that what will emerge from faculty efforts will be even richer than what has been before.

We suggest capitalizing on current best practices for essential transfer and articulation efforts. This proposed arrangement addresses the limitations noted earlier and builds on the strengths of current initiatives by:

- Retaining the infrastructure from IMPAC for necessary faculty-to-faculty discussions to address disciplinary and interdisciplinary issues; to convene additional discussions necessitated by system need (e.g., LDTP); and to share information and discuss curricular decisions made within the segments so that curricula can be improved
- Continuing to use IMPAC, professional groups, and segmental initiatives to generate common numbers or course identifiers and course descriptors;
- Providing a mechanism for wide dissemination of curricular information, proposed changes or resolution of conflicts;
- Strengthening intersegmental faculty review of course outlines for IGETC, CSU Breadth, SciGETC and course identification numbers;
- Acknowledging the significant contribution of articulation officers for reaching and codifying articulation agreements across the segments;
- Supporting the online posting of all articulation agreements on ASSIST
- Supporting counselors and tools such as ASSIST, the Transfer Planner, and other on-line guides to help students identify transferable courses, needed major preparation, and transfer requirements;
- Identifying the parties primarily responsible for conducting the work; and
- Adding systematic annual review of transfer initiatives.

Appendix A: Summary of Legislative and Faculty Initiatives

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|---|---|---|---|
| | Summary | Status | Summary | Current Status |
| 1960 | Master Plan for Higher Education established community college transfer as a priority for California colleges and universities. | | | |
| 1982 | | | California Articulation Numbering (CAN) System created by representatives of all three public higher education segments as a voluntary. | Although CAN attempted to restructure its model of how courses are CANed and broaden its course descriptors, CAN as once configured will no longer exist after June 30, 2005. |
| 1983 | SB85 requested CPEC to develop a plan for course numbering system to be used by public postsecondary education | | | |
| 1985 | | CPEC concluded its nationwide study of course numbering systems and recommended to the Legislature the CAN system | CSU adopted a systemwide general education pattern of courses, and faculty at UC conducted a series of studies of the general education and lower-division major requirements in several disciplines. | Led to adoption of IGETC, adopted in 1991. |

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|---|---|---|---|
| 1985 | | | In 1985, the Articulation System Stimulating Inter-institutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) project began as a computerized system for listing all articulated courses and agreements among the three public systems. | Continues |
| 1986 | | | ICAS began work on a common core of general education courses in response to recommendations in reports from the Commission to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education and the Joint Legislative Committee to Review the Master Plan. | Laid groundwork for IGETC, adopted in 1991. |
| 1988 | AB1725 (Vasconcellos) directed the systems to complete their work on the common core of GE work | | | |
| 1988 | | | ICAS officially endorses the CAN system. | |
| 1988 | Chaptered legislation required CCC, CSU, and UC to jointly develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer. | Intent language now expressed in Education Code Section 66720 | | |

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|--|---|--|--|
| 1991 | SB121 emphasized that a strong transfer function is the shared responsibility of CCC, CSU, and UC and included a number of provisions designed to enhance collaboration in support of transfer. | Intent language now expressed in Education Code Section 66740 | ICAS develops and approves IGETC—an intersegmental GE Curriculum Project where all CCC courses are reviewed for appropriate curriculum to meet UC and/or CSU requirements in the lower division. | |
| 1991 | AB617 expressed the legislature’s commitment to encourage and support collaboration and coordination among all segments of higher education.” | Intent language now expressed in Education Code Section 66010.7 | | |
| 1995 | SB450 (Solis) required the CCC BOG to develop a common numbering system for community colleges with the intent to create a single uniform number for each course within the community college system only. | In June 2003, CCC Chancellor Tom Nussbaum declared the California Articulated Numbering (CAN) System as the common number system for California Community Colleges and issued an executive order requiring all colleges to participate. | | |
| 1997 | | | All three systems formally adopted ASSIST as the statewide repository of articulation information. | |
| 1998 | AB 1972 (Alpert) amended IGETC to permit a student to be certified by CCCs even though he/she is one or two courses short of meeting full IGETC | Not passed. | ICAS worked with the author to develop a policy on “IGETC After Transfer” that accomplished the bill’s intent. | Passed by all faculty of three segments in 1999. |

