

2005-2006 Articulation Addendum Summary

100 surveys (partial or complete) submitted.

Number of respondents to choose particular answer is listed first.

I. ADMINISTRATION

1. Articulation Officer time base:
 - 31 are 100% time base
 - 28 are 50% time base
 - 28 work less than 50%
2. The Articulation Officer is:
 - 6 are Classified
 - 12 are Administration/Management
 - 82 are Faculty/Certificated (of the 82; 59 are Counseling discipline)
3. Articulation Officer's schedule is:
 - 36 work 10 months a year
 - 25 work 11 months a year
 - 32 work 12 months a year
4. Articulation Officer's experience:
 - 10 – have been in the job less than 1 year
 - 14 – have been doing the job for 1 – 2 years
 - 22 – have been doing the job for 3-4 years
 - 54 - have been doing the job for more than 4 years
5. Articulation support staff:
 - 12 Articulation Officers have full-time support
 - 20 AO's have half-time support
 - 7 AO's have less than half-time support
6. The Articulation Officer reports directly to:
 - 14 report directly to Chief Instructional Officer
 - 39 report directly to the Chief Student Services Officer
 - 17 report directly to the Dean of Counseling
7. Does the articulation officer serve on the curriculum committee? Yes or No
If yes, is the articulation officer a voting member? Yes or No
 - 63 - Yes/Yes Responses
 - 30 – Yes/No Responses
 - 7 – No

II. ARTICULATION ACTIVITY

1. Does your college have a written "articulation plan" or annually established goals for articulation activity?

73 – Yes

27 – No

2. Are articulation goals or activities coordinated with transfer center plan?

75 – Yes

25 – No

3. Which of the following best characterizes the current status of the articulation process on your campus?

7 – Seamless

10 – Well coordinated

32 – Adequate

43 – Needs some improvement

8 – Needs major improvement

Comments from question #3:

- o Because this position is split with Berkeley City College, my accessibility is very limited. Also, the workload has increased especially with LDTP.
- o We recently received a grant which includes funding for a half-time articulation position, so we expect things to improve with additional time being allocated for articulation
- o But needs more time and a larger support staff.
- o The articulation officer also serves as the Counseling Coordinator, University Center Coordinator, and as a counselor. My experience & clerical help permits me to multi-task!
- o We will be implementing Curricunet which will streamline our current process making it more efficient.
- o The very limited amount of articulation time doesn't allow time for full coordination of articulation duties as well as coordination with transfer center.
- o The articulation officer's other duties prohibit adequate attention to the process. The lack of budget prohibits part time hires to attend to necessities.
- o The position changed to 100% in 2005. This has greatly improved the articulation process, though there is still a need for clerical/technical help for a seamless process.
- o Now have faculty level position designated as Articulation Officer. New Dean of Counseling supportive in developing articulation services. More connection with other faculty
- o Additional FTE for the articulation function on our campus would definitely improve the and increase our efforts.
- o Still attempting to connect with some So. Cal CSU's (SDSU) for articulation. Am hoping that with LDTP, things will be expedited.
- o Prep. for major with CSULB is posted on ASSIST which has greatly enhanced the articulation process at LACC.
- o There is still a need for consistent clerical support.
- o There is good cooperation between Articulation Officer and teaching faculty on campus.
- o We have staff, but due to our antiquated IT systems, we spend most of the time producing the schedule and catalog. We will adopt Banner soon, which should help with artic.
- o Much articulation depends upon the capacity, willingness etc. of our university partners.
- o The articulation responsibilities continue to increase due to more university articulation demands such as the new CSU LDTP program and (OSCAR).
- o Dr. Tan Pham is no longer employed at Columbia College.
- o As the Articulation Officer, Transfer Center Director, and Curriculum Chair I think the articulation has worked well.
- o Position should be dedicated (100%) to articulation related activities, on a 11th month contract & have consistent clerical/technical support.
- o Other duties as assigned take up 40% to 60% of time without any clerical support. May have some clerical help now that the Articulation Grants have been issued.
- o With Michael Stephans retirement, Ed Martinez has taken over the articulation responsibilities. He began his articulation duties in July.
- o Even though the Articulation Officer is 100%/1.00 FTE, she has many other assigned duties and serves on other committees.
- o Comments from Counselors: Wonderful. Greatly improved. We have an excellent Articulation Officer, however, we need full time clerical/technical support staff for Artic.
- o Vista's A.O. (.50 FTE) is a shared position with College of Alameda (.50 FTE).
- o We have a great relationship established with our faculty and with articulation officers at 4-year institutions.
- o During the 2005-06 year SCC established a 50% articulation officer, 50% counselor position to deal with the articulation needs of the district.
- o The better established LAMC becomes with articulation agreements, the more difficult it becomes to maintain and function without support staff.
- o The Articulation officer is also the Transfer Center Director and is assigned to Counseling students 50% of the time.
- o Faculty/Administration still need to be more aware of articulation and its impact. Articulation Officer is responsible for many other duties that are not articulation-oriented.
- o Need dedicated time for AO w/staff. Articulation review/update, & maintenance are more time consuming not less(LDTP, etc.)
- o To perform this job well, additional time must be devoted to articulation. I wear many hats as a full-time employee. I do have a student worker 10 hours per week.
- o The 05-06 saw a reinstatement of the Articulation Officer to 40% assignment. Lack of full time counselors meant that the Articulation Officer often had to neglect artic.
- o The articulation process is adequate at this time. Assistance is provided by the Curriculum Coordinator.
- o 1) not able to do artic duties full-time (artic approx 75% of load) and, 2) not having current and electronically accessible course outlines.
- o Need Clerical Support
- o Need permanent assistant (half time would be ideal) to attain "seamless" status.

