

Issues of Articulation and Transfer

**A Workshop Presented By
Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates
Independent Colleges and Universities
California Virtual University
Corporate Partners**

**Final Report
Workshop Planning Committee**

July 6, 1998

Workshop Planning Committee

Ric Matthews, Chair - San Diego Miramar College
Gene Dinielli - CSU, Long Beach
Aimée Dorr - UC, Los Angeles
Diane Glow - San Diego Miramar College
Bernie Goldstein - CSU, San Francisco, Faculty Trustee
Kathy Kaiser - CSU, Chico
Dorothy Perry - UC, San Francisco
Janice Plastino - UC, Irvine
Pam Brown Schachter - Marymount College

Breakout Group Co-Leaders

Kate Clark - Irvine Valley College
Ken Nishita - CSU, Monterey Bay

Academic Senate Leaders

James Highsmith - California State University
Bill Scroggins - California Community Colleges
Sandra Weiss - University of California

Academic Senate Staff

Julie Adams - California Community Colleges
Jane Carey - University of California
Debbie Hennessy - California State University

Report Writer - Shimon-Craig Van Collie, in collaboration with Aimée Dorr

This workshop was sponsored in part by contributions from:

California Community College Foundation
California State University Foundation
University of California, Office of the President
and

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Founded in 1807, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., is an independent, global publishing company specializing in scientific and technical books and journals, textbooks and educational materials for colleges and universities, as well as professional and consumer books and subscription services. Wiley has publishing, marketing, and distribution centers located in the U.S., Canada, Europe, Asia, and Australia.

Wiley's Internet site can be accessed at <http://www.wiley.com>.

Introduction

On April 29, 1998, about 100 faculty, articulation staff, and administrators from the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), the University of California (UC), and California's independent colleges and universities participated in "A Workshop on Issues of Articulation and Transfer" (see Appendix A for Workshop program).

The Workshop had two goals:

1. to identify articulation processes within and among the segments of higher education which can effectively support transfer of coursework, including courses available through the California Virtual University (CVU), and
2. to identify articulation issues that need to be resolved after the conference, along with suggested means to address them.

Workshop participants (see Appendix B) were presented with the scope of the challenges and opportunities facing students trying to achieve articulation and transfer both intrasegmentally and intersegmentally. They also worked in small, intersegmentally diverse groups to identify the major challenges we have today and, most importantly, to suggest solutions for them. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which spearheaded the Workshop, intends to use the generated information to help develop a workplan to guide its 1998-1999 efforts to improve articulation and transfer.

Factors Behind The Workshop

This Workshop on articulation and transfer resulted from a combination of four factors, not the least of which has been intersegmental cooperation over the past 18 months in designing the CVU. Because CVU is an on-line catalogue accessing technology-mediated courses from all segments and campuses, it will likely increase students' interest in taking courses from campuses other than their own and that will require articulation.

Secondly, a long standing need exists to develop articulation agreements for lower division preparation for majors as prescribed by State Senator Gary Hart's SB 121 legislation from 1991. Previous attempts to achieve this goal have met with partial success, and the Workshop refocused attention on this issue.

Thirdly, legislative and faculty interest continues to focus on shortening time to degree. Awareness of articulated courses allows students to plan an efficient degree path and to reduce the chances of needing to take courses when they reach four-year campuses that could have been taken at the community college. Also, starting in the 1998 fall semester, CSU campuses will require that transferring CCC students complete their general education requirement and lower division major preparation before transfer. This heightens the need for both CSU and CCC to have articulation agreements in place.

Lastly, the Workshop arose in part from the strong atmosphere of cooperation that exists among the public higher education segments. The recent memorandum of understanding between CCC and UC on the issue of enhancing student transfer also reflects this spirit, and articulation plays a major role in achieving the dictates of that agreement.

Opening Remarks

The three public segment faculty leaders set the tone for the day by expressing their enthusiasm for the Workshop and the opportunity for cooperation among their three groups. ICAS Chair and University of California Academic Senate Chair Sandra Weiss applauded the fact that the participants were gathered to focus on articulation and transfer, since these issues have and will have far reaching effects on higher education in California. California Community Colleges Academic Senate President Bill Scroggins noted that three major challenges now being faced are how to articulate with world-wide distance education courses, how to achieve both efficiency and effectiveness in the transfer process, and how to provide students with access. James Highsmith, the California State University Academic Senate Chair, urged all faculty members to ensure that articulation and transfer function smoothly so that control over the process remains in the hands of faculty.

Organization Of The Report

This report presents a brief overview of articulation and transfer as they exist today and then summarizes the Workshop participants' efforts to identify both the barriers to effective articulation and transfer and the means by which these barriers might be removed. The report contents are not intended to be exhaustive, but to capture the highlights of the Workshop so as to inform the reader of the major issues as identified by the Workshop participants. For a more complete presentation of the barriers and solutions offered during the Workshop, see Appendices [C](#) and [D](#) respectively.

Articulation and Transfer Today

California Higher Education

Public higher education in California consists of three segments:

- University of California, which has 9 campuses and confers bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees.
- California State University, with 22 campuses and offering bachelor's and master's degrees.
- California Community Colleges, featuring 110 campuses and providing associate degrees, certificates, and a variety of adult education.

In addition, there are a large number of private institutions in the state. Four-year independents also accept CCC transfer students. Other private schools provide career and occupational instruction, and credit for courses given at these schools is accepted at public institutions provided that they can be validated by the receiving campus.

Each university campus determines its own local degree and general education requirements within the system framework. In addition, each campus is responsible for developing agreements with the community colleges that specify how courses taken at the community college can be applied to specific academic goals of the campus. The resulting complexity of intersegmental agreements has prompted the development of statewide articulation policies and procedures that enable and encourage interinstitutional student transfer. Since courses and curricula are primarily a faculty issue, ICAS plays a leadership role in promoting effective and efficient transfer and articulation.

Of importance is the definition of course articulation, which refers to the process of developing a formal, written agreement that identifies a course (or courses or a sequence of courses) on a "sending" campus that is comparable to, or acceptable in lieu of, a specific course (or courses, course sequence, or substantive requirement) at a "receiving" campus. Successful completion of an articulated course at a sending institution assures the student and the faculty that the student has achieved a level of knowledge and skill comparable to that he or she would have attained at the receiving institution and is ready to undertake the next level of instruction at the receiving institution.

California's Master Plan

For the past four decades, California public higher education has operated under the state's Master Plan for Higher Education, which includes the proviso that students can take the first two years of a baccalaureate program at a CCC and, if they perform adequately, transfer smoothly to any UC or CSU campus. By law, these four-year colleges must have more upper division than lower division students. These mandates call for a system to ensure the smooth, steady flow of students to four-year institutions as they complete their lower division coursework at the two-year institutions.

Since the Master Plan was established, various actions and plans have been developed to ensure that CCC students were completing their lower division preparations and ready to proceed to upper division work at four-year institutions. Starting in 1968, for example, community colleges were given the power to certify that students had completed the general education requirements that would allow them to move forward. In 1981, new arrangements were made whereby the community colleges could approve lower division courses for what was now called the CSU GE Breadth requirement. In 1993, the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) was added, which allowed students to meet general education standards for both CSU and UC institutions. Currently, the GE Breadth program only applies to students transferring to CSU campuses. Students who know they want to attain degrees in high unit majors, such as engineering or physics, or who are sure which CSU or UC campus they want to attend, can also follow individual articulation paths that are particularly well suited to their goals.

Volume Of Transfers

The issue of articulation and transfer becomes more important with the realization of how many students move between systems and between campuses within a system. The vast majority move from a community college to a four-year institution. Each year, 46,000 - 50,000 CCC students transfer to CSU campuses. As many as 12,000 migrate from CCC to UC campuses, and 6,000 - 12,000 transfer from CCC to California independents.

Movement also takes place intrasegmentally. Up to one-third of the 1.4 million CCC students take courses at more than one CCC campus. Each year, 2,000 to 4,000 students transfer between CSU campuses, and about 500 move from one UC campus to another.

Students in four-year institutions also transfer across segments. As many as 1000 students move from a CSU campus to a UC campus annually. An equal number do the reverse, transferring from UC to CSU. Between 1,000 and 2,000 students transfer each year from independents to CSU. In addition, an unknown number of students transfer from four-year institutions to the community colleges.

