

INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATES

Wednesday, June 9, 2010
10:30 am – 4:00 pm

UC Sacramento Center
1130 K Street, 1st floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

AGENDA

Action	Item	Enclosures
Information 10:30-10:45	I. Chair's Welcome, Introductions & Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Chair Henry Powell	
Action 10:45-10:50	II. Consent Calendar <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Approval of the AgendaB. Approval of April 26, 2010 Meeting Notes <p><u>Action requested:</u> Approve consent calendar</p>	TBD
Discussion 10:50-11:15	III. Debriefing on ICAS Legislative Day <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ UC Academic Senate Vice Chair Dan Simmons	
Discussion 11:15-12:00	IV. Senator Carol Liu <p>Senator Liu is a graduate of San Jose State University and UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education. She was a junior and senior high school history teacher in the Richmond, California, public schools from 1964 through 1978, and an administrator from 1978 to 1984. She was President of the Pasadena City College Foundation Board, and served on the La Cañada Flintridge City Council for eight years. From 2000 to 2006, she served in the state Assembly. She has proposed SB 1126 (held in the Senate Appropriations Committee) that requires CCC and CSU, and requests the UC, to review the lower division 8 common core courses in child development or early education to improve articulation, and not require students who fulfilled lower division requirements to take more units in child development to satisfy graduation requirements; SB 1143 (passed the Senate Appropriations Committee) that would alter the community college funding formula to create an incentive for the colleges to help students complete their courses; and SB 969, which limits enrollment fees, prohibits year-over-year fee increases exceeding a specified percentage, and places a 6-month waiting period on fee increases.</p>	See hyperlinks to bills at left

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient.
Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.

<p>Discussion/ Action 12:00-12:30</p>	<p>V. Working Lunch – Transfer Curriculum</p>	<p>A) IGETC Standards Committee Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard Mahon, CCC Curriculum Committee Chair B) C-ID & LDTP Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michelle Pilati, CCC Vice President ▪ Barbara Swerkes, CSU Member-at-Large <p><u>Action requested:</u> Approve changes to the IGETC Standards, Policies and Procedures recommended by the IGETC Standards Committee.</p> </p>	<p>1 (pg 4-5) 2 (pg 6) 3 (pg 7-42)</p>
<p>Discussion/ Action 12:30 -1:45</p>	<p>VI. Transfer Issues and Initiatives</p>	<p>Transfer has become a major issue in the legislature. Several bills propose mechanisms that attempt to standardize transfer requirements and procedures, and the administrations of the three segments are moving toward solutions intended to ease the transfer of credit. Provost Pitts will brief us on the recent meeting of the California Roundtable. It is anticipated that SB 1440 will pass.</p> <p>A) California Education Roundtable Resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lawrence Pitts, UC Provost B) Aligning CSU’s GE Breadth with IGETC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bill Jacob, BOARS Vice Chair, UC C) Legislative Bills on Transfer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic Senate Chairs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SB 1440 (Padilla)(passed out of Senate Appropriations Committee) 2. AB 2302 (Fong)(in suspense) 3. SB 1126 (Liu)(in suspense) <p>See also: CSU’s legislative page and UC’s legislative page</p> <p><u>Action requested:</u> Determine next steps to respond to Roundtable request and likely legislative mandate for an AA transfer degree.</p> </p>	<p>4 (pg 43) 5 (pg 44-48) 6 (pg 49) 7 (pg 50-52)</p> <p>See links to bills at left.</p> <p>Background materials:</p> <p>Article on CCC/ Kaplan agreement</p> <p>PPIC report</p> <p>Moore/ Shulock report</p> <p>Jan. 2006 LAO report</p>
<p>Discussion/ Action 1:45-2:30</p>	<p>VII.</p>	<p>Response to Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dan Simmons, UC Academic Senate Vice Chair <p><u>Action requested:</u> Approve draft response</p> </p>	<p>8 (pg 53)</p>
<p>Discussion/ Action 2:30-2:45</p>	<p>VIII.</p>	<p>Area ‘b’ Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bill Jacob, BOARS Vice Chair, UC <p><u>Action requested:</u> Approve formation of Area ‘b’ Task Force</p> </p>	<p>9 (pg 54)</p>

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient.
Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.

Discussion/ Action **IX. Advocacy** **10 (pg 55)**

2:45-3:15 Discuss opportunities for advocacy during the summer and plan ahead for fall 2010.

- **Dan Simmons, UC Academic Senate Vice Chair**

- A) Summer Activities**
- B) Joint Op-Ed**
- C) Regional advocacy councils**

Action requested: **Determine next steps**

Discussion/ Action **X. Transition Discussion/2010-11 Meeting Dates**

3:15-3:45

- **Dan Simmons, UC Academic Senate Vice Chair**
- **Jane Patton, 2010-11 ICAS Chair and CCC Senate President**

Action requested: **Set 2010-11 meeting dates**

Discussion **XI. New Business**
3:45-4:00

Agenda Enclosures:

1. Unapproved minutes from May 10 meeting of IGETC Standards Committee (2 pgs), pgs. 4-5
2. Summary of proposed changes to IGETC Standards (1 pg), pg. 6
3. Marked up version of IGETC Standards, Policies and Procedures (36 pgs), pgs. 7-42
4. Pitts letter to Powell re: California Roundtable Resolution on Transfer (1 pg), pg. 43
5. California Roundtable Resolution on Transfer and meeting notes (5 pgs), pgs. 44-48
6. Duncan Orders Study of Restrictive Transfer of Credit Rules (1 pg), pg. 49
7. Powell letter regarding UC Work Group on recognizing GE Breadth (3 pgs), pgs. 50-52
8. Draft ICAS response to Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan (1 pg), pg. 53
9. BOARS' memo recommending Area 'b' Task Force (1 pg), pg. 54
10. Draft letter to the editor from ICAS chairs advocating for funding higher education (1 pg), pg. 55

Important Meeting Information

Location: The meeting will be held at the UC Sacramento Center, 1130 K Street, 1st floor.

Assistance: For assistance on the day of the meeting, please call Clare Sheridan at 510-590-0092 (cell) or Tacia Bates, CCC Academic Senate Office Manager, at 916-445-4753.

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient.
Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.



**Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS):
Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)
Standards Committee**

Monday, May 10, 2010 9-11 am • **Un**approved Minutes

Members present: Thea Labrenz, Richard Mahon (chair), Estela Narrie, Ken O'Donnell, Harry Powell, Dawn Sheibani

Members unavailable: Bob Quinn; John Tarjan

Guest: Elizabeth Atondo (who will take Estela's place in 2010-11).

The meeting began at 9:05

- I. The **agenda** was approved by consensus
- II. The **minutes** of March 15, 2010 and April 24, 2010 were approved by consensus
- III. **ICAS Update, common GE:** Richard summarized the ICAS discussion of April 26, 2010 on the desirability of moving IGETC and CSU Breadth closer together. Richard noted that he had emphasized the committee's view that the state already has a common GE pattern (IGETC) and that the question before ICAS was whether students educational needs are best served by IGETC in its current form, and whether it would be improved by the inclusion of some of the CSU elements (U.S. history and government at the college level, oral communication). Richard noted the lack of consensus expressed in the CIAC breakout Ken and Dawn had conducted about "what to do next" with common GE. Richard also noted the observation he'd made to ICAS that the question of *what students should know* is broader than the special expertise of the IGETC Standards committee and would require ICAS to appoint a broader group of faculty—whose discussion should certainly be informed about the likely impact on students the IGETC Standards committee can provide.

Richard noted that the ICAS discussion of greater GE alignment was eclipsed a bit by discussion of SB 1440 and that ICAS finally concluded to revisit GE question the issue early in the fall.

- IV. **IGETC Standards 1.2:** The committee reviewed the various edits Estela provided to the committee based on discussions throughout the year. There was agreement on the desirability of creating an appendix on "pass along" courses for the *IGETC Standards*. Although the Feb. 4, 2010 presentation to ICAS suggested that the committee would bring back "pass along" new language and guidelines about how to apply the language, the committee felt strongly that it would be preferable to add the language to the *IGETC Standards* now and to wait a year to develop the guideline language on the basis of the questions that arise from the field. Subject to subsequent review of language on AP scores, the committee voted to forward IGETC Standards

1.2 to the June 9, 2010 ICAS meeting for review and potential approval (M/S/C Powell/O'Donnell).

The committee expressed its great appreciation to Estela for acting as editor of the *Standards* for the past two years and wondered if she would be willing to continue on informally as document editor. Harry noted the great value the committee derives from members who have longer institutional memory and noted the fact that Estela had been part of the original group would make her ongoing participation very valuable. Richard suggested that next year's chair could organize agendas so that Estela need only be present for discussion of actual language changes. There was general agreement this would be desirable and the committee encourages next year's chair to include Estela in committee communications.

V. **Tasks to recommend to the committee for 2010-11:** Members identified two issues to recommend to next year's committee. (1) Drafting appendix language to guide the application of new flexibility for "pass along" courses. (2) Review the *Standards* language and courses that are eligible to meet the English/Critical Thinking requirement.

At this point it appears the AOs and segment system reps to the committee are clear, with the ICAS members yet to be determined. Both Harry and John will rotate off of ICAS. Richard indicated that he will remain on ICAS but he will not necessarily continue as committee chair.

	<u>CCC</u>	<u>CSU</u>	<u>UC</u>
faculty	Mahon?	?	?
artic	Atondo	Rizzoli	Labrenz
admin	Quinn	O'Donnell	Sheibani

The meeting adjourned at 10:15

CHANGES MADE TO IGETC STANDARDS 1.1

Cover: change version 1.1 to 1.2

Table of Contents: correct page numbers

Pages 1-2: Section 1..0: add statement that ICAS oversees IGETC. Add areas of distribution.

Page 6: Section 5.2.1: add #3 liberalizing “pass along” coursework from non CCC institutions. This policy aligns with CSUGE.

Page 9: Section 7.0: Insert AP Calculus AB sub-score of the Calculus BC exam. This keeps the AP test acceptances in IGETC synchronized to those in GE Breadth. The “Calculus AB sub-score” is reported by the College Board for the AP Calculus BC exam, and represents what a student who takes the longer Calculus BC test would have earned by taking the shorter Calculus AB test. The College Board and ACE recommend treating the AB sub-score the same as the stand-alone test.

Page 10 and 11: Section 7.1 and 7.2: language added to clarify that the CSU and UC accept other AP and IB exams for admission in addition to those listed and accepted for IGETC. Websites updated.

Page 11: Section 7.4: Place paragraph 2 and 3 before paragraph 1 for clarity.
Section 8.1: add exception to minimum unit value per course to permit use of two 3-quarter unit sequential math and English courses for Areas 1A and 2. This aligns with admission policy.

Page 22: Section 10.6.1: add Defense Language Institute courses to meet Area 6A

Page 24: Section 10.7: add “applied to” for clarity.

Page 28: Section 11.5: delete IB from Area 1A. Add note that IB is not accepted in this area.

