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**Introduction**

In 2010, Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) was signed into law. This bill mandated that California’s 112 community colleges develop a new type of associate degree, an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), that conforms to specified unit limits at the California Community College (CCC) and specifically prepares a student for admission to the California State University (CSU) with certain guarantees after transfer. The legislation did not specify how the degrees should be developed, making it possible for faculty to take responsibility and propose a concerted, coordinated approach to implementation that would ensure that the college and university faculty remained in charge of the curriculum and yield additional benefits for students not dictated by the legislation.

As a consequence of this legislation, Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) were developed intersegmentally to establish some consistency in ADTs in a given major or area of emphasis. The TMC process provides a template for ADT development and introduces a statewide curriculum that establishes the preparation that CSU can expect. As interest in realizing the potential benefit of SB 1440 increased, the CCC Board of Governor’s established a system of degree-development goals to prompt ADT development. More recently, a second piece of legislation (Senate Bill 440, Padilla, 2013) established degree-development mandates. While structures were established for the identification of the curriculum in these degrees and guidance was provided to individual colleges when requested, a more methodical approach was lacking. This paper is a response to Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) Resolution 9.01 from fall of 2012 that stated the following:

Whereas, The California Community College Chancellor’s Office based upon the passage of SB 1440 has set Associate in Arts for Transfer and Associate in Science for Transfer degree completion goals;

Whereas, California community college campuses are mandated to rapidly develop and implement Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) to improve student transfer completion and to streamline the transfer process;

Whereas, There are minimal guidelines and/or best practices available to assist instructional faculty, counselors, and articulation officers with ADT development issues such as campus coordination and oversight, alignment with and application of the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC), modification of courses to meet C-ID descriptors; and

Whereas, There are no written guidelines and/or best practices available for student services faculty to address ADT implementation issues such as reciprocity, course pass pass-alongs, course substitutions, pass/no pass and C- grading, external examinations;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University develop guidelines and/or best practices for the development and implementation of ADTs and report to the body by Fall 2014.

This paper will provide a brief history of TMCs and the supporting C-ID system, summarize existing policies relevant to ADTs, and suggest local effective practices for degree development. Readers who are not familiar with these efforts and the many acronyms used to facilitate communication may wish to print out Appendix A for reference.

**History of C-ID and TMC**

Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) came into existence in response to Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) and are an intersegmentally developed structure for the major component of an associate degree. Because a TMC consists of courses, a system was needed to define the courses that comprise the TMC. The Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) was already in existence when the TMC effort was initiated and offered a means of identifying the courses in a TMC. C-ID was the California Community College (CCC) system’s response to legislation (SB 1415, 2004) that mandated a common course numbering system and offered a means of attaching a designation to a course to signal that the course was comparable to other courses with the same designation. Since its inception in 2007, C-ID has provided a centralized system facilitating communication between and among faculty at the three segments of public higher education.

**Background**

California has long had an interest in creating clear pathways that would allow students to easily and successfully navigate transfer between segments to achieve their educational goals. The concept was articulated in the 1960 *Master Plan for Higher Education* and subsequently strengthened by various pieces of legislation. One solution proposed in legislation was a common course numbering system as a way to facilitate transfer by identifying comparable courses.

The California Articulation Number (CAN) System began as a pilot project in 1982, involving a dozen California community colleges, 5 baccalaureate-granting institutions, and transfer courses in 27 disciplines (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1983). CAN went on to serve as a statewide mechanism for recognizing comparable courses by attaching a California Articulation Number to courses that were part of the system. Participation in CAN was voluntary. Brief CAN identifiers were developed for common transferable courses, creating a system to numerically tag courses to signal their comparability. After establishing articulation with just four participating state universities, a community college course would receive a CAN number and, consequently, articulation with all participating institutions. Thus, the necessity for each campus to negotiate articulation agreements with every other campus was eliminated.

CAN was the foundation for a statewide articulation numbering system but had several shortcomings, including vague course descriptions and a lack of significant faculty participation and review. Due to a lack of funding, CAN’s operation ended in 2005 and California was in need of a system more comprehensive than CAN that identified comparable courses, had significant faculty involvement, and was capable of allowing local colleges to maintain their autonomy with respect to courses and curriculum.

Expanding on the efforts of CAN, the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum Project (IMPAC) convened intersegmental discipline faculty from across the state to discuss how best to prepare community college students to meet faculty expectations at the CSU and University of California (UC) in terms of major preparation. In doing so, faculty discovered that it would be possible to develop a core curricular pattern in many majors that would allow students to better prepare for upper division coursework regardless of their transfer destination. Although funding for IMPAC ended in 2006, the work of this project helped provide a stepping-stone on the pathway to improving the transfer efforts of California students by identifying potential transfer pathways that could prepare students for multiple institutions.

Subsequent to IMPAC, the CSU system sought to improve the transfer pathway for community college students with the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) project. LDTP expanded on the work of IMPAC by developing transfer pathways that were accepted by all CSUs. As a part of the LDTP process, the CSU developed a detailed course descriptor for each course in LDTP that was required by all CSUs with that major. Community college courses received a Transfer CSU number (TCSU) when their courses were deemed comparable to a descriptor (in contrast to the articulation-based numbering system used by CAN). Ultimately, however, only a handful of LDTP descriptors were completed for each of the 30 disciplines before funding ended and left unaddressed hundreds of courses articulated and posted in ASSIST ([www.assist.org](http://www.assist.org), the official repository of articulation information for California’s public colleges and universities).

**Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)**

In 2007, the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) began as a pilot project to improve on the organizational structures provided by CAN and the intersegmental faculty engagement process initiated with IMPAC. As a result, a system was developed that could respond to the need for a common course numbering system supported by intersegmental collaboration, increased faculty participation, and the creation of descriptors with specificity and rigor which more closely resembled course outlines of record. As C-ID’s work began while CSU was engaged in its LDTP efforts, C-ID initially avoided the courses that were part of the TCSU system and, when LDTP’s functioning ceased, TCSU descriptors were absorbed into C-ID.

Recognizing the impact that such a system would have on all four segments of higher education in California (CCCs, CSUs, University of California (UC), and the Independents), the C-ID pilot project began by garnering intersegmental support through the establishment of an advisory committee. This advisory committee consisted of intersegmental representatives who directed the development of a pilot numbering system that would add numerical identifiers to courses in the same way that CAN had done and LDTP began to do.

C-ID proponents recognized early that any course identification system must be predominately faculty-driven. Since teaching faculty have the necessary expertise and responsibility for curricular design and revision, the C-ID process relied heavily upon Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) that consisted of discipline faculty appointed by their respective academic senates. Most commonly, an FDRG consists of 3 CCC and 3 CSU faculty although faculty at the University of California and private institutions have also participated for some disciplines. FDRG members identify the courses that would benefit from descriptor development, develop the descriptors based on broad input from discipline faculty statewide, and, typically, play a role in determining which courses receive a C-ID designation. In an effort to address one of the shortcomings of the CAN system, C-ID descriptors are comparable to a community college course outline of record. C-ID’s initial implementation efforts and on-going processes benefit from and build on the work of other faculty driven initiatives (e.g., CAN, IMPAC, LDTP, UC Streamlining and Pathways projects). The FDRGs are tasked with the following:

* identifying those courses already widely articulated in their field, particularly those lower division, pre-major, or major courses in their  discipline beyond the introductory core courses,
* determining which courses within the discipline needed descriptors and a C-ID number,
* assignment of a supra-number to those prioritized courses based on the C-ID numbering protocol, and
* development of C-ID descriptors for those numbered courses including course content and topics to be addressed in each course and any applicable outcomes and knowledge expected of students who complete the course.

Upon the FDRG’s development of a draft descriptor, that descriptor is made available on the C-ID website for statewide intersegmental vetting. After the vetting process is completed, the FDRG reviews the feedback to ensure that the descriptor reflects a general discipline consensus statewide. As curriculum is not static, all descriptors are scheduled for review approximately every five years.