Course Transfer And Articulation Agreements And Processes

Although parts of the articulation and transfer process have been simplified, the mechanics of the system are complex (see Appendix E for relevant source documents). In one sense the complexity is positive, since it reflects different options open to California students pursuing their degrees. On the other hand, the complexity can also lead to confusion, inefficiency, and frustration.

In general, there are course patterns that students must complete in order to fulfill their lower division requirements and major preparation. Specific articulation agreements establish a set of CCC courses which are said to be comparable to courses at a four-year institution. At the same time, some courses can count for unit credit but not toward a degree requirement. In most cases, articulation agreements are negotiated between individual campuses. Given the large number of campuses in California, this has led to a large volume of such agreements.

Some general agreements for articulation and transfer have been worked out, including:

CSU GE Breadth is an agreed upon set of academic competencies used to fulfill lower division requirements for entry into CSU campuses. GE Breadth is not a course-to-course articulation, but rather one of competency. Disciplinary areas, amount of exploration of them, and acceptable courses within them are specified. By completing an approved course at a community college, students would be considered to have attained the same competencies that they would have achieved by taking a similar, but probably not identical, course at a CSU campus.

IGETC is also a competency certification. It can be used by CCC transfer students to fulfill lower division general education requirements at any CSU or UC campus. This curriculum provides an alternative to CSU GE Breadth requirements and to each UC campus's general education requirements. IGETC uses a slightly different set of subject headings from CSU GE Breadth, including a foreign language requirement. The community college from which a student transfers is responsible for certifying that IGETC has been completed.

Transfer course agreements identify community college courses that are generally transferable to the UC and/or CSU systems, or that apply to IGETC or CSU general education certification requirements. The UC Transfer Course Agreements (TCAs) are developed by staff in the UC Office of the President in accordance with policies established by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). BOARS' policies determine which courses can be accepted upon transfer for advanced standing elective credit toward a UC degree. The CSU system follows its Executive Order 167 to establish criteria for community colleges to designate those courses offered on each campus deemed to be baccalaureate level and, therefore, transferable to all campuses in the CSU system. Preparation of the "Bacc list" is the responsibility of the community college articulation officer in consultation with the faculty.

Articulation officers on each campus coordinate and facilitate faculty review leading to the articulation of courses between institutions. These officers may be faculty or former faculty, or they may be staff administrators who may or may not have faculty experience.

It should also be noted that the above articulation and transfer agreements, in general, assume that students are matriculated at only one campus at a time. Most transfer students complete their lower division requirements at CCC campuses before moving on to complete their degrees at UC or CSU. Once enrolled in these four-year institutions, students are generally discouraged or prohibited from taking courses elsewhere. The increasing availability and popularity of distance education, however, raise the issue of concurrent enrollment. Students at one campus may be taking on-line courses from another institution and want to receive credit for those distance education units, which puts additional pressure on the articulation process to provide for the students' needs.

Tools And Aids

The Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) is California's official statewide repository of public higher education articulation information. The ASSIST database, available at computer kiosks on college campuses and on the Internet, maintains a tracking system of CCC, CSU, and UC transfer and articulation agreements. Students, articulation officers, and faculty can use ASSIST to determine what course will meet requirements at the receiving institution. In the future, students will be able to apply to transfer institutions electronically and, through ASSIST, have their transcripts evaluated automatically rather than rely on the current paper-based system.

California Articulation Number (CAN) System is a cross-referenced course identification system for many lower-division, transferable courses commonly taught on community college campuses. Each campus retains its own course number, prefix, and title and adds the CAN number as an addendum. Courses with the same CAN number are considered comparable. An annual publication including all CAN-numbered courses is regularly distributed to CCC and CSU. At this time, UC does not participate in the CAN system.

Barriers to Articulation and Transfer

Following are seven major areas that Workshop participants identified and widely supported as primary barriers to articulation and transfer. The groupings should not be considered rigid or in any way final; instead, they serve as first cuts in the process of developing opportunities to improve articulation and transfer. Barriers were identified in five small intersegmental breakout groups (see Appendix C for a fuller description of these barriers) and subsequently organized into these seven areas by members of the Workshop Planning Committee, most of whom also served as breakout group leaders.

1. Resources And Personnel

Inadequate funding exists for the articulation process, and that which is available does not recognize the breadth of the work involved. There are too few staff and a lack of access to technology and administrative resources. Articulation officers have too many different responsibilities and other duties that detract from that function, and there is no comprehensive description of what articulation officers do and how they should do it. The result is variability from campus to campus and frequent changes in articulation officers, all of which often inhibits the process. Due to inadequate staffing, students sometimes suffer from the extraordinary length of time it takes to get a course evaluated. In addition, there is inadequate recognition of the time spent by faculty on articulation issues, and few rewards are offered to faculty for engaging in these issues.

2. Faculty To Faculty Communication And Trust

Lack of communication among faculty and lack of a structure in which to conduct such communication are key barriers, both on regional and state-wide levels. Insufficient faculty communication takes place to create the shared understandings needed for articulation agreements. Some of the problem can be traced to assumed inequalities between faculties, which can lead to a lack of trust. The articulation process also tends, on occasion, to be hierarchical, with CSU and UC faculty behaving as though their course requirement needs were the only factors to be considered by their counterparts in CCC. There can also be mistrust intrasegmentally, with some UC and CSU faculty unwilling to cede articulation authority to faculty colleagues in order to make state-level agreements. This problem further underscores the need for more collegial cooperation and clear and honest communication.

3. Technology

Not all students, faculty, or articulation officers have the access or the expertise to retrieve necessary articulation and transfer information. Access to on-line services, such as ASSIST, is not universal. Even those who are on-line cannot always communicate

effectively. Implementing technological solutions, such as creating an Internet web page for CAN, requires tremendous resources, training, and funds.

As it applies to distance learning, which tends to be technology-based, many faculty still question the quality and rigor of these courses and if these courses are being subjected to the same critical review process that applies to traditional forms of teaching. Also at issue is the loss of direct contact between student and teacher. Students taking technology mediated instruction classes may also be unaware that they need to declare a "home campus" in the system so that the courses they do take can be articulated through a specific system.

4. Change

Changes in curriculum and/or entrance and exit requirements at one institution cause reverberations at others. Change is unavoidable and generally desirable and may result from many factors, such as advances in technology, accreditation needs, shifts in societal needs or values, or changes in student characteristics. Too often, however, change is not communicated early enough or fully enough either intersegmentally or intrasegmentally, which results in problems for students and faculty at both the sending and receiving institutions. In addition, the three segments of California's public higher education system sometimes behave as though they are independent operators or even competitors rather than clients of one another.

5. Evaluation Of Courses

Community colleges are responsible for lower division preparation of transfer students. However, determining what are upper and lower division courses and courses identified as non-transferable presents ongoing problems. There is no way to cleanly recognize differences between these courses. In some cases, lower division courses have been moved to upper division status simply to save departments or jobs within campuses. In other cases, courses taught at the lower division level may have increased in complexity over time and have been rightly moved to upper division status. Similarly, upper division courses at one school might equate to lower division offerings at another, which can lead to problems for transferring students.

The evaluation process sometimes suffers from lack of sufficient information about courses, which could include, for example, the syllabus, assignments, and exams. Evaluators do not always convey their expectations about what they need to conduct their assessment.

There are also issues of disparity between how a course is described and how it is taught, which affects articulation: Are students in a given course achieving the required competencies? Also, students have no appeal process for course articulation.

6. Data And Information

There is insufficient information about what we do regarding articulation and transfer and how it works. Available information is not presented often enough or in an

understandable enough form. Moreover, the Legislature and the public generally are neither kept up-to-date on the many successes of articulation and transfer nor regularly informed about what is needed to be successful in this area.

Newly transferred students do not receive transcript evaluation soon enough after enrollment in the four-year institution, forcing many of them to wait half a semester or longer until they are informed about their articulation status.

Also important is unequal access to information. When changes are made centrally and placed in the ASSIST database, for example, not all members of the academic community have the resources needed to obtain the latest data. Moreover, there is no sufficiently effective proactive means of notifying everyone when changes in transfer and articulation agreements or policies are made. As a result of these various problems, some of those involved with articulation and transfer operate with current information and others do not.