FINAL Draft VERSION 1.24 June 4, 2009-May 2010 (For approval history, see last page)

IGETC

**STANDARDS, POLICIES
&
PROCEDURES
FOR
INTERSEGMENTAL
GENERAL EDUCATION
TRANSFER
CURRICULUM
Version 1.24**

The 2009 IGETC Standards, Policies and Procedures Version 1.1 provides an accessible way to review information related to the IGETC. This information includes current practices and policies and new policies and procedures as approved by the California Community Colleges, the California State University and the University of California. The IGETC Standards, Policies and Procedures contained in this document supersede any and all previous versions of IGETC Standards, Policies and Procedures including, but not limited to, IGETC Notes 1, 2, and 3.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

Table of Contents

1.0	History	pg. 1
2.0	Students Who May Use IGETC	pg. 32
	2.1 IGETC and Other Lower Division GE Options.....	pg. 32
	2.2 Students Who Are Eligible for IGETC.....	pg. 32
	2.3 Students Who Are Not Eligible to use IGETC.....	pg. 43
3.0	IGETC Course Database	pg. 43
4.0	IGETC Course Submission and Review Process	pg. 43
5.0	Courses Appropriate for IGETC	pg. 54
	5.1 CCC Courses on IGETC.....	pg. 54
	5.1.1 CCC Course Application Rights.....	pg. 54
	5.2 Non-CCC Courses on IGETC.....	pg. 54
	5.2.1 Lower Division Courses.....	pg. 65
	5.2.2 Upper Division Courses.....	pg. 65
	5.3 Foreign Coursework on IGETC.....	pg. 76
	5.4 Coursework taught in a Language Other Than English.....	pg. 76
	5.5 Online/Distance Education/Telecourses.....	pg. 76
	5.5.1 CCC Courses.....	pg. 76
	5.5.2 Non-CCC Courses.....	pg. 76
	5.5.3 Area 1C-Oral Communication.....	pg. 76
6.0	Courses Not Appropriate for IGETC	pg. 76
	6.1 Courses That Focus on Personal, Practical, or Applied Aspects.....	pg. 76
	6.2 Introductory Courses to Professional Programs.....	pg. 87
	6.3 Independent Study or Topics Courses.....	pg. 87
	6.4 Foreign Coursework.....	pg. 87
	6.5 Subject Area 1C: Oral Communication.....	pg. 87
	6.6 Summary of Non-Applicable Courses.....	pg. 87
7.0	Credit By Exam	pg. 98
	7.1 Advanced Placement.....	pg. 98
	7.2 International Baccalaureate (IB).....	pg. 109
	7.3 College Level Examination Program (CLEP).....	pg. 109
	7.4 Other Exams.....	pg. 1140
8.0	Unit Value	pg. 1140
	8.1 Minimum Unit Value.....	pg. 1140
	8.2 Combining Quarter and Semester Units.....	pg. 1140
9.0	Grades	pg. 1244
	9.1 Minimum Grade Requirements.....	pg. 1244
	9.2 Credit/No Credit – Pass/No Pass.....	pg. 1244

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

9.3 Language Other Than English (LOTE) – High School Grade Exception.....	pg.	12 ¹¹
10.0 Subject Areas and Course Guidelines.....	pg.	13 ¹²
10.1 Subject Area 1: English Communication.....	pg.	13 ¹²
10.1.1 Subject Area 1A: English Composition.....	pg.	13 ¹²
10.1.1a Courses That Do Not Fulfill The English Composition Requirement.....	pg.	14 ¹³
10.1.2 Subject Area 1B: Critical Thinking and Composition.....	pg.	14 ¹³
10.1.2a Critical Thinking and Composition Background.....	pg.	14 ¹³
10.1.2b Critical Thinking/Composition Courses From Institutions Other Than the California Community College System.....	pg.	15 ¹⁴
10.1.3 Subject Area 1C: Oral Communication.....	pg.	15 ¹⁴
10.1.3a Oral Communication Online/Distance Education/Telecourse Limitations.....	pg.	16 ¹⁵
10.2 Subject Area 2: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning.....	pg.	16 ¹⁵
10.3 Subject Area 3 A/B: Arts and Humanities.....	pg.	17 ¹⁶
10.3.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Arts Requirement.....	pg.	17 ¹⁶
10.3.2 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Humanities Requirement.....	pg.	18 ¹⁷
10.4 Subject Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences.....	pg.	18 ¹⁷
10.4.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Social and Behavioral Sciences Requirement.....	pg.	19 ¹⁸
10.5 Subject Area 5 A/B: Physical and Biological Sciences.....	pg.	19 ¹⁸
10.5.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Physical and Biological Sciences Requirement.....	pg.	19 ¹⁸
10.5.2 IGETC Laboratory Science Requirement.....	pg.	20 ¹⁹
10.5.3 Unit Requirement for Laboratory Science Courses.....	pg.	20 ¹⁹
10.6 Language Other Than English (LOTE).....	pg.	20 ¹⁹
10.6.1 Certification of Competence In a Language Other Than English.....	pg.	21 ²⁰

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.6.1a	Language Other Than English-Sequential Knowledge.....	pg. 22 ²¹
10.6.2	Using High School Courses to Meet the Language Proficiency Requirement.....	pg. 22 ²¹
10.6.2a	Acceptable Courses.....	pg. 23 ²²
10.6.2b	Seventh and Eighth Grade Courses.....	pg. 23 ²²
10.6.2c	Validation of Less Advanced Coursework.....	pg. 23 ²²
10.6.2d	Evaluation of Letter Grades.....	pg. 23 ²²
10.6.2e	“D” and “F” Grades in Less Advanced Work.....	pg. 24 ²³
10.6.2f	Repeating Courses With “D” or “F” Grades.....	pg. 24 ²³
10.6.3	Placement of Courses Meeting the Language Other Than English Requirement.....	pg. 24 ²³
10.7	CSU U.S. History, Constitution and American Ideals Graduation Requirements..	Pg. 24 ²³
11.0	Certification Process.....	Pg. 25 ²⁴
11.1	Who Certifies the IGETC?.....	pg. 25 ²⁴
11.2	Reviewing Coursework From Other Institutions.....	pg. 25 ²⁴
11.2.1	Coursework From Other California Community Colleges.....	pg. 25 ²⁴
11.2.2	Coursework From All Other U.S. Regionally Accredited Institution.....	pg. 25 ²⁴
11.3	Instructions for Completing IGETC Certification Form.....	pg. 25 ²⁴
11.4	Partial IGETC Certification.....	pg. 27 ²⁶
11.5	The IGETC Certification Form.....	pg. 28 ²⁷
11.6	Sample Letter Validating LOTE.....	pg. 29 ²⁸
	IGETC Standards Founding Committee.....	pg. 30 ²⁹
	IGETC Standards Approval History.....	pg. 31 ³⁰
	IGETC Standards Ongoing Governance.....	pg. 31 ³⁰

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

1.0 History

Purpose

The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (*IGETC*) began in 1991 to provide an option for California Community College students to fulfill lower-division general education requirements before transferring to either a California State University or University of California campus. [The curriculum and its policies are overseen by the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates \(ICAS\), representing faculty from California's three segments of public higher education.](#)

Background

Since the development of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, ease of transfer has been the cornerstone of California's three-tiered system of higher education. Transfer issues were therefore central to the concerns of legislators and members of the Commission to Review the Master Plan ("*the Commission*"), who examined and renewed the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in the 1980s.

In response to the concerns raised by the Commission and the Legislature, embodied in Assembly Bill 1725 (*Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988*), faculty from the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California developed IGETC to provide a statewide, lower-division general education transfer curriculum applicable to all California Community College (*CCC*) students transferring to a California State University (*CSU*) or University of California (*UC*) campus. The Academic Senates of the California Community College, the California State University, and the University of California endorsed the creation of IGETC to facilitate the ease of transfer for California Community College students, regardless of the CSU or UC campus to which they transfer.

Other General Education Programs

Both the California State University (*CSU*) and the University of California (*UC*) established curricular programs to assist California Community College students in meeting lower-division general education requirements prior to transfer.

Beginning in Fall 1981, CCC students were able to use the statewide CSU General Education-Breadth pattern to meet lower-division general education, a lower-division GE pattern that is still predominantly used by CCC students who transfer to a CSU campus. Both CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC are authorized and described in CSU Executive Order 595.

Realizing the need for transfer facilitation, the University of California adopted the Transfer Core Curriculum (*TCC*) in 1988. The TCC option for meeting general education requirements was phased out by Fall 1993 following IGETC's 1991 adoption by the CCC Board of Trustees, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the UC Board of Regents.

Areas of Distribution

[The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum is comprised of courses taught at California Community Colleges that satisfy specific areas of general education:](#)

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

[Area 1: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking](#)
[Area 2: Quantitative Reasoning](#)
[Area 3: Arts and Humanities](#)
[Area 4: Social Sciences](#)
[Area 5: Natural Sciences](#)
[Area 6: Language Other Than English.](#)
[Full descriptions of these six areas and their subareas begin in Section 10.0.](#)

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

2.0 Students Who May Use IGETC

Completion of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (*IGETC*) will permit a student to transfer from a California Community College to a California State University (*CSU*) or University of California (*UC*) campus generally without the need, after transfer, to take additional lower-division, general education courses to satisfy campus general education requirements. It is strongly recommended that students complete IGETC prior to transfer. Advantages of completing IGETC include more flexibility in class selection at the university and timely progress to degree completion. All UC and CSU campuses will accept the completed IGETC to satisfy all lower division general education requirements. However, individual colleges or majors within a CSU or UC campus may not accept IGETC for meeting general education. A list of those UC colleges and majors is found on the following website:

www.universityofcalifornia.edu/educators/counselors/adminfo/transfer/advising/igetc.html

Note: Students transferring to a CSU with a completed IGETC will still need to complete 9 semester units of upper division general education and may be held to other campus specific graduation requirements outside of general education and major coursework.

2.1 IGETC and Other Lower Division General Education Options

Completion of the IGETC is not an admission requirement or admission guarantee for transfer to CSU or UC, nor is it the only way to fulfill the lower-division, general education requirements for CSU or UC prior to transfer. Engineering students and students completing majors that have high lower division unit requirements are advised to focus on completing the pre-major requirements while meeting minimum admission requirements.

Students may also choose to complete coursework to meet the campus general education requirements of the university that they plan to attend. Depending on a student's major, the student may find it advantageous to take courses fulfilling CSU's general education requirements or those of the UC campus or college to which the student plans to transfer.

Students transferring to a CSU campus may choose to use the CSU GE-Breadth pattern in lieu of IGETC. Students may elect the GE pattern (*GE-Breadth or IGETC*) for certification at the time of transfer because nearly all IGETC coursework is embedded in the CSU GE-Breadth pattern.

2.2 Students who are eligible to use the IGETC

The IGETC was developed by the Academic Senates of the CCC, UC and CSU for use by California Community College transfer students. A student may be IGETC certified if they have completed coursework at a California Community College(s) without regard to current enrollment status or number of units accrued at a CCC.

Students who enroll at a UC or CSU campus, then leave and attend a community college, and subsequently return to a different UC or CSU campus may use the IGETC.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

2.3 Students who are not eligible to use the IGETC

Students who initially enroll at a UC campus, then leave and attend a community college, and subsequently return to the same campus are considered “readmits” by the UC. Such students cannot use the IGETC. CSU does not have a system-wide policy that addresses this issue. Questions regarding the use of IGETC for a student who has recently been enrolled at a CSU should be directed to the specific campus the student wishes to attend.

3.0 IGETC Course Database

The IGETC course list for all California Community Colleges is available on the ASSIST Coordination site at <http://www.assist.org>. Development of the IGETC database allows counselors and students easy electronic access to all California Community College lists and provides expeditious access to accurate information that facilitates certification of coursework completed at other California Community Colleges.

4.0 IGETC Course Submission and Review Process

Annually, the UC and the CSU jointly review courses that are submitted for IGETC consideration by CCC Articulation Officers. Submission details can be found on the ASSIST Coordination site at:

http://info.assist.org/pdf/assist/IGETC_Letter.pdf

Approved courses become effective the fall of the same academic year the course was submitted and approved if the course was active in the college’s curriculum at that time.

Example: A course submitted in December of 2008 and approved in March 2009, becomes effective on IGETC beginning fall 2008.

If a course is not approved for IGETC inclusion, detailed reasons for denial will be provided to the CCC. The CCC may then modify their outline of record and resubmit in the following submission cycle.

Occasionally, during the IGETC review cycle certain existing IGETC course(s) are reviewed to verify the course(s) continue to meet the IGETC standards. Course(s) resubmitted for content review and no longer found to meet the IGETC standards will be allowed to remain on the CCC IGETC list for at least one year. This allows the CCC time to submit a revised course outline for review, if appropriate.

Example: A CCC is notified in spring 2008 that English 101 no longer meets the IGETC standards. The course outline will remain effective on IGETC through summer 2009.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

5.0 Courses Appropriate for IGETC

Courses must be CSU and UC transferable.