As discipline experts with first-hand knowledge of the descriptors, FDRG members are then uniquely qualified to serve as Course Outline of Record Evaluators (COREs) and to review community college course outlines of record submitted for a C-ID designation. As needed, additional faculty discipline experts from outside of the FDRG are brought on as COREs. Training is provided both on the technology related to the course review process as well as discipline-specific norming for Course Outline of Record (COR) review and evaluation.

As C-ID expanded in scope, the C-ID Advisory Committee created policies and established foundational processes to structure the work of the FDRG and enhance the development of a vigorous course numbering system. Further, a web-based infrastructure was developed to support the course outline of record review process, including a database of approved descriptors and an online submission and review system. While participation in C-ID was not initially mandated and submission of courses to C-ID was not proposed to confer any obligations on the submitting college, the use of C-ID in Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs), as well as the general interest in facilitating student movement among the CCCs, has resulted in mandates from the CCC Chancellor’s Office. Today, submission to C-ID of certain courses in ADTs is required and a C-ID designation on a course establishes intrasegmental articulation (Appendix B – Chancellor’s Office Memos dated November 30 2012 and January 28 2015). In addition to a C-ID designation granting portability within the CCC system, numerous CSU departments are granting articulation upon receipt of a C-ID designation.

**Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)** **and Senate Bill 1440**

Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) was intended to ensure that students transferring from a California Community College (CCC) to the California State University (CSU) received a degree prior to transferring, had an efficient transfer pathway, and were guaranteed admission to the CSU. SB 1440 attempted to streamline the process of student transfer between the CCC and CSU systems. The legislation required the creation of a 60-unit Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) guaranteeing admission with junior standing to the CSU system. The CSU system, in turn, was prohibited from making students repeat similar courses and the student could only be held to 60 more units for a total of 120 units for a baccalaureate degree. The legislation prohibited a community college from imposing “local graduation requirements” and the CSU from ”requiring a transferring student to repeat courses that are similar to those taken at the community college that counted towards the units required for the associate degree for transfer”. According to SB 1440, Section 1 (c) “Currently, the coursework necessary to transfer to a campus of the California State University or the University of California differs from the coursework needed to earn an associate degree. As a result, many transfer students leave the community college system having completed transfer requirements, but are unable to participate in community college graduation ceremonies, do not have a degree to show for their work, and are ineligible for some awards and scholarships because they did not fulfill current requirements for an associate degree”.

Since the content of community college degrees is an academic matter, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) and the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) took the lead on coordinating a statewide response to SB 1440. Rather than all 112 community colleges developing 112 different degrees in each transfer major, a statewide response was initiated in the form of a transfer model curriculum (TMC). With the C-ID structure established, a viable framework existed for the creation of the TMC. In order to establish ASCCC’s support for the use of the C-ID framework for the development of SB1440 degrees, ASCCC Resolution 9.12 was passed in fall of 2010:

Whereas, It is the intent of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) to improve student transfer by decreasing the complexity of transfer and the unique requirements of the 23 California State University (CSU) campuses that are a primary source of confusion for students preparing to transfer;

Whereas, SB 1440 permits each of the 112 California community colleges to develop a variety of unique degrees which would not provide the opportunity to develop programs based on statewide coordination (i.e., the ability to transfer to any CSU where that major or a similar major exists) where possible; and

Whereas, SB 1440 does not prohibit the development of model curriculum in each transfer major;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges support the development of transfer model curriculum in majors and areas of emphasis through the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID).

Since the effort required intersegmental cooperation, the ASCCC and ASCSU leadership agreed that the established infrastructure of C-ID would be the best implementation vehicle as the technology and faculty expertise were already in place. ASCSU position was established in resolution AS-311-13 in January of 2013:

# AS-3111-13/APEP (Rev)

January 17-18, 2013

Second reading

Support for the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) applaud the work of the C-ID system and continue to support it (<http://www.c-id.net/>) ; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commit to shared leadership with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to ensure the continued success of the C-ID system; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That sufficient continuing funding be provided to ensure viability of the C-ID system; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

* Chancellor Timothy White
* California Community College Chancellor Brice Harris
* EVC Ephraim Smith
* ASCCC President Michelle Pilati

**RATIONALE**: C-ID offers a system-wide articulation alternative to campus-to-campus articulation between 23 CSU and 112 California Community College campuses. More specifically, it provides a means by which courses and curricula are approved for inclusion in the transfer AA degrees established under the guidelines contained in SB 1440. It has the potential to increase the ease of transfer, to ensure comparability of courses across colleges, and to provide a system-wide method for ensuring that curricula and courses continue to meet the needs of our students and to facilitate their success after transfer. Without a viable C-ID system, or a replacement, it would be impossible to implement these degrees on community college campuses.

As initial funding for the system diminishes and the project matures, it is important that sufficient funding be secured to continue the efforts to develop and maintain articulation, to support the course review process, and to keep course descriptors and curricular patterns up-to-date. It would enhance the system’s viability for the ASCSU to become an equal partner with ASCCC in the ongoing functioning of C-ID.

As aresult of strong intersegmental coordination, early and effective policy discussions, and the two systems’ commitment to a statewide process, SB 1440 implementation began in 2011 through Discipline Input Group (DIG) meetings, open regional events at which all interested discipline faculty are invited to attend. Building on the process established by C-ID, faculty attendees of a DIG begin the discussion of a transfer model curriculum (TMC) and the corresponding descriptors. By calling together discipline faculty from both the CCCs and CSUs with a broad range of interests and viewpoints, these statewide meetings mark the first phase in the development of new TMCs and identification of the C-ID course descriptors necessary to define the required courses in the TMCs.

DIG meetings are usually the precursors to the work of the Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG), whose role is to take what was started at the DIG and bring it to conclusion. Based on the input from the DIG, the FDRG develops a draft TMC and its associated C-ID descriptors. Each TMC defines the essential components of a degree in a major or area of emphasis delineating additional options that colleges may select as they design a degree that meets the needs of their local student population. The goal is to establish common major preparation while also allowing for some local flexibility. In this way, students would know what was expected in each major, and CSU faculty could be confident that incoming transfer students who receive priority admission - as required by the legislation - have a certain minimum level of preparation for the major. As a TMC describes both the major component of an associate degree and the coursework required for transfer, the course requirements may exceed what is necessary for transfer.

The Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) was established to oversee the development of TMCs. The core members of the ICW, as appropriate for curricular matters, are faculty. Providing support and additional input were CCC and CSU representatives from both the CCC and CSU academic senates and chancellors’ offices. Additional representatives brought later to the ICW table came from administration, articulation, and transfer centers. Initially, the ICW identified the top 25 majors, building from the work initiated in California Articulation Number (CAN), Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum Project (IMPAC), and Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) project, as well as those majors identified with the highest number of transfers. The ICW was vested with overseeing policies related to the TMCs as well as serving as the accepting body once a TMC was finalized.

Articulation officers (AOs) from both the CCC and CSU have played a vital role in the C-ID process from its inception and serve as the primary conduit between the C-ID/TMC system and their local discipline faculty. AOs attend and participate in Discipline Input Group (DIG) meetings to support the work of discipline faculty. AOs also participate in the descriptor and Transfer Model Curriculum vetting process, assist C-ID with identifying faculty from their respective campuses to serve as members of the FDRGs or as COREs, and at the CCC they assist discipline faculty as they modify courses to be proposed for a C-ID designation. In 2013, a C-ID Articulation Officer Subgroup was created to support and assist the work of C-ID and ICW, when appropriate.

CSU articulation officers (CSU AO) also act as conduits, sharing C-ID descriptors with the discipline faculty on their own campus to potentially articulate the descriptors and educating their faculty regarding C-ID and TMC efforts. CSU AOs are also using the C-ID website to indicate their courses which have been deemed comparable to C-ID descriptors, forging the way to new articulation by seeking out community colleges which have obtained C-ID designation for those courses. In other words, for any given C-ID descriptor the C-ID website indicates which CSUs grant course-to-course articulation based a course having obtain a C-ID designation. For example, as of February 23, 2015, the C-ID website indicates that four CSUs have identified courses that articulate with any CCC course with a C-ID Math 120 designation.