7. Process, Variability, And Venue

A lack of consistency and uniform standards exists at every level of the articulation and transfer process. This applies to expectations, sequence of activities, time frames, essentials of review, outcome options, and results of reporting mechanisms. It also surfaces in the lack of articulation consistencies in terms of preparation for majors. There is no central control for articulation, where staff and resources could be focused. Articulation suffers from the fact that independents do not participate in GE Breadth or IGETC. Also, where articulation officers are not faculty members, they may not have adequate access to faculty committees to make articulation work smoothly. For example, at UC, where articulation officers are not drawn from the faculty, they may not be regularly included in faculty committees responsible for articulation and transfer policies.

Others

High school students and their counselors, especially at schools with limited resources, are not being adequately informed about articulation and transfer options.

Interdisciplinary courses and courses in experimental curricula sometimes pose problems to articulation.

Removing the Barriers to Articulation and Transfer

The following are summaries of suggestions for removing the barriers to articulation and transfer, organized according to the same seven major areas as were the barriers. Suggestions were first offered during breakout groups at the Workshop (see Appendix D for a fuller description of these solutions) and then further developed by the Workshop Planning Committee. Please note that none of these solutions exists as a plan, no priorities were established, and no feasibility analysis has been performed. Solutions presented for one problem may also be a vehicle or solution for another problem, but that evaluation has yet to be completed.

1. Resources And Personnel

We should seek adequate funding for articulation via several means. One would be to identify funding for underfunded or unfunded state mandates. Another would be to enhance currently identified categorical funds that would be sufficient to cover articulation. In addition, we could seek more funding from federal grants and foundations. Partnerships could also be established with private independents to share resources for articulation that extends to them.

We need to identify resources at system and campus levels for articulation staffing, including articulation officers and support personnel, and for administrative work, such as copying, meetings, etc. Links with independents, federal organizations, and foundations need to be made for funding purposes. We also need to analyze the time spent by articulation officers and faculty on these issues and acknowledge, either by assigned duties or stipends, the leading roles that faculty and articulation officers play in articulation. In addition, we need an ongoing training component and faculty release time for that purpose, as well as a plan for technological support.

These additional funds should supplement current articulation activities and not be used to redirect them. At the same time, funding is needed for innovation, such as system-wide articulation arrangements.

2. Faculty To Faculty Communication And Trust

We encourage ongoing collaborative and collegial discussions among faculty from all different segments. One suggestion is to put CSU and UC faculty on program review committees for community colleges and vice versa, which could help faculty from all three segments better appreciate what is going on at other institutions. Participants in the proposed intersegmental faculty conversations also need the authority to make decisions based on their work together. Another idea is to set up three levels of dialogue: regional, "feeder" to "receiver" colleges, and specific disciplinary discussions for math, biology, etc. Discipline-based discussions should also take place statewide.

The overarching aim of these solutions is to generate trust among faculties, both intersegmentally and intrasegmentally. Members of all faculties need to be discussing what they want students to learn, when they want them to learn it, and which institutions have the capacity to provide that instruction. Receiving institutions also have to realize that at times the best arrangement for student learning may arise when they adapt to sending institutions' circumstances, instead of looking to the sending institutions to adapt to theirs. The payoff from faculty-to-faculty communication may be greatest if discussions focus on majors with many transfer students, such as has been done for engineering, since solutions generated for a popular major would affect a large number of students.

3. Technology

In order to conduct articulation and transfer functions effectively, a technology infrastructure and the expertise to operate and utilize it need to be established and maintained.

Technology mediated instruction courses need to be approved with the same rigor as any other courses in order to maintain quality and to establish credibility. We recognize the relative newness of these courses and hence a lack of shared understanding of what constitutes reasonable course development and teaching for distance education. We recommend establishing models and/or benchmarks by which these courses could be evaluated. In addition, standards for quality, rigor, and content assessment could be assembled in an on-line and a printed handbook.

We also suggest that technology mediated instruction relates to the home campus issue for students taking distance learning courses listed in the CVU. Institutions offering distance education courses have to let students know that they need to establish a home campus in order to determine the articulation of the courses they are taking. The home campus can then act as an advocate to guide students through the system.

4. Change

Methods for dealing with change, both within an individual campus system and with other campuses intersegmentally and intrasegmentally, have to be built into the policies and procedures for articulation. Any changes in degree programs and entrance/exit requirements have to be communicated to other campuses that will be affected. As the campus is developing its changes, it should communicate its enthusiasm and the rationale for the change to those whose articulation agreements will be affected. Ideally, those creating the changes will seek not necessarily approval but concurrence from those who will be affected. Students who change degree programs also need to realize that those actions may affect how courses taken in various segments in the system are evaluated.

Changes also have to be made to the system. Just as IGETC is an intersegmental agreement, so should GE Breadth and TCAs be expanded to cover all segments. We should model collaboration in this system-wide change process just as we expect it from campuses within the system. CAN should also be expanded with emphasis on both program-to-program agreements and model-type agreements.

5. Evaluation Of Courses

We need to increase understanding of the concept of comparability, which is the basis for establishing articulation. Comparability does not mean two courses are the same; it means a student taking either course would gain the knowledge and ability needed to succeed in subsequent course work. We need better examples and teaching tools to communicate this concept; perhaps we need discussions facilitated by those experienced in assessing comparability.

Faculty on both sides of the articulation process need to know what information should be provided in order to decide about articulation and what criteria will be used to make that decision. If CCC faculty want a course articulated but UC or CSU faculty disapprove, there should be some form of appeal process.

For students who have transferred, transcript evaluation needs to be accelerated so that students can be informed more quickly of their status. Transfer students also need to be interviewed to determine how well prepared they believe they were for the transition. That information should be used to address the strengths and weaknesses of feeder colleges. Institutions need to develop more memoranda of agreement about articulation, especially those establishing expectations, feedback processes on transfer student performance, and means of dealing with upper/lower division discrepancies.

6. Data And Information

We are doing more and better articulation and transfer work than perceived. Therefore we need to collect more information about articulation and the progress of students and communicate those results to a larger audience, including the public at large and the Legislature. We also need a readable student handbook about transfer and articulation. It should be maintained and updated regularly in both hard copy and on-line versions.

7. Process, Variability, And Venue

Faculties from all of the segments need to develop a shared understanding of processes for articulation and for dealing with disagreements, differences, and variability. Agreements need to permit adequate variability for the state's heterogeneous student population and the different institutions serving them. At the same time, these agreements should reduce unnecessary variability from campus to campus. Also needed is a central body, perhaps an intersegmental council, for intersegmental transfer and articulation issues, one that would have staff and resources.

We need to revive system-wide articulation conferences where faculty and articulation officers meet regularly. We also need a stronger group of articulation professionals who meet as part of the governing structure of the three public higher education segments.

A task force needs to address how to leverage articulation agreements, especially at the program-to-program level. We need a mechanism whereby an articulation agreement between two campuses can extend to other campuses. Confusion could be reduced by streamlining general education requirements. At the same time, some variability needs to be retained to offer students multiple pathways for completing requirements.

Transfer students need transition services as they enter four-year institutions, with more

faculty involvement in this process. Effective examples include summer bridge programs and transfer student orientations. Independents need to be involved in general education agreements of which IGETC is a prime example. Programs like CAN need UC involvement, and UC faculty generally need to be more involved in articulation.

Others

High school students need more preparation, as do their counselors, on how articulation affects student progress through higher education. The articulation process also needs to be made more comprehensible to facilitate this goal.

Next Steps

Workshop participants felt that the day produced a tremendous number of important ideas and demonstrated considerable commitment and enthusiasm on the part of faculty and articulation officers. More importantly, the Workshop demonstrated the participants' ability to work together and provided a solid base from which to go forward. After reviewing and discussing the contents of this report from the Workshop Planning Committee, ICAS will establish mechanisms for continuing to work on these issues.

There are several avenues that ICAS may consider as it undertakes this work. We offer just a few examples. The Academic Senates may be the vehicle for increasing faculty-to-faculty cooperation. System offices may be approached to increase segmental commitment in terms of articulation and transfer staff and resources. Regulations affecting articulation and transfer may be revised. There could be efforts to change the Education Code through Legislative action. Budget reallocations using state resources may be sought.

Several long term effects may result from ICAS engaging in this work. Curricula from both sending and receiving institutions could be strengthened and better aligned. Students may find that the transitions between segments and schools are smoother. Faculty in particular disciplines may have increased dialogue and sharing of ideas. Generally, there could be increased quality of instruction for California's higher education students.