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|---|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1998 | | | ICC sponsored and CDE developed Student Friendly Services website for 4 segments of education to serve as a single portal for college information, including transfer and articulation. | Operational but incomplete. |
| 1998 | | | CSU develops the Transfer Planner | |
| 1999 | Governor Davis challenged UC/CSU to establish course comparability agreements between all segments; develop transfer agreements to ensure courses transfer and avoid duplication of courses taken before and after transfer; and to develop transfer agreements, similar to IGETC, for high demand major in major coursework. | | ICAS sponsored Transfer Issues summit to identify barriers to transfer; laid groundwork for IMPAC. | |
| 1999 | SB 1211 (Monteith) required that articulation and transfer program agreements be made between California State University campuses and community college districts that have a minimum of 20 applicants. | Introduced; not passed. | | |

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|--|---|---|--|
| 1999 | | | <p>ICAS develops the IMPAC Project to review major preparation and determine the competencies, skills, bodies of knowledge and experiences, and proper sequencing of coursework with a series of disciplines.</p> | <p>IMPAC funded by a Governor’s grant; continues to be vital and functional</p> |
| 2000 | <p>AB1861 (Runner) requested UC and required CCC to develop systemwide articulation/transfer agreements with all CCCs articulating all lower-division course requirements for 20 high-demand majors. In addition, required CSU and requested UC to develop articulation/transfer agreements with all community colleges within their respective geographic regions</p> | <p>Enrolled and vetoed by the Governor because of state-mandated costs.</p> | | |
| 2000 | | | <p>CSU Presidential Summit created by CSU administration to develop major preparation among colleges and universities in LA region</p> | |
| 2000 | | | <p>CSU Lower Division Common Core Project is formed by CSU faculty to work on aligning their own lower division coursework across the state.</p> | <p>Renamed POL in 2003 (Project on Lower Division Requirements); many of efforts now contained in ongoing Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) Project</p> |

| Year | Legislative Initiatives | | Faculty/System Initiatives | |
|------|--|--|--|--|
| 2003 | | | OSCAR developed | |
| 2004 | SB 1785 (Scott) required that CSU campuses shall develop a transfer admission agreement with each student who intends to meet the requirements | | CSU creates the Lower Division Transfer Pattern Project to identify the transfer patterns for lower division transfers in 26 majors complete this requirement | In progress, with implementation by June 2006. |
| 2004 | SB1415 (Brulte) required that CCC and CSU, and requests UC to adopt, a common course numbering system for the 20 highest-demand majors in the respective segments. | | CSU's LDTP Project will assign common course numbers to statewide transferable courses. | Developing course descriptors as of spring 2005 |
| 2005 | | | UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process Proposed to increase acceptance of articulation agreements among campuses when four campuses have articulated a course | UC Council of Academic Senates adopts resolution, May 2005. |
| 2005 | | | SciGETC modifies the IGETC path for students to satisfy the general education requirements. It allows students majoring in the physical and biological sciences to defer two of the IGETC course until after transfer. | Approved as a UC Senate regulation to be effective in Fall 2006. Adopted by the CCC AS in Fall 2004. Approved by the CSU AS in January 2005. Implementation to be codified in 2005-06. |

APPENDIX B: INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS

ASSIST – direct service for students, faculty, counselors (Intersegmental Effort)

Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) is an online student-transfer information system (<http://www.assist.org> website) that provides students, counseling faculty, and articulation officers with information on what courses at one public California Community College or university can be applied when transferred to another community college or university. ASSIST is the official repository of articulation for California’s public colleges and universities and provides the most accurate and up-to-date information about student transfer in California.

The campuses of each public higher education segment maintain extensive course articulation data in ASSIST, which is accessible to students trying to determine coursework that can be transferred to a four-year institution and that will allow the most efficient path to degree completion. In addition to traditional major preparation articulation agreements between pairs of institutions, ASSIST displays the CCC courses that meet the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements for completion of general education requirements at CSU and UC. IGETC is standardized across both CSU and UC. ASSIST also lists the courses approved for CSU GE Breadth. This past year, ASSIST worked with the CAN System Office to include CAN numbers on its website. In the 2004 calendar year 660,000 unique visitors requested over 5.8 million articulation reports in over 4 million visits where the ASSIST servers handled over 84 million web site hits.

Governance: The ASSIST Board of Directors, made up of representatives from each of the public postsecondary educational segments, oversees development and establishes policy for ASSIST. The ASSIST Coordination Site manages the daily implementation and project operations. The Board of Directors and the Coordination Site work together with participating campuses to ensure that ASSIST continues to meet the needs of students transferring among California’s institutions of higher education.

Funding: ASSIST is funded by the California State Legislature and is currently funded by all three segments, with their annual budget \$1,189,000 (CCC \$589,000, UC \$530,000, and CSU \$70,000). See www.assist.org for further information.

