INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

A TRANSFER DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

Revised July 2005

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)

George Blumenthal, Chair, University of California Academic Senate
Kate Clark, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
David O. McNeil, Chair, Academic Senate of The California State Universities

AUTHORED BY ICAS 2004-05 MEMBERS

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Kate Clark, Professor of English, Irvine Valley College
Greg Gilbert, Professor of English, Copper Mountain College
Mark Wade Lieu, Professor of ESL, Ohlone College
Mark Snowhite, Professor of English, Crafton Hills College
Ian Walton, Professor of Mathematics, Mission College

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
David O. McNeil, Professor of History, San Jose State University
Lynne Cook, Professor of Special Education, CSU Northridge
Cristy Jensen, Professor of Public Policy And Administration, CSU Sacramento
John Tarjan, Professor of Management/MIS, CSU Bakersfield
Marshelle Thobaben, Professor of Nursing, Humboldt State University

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
George Blumenthal, Professor of Astronomy & Astrophysics, UC Santa Cruz
Cliff Brunk, Professor of Cell and Molecular Biology, UCLA
Michael Brown, Professor of Education, UC Santa Barbara
Joseph Kiskis. Professor of Physics, UC Davis
Arvan Fluharty, Professor of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science, UCLA

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

Table of Contents

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

We then identified the following functions as essential to transfer:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

II. WHAT DOES TRANSFER ENTAIL?

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

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

Students must:

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. LEGISLATION AND LEGISLATIVE INTENT

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

IV. INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS

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

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

Institution Specific

University Outreach and Admission (UC/CSU)

Faculty Advisors (UC/CSU)

Advisement and other Counseling Staff (UC/CSU)

Counseling Faculty (CCC)

Transfer Transcripts Evaluators (UC/CSU)

Intersegmental Transfer Initiatives

Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)

Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST)

Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)

Science General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC)

Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC)

Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review (OSCAR)

Member Initiatives

California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)

Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC)

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)

Segment-specific Initiatives

General Education (GE)

CSU:

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

UC:

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

CDE:

- Student Friendly Services (californiacolleges.edu)

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

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

V. COMPONENTS OF THE TRANSFER FUNCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Responses to the Need:

CSU Lower Division Transfer Pattern Project

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

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

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

Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC)

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

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

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

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

Responses to the Need:

IMPAC, ASSIST, and LDTP

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

UC Streamlining Course Major Articulation Preparation Process

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

California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)

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

Current Limitations:

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

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

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

Response to the Need:

IGETC/CSU GE-Breadth Course Review Subcommittee

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

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

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

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

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

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

Responses to the Need:

"Common Course Numbering"

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

Current Limitations:

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

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

California Articulated Number (CAN)

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

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

<u>Current Limitations:</u>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Responses to the Need:

UC Transfer Admission Agreements (TAA)

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

CSU Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG)

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

CSU Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. FORWARD LOOKING: A PLAN TO IMPROVE TRANSFER FUNCTIONS

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

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

A. Addressing Essential Functions

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

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

IMPAC's Venue for Faculty Discussions and Dissemination of Information

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

Supporting Segment-specific Initiatives

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Funding a Consolidated Proposal

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

Entity and Task	System Contributions: Cash and in-kind	Accountable System
ASSIST: continues present work; assumes technical posting of course identifier numbers;		UC
IMPAC: continues necessary faculty-to-faculty work; creates course identifier numbers/descriptors, has broad dissemination function		CCC
COURSE QUALIFICATION EFFORTS ▪ Intersegmental committee reviews on-line submission of courses for SciGETC, GE/IGETC certification ▪ LDTP course identifier number qualification ▪ CCC course identifier number		 CSU/UC CSU CCC
SEGMENTAL INITIATIVES: ▪ LDTP ▪ Streamlining Course Major Preparation Articulation ▪ CCC replacement for CAN		 CSU UC CCC

C. Accountability and Evaluation

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

Proposed Annual Review Process

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

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

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

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

VII. CONCLUSION

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

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

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

Appendix A: Summary of Legislative and Faculty Initiatives

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B: INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)

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

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

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

- IGETC/CSU Breadth Patterns

The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is a general education pattern that community college transfer students can use to fulfill lower-division general education requirements in either the CSU or UC system without the need, after transfer, to take additional lower-division courses to satisfy campus GE requirements. This "core curriculum" is the intersegmental faculty response to legislative mandates calling for such a general education core. All courses proposed for IGETC must be transferable to both CSU and UC. Course outlines, including representative texts, must be submitted for all proposed additions to IGETC lists.

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

__ IGETC/CSU GE-Breadth Course Review Subcommittee

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

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

Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)

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

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

California Education Roundtable's Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC)

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

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

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

IMPAC – direct service for faculty (Intersegmental)

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

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

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

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

LDTP: The Lower-Division Transfer Patterns

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

Funding: LDTP is funded by CSU.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ASSIST (See page 32)

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

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

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

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

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

__ UC Pathways

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

Advisement to Students –direct services to students

Counseling faculty (CCC):

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

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