Appendix A Workshop Program

8:00 - 9:00AM Registration and Continental Breakfast

9:00 - 9:10AM Welcome Sandra Weiss, ICAS Chair

9:10 - 9:30AM Benefits of Articulation and Transfer Sandra Weiss, Moderator
Bill Scroggins, California Community Colleges Academic Senate President
James Highsmith, California State University Academic Senate Chair
Sandra Weiss, University of California Academic Senate Chair

9:30 - 9:45AM Setting the Stage via Scenarios Ric Matthews, Moderator
Kathy Kaiser, CSU Chico and CSUSAT
Diane Glow, San Diego Miramar College

9:45 - 10:30AM Current Procedures Ric Matthews, Moderator
Vivian Franco, CSU Fresno "IGETC, CAN, and GE Breadth"
Louise Randolph, UC Office of the President "TCA and IGETC"
Eric Taggart, ASSIST Coordinator "ASSIST"
Juan Yniguez, AICCU "Independent Colleges and Universities"

10:30 - 10:45AM Coffee Break

10:45AM - 12:00 noon Intersegmental Breakout Groups - Identifying the Barriers

12:00 - 1:15PM Luncheon and Speaker James Highsmith, Moderator
Dr. Cliff Adelman, US Department of Education; 1998-99 College Board Fellow
"Articulation and Transfer, A National Perspective"

1:15 - 1:30PM Break

1:30 - 2:45PM Intersegmental Breakout Groups - Identifying the Solutions

2:45 - 3:00PM Coffee Break

3:00 - 3:50PM Sharing Solutions Bill Scroggins, Moderator

3:50 - 4:00PM Closing Remarks Sandra Weiss

The Workshop was held at the Los Angeles Airport Westin Hotel

Appendix B Workshop Participants

Julie Adams
CCC Academic Senate
910 K Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Cliff Adelman
United States Department of Education
History of Culture
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208-5531
clifford_adelman@ed.gov

Steve Arbuckle
USC Articulation Analyst
Office of Registrar REG 204, University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0912
arbuckle@bcf.usc.edu

Peter Arnade
CSU San Marcos
History
San Marcos, CA 92096-0001
parnade@mailhost1.csusm.edu

Margy Austin
Santa Rosa College
1501 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95401-4396
margy_austin@santarosa.edu

Stan Awramik
UC Santa Barbara
Academic Senate Divisional Chair
1230 Girvetz Hall
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
aawramik@magic.geol.ucsb.edu

Kathryn Barth
CSU Chico
Academic Advising Services
First and Normal Streets
Chico, CA 95929-0713
kbarth@oavax.csuchico.edu

M. L. Bettino
Cerritos College
11110 Alondra Blvd.
Norwalk, CA 90650
bettino@cerritos.edu

Margaret Blue
CSU Dominguez Hills
Univ. Advisement Center/Political Science
1000 East Victoria Street
Carson, CA 90747
mblue@csudh.edu

Clyde Brewer
San Jose State University
Articulation Office
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192
cbrewer@anrnet.sjsu.edu

Jane Carey
Academic Council Director
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
jane.carey@ucop.edu

Susan Cash
CSU Los Angeles
Art
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032
scash@calstatela.edu

Stephen Cato
Yuba College
2088 N. Beale Road
Marysville, CA 95901-7699
scato@mail2.yuba.cc.ca.us

Vernon Church
John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
Director, New Media
605 3rd Avenue
New York, New York 10158
vchurch@wiley.com

ICAS April 29, 1998 Articulation and Transfer Workshop

Kate Clark
Irvine Valley College
5500 Irvine Center Drive
Irvine, CA 92620
kclark@ivc.cc.ca.us

Linda Collins
Los Medanos College
4151 Shafter Avenue
Oakland, CA 94609
lcollins@ccnet.com

Don Cordero
Mission College
Counseling
3000 Mission College Blvd
Santa Clarav 95054-1897
don_cordero@wvmccd.cc.ca.us

Dan Crump
American River College
4700 College Oak Drive
Sacramento, CA 95841-4286
crumpd@arc.losrios.cc.ca.us

Marlene Demerjian
College of the Canyons
Mathematics
26455 Rockwell Canyon Rd.
Valencia, CA 91355-1899
demerjian_m@mail.coc.cc.ca.us

Gene Dinielli
CSU Long Beach
111-1/2 12th Street
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Aimée Dorr
UC Academic Senate Vice Chair
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
dorr@gseis.ucla.edu

Sam Edelman
CSU Chico
Communication Arts and Science
First and Normal Streets
Chico 95929
sedelman@csuchico.edu

Bob Ellsworth
Butte College
Media and Distance Learning
3536 Butte Campus Drive
Oroville, CA 95965-8381
ellsworth@butte.cc.ca.us

David Esparza
Los Angeles Trade Tech
400 W. Washington Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90015-4181
david_r._esparza@laccd.cc.ca.us

Scott Farrand
CSU Sacramento
Mathematics
Sacramento, CA 95819-6051
farrand@csus.edu

Jeff Ferguson
Ventura College
Articulation
4667 Telegraph Road
Ventura, CA 93003-3899

Robert Ferrando
UC Davis
Undergraduate Admissions
1 Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
rferrando@ucdavis.edu

Vivian Franco
CSU Fresno
Interim Director of Admissions
5241 North Maple Avenue
Fresno, CA 93740

Carol Freeman
UC Santa Cruz
Writing Program
210 Cowell College
Santa Cruz 95064
freeman@cats.ucsc.edu

Jan Frodesen
UC Santa Barbara
Department of Linguistics
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
frodesen@humanitas.ucsb.edu

ICAS April 29, 1998 Articulation and Transfer Workshop

Diane Glow
San Diego Miramar College
10440 Black Mountain Road
San Diego, CA 92126-2999

Bernard Goldstein
111 Park Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

Harold Goldwhite
c/o CSU Academic Senate
Chemistry
400 Golden Shore, Suite 317
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275
harold_goldwhite@calstate.edu

Julie Gordon
UC Office of the President
Academic Initiatives
300 Lakeside Drive, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
julie.gordon@ucop.edu

Raschel Greenberg
UC Irvine
Articulation Officer
Office of Admissions and Relations with
Schools
Irvine, CA 92697
rgreenbe@uci.edu

Ole Hald
UC Berkeley
Mathematics
875 Evans
Berkeley, CA 94720
hald@math.berkeley.edu

Shirley Holder Hazlett
California Department of Education
Intersegmental Relations Office
721 Capitol Mall, 4th Floor
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720
shazlett@cde.ca.gov

Debbie Hennessy
CSU Academic Senate Executive Director
400 Golden Shore, Suite 132
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275
dhennessy@calstate.edu

James Highsmith
CSU Academic Senate
400 Golden Shore, Suite 132
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

Anne Hoger
UC San Diego
Applied Mechanics & Engineering Science
279 Engineering Bldg., II
La Jolla, CA 92093-0411
ahoger@ucsd.edu

Allison Jones
CSU Chancellor's Office

Kathy Kaiser
CSU Chico
Sociology
1603 Arbutus Avenue
Chico, CA 95926
kkaiser@oavax.csuschico.edu

Anita Kinser
Riverside College
Nursing
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, CA 92506
skizx@aol.com

Richard Kroll
UC Irvine
English and Comparative Literature
300 HIB, 2650
Irvine, CA 92697-2650
rwkroll@uci.edu

Gene Lamke
San Diego State University
Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism
6771 Dicenza Way
San Diego, CA 92119
glamke@mail.sdsu.edu

Gale Larson
CSU Northridge
English
18111 Nordoff Street
Northridge, CA 91330
gale.larson@csun.edu

ICAS April 29, 1998 Articulation and Transfer Workshop

Jane Leaphart
CPSU San Luis Obispo
Office of Academic Records
San Luis Obispo, CA 90802-4275
jleaphar@calpoly.edu

Al Lewis
Marymount College
ESL
30800 Palos Verdes Dr., East
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275-6299

Jannie Mackay
Long Beach City College
Counseling
4901 E. Carson Street
Long Beach, CA 90808-1706
jmackay@lbcc.cc.ca.us

Ric Matthews
San Diego Miramar College
Biology
10598 Oakbend Drive
San Diego, CA 92131-2369
ricmat@ix.netcom.com

Nan Maxwell
CSU Hayward
Department of Economics
Hayward 94542-3015
nmaxwell@csushayward.edu

Unny Menon
CPSU San Luis Obispo
Industrial Engineering Department
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
umenon@calpoly.edu

Jennifer Merlic
Santa Monica College
1900 Pico Blvd.
Santa Monica, CA 90405-1644
smtp:jmerlic@smc.edu