- A course is already UC/CSU transferable, course must go through curriculum and board approval before it can be submitted for IGETC/CSU. Could take up to a year to go through.
- Many faculty believe that CSU transferability does not necessarily mean course-to-course articulation, GE, or major preparation. We have too many CSU transferable electives.
- I have not seen an articulation or transfer center plan. We are working to develop several areas of the articulation office.
- Updating course outlines is still a major focus; communicating transfer requirements to students is also paramount.
- We recently created a plan between Articulation and the Transfer Center. It is the first time a plan has been put together in the 7 years I have worked at Oxnard College.
- Lack of clear internal curriculum policies still hinder articulation development.
- Everything seems to work fairly well.
- District's poor curriculum management system hampers efforts. Articulation Officer schedule is 9 months/yr.
- Clerical help in the form of an articulation office assistant would prove very useful.
- Articulation Officer works closely with Curriculum Chair, but no clerical support, no student workers.
- Students don't stay long, not feasible to keep re-training.

4. Does your college have a sufficient quantity of articulation in each of the following?

(a) Course to Course with the University of California	68 – Yes; 30 – No
(b) Course to Course with the California State University	54 – Yes; 44 – No
(c) Preparation for the major with the University of California	67 – Yes; 29 – No
(d) Preparation for the major with California State University	49 – Yes; 49 – No
(e) General Education (IGETC and/or CSU GE)	86 – Yes; 4 – No

Comments:

- I would say that our that our course-to-course and major agreements with our top feeder school, i.e. CSUEB, SFSU, UCB, & UCD. LDTP no submissions yet.
- Cal State major prep continues to be less than desired and I think the LDTP articulation has lots of problems.
- Courses have not yet been submitted for LDTP; we do have adequate CAN courses.
- Didn't start LDTP in 2005-06
- No articulation with Bakersfield, Fullerton, San Marcos, or Stanislaus. Over 2 years old with Northridge, Sac, and Fresno.
- LDTP just started and IVC is concentrating on Accreditation visit for March 2007 right now.
- I am not quite sure how to answer the LDTP question, it is new and we have just begun the submission process.
- currently working on submitting for LDTP
- The small amount of release time doesn't allow for the increasing articulation. Only maintenance of articulation agreements has occurred.
- The LDTP will be a priority for SP 07 term.
- The LDTP Project has put a strain on the articulation process. It will be a challenge to follow-through on this CSU-driven initiative without staff support.
- LDTP is just starting .. too soon to comment. Better major prep with some CSU schools in LA area... Articulation officers at all schools very helpful
- I am waiting for CI, SM, STAN AND SON to respond to my artic request from last year. Some others are very slow (SAC, SLO)
- We will be submitting courses for the first cycle of LDTP; until our courses have been approved I can't state whether or not we have a sufficient quantity of LDTP articulation.
- LDTP is a work in progress. We submitted 14 outlines for LDTP consideration for the first update cycle. Would like more major artic with CSU (as is lacking) and UC.
- LDTP is a goal when resources permit.
- in the 06-07 year, we finally have Major Prep with CPSLO--this is very helpful but some CSU's do not articulate at all we are just beginning to submit for LDTP
- Several CSU campuses are a few years behind in updating articulation on www.assist.org.
- Some majors at UC and CSU systems are not articulated and/or displayed on ASSIST.
- We need to expand the major prep area with UC and CSU.
- We appreciate the articulation our univ. partners provide. However, we won't have "sufficient" articulation until we have complete, and current, articulation with all univs.
- Major-to-major and course-to-course articulation with UC/CSU could be improved with CSU and UC but the system needs to become flexible to accommodate some small curriculum dif
- We are always updating the articulations. The addition of LDTP has added a lot of additional work to the office.
- The opportunity to strengthen articulation is always present, eg: faculty updating old outlines, 'out of the area' CSU majors, and now CSU LDTP articulation.
- With CAN courses have most of LDTP covered for two years.
- Still working on submission of course outlines into OSCAR for LDTP descriptions
- Very limited articulation with most of the southern CSU campuses due to work time and lack of staff for CSU and us. And, low number of transfer students drives the priority.
- Comments from Counselors: While we have sufficient quantity of articulations, we always need more.
- The first LDTP submission/review has not been completed so this question seems premature.
- Because this position is shared with the articulation duties with College of Alameda, the A.O. has limited time to focus on articulation with individual campuses.
- Still don't have articulation with all CSU's. Course to course not available for all UC's. LDTP to be determined since we just submitted our first course proposals for review.
- I don't have enough experience with LDTP at this time to answer this with an emphatic yes or no, so I will be forced to answer yes.
- Need to expand course to course with UC.
- LDTP articulation requests have been submitted for Cycle 1 a-d "no" since there are gaps. Time insufficient to review/submit outlines for 4-year review. LDTP for AOs and faculty review for LDTP TCSUs require more time not less.
- There is an ongoing need to increase articulation agreements.
- I would prefer the major prep over the course to course articulation. However, both are important. I am in the process of submitting courses for LDTP.
- Our college submitted courses for LDTP articulation, but it's too early to know the results. Articulation with CSU campuses has been improving, but still has some big gaps.
- We will submit courses for LDTP in the next
- Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) course submission and review process did not materialize until after the 2005-2006 year.
- Good articulation with the area CSUs, but many CSUs will not articulate with us because we are out of the area, they are under-staffed, and we're low priority.

- While there has been improvement in prep for major, we need more from San Luis Obispo (2002-03), Pomona and Long Beach.
- CSU should have program like UC's to implement top 20 majors w/ all CCCs. LDTP course descriptor artic going to be HUGE project-- descriptors inconsistent and unclear.
- Too early to have attained articulation for LDTP.
- Both systems have a fairly decent amount of major preparation articulation in So.CA but it would be nice to have more major preparation for UCLA, N.CA CSU's, and Polytechnics.
- Many CSUs will not articulate and believe that LDTP will replace course-to-course articulation.
- There is sufficient quantity of articulation within the county. Could have more outside of the county. The LDTP is new and we are currently working to establish articulation.
- While articulation has increased over the years, there are still schools (CSU in particular)with whom we have few to no agreements.
- DVC has one of the highest numbers of CAN courses in the state that may be used as CSU LDTP courses until LDTP course reviews become necessary.
- We have had a large turnover at Oxnard College in the position of Articulation. We hope to have consistency in this position and improve articulation.
- We are beginning to work on the LDTP course descriptions
- LDTP still in progress.
- CSU articulation is difficult to establish with some CSU campuses when they use the argument that RC does not send them enough transfers to warrant articulation efforts.
- No participation in LDTP until dust settles.
- We are currently working on articulating with the LDTP course descriptors.
- We have a sufficient quantity, but are always working on more articulation. LDTP has been relegated a very low priority. First round submissions will be submitted in the sec
- Would be desirable to have more complete major articulation with all CSU campuses. It remains to be seen as to whether or not LDTP will help in this area.
- The college is continuing to work on improving its number of articulation agreements with UC & CSU systems.
The college is in its freshman year of LDTP course descriptions.
- Articulation agreements are increasing, but our size (5,000 students) and location cause some four year colleges to deny articulation with our campus.
- We are still awaiting word on LDTP submissions; therefore, we cannot respond definitively to this question.
- We have not yet implemented LDTP.