California Articulation Number (CAN) System – service to articulation officers and counselors; subsequently to students (CSU/CCC)

The California Articulation Number System (CAN) was a course identification system for common core lower-division transferable, major preparation courses commonly taught. Colleges and universities that demonstrated acceptance of courses through traditional articulation agreements could qualify courses for CAN designations. Courses with CAN designators were accepted by any other CAN-participating institutions as being comparable to their local courses with the same CAN designators to meet local requirements, even if the receiving university had not established an explicit traditional articulation agreement with a particular California community college. These CAN course numbers were listed next to the campus course number and prefix in local college catalogs and other publications to provide students at the participating campus with certainty that a CAN designated course on their campus would be accepted in lieu of an identically designated CAN course at any other participating campus in the state. The vision was that CAN would become California’s official statewide articulation system, and numbers would be posted and used by both

sending and receiving institutions. CAN sought to facilitate student transfer to California higher education through the establishment of a unified course articulation system for California.

The CAN System had been undergoing a restructuring for several years. In January 2000, the CAN Board determined that the CAN process developed in 1982 needed to be restructured to be more effective, comprehensive, and responsive to the needs of the participating colleges and universities. Under the old CAN System, one community college would identify four public universities that would accept the course curriculum for transfer, that course or course sequence could then be given a CAN number. Each CAN course is defined by a CAN course descriptor, developed by intersegmental faculty committees. The descriptors are guidelines for faculty to determine if a comparable course were offered on their campus in order to identify it for the CAN System and to articulate it with other campuses offering a comparable course. The CAN System was developed to eliminate the need to negotiate articulation agreements with every other campus. CSU has now withdrawn from CAN and UC has not participated for many years, and the California Community College system is presently determining its response to the dissolution of CAN in order to comply with SB 1415.

Based on information provided to ICAS by ASSIST, there are 9,821 CCC and 1,111 CSU courses qualified for CAN numbers. The 9,821 CCC courses qualified for CAN represent just less than 10% of the total 100,800 CCC courses that are transferable to CSU for general credit. Currently there are 260 generic CAN course descriptions and 36 generic CAN sequence descriptions. The status of these CANned courses is frozen, although LDTP and the community college course identifier system will each commence with existing CAN numbers for the immediate future.

Governance: CAN had been governed by the CAN Board of Directors responsible for guiding the development, management, and growth of CAN. It was made up of faculty, campus staff, and system office representatives from the University of California, California State University, the California Community Colleges, the Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The CAN System Office, ASSIST Director, and IMPAC Executive Director were also represented on the Board as ex-officio members.

Funding: CAN had been jointly funded by the California Community Colleges and the California State University through the State Budget and received \$835,000 through a CCC BCP and another \$154,989 from CSU for a total of \$989,989. However, \$540,000 of these funds had been sent annually to the 109 campuses at \$5,000 per campus for use in articulation and transfer training and support.

California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)

CIAC serves as a statewide intersegmental forum for Articulation Officers to meet, discuss, and resolve college transfer and articulation issues; and to facilitate the progress of students between and among the segments of postsecondary education in California. Their activities include: serving as an advocate for articulation and transfer between segments; providing professional development and mentoring for articulation officers; supporting the role of articulation officer throughout the state; providing a forum for the discussion of articulation and transfer issues throughout the state; and serving as a liaison between segmental offices, faculty senates, and member institutions regarding articulation, transfer, and related curricular issues.

Articulation Officers: While the faculty make the articulation decisions, the articulation process is directed and facilitated by the articulation officer at each institution. The articulation officers are liaisons between their home campuses and other institutions and serve as consultants, moderators, advisers, and communicators of articulation information. Articulation officers generally initiate faculty-approved articulation agreements and maintain official campus records. Articulation officers work very closely with faculty and academic departments; are knowledgeable about their campus programs as well as those of other institutions; and communicate changes and concerns of other campuses.

Funding: CIAC is funded by membership dues, generally paid through institutional funds.

▪ IGETC/CSU Breadth Patterns

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 “core curriculum” is the intersegmental faculty response to legislative mandates calling for such a general education core. All courses proposed for IGETC must be transferable to both CSU and UC. Course outlines, including representative texts, must be submitted for all proposed additions to IGETC lists.

For prospective transfer students who are definitely planning to enroll in the CSU the CSU General Education-Breadth (CSU GE-Breadth) as a more flexible pattern than IGETC as the CSU GE-Breadth pattern does not have to be completed in its entirety to be advantageous to transfer students. In some areas (e.g., the arts), the CSU GE-Breadth specifications allow a significantly wider range of courses to be accepted than the IGETC specifications allow. Further, certain courses used to satisfy CSU GE-Breadth requirements might also be certified as satisfying the CSU’s United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals requirement.