Kent Merryfield
CSU Long Beach
Mathematics
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840
kmerry@csulb.edu

Bryan Miller
UC Davis
Academic Senate Divisional Chair
356 Mark Hall
Davis, CA 95616

Lynn Miller
California Community Colleges
Curriculum Studies
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
lmiller@cc1.cccco.edu

Alden Mosshammer
UC San Diego
History
4044 H&SS
La Jolla, CA 92093-0104
amosshammer@ucsd.edu

J. Ken Nishita
CSU Monterey Bay
3267 Marina Drive
Marina, CA 93933

Kathy O'Connor
Santa Barbara College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109-2394
oconnork@sbcc.net

Keith Oddson
UC Riverside
Mathematics Department
3108 Sproul Hall
Riverside, CA 92521
jko@enr.ucr.edu

Walter Oliver
CSU San Bernardino
Foreign Language
3483 Circle Road
San Bernardino, CA 92405
woliver@wiley.csusb.edu

Judy Osman
CSU
Access and Retention
400 Golden Shore, Suite 304
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275
judy_osman@calstate.edu

Dorothy Perry
UC San Francisco
School of Dentistry
707 Parnassus, Box 0754
San Francisco, CA 94143
dperry@itsa.ucsf.edu

Janis Perry
Santa Ana College
Counseling
915 Cercis Place
Newport Beach, CA 92660
jdperry@ix.netcom.com

Janice Plastino
UC Irvine
School of the Arts
300 Mesa Arts Bldg.
Irvine, CA 92697-2775
jgplasti@uci.edu

Yat Sun Poon
UC Riverside
Mathematics
Riverside, CA 92521

Louise Randolph
UC Office of the President
Student Academic Services
300 Lakeside Drive, 17th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
louise.randolph@ucop.edu

Sorel Reisman
CSU Fullerton
Management Science and Information Systems
800 N. State College Blvd.
Fullerton, CA 92834
sreisman@fullerton.edu

Pam Brown Schachter
Marymount College
Articulation Officer
30800 Palos Verdes Dr., East
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Thelma Scott-Skillman
California Community Colleges
Vice Chancellor
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
tscottsk@cc1.cccco.edu

Bill Scroggins
Chabot College
Chemistry
910 K Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
bscrogg@ix.netcom.com

Evelyn Silvia
UC Davis
Mathematics
1 Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
emsilvia@ucdavis.edu

Douglas Smith
UC San Diego
Department of Biology
San Diego, CA 92093
dsmith@ucsd.edu

David Spence
CSU Chancellor's Office
Vice Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802
david_spence@qm.calstate.edu

Bob Stafford
San Bernardino College
701 S. Mt. Vernon Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92410-2798
rcstaff@sbcc.cc.ca.us

Judith Stanley
CSU Hayward
History
6 Admiral Drive, #374
Emeryville, CA 94608
jstanley@csuhayward.edu

Fadia Stermasi
John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
Media Editor
2397 Shattuck Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94704
fstermas@wiley.com

Betty Sundberg
California Community Colleges
Coordinator of Transfer and Articulation
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
bsunber@cc1.cccco.edu

Eric Taggart
UC Irvine
ASSIST Coordinator
820 University Tower
Irvine, CA 92697
eric@assist.org

Karen Taylor
UC Berkeley
Admissions & Relations with Schools
110 Sproul Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-5800
karent@uclink.berkeley.edu

Susan Taylor
San Francisco State University
Undergraduate Studies
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132
staylor@sfsu.edu

Marshelle Thobaben
CSU Academic Senate
432 Shirley Blvd.
Arcata, CA 95521
mt1@axe.humboldt.edu

Barbara Thorpe
CSU Institute
Nursing
400 Golden Shore Suite 116
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275
bthorpe@pacbell.net

Steve Varvis
Fresno Pacific University
Dean of the College
1717 S. Chestnut Avenue
Fresno, CA 93702
slvaris@fresno.edu

John Vohs
UC Davis
Rhetoric and Communications
Davis, CA 95616
jlvohs@ucdavis.edu

Jaci Ward
San Bernardino Community College District
Distance Education Director
701 South Mount Vernon Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92410
jaci_ward@kver.pbs.org

Sandra Weiss
UC Academic Council Chair
300 Lakeside Drive, 22nd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
sandra.weiss@ucop.edu

Joy Wentz
College of the Desert
English
43-500 Monterey Avenue
Palm Desert, CA 92260-2499
jwentz@desert.cc.ca.us

Edwenna Werner
University of Southern California
Articulation Coordinator
Office of Registrar REG 204, University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0912

Fred Wood
UC Davis
L&S Dean's Office
1 Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
fewood@ucdavis.edu

ICAS April 29, 1998 Articulation and Transfer Workshop

Ann Wynne
Orange Coast College
History
2701 Fairview Road
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
awynne@occ.cccd.edu

Juan Yniquez
AICCU
Vice President
Research and Information Services
1100 Eleventh Street, Suite 315
Sacramento, CA 95814
jcy@aiccu.edu

Appendix C

Barriers to Articulation and Transfer Identified in Breakout Groups

Altogether the five Workshop breakout groups created more than 100 statements describing barriers to articulation and transfer. These statements, and each breakout group's opinion about which barriers were most important, were the basis for creating the seven major areas described in the body of this report. Here, we provide a more detailed analysis of the many barrier descriptions created during the morning breakout group session. Barrier statements are organized according to the seven major areas, with subsections in some. When more than one barrier statement expressed nearly the same idea, statements were combined into one. In parentheses after each barrier statement are, first, the number of different statements describing this barrier and, second, the number of breakout groups (five maximum) with at least one statement describing this barrier.

1. Resources And Personnel

- 1a. There is a lack of adequate funding for articulation, and available funding is insufficiently consistent, predictable, and long-range. (4 statements, 4 groups)
- 1b. At the system-wide and campus levels, there is a lack of resources for articulation, including technology, training, major advisement planning sheets, and time. (5 statements, 4 groups)
- 1c. Articulation officers are too often given competing workload priorities that interfere with doing the best possible job of articulation; faculty too often do not have enough time available to work on articulation. (3 statements, 2 groups)
- 1d. There is a lack of segmental commitment to articulation and transfer (reluctance to conform to E.O. 575). (3 statements, 3 groups)
- 1e. Faculty are not sufficiently committed to articulation and transfer; they need to understand their critical role and the impact the process has on them. (2 statements, 1 group)
- 1f. It takes receiving institutions too long right now to produce for newly admitted transfer students the list of courses that will transfer and what they will count for. This makes it hard for transfer students to make the most of their first quarter or semester at the receiving institution and to plan their course sequence well. (3 statements, 2 groups)

2. Faculty To Faculty Communication And Trust

Trust and collegiality among faculty

- 2a. Faculty in the different segments do not trust each other enough in the areas of shared educational values, effort, rigor, respect, etc., and trust is critical. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 2b. The bottom line issue that undergirds articulation is the perception or misperception of quality. It is the "skunk rat" that is never put on the table but, in fact, both

- between campuses in a segment, and across segments, there are various views of the "quality" of courses offered. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 2c. There is a need for a basic understanding that faculty at community colleges are invested in the same goals as the four-year institutions, namely to get the student a four-year degree, that community colleges and 4-year institutions are partners not competitors, and that transfer students are students of BOTH institutions. (2 statements, 1 group)
- 2d. Perhaps there is a need for more general competency assessments of community college students, in order to show that they are, in fact, ready for the receiving 4-year institutions. This would increase trust among faculty from the different segments. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 2e. A real barrier is hierarchical rather than collaborative relationships in determining transferability and in establishing agreements on major preparation. In particular, CCC faculty feel they are treated with less regard by UC faculty. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 2f. At community colleges, faculty sometimes have oppositional perspectives, e.g., "vocational" faculty vs. general education/transfer faculty. (1 statement, 1 group)

Community college preparation of transfer students

- 2g. Incoming community college students are not well enough prepared; it seems that there is grade inflation in articulated courses or perhaps community colleges have to "water down" their courses to meet their students' skill levels. (3 statements, 2 groups)
- 2h. Too many community college transfers cannot pass a particular CSU upper division writing proficiency requirement (GWAR) and that CSU campus is then burdened with providing remedial instruction. We need to get community college frosh composition comparable to that at CSU so we don't wind up with this problem. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 2i. There is perhaps a tendency for some faculty and others in receiving institutions to overgeneralize about a sending institution based on experience with just a few students from that institution. Anecdotal stories harm the majority of high performance students. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 2j. Receiving institutions have to accept whatever problems (or deficiencies) transfer students bring with them and either take responsibility for fixing them or ask the student to leave. (1 statement, 1 group)