III. CAPACITY

1. The following is a list of commonly reported challenges to Articulation.

- (a) Only mark the challenges that your college currently experiences, if a challenge is not applicable, do not select anything in that row.
- (b) Indicate if the challenge is new this year or the status compared to last year.

Challenge

Insufficient articulation officer time	8 – New This Year 15 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 46 – Same: Compared to Last Year 27 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Insufficient clerical/support time	8 – New This Year 11 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 53 – Same: Compared to Last Year 26 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Insufficient/inconsistent funding	8 – New This Year 10 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 54 – Same: Compared to Last Year 26 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Insufficient/inefficient hardware/software	8 – New This Year 15 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 42 – Same: Compared to Last Year 13 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
UC unwillingness due to geographic distance	8 – New This Year 30 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 40 – Same: Compared to Last Year

	2 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
CSU unwillingness due to geographic distance	8 – New This Year 8 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 52 – Same: Compared to Last Year 31 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
UC unwillingness due to low transfer numbers	8 – New This Year 26 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 47 – Same: Compared to Last Year 0 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
CSU unwillingness due to low transfer numbers	8 – New This Year 8 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 52 – Same: Compared to Last Year 22 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
UC process (slow, inconsistent, inadequate)	8 – New This Year 21 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 42 – Same: Compared to Last Year 21 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
UC/CSU process (slow, inconsistent, inadequate)	8 – New This Year 19 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 49 – Same: Compared to Last Year 19 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
UC lack of preparation for major information	8 – New This Year 29 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 39 – Same: Compared to Last Year 2 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
CSU lack of preparation for major information	8 – New This Year 14 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 46 – Same: Compared to Last Year 29 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Lack of articulation information for AICUU institutions	8 – New This Year 14 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 47 – Same: Compared to Last Year 27 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
ASSIST confusing to faculty, students and staff	8 – New This Year 30 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 28 – Same: Compared to Last Year 7 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
ASSIST slow, inefficient or lacking in features	8 – New This Year 30 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 19 – Same: Compared to Last Year 15 – Worse: Compared to Last Year

Lack of four year institution course outlines	7 – New This Year 1 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 56 – Same: Compared to Last Year 13 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Lack of up-to-date community college courses outlines	6 – New This Year 29 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 32 – Same: Compared to Last Year 16 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
CCC internal approval process (slow, inefficient)	3 – New This Year 44 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 12 – Same: Compared to Last Year 2 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
Faculty uninformed, uninvolved, or disinterested in articulation process	0 – New This Year 29 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 40 – Same: Compared to Last Year 14 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
LDTP inefficient, difficult process	1 – New This Year 0 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 24 – Same: Compared to Last Year 33 – Worse: Compared to Last Year
LDTP confusing to faculty, students and staff	1 – New This Year 0 – Improved: Compared to Last Year 32 – Same: Compared to Last Year

Other:

- Lack of CSU Reps at College & University Day Event
- over-extended in non-articulation activities
- Lack of articulation support at CSUs
- Faculty reluctance to update old course outlines
- LDTP project necessity remains questionable to CCC
- Insufficient AO time on CSU campuses
- I share a small office with a History Instructor.
- LDTP: cost vs. benefit to students?
- AP information for UC
- LDTP implementation unknowns & descriptor issues
- Admin. uninformed or disinterested in articulation
- Online outlines unable to upload to OSCAR.
- Lack of internal structural support
- UC Transfer Pathways clear

2. Select and rank only the top priorities that would enhance the quality and/or increase the quantity of your articulation.