IGETC/CSU GE-Breadth Course Review Subcommittee

The courses submitted by the CCCs for consideration as IGETC or CSU GE Breadth courses are evaluated by faculty from all three segments under the auspices of the CSU administration.

Funding: In the 1990s, the CSU Chancellor's Office permanently transferred \$10,000 to the Academic Senate CSU budget to support travel expenses of CSU faculty members participating in the review of course outlines for IGETC and CSU GE-Breadth. CCC faculty are also represented on IGETC and GE review committees. Conducting much of the review online has reduced but not eliminated faculty travel, as faculty reviewers gather only for an initial orientation and training session.

Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)

ICAS was established by faculty in 1980 as a voluntary organization consisting of representatives of the Academic Senates of the three segments of public higher education in California. ICAS discusses a variety of issues of mutual concern such as student preparation for postsecondary education, the California Master Plan for Higher Education, access, transfer, articulation, general education, and educational quality and standards. The recommendations of ICAS are made to the Academic Senates of each of the three segments. In addition, ICAS advises the senates of public higher education, as well as education officials and policy makers in California. While ICAS does not directly implement higher education policy, it does develop standards. For example, ICAS developed IGETC and is responsible for updating the competency statements for entering freshman. In addition, ICAS developed and continues to supervise the IMPAC Project.

Funding: Participation of ICAS members and its appointees to its task forces or workgroups (including travel) is funded by the academic senates of each of the three segments. The chairship rotates, and his/her academic senate is responsible for costs of meetings and duplication of some materials.

California Education Roundtable's Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC)

The ICC is composed of staff, faculty, and student representatives from all sectors of education. It seeks to foster collaboration within California's educational community at all levels by conducting activities and supporting strategies that link the public schools, community colleges, and baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities.

Governance: The ICC is the arm of the California Education Round Table whose members give direction to the ICC and set priorities for ICC committees and their activities.

Funding: Funded by dues from Round Table members and other public and private entities.

IMPAC – direct service for faculty (Intersegmental)

The Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project is an initiative of ICAS. IMPAC's goal is to improve student transfer through increased awareness and involvement of faculty and to ensure that all students are well prepared for upper division work. The project ensures the voice of intersegmental higher education faculty in curricular decisions relative to transfer preparation.

The IMPAC project was designed to work in conjunction with other intersegmental transfer efforts and has provided a valuable linkage to the work of many other initiatives such as CAN and ASSIST. In an effort to reduce duplication, the IMPAC Project has worked very closely with the CAN System to accomplish mutual goals and includes on each discipline's meeting agenda the drafting of CAN descriptors. Moreover, some of the initial work of the IMPAC project has also been used as a springboard for the segmental faculty discussions of the CSU LDTP project.

Governance: IMPAC is overseen by an Executive Committee that is comprised by the three chairs of the CCC, CSU, and UC and is coordinated by a Steering Committee that includes faculty appointed by the three Academic Senates. The IMPAC Executive Committee is chaired in alternating years by the UC and CSU Academic Senate chairs.

Funding: The project is funded by a five year, \$2.75 million grant to the California Community Colleges with a community college serving as the fiscal agent. The grant enables faculty from the three higher education systems to meet regionally to discuss issues, concerns, and academic procedures that impinge upon the transfer of students in those majors. Specifically, the grant funds regional and state-wide faculty disciplinary and interdisciplinary discussions to address prerequisite and lower division courses students must complete prior to transfer to either CSU or UC.

LDTP: The Lower-Division Transfer Patterns

LDTP project is a joint effort of the Academic Senate CSU and the CSU Chancellor's Office. The project's central purpose is to help community college students who wish to transfer to the CSU choose efficient patterns of classes, so that they may graduate in a more timely fashion and without unnecessary duplication of units. CCC students completing LDTP contracts receive priority admission consideration at their selected CSU campuses. The project goal for the 2004-06 academic years is to identify a pattern of lower-division coursework to be taken in community college for each of the sixty high-demand majors. Beginning in fall term 2006, students who take the recommended path may be given priority admission when they transfer to a CSU campus. As with the IMPAC Project, discipline leaders for each LDTP Discipline are selected by the Academic Senate—in this case the CSU Academic Senate. In addition, the Academic Senate for the CCC was invited to send a discipline faculty representative to each of the discipline meetings to share the views of community college faculty.

Funding: LDTP is funded by CSU.

OSCAR – direct service to faculty and articulation officers (intersegmental)

The Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review (OSCAR) system is a new online, web-based computer system for the submission, review, and archiving of course outlines for California Community College courses proposed for articulation with the California State University and the University of California. OSCAR is a project developed by the California State University and ASSIST in close collaboration with the University of California. Using OSCAR, California Community College articulation officers can either type outlines into the OSCAR web pages, copy and paste outline data from other electronic

sources into OSCAR web pages, or directly download outline data from computerized curriculum management systems.