C-ID MATH 120 Mathematical Concepts for Elementary School Teachers - Number Systems articulates with:

* California State University, Dominguez Hills : MAT 107 Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers: Real Numbers
* California State University, Chico : MATH 110 Concepts and Structures of Mathematics
* California State University, Long Beach : MTED 110 The Real Number System for Elementary and Middle School Teachers
* California State University, Fresno : MATH 10A Structure and Concepts in Mathematics I

Over time, the C-ID project and the development of the TMCs have been inextricably integrated. The benefits to students are numerous as evidenced by the increase in the number of TMC-aligned degrees awarded each year.

Annual Award Count (datamart.cccco.edu, September 9, 2014)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 |
| Associate in Science for Transfer (A.S.-T) Degree |  | 72 | 1,742 | 4,008 |
| Associate in Arts for Transfer (A.A.-T) Degree | 5 | 735 | 3,625 | 5,489 |

**Effective Practices: TMC > COT > ADT**

**Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)**

Local faculty engagement in all aspects of the Course Numbering Identification (C-ID) descriptor and Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) development process is critical. Discipline listservs are one-way forms of communication, used by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) to send messages to intersegmental faculty in the discipline, as well as other interested parties who have subscribed to the list-serv. All faculty in a discipline should ensure that they are on their discipline’s listserv (<http://www.c-id.net/listserv.html>), as well as on the listserv for other disciplines that impact their discipline (e.g., biology and physics faculty may have an interest in chemistry curriculum). Many California Community College (CCC) Articulation Officers (AOs) have opted to sign up for all listservs in order to be informed of any proposed, in progress, or finalized work.

Once a TMC has completed the vetting process and the Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) has reviewed and incorporated all feedback received, a faculty subcommittee of the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW), the Intersegmental Curriculum Faculty Workgroup (ICFW), reviews the TMC and the processes employed to develop it. Upon acceptance by the ICFW and final approval of all required C-ID descriptors, the TMC is ready for local consideration. Although formal degree submission to the Chancellor’s Office is not possible until the creation of a Chancellor’s Office Template (COT), local discussions should begin once the TMC is finalized. The steps outlined below propose a structure for this local discussion.

**Step 1: TMC Review**

Finalized CCC Chancellor’s Office Templates (COTs) for degree submission based on accepted TMCs are scheduled to be posted by the CCC Chancellor’s Office twice per year, on February 1 and September 1. However, the local process for determining local need and feasibility can begin as soon as an accepted TMC is posted to the C-ID website ([www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net)). Colleges should initiate discussion of the potential development of a TMC-aligned degree while the TMC is being vetted and any local issues or concerns regarding the TMC should be shared via the vetting process. The posted TMC documents include sufficient detail and local degree development suggestions to make broad, initial determinations as to whether or not development of an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) based on the TMC is desired. Whether or not degree development is required (per Senate Bill 440; Padilla, 2013) should also be factored into the conversation.

**Step 2: Considerations**

As with the creation of any degree, colleges and districts will need to consider whether the creation of an ADT based on a finalized TMC will fit with their curricula, meet local student transfer patterns and needs, and be feasible in both the short and long terms. To this end, local colleges should ask the following questions before faculty begin crafting a local ADT based on the TMC.

**A. Is it necessary?**

The first consideration is to determine if the college is required to develop an ADT for a given TMC. Senate Bill 440 (SB 440; Padilla, 2013) and the resulting changes to Education Code (i.e, Section 66746) require that local colleges must create and offer an ADT if they currently offer an associate degree in the same program, as defined by TOP code. Colleges can review the listings of their active degrees in the Curriculum Inventory (curriculum.cccco.edu) maintained by the Chancellor’s Office. TOP Codes are specified by the FDRG and included in the vetting process. Per Education Code Section 66746 (C), “A community college shall create an associate degree for transfer in every major and area of emphasis offered by that college for any approved transfer model curriculum approved subsequent to the commencement of the 2013-14 academic year within 18 months of the approval of the transfer model curriculum.” As ADTs can not receive Chancellor’s Office approval until after the Chancellor’s Office Template (COT) for a given TMC has been made available, the 18 month timelines for degree submission begins when the COT is posted at: <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit/TransferModelCurriculum.aspx>

For colleges that have an existing degree and ADT in the same discipline, it is important for local discipline faculty to evaluate the benefit to students of having two degrees in the same discipline. If local discipline faculty determine maintaining both degrees is advantageous for students, colleges are encouraged to market the degrees as distinct and make those distinctions very clear in published information so students understand the differences between the two degrees.

**B. Is it desirable?**

Many colleges have embraced existing TMCs and developed ADTs because offering the option benefits their students and the TMC was consistent with the local faculty view of degree components. If the college is not obligated to develop the degree, initial conversations should focus on whether or not degree-creation would satisfy an existing or anticipated student need.

**C. How does your college’s existing curriculum align with the TMC?**

If a college has determined that it needs or wants to create an ADT, faculty should next carefully review local course offerings to determine if existing local courses and course sequences are consistent with the courses, requirements, and intent of the Transfer Model Curriculum. This review should provide a snapshot of how the college’s curriculum matches the TMC. Specifically,

* Does the college have local equivalents for all required courses in the TMC? What courses are missing, if any?
* Does the college have sufficient local courses to meet the minimum unit requirements for restricted electives or other variable components of the TMC?
* Are the college’s courses comparable to the C-ID descriptors for courses listed in the TMC by descriptor? Are all prerequisites required by C-ID already in place?
* What new courses would the college need to develop in order to create an ADT based on the TMC?
* Do the unit values of the college’s courses meet the minimum requirements of the TMC?
* Do the unit values for courses in the college’s curriculum exceed the minimum values established by C-ID and potentially interfere with ADT development as the 60-unit limit would be exceeded?
* Are there key courses in the college’s CSU GE Breadth or IGETC pattern that are higher in unit value, such as four or five unit English 1A or statistics courses that will make it likely that some ADTs may exceed the 60-unit maximum?
* Are there any other local anomalies in the program or college’s curriculum that would make alignment with the TMC within the prescribed limits difficult or impossible?

Many TMCs include detailed notes and degree development guidelines to assist local faculty in creating strong matches to the TMC while also accommodating the need for local variations in program emphases common in the CCC system. Faculty should carefully review these notes during this stage of degree review and development.

**D. Does it align with your local CSU programs and transfer patterns?**

ADTs are intended to simplify student transfer between the CCC and CSU systems. Students successfully earning an ADT are granted admission with junior standing into the CSU system and the assurance of the potential to earn a baccalaureate degree within 120 total units. The TMCs are developed by faculty from both systems to meet broad, statewide discipline needs and typical major transfer preparation requirements. While most TMCs are broadly designed, a local ADT based on a TMC should be crafted to best meet the needs of students transferring to local CSU programs. Some TMCs provide more flexibility than others, particularly in the restricted electives, while others are more prescriptive as required by the demands and standards of the particular discipline.

Whether flexible or prescriptive, local faculty should review how a potential ADT would align with the transfer requirements or expectations of the CSU campuses where their students are most likely to apply for transfer admission. Existing transfer preparation requirements can be found in ASSIST ([www.assist.org](http://www.assist.org)) and college catalogs. Likewise, CCC faculty can contact CSU department chairs or faculty advisors directly to discuss preferred courses, course sequences, and other transfer preferences to determine how and if these can be incorporated into an ADT.

In this stage of the review, faculty should ask the following questions:

* To which CSU or CSUs do the college’s students transfer? This information can be both anecdotal and based on data. Historical transfer data can be obtained from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (<http://www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/TransferPathway.asp>), the local CSU, and through other sites that can be accessed by institutional researchers at local colleges. Additionally, the transfer center director and articulation officer may be excellent resources for data.
* Does the TMC allow enough flexibility to develop an ADT that is consistent with the existing transfer requirements of more than one CSU? This is particularly important in geographic areas where students have numerous CSU campuses nearby to which they are likely to transfer, but it can be an important consideration even for remote or rural schools. A good practice would be to develop local ADTs that continue, or enhance, the existing curricular relationships developed between higher education institutions.
* Which CSUs have identified a given TMC as similar and for which degree options? This information is available from the SB 1440 website for counselors (<http://www.sb1440.org/Counseling.aspx>).

