

CURRICULUM and INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
DISTRICT ARTICULATION COUNCIL
ACTION ITEMS
02-04-09

Attendees:

Margie Aguayo- City College Evaluator
Libby Andersen- City College Articulation Officer
Reginald Boyd- Miramar College Evaluator
Paula Christopher- Mesa College Evaluator
Shelly Hess- Dean of Instructional Services, District Office
Christina Monaco- City College Evaluator
Susan Newell- Mesa College Evaluator
Juliette Parker- Mesa College Articulation Officer
Michelle Radley- Articulation Assistant, Instructional Services
Duane Short- Miramar College Articulation Officer
Vang Thao- Mesa College Evaluator

Old Business

1. Proposed changes to AP Exam review for 09-10 catalog:

Libby shared that Articulation Officers have been working on updating the AP list with the changes proposed by the CSU system and she wanted to make sure everybody is aware of what will be presented to the subject Department Chairs at each campus. Duane sent out an e-mail to the Articulation Officers to make sure the AP information is presented in a uniform manner to the subject Department Chairs at each campus. Duane explained that the goal is to align as much as possible the credit the student earns with SDCCD, meaning the units of credit, what GE categories are cleared, possibly what courses are cleared with what the CSU and UC systems do as a whole and if possible what our most popular transfer destinations do (SDSU and UCSD). For the units, Duane explained he went through and looked at what system wide minimum number of units will be awarded for each one of these tests at the CSU and UC system. Those units from UC came from that list, the minimum units, and the CSU minimum units came from the AP chart where they list minimum semester units earned. Duane explained that he came up with how the courses might clear GE requirements for SDCCD based on how they clear GE requirements for CSU and IGETC which are now aligned, and to clear the course requirements he looked mostly at what SDSU and UCSD do. He also explained that each of those decisions are made by different people, the course equivalency or clearing the course requirements is made by the department faculty, clearing GE requirements is made at Miramar by the Academic Standards committee and the other two campuses have similar committees, and clearing units of credit is made by the evaluators.

Margie asked if the faculty know how the CSU and UC accept the units, because there have been situations where the departments don't want to award credit to the student. Duane explained that he provides this information for some representative CSU and UC campuses. Duane explained that he also tries to make clear to the faculty that they are not reviewing the course to determine if the units exactly match up, they are looking at the content.

2. CAN and 09-10 Catalog:

Libby wanted to ask the AOS, evaluators and Shelly whether we want to keep the CAN information in the catalog; she made reference to an e-mail sent through the CIAC list serve by Carolyn Reisner from American River College, at her college there is a discussion on whether or not they should take CAN and CAN designators out of their courses or keep them.

Duane stated that at the regional reps meeting he attended last week, there was a discussion about CAN and most people agreed to remove CAN from the catalogs and ASSIST. There are two important reasons to remove CAN: the CSU will not use CAN information for the LDTP because the timeline they established of two years has already passed and the most important reason is that CAN has not been updated for the last seven years. He explained that everybody's courses have drifted in that time frame because of revisions and courses listed as CAN, may actually not be CAN equivalent anymore. He added that the regional reps are working on a statement that will be sent out to all of the regions.

Shelly mentioned that since last time agreement was reached at DAC to remove CAN from the catalog, this was done immediately after the meeting. The information is saved in case it needs to be put back in the catalog.

The Articulation Officers will finalize their decision at the next DAC meeting.

3. Military Course Articulation Review Process Flowchart:

Shelly said that in a previous discussion with military ed, a few steps were added to the flowchart, the process will start with the district and the Articulation Officers will work with the faculty on their campuses. She stated that she is revising policy 5300 and the flowchart will be added to the policy.

Duane asked to standardize the flowchart for any external incoming articulation request. Susan asked if the request needs to come from the outside or if it can be internal as well. Duane explained that it can be an internal request as well, if the Evaluators run across some military training experience that it looks like it could be articulated to one of our courses, then the AOs can propose it to the military for articulation.

Shelly explained that one of the reasons the process is being standardized is that some agreements were made outside of articulation, outside of instruction and now Shelly and the Articulation Officers are trying to correct the situation.

Margie stated that it has been her experience that in the past there have been many students that go directly to a department and ask for course credit for their military experience, the department will review the experience and will substitute their service school for the credit they want. The Articulation Officers agreed that the procedure is correct.

Shelly presented the articulation tracker to the Evaluators, she explained that the tracker will be posted on the Instructional Services website and I.S. will keep it updated. The tracker will be available at the end of April.

Duane stated that once the tracker is populated, the Articulation Officers can review it during the DAC meeting in May.

New Business

4. Determining transfer codes for old courses.

Shelly explained the issue we have been running into with assigning transfer codes to old courses. She explained that the way she understands the issue is that courses that were approved before 1991 may be applied to IGETC if they were completed prior to Fall 1991, anything after may not be approved. The evaluators agreed with this and said that if the course is an IGETC approved course in ASSIST as of 1991, if the student took it prior to this date they should still be IGETC approved, if the course is approved for IGETC is also approved for UC.

The evaluators agreed that we can assign old transferable courses a code of 3 if they appear in the ASSIST IGETC list with a date of Fall 1991.

5. Program references in catalog:

Duane brought forward a suggestion from a faculty member at his campus that in our catalogs under the courses section we put a box listing every degree the course applies to. After discussion, the Articulation Officers and Evaluators were opposed to this idea. The evaluators suggested that putting an ad in the class schedule is the best solution.

6. SDSU ROTC cross-enrollment agreement:

Duane stated that the SDSU ROTC program sent a cross-enrollment agreement directly to the presidents at each campus. Mesa's president signed the agreement; City's president made a revision to the agreement and sent it back to SDSU and at Miramar the president sent it to the VPI, who sent it to Duane for review. Duane reviewed it and found some points on the agreement that he believes are problematic. For example, one item was for Miramar to list SDSU military science courses in the Miramar catalog and on our transcripts.

Libby said that there is a person at SDSU that is taking the lead on the agreement, SDSU is working on a revised proposal and it will be sent out shortly. She also mentioned that Lynn Neault is aware of the discussion because a lot of the points on the agreement are more student services oriented. Duane agreed to wait until the revised proposal is received before proceeding at Miramar.

7. Establishing a submission timeline for ECON 120 and 121:

Faculty members at Mesa are revising Economics 120 and 121 and they asked Juliette for a time frame to complete the revision; the courses are being revised to maintain articulation with SDSU and CSU Long Beach through the LDTP. After discussion, the Articulation Officers agreed that the revision should be completed by the end of March.

8. Tech Prep:

Lynne Ornelas attended DAC to give an update of Tech Prep; her office is looking at how the credit by exam is applied and they are incorporating the new changes in Title 5.

Shelly explained that Instructional Services is incorporating the changes into the 5300.2 procedure, and I.S. is working on separating articulation and credit by exam, so there is a clear distinction between the two.

Margie requested an updated credit by exam list.

9. Proposed CCC GE AP Exam list for City, Mesa and Miramar Senate review:

Libby wanted to make sure that the presentation the Articulation Officers are taking to their Senates for support on the acceptance for system wide AP exam is the same.

Juliette will like to establish a process to review AP exams because it will be helpful for her to have a time frame.

Articulation Officers will talk later about establishing a time frame for review of AP exams.

10. MOU Coordination:

Otto explained the Chancellor would like to have more information on the incoming MOU agreements before she signs them; therefore, he met with Arizona State University representatives last month. The Articulation Officers stated that ASU appeared to be proposing articulation, not an MOU. They were concerned because the district apparently asked the colleges to cancel their articulation meeting with ASU last month.

Otto explained that he did not sign an agreement with ASU; his only interest in meeting with them was to give more information to the Chancellor about their proposed agreement.

Duane provided additional background information. He explained that the colleges or district often receive “proposals” from other institutions. These proposals typically fall into one of three categories: Transfer information, which is usually information about the institution’s transfer admission policies or procedures; Articulation, which is a proposal about the acceptance of the college’s courses to meet university requirements; and MOUs, which are proposals for special relationships between institutions in which particular benefits are provided that are not normally given to other institutions. Approved practice is for “proposals” from any institution to go to the Articulation Officers first so that they can determine what category the proposal falls under. The Articulation Officers all felt that ASU was proposing an articulation agreement; not an MOU.

The Articulation Officers stated that they have been concerned about the fact that documents have been signed in the past that do not actually constitute an agreement, or that are executed without consultation or concurrence. For example, a document from Howard University that described the university’s regular transfer admissions policies that were in place for all potential transfer students was signed by our district in the past and then publicized in the local media after the Articulation Officers determined that it was not, in fact, an “agreement”. As another example, in the past the Articulation

Officers were encouraged by the district to sign an articulation agreement with the Gemological Institute, despite the fact that this is not a regionally accredited institution.

Duane further explained that MOUs are typically signed after a longstanding relationship has already existed between an SDCCD college and a transfer institution. They provide SDCCD students with special privileges that are not offered to every student at their institution in exchange for certain privileges with SDCCD. He also stated that the goal of the Articulation Officers in establishing the district's approved MOU procedure was to prevent someone from signing an MOU that would obligate SDCCD to comply with obligations that are not in our best interest and also to prevent signing documents that are not really agreements.

Libby stated that the Articulation Officers are best to handle MOUs and other proposals from the beginning of the process. She explained when other parties become involved in the process without collaboration with the Articulation Officers it often times prevents them from making informed decisions; i.e. to correctly categorize a proposal from a university and follow the approved process for that proposal.

Juliette expressed her concern that in the case of ASU, the current procedure that all agreement proposals should go to the Articulation Officers was not followed and this created unnecessary confusion. She also asked Otto if a narrative of the incoming proposals would help him give information to the Chancellor while allowing the Articulation Officers to handle incoming proposals.

Otto agreed and said that if he received the initial contact he will direct that person to the Articulation Officers with the expectation that at the next DAC meeting he will receive a summary of the proposal to pass on to Constance.

The Articulation Officers agreed to provide a summary of any new inter-institutional proposals or any major modification to agreements to DAC.

Duane will be the contact person for Arizona State University; he will call them and let them know.

11. Proposed CCC GE AP exam list for City, Mesa and Miramar Senate review:

Libby wanted to make sure that the information the Articulation Officers are presenting to their Academic Senates is uniform. Duane suggested presenting the resolutions page and the title 5 information for background. Libby will forward this information to Articulation Officers and Shelly.

12. Establishing a process and time period for exam reviews (i.e. AP):

Juliette requesting a time table to review the AP exams; she suggested reviewing the exams during the Fall semester, the Articulation Officers agreed.

13. Catalog removal proposal:

Juliette put together a proposal to remove the phrase “Associate Degree credit & transfer to CSU **and/or private colleges and universities.**” from the course descriptions. She explained that it is impossible to verify whether a course is transferable to a private school because each private institution has the option to accept or reject any course they want. The recommendation will make the information in the catalogs more accurate. She stated that the change should be effective for the 2010-2011 catalog. She also said that the information can be updated on the explanation of terms page in the catalog.

Duane said that he can bring the issue to his campus but he first would like to see a draft of the explanation of terms; Juliette will bring a draft to the next DAC.

Libby explained that at her campus the suggestion is to possibly change it to “may transfer to private colleges and universities”.

14. CCC Early Childhood Education Curriculum Alignment:

Libby asked the other Articulation Officers if they have any feedback from faculty at their campus on regards to this issue. Duane and Juliette said they don't have any feedback from their faculty; but will ask.

Standing Items:

- a) Tech Prep: Mario Chacon
- b) Inter-institutional agreements