OSCAR course outlines are used to update the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), the CSU General Education Breadth (GE-B) course certification lists, the CSU American Ideals course lists, and the UC Transfer Course Agreement lists. CCC campuses receive electronic records of their submitted requests.

Presently, discussions are being held to determine if OSCAR will be expanded to support the LDTP and further expanded to provide an open repository of course outlines for faculty and articulation officer review. The CCC system will be exploring a potential use of OSCAR for its independent numbering system.

Governance: The OSCAR project has been developed, evaluated, and guided by an intersegmental advisory committee that includes CCC, CSU, and UC faculty, campus, and system office representatives as well as ASSIST staff. Components of the OSCAR system used by campuses to submit outlines are developed, maintained, and supported by ASSIST. Components of the OSCAR system used by faculty and system office staff to record decisions and notify campuses are developed, maintained, and supported by the CSU Chancellor's Office and ASSIST.

ASSIST operates the front-end OSCAR web site where campus Articulation officers enter course outlines and request the various articulation reviews to be conducted. The CSU Chancellor's Office operates a back-end OSCAR system that is used by CSU and UC faculty and staff to record IGETC and CSU GE-Breadth review decisions and transmit final decision data to ASSIST for inclusion in the ASSIST database.

Funding: ASSIST funding covers operations of the OSCAR front-end web site and the CSU Chancellor's Office internally funds operation and modification to the back-end OSCAR review system for IGETC and CSU GE-Breadth review.

Web-based Services to Students --direct service to students

ASSIST (See page 32)

— CSU Mentor

This CSU-maintained web -based portal at <http://www.csumentor.edu> contains a Transfer Planner that will be used by LDTP for posting of information about system-wide major patterns and the 15 campus-specific, locally determined units for each CSU.

▪ Student Friendly Services

Student Friendly Services is a website developed in collaboration with the California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), California Community Colleges (CCC), Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU), and the California Department of Education to allow students to obtain information about higher education opportunities in California. The site aims to become the portal for all colleges and universities in the state and provides tools for college exploration and admissions guidance/counseling.

The sites' Transfer Planner is a tool designed for California Community College students to track and plan their college work to meet CSU and/or UC general education requirements. There are two general education patterns currently supported in the Transfer Planner: the CSU General Education Breadth pattern and the IGETC. The Transfer Planner allows students to enter course information to view their status in completing either program.

However, the website has not been updated due to lack of staff support for at least a year, causing its data to be incomplete or inaccurate. Thus, in its present form, its contributions to students seeking information about community colleges, for example, may actually be counterproductive.

Funding: Student Friendly Services receives annual funding through the state budget to the California Department of Education.

— UC Pathways

UC Pathways is maintained by the University of California Office of the President. Its annual publication, *Answers for Transfers* can be found at <http://www.ucop.edu/pathways/>

Advisement to Students –direct services to students

Counseling faculty (CCC):

Counseling faculty--well-trained and informed faculty--within California's Community Colleges are integral to the success of students who seek guidance. They not only provide information about courses and programs but “counseling faculty are professionally trained to diagnose the difficulties students face in the educational arena, to prescribe solutions for those difficulties, and to support students during their struggle toward success” (Academic Senate for California Community College paper, *The Role of Counseling Faculty in the California Community Colleges*, January 1995). However, counseling faculty on California community college campuses are diminishing, with a ratio of 1900:1 students—about twice the ratio of California’s K-12 counselors. Thus, students do not have access to counseling services that would be afforded in an appropriate 350:1 ratio, as recommended by the *Real Cost of Education Report*, (2003, CCC Chancellor’s Office). The brightest and most capable community college students can negotiate the challenges posed by selecting and declaring a major, by preparing to meet the transfer requirements of specific institutions, and by ensuring their eligibility for financial aid. But most of the first-generation, college-going students are reluctant to seek the help they need or are uncertain about the information they need or the questions to ask when they do seek counselors' assistance. We have seen that students without proper guidance of counselors often take unnecessary courses. Without funding to hire more counseling faculty in the immediate future, it is imperative that accurate information portals lead unerringly to accurate information, and that adequate training sessions are provided for counseling faculty who serve students in a climate when the requirements seem to change daily.

Academic advisors (UC/CSU): At both CSU and UC, departmental faculty provide advisement within the department or school of the students’ identified major. Other experienced staff may provide advice to lower division students, particularly to prospective transfer students.