There is no limitation on the number of courses completed at other United States regionally accredited institutions that can be included in the IGETC certification.

5.1 California Community College (CCC) Courses on IGETC

In recognition that students often attend multiple California Community Colleges, policy specifies that IGETC coursework completed in specific subject areas will be used in the area designated by the CCC at which the course was completed. In other words, if College A is certifying IGETC completion using work completed at College B, College A should use the coursework according to the approved list for College B.

5.1.1 California Community College Course Application Rights

Certification of coursework completed for IGETC will be honored provided that a course was on a college's approved IGETC list when it was completed. Courses with an approval date of fall 1991 may be applied to the IGETC if completed prior to fall 1991. Courses approved after fall 1991 may only be applied if completed on or after the approval date.

Example: Student 1 took Psychology 101 in 1975 (*IGETC approval date Fall 1991*). The course may be applied to IGETC. Student 2 took Chemistry 10 in 1975 (*IGETC approval date Fall 1992*). The course may not be applied to IGETC. Only if Chemistry 10 is taken fall 1992 or later can it be applied to IGETC.

Although California Community College courses may be listed in more than one area, they can only be applied to one area for certification purposes. The only exception is Language Other Than English (*LOTE*).
(See Section 10.6.3 for details)

5.2 Non-California Community College Courses on IGETC

Appropriate non-CCC general education courses in the humanities, mathematics, social sciences, and natural sciences that are completed at United States regionally accredited institutions should be routinely included in IGETC. For example, California Community Colleges should not hesitate to include such traditional introductory general education courses as Psychology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science, Biology, or Chemistry that have been completed at non-CCC colleges. Care should be taken to carefully scrutinize course outlines for content, prerequisites, texts, units, and IGETC Area Standards (See Section 10.0 for Standards). Particular care should be taken when evaluating non-CCC courses to fulfill IGETC Area 1B, Critical Thinking and Composition. Few non-CCC second semester English Composition courses offer a course in Critical Thinking/English Composition. Guidelines to determine if a course is appropriate can be found in Section 10.1.2b.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

5.2.1 Lower Division Courses

A California Community College may include non-CCC lower-division courses that are completed at a United States regionally accredited institution and meet IGETC specifications if the following criteria are met:

1. The coursework completed at these institutions is deemed by the CCC faculty in the discipline or their designee to be comparable to coursework on that community college's approved IGETC course list; or
2. If the certifying CCC does not have an IGETC comparable course for a non-CCC course, but there is an comparable course at another CCC which is found on their IGETC pattern, the course may be used on IGETC as long as the course outlines are compared and scrutinized as to equivalency in content, prerequisites, texts, units, and conformity to IGETC Area Standards.
(See Section 10.0 for Standards).
3. If there is no comparable course at either the certifying CCC or another CCC's, then the certifying CCC may use the non-CCC course on the IGETC provided that the non-CCC course conforms to the IGETC Area Standards. (See Section 10.0 for Standards)

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

If the non-CCC course was completed prior to the CCC course's IGETC effective date and meets the criteria as outlined in number 2 above, the non-CCC course may be applied to IGETC.

5.2.2 Upper Division Courses

In general, non-CCC courses applied to IGETC should be classified as lower-division. However, there are occasions when a course that is listed as upper-division may be applied to the IGETC. They include the following:

1. When a UC or CSU campus has classified a course or series as upper-division but has requested that the system wide offices allow lower-division transfer credit because an equivalent course is taught at a community college or because the preparation of the subject is desired prior to transfer from the 2-year institution to the 4-year institution. Current examples include economics, organic chemistry and abnormal psychology.
2. When a non-CCC course is determined comparable to one taught and approved for IGETC at a CCC, it may be applied to IGETC regardless of its upper-division status.
3. When a CSU uses an upper-division course in its "lower-division" General Education Breadth Pattern.

Note: In all cases, these courses should have sufficient breadth to meet the intent of IGETC.

CSU students are required to complete 39 semester units of lower division general education requirements to graduate. If students apply upper division units to the lower-division requirements for IGETC certification, they may need to complete

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

additional lower-division units to reach the required 39 lower-division units needed to graduate. Students should be advised of the potential ramifications of using this option.

5.3 Foreign Coursework on IGETC

Foreign coursework may be applied to IGETC if the foreign institution has United States regional accreditation. All other foreign coursework cannot be applied to IGETC.

Exception: Area 6: Language Other Than English (*LOTE*). Foreign coursework completed at a non-United States institution may be applied.
(See Section 10.6.1 for details on Language Other than English)

Students with a substantial amount of foreign coursework at a non-United States regionally accredited institution should be encouraged to follow the CSU or UC campus-specific general education pattern.

5.4 Coursework Taught in a Language Other Than English

United States regionally accredited coursework taught in a language other than English may be used on IGETC. However, course outlines must be submitted for review in English.

— **Exception:** Courses in the area of written communication/critical thinking and oral communication must be delivered in English. (IGETC Area 1)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

5.5 Online/Distance Education/Telecourses

5.5.1 CCC Courses

California Community Colleges may use online/distance education/telecourses for IGETC provided that the courses have been approved by the CSU and UC during the IGETC course review process. The relevant CCC Code of Regulations for distance education courses can be found in Title 5, Sections 55205 through 55215.

5.5.2 Non-CCC Courses

Non-CCC Institutions online/distance education/telecourses may be used on IGETC. The same scrutiny should be applied when reviewing these courses as when reviewing other non-CCC courses. (See Section 5.2 for guidelines)

5.5.3 Area 1C: Oral Communication (*CSU Only*) (Same as Section 6.5)

Strictly online Oral Communication courses may not be used on IGETC Area 1C (*CSU Only*). (See Section 10.1.3a) Hybrid-delivery courses may meet the area criteria.

6.0 Courses Not Appropriate For IGETC

6.1 Courses That Focus on Personal, Practical, or Applied Aspects

Content taught in courses applicable to IGETC shall be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on the core concepts and methods of the discipline. Courses such as Everyday Legal Problems, Beginning Drawing, News Writing, Physical Education,

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

College Success, Library Science or Child Development: Implications for Child Guidance are examples of courses that focus on personal, practical, or applied aspects and therefore do not meet the IGETC criteria.

6.2 Introductory Courses to Professional Programs

Courses such as Introduction to Business, Set Design for Theater, and Writing for Commercial Markets and other introductory professional courses are not considered to have breadth sufficient to meet general education requirements and are therefore excluded from IGETC.

6.3 Independent Study or Topics Courses

Independent study and special topics courses are not acceptable for IGETC. Content varies from term to term; therefore the applicability of these courses to IGETC cannot be determined.

6.4 Foreign Coursework

Foreign coursework may be applied to IGETC if the foreign institution has United States regional accreditation. All other foreign coursework cannot be applied to IGETC.

Exception: Area 6: Language Other Than English (*LOTE*). Foreign coursework completed at a non-United States institution may be applied.
(See Section 10.6.1 for details on *Language Other than English*).

6.5 Area 1C: Oral Communication (CSU Only) (same as 5.4.3)

Strictly online Oral Communication courses may not be used on IGETC Area 1C (*CSU Only*). (See Section 10.1.3a) Hybrid-delivery courses may meet the area criteria.

6.6 Summary of Non-Applicable Courses, including but not limited to the following:

- Courses not transferable to the CSU and UC
- Pre-baccalaureate courses (*including remedial English composition*)
- Variable Topics
- Directed Study
- Independent Study
- Foreign coursework from non-United States regionally accredited institutions (*Except LOTE, see Section 10.6*)
- Personal, Practical, Skills Courses
- Introductory courses to professional programs
- Performance Courses
- Creative Writing
- Logic
- Computer Science
- Trigonometry, unless combined with college algebra or pre-calculus
- Strictly online Oral Communication courses, Area 1C
- Courses with fewer than 3 semester or 4 quarter units
- Course outlines written in a language other than English

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

7.0 Credit by External Exams

There is no limit on the number of external exams that can be applied to IGETC.

7.1 Advanced Placement (AP)

A score of 3, 4, or 5 is required to grant credit for IGETC certification. An acceptable AP score for IGETC equates to either 3 semester or 4 quarter units for certification purposes.

Each AP exam may be applied to one IGETC area as satisfying one course requirement, with the exception of Language other Than English (LOTE). (See Section 10.6.3)

Students who have earned credit from an AP exam should not take a comparable college course because transfer credit will not be granted for both.

There is no equivalent AP exam for Area 1B- Critical Thinking/Composition requirement.

Students earning scores of 3, 4, or 5 in the physical and biological science AP examinations earn credit toward IGETC Area 5 and meet the IGETC laboratory activity requirement.

AP exams in Biology, Chemistry or Physics B allow CCC campuses to apply 4 semester or 5 quarter units to IGETC certification. For Environmental Science, Physics C: Mechanics and Physics C: Electricity/Magnetism, 3 semester or 4 quarter units are applied for IGETC certification; therefore, students who complete these exams will be required to complete at least 4 semester or 5 quarter units to satisfy the minimum required units for Area 5.

AP EXAMINATION	IGETC AREA	AP EXAMINATION	IGETC AREA
Art History*	3A or 3B*	Comparative Government & Politics U.S. Government & Politics	4H 4H and US 2
Biology	5B with lab	U.S. Government & Politics Human Geography	4H and US 24E
Calculus AB	2A	Human Geography Italian Language & Culture	4E 3B and 6A
Calculus BC	2A	Italian Language & Culture Japanese Language & Culture	3B and 6A 3B and 6A
Calculus BC/ AB subscore Chemistry	2A 5A with lab	Japanese Language & Culture Latin Literature	3B and 6A 3B and 6A
Chemistry Chinese Language & Culture	5A with lab 3B and 6A	Latin Literature Latin: Vergil	3B and 6A 3B and 6A
Chinese Language & Culture Macroeconomics	3B and 6A 4B	Latin: Vergil Physics B	3B and 6A 5A with lab
Macroeconomics Microeconomics	4B 4B	Physics B Physics C mechanics	5A with lab 5A with lab
Microeconomics English Language	4B 4A	Physics C mechanics Physics C	5A with lab 5A with lab

Formatted Table

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

English Language English Literature*	1A-1A or 3B*	electricity/magnetism Physics C electricity/magnetism Psychology	with lab 5A with lab 4H
English Literature* Environmental Science	1A or 3B* 5A with lab	Psychology Spanish Language	4I 3B and 6A
Environmental Science European History*	5A with lab 3B or 4F*	Spanish Language Spanish Literature	3B and 6A 3B and 6A
European History* French Language	3B or 4F* 3B and 6A	Spanish Literature Statistics	3B and 6A 2A
French Language French Literature	3B and 6A 3B and 6A	Statistics U.S. History*	2A (3B or 4F*) and US 1
French Literature German Language	3B and 6A 3B and 6A	U.S. History* World History*	(3B or 4F*) and US 1 3B or 4F*
German Language Comparative Government & Politics	3B and 6A 4H	World History*	3B or 4F*

*AP exams may be used in either area regardless of where the certifying CCC's discipline is located.

Example: U.S. History at a CCC is approved for Area 3B. The U.S. History AP may be used in Areas 3B or Area 4.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.71"

Actual AP transfer credit awarded [for these and other AP exams](#) for admission is determined by the CSU and UC. The UC Policy for AP credit can be found in the publication *Quick Reference for Counselors*, <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/educators/counselors/resources/materials/OR.pdf>

The CSU also has a systemwide policy [for these and other AP exams](#) for awarding transfer credit for admission. The CSU policy for AP can be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/app/general-ed-transfer.shtml> http://www.calstate.edu/app/general_education.shtml

7.2 International Baccalaureate (IB)

A score of 5, 6 or 7 on Higher Level exams is required to grant credit for IGETC certification. An acceptable IB score for IGETC equates to either 3 semester or 4 quarter units for certification purposes.

Students who have earned credit from an IB exam should not take a comparable college course because transfer credit will not be granted for both.