**E. Do student and program data support the implementation of the ADT?**

Student pathway, enrollment, success, and transfer data can provide local colleges with additional perspectives when considering the development of an ADT. These data can include the number of degrees awarded in programs or majors similar to the TMC, course and program enrollment trends in those courses, transfer rates to local CSU in general and by major, and other information. Taken together, these data can provide a broad perspective on what currently works for students and the college and can point faculty in the right direction for the development of an ADT. Institutional Researchers can be valuable resources for faculty in assembling and interpreting these sorts of data.

The following are specific data-related questions colleges can ask at this point in the process:

* Where do students transfer? As mentioned previously, transfer data are available from multiple sources that can provide a broad picture of transfer patterns between local CCC and CSU.
* How many students complete and earn existing associate degrees in the same or similar disciplines as the TMC?
* What are the historical trends in degree completion? Faculty should look at trends over time to determine if interest is declining, increasing, or remaining consistent with past trends.
* What are the enrollment trends in courses that may be used in the ADT? This information can help provide a perspective on the potential impact of ADT implementation on areas such as course scheduling and course section growth.
* What are the enrollment and program trends for out-of-discipline courses in the degree? What are the potential impacts for those programs if an ADT added to the curriculum?

The answers to these questions can help colleges develop a coherent picture of current student and program trends and forecast potential impacts. Additionally, they provide a starting point for analyzing what is already working and incorporating those successful practices into the development of an ADT.

**F. Is the degree feasible within existing college structures and resources?**

When a college decides to develop and implement an ADT, faculty should review any feasibility questions as part of the initial consideration for developing an ADT. If degree development is not required, there is no point in developing a degree that the college cannot support.

Key considerations for new degree feasibility are as follows:

* Will the potential ADT degree be aligned with the program and college mission?
* Will the degree increase student enrollment or demand in particular programs?
* Does the college have sufficient faculty with expertise in all of the courses necessary to offer the degree? Will the degree require the hiring of additional faculty?
* Is there an existing or potential departmental home for the degree with full-time faculty to oversee curriculum development and ongoing updates? In other words, who will be responsible for degree oversight?
* Will the degree lead to increased need for instructional supplies, equipment, or facilities?
* Do the library and learning resources areas have sufficient resources to support the new degree?
* If the implementation of an ADT could lead to growth in a program, does the college have enough classroom or lab space?
* If program growth is anticipated, will the college be able to allocate sufficient FTES to the program?
* Will the degree impact resource allocation in other college programs?
* What is the impact on all aspects of student services including admissions and records, counseling, and advising?
* How will this degree be integrated with existing program review and planning cycles?
* Do sufficient faculty and institutional resources exist to support the creation and assessment of student learning outcomes in the program?
* Will the college be able to schedule the courses so that students will have a reasonable chance of completing the degree within two years?

**G. Degree Integrity**

Given all of the conditions and analysis above, can the college create and offer a degree that meets student needs, aligns with local curriculum and programs, and do so in a feasible manner? Despite the introduction of degree creation mandates, colleges should be careful to adopt degrees that genuinely serve students and are viable for the college. There may be instances where eliminating an existing degree in order to eliminate an ADT mandate may be the most appropriate option for students and the college. A degree that only exists as a list of courses in a catalog without adequate faculty or institutional support, or are not able to complete the degree in a reasonable time, does not serve students and the community. Colleges must ensure the integrity of every degree in their catalogs.

**Step 3: Yes or No?**

After thorough review of the considerations listed above and any others relevant to local colleges, discipline faculty and the administration should decide whether to proceed with the development and submission of an ADT based on the TMC. Whether or not degree development is required should factor into the decision. Good practice suggests that faculty develop clear responses to all questions of integrity, feasibility, alignment with existing curricula, fit with local CSU programs, data trends, and need prior to curriculum development. A simple checklist covering all of the above considerations can be helpful in this process.

**Creating a New Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) At Your Campus**

*Roles and Responsibilities*

Creating a new Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) requires the collaboration of many groups and individuals at the college. The process of developing and locally approving a new ADT will be more efficient if the work is divided among several groups and all of those groups work cooperatively. While every college is different, the following individuals and groups will likely have a role in the development of a new ADT.

* **Discipline Faculty**: The faculty in the discipline need to be involved in every step of the process. These individuals are responsible for determining the courses to be included in the degree, modifying course outlines to obtain required articulation and C-ID approvals, creating new courses, if necessary, for the new ADT, and developing required portions of the degree like the catalog description and learning outcomes.
* **Articulation Officer**: The articulation officer is a vital resource for the creation of an ADT. The articulation officer will submit courses to C-ID for approval, advise faculty about changing course outlines to obtain C-ID or articulation approval, and assist with the collection of the required documentation for all courses included in the ADT.
* **Curriculum Committee Members**: Members of the curriculum committee are knowledgeable about course outlines and curriculum processes. As curriculum trained faculty, the committee members serve as a resource for discipline faculty to assist with the creation of new courses, modification of existing courses, and development of local degree paperwork.
* **Curriculum Chair:** The curriculum chair will need to facilitate the work to ensure that the ADT is completed. This facilitation will include developing a timeline for each step of the approval process, working with the articulation officer to determine what courses must be added or modified to submit the degree, assisting the discipline faculty with the modification and creation of new courses, working with the curriculum office staff to ensure that the degree is submitted to the Chancellor’s Office, and serving as a liaison to the local academic senate to provide updates on progress and ensure that the senate is informed during every step of the process.
* **Curriculum Specialist:** Curriculum specialists often serve as the liaison between the college and the Chancellor’s Office. Curriculum specialists are typically responsible for submitting the required information to the Chancellor’s Office for degree approval and seeking additional information requested by the Chancellor’s Office.
* **Institutional Researcher:** The institutional researcher’s role is to provide data and support for faculty.
* **Administrators:** Administrators provide support for faculty in the development of the ADT.
* **Counselors:** Counselors inform the process of creating degrees by assisting with issues such as student demand for an ADT, clarifying the difference between a local degree and an ADT, and communicating to students the benefits and disadvantages of each.
* **Academic Senate:** Every college’s academic senate has created its own local policies about how curriculum is developed and approved. Whether the academic senate approves every curriculum item or gives that power to the curriculum committee, the senate must always be kept updated about the progress of a new ADT. At a minimum, the curriculum chair should include updates on ADTs in a curriculum report given at senate meetings. If the senate is concerned about the progress, it can take an active role in developing strategies to accelerate or alter the approval process.
* **Board of Trustees:** The Board of Trustees has the final approval of the curriculum as well as the responsibility to promote the benefits of ADTs to the community at large.

When all of these groups are collaborating, the creation of the new degree will be smoother and more predictable. Colleges should avoid counting on one or two individuals to create ADTs. Keeping the entire campus engaged in the process will lead to better discussions and facilitate degree development.

*Chancellor’s Office Templates (COTs)*

While local discussion and consideration of ADT development should begin when a TMC is finalized, preparation of a new ADT for submission to the CCC Chancellor’s Office requires the use of a Chancellor’s Office Template (COT). While the COT should reflect the TMC, stylistic differences may exist regarding the manner in which course requirements are presented. Any questions about a new COT should be referred to the Chancellor’s Office. The COT specifies all of the courses that can be included in the degree and the documentation required for each course when the new degree is submitted to the Chancellor’s Office.

*Degree Creation and Local Approval*

Local ADT development begins with an analysis of the TMC, local curriculum, and the requirements of common transfer destinations. Typically, all required core courses are specified by a C-ID descriptor and no articulation options are available. Per the Chancellor’s Office memo dated January 28, 2015 and titled “Update on C-ID Verification for Associated Degrees for Transfer, “Effective July 1, 2015, all ADT proposals (new, substantial and nonsubstantial change), submitted to the CCCCO for review must:

1) Have a C-ID status of “Approved” for all courses entered on a TMC Template where a C-ID descriptor is listed. That is, any course listed on a TMC Template next to a C-ID descriptor in the Required Core, List A, List B, or List C sections, must appear in C-ID.net with an “Approved” status for that descriptor. One exception is that if the TMC Template indicates that an ASSIST Articulation Agreement by Major (AAM) is accepted in addition to the C-ID descriptor, then a valid AAM will be accepted in lieu of the “Approved” C-ID status, and

2) Include all the correct required attachments (Narrative, Template, Course Outline of Records, if applicable: ASSIST Reports, Advisory Board Minutes, Labor Market information and all attachments must include the required information).”

