History of C-ID and TMCs –
An Academic Senate White Paper

Approved by the Executive Committee

October 2 – 3, 2015

<u>2015-2016 Executive Committee</u>
David Morse, President, Long Beach City College
Julie Bruno, Vice President, Sierra College
Peter-John Stanskas, Secretary, San Bernardino Valley College
Wheeler North, Treasurer, San Diego Miramar College
Grant Goold, Area A, American River College
Dolores Davison, Area B, Foothill College
John Freitas, Area C, Los Angeles City College
Craig Rutan, Area D, Santiago Canyon College
Cleavon Smith, North Representative, Berkeley City College
Virginia May, North Representative, Sacramento City College
Adrienne Foster, South Representative, West Los Angeles College
Cynthia Rico, South Representative, San Diego Mesa College
Cheryl Aschenbach, Representative At-Large, Lassen College
Randy Beach, Representative At-Large, Southwestern College

Introduction

Since 2004, three key pieces of legislation have mandated clear and specific action from the California Community Colleges (CCCs) in order to support student success and improve transfer rates to the California State University (CSU) system. Senate Bill 1415 (2004, Brulte) sought to improve student outcomes through the establishment of a common course numbering system, Senate Bill 1440 (2010, Padilla) mandated the development of a new type of associate degree for transfer (ADT) designed to facilitate student transfer to the CSU, and Senate Bill 440 (2013, Padilla) expanded on the intent of the previous legislation regarding ADT development. Fortunately, most of this legislation allowed for faculty to take responsibility and propose a concerted, coordinated approach to implementation that would ensure that the CCC and CSU faculty remained in control of the curriculum and yielded additional benefits for students not dictated by the legislation. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) played a primary role in assisting the CCC system in responding to these legislative mandates by leading the creation of the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID). C-ID facilitates the portability of courses between CCCs and supports the development of Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) upon which the ADTs are based.[1]

History of C-ID and TMC

Precursors to the C-ID System

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 was to establish a common course numbering system as a way to facilitate transfer by identifying comparable courses. To that end, the California Articulation Number (CAN) System began as a pilot project in 1982, involving a dozen California community colleges, five 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, consisting of a few sentences to describe the content of each course, 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

---

[1] Readers who are not conversant with the many acronyms used for expediency may wish to print out Appendix A for reference. Additional background information on the C-ID and TMCs may be found on the C-ID website at www.c-id.net.

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. Furthermore, CAN suffered from a lack of funding, which ultimately ended its operation in 2005, leaving colleges 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 determined that a core curricular pattern could be developed in many majors, allowing 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 transfer for California students by identifying potential transfer pathways that could prepare students for multiple institutions.

Subsequent to IMPAC, the CSU system, in response to the legislative mandate of Senate Bill 1785 (2004, Scott) 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 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. In contrast to the articulation-based numbering system used by CAN, community college courses received a Transfer CSU number (TCSU) when a course was deemed comparable to a descriptor. Unfortunately, descriptor development was not an intersegmental effort and the transfer pathways sometimes only consisted of a single course. Ultimately, only a handful of LDTP descriptors were completed for each of the 30 disciplines before funding ended

Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)

In 2007, the Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System began as a pilot project to improve on the organizational structures provided by CAN, and the intersegmental faculty engagement process initiated with IMPAC. C-ID was developed to respond to the need for a common course numbering system supported by intersegmental faculty collaboration. 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, UC, and the independent colleges and universities), the C-ID pilot project began by garnering intersegmental support through the establishment of an advisory committee. This committee consisted of intersegmental representatives who directed the development of a pilot numbering system that would add alphanumeric 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 predominantly faculty-driven. Since faculty have the necessary expertise and responsibility for curricular design and revision, the C-ID process relies heavily upon Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs) that consist of discipline faculty appointed by their respective statewide academic senates. Most commonly, an FDRG consists of three CCC and three CSU faculty, although faculty at UC 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 significantly more detailed and their components align with a community college course outline of record, as they include course objectives, content, and methods of evaluation as well as minimum units, prerequisites and sample texts. Similar to LDTP, a C-ID designation is received after a team of CCC and university faculty establishes that a CCC course outline of record (COR) is comparable to a C-ID descriptor. The FDRGs are tasked with the following:

- identifying those lower division courses already widely articulated in their field, particularly pre-major or major courses in their discipline,
- determining which courses within the discipline need descriptors and a C-ID designation,
- assignment of an alphanumeric designator 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 objectives and knowledge expected of students who complete the course.

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

As discipline experts with first-hand knowledge of the descriptors, FDRG members are uniquely qualified to serve as Course Outline of Record Evaluators (COREs) for reviewing 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 on the technology related to the course review

process. COREs also participate in 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 the COREs, as well as enhance the development of a dynamic course numbering system. Further, a web-based infrastructure was developed to support the COR review process, including a database of approved descriptors and an online submission and review system.