International Baccalaureate (IB)	IGETC AREA
IB Biology HL	5B (without lab)
IB Chemistry HL	5A (without lab)
IB Economics HL	4B
IB Geography HL	4E
IB History (any region) HL	3B or 4F*
IB Language A1 (any language, except English) HL	3B and 6A
IB Language A2 (any language, except English) HL	3B and 6A
IB Language A1 (any language) HL	3B
IB Language A2 (any language) HL	3B

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

IB Language B (any language) HL	6A
IB Mathematics HL	2A
IB Physics HL	5A (without lab)
IB Psychology HL	4I
IB Theatre HL	3A

*IB exam may be used in either area regardless of where the certifying CCC's discipline is located.

Example: History at a CCC is approved for Area 3B. The History IB may be used in Areas 3B or Area 4.

Actual IB transfer credit awarded for these and other AP exams for admission is determined by the CSU and UC. The UC Policy for IB credit can be found in the publication *Quick Reference for Counselors*.

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/educators/counselors/resources/materials/OR.pdf>

The CSU also has a systemwide policy for these and other AP exams for awarding transfer credit for admission. The CSU policy for IB can be found at

<http://www.calstate.edu/app/general-ed-transfer.shtml>
http://www.calstate.edu/app/general_education.shtml

7.3 College Level Examination Program (CLEP)

CLEP cannot be used on IGETC.

7.4 Other Exams

College Board and ACT exams cannot be used to satisfy IGETC requirements (e.g. SAT I, SAT II, Subject Tests, Achievement Tests).

Exceptions: AP exams as listed in Section 7.1 and SAT II for Language Other Than English (LOTE) as listed in Section 10.6.1 may be used.

Credit by exam is acceptable provided that a United States regionally accredited college or university transcript specifies the course title, unit value and grade. A "Credit/Pass" designation is acceptable provided that the institution's policy states that a "Credit/Pass" designation is equivalent to a "C" grade (*2.0 grade points on a 4.0 scale*) or better. The course must be deemed comparable by the CCC faculty in the discipline or its designee as defined in Section 5.2.

College Board and ACT exams cannot be used to satisfy IGETC requirements (e.g. SAT I, SAT II, Subject Tests, Achievement Tests).

Exceptions: AP exams as listed in Section 7.1 and SAT II for Language Other Than English (LOTE) as listed in Section 10.6.1 may be used.

8.0 Unit Value

8.1 Minimum Unit Value

A course must have a minimum unit value of 3 semester or 4 quarter units to meet the

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

requirements for IGETC. (*Laboratory courses intended to accompany lecture courses are an exception to this guideline, see Section 10.5.3*). It is not acceptable to take three 1 unit courses to fulfill a 3 unit requirement, because as a rule three 1 unit courses will not together provide the depth or rigor of a single 3-unit course.

Exception: 3-quarter unit Math and English courses that satisfy IGETC Area/s 1A or 2 may be applied if they are a part of a sequence, and at least two of the 3-quarter unit sequence courses have each been completed with “C” grade (2.0 on a 4.0 scale) or higher. The course sequence must meet the rigor of IGETC Standards. (See Section/s 10.1.1 and/or 10.2)

Example A: Student takes English 101, 102, and 103 (3-quarter units each). The CCC certifying college may apply any combination of 101, 102 or 103 that have been completed with a “C” grade (2.0 on a 4.0 scale) or higher, for a total of six quarter units, to clear Area 1A. The combination of courses must meet the rigor of the IGETC Standards. (See Section 10.1.1.)

Example B: Student takes Math 121, Calculus A (3 quarter units) and Math 122, Calculus B (3 quarter units) and completes each course with a “C” grade (2.0 on a 4.0 scale) or higher.. [Calculus 121 and 122 are the same as Calculus 120, Calculus (6 quarter units)]. The certifying CCC campus may apply Math 121 and 122, for a total of 6 quarter units, to IGETC Area 2 as long as the courses meet the rigor of the IGETC Standards. (See section 10.2)

8.2 Combining Quarter and Semester Units

When combining quarter and semester unit values within an IGETC area, units shall be converted to either all quarter units or all semester units to best serve the student. For example, in Social/Behavioral Sciences (*Area 4*), a student needs either a minimum of 9 semester units or 12 quarter units. If a student takes one 4 quarter unit course and two 3 semester unit courses, convert the semester units to quarter units (*6 units x 1.5 quarter units=9 quarter units*). The student will be credited with 13 quarter units in Area 4 and has satisfied the requirement.

The conversion of units from semester to quarter for meeting minimum unit requirements may result in a student needing additional coursework to meet CSU graduation requirements. To graduate from the CSU, students must complete 48 semester or 72 quarter units of general education which includes 9 units of upper-division general education coursework, as determined by the receiving CSU campus.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

9.0 Grades

9.1 Minimum Grade Requirements

A minimum “C” grade is required in each college course for IGETC. A “C” is defined as a minimum of 2.0 grade points on a 4.0 scale. A “C-” grade valued at less than 2.0 grade points on a 4.0 scale can not be used for IGETC certification.

9.2 Credit/No Credit-Pass/No Pass

Courses in which a student receives a “Credit/Pass” grade may be certified for IGETC if the community college’s policy states that a “Credit/Pass” designation is equivalent to a “C” grade (*2.0 grade points on a 4.0 scale*) or better. It is important to keep in mind that some CSU and UC campuses may have limitations on the number of “Credit/No Credit” (*“Pass/No Pass”*) courses that may be used to meet degree requirements. The UC system allows a maximum of 14 semester units graded “Pass/No Pass” (*Credit/No Credit*) basis of the 60 transferable semester units required for admission.

There is no system-wide policy for CSU campuses. Therefore, each campus has established its own policy on limitations of courses transferred with grades of “Credit/Pass”. The information is updated annually and is available as part of the materials made available for the CSU fall counselor conferences. See the CSU Student Academic Support website: <http://www.calstate.edu/ar/counselors.shtml>, under Counselors and Educators, for counselor conference materials.

9.3 Language Other Than English High School Grade Exception

For the UC Language Other Than English requirement, Area 6A, the University of California does not count “minus” or “plus” grades for high school coursework, only the whole grade is used. In other words, a “C-” grade is counted as a “C”.

Example: A student receiving “C-” grades in high school Spanish 1 and 2 meets the language proficiency requirement.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.0 Subject Areas and Course Guidelines

All courses offered towards satisfaction of the requirements of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum must be baccalaureate in level and must be acceptable for transfer among all segments of California public postsecondary education. Courses listed in more than one area can only be applied in one area.

Courses in the IGETC shall be culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach and have a pronounced historical perspective. They should recognize the contributions to knowledge, civilization, and society that have been made by men, women and members of various ethnic or cultural groups.

IGETC courses shall address the modes of inquiry that characterize the different areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted, and the validity and implications of the answers obtained.

Coursework taken at a United States regionally accredited institution of higher education taught in a language other than English may be used on IGETC. However, course outlines must be submitted for review in English.

Exception: Courses in the area of written communication/critical thinking and oral communication must be delivered in English. (IGETC Area 1)

The following requirements are listed in terms of the number of courses specified for each designated area and the minimum number of semester and quarter units so represented.

10.1 Subject Area 1: English Communication (3 courses; 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units)

Area 1A: One course, English composition, 3 semester/4-5 quarter units;

Area 1B: One course, Critical Thinking/English Composition, 3 semester/4-5 quarter units;

Area 1C: One course, oral communication, 3 semester/4-5 quarter units.

Exception: Area 1C, Oral Communication, is required only for students transferring to the CSU.

10.1.1 Subject Area 1A: English Composition

A first-semester course in English reading and written composition must include substantial instruction and practice in expository essay writing at the college level with a minimum of 6,000 words. Courses should also require a substantial amount of reading of significant literature. Successful completion of the course in reading and written composition must be prerequisite to the course in Critical Thinking/English Composition.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.1.1a Courses That Do Not Fulfill the English Composition Requirement, including but not limited to:

1. English as a Second Language courses (*ESL*).
2. English composition courses which are intended for non-native or international students.
Example: English 101, English Composition for Non-Native Speakers (same as English 100, Freshman English Composition)
3. Writing courses designed to meet the needs of a particular major, (*e.g.*, *Writing for Accountants, Journalism, Business Writing/Communication*).
4. Courses designed exclusively for the satisfaction of remedial composition (*ELD*).

10.1.2 Subject Area 1B: Critical Thinking and Composition

Successful completion of the course in reading and written composition must be prerequisite to the course in Critical Thinking/English Composition.

The second semester of English composition may be met by those courses in critical thinking taught in a variety of disciplines which provide, as a major component, instruction in the composition of substantial essays and require students to write a sequence of such essays. Successful completion of the course in reading and written composition shall be prerequisite to the course in Critical Thinking/English Composition. Written work shall be evaluated for both composition and critical thinking. Texts chosen in this area should reflect an awareness of cultural diversity. A minimum of 6000 words of writing is required.

Instruction in critical thinking is to be designed to achieve an understanding of the relationship of language to logic, which should lead to the ability to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to identify the assumptions upon which particular conclusions depend. The minimal competence to be expected at the successful conclusion of instruction in critical thinking should be the ability to distinguish fact from judgment, and belief from knowledge; to use elementary inductive and deductive processes; and to recognize common logical errors or fallacies of language and thought.

10.1.2a Critical Thinking and Composition Background

From fall 1991 through the summer of 1993 there was a phase-in period for courses meeting the critical thinking and composition requirement. Community college students could satisfy this requirement by completing a second-semester English composition course and a critical thinking course, with no regard to the actual date of transfer. Students, who completed one of the two courses for this requirement prior to fall 1993, may still satisfy the requirement by completing the remaining course. After the summer 1993 term, completion of a single course is required to fulfill the Critical Thinking/English Composition requirement.

Please refer to IGETC Areas 8A and 8B available on the ASSIST Coordination site at <http://www.assist.org>.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.1.2b Critical Thinking/Composition Courses from Institutions Other Than the California Community College (CCC) System

In most cases, courses are found lacking in instruction in critical thinking if the course description and objectives did not specifically include critical thinking skills. Introduction to principles of inductive and deductive processes, the relationship of language to logic, and the abilities to analyze, criticize, and advocate ideas often are not evident. The critical thinking component should go beyond critical reasoning or literary criticism.

When certifying completion of coursework taken at non-CCC United States regionally accredited institutions, the rule is that community college faculty in the discipline or their designee determines that the coursework is comparable to courses approved for IGETC at a California Community College. Since it is unlikely that institutions other than California Community Colleges will have a combined course in Critical Thinking/English Composition, certification of coursework from other institutions to satisfy this requirement is not common.

However, there are some courses outside the CCC system that have been found to meet this requirement. Care should be taken when evaluating the course to ensure that it meets the course requirements as outlined in the above paragraphs. It is strongly suggested that valid documentation (*i.e. course outline of record or syllabus*) be kept on file by the CCC and by the student.

10.1.3 Subject Area 1C: Oral Communication (CSU Requirement Only) (One course: 3 semester, 4 quarter units)

Instruction approved for fulfillment of the requirement in oral communication is to be designed to emphasize the content of communication as well as the form and should provide an understanding of the psychological basis and the social significance of communication, including how communication operates in various situations. Applicable courses should view communication as the process of human symbolic interaction focusing on the communicative process from the rhetorical perspective: reasoning and advocacy, organization, accuracy; the discovery, critical evaluation and reporting of information; reading and listening effectively as well as speaking and writing. This must include active participation and practice in written communication and oral communication.

Interpersonal communication courses are not a natural fit in the oral communication area, but a few have incorporated significant faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in speaking with others; added at least a small component of traditional rhetoric; and won placement in the oral communication area.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.1.3a Oral Communication Online/Distance Education/Telecourse Limitations

Oral communication courses must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in communicating orally in the presence of other listeners. Rhetorical principles must be covered; for example, study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction is appropriate.