If a course requiring C-ID approval does not currently have C-ID approval and has not been submitted to C-ID for approval yet, but the course outline has all of the required elements listed in the descriptor, then the Articulation Officer should submit the course outline of record (COR) to C-ID for approval. Ideally, submission to C-ID and revisions for C-ID are made prior to initiating degree development. Until June 30, 2015, submission to C-ID and any status recognized as “pending” by the Chancellor’s Office (see Appendix C) suffices for ADT submission.

If a course does not have C-ID approval and requires revisions to the course outline before it can be submitted to C-ID, the course revision process needs to begin as soon as possible. Given that an 18-month time limit is initiated when a new COT is made available, revising curriculum in advance is highly recommended. If a course does not exist in the curriculum, is required for the ADT, and the college is required to or wants to create the ADT, the college will need to create the new course. Assuming C-ID approval is also required, early course development and submission to C-ID is critical to meet any externally imposed deadlines.

Courses that do not have or require receipt of a C-ID designation will need different documentation to permit the inclusion of the course in an ADT as noted on the TMC and the COT. At a minimum, all courses included in the degree must be transferable to CSU. Verification of transferability and all other forms of articulation can be obtained from ASSIST (www.assist.org). Often, articulation as major preparation for at least one CSU campus is required. In some instances, articulation for general education may be sufficient. If articulation as major preparation is required and has not been obtained, a college has several options from which to choose. The first is to not include the course in the new ADT. If the proposed course is not necessary for the development of the ADT, the chosen course can be omitted. If the discipline faculty want to include this course in the ADT or the degree requirements cannot be completed without the course, then articulation will need to be established.

In some instances, a list within a TMC may include courses specified by C-ID but allowing the option to include courses with some specified articulation. In such an instance, the college may either indicate that their course is comparable to the C-ID descriptor and obtain C-ID approval or work with a CSU to establish the required articulation. In those cases where submission to C-ID is an option, submission to C-ID and subsequent receipt of a C-ID designation is required when the college indicates that the course is comparable to the C-ID descriptor on the COT. For example, List B of the Administration of Justice COT, allows the inclusion of courses from List A (all have C-ID designations), other courses specified by C-ID descriptors (e.g., SOCI 110, SOCI 125), any CSU transferable administration of justice course, and any course that carries major preparation articulation. The obligation to submit a given course to C-ID is created when the college enters their Course ID adjacent to a C-ID designation on the COT. While a college might have an administration of justice course with a title identical or similar to that of one of the C-ID descriptors, the obligation to submit to C-ID only applies if they wish to include the course in List A (no articulation option) or if they specify the C-ID descriptor and their course in the List B row that states “Any LIST A course not already used.” In the example below, the requirement to obtain a C-ID designation is created by the act of listing AJ 222 alongside the AJ 122 C-ID descriptor and SOC 100 alongside SOCI 110. In contrast, AJ 256, SOC 112, and PSY 100 have not been associated with a C-ID designation and can be included based on carrying the specified articulation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Title (Units)** | C-ID Descriptor | Course ID | Course Title |
| **LIST B: Select two** (6 units) |  |  |  |
| Any **LIST A** course not already used. | AJ 122 | AJ 222 | Criminal Court Process |
| Introduction to Sociology (3) | SOCI 110 | SOC 100 | Intro to Sociology |
| Introductory Psychology (3) | PSY 110 |  |  |
| Any CSU transferable Administration of Justice Course. |  | AJ 256 | Introduction to Juvenile Procedures |
| Any course outside of Administration of Justice discipline articulated as lower division preparation in the Criminology major at CSU. (3) |  | SOC 112  PSY 100 | Introduction to Criminology  Introduction to Psychology |

If a college has all of the required documentation for all of the courses it plans to include in the ADT, the next step is obtaining approval of the degree locally. As previously noted, colleges may need to modify existing or create new courses to obtain C-ID approval or articulation. Before revising existing courses, faculty developing the degree should consult with the college’s articulation officer (AO) to ensure that the proposed changes will not affect existing articulation agreements. Discipline faculty should consult with the AO to develop a strategy for revising and creating courses to maximize the likelihood of approval.

Creation and modification of courses is not enough to create a new degree. Each new degree will need a catalog entry, learning outcomes, and a listing of required and elective courses to satisfy the major requirements for the degree. To maximize the time available for approval, faculty should complete the proposal for a new degree and submit it with the revised and new course outlines. Even though the new degree cannot be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office until all courses have the required documentation, a college can approve the degree locally so it can be submitted once the course approvals are received.

Local curriculum approval processes vary, but they often include review by departments, deans, divisions, and the curriculum committee. The approval process could take as little as a month, but it could also take much longer. While colleges cannot control the length of time needed to obtain C-ID approval or approval from the Chancellor’s Office, they can control the length of time local approval takes. Colleges should take steps locally to ensure that local processes are as efficient as possible, exploring this possibility is highly recommended.

Curriculum chairs should develop a plan that will move the courses and the new degree through the approval process as quickly as possible. One strategy may be to determine a date when the degree must be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office and work backwards to determine when each approval needs to happen. Colleges should allow for a minimum of two months for approval by the Chancellor’s Office. Even though the approval might come though more quickly, an effective practice is to give the Chancellor’s Office as much time as possible to review and approve the new ADT. C-ID approval takes approximately one month, but may take longer if revisions to the course are necessary for final approval. The timeline will also need to include time to develop the courses and the degree, time for all the reviews required locally prior to submission to the curriculum committee, approval by the curriculum committee, approval at the academic senate, if necessary, and approval by the governing board.

The aggressive timelines for ADT development have highlighted challenges that some colleges have with their curriculum and degree approval processes to make modifications within a reasonable time period. Colleges should review their local processes to ensure that they are flexible enough to respond to any situation. One option would be to create an accelerated process to review and approve curriculum that is time sensitive. The key to accelerating the approval process is to have an open dialog about what needs to happen and make sure that everyone has a clearly defined role in the process. Accelerating the process can be challenging and the curriculum chair should work with the articulation officer, faculty, classified staff, and administrators to develop a strategy that will allow the college to address any situation that arises. After using an accelerated process for a few approvals, colleges may discover that their current process could be improved, eliminating the need for two separate processes.

There are a number of challenges that arise with some frequency, but will not affect every college. One such challenge is how curriculum approval is handled in a multi-college district. In some multi-college districts where curriculum is aligned, a single outline is used for a course at multiple campuses. In these cases, course revisions often have to go through each college’s curriculum committee and a district curriculum committee before being brought to the governing board. Each additional approval step makes development of an ADT more difficult to achieve. In these cases, representatives from all campuses in the district must come together and develop processes that will satisfy local requirements and allow colleges to meet all timelines.

**One TMC Yields a Variety of ADTs**

It should be noted that the TMC is intended to serve as a tool that allows local colleges to create degrees that best meet the needs of their students. While some TMCs are very structured, most introduce a variety of options. Some colleges may choose to pass these options on to students, while others may make the local ADTs more prescriptive. Examples of the variety of ADTs that can be produced from one TMC have been provided in the documentation for some TMCs, often as a means of addressing concerns raised during the vetting. On the following page are examples of the different degree configurations that can be created based on the Administration of Justice TMC, demonstrating the variety of ADTs that can be developed and aligned to the TMC. Other degree samples can be found in the documentation associated with the both the English and the psychology TMCs. Colleges typically limit student options based on the courses that are in their local curriculum and the courses that are most desired by the local CSUs.