Conversation and consensus among disciplinary faculty

- 2k. There is a need to increase conversation and interaction among faculty in the same discipline at different institutions in the three segments because this will increase articulation. (3 statements, 3 groups)
- 2l. Faculty have to get together and talk in order to develop shared expectations about writing competency. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 2m. A real problem is the inability of the faculty to develop a consensus on the content and outcomes of courses in need of articulation, especially in Humanities, Arts, and the Social Sciences. (1 statement, 1 group)

3. Technology

Access, resources, and security

- 3a. There is a serious lack of access to technology generally and of the particular resources needed to handle technology mediated instruction. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 3b. We need to use the web more for our articulation and transfer work, as well as for our teaching, but in order to do so we need much more security on the web. (1 statement, 1 group)

Quality technology-mediated courses

- 3c. We are now encouraging faculty to make web courses so fast that we may lose control over whether the web course actually matches the catalogue. We need to know that each web course matches the catalogue when we decide to accept the course for transfer. This is a quality control issue. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 3d. In assessing the quality of web-based courses, there are few good benchmarks, some difficulty deciding how to compare the quality and outcomes of web-based courses and classroom courses, uncertainty about what constitutes course competencies in technology mediated courses, and need for communication standards to replace those for face-to-face instruction (e.g., for facilitating cooperative learning models in distance education). (5 statements, 2 groups)
- 3e. Some great face-to-face teachers may not be good distance education teachers. Conversely, good distance education instructors may be weak in their face-to-face methodology. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 3f. Four-year institutions need to realize that distributed education of CCC general education courses will be rigorous due to curriculum committee requirements. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 3g. Distrust seems to come up a lot more now because of distance education. The California Community Colleges' document on good distance education could serve as a basis for establishing trust. Knowledge of this document had a significant positive effect on improving the UC and CSU attitudes and understandings of what standards are maintained by CCCs. (2 statements, 2 groups)

California Virtual University

- 3h. CVU is going to present challenges for articulation of distance learning courses, specifically on-line courses at CCC level that would transfer to UC/CSU. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 3i. There is a need to involve faculty more in CVU and to educate them about it as part of the process of developing distance education guidelines. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 3j. The opportunity CVU provides students in California and throughout the world to identify courses to take raises many responsibilities for the colleges. The CVU web site, according to Larry Toy, is getting 20,000 "hits" per day. However, the CVU site DOES NOT alert the web site visitor to be sure to connect with an advisor! The colleges will make every effort to counsel students. It would be wise for the CVU to also put a friendly notice visibly on the web site -- not buried 3 links down -- which urges students to seek advising, order college catalogs, etc. (1 statement, 1 group)

- 3k. If students are going to be taking many courses via CVU, we will need to figure out how to be certain that they can and do pass the CSU upper division writing exam. (1 statement, 1 group)

4. Change

- 4a. When one segment decides to grow or change its requirements and/or curriculum, it is likely to disrupt existing transfer and articulation arrangements. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 4b. Various campuses and systems (e.g., San Jose State, CSU) are introducing computer skills or information competency requirements for entrance. If it is not passed, the student must take a designated course. This will cause an articulation problem with the community colleges. Perhaps they need to identify community college courses that will satisfy this information competency requirement. (1 statement, 1 group)

5. Evaluation Of Courses

- 5a. We need quality control of transferable courses, including some verification that the stipulated course content is actually being covered in an articulated course and the knowledge, that cannot be gained from paper, that a course has good academic standards and holds students to the "right" level of learning. (4 statements, 2 groups)
- 5b. We need to revalidate articulated courses often enough to be sure that they are still the courses that were approved for articulation; we need to keep course outlines up-to-date. (1 statement, 1 group)

Discriminating between upper and lower division courses

- 5c. There are problems with inconsistent placement of courses at lower or upper division in the receiving transfer schools. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 5d. It can be difficult to make clear distinctions between lower and upper division work in the major, and there is much complexity of accessing transcripts, catalog descriptions, and articulation agreements. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5e. CCC lower division courses cannot be, in general, articulated with 4-year upper division courses at CSU and course levels for the upper division courses are not carefully considered. (1 statement, 1 group)

Competency assessment

- 5f. We need to find alternative paths to articulation through demonstrated competencies. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5g. We need to forget about evaluating the sending institution and its courses, and simply evaluate each student when he or she transfers and then ameliorate as needed. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 5h. Given the problems community college transfers have passing a particular CSU upper division writing proficiency requirement (GWAR), perhaps each community college should have an exit requirement that the student had to satisfy the CSU

writing requirement before completing the community college. (1 statement, 1 group)

General education

- 5i. Students are faced with three general education choices -- IGETC, CSU GE Breadth, and campus-based -- and perhaps this is too much. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5j. IGETC criteria are not suitable for transfer into math/science majors, and a common student problem is to concentrate on general education requirements early and get a very late start on a technical, high prerequisite major. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 5k. We need to work on rules concerning the certification of transfer general education. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5l. Especially when the independent colleges and universities are included among receiving institutions, the differences across receiving institutions in general education requirements are so great that it is difficult for a community college student who does not know at the outset where he or she will transfer to be sure he or she is satisfying general education requirements while at the community college. (2 statements, 2 groups)

Miscellany

- 5m. The purpose/scope/depth criterion too often kicks out courses that have non-specific discipline-specific material. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5n. We need to find a way of establishing equivalency of courses taken in out-of-state or international institutions. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5o. Some community college districts seem to be encouraging removal of (appropriate) prerequisites on math/science courses in favor of merely "advisories." (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5p. we need to learn how to avoid the 80-unit frosh in terms of the major. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5q. We need to pay more attention to "not for major credit" transferable coursework. (1 statement, 1 group)

6. Data And Information

Information needs

- 6a. It seems likely that transfer students are disadvantaged when it comes to being admitted to impacted majors. We need to find out if this is so and, if so, remove the disadvantage. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 6b. We need to learn more about what admission committees can do, require, or permit. (1 statement, 1 group)

Educate faculty

- 6c. We need to educate faculty on the value and issues of articulation so that they are aware of the interactive critical role played by them in the process and the impact the process has on them in terms of curriculum, student preparation, etc. (2 statements, 1 group)

- 6d. There is a need to involve faculty more in CVU and to educate them about it as part of the process of developing distance education guidelines. (2 statements, 2 groups)

Availability of good information

- 6e. Students and staff may not know articulation information exists or where to find it. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 6f. Students are too often confused. Because of poor counseling, they have difficulty finding out what they need to know, and determining what "counts." They also report (and if it is accurate it is a barrier) that as they near the time of completion of community college work and transfer to a 4-year institution they are told something different than what they were first told about what they needed to take and what would count. (1 statement, 1 group)

Public relations

- 6g. The complexity of the process makes it very confusing to the public and the legislature as well. There is a great need for some systematic communication with the legislature in order to better educate them to the issues and the processes operating. (1 statement, 1 group)

7. Process, Variability And Venue

Institutional variability in requirements, courses, or course numbers

- 7a. There is a dizzy array of course numbers and numbering systems used on different campuses, or the same numbers are used to mean different things on different campuses. More common numbering or "CANning" would really help. This viable entity must be utilized and expanded, and we need to establish a means for increased participation in CAN. UCs don't participate, and some CSUs and CCCs don't participate either. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 7b. UC and CSU have different requirements for the same course. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7c. Among institutions that can be involved in transfer and articulation there are too many differences in general education requirements, diversity (multicultural) requirements, and expository writing requirements. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7d. There is a lack of uniform proficiency standards in transfer courses involving English as a second language and a lack of uniform assessment standards within district and throughout California in K-18. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7e. Course content is not equivalent on many campuses. (1 statement, 1 group)

Inconsistent process, structure, or personnel for articulation and transfer

- 7f. Intersegmental regional coordination for transfer and articulation is not seamless; e.g., the CCC have 10 regions for transfer center directors and articulation officers. In some regions these two officer groups meet together. In others, they don't. Some regions meet intersegmentally; others don't. Without seamless regional intersegmental coordination, transfer and articulation challenges will not be adequately addressed. (1 statement, 1 group)