The CSU Communication departments have asked that for courses submitted for IGETC Area 1C, the “methods of instruction” and “methods of evaluation” section of the outline be very specific about how instruction and evaluation are conducted so that it may be determined that student presentations will be made in front of faculty and other listeners and not online or recorded. This request is met by language in the CSU’s executive order governing General Education Breadth:

<http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1033.html>

Acceptable courses must include faculty-supervised, faculty-evaluated practice in communicating orally (*live*) in the physical presence of other (*live*) listeners. Rhetorical principles must be included and specified in the course outline (*for example, the study of effective communication in formal speeches or social interaction would be appropriate*). Acceptable outlines will specify the “methods of instruction” and “methods of evaluation” to assist reviewers in determining whether performance and evaluation take place live in the presence of faculty and other listeners.

Strictly online oral communication courses may not be used on IGETC Area 1C (*CSU Only*). Hybrid-delivery courses may meet the area criteria.

10.2 Subject Area 2: Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning (1 course; 3 semester, 4-5 quarter units)

The Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-term course in mathematics or statistics above the level of intermediate algebra, with a stated course prerequisite of intermediate algebra. Courses outside the discipline of math using the application of statistics may be used to fulfill this requirement, as long as the course has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite and knowledge of intermediate algebra is necessary to be successful. An appropriate course in statistics must emphasize the mathematical basis of statistics, probability theory and estimation, application and interpretation, uses and misuses, and the analysis and criticism of statistical arguments in public discourse.

Knowledge relevant to public and private decision making is expressed frequently in quantitative terms, we are routinely confronted with information requiring quantitative analysis, calculation, and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematical Concepts and

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

Quantitative Reasoning is designed to help prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges.

Courses approved to fulfill this requirement must focus on quantitative analysis and the ability to use and criticize quantitative arguments. Symbolic Logic, Computer Programming, and survey courses such as Math in Society, were deemed unacceptable to fulfill the Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

10.3 Subject Area 3 A/B: Arts and Humanities

(3 courses; 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units)

At least one course in the Arts and at least one course in the Humanities are required.

The Arts and Humanities requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least three courses which encourage students to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to develop an historical understanding of major civilizations and cultures, both Western and non-Western, and should recognize the contributions to knowledge, civilization, and society that have been made by men and women, and members of various ethnic or cultural groups.

At least one course shall be completed in the Arts (*Area 3A*) and one in the Humanities (*Area 3B*). Within the Arts area, performance and studio classes may be credited toward satisfaction of this subject area if their major emphasis is the integration of history, theory, and criticism. CSU campuses have the discretion whether to allow courses used to satisfy the CSU United States History, Constitution and American Ideals (*AI*) graduation requirement to count in both Areas 3B/4 and to meet the AI graduation requirement.

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Our understanding of the world is fundamentally advanced through the study of Western and non-Western philosophy, language, literature, and the fine arts. Inclusion of the contributions and perspectives of men and women, and members of various ethnic or cultural groups shall be included.

10.3.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Arts Requirement

The Arts courses meeting this requirement have as their major emphasis the integration of history, theory, aesthetics, and criticism. Courses which focus on technique or performance were not approved to meet this requirement (*e.g., Beginning Drawing, Beginning Painting, and Readers Theater and Oral Interpretation courses focusing primarily on performance*).

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.3.2 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Humanities Requirement

Acceptable Humanities courses are those that encourage students to analyze and appreciate works of philosophical, historical, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. The faculty of the two segments determined that courses such as English composition, Logic, Speech, Creative Writing, Oral Interpretation, Readers Theater, Spanish for Spanish Speakers, and all elementary foreign language courses were skills or performance courses that do not meet the specifications for IGETC. Advanced foreign language courses were approved if they include literature or cultural aspects. Theater and film courses were approved if they were taught with emphasis on historical, literary, or cultural aspects. The segments will also accept Logic courses if the focus is not solely on technique but includes the role of logic in humanities disciplines.

10.4 Subject Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences

(3 courses: 9 semester, 12-15 quarter units); from at least two academic disciplines.

The Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least three courses dealing with individual behavior and with behavior in human social, political, and economic institutions; the three courses must be in a minimum of two academic disciplines or in an interdisciplinary sequence. The pattern of coursework completed shall ensure opportunities for students to develop understanding of the perspectives and methods of the social and behavioral sciences. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary, historical, and geographical settings. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to help them gain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of men, women and of ethnic and other minorities and a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies. The material should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects. CSU campuses have the discretion whether to allow courses used to satisfy the CSU United States History, Constitution and American Ideals (AI) graduation requirement to count in both Areas 3B/4 and to meet the AI graduation requirement.

Courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences allow students to gain a basic knowledge of the cultural and social organizations in which they exist as well as the behavior and social organizations of other human societies. People have, from earliest times, formed social and cultural groups that constitute the framework for the behavior of the individual as well as the group. Inclusion of the contributions and perspectives that have been made by men and women, and members of various ethnic or cultural groups as part of such study will provide a more complete and accurate view of the world.

Introduction to American Government courses are not required to contain a California Government component in order to be applied in Area 4. However, a California Government component is required for the CSU AI requirement.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.4.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Social and Behavioral Sciences Requirement

Only courses taught from the perspective of a social or behavioral science are approved. Consequently, courses such as Physical Geography and Statistics do not meet the IGETC specifications for this area and are not approved. Community colleges may resubmit these courses in a more appropriate area. Courses with a practical, personal, or applied focus are not approved (*See Section 6.0*). Administration of Justice courses may be approved if the content focuses on core concepts of the social and behavioral sciences.

10.5 Subject Area 5 A/B: Physical and Biological Sciences

(At least 2 courses: 7-9 semester, 9-12 quarter units); A minimum of one course in each area is required, and at least one must include a laboratory.

The Physical and Biological Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of at least two courses, one of which is in Physical Science (*Area 5A*) and one in Biological Science (*Area 5B*), at least one of which incorporates a laboratory. Courses must emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic questioning, rather than only the recall of facts. Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.

The contemporary world is influenced by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the relationship of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

10.5.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Physical and Biological Sciences Requirement

Acceptable courses must focus on teaching the basic concepts of biological sciences. Human Nutrition, Horticulture, Forestry, Health, and Human Environment courses were determined to have a narrow or applied focus and therefore unacceptable for this area. Courses which emphasize the major concepts of the discipline, including biochemical and physiological principles, will be considered. Courses which do not focus on the core concepts of a physical science discipline, such as Energy and the Way We Live, are not acceptable. Courses which survey both the physical and biological sciences but are not comparable in depth and scope to a traditional science course or focus on a particular subject will not satisfy Area 5 of IGETC.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.5.2 IGETC Laboratory Science Requirement

The IGETC physical and biological science area requires a minimum of two courses, at least one of the two must include a laboratory. The intent of the IGETC laboratory science requirement is that students take at least one physical or biological science course incorporating a laboratory component. Since the experimental methodology and hypothesis testing taught in a lab builds on the principles presented in the lecture portion of the course, the two must be related. Therefore, the laboratory must correspond to one of the lecture courses taken to fulfill this IGETC requirement. A student cannot use lecture courses in two subjects and a laboratory in a third subject. It is expected that the lecture course is a prerequisite or co-requisite of the laboratory course. Lecture and lab courses may have separate course numbers.

10.5.3 Unit Requirement for Laboratory Science Courses

Three semester or four quarter unit laboratory science courses may be used on IGETC to clear the laboratory science requirement as long as the minimum unit value is met for this area (*7 semester or 9 quarter units*).

Example A: 1 biological science w/lab, 3 semester units
1 physical science, 4 semester units
Conclusion: Area 5 satisfied

Example B: 1 biological science w/lab, 3 semester units
1 physical science, 3 semester units
1 physical or 1 biological science, 3 semester units
Conclusion: Area 5 satisfied

10.6 Language Other Than English (LOTE)

Exception: Only students transferring to the UC are required to meet this area.

Students shall demonstrate proficiency in a language other than English equal to two years of high school study. Those students who have satisfied the UC freshman entrance requirement in a language other than English will have fulfilled this requirement. This requirement may also be satisfied by demonstration of equivalent proficiency prior to transfer.

Language courses should provide instruction in the written and oral language as well as history and cultural traditions of the country associated with the language studied. Languages other than English for Native Speakers are appropriate for transfer. Courses primarily conversational must have as a prerequisite a course equivalent to the third year of high school study or one year of college level in the language. Also, the content of conversation courses should not be primarily business or travel-oriented.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.6.1 Certification of Competence in a Language Other Than English

Students transferring to the University of California are required to demonstrate competence (*proficiency*) in a language other than English equal to two years of high school study. Competence may be demonstrated through one of the following mechanisms:

1. Satisfactory completion of two years of high school coursework (*United States high school or high school in country where the language of instruction is English*) in a language other than English, with a grade of "C-" or better in each course. The two years must be in the same language.
2. Satisfactory completion of a course (*or courses*) at a college or university with a grade of "C" (2.0) or better in each course. Usually, one semester of college work in a language other than English is equivalent to two years of high school work. The equivalency is usually stated in the college catalog. For the purpose of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, the appropriate course (*or courses*) that can be used to satisfy the Language Other Than English (*LOTE*) requirement is indicated on the approved IGETC list of each community college.
3. Satisfactory completion, with "C" (2.0) grades or better, of two years of formal schooling at the sixth grade level or higher in an institution where the language of instruction is not English. Appropriate documentation must be presented to substantiate that the required coursework was completed. If an official sealed transcript cannot be obtained from a foreign institution an unofficial or opened transcript may be used to verify proficiency. Students who cannot provide documentation should either pass one of the examinations or tests listed below in 4 through 10, or satisfactorily complete an appropriate language course at their college, as outlined in 2 above.
4. Satisfactory score on the SAT II: Subject Test in languages other than English.

Before May 1995 use 1st score; if taken after May 1995 use 2nd score:

Chinese with listening: 500/520
 Hebrew (Modern): 500/470
 Korean/Korean with listening: /500
 French/French with listening: 500/540
 Italian: 500/520
 Latin: 500/530
 German/German with listening: 500/510
 Japanese with listening: 500/510
 Spanish/Spanish with listening: 500/520

5. Satisfactory score, 3 or higher, on the College Board Advanced Placement examinations in languages other than English.
6. Satisfactory score, 5 or higher, on the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examinations in language other than English.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

7. Satisfactory completion of an achievement test administered by a community college, university, or other college in a language other than English. The test will have to assess the student's proficiency at the level equivalent to two years of high school language. This conclusion must be posted on a transcript indicating unit, course title and grade or on a document with letter head of the institution granting proficiency stating that the student has mastered proficiency in the language equivalent to two years of high school language.
8. If an achievement test is not available, a faculty member associated with a United States regionally accredited institution of higher education can verify a student's competency. The institution must provide a document on letterhead asserting that the student has mastered proficiency in the language equivalent to two years of high school study. (See Section 11.6 for a sample. This sample must be printed on college/ university letterhead.)
9. Language other than English "O" level exam with grade of "A", "B", or "C".
10. Language other than English International "A" Level exam with a score of 5, 6, or 7.
11. A Defense Language Institute language other than English course which is indicated as passed with a "C" or higher on the official transcript.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

10.6.1a Language Other Than English-Sequential Knowledge

In May 2005, UC faculty confirmed that foreign language is an area of sequential knowledge and validation in this area is acceptable. During the 2005-06 TCA update, agreements were adjusted to reflect this understanding. Courses that are equivalent to two years of high school study are identified by a footnote and with the IGETC Area 6A designation for each foreign language at each CCC. In addition, courses beyond the proficiency level as well as the second half of split courses are also identified with the IGETC Area 6A designation. UCOP no longer requires both courses of a split sequence to be taken in order for credit to be granted. The second half of a split course sequence may now validate the first half. Credit should be granted for each individual course as indicated on the community college transcript. For practical purposes this policy began in the 2005-06 year but UC campuses may use discretion when considering students from past years. Flexibility is encouraged whenever possible.

10.6.2 Using High School Courses to Meet the Language Proficiency Requirement

The following are regulations used by the University of California in evaluating high school work in Languages Other Than English:

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.6.2a Acceptable Courses

Two years of high school coursework in a language other than English. The two years must be in the same language.