Sample TMC-Aligned Degrees

**A - Prescriptive**

1. AJ 110 - Introduction to Criminal Justice (Core)

2. AJ 120 - Concepts of Criminal Law (Core)

3. AJ 122 - Criminal Court Process (List A)

4. AJ 124 - Legal Aspects of Evidence (List A)

5. SOCI 110 - Introduction to Sociology (List B)

6. MATH 110 – Introduction to Statistics (List B)

*Students have no options within the major component of the degree. This lack of flexibility may be due to limited curriculum, the requirements of the CSUs students commonly attend, or the philosophy of the CCC faculty. Note – some posted TMCs may refer to the CORE as List A. The first list in the TMC that typically consists of required courses is the CORE and the subsequent lists are alphabetized.*

**B – Options within List A, no List B**

1. AJ 110 - Introduction to Criminal Justice (Core)

2. AJ 120 - Concepts of Criminal Law (Core)

Choose four of (List A)

AJ 122 - Criminal Court Process AJ 124 - Legal Aspects of Evidence

AJ 140 – Criminal Investigation AJ 150 – Introduction to Forensics

AJ 160 – Community and the Justice System

AJ 200 – Introduction to Corrections AJ 220 – Juvenile Procedures

*In this example there is no “List B”. Instead, the student selects four courses from List A.*

**C – No options within List A, one List B course required**

1. AJ 110 - Introduction to Criminal Justice (Core)

2. AJ 120 - Concepts of Criminal Law (Core)

3. AJ 122 - Criminal Court Process (List A)

4. AJ 124 - Legal Aspects of Evidence (List A)

5. MATH 110 – Introduction to Statistics (List B)

Choose one of (List B):|  
**Any CSU transferable Administration of Justice lower division course or courses outside the Administration of Justice discipline that are articulated as lower division major preparation for the Criminal Justice or Criminology Major at any CSU.**

*Board of Trustee Approval*

Some colleges that submit curriculum to their boards once or twice a year may face a challenge with respect to obtaining timely approval by the local governing board. Bringing curriculum to the governing board infrequently makes completing all of the work necessary to submit a new ADT to the Chancellor’s Office a difficult task. Colleges may address this challenge in a number of ways. The first option is to bring curriculum to the governing board more frequently. Bringing curriculum to the board more often usually simply involves working with administration and having them keep a placeholder for curriculum at each board meeting. Another possible challenge could occur in multi-college districts if the board prefers to review curriculum items from all of the colleges at the same time. In these cases, one college could hold up the approval of another college’s curriculum because the two colleges are not ready to bring items to the governing board at the same time.

If coming to the board more frequently does not appear to be a good option for a college, the board could grant a designee the authority to approve curriculum. This solution would require the development of a board policy and administrative procedures outlining the designation of authority and how the approval is completed. If authority is delegated, the board approval date is replaced by the date of the approval by the delegated authority. Colleges could implement this approval process in several possible ways, such as a curriculum review committee composed of administration and faculty or an approval by the college president or chief instructional officer. This option would likely make obtaining board approval much easier, but the governing board may not be willing to give up its decision-making authority. Other options may exist, but these two will both facilitate more rapid approval by the governing board.

*Chancellor’s Office Approval*

Once all local approvals have been completed and all required documentation for the included courses is available, the ADT is ready to be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office. Before submitting the degree proposal, several pieces of information will need to be collected. The required items include:

* the catalog entry for the new degree
* a description of how the degree will help meet the needs of students
* the expected number of students completing the degree each year
* the number of full time faculty dedicated to the degree
* any additional resources necessary to offer the degree at the college
* the course outlines for each course included in the degree
* C-ID or articulation documentation for each course
* documentation for general education
* a completed Chancellor’s Office Template

When compiling this information, it is often helpful to provide a template including examples from previously approved ADTs. Even though the degrees will be different, each submission has similarities and providing approved examples is an excellent way to ensure that the submission is complete.

Completion of the Chancellor’s Office Template requires the college to demonstrate that the student can complete the major requirements and a transfer general education pattern in no more than 60 units. Colleges must look at each pattern (CSU GE Breadth or IGETC), identify the required and elective courses that satisfy a general education requirement, determine the range of units that can be double-counted, and compute the range of transferable elective units needed complete the 60 unit degree requirement. Colleges are encouraged to determine the double-counting and elective units for both CSU GE Breadth and IGETC. It is important to keep in mind that students who are choosing to use IGETC must also complete the CSU admissions requirements, including a course that fulfills the oral communication requirement (Area 1C). When specified in the TMC, CSU GE Breadth or IGETC for STEM may be an option. Both allow some lower division general education courses to be completed after transfer.

The degree proposal, along with all of the required documentation, is submitted using the Curriculum Inventory (<http://curriculum.cccco.edu>). Instructions for using the Curriculum Inventory can be found on the Chancellor’s office website.

**Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) Outreach: Messaging and Marketing**

An essential aspect of making an ADT fully advantageous for students is messaging and marketing regarding the opportunities created for those who complete the degree. Colleges must ensure that all appropriate parties are aware of the advantages of completing an ADT as well as the limitations inherent in the guarantees provided by these degrees. Students who have transfer as a goal but have not yet selected a major need to be effectively advised to ensure course selections that are most likely to align with their ultimate educational goal. In other words, initial coursework should consist of general education requirements that facilitate student major selection. In order to complete an ADT in 60 units students must need minimal or no remediation and identify a transfer major early.

Many students are not fully aware that associate degrees for transfer are available. Even for students who are aware of the degrees, some confusion remains regarding the advantages and limitations to completing an ADT. Colleges need to educate potential students, their parents, and high school counselors regarding the ADT pathway to the CSU. College representatives should clearly explain that an ADT is comprised of 60 transferable units, which includes completion of a transferable general education pattern and a minimum of 18 units in a major or area of emphasis.

When a college offers both a local degree and an ADT in a given discipline, clear messaging needs to be provided to inform student degree selection. The distinctions between the ADTs and local degrees, at times, may not be obvious and frequent communication to counseling departments is essential as counselors assist students.

When possible, an effective practice for colleges to employ is to have frequent workshops about the ADTs. Ideally, the workshops would be a collaborative effort between discipline faculty, counselors, and a representative from a local CSU. These workshops can also be used for marketing the college’s ADTs by providing advising sheets listing the requirements of the available ADTs.

Counselors, advisors and other college representatives should take every opportunity to communicate clear information to students and help to dispel confusion. Colleges should consider adding disclaimer language to published information explaining to students that appropriateness of ADT’s are based on individualized goals, and that students should consult with a counselor to evaluate if an ADT is recommended.

Below are just a few of the most frequently asked questions from students which may be used as an initial list of FAQs that college may want to have available with answers on their local websites.

1. How and what is the process for earning an ADT?
2. What are the advantages of completing an ADT as opposed to another degree that the college offers?
3. Does completing an ADT guarantee transfer or admission to the CSU campus that is the student’s first choice?
4. What is guaranteed? What happens after the student is accepted to the CSU with an ADT?
5. How is GPA calculated and what does the ADT GPA bump mean for the application to the CSU?
6. What is the deadline to apply for graduation from a community college if the student is earning an ADT?
7. How is CSU notified that the student is transferring with an ADT?

**Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Policies**

A number of policies addressing the Associate Degrees for Transfer were developed and adopted by the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup.  These policies can be found at the C-ID website at <http://www.c-id.net/policies.html>.  However, it is important to remember that the ADT process, including both the development of Transfer Model Curricula and local implementation of ADTs, is ongoing and constantly evolving.  The Academic Senate (ASCCC) and Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW), in consultation with the C-ID Articulation Officers Subgroup and California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), are continually developing policies to address ADT issues that arise. Faculty should regularly and frequently check with their articulation officers and the C-ID policy resource website link to keep abreast of policy developments.

The Academic Senate has taken the position that where no system wide policy exists, via legislation or by the Chancellor’s Office, local policies should be followed.  Local policy, for example, would establish how a college would evaluate a course from a private institution that does not have a C-ID designation and appears to be comparable to a course required in the ADT. Thus, local discipline faculty must be involved in local ADT policy development and must also be aware of statewide issues and concerns in the development and implementation of ADTs.