Resource

Facilities	1 – Rank 1 15– Rank 2
Personnel	64 - Rank 1 21 – Rank 2
Equipment	5 - Rank 1 17 – Rank 2
Operating Expenses (e.g. supplies, printing, travel....etc.)	24 – Rank 1 45 – Rank 2

Other:

- o CSU Supporting their own articulation people
- o Additional Release time for Articulation Officer
- o Consistent Funding
- o More time for CSU AO to act on artic requests
- o updated course outlines
- o univ. unwillingness to make it an annual priority
- o More hours
- o Hourly classified and certificated
- o Internal process of updating course outlines
- o Adequate space is crucial.
- o Personnel at four-year institutions
- o LDTP - see above
- o Curriculum/Articulation Management System
- o Time to do articulation
- o Time
- o Current/electronically accessible course outlines
- o CSU/UCs improve artic request response time
- o tech. for online outlines to be uploaded for OSCAR
- o Time dedicated to Articulation and training
- o Curriculum Management System
- o Easier way to search for and propose new agreement
- o Time assigned to task
- o More reassigned time.
- o Additional hourly overload
- o Time for Articulation
- o My response to "Insufficient/inefficient funding" is due to the lack of state articulation funding for the 2005-06 year.
- o We expect our articulation to improve with the additional grant funding for 2006-07.
- o Funding is improved for this year, but with no commitment for next year, it's inconsistent and impacts any ability to plan for articulation projects on an ongoing basis!
- o Need for another Transfer Center (FT) counselor to free up the TCD/AO for more articulation services to be accomplished.
- o I am defining personnel as clerical support of which I have none.
- o The Articulation Grant (formerly CAN Grant) of \$5,000 has been allocated for 2 years vs. one year. This money is the only funding received for articulation activities.
- o It would be most helpful to all CCC if the CSU CO would increase funding for their AO so they could devote more time to articulation instead of other activities.
- o The \$5,000. CAN Grant was the only budget I had for artic. All travel/mileage came was paid out of my own "pocket." My salary is paid out of Counseling Dept.
- o .5 release time for Articulation is insufficient. Current clerical staff is temporary and has no office.
- o CAN / Articulation categorical funding was not received in 2005-06. In previous years this funding made up virtually all of the non-salary Articulation budget.
- o Priority #2: availability of 4-year course outlines is limited in many cases
- o The \$5,000 is an important resource that allows me to attend all, or most CSU, UC, CIAC conferences and keep well informed regarding university policies and procedures.
- o Due to declining enrollment, we have less counselors available, which translates less time for me to address articulation duties
- o With consistent & adequately trained clerical/technical support, articulation could be increased, eg: activities to initiate/maintain artic & teaching faculty trng & support.
- o Funds for a part-time clerical person would help increase the number of articulation agreements and review process required.

- The \$5,000 06/07 Articulation Funds help. Last year was very difficult with no operating budget. These funds will allow for necessary Articulation travel/supplies.
- Even though my assignment includes 70% articulation I rarely spend more than 50% due to competing priorities.
- Because Vista's A.O. position is shared with College of Alameda, it's imperative that Vista College needs its own A.O.
- It is more important than ever for AOs to be full time and have para-professional assistance.
- Really need personnel - primarily to meet the demand of LDTP - input of course outlines
- Articulation officer assigned as Transfer Center Director , plus 50% Counseling students
- Attempts to streamline transfer/articulation create more complexity & confusion (at least initially)- Not sure the student is better served.
- More space to make comments would be nice. It cuts off too quickly. I also do student academic evaluations, accept credit from other colleges, chair the technical review etc
- This year the articulation part-time clerical position was reinstated, which has helped with the continually increasing articulation workload from new programs like LDTP.
- Improved funding noted in #1 due only to receipt of Unused 2005-06 Articulation Allocation from CCCCCO, not from improved local funding on campus.
- CSU & UC campuses improve response time to artic requests and updating in ASSIST. Also, publish new academic year agreements in ASSIST before or very early in fall.
- Full time clerical assistance would be beneficial for the office. Most of my time is spent typing documents and the time could be spent on viewing catalogs and articulation.
- Faculty want the academic freedom to create courses that are CSU transferable without course-to-course, GE, or major preparation articulation.
- For a college of our size, a full-time articulation asst. is needed. Lost 75% of budget due to the loss of the CAN grant. Unsuccessful in getting the college to provide funds.
- Without the help of a student assistant, I could not do this job (while balancing my other hats).
- Need a line-item in college budget
- Need funding for articulation. The CAN/LDTP funds need to be ongoing, as this IS the budget for most articulation officers. When we don't receive the funds, we suffer.
- First year for LMC to articulate courses in LDTP.