Example: If a student takes two languages, but completes only one year in each, he/she **has not met** the requirement. If a student has not completed two years of foreign language in high school, he/she can meet the proficiency requirement by completing a community college course that is equivalent in level to two years of high school, with a “C” (2.0) grade or better.

10.6.2b Seventh and Eighth Grade Courses

Courses in languages other than English completed in the 7th and 8th grades with grades of at least “C-” may be used (*see Section 9.3/10.6.2d*). However, the principal of the high school from which a student graduates must certify that the 7th and 8th grade courses are comparable in content to those offered at the high school. This may be done by including the names of and grades for these courses on the student's transcript, or by stating their equivalency on the transcript. The 7th and 8th grade courses may also be validated if the student completes one semester or more of a foreign language in the high school at level three or higher.

10.6.2c Validation of Less Advanced Coursework

A more advanced course may be used to “validate” a less advanced course even if the less advanced course does not appear on the high school transcript.

Example: Spanish level 2 in high school completed with at least “C-” grades “validates” Spanish level 1.

10.6.2d Evaluation of Letter Grades

The University of California does not count “minus” or “plus” grades in computing the grade point average; only the whole grade is used from high school coursework. In other words, a “C-” grade is counted as a whole “C”.

Example: A student receiving “C-” grades in Spanish level 1 and level 2 meets the language proficiency requirement.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

10.6.2e “D” and “F” Grades in Less Advanced Work

Students may clear “D” and “F” grades in less advanced work by completing more advanced work with grades of “C-” or higher.

Examples:

1. A student taking two years of the same language with grades “DD” and “CC” meets the requirement because the “CC” in the more advanced course validates the “DD” in the first level course.
2. Two years of the same language with grades “DD” and “DC” meets the requirement because the “D’s” are validated by the grade in the most advanced class.
3. Two years of the same language with grades “CC” and “DD” does NOT meet the requirement because the “D” grade is in the most advanced course.

10.6.2f Repeating Courses with “D” or “F” Grades

A student may clear “D” and “F” grades by repeating the course(s) in which the “D” or “F” grades were received.

Example: If a student repeats Spanish level 1 because of “D” grades and then gets a “C-” or better, it counts as one year completed. However, the student will still need to take an additional year (*Spanish level 2*) to meet the requirement.

10.6.3 Placement of Courses Meeting the Language Other Than English Requirement

The completion of an advanced course, such as French level 3, “validates” the student’s proficiency in the language and can be used to satisfy proficiency and clear IGETC Area 6A, Language Other Than English. Appropriate exams can be used to certify the Language Other Than English (*LOTE*) requirement. The more advanced language courses that focus on culture and otherwise satisfy the specifications of the humanities can be used to satisfy the Area 3B (*Humanities*) and clear IGETC Area 6A, Language Other Than English (*LOTE*).

10.7 CSU U.S. History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement

The CSU U.S. History, Constitution, and American Ideals (*AI*) graduation requirement is not part of IGETC. Courses used to satisfy this requirement may also be listed [and applied to](#) ~~in~~ IGETC Subject Areas 3B and/or 4. CSU campuses have the discretion whether to allow courses used to satisfy the CSU United States History, Constitution and American Ideals (*AI*) graduation requirement to count in both Areas 3B/4 and to meet the AI graduation requirement.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

11.0 Certification Processes

It is the student's responsibility to request IGETC Certification. It is strongly recommended that students complete IGETC prior to transfer. Advantages of completing IGETC include more flexibility in class selection at the university and timely progress to degree completion.

There is no limitation on the number of courses completed at other United States regionally accredited institutions that can be included in the IGETC certification.

11.1 Who Certifies the IGETC?

Students who have completed coursework at more than one California Community College should have their coursework certified by the last California Community College they attended for a regular term (*fall or spring for semester schools; fall, winter or spring for quarter schools*) prior to transfer. If a student requests certification from a California Community College that is not the last school of attendance, it is at the discretion of that community college to certify.

IGETC certifications will be processed by each CCC campus without regard to current enrollment status or number of units accrued at a particular CCC. IGETC certification form shall be included on or sent with the student's transcript directly to the UC or CSU campus Admission's Office.

11.2 Reviewing Coursework from Other Institutions:

11.2.1 Coursework from another California Community College

The coursework should be applied to the subject area in which it is listed by the institution where the work was completed. In other words, if college A is certifying completion of the IGETC using work completed at college B, college A should place that work according to the approved list for college B.

11.2.2 Coursework from all Other United States Regionally Accredited Institutions

The coursework from these institutions should be placed in the same subject areas as those for the community college completing the certification.

(See Section 5.2 for details)

11.3 Instructions for Completing Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum Certification Form

1. The IGETC certification form shall be completed by authorized CCC staff or faculty as determined by each community college.
2. For each area, list course(s) taken, name of college or the Advanced Placement exam (*minimum score of 3 is required*). Advanced Placement cannot be used for Area 1B (*Critical Thinking/English Composition*) or 1C (*Oral Communication*). List units in "Units Completed" column on right side, indicating quarter or semester units.
3. Full IGETC Certification may be forwarded to the CSU or UC in one of two ways:
 - i. Utilizing a separate form, with all areas completed (see section 11.5 for a sample IGETC Certification form).

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

- ii. Noting full IGETC certification on the official transcript. Notation must include whether the full certification is for UC or CSU and must indicate which courses are being used for full certification.

Example: Full IGETC Certification: UC or Full IGETC Certification: CSU with a note next to each class used for certification.

Partial IGETC Certifications must be sent as a separate form (see section 11.4)

4. Courses used for IGETC certification must be passed with a minimum grade of “C” (“C-” is not acceptable, except for high school courses used to satisfy LOTE. See Section 9.3/10.6.2d). A “C” is defined a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. A “Credit” or “Pass” is acceptable providing either is equivalent to a grade of “C” (a 2.0 on a 4.0 scale) or higher. A college transcript or catalog must reflect this policy.
5. On the bottom section of the form, check if IGETC certification is directed to the California State University or University of California.
6. Sign and date the form. A campus seal is not required.
7. The form must come directly from the community college to the UC or CSU campus(es) to be considered official. A copy of the form will be considered official by CSU and UC campuses providing it has an official signature or stamp.
8. Students who have completed coursework at more than one California Community College should have their coursework certified by authorized staff from the last California Community College attended for a regular term (*fall or spring for semester schools; fall, winter or spring for quarter schools*) prior to transfer. If a student requests certification from a California Community College that is not the last school of attendance, it is at the discretion of that community college to certify.
9. Although not part of IGETC, community colleges may certify completion of the CSU graduation requirement in U.S. History, Constitution and American Ideals. Courses used to meet this requirement may also be used to satisfy IGETC Subject area requirements. CSU campuses have the discretion whether to allow courses used to satisfy the CSU United States History, Constitution and American Ideals (*AI*) graduation requirement to count in both Area 3B/4 and to meet the AI graduation requirement.
10. Open or unofficial transcripts for LOTE are acceptable.
11. When combining quarter and semester unit values within an IGETC area, units shall be converted to either all quarter units or all semester units to best serve the student. For example, in Social/Behavioral Sciences (*Area 4*), a student needs either a minimum of 9 semester units or 12 quarter units. If a student takes one 4 quarter unit course and two 3 semester unit courses, convert the semester units to quarter units ($6 \text{ units} \times 1.5 \text{ quarter units} = 9 \text{ quarter units}$). The student will be credited with 13 quarter units in Area 4 and has satisfied the requirement.

The conversion of units from semester to quarter for meeting minimum unit requirements may result in a student needing additional coursework to meet CSU graduation requirements. To graduate from the CSU, students must complete 48 semester/72 quarter units of general education per Executive Order 1033.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

11.4 Partial IGETC Certification

Partial certification is defined as completing all but two (2) courses on the IGETC pattern. The student petitions for certification and either the complete or partial certification is sent by the CCC to the UC or CSU. Partial Certifications must be accompanied by a separate IGETC Certification Form, which clearly indicates that the certification is "Partial", and identifies which requirement(s) remain to be completed. (See section 11.5 for a sample IGETC Certification form). Each UC or CSU campus will inform a student that has submitted a partial certified IGETC of the specific timelines and courses needed to complete the IGETC. The UC or CSU is responsible for verifying that the missing IGETC course(s) has been completed.

The student may complete the missing course(s) in one or more of the following ways or in some other manner acceptable to the receiving institution:

1. Take an approved IGETC course, in the area(s) to be completed, at any California Community College at a time that does not require concurrent enrollment, such as during the summer.
2. Take a course approved by the UC or CSU campus of attendance in the area(s) to be completed at a United States regionally accredited institution at a time that does not require concurrent enrollment, such as during summer.
3. Take an approved IGETC course, in the area(s) to be completed, at any California Community College while concurrently enrolled at a UC or CSU campus. The student will be subject to the UC or CSU campus rules regarding concurrent enrollment, so this option may not be available.
4. Take a course approved by the UC or CSU campus of attendance at a United States regionally accredited institution in the area(s) to be completed while concurrently enrolled at a UC or CSU campus. The student will be subject to the UC or CSU campus rules regarding concurrent enrollment, so this option may not be available.
5. Take a comparable course at a UC or CSU campus in the area(s) to be completed. This option is at the discretion of each UC or CSU campus, so it may not be a choice available to the student.

Warning: Students need to meet minimum UC/CSU transfer admission requirements. Therefore, partial certification that acknowledges a deficiency in IGETC Areas 1 and/or 2 *may* also indicate a student does not meet minimum transfer requirements. Community colleges should make every effort to notify students of this potential problem.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

11.5 IGETC Form

**Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum
IGETC Certification**

Name: _____ Student ID#: _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

Transferring to: UC CSU School: _____ Date of Birth: ____/____/____

A minimum "C" grade is required in each college course for IGETC. A "C" is defined as a minimum 2.0 grade points on a 4.0 scale.		Units Comp.
AREA 1 – ENGLISH COMMUNICATION CSU: 3 courses required, one each from Group A, B and C. UC: 2 courses required, one each from Group A and B.		
1A	English Composition (one course – 3 semester or 4-5 quarter units) Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement (No IB score accepted for this area)/International Baccalaureate: _____	
1B	Critical Thinking – English Composition (one course – 3 semester or 4-5 quarter units) Course: _____ College: _____ (No AP or IB scores accepted for this area)	
1C	Oral Communication (CSU requirement only) (one course – 3 semester or 4-5 quarter units) Course: _____ College: _____ (No AP or IB scores accepted for this area)	
AREA 2 – MATHEMATICAL CONCEPTS & QUANTITATIVE REASONING (one course – 3 semester or 4-5 quarter units) Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____		
AREA 3 – ARTS AND HUMANITIES (At least 3 courses, with at least one from the Arts and one from the Humanities. 9 semester or 12-15 quarter units)		
3A	ARTS Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
3B	HUMANITIES Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____ Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
AREA 4 – SOCIAL and BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES (At least 3 courses from at least two academic disciplines. 9 semester or 12-15 quarter units)		
	Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
	Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
	Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
AREA 5 – PHYSICAL and BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (At least 2 courses, with one from the Physical Science and one from the Biological Science, at least one of the two courses must include a laboratory. 7-9 semester units or 9-12 quarter units)		
5A	PHYSICAL SCIENCE Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
5B	BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____	
AREA 6 – LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH (UC Requirement Only) (Proficiency equivalent to two years of high school study in the same language.) 1. Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____ 2. Completed in High School: _____ 3. Other: _____		
CSU GRADUATION REQUIREMENT IN U.S. HISTORY, CONSTITUTION & AMERICAN IDEALS (not part of IGETC; may be completed prior to transfer, 6 units) Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____ Course: _____ College: _____ Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate: _____		

IGETC certified for: UC CSU Circle one: **Full / Partial Certification**
 Signature: _____ Phone #: () _____
 Certified by (print name): _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

11.6 IGETC Certification in a Language Other than English

<p>IGETC Certification in a Language Other than English Proficiency Test Certification</p>

STUDENT'S LAST NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	STUDENT'S FIRST NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	STUDENT ID #

Purpose:

The purpose of this IGETC certification of “Language Other Than English” (LOTE) is to assist students who have acquired the knowledge of a language other than English and demonstrate proficiency as outlined in the IGETC Standards Area 10.6.