*Reciprocity*

At the Academic Senate Plenary Session in spring of 2011, two resolutions were passed that encourage local districts to review their course substitution processes within the context of ADTs:

Resolution 15.01 - Reciprocity for TMC Courses in Associate Degrees for Transfer:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge local senates and curriculum committees to adopt a reciprocity policy for courses contained in the TMC for the associate degrees for transfer.

and

Resolution 09.13 - Course Substitutions in TMC-aligned Degrees:

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to review their course substitution processes to ensure that those processes are appropriately rigorous; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges encourage local senates to take measures to ensure that any substitutions made for courses within TMC-aligned degrees are appropriate.

The intent of both of these resolutions is to give as much flexibility as possible for the student seeking an ADT while remaining in alignment with the legislative intent of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) and SB 440 (Padilla, 2013), as well as remaining true to the integrity of the local degree as determined by local discipline faculty. Thus, the ICW, in collaboration with the C-ID Articulation Officers Subgroup, developed a Reciprocity policy.

The ADT Reciprocity Policy, which can be found in Appendix D and at the C-ID policy website <http://www.c-id.net/policies.html>, addresses the issue of utilizing courses from other colleges or universities to fulfill requirements in the local ADT degree. The policy encourages local colleges to ensure that a course taken at another college to fulfill an ADT requirement is recognized and used as a component of the same ADT degree at the other college, even if the course is not recognized as a part of the degree at that college.  In other words, a course that counted in an ADT at one college should still count at another college. The course in question, however, may not fit in the same area of the degree at the second college.  The following is an example from the Reciprocity Policy:

**Example**: The TMC for psychology includes three options in List A: Introduction to Biology, Human Biology, and Introduction to Biological Psychology. Students are required to complete one of these three courses. College X may choose to allow all three of these List A options in their local psychology ADT degree. However, College Y might decide that Human Biology is necessary for all students and thus might eliminate the other two List A options. A student who took Introduction to Biology at College X, expecting that course to fulfill the List A requirement, but who then enrolled at College Y to complete the associate degree for transfer would have taken a course not included or not fulfilling the same requirements in the local AA-T for psychology at College Y. In such a case, because the student has acted in good faith and the course taken falls within the requirements of the TMC, the ASCCC (and the language of SB 1440) would strongly encourage College Y to accept Introduction to Biology as fulfilling the List A requirement or, at the least, to accept the Introduction to Biology course as fulfilling a List B or C requirement as is permitted by the TMC. It should be recognized that “moving” the course may be desirable as the degree-awarding college presumably has designed its degree to align with the course requirements of the local CSU.

Courses that are not C-ID approved, were completed at a university, or are from a college not in the California community college system need to be addressed through local course substitution policies. Faculty involved in considering course substitutions within ADT degrees should include in their review the C-ID course descriptor as well as the comparison to their local course content. The course may appear to be consistent with the C-ID course descriptor, but may not have C-ID approval and may not be as rigorous as the local course. If the course does not have C-ID approval, intrasegmental articulation is not ensured and the course may be deemed inappropriate as a substitute. Thus, it is important that local course substitution policies and processes must be reviewed and updated in the context of ADT degrees.

*External Examinations*

External examinations include nationally recognized programs such as Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and International Baccalaureate (IB).  The C-ID Reciprocity Policy includes a section titled “External Sources of Credit”:

In addition to allowing reciprocity for courses earned toward a transfer degree at other institutions, colleges should continue to allow students to apply course credit earned through external exams or processes, including AP, CLEP, and IB, to the major requirements for transfer degrees. Education Code clearly grants the authority to community colleges for the content of the AA –T and AS-T degrees, and this authority extends to community colleges the right and responsibility for granting credit they deem appropriate in the AA/S-T degrees.

The ASCCC has passed numerous resolutions endorsing the use of external credit and has even created statewide templates to recommend the use of external credit in manners consistent with policies regarding CSU GE and IGETC (see ASCCC Resolutions 9.01 S10, 9.05 F10, 9.06 S07, 9.03 S05, 4.02 S08, 4.03 S08, 4.04 S08, 4,01 S09, 9.04 F10, 9.01 S11). The reasoning in these resolutions applies to AA-T and AS-T degrees as fully as it does to all other applications of their intent and can also include other methods of earning external credit, such as the units often granted to veterans for their experience in military service.

While efforts have been made to encourage consistency with respect to the awarding of general education credit for the completion of external examinations, both within the California community college (CCC) system and intersegmentally, no such comparable effort has been made in the determination of credit for the major. As SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) states: “Community colleges are encouraged to facilitate the acceptance of credits earned at other community colleges toward the associate degree for transfer pursuant to this section...” and the Academic Senate (ASCCC) has encouraged local adoption of a reciprocity process, any credit awarded by another CCC for an external examination should be honored by all other CCCs. Students who complete coursework at multiple colleges should not be at risk of losing credit previously earned.

*Internal Examinations (Credit by Examination)*

Internal examinations include any credit by examination (CBE) earned through processes and procedures established by a college.  Where local colleges have CBE opportunities for courses required in their ADTs, Title 5 establishes that discipline faculty determine the courses for which credit by exam is available and the means of assessing student mastery of the course content, objectives, and outcomes. The Academic Senate paper, Awarding Credit Where Credit is due: Effective Practices for the Implementation of Credit by Exam (link or reference to paper), is an excellent source for further guidelines. The following recommendations set forth in the paper would serve local faculty well when determining policies related to ADTs and local CBE:

* Local senates, particularly colleges with large population of students with prior learning from non-collegiate experiences such as military service, need to recommend policy regarding the use of Credit By Exam as a means for students to earn course credit.
* Discipline faculty are the experts who need to determine which courses for which Credit by Exam may be offered and the nature and content of the assessment tools used to determine if students have mastered the course content, objectives, and outcomes.
* Credit by Exam processes must be applied consistently to all students.
* The college should provide students with a copy of the Course Outline of Record to aid them in making the decision whether or not to attempt taking the credit by exam test.
* Credit by Exam processes must be held to the same high standards of quality as the traditional method of passing a course.

**Special Considerations**

**Student Educational Goals vs. Faculty Interests**

Faculty should remember that creation of an ADT is intended to provide an option for students, not to protect an existing program or courses. Locally, additional course creation should be a component of developing an ADT if a required course is lacking or if the college is missing courses that are required by local CSUs and are included in the TMC. Colleges can often satisfy the components of a TMC with courses in their curriculum and do not need to add curriculum solely to pass on all possible options to the student. In addition, the interdisciplinary nature of many disciplines should be honored.

**Course Unit Considerations**

In order to have an ADT approved, the college must demonstrate that it is possible for a student to complete all of the major and general education requirements within 60 units. Students are required to complete a minimum of 39 units of general education for CSU GE Breadth, but many colleges require more units because their course units are greater than the minimum. As the units in English, mathematics, and the sciences have increased, students may need to take 40 – 45 units to complete their general education requirements. If a college has courses that require 40 units of general education and none of those courses are part of the major, the college may have difficulty creating some ADTs.

Many factors may lead to increasing the number of units in these various disciplines. For example, transfer institutions may require more content to be covered and additional time was needed to include the new material. Prior to the creation of ADTs, the number of units for each course was not a significant curricular concern, as long as increasing the hours and units benefited the students. Now the 60-unit limit on ADTs, coupled with these courses with increased units, has created a situation where colleges may not be able to create some ADTs within the legally mandated requirements.

In order to address this issue, every college should look at its courses and determine whether they are meeting the needs of students. If a course was changed from four to five units, the college should assess what the students gained by adding the additional hours and units and whether the benefits gained are more valuable than the opportunity to earn an ADT. Some colleges may determine that the benefits from the increased hours and units outweigh the benefits of the ADT and may therefore choose not to develop the new ADT if they are not obligated to do so. Other colleges might determine that having the ADT is a greater benefit than what was gained by adding a unit, and those colleges will choose to revise their courses. Whether a college chooses to revise courses to reduce units or keeps the units and forgoes the ADT, the discussion should include broad participation by involving discipline faculty, students, counselors, administration, and the academic senate. These decisions go beyond the discipline or department, they affect the entire college, and for that reason, all relevant parties need to be involved in the discussion.