- 7g. There is a lack of a venue, in both content and agenda, for statewide coordination to occur. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7h. There is a lack of consistent and reliable structure, process, and personnel from campus to campus and from segment to segment to deal with issues of articulation. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7i. There is no state level system of agreements about major preparedness nor any perception that this is possible while still maintaining campus autonomy; instead there are agreements involving single campuses and the venues for collaboration are inconsistent. (3 statements, 2 groups)

Other inconsistencies

- 7j. There is a problem with inconsistent acceptance of transferable courses across majors; e.g., the same math course may not be accepted across majors. Also there is inconsistent placement within majors depending on which faculty member reviews the course. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7k. Lack of common academic calendars, application dates, and term dates makes communication and student processing difficult. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7l. Teaching credential students come to CSU from UC without an advanced course in writing and want to be waived of the requirement. (1 statement, 1 group)

8. Other Topics

High school

- 8a. How can high school graduation standards be articulated with college entrance requirements for the multiple private and public college systems in California -- are students aware of and completing the A-F requirements, for instance? (1 statement, 1 group)
- 8b. How is information made available to high school students regarding college admission, major, financial aid, and other options? (1 statement, 1 group)

Expand articulation

- 8c. There are no articulation agreements by major between CSU campuses. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 8d. What would be a reasonable basis for articulating courses world wide (on-line, etc.)? (1 statement, 1 group)
- 8e. California independent institutions do not collaborate enough. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 8f. The articulation process is tedious because each agreement is course by course between just two institutions. In addition to CAN, there should be ways to get one agreement between any two institutions to scale up easily to include more institutions. (2 statements, 2 groups)

9. Miscellaneous Unique Statements

- 9a. We sometimes have wrong expectations. We cannot fix everything and we should not try to fix everything. Some things -- that could be judged in need of fixing -- may be right just the way they are. For example, a program aligned for one college's transfer may be misaligned for another's, but that may be exactly the way it should be. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 9b. There are inequities in the time limits we set to determine the earlier work for which a student can receive credit. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 9c. Transfer to independent institutions is difficult to achieve because they lack attractive financial aid packages. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 9d. Need to identify and distribute student profiles. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 9e. There are givens over which we have no control yet wish to retain; e.g., process, transient student population, and quality assurance. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 9f. Many problems exist for students who travel great distances to attend CCC for counseling and advising. (1 statement, 1 group)

Appendix D

Solutions to Barriers to Articulation and Transfer Identified in Breakout Groups

Altogether the five Workshop breakout groups created more than 60 statements describing possible solutions to barriers to articulation and transfer. Some were brief; others were elaborated. To create the description in the body of this report of the possible solutions for each of the seven barrier areas, all the solution statements were reviewed and organized by the Workshop Planning Committee. Here, we provide a more detailed analysis of the many solution descriptions created during the afternoon breakout group session. Solution statements are organized according to the seven major areas of barriers, with subsections in some. When more than one solution statement expressed nearly the same idea, statements were combined into one. Detailed descriptions of possible solutions are included along with short statements about possible solutions. In parentheses after each numbered solution are, first, the number of different statements describing this solution and, second, the number of breakout groups (five maximum) with at least one statement describing this solution.

1. Resources And Personnel

- 1a. We must increase commitment to articulation. This includes identifying resources for implementation of policy and mandates, giving faculty support and time for articulation, and focusing on funding and sustainable funding. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 1b. Resources must be provided for articulation, planning, and convening of key parties; we need resources for faculty to faculty discussions; for example, discipline specific (e.g., ELC) intersegmental bodies with itemized missions to accomplish. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 1c. Since articulation and transfer are high priority public policy goals, consistent sources (e.g., from ICC, ICAS, State budget, or joint budget proposal) of sustained funding should be available for faculty to faculty meetings (including travel), campus articulation officers, office staff, and an annual faculty articulation conference to discuss research on articulation, CAN, Project ASSIST, and other issues. (3 statements, 2 groups)
- 1d. Additional delta funds should be secured to provide needed resources. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 1e. A light-hearted recommendation for resources was the suggestion of bake sales, perhaps to point to the long history of lack of resources made available. Before establishing a complicated communication structure to improve and increase articulation, basic resources need to be in place. This is not the case today as very few institutions have full-time articulation officers. It is estimated that most articulation officers may be under 50% time. In addition, those articulation officers who are part-time have no clerical support, so their limited, valuable time is spent on clerical duties. There should be an articulation officer at every community college, and articulation officers should be afforded more status in their institutions. A number of articulation officers still do not have access to updated technology, from an updated computer to access to the internet (for ASSIST). This should be

remedied. Finally, articulation officers should receive more training than is common across institutions. (2 statements, 2 groups)

2. Faculty To Faculty Communication And Trust

Faculty to faculty dialogue

(note that every group strongly recommended a solution like this)

- 2a. We should support, encourage, and fund more faculty to faculty, intersegmental meetings about lower division general education and major preparation articulation and transfer and such issues and timely topics as what constitutes regular, effective, instructional contact in distance education, what are formulae for content assessment and outcomes, and what do faculty think about the impact on articulation of the knowledge explosion, future funding for higher education, culture wars, science wars, diversity, etc? (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 2b. We should have discipline specific (e.g., ELC) intersegmental bodies or small regional informal groups organized to accomplish itemized missions and review articulation agreements, courses, and curricula. In some cases, we will find we must agree to disagree. (4 statements, 3 groups)
- 2c. Trust and faculty support for articulation will come about through contact among faculty, especially those in similar disciplines across institutions, and particularly faculty from two- and four-year institutions when the two-year institutions are feeders to the four-year institutions. Such contact might involve the following elements:
 - Establish a faculty exchange program within and across the segments (particularly by discipline) to build understanding and trust.
 - One of the responsibilities of articulation officers should be to facilitate intergroup communication and relationships; however, an articulation officer's work cannot substitute for direct contact among the faculty.
 - Faculty from feeder and receiver institutions need to focus their communication on substantive issues not on the mechanics of articulation and transfer.
 - Receiver institutions (and faculty) need to have frank, collegial dialogues with feeder institutions (and faculty); receiver institutions cannot dictate requirements to feeder institutions. Right now the communication is one-way: CCC faculty have to respond to UC/CSU dictates.
 - Faculty-to-faculty dialogue needs to be sustained over time not a single event or a recurring event with long breaks between each meeting.
 - It would be great if the faculty participating in such dialogues were empowered to make articulation agreements; also, participating faculty should be key decision makers (e.g., UC BOARS members) to the extent possible.
 - Faculty contact needs to occur within particular, supporting organizational structures; for example, a group of institutions in all segments of higher education in one region of the state or a group of feeder and receiver institutions.
 - The regional collaborative efforts that the CSU is embarking on (aimed largely at connections with K-12 schools) should include aspects that bring

- CCC, CSU, UC, and possibly private college faculty together, discipline by discipline. This should be done by the campuses -- not as a statewide Senate operation. (2 "statements," 2 groups)
- 2d. To move forward with the proposal to have more faculty-to-faculty dialogue, the following could be done:
- It would be useful to have system-level coordination and funding for such a program.
 - The three Senates should agree on a process, help identify disciplines and faculty, and give authority to the involved faculty.
 - We must establish priorities and then match resources to values, fund high priority goals, remove unfunded mandates, and allocate funds according to priority.
 - The three Senates should develop a proposal for a pilot program, including a rationale, a plan, and a budget, obtain support for it, implement it, and evaluate it.
 - Legislators, legislative aides, and journalists should be brought in to learn about the program and see it in action.
 - Assuming the pilot program is successful, we should seek more funding and sustained funding for it; possible funding sources include the federal government, foundations with articulation interests, and public/private partnerships perhaps by discipline (e.g., engineering, computer science). (2 "statements," 2 groups)

Community college preparation of transfer students

- 2e. In classes at receiver institutions, faculty should ask transfer students if they feel prepared for the class and what was their sending institution; the articulation officer at the receiver institution should take this information back to the feeder institutions so that they can either keep up the good work or figure out how to do better. (1 statement, 1 group)

3. Technology

- 3a. We should do whatever is necessary to increase faculty expertise so that confident criteria for accepting technologically mediated instruction can be developed. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 3b. Articulation officers and faculty need resources and guidelines to review distance education courses from many providers, including all California segments, out of state, privates, and corporate entities. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 3c. An ad hoc intersegmental group should be created to identify articulation and transfer issues involving technology mediated instruction (TMI) and CVU and then recommend how to address them; if the segments already have groups addressing TMI issues, then representatives from these groups are probably the best members for the ad hoc intersegmental group. This group could also provide needed input to Title 5 guidelines in relationship to changes needed by 2002. (3 statements, 2 groups)