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

Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) was intended to ensure that students transferring from a CCC to the CSU system received a degree prior to transferring, had a clear and efficient transfer pathway, and were guaranteed admission to the CSU. Requirements of the legislation included the creation of a 60-unit ADT by the CCCs guaranteeing admission with junior standing to the CSU system. Moreover, the student could only be required to complete 60 more units for a total of 120 units for a baccalaureate degree. The legislation also 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 113 community colleges developing 113 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.

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. To support the use of the C-ID framework for the development of SB1440 degrees, the ASCCC passed Resolution 9.12 F10. (Appendix C) and the ASCSU passed resolution AS-311-13 in January of 2013 (Appendix D).

As a result of strong intersegmental coordination, early and effective policy discussions, and both systems' commitment to a statewide process, SB 1440 implementation began in 2011 with Discipline Input Group (DIG) meetings that are 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, usually with support from an articulation officer, began the discussion of a 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 marked the first phase in the development of TMCs and the identification of the corresponding C-ID course descriptors necessary to define the required courses in the TMCs.

DIG meetings were usually the precursors to the work of the Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG), whose role included taking what was started at the DIG and bringing it to conclusion. Based on the input from the DIG meetings, the FDRGs developed draft TMCs and their associated C-ID descriptors. Each TMC defined the essential components of a degree in a major or area of emphasis, delineating additional options that colleges may select as they designed an Associate Degree for Transfer that meets the needs of their local student population. The goal was 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 received priority admission - as required by the legislation - had a specific minimum level of preparation for the major. As a TMC described both the major component of an associate degree and the coursework required for transfer, the course requirements in some cases exceed what is necessary for transfer at a given CSU.

To ensure success, intersegmental cooperation and oversight of the project was critical. Intersegmental faculty conversations began prior to the signing of the legislation, and the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) was established and convened even before the bill was signed to guide the curriculum elements of SB 1440. The core members of the ICW, as appropriate for curricular matters, were CCC and CSU faculty appointed by their respective academic senates. Providing support and additional input were representatives from both the CCC and CSU 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 and processes 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 system, TMC development, and local discipline faculty. AOs attend and participate in DIG meetings to support the work of discipline faculty, participate in the descriptor and TMC vetting process, and assist C-ID with identifying faculty from their respective

campuses to serve as members of the FDRGs or as COREs. At the local colleges, AOs 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 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 also use the C-ID website to indicate courses that are deemed comparable to C-ID descriptors, forging the way to new articulation by seeking out community colleges that 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 on a course having obtained a C-ID designation.

Conclusion

The collaboration between the faculty of the CCCs and the CSU, prompted by various legislative mandates, has profoundly altered higher education in California. C-ID, TMCs, and ADTs all ultimately serve to simplify the complicated connections that exist among California's 113 CCCs and between the CCCs and the 23 CSU campuses. In improving the portability of classes and defining new pathways to assist students in reaching their educational goals, C-ID and ADTs have made it easier for students to navigate the complexity of higher education. The creation of this framework has the potential to significantly improve the likelihood that students will complete their educational goals and achieve rewarding careers. The benefits to students are numerous and will be further realized with the passage of time. Moreover, many opportunities exist for these efforts to expand and increase their import, most notably, the expansion of C-ID within the CCC system and the increase of participation by UC.

C-ID and TMCs have fundamentally changed the way faculty and the segments of higher education relate to one another and work together for the benefit of students. From the inception of C-ID, through the development of the TMCs and the creation of ADTs, discipline faculty have collaborated both intrasegmentally and intersegmentally to define not only strong pathways between segments but also discipline standards for courses and degrees to prepare students to achieve their educational and career goals. This model of collaboration will serve higher education well as the foundation for future projects among the CCCs, CSUs and UCs to ensure the success of all students in California.

Appendix A Acronym Glossary

ADT Associate Degree for Transfer
AO Articulation Officer
ASCCC Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
ASCSU Academic Senate for California State University
ASSIST Articulation System Stimulating Intersegmental Transfer
CAN California Articulation Number
CCC California Community Colleges
C-ID Course Identification System
CORE Course Outline of Record Evaluator
CSU California State University
DIG Discipline Input Group
FDRG Faculty Discipline Review Group
ICW Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup
ICFW Intersegmenatl Curriculum Faculty Workgroup
IMPAC Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum Project
LDTP Lower Division Transfer Pattern
SB Senate Bill
TMC Transfer Model Curriculum/Curricula
UC University of California

Appendix B
Chancellor's Office Memos dated November 30 2012 and January 28 2015

Appendix C

> 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).

Appendix D

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.