**TMCs Lacking a Departmental Home – Organizational Structure**

With the passage of SB 440 (Padilla, 2013), the CCC and CSU Academic Senates are mandated to develop additional TMCs for “area of emphasis” (AOE) degrees. To create these degrees, the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) adopted a working definition for area of emphasis as “an interdisciplinary TMC that is developed to serve multiple majors at the CSU. Such a TMC may not have a clear department of origin at the CCC and would be designated to prepare the student for an array of majors at the CSU.” (Appendix E – ICW Working Definition of Area of Emphasis)

While the initial TMCs were all in well-established disciplines, the mandate to create degrees based on an “area of emphasis” will likely result in the introduction of TMCs that do not have a clear departmental home at the college. Locally, colleges will need to determine who will take responsibility for creating area of emphasis ADTs.

**IGETC and CSU GE Breadth for STEM**

As a consequence of the unit limits imposed by SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010), the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) approved a transfer general education pattern, IGETC for STEM and the CSU has established CSU GE for STEM. Both allow for two general education courses to be completed after transfer. These alternative general education packages are only an option when creating an ADT aligned with a TMC that has specified this option. Discipline groups creating TMCs should use these alternative general education plans with caution, as postponing the completion of two lower division courses until after transfer may impact CSU determinations of similar. A CSU identifies a TMC as “similar” when they can provide a pathway to the baccalaureate that can be completed in 60 units. Adding 2 courses to the CSU’s 60 units may make this impossible.

**Recommendations for Establishing Effective ADT Policies, Processes, and Practices**

1. Ensure that ADTs are designed to serve local student populations, enabling them to reach their educational goals, and not as a way to protect special courses, faculty loading or teaching preferences.
2. Design ADTs to provide as much flexibility as possible for students while still creating a degree with instructional integrity.
3. Encourage double counting.
4. Encourage local discussion of courses with units greater than required by C-ID to determine whether or not the additional units and hours are warranted.
5. Develop local policies that clearly delineate processes such as reciprocity and course substitutions for ADTs. (See Appendix F for examples.)
6. Establish clear messages for students on the benefits and disadvantages of ADTs, including the distinction between local A.A./A.S. degrees and ADTs.
7. Review curriculum policies for efficiency.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Acronym glossary

Appendix B: CCCCO Memos, 11/30/12 and 1/28/15

Note: See <http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/CurriculumandInstructionUnit/TransferModelCurriculum.aspx> to access the most current information.

Appendix C: C-ID Course Status Definitions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| All Status Types | Status Definition | CCCCO Action |
| Approved | Course issued a C-ID number. | Approved/ Final |
| Conditional Approval | Course was conditionally approved for C-ID designation.  The COR aligned with most areas of the C-ID descriptor, but not all.  College has one year to correct and resubmit the COR. | Pending – accept the status as pending. |
| Expired | Course no longer has a valid C-ID designation. | Not Approved – do not accept. |
| In Progress | Course review in progress. | Pending – accept the status as pending. |
| Not Approved | Course had significant and fundamental variations from the C-ID descriptor. | Not approved – do not accept. |
| Not Approved COR | Course submitted inappropriately. COR will not enter review process. | Not Approved – do not accept. |
| Re-Submit: IP | Course resubmitted with requested changes and the review is in progress. | Pending – accept the status as pending. |
| Re-Submitted | Course resubmitted with requested changes and awaiting reviewer assignment. | Pending – accept the status as pending. |
| Submitted | Course entered into the system and awaiting reviewer assignment. | Pending – accept the status as pending. |

Appendix D: Academic Senate Statements on Reciprocity, Course Substitution, and Credit by Exam - in light of AA-T and AS-T degrees

Appendix E: ICW Working Definition of Area of Emphasis

Appendix F: Sample Reciprocity Policies

**Santiago Canyon College**

**Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) and Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T) Reciprocity, Course Substitution, External Exams, and Credit by Exam Policy and Procedures.**

Students who have taken courses from a California Community College, a regionally accredited institution, completed an external exam such as AP, CLEP, or IB or Credit by Exam may be granted credit towards an AA-T/AS-T general education and/or major requirement. Courses will be reviewed by one of the following methods.

**General Education Courses**

* General education courses taken at other California Community Colleges are granted course-to-course reciprocity providing the course in question appears on the CSU-Plan B or IGETC-Plan C at the time the student completed the course.
* Non-California Community College general education courses are reviewed by the Articulation Officer via the pass along process in accordance with the CSU-Plan B or IGETC-Plan C standards.
* Students who completed an external examination such as AP, CLEP or IB are granted credit towards general education consistent with CSU GE and IGETC policies.
* Santiago Canyon College Credit by Exam may be granted for general education only if a course is eligible and listed in the Credit by Exam section of the SCC Catalog.

**Major Requirement Courses**

* + A major requirement with a C-ID number taken at another California Community College (CCC) is granted course-to-course reciprocity and meets the same designated C-ID major requirement found in the SCC’s AA- T/AS-T.
  + A major requirement completed at another California Community College that is approved as part of their AA-T or AS-T, will be applied to the corresponding Santiago Canyon College AA-T/AS-T area. Courses completed at other CCCs must be part of their AA-T/AS-T at the time the student completed the course, if a course is not part of the AA-T/AS-T then the course must be reviewed by the SCC discipline faculty in accordance with the C-ID descriptor. Courses completed at other CCCs prior to the AA-T/AS-T approval, will be “grandfathered”.
  + A major requirement without a C-ID number taken at another California Community College, where an AA- T/AS-T does not exist, is reviewed by the SCC discipline faculty in accordance with the C-ID descriptor.
  + A non-California Community College major requirement taken at a regionally accredited institution is reviewed by the SCC discipline faculty in accordance with the C-ID descriptor and if comparable, course-to-course substitution is granted.
  + Students who completed an external examination such as AP, CLEP or IB are granted credit towards major requirements where exam-to-course comparability exists; if exam-to-course comparability does not exist the discipline faculty reviews the external exam and determines course comparability if a course is offered (Students should be aware that external exam credit may be awarded/counted differently by the transfer institution).
  + Santiago Canyon College Credit by Exam may be granted for major requirement only if a course is eligible and listed in the Credit by Exam section of the SCC Catalog.

It is strongly recommended students make an appointment with a Santiago Canyon College counselor to discuss appropriate credit placement.

Appendix XX: Frequently Asked Questions

Pass and No Pass

Included in the 5th edition of the Program and Course Approval Handbook,

As of May 2014, the Chancellor’s Office clarified:

Status of approved ADT when a C-ID course in the ADT gets a C-ID Course “Not

Approved” determination? Will the CCCCO follow the C-ID time frame of allowing one-year to revise and get the course C-ID approved before terminating the ADT degree?

The CO says they will deactivate. However, Accreditation standards say 2 years to provide opportunity for students within the program to complete. The CO has acknowledged that they will need to allow for students in the program to complete the ADT within a reasonable timeframe.

Appendix XX: San Diego Policy on additional degrees

San Diego - Additional College Degree

A student having received an associate or baccalaureate degree may qualify for an additional Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree in a new major or concentration.

An additional degree:

1. Permits upgrading or preparation for upgrading current employment.

2. Prepares for employment in an area different from that provided by previous training.

3. Provides general knowledge leading to fulfillment of personal goals.

The following requirements are applicable:

1. The degree to be earned must represent a change in major or concentration from the degree or degrees previously earned.

2. A student must earn a minimum of 18 required semester units in the new major or concentration beyond the minimum 60 units required for the Associate Degree, bringing the total units required for the second degree to a minimum of 78 units, a minimum of 96 units for the third degree, and so on. Twelve (12) semester units of the new major or concentration must be completed in residence at City, Mesa and/or Miramar.

3. A student must fulfill current catalog associate degree requirements.

4. In order to receive an additional college degree, the student must file a Petition for Graduation in the Evaluations Office. Counselors will review all previous college work to determine the student’s eligibility for a second.

Appendix XX: Resource Page with links to websites

REFERENCES

Towards a Common Course Numbering System (ASCCC, 1995)

<http://www.asccc.org/sites/default/files/publications/CCNF95_0.pdf>