4. Change

- 4a. When receiver institutions decide to change their requirements, receiver representatives (articulation officers, faculty) need to communicate to sending institutions the nature of the changes, the rationale for them, and the excitement about them and to evidence real consideration for any concerns feeder institutions may have about effects of the change on their institution. While a receiving institution's faculty is in the process of developing a curriculum or making major changes to it, the faculty should have ongoing dialogue with the main sending institutions' faculty so that the sending and receiving institutions will wind up with a coordinated set of offerings and requirements at about the same time. This should also be done when receiving institutions are developing or revising entrance or exit competency tests. Also, if either or both receiving and sending institutions intend to have competency tests for the articulated courses, this is the time to be talking to each other about what they will be like. (2 statements, 2 groups)

5. Evaluation Of Courses

- 5a. Certain faculty should be designated and identified for consultation about courses. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5b. We need to work with faculty to develop (1) expertise so that evaluation of courses offered by other segments is well informed, (2) consensus among faculty concerning content and outcomes of articulated courses, and (3) communication procedures with CSU faculty so that courses are comparable for transfer. (3 statements, 3 groups)
- 5c. Faculty who are going to decide about whether a sending institution's courses articulate with the receiving institution's courses should get much more information, and more useful information, about the courses, including for example the syllabus, assignments, and exams. (2 statements, 2 groups)
- 5d. Some group members believed we should use the Math and English standards to assess and evaluate curricula, and others disagreed. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 5e. We need to institute quality control of transferable courses. (1 statement, 1 group)

Competency assessment

- 5f. Some group members believed we should stop thinking about articulation by course content and comparability and instead develop competency-based articulation. Some members stated that the Legislature either now required various kinds of competency testing in higher education or was likely to require it in the future. If so, this suggestion for competency-based articulation would fit well with the Legislative mandate. While the suggestion was not fully worked out, it would probably have the following elements:
- Course-based articulation agreements would exist and be used.
 - Every such course that a student took in a sending institution would count for general credit at the receiving institution.
 - At the receiving institution, transfer students would be tested for competencies that should have been acquired at the sending institution based on the articulation agreements.

- If a transfer student did not pass any given competency test, he or she would take courses (or do something else) to develop the needed competency.
- If the competency testing suggested that students from a particular feeder institution were routinely failing in any particular area, then faculty and articulation officers from the feeder and receiver institutions would work together to identify and repair the problems that led to the students' failure. Discussions would be frank and respectful.

This suggestion was hotly debated by group members. Among the arguments against the proposal were the following:

- Receiver institution competency assessments per se imply a lack of trust in feeder institutions.
- All students forget what they have learned, no matter where they learned it, so receiver institution competency assessments could be inappropriately interpreted as indicating that a feeder institution did not educate students well.
- Competency assessment at the receiver institution will be a disincentive for students to take lower division work at the feeder institution.
- Competency assessment is costly and time consuming to develop and administer, and it is difficult to develop a fair and valid competency test. (1 statement, 1 group)

6. Data And Information

Information needs

- 6a. There need to be better coordinated information systems at all levels, beginning even in elementary school, and the systems need to be more user friendly for the students. (2 statements, 1 group)
- 6b. We should create hyperlinks from ASSIST to on-line catalogues for higher education institutions and from one institution to the next; presumably these links would be at the level of courses, majors, general education, and the like rather than at the level of the institution per se. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 6c. We should examine demonstrated outcomes in regard to articulation to solve some of the issues we face. (1 statement, 1 group)

Educate and inform faculty, articulation officers, counselors, and the like

- 6d. Articulation activities should be used as a form of faculty development. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 6e. There should be clear communications to registrars and articulation officers as to what general education courses actually transfer. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 6f. Community college academic counselors should go to receiver institutions to talk with faculty, registrars, admissions officers, and articulation officers to learn more that will help them in their work with community college students intending to transfer. (1 statement, 1 group)

Public relations

- 6g. We need to be better at public relations and publicize our successes; for example, GE Breadth/IGETC and ASSIST. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 6h. We should get the CSU Institute for Educational Reform interested in issues of articulation and transfer and see if they can assist in the education of the Legislature about these matters. (1 statement, 1 group)

7. Process, Variability, And Venue

Institutional variability in requirements, courses, or course numbers

- 7a. We should try again to get UC to participate in CAN. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7b. We should use CAN and ASSIST to help the transfer process. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7c. We should adopt a common course numbering system for all segments; for example, specific ranges of numbers indicating non-4-year transferable, freshman-sophomore, junior-senior, and graduate level courses. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7d. In order to solve problems of institutional variability, faculty at each institution should be encouraged to become better informed about what students planning to transfer and those who have transferred face. With such knowledge, faculty themselves will work to simplify and coordinate processes. Various mechanisms for becoming better informed include the following: using ASSIST, looking at the website for one's own institution, examining the presentation of the major for one's own department, asking students in one's own classes or one's advisees to describe their experiences, looking at the website for the institution from which one's students transferred, and trying to organize coursework at a sending institution as though one were planning to transfer to one's own institution and major. (1 statement, 1 group)

**Inconsistent process, structure, or personnel for articulation and transfer
(note that 7e, f, and g are the same sort of idea from 3 different groups)**

- 7e. We need to formalize the process of articulation between and among segments by developing a consistent policy in terms of expectations, sequence of activity, time frame, essentials of review, outcome options, results, and reporting mechanisms. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7f. There is a need for statewide organization, including independents, which is modeled after the CSU GE Breadth/IGETC Course Review Subcommittee for articulation of transfer, where faculty, supported by staff from their segments, would, "with portfolio" from their segments, make decisions about articulation of courses which would apply to all segments, including the privates. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7g. Articulation agreements should be accomplished on a state-wide basis by committees based by discipline. They should address the following: consistent course numbering, common academic curriculum, same academic calendar, and use of technology with EDI National Database for articulation and degree audit system. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7h. A good plan for developing better articulation would begin with regional collaboration of faculty by major, move to statewide collaborations, and then go on

- to combined faculty and administrative groups. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7i. Articulation arrangements will be facilitated if we establish and work within particular organizational structures; for example, regional groups of institutions in all segments of higher education or feeder and receiver institutions. (2 statements, 2 groups)
 - 7j. There needs to be greater delineation of CSU and UC responsibilities vis-a-vis articulation and transfer. (1 statement, 1 group)
 - 7k. There needs to be a venue to discuss general issues consistently and continually between CCC, CSU, and UC. (2 statements, 2 groups)
 - 7l. We need more cooperation between K-18 -- a council would be useful. (1 statement, 1 group)

Simplicity, autonomy, and reasonable goals

- 7m. We should always be striving for simple solutions and always looking for ways to simplify agreements and processes. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7n. It is important to retain the uniqueness and autonomy of each institution while improving articulation. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7o. All segments need to be more fluid. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 7p. We should try for small gains and be reasonable. (1 statement, 1 group)

8. Other Topics

- 8a. Catalogue Rights -- A student should be held to the requirements of the (four-year institution) catalogue available when he or she first enrolled in a California institution of higher education (especially a community college), not held to the requirements of the catalogue the year he or she transfers to the four-year institution. Otherwise it is not fair for transfer students and makes it take much longer for a transfer student to graduate. (1 statement, 1 group)
- 8b. The issues of articulation and transfer need to go to ICC via ICAS. Commitment needs to be from the top down on both the state level and the institutional level. (1 statement, 1 group)

Appendix E Resource Documents

A Guide for CAN, 1995 Edition. California Articulation Number System. 550 East Shaw Ave., 2nd Floor, Fresno, CA 93710-7702. 209-278-6880. FAX: 209-227-2326.

Handbook of California Articulation Policies and Procedures 1995. California Public and Independent Colleges and Universities.

"Enhancing Student Transfer: A Memorandum of Understanding Between the California Community Colleges and the University of California." Academic Council, April 8, 1998.

"Guidelines for Good Practice: Technology Mediated Instruction." The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Adopted Fall 1997. Ric Matthews, Technology Committee Chair.

"Creating General Education Linkages in Public Higher Education." Kathleen E. Kaiser, Ph.D. and Jolayne Service, Ph.D. Presented at SUNY Conference on General Education, October 4-5, 1996, University of Albany.