Instructors:

As a college instructor who is fluent in the student’s native language you are asked to voluntarily assess the basic language ability of this student who falls into the category listed above.

Criteria:

Equivalent to two (2) years of foreign language as taught in United States high schools. Specifically the student should have;

1. Basic vocabulary of approximately 1,000 words;
2. Basic ability to read, write and speak using the present, past (preterit) and future tenses.

Method of Evaluation:

It is suggested that the instructor give the student written material for the language being evaluated. The material could be a magazine article, or newspaper or other written material. The instructor should ask the student to answer questions in writing that pertain to the written material. The instructor should also ask the student to answer questions verbally. The student needs to demonstrate basic use of present, past (preterit) and future tenses.

I certify that this student possesses basic language proficiency in the following language other than

English: _____

I assessed this student’s ability by:

1. Requiring the student to answer questions in writing and verbally after reading material written in the language listed above.
2. Determining that the student has basic knowledge of reading, writing, and speaking in the present tense, basic past tense, (preterit) and simple future tense with a basic vocabulary of approximately 1,000 words.

This assessment indicates the student’s ability is equivalent to at least two years of high school foreign language as taught in the United States.

 Instructor’s Name (please print)

 Instructor’s Signature (please print)

 Instructor’s College/University Affiliation (please print)

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

IGETC Standards Founding Committee

Users of the IGETC Standards are indebted to the faculty, staff, and administrators who from 2006 to 2008 volunteered their time and effort to compile the first edition of this document:

Elizabeth Atondo Counseling Faculty, Articulation Officer, Transfer Center Director Los Angeles Pierce College	Estela Narrie Articulation Officer/Counseling Faculty Santa Monica College
James C. Blackburn Associate Director Enrollment Management Services CSU Office of the Chancellor	Dan Nannini Transfer Center Faculty Leader Santa Monica College
Dave DeGroot Articulation Officer/University Programs Coordinator Allan Hancock College	Judy Osman Special Consultant CSU Office of the Chancellor
Christine Hanson State University Dean, Academic Program Planning CSU Office of the Chancellor	Dawn Sheibani Principal Analyst, Admissions & Community College Articulation UC Office of the President
Kurt Hessinger Associate Director Transfer Programs CSU Office of the Chancellor	Joanne Vorhies Academic Affairs Division California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Christine Jamshidnejad Articulation Officer Diablo Valley College	Jane Woo Articulation Officer Sacramento City College.

FINAL VERSION 1.1 June 4, 2009 (For approval history, see last page)

IGETC Standards Approval History

November 15, 2006: As a result of CIAC suggestion to update and revise IGETC Standards/Notes, an intersegmental committee was formed.

June 12, 2007: Document created

September 12, 2007: Document reviewed by ICAS and referred to each segment for review and approval.

September 28, 2007: CSU Chancellor's Office, Academic Program Planning Division reviewed and forwarded to CSU GEAC.

October 11, 2007: CSU General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) reviewed and endorsed the document and forwarded to CSU Senate Executive Committee.

November 3, 2007: Document endorsed by the California Community College Academic Senate at their statewide plenary session.

November 1, 2007: Document forwarded to the UC A & E BOARS subcommittee for review.

November 16, 2007: The A & E subcommittee carried forward the document with a recommendation of approval to the full BOARS committee; the document was approved by BOARS.

December 5, 2007: Approved provisionally by ICAS through June 2008.

April 19, 2008- Document re-endorsed by the California Community College Academic Senate at their statewide plenary session, due to the addition of the Advanced Placement Chart.

April 30, 2008: Final Approval by ICAS

May 8, 2008: CSU approves updated EO 1033. No conflicts with new IGETC Standards. Final signature process begins.

June 4, 2009: Version 1.1 approved by ICAS.

IGETC Standards Ongoing Governance

The IGETC Standards are maintained by the faculties of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges, all through their elected representatives on the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS).

The current roster and contact information for both ICAS and the subcommittee that advises it on the IGETC Standards are available at icas-ca.org.



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT --
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

May 24, 2010

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR HENRY POWELL

Dear Harry,

In January I wrote to you and the other segment representatives to the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to provide an update on the preparations for the April meeting of the California Education Roundtable.

The meeting was very successful, and I am writing to specifically request your assistance in following-up on the "*Resolution to Increase the Number of Students Prepared to Transfer from California's Community Colleges to Public and Independent Non-Profit Baccalaureate-Granting Institutions through Development of a Common Lower-Division General Education (GE) Pattern and Creation of an Associate Degree for Transfer.*" The complete notes and the resolution regarding transfer students are attached for your information.

Resolved: The faculty of the three segments of public higher education and faculty representatives from the independent non-profit sector are requested to come together to develop and propose a common, shared lower division general education pattern and Associate Degree for Transfer before December 1, 2010 that will enable California Community College students to successfully transfer to a California four-year college or university.

I would be grateful if you would pass on this resolution/request from the three segment President and Chancellors to the CCC and CSU Academic Senate leaders so you can decide how to move forward.

I look forward to discussing this with you all at your next ICAS meeting in June. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of assistance in any way.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Attachments

cc: Vice President Sakaki
Executive Director Edgert
Executive Director Winnacker

**Resolution to Increase the Number of Students Prepared to Transfer
from California's Community Colleges
to Public and Independent Non-Profit Baccalaureate-Granting Institutions
through Development of a Common Lower-Division General Education (GE)
Pattern
and Creation of an Associate Degree for Transfer**

Whereas through the Master Plan For Higher Education, California has committed itself to advancing higher education for its citizens, and an efficient student transfer system is a cost-effective way for students to achieve the baccalaureate degree and meet the state's workforce needs; and

Whereas California Community Colleges play an important role in producing baccalaureate degrees through the transfer process, but only a small percentage of community college students transfer to four-year universities in part because the current transfer system can be confusing for students and is without sufficient commonality in academic preparation among segments to allow potential students to prepare for multiple four-year universities; and

Whereas standardizing the transfer process from the community colleges to four-year universities may increase the number of students prepared to transfer, and a common lower-division general education pathway and an Associate's Degree for Transfer will make it easier for students, counselors, advisors, and articulation officers to navigate the transfer process; and,

Whereas increasing the number of students prepared to transfer from California Community Colleges to four-year degree-granting institution in California is a high priority for the higher education segments and there is a strong history of inter-segmental faculty collaboration on academic preparation issues, conditions which are essential for improving the transfer process;

Resolved: The faculty of the three segments of public higher education and faculty representatives from the independent non-profit sector are requested to come together to develop and propose a common, shared lower division general education pattern and Associate Degree for Transfer before December 1, 2010 that will enable California Community College students to successfully transfer to a California four-year college or university.

Be it further resolved that students who complete an Associate Degree for Transfer with 60 transferable units comprised of:

- a common lower division General Education pattern, with
- a specified number of units in a major or area of emphasis, and,
- a minimum clearly stated Grade Point Average (GPA)

will be prepared to enroll at the California State University and University of California systems, as well as participating independent colleges and universities, with junior standing.

While these strategies can be expected to smooth the transfer process for many students seeking the baccalaureate degree, in order for these efforts to make a significant difference for California, it also will be essential for the state to provide the financial support necessary to accommodate current and expected growth in enrollment demand.

SUMMARY NOTES

California Education Round Table

April 8, 2010

Sacramento

Round Table Members Present: President Yudof (Convener), President Jonathan Brown, Executive Director Humphrey, Superintendent O'Connell, and Chancellor Reed

Staff Members Present: Director Blair, Deputy Superintendent Cunningham, Executive Vice Chancellor Echeverria, Executive Director Edgert, Executive Director Gullatt, Administrator Hansen, Director Ortega, Chief Deputy Superintendent Payne, Provost Pitts, Vice Chancellor Russell, Vice President Sakaki, and Coordinator Woolfork

Introduction and Welcome: President Yudof welcomed Round Table members and their staffs to this meeting. He asked Provost Pitts to discuss the process that led to the Action Items that the group would be discussing at this meeting.

Jonathan Brown expressed gratitude to Provost Pitts for his orchestration of a content-rich meeting and the preparation of an action agenda in various content areas.

Action Items

Race to the Top: Superintendent O'Connell briefly discussed the *Race to the Top* competition for state grants that had recently been announced by the federal government. California did not receive a grant in the first round; discussions were underway in the Governor's Office about whether California would prepare a proposal for the second round.

Superintendent O'Connell stated that California's application was supported by over 600 school districts, higher educational institutions, community organizations, the private sector, and other interested organizations. He expressed his appreciation to the higher educational sectors on their willingness to submit letters of support and Memoranda of Understanding that were included in California's application. The Superintendent urged his higher educational colleagues to continue to collaborate with public schools and school districts in improving student achievement, irrespective of the outcome of the *Race to the Top* competition.

Cal Grants: Vice President Sakaki introduced this item. She offered a "sense of the group" recommendation that "(t)he members of the Round Table support the full funding of the Cal Grant Program for 2010-11 and embed this message, as deemed appropriate, in each member's individual communications on the overall 2010-11 state higher education budget". The Round Table members discussed the importance of Cal Grants and indicated that each would advocate for funding for them in their respective budget letters to the Legislature and in their communication with legislative staff. However, the Round Table members chose not to engage in joint advocacy on this matter at this time.

Vice President Sakaki distributed a revision of an one-page "flyer" that the University of California disseminated last year to advocate for full funding for the Cal Grant Program. Unique to each legislator, this "flyer" identifies the number of Cal Grant awardees in his or her district and includes narrative about the importance of the Cal Grant Program. The revised "flyer" included the names of all member organizations that comprise the Round

Table. Vice President Sakaki offered to make copies of these “flyers” available for use by Round Table members at their discretion.

Similarly, President Brown distributed a copy of a Certificate that the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities created based on the “flyer” disseminated by the University of California the previous year. He offered to include the logo of all the Round Table members and provide the Certificates for use in this year’s budget discussions.

Action:

Upon finalization, these materials will be available for distribution in a manner that is most appropriate to each Round Table member’s legislative strategy.

Transfer: Vice President Sakaki introduced this item. She reported on the discussion at the Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) meeting about this item, including the concerns raised by the faculty representatives from all three public educational systems.

Following the Vice President’s introduction, the Round Table members considered the recommendation for developing a Transfer-Related Associate of Arts Degree that would indicate a student’s readiness to enroll in upper division courses once admitted to a baccalaureate-granting institution. The discussion centered on the frustration with the current transfer process including the accumulation by students of extra units prior to transfer, the lack of consistency in designating courses as transferable among community college campuses, the inconsistency of acceptance of courses among the baccalaureate-granting systems, and the general inefficiency of this process for students.

Actions:

- Chief academic officers from the higher educational sectors, including the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, would solicit an invitation from the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to discuss this proposal at a forthcoming meeting because garnering faculty support is critical as awarding degrees is under their purview.
- Each Round Table member would appoint a representative to a Committee that would develop a plan to implement this recommendation that would be submitted to the Round Table by December 1, 2010.

Developing a State Plan for Future Higher Education Enrollment and Degree Attainment: Executive Director Gullatt introduced this item by explaining the evolution of thinking about the necessity of developing a State Plan. The original impetus for this item was the possibility of California receiving federal funds through the Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act (SAFRA) that required a State Plan for expanding access and success in higher education. Subsequently, representatives of the Round Table members concluded that developing a State Plan was important irrespective of the fate of SAFRA in Congress.

The Round Table members discussed the materials developed by Jane Wellman, Founder of the Delta Project on Postsecondary Education Costs, Productivity, and Accountability, that analyzes the California situation and make recommendations for a process to develop and implement a State Plan. The discussion that ensued included comments about the importance of specificity of goals, the possibility that this activity could be positioned to generate public support for higher education, and the criticality of any process in this regard being respectful of related activities underway in various educational sectors.

