

CURRICULUM and INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
DISTRICT ARTICULATION COUNCIL
ACTION ITEMS
10-01-08

Attendees:

Libby Andersen – City College Articulation Officer
Mario Chacon - Associate Dean for Tech Prep
Shelly Hess – Dean of Curriculum and Instructional Services
Otto Lee – Vice Chancellor of Instructional Services & Planning
Juliette Parker – Mesa College Articulation Officer
Michelle Radley – Articulation Assistant, Instructional Services
Duane Short – Miramar College Articulation Officer

Old Business

1. LDTP: Lower Division Transfer Pattern

Duane explained to Otto and the DAC members the history of the Lower Division Transfer Pattern, LDTP:

The purpose for the LDTP was to align at least 45 units of the CSU lower division requirements for their most popular majors. The CSU agreed on a set of criteria for the courses that will fit into those LDTP patterns, the set of criteria is called the LDTP descriptor, the descriptor include recommended preparation, minimum units, student learning outcomes, etc; the CSU requires that the community college courses fit those descriptors. When the CSU first presented the LDTP, they stated that this was an alternative pathway to transfer and will not replace course to course articulation.

During the first LDTP submission period back in 2006, several community colleges submitted their courses for articulation through LDTP; SDCDD waited for the second submission. By the time the first submission approvals were published, many community colleges that participated in the LDTP saw their courses rejected for LDTP and as a result were concerned about losing course to course articulation with some CSU campuses. Because of what happened to other community colleges, SDCCD administrators and academic senates decided to adopt a “watch and wait” policy toward LDTP.

On February 28, 2007 at the Southern California Intersegmental Articulation Council (SCIAC) meeting it was announced that individual CSU campuses were free to adopt the LDTP pattern to replace their current articulation; this announcement was against what was said by the CSU in prior statements, that the LDTP will not replace course to course articulation.

Articulation Officers from several regions voiced their opposition to course submission through LDTP; their concerns were addressed by the Chancellor’s Office of the CSU, but nothing was done at the CSU level.

Deleted: s

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: s

Deleted: s

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: just

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: lost

Deleted: the Articulation Officers at

Deleted: not to

Deleted: submit any courses through the

Deleted: and

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: and

Formatted: Strikethrough

The Articulation Officers emphasized the following points:

- a) Students need to declare a major and a campus they want to attend by the time they complete 45 units at the community college.
- b) One of the benefits of participating in the LDTP was that the students would get the highest priority at the CSU of their choice; however, this would only benefit students who are transferring out of the local area (not SDSU, not San Marcos). Campuses may still restrict the number of LDTP guarantees issued. Even if the student gets a guarantee they will still need to comply with all of the major impactation criteria which might be different than the LDTP pattern they are following.
- c) At SDSU campus to campus articulation for Accounting has been removed and replaced with LDTP. SDSU decided that they will not review accounting courses that were not approved through the LDTP; therefore, at CIC it was decided to re-design the accounting courses to fit the LDTP descriptors and submit them through LDTP.
- d) According to the CSU, another advantage to participate in the LDTP was for students that know their major but don't know where they wanted to transfer. Theoretically, they will take 45 units that would work for every CSU campus. However, this is not the case at all CSUs because campuses don't have to adjust their curriculum to match the LDTP descriptors. For example, if the student wants to major in Administration of Justice, they will follow the LDTP criminal justice plan, but if they want to transfer to SDSU they would end up taking two courses that don't fit the prep for the major at SDSU's criminal justice, ADJU 101 & 102, resulting in 6 units of excess course work by following this pattern that is supposed to be uniform.
- e) Another concern is the fact that the CSUs are imposing an intermediate algebra prerequisite to Economics courses; students can be impacted because it will delay a student from taking Economics until they can take the transferable math course.
- f) The student can only choose one CSU campus to transfer, if he or she chooses a different campus, the LDTP pattern and guarantee may not work and they may have to use campus-to-campus articulation, even if different than the LDTP articulation.
- g) The accounting major will accept ACCT 116A & B for their major, but if those courses are also required for other majors, such as Hotel Management, the Articulation Officers don't know if the course will work for that major.

Deleted: will

Deleted: according to the Articulation Officers the only students the LDTP pattern

Deleted: pattern benefits are students that

Deleted: submitted

Deleted: designed

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: ;

Deleted: because the CSU

Deleted: CSU

Deleted: math

Deleted: do that

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: actually work for

Deleted: so the student has wasted

Deleted: SDSU doesn't take those two ADJU courses because they don't fit in their prep for the major.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Deleted: that will need to start at a lower level math

Deleted: to get up to a

Deleted: won't

Deleted: work

Deleted: will

Deleted: prep for the major to get in that campus

Otto suggested putting all this information in one piece so that he may be able to communicate the information effectively to the many administrative levels he has access to; the information should include a clear statement of the issue, the impact on students, the percentage of students that could be impacted by this and the Articulation Officers recommendations. He also suggested involving Lynn Neault, Vice Chancellor of Student Services, in the discussion. Otto will ask Lynn to meet with the VPSS to discuss the issue.

Shelly suggested creating an LDTP task force that will include the Articulation Officers and invite Lynn to join in the discussion.

2. MOU:

Deleted: ¶

Shelly ask the Articulation Officers for the history of the MOU; Duane explained that when he was the Transfer Center Director at City, he worked with Libby to develop the MOU because in the past there were several agreements that were signed at the campus without any input from faculty or others responsible for implementation obligating it to make significant expenditures. Originally it was suggested the Articulation Officers be the point of contact but Student Services Council decided that the Transfer Center Directors would be the point of contact.

Deleted: will

Duane explained that it is important to be consistent across the board because he feels it will be problematic that the point of contact is the AO at one campus and the Transfer Center Director at another. He explained that it is important to have a working group that represents the 3 campuses and it has to be a group that meets on a regular basis, the AOs as well as the Transfer Center Directors meet on a regular basis, so either one of these groups would work. Juliette said that the discussion at Mesa is to have co-chairs, the AO and the Transfer Center Director, as the point of contact. Libby said that at City, the Articulation Officer is the point of contact; Duane said Miramar.

Deleted: another campus

Deleted: is the point of contact

Shelly would like the point of contact to be the AO but currently the TCD is the point of contact because that is what was agreed upon in the original procedure.

Deleted: that it hasn't been decided at Miramar yet

Shelly would like to put the MOU in an official place such as policies and procedures.

Deleted: will

The Articulation Officers agreed that there needs to be consistency on the point of contact before the MOU is written in procedures.

3. Military Articulation:

Shelly met with Lisa Curtin and Melody Campbell regarding COMP 110 and she explained to them why the course is not eligible for articulation; Lisa and Melody were led to believe by the group that was working with them that it was and entered a contract with the military. Shelly suggested finding another way to fulfill this contract because COMP 110 is not eligible for articulation.

Shelly sent Lynn Neault her recommendations of the military articulation agreements and Lynn has two concerns:

- 1) Lynn doesn't think that including veterans in the agreements is necessary because veterans follow a different procedure.
- 2) Lynne wants to make clear the Lisa Curtin is only in charge of contract military education and not representing the overall Navy.

Articulation Officers agreed that the military articulation procedure needs to be revised so they can be included in the first stages of the process. Duane emphasized that in reality there are only two models to follow: Credit by Exam and Articulation.

Shelly will look at what other colleges are doing in regards to military articulation and will revise the procedures for military articulation and Credit by Exam.

Shelly will also ask for clarification on Lisa Curtin's title to see if she needs to be on the signature pages for military articulation.

4. AP/CSUGE

Deleted: ¶

Libby wanted to get the Articulation Officers input on how to list the new information for the CSU GE AP exam in the catalog. Duane proposed to use the minimum semester credits earned column to list the information in the AP chart and also list the information in the CSUGE pattern, so the students will know which areas the AP exam will clear. Shelly and Articulation Officers agreed, but this approach will need more research. Duane will take the issue back to his campus.

New Business

5. Status Report on Military Education agreements:

Libby has a meeting with Otto today to talk about the military education agreements; back in 2005 Terry Burgess and Lisa Curtin signed off an agreement that [they](#) are calling the ACE articulation agreement. [After the discussion](#), Terry [recommended it be renamed](#) U.S. Navy [Elective Credit](#) [Elective Credit](#) Agreement. Libby explained that the agreement lists Navy courses that are also listed in the ACE guide; Libby talked to the Evaluators and they said that every course that is listed in the ACE guide is accepted for elective credit at the college, [not just the few listed on the agreement](#); Duane confirmed this and also expressed his concern that the agreement is implying that if a course is not listed on the agreement but is listed on the ACE guide, we won't give the student credit for the course.

Deleted: and that

Deleted: wants to change the name to

Deleted: e

Deleted: c

Deleted: a

The other agreement that Libby talked about is the Maritime Institute; Libby learned that someone from the [Maritime](#) [Maritime](#) Institute contacted the college and wanted to set up an agreement. Ron Manzoni took their catalog and worked out the hours to [determine](#) the Carnegie units. However, there was no one on campus that could review the courses for course to course articulation so the courses [were](#) accepted as elective credit. Libby [said](#) that this institute is accredited by the Commission Council on Occupational Education which is not accepted according to Policy 3900, which makes this agreement invalid.

Deleted: m

Deleted: i

Deleted: will

Deleted: also

Libby asked if there is a need to [review](#) and [approve](#) the military articulation agreements that were signed between 2003 and 2005 by City [for the other colleges, dating the agreement for 2008-2009](#). Duane suggested looking at the ACE guide; the guide tells you if the course has been revised, if the course has not changed at the Navy or at the college then there is no need for faculty to review the course.

Deleted: go back

Deleted: review

Libby will start working with the ACE guide and will talk to Lisa about these two agreements.

Duane and Shelly will attend the meeting with Otto as well.

6. Articulation with USD:

Juliette shared USD's process for articulation: USD faculty reviews every single course listed in the articulation agreement even if the course has been approved for articulation in the past.

[On behalf of the three colleges](#), Libby will contact Pauline and set up a meeting in the next three weeks to go over the courses proposed for articulation for all three campuses. The Articulation Officers will give Libby what they want to present to USD, the deadline for AOs to give this information to Libby is October 10th.

7. Tech Prep update:

Duane has been working with the Tech Prep Office on the Credit by Exam procedure; they have been modifying some agreements to fit the credit by exam rules. He also shared that it might be beneficial for students to do some agreements as articulation as opposed to credit by exam. He explained that the benefit would be for those students going to high unit majors, because financial aid only pays up to 70 units.

8. CSUGE and Online Labs:

Duane attended the CSU's [Fall Counselor](#) Conference last Friday and Ken O'Donnell in one of his presentations about GE said that online courses are not accepted towards the oral communication requirement or the science lab requirement. Duane asked Ken for a written statement and Ken said that there is an internal policy that the CSU's reviewers use to evaluate courses proposed for CSUGE.

Deleted: Council

Standing Items:

- a) Tech Prep: Mario Chacon