

CURRICULUM and INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
DISTRICT ARTICULATION COUNCIL
ACTION ITEMS
11-05-08

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. Credit for Military Schools:

Duane presented a spreadsheet that Miramar is creating to keep track of all incoming articulation. The spreadsheet was created in response to the discussion from the last DAC meeting where we talked about how to organize and keep track of military articulation. Duane suggested that instead of having the spreadsheet campus based, it will be better if Instructional Services kept the spreadsheet, in this way it will serve as a repository for all articulation and will only be updated by Instructional Services; Shelly agreed, Instructional Services will keep the spreadsheet and will update it with the information the Articulation Officers submit; once the spreadsheet is ready, it can be posted on the Instructional Services website. Duane will e-mail the spreadsheet to Shelly, and it will be discussed at the next DAC meeting.

2. Military Articulation:

Instructional Services and the Articulation Officers are working together to clarify the military articulation process. In the past there have been several articulation agreements that were signed without the Articulation Officers knowledge and in some cases the articulation on the agreements was not valid. Shelly stated that Instructional Services and the Articulation Officers support the military, but want to make sure that the process is clear and in compliance with Title 5.

3. Military Education:

Libby has made some changes to the 2008-2010 articulation agreement drafts and has incorporated new language. The culinary arts course for Mesa's agreement has been removed because it is on a separate agreement.

Duane suggested changing the word “military trainees” to “students”. Libby will make the change. Libby will send electronic copies of the agreements and the Articulation Officers will take the agreements back to their campus for faculty review.

Duane clarified the concept of military articulation for the evaluators: The District articulation agreements are made with the U.S. Navy; these courses were developed by the Navy and taught to Navy personnel. It doesn't matter who teaches the courses, the curriculum belongs to the Navy.

The evaluators expressed their concerns with the military Ed rosters that get posted on ISIS. The rosters are sent to the records office from the military and are posted on ISIS. Evaluators explained the problem with coding students into the system is that the credit will appear on their transcript even if they don't have a student application with SDCCD.

Libby explained that she attended an evaluator meeting with Lynne Neault and Catrina Hixon, and at the meeting it was stated that military credit with ACE recommendation, what is called service schools based on the ACE guide recommendations, is all military service school credit. The ACE guide credit is determined on campus by the evaluators, units earned are posted in the system and on the transcript on lump sum total, the credit is elective credit only and the heading on the transcript is service schools. Military articulated contract education course is based on the approved articulation agreement; courses come on rosters from the military; the detail is posted on the transcript system with units and credit, evaluators clear for degrees and certificates based on a list of articulated courses that has been approved by faculty and the heading on the transcript would be military contract education.

Shelly suggested a meeting with Lynne Neault and the evaluators to clarify their questions.

Shelly stated that once the Military Articulation process is in place, it will be reviewed by the District Articulation Council and it will be written on Policy 5300. Duane stated that there should be two written processes, one for Articulation and one for Credit by Exam. The issue will be discussed at next DAC meeting.

4. USD Articulation:

Libby is working on the individual proposals for USD; she has made the corrections submitted by Juliette and Duane. Juliette suggested sending the proposals to Pauline at USD and she will distribute the proposals at her campus.

5. AP test:

City College faculty reviewed the Italian AP exams and determined that a score of 3 for Italian 101 and a score of 4 or 5 for Italian 102 is appropriate. Instructional Services will update the AP chart in the catalog.

Libby also talked about how the Environmental Science test only lists a score of 4 or 5, and the District policy states that a minimum score of 3 is recommended. She would like the chart to reflect this.

Duane explained the reason that lists a score of 4 or 5 is because Mesa didn't agree to a score of 3 to make it equivalent to BIOL 120.

Articulation Officers agreed to list two different scores, 3 clears the GE, Area B and 4 or 5 will also clear BIOL 120.

Instructional Services will update the AP chart in the catalog.

New Business

6. SDSU economics prerequisite:

The issue will be discussed at the next DAC meeting.

7. LDTP- example outcomes for students:

Duane presented a chart to explain the impact the LDTP may have on SDCCD students. There are two parts to the chart: the impact on admission and the impact on course selection. Approximately 82 percent of SDCCD CSU system transfer students attend the local universities: SDSU and CSU San Marcos, the Articulation Officers don't anticipate an impact on those students. Of the 18 percent left, 2 percent would choose a major not included in LDTP and 16 percent would choose a major covered by the LDTP. Of that 16 percent, only 5 percent would choose an impacted major. For admission purposes, the only time students will benefit from participating in the LDTP is if their major is impacted, non impacted majors accept every student that meets the minimum CSU requirements; so only a potential 5 percent will be affected on admission by LDTP.

In order to get the LDTP guarantee, the student would have to declare one CSU campus and one CSU major by the time they reach 45 units; otherwise they are ineligible for LDTP admission. But even if the student declares the campus and major, they might not receive an LDTP guarantee because according to the CSU system, each individual campus can limit the number of transfer guarantees they give out.

For those who do have a major included in the LDTP, some of them will have an incorrect LDTP pattern such as the ADJU program.

One benefit that students could have is if there is a campus that does not already fully articulate with SDCCD, if the LDTP pattern is correct, then participating in LDTP could be helpful for some students because it will help us establish articulation with campuses that currently don't articulate with us.

Duane noted that for some, following the LDTP could be beneficial in that the LDTP guarantees admission but at the same time the student would have to follow the incorrect pattern (such as the ADJU major) in order to receive a guarantee.

Duane stated that from the District stand point, the initial decision that we need to make is whether we are going to participate in the LDTP. If we are going to participate, then the next decision is if we are going to target certain majors and not target others. He stated that is going to be difficult to manage selective LDTP participation.

Duane will create a summary of the effects on SDCCD students in terms of percentages and redesign the chart.

8. Review and update of catalog charts:

Duane said that the AP chart needed to be updated with the new CSUGE information. Instructional Services has updated the chart.

Last year asterisks were removed in the CSUGE pattern Area D for courses that were listed more than once in the same area. Libby talked to the evaluators at her campus and they were concerned on the impact this would have on the advising sheets they create. The Articulation Officers agreed to mark these courses with a symbol other than an asterisk. Instructional Services will update the chart.

9. International Baccalaureate credit:

Paula asked the Articulation Officers to ask faculty to review the English IB test to determine if the test is equivalent to English 101.

Evaluators asked that all of the IB tests be reviewed by faculty. Reggie will send a list of the tests to Articulation Officers and Instructional Services; Instructional Services will provide copies of the tests.

Evaluators requested copies of the DANTES and CLEP charts; Michelle will e-mail a copy of the charts.

10. AP use in Associate Degree GE pattern:

Duane talked about the survey that Dave DeGroot sent through the CIAC list about the use of AP tests to clear GE requirements. The goal is to have an aligned CCC GE AP list. Duane stated that the way our AP review procedure works right now is that once all of the AP tests go to faculty to determine if they are equivalent to any of our courses then they go to the GE committees, in Miramar's case would be the Academic Standards Committee, to determine if they clear GE requirements, even if the departments determine that the test is not equivalent to any of our courses, it will be reviewed for the GE area.

Duane will e-mail a list of AP tests that faculty will need to review and Instructional Services will provide copies of tests.

11. ASU articulation request:

Arizona State University contacted the President's of City, Mesa and Miramar to establish an articulation agreement. Duane wanted Otto and Shelly to be aware that there is a procedure in place that needs to be followed.

Libby mentioned that there are several articulation agreements that were signed when Auggie Gallego was the Chancellor and soon they will be up for renewal, so this would be a good time to review the agreements and follow the articulation procedure.

12. Catalog transferability listing of private colleges/universities:

Juliette stated that she wants to create a proposal to modify the following sentence: “Associate Degree Credit & transfer to CSU and/or private colleges and Universities”. She wants the part, “and/or private colleges and universities” removed from the sentence. She doesn’t think is appropriate to mention private institutions because the Articulation Officers do not have a list of private institutions that will accept our courses. Duane and Libby agreed to take this item back to their campuses. Duane stated that he suggested wording should be drafted prior to presenting this at CIC.

Standing Items:

- a) Tech Prep: Mario Chacon