Round Table members were informed that the philanthropic community may be interested in supporting the development of a State Plan. Julia Lopez, President and Chief Executive Officer of the College Access Foundation of California, has met with Round Table members and their staffs on several occasions. She has offered to orchestrate an effort among her colleagues in the philanthropic community to provide financial support for furthering the analytical and public dialogue aspect of this proposal.

Actions:

- Provost Pitts will communicate to President Lopez that the Round Table is interested in pursuing her offer to solicit philanthropic support for the development of a State Plan for Future Higher Education Enrollment and Degree Attainment.
- Each Round Table member will appoint representatives to serve on a State Plan Task Force whose first task will be to consult with a neutral party responsible for developing the analytical basis for the Plan.
- As the analytical basis for the Plan is being developed, the Round Table will be discussing the optimal means by which to create a public dialogue that ensures sufficient resources are available from various sources -- the federal government, the State, institutions, the private sector, students, and their families -- to implement a Plan to achieve the State goals.

On-Line Education: Provost Pitts introduced this item on behalf of Vice Provost Dan Greenstein. Discussions have occurred and will continue as to aspects of on-line education that could be developed collaboratively among the educational sectors, including the public schools, in order to share costs and increase efficiencies. The traditional academic modes for delivering instruction are being supplemented by new technologies and the for-profit educational sector is a leader in this regard.

The Round Table members acknowledged that on-line education offers a potential mechanism for efficiency and a possible means by which to increase student access; however, further internal discussions in each educational sector need to occur before collaborative actions are considered. As such, Round Table members will encourage their staffs to continue the nascent discussions about development of On-Line Degree Pathways, infrastructure, and support services that occurred as precursors to this meeting.

Action:

The next meeting of the Round Table should include a more comprehensive discussion of On-Line Education, including the current status of this instructional mode within each educational sector and potential for collaboration across sectors.

Improving Teacher Quality State Grant Program: Executive Director Humphrey introduced this item by providing a background of this federal program that has been administered by the California Postsecondary Education Commission for many years. The new Elementary and Secondary Education Act that is being re-authorized currently in Congress proposes to eliminate this 2.5 percent portion of the larger program – a part that is designed to encourage and fund collaborative efforts between schools and higher education.

Executive Director Humphrey provided examples of the results of the collaborative projects that have been funded in California through this program. She asked that Round Table members advocate for continued funding of the portion of this program that is administered by the State Agency for Higher Education in each state.

Actions:

- Executive Director Humphrey will distribute a Fact Sheet and draft letter of support to Round Table members for their consideration.
- Each Round Table member will determine the manner by which it will advocate for the continuation of the State Grant part of this federal program.

Other Items: No other items were discussed.

Adjournment: Round Table members expressed appreciation to the University for convening this meeting.

Duncan Orders Study of Restrictive Transfer of Credit Rules

Arne Duncan, the secretary of education, has announced that he is ordering a study on "restrictive" policies on the transfer of academic credit from colleges to one another. In a letter <<https://www.goacta.org/publications/downloads/Duncan%20Response%20Letter%204-30-10.pdf>> to the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, one of the groups that requested such a study, he said that the analysis should be completed within a year. With more students attending multiple institutions to earn a bachelor's degree, transfer rules have become increasingly controversial, with many community colleges charging that they are needlessly detailed and some for-profit institutions saying their students are discriminated against.



Henry C. Powell
 Telephone: (510) 987-0711
 Fax: (510) 763-0309
 Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
 Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
 University of California
 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
 Oakland, California 94607-5200

May 12, 2010

SYLVIA HURTADO, BOARS CHAIR
KEITH WILLIAMS, UCEP CHAIR
JONATHAN ALEXANDER, UCOPE CHAIR
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Work Group on Recognizing CSU General Education Breadth requirements

Dear Colleagues:

The Academic Council recently endorsed a request by BOARS to form a Senate Work Group to explore the possibility of simplifying transfer. BOARS' letter, which provides a rationale for the request, is attached. The Work Group will consist of the 2010-11 chairs of BOARS, UCEP and UCOPE and any additional committee members they designate. It will consider whether UC should accept the "CSU Breadth" pathway to transfer in addition to the IGETC path. Given the high level of interest in issues surrounding transfer, I request that the chairs begin their discussions in September and make a recommendation to Council at its November meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Powell, Chair
 Academic Council

Copy: Bill Jacob, BOARS Vice Chair
 David Kay, UCEP Vice Chair
 Academic Council
 Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

Sylvia Hurtado, Chair
sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com

Assembly of the Academic Senate
 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
 Oakland, CA 94607-5200
 Phone: (510) 987-9466
 Fax: (510) 763-0309

April 15, 2010

HENRY POWELL, CHAIR
 ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: UC Senate Working Group to examine expansion of UC Transfer Requirements to include CSU Breadth

Dear Harry,

The lack of alignment between IGETC and CSU's General Education Breadth continues to be a source of confusion for potential transfer students from the California Community Colleges. Several recent reports, including the LAO's review of the Master Plan (which appears to base much of its transfer commentary on a report by Moore, Shulock and Jensen, 2009¹) have called on UC and CSU to align their transfer requirements. As you know, this was also discussed briefly by ICAS in February. The joint CCC/CSU/UC Community College Task Force that President Yudof helped assemble in January 2009 also advocates for "a coherent set of clear, shared messages regarding post-secondary education options that include transfer," and adds that "these messages must include strategies for efficiently and effectively negotiating the transfer pathway."

ICAS established the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) with the intention of providing a uniform transfer pathway to both UC and CSU. In reality, however, there are now two firmly entrenched pathways, with the vast majority (about 80%) of UC transfers completing IGETC and the vast majority (about 90%), of CSU transfers completing "General Education Breadth," although CSU does recognize IGETC. The Moore, Shulock and Jensen report emphasizes the importance of aligning pathways and adds "one could argue that the efforts to improve the process have contributed to the complexity as suggested by the medley of transfer initiatives" adding that simplifying the process "would require leaders at the state level to think outside the 'silos' and would call upon institutional leaders to concede some of their local control in the interest of better serving students."

In the spirit of collaboration, BOARS suggests that UC consider recognizing the CSU "Breadth" pattern, which would help alleviate confusion for Community College students who could choose between the two pathways knowing they would be prepared for either institution. As

¹ Moore, C., Shulock, N., et al. *Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California: Lessons from Other States*. Sacramento, CA: Institute of Higher Education Leadership and Policy, 2009.

noted at ICAS, the pathways are not that far apart, and CSU's "Breadth" has strong points as well. The CSU members of ICAS clearly supported the idea of both segments agreeing to use both pathways.

BOARS suggests that the Academic Council authorize a working group of BOARS, UCEP and UCOPE members to explore this idea and determine if the idea is feasible based on available information. We believe the question at hand is whether or not the information provided by available reports is sufficient to justify taking the proposed action. Presumably, UC would require a grade of C or better in all CSU Breadth courses, but other than that, the idea is to keep the transfer process as simple possible and assure CCC students that UC will accept the CSU pattern for transfer. BOARS believes this could facilitate more efficient transfer from the community colleges to UC and CSU.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sylvia Hurtado".

Sylvia Hurtado
BOARS Chair

cc: BOARS
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

June 9, 2010

Dear Assemblyman Ruskin:

Very many thanks for affording us the opportunity as Faculty Representatives to participate in the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Thank you, too, for joining our meetings and for sending us the Joint Committee's draft report.

As you know, we embrace many of the priorities and concerns addressed in the report. We particularly agree with its statement on access, in particular the significance of facilitating access to public higher education for an increasingly diverse population in the nation's most populous state. We are equally in agreement with its concern for affordability, in terms of both the state's need for a well-educated citizenry and the recognition of the heavy debt burden falling on younger shoulders. We worry that young people may not fully appreciate the burden that they take on when they commit to loan terms. Many of our students are first-generation college goers for whom the financial challenges loom large.

We heartily embrace your call for closure of the achievement gap that stands in the way of underserved and disadvantaged communities and we hope that California public universities will continue to educate first-generation college students at a higher level than other states or the private sector. We hope that opportunities for increased rigor in the later years of K-12 education, a strategy that has been pursued by European universities, could enable future classes of students to prepare more fully for higher education and meet university requirements in a more timely way. We hear the calls for a system of articulation that improves upon the present one, but worry that any system that delivers inadequately prepared students may meet one definition of efficiency while failing another.

We also agree with your sentiments on transparency and believe that the three segments have made greater efforts in recent years toward accountability and transparency.

The assurance of quality is for UC, CSU and CCC faculty the cornerstone of our contribution to public higher education and we are very happy to see you cite this factor as underpinning the state's capability to maintain competitiveness. Other nations, particularly in Asia, grasp the importance of producing the numbers of scientists and scholars sufficient to meet the requirements of growing economies in an environment of global competition.

Finally, we have learned a great deal from you and your colleagues about the importance of explaining to the public and their legislative leaders the importance of what we do in preparing California's youth for participation in the global economy of the twenty first century. We greatly appreciate your guidance, your commitment to public higher education, and your service.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Powell
Chair, ICAS and UC Academic Senate

John Tarjan, Past Chair
CSU Academic Senate

Jane Patton, President
CCC Academic Senate



Henry C. Powell
 Telephone: (510) 987-0711
 Fax: (510) 763-0309
 Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
 Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
 University of California
 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
 Oakland, California 94607-5200*

May 12, 2010

**SENATE DIVISION CHAIRS
 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Area 'b' Task Force

Dear Colleagues:

As you know, at the April 2010 Academic Council meeting, Council endorsed a recommendation by BOARS that an intersegmental Task Force be formed to reexamine the Area 'b' (English) admission requirements to UC and CSU. The Task Force will include representatives from UC and CSU and will work under the auspices of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), as a similar task force on the Area 'c' (Mathematics) requirement did in 2007-08.

While the Task Force will not convene until the 2010-11 academic year, we request that you consider nominating Senate members with appropriate expertise now to serve on the Task Force next year. BOARS will then select several UC members to serve. Please note that BOARS recommends that at least one member of the Task Force be an expert on second language acquisition. I have attached BOARS' letter describing the Task Force in greater detail.

Please submit names of nominees to Martha Winnacker in the Senate office by **July 1, 2010** (Martha.winnacker@ucop.edu).

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Henry C. Powell, Chair
 Academic Council

Copy: Senate Directors
 Academic Council
 Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.

Dear Editor:

The most pressing issue for California is the economic health of our state. Negotiations in the Legislature over how to deal with the ballooning budget deficit are now underway. The decisions facing our elected officials are unpleasant and difficult. We are writing to encourage support for the Governor's budget proposals relative to higher education. While his proposals fall far short of the Legislature's and his own estimates of funding requirements, we believe that they are prudent during a time of unprecedented fiscal difficulties for the state. How can we ask Californians to support a partial restoration of funding for higher education even as other state agencies and programs are facing further budget reductions? We believe the arguments are straightforward and the evidence is compelling.

Public higher education is the key to building California's economy and paving the way for recovery from the current financial crises that confront our state and the nation. Public higher education

- is key to meeting California's workforce needs,
- is the engine that fuels innovation and new job/industry growth,
- dramatically increases the earning power of its graduates, resulting in increased tax revenues,
- produces graduates that place a lower demand on already-strained social services, and
- results in an economic stimulus to the state through federal student financial aid and other programs.

Studies have repeatedly shown that California's investment in public higher education has the best return of any state investment, with a return of several hundred percent in terms of increased revenues and decreased demand for services. Together, the three segments of public higher education serve over 3 million students each year. They are interdependent systems, and cuts to any of them resulting in lowered access to higher education adversely impact the long-term economic health of the state.

We encourage your readers, including elected officials, to keep the long-term economic health of California in mind as painful budget decisions are being made in Sacramento.

The Academic Senates are the academic policy recommendatory bodies for the three segments of public higher education. Together, we are the united voice of over 65,000 faculty, all of whom are dedicated to the access and success of our students.

Harry Powell, Chair

Academic Senate of the University of California

Jim Postma, Chair

Academic Senate of the California State University

Jane Patton, President

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges