



C-ID: First Year Report July 2008

By any measure, the Course Identification Project, or **C-ID**, had a successful first year as the Advisory Committee and the project leadership tackled objectives identified in the System Office grant (and noted in this report in quotation marks).

ORGANIZATION

Advisory Committee

Within days of receiving the contract in July 2007, the C-ID project leadership had established its Advisory Committee. California's post-secondary systems are represented as follows:

- **System offices'** representatives for University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), the California Community Colleges (CCCs), and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
- **Faculty** appointed by the senates of the three public systems (including members of the UC, CSU, and CCC Academic Senate executive committees and the current faculty leader of the LDTP project)
- **Articulation officers** identified by each segment (UC, CSU, CCC and AICCU)
- A **California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC)** representative
- **Contracting Agent**, Los Rios CCCD, representatives
- Project **staff** and leadership

The Advisory Committee met five times during the 2007-2008 contract year, providing useful suggestions, reviewing draft documents and reports, and recruiting and appointing faculty who participated in the implementation phases. The advisory committee's presence and on-going participation throughout the year advanced the project's efforts to "secure the commitment of faculty representing the CCC, CSU, UC and AICCU member institutions to participate in the organizational infrastructure that supports a common course numbering system and determines its long-term sustainability." The Advisory Committee members also helped the project "maintain formal links with other intersegmental groups;" promoted the project at CIAC, Regional Articulation Officer (AO) and Transfer Center Director (TCD) meetings; and clarified the project's aims among those working with Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP; a CSU project), Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST), and UC Transfer Preparation Paths. An Advisory Committee meeting held immediately preceding the first Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) training session (February 1) enabled them to observe and critique those proceedings as well.

Selection of "Top 20" Majors Related to Transfer

To determine the "Top 20 majors related to transfer," the C-ID project relied on evidence from California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and from the UC, CSU, and the CCC system offices. Ultimately, the chosen disciplines reflected overlapping majors identified by these three systems as well as other disciplines specifically requested by the senior transfer partners. In embarking on targeted disciplines, certain principles were agreed upon:

- C-ID would not duplicate the efforts of LDTP and would not revise posted Transfer CSU Course Number descriptors (TCSU; the LDTP numbering system designator)—

unless community college faculty determined that the TCSU () descriptors did not meet needs unique to their multiple missions.

- C-ID would focus on courses already articulated in large numbers as General Education (GE), elective, or campus-specific major preparation courses as indicated in LDTP campus agreements, or as indicated in UC's Transfer Preparation Paths.
- C-ID would attempt to undertake 10 disciplines each year, including Agriculture, which had already undergone years of statewide discussions and had reached consensus on 105 course descriptors.

Protocol for the Numbering Model

At meetings in the early fall, staff presented numbering models culled from research of other states' systems. After extended discussions with articulation officers from all segments, a final model was presented to the Advisory Committee and approved. The model protocol, approved by the Advisory Committee, offers a more expansive number than did the old California Articulation Numbering (CAN) System model, fulfilling the goal to "design, develop and prepare for implementation and use by all segments an overarching common numbering system."

General Numbering Protocol:

- Courses numbered 100-299 reflected lower division, transferable courses. The lower the number, the less preparation needed for the course; the higher the number, the more likely there are to be multiple prerequisites.
- Courses would not be assigned numbers between 1-99; those numbers would be reserved for non-transferable courses to be considered at a later date.
- Courses would increase in increments of 5 or 10 (105, 110)
- Courses would begin numbering again at 100 (or a similarly low number) for each subdiscipline;
- Disciplines with TCSU numbers already assigned would skip those numbers and begin numbering other courses using higher integers
- Suffixes could be assigned to provide additional information:
 - o P indicates that the course has a prerequisite
 - o L indicates that the course is a separate lab course
 - o B indicates that the course is a lecture and lab course combined for a single grade
 - o S indicates that the course is a sequence (e.g., a first semester may be numbered 125, a second semester 130, while the combination of 125 + 130 would become 135 S)

EXAMPLE:

Uniform Discipline Abbreviation	Subdiscipline (Optional)	Course Title	Number	Suffix (Optional)
BIOL	DIVR	Botany/Plant Diversity	155	B

FDRGs

The project leadership also completed the training manual and the related training procedures to prepare the faculty leads for the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs). While awaiting CIAC's appointment of AOs to each group, the leadership also prepared matrices, articulation charts and other materials to assist the FDRGs in determining the courses to be assigned a descriptor. At year's end, the Advisory Committee approved processes for paying stipends, requiring FDRG participants to submit all work and complete a self-evaluation tool prior to payment.

FDRGs were appointed by their respective senates or, in the case of AICCU, invited by their Advisory Committee representatives; the project leadership provided segment-specific

recruitment tools, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) sheets and personalized emails to assist in filling discipline faculty slots allotted: 3 UC, 3 CSU, 3CCC (one of whom served as the FDRG lead), and faculty from AICCU-affiliated private colleges or universities. CIAC appointed one articulation officer to each FDRG.

IMPLEMENTATION

The project's goals required significant implementation of two key areas within this first year:

(1) convene 9 FDRG discussion groups and promote their creation of descriptors;

(2) create a web site that would

- house the drafted descriptors
- permit an interactive exchange of ideas among reviewers of draft descriptors during a review cycle
- house the active descriptors
- "maintain a web portal for public and internal use" for discussion and planning among project leaders and participants.

Drafting Descriptors

The first four FDRGs in Psychology, Chemistry, Physics, and Biology, met on February 1 for training and to commence drafting their descriptors. The second FDRGs, in English, History, Philosophy, Political Science and Child Development/ECE, were trained and began their work on April 11. Participating in these initial FDRGs were 46 faculty members (23 Community College, 16 CSU, 3 UC and 4 AICCU).

While community college faculty were more numerous than other segmental representatives, the Advisory Committee was cognizant of factors that might explain a lack of CSU and UC participation and committed to ensuring full-participation of all segments in the descriptor review process. It appears that among some CSU faculty, doubt remained about the utility of two separate sets of numbers—even though their purposes are very different and C-ID is endorsed by the LDTP leadership. UC ladder faculty, on the other hand, less frequently teach these lower division courses and may be less inclined to come with the critical knowledge necessary about topics and learning objectives, and current textbooks. A number of additional UC/CSU faculty were appointed but did not attend the training sessions or participate fully. Segments without full FDRG representation to work on the drafts will still have ample opportunity for review and comment during the review period, prior to any subsequent revision and activation of the descriptor. Thus, there are means in place to ensure intersegmental input even if attendance at the FDRGs is not always possible.

At the training session it was made clear to all participating faculty that C-ID welcomed the advice and counsel of our senior partners, but that this is a community college project aimed at writing descriptors for community college courses. The resulting numbers and descriptors are intended be used, on a voluntary basis, by CSU, UC, and private institutions who see value in having such a numbering system to convey the contents and expectations of their own comparable lower division courses, but would also serve to facilitate student movement within the CCCs.

Many descriptors were drafted during the training session, though all disciplines used subsequent phone conferences and email exchanges to finalize their robust descriptors and determine the suitable numbers for the template forms. Once finalized, the draft descriptors were sent to the Project Coordinator for a final technical review to ensure some formatting consistency. (An example of the template is included at the end of this report.)

Website

The Advisory Committee reviewed a beta test of the website (May 2008) and provided comments and suggestions. The website, at <http://www.c-id.net> was next showcased at the

Academic Senate's 2008 Curriculum Institute, and will be widely advertised to CIAC members in early August. Particularly, the website features:

- An "About" section that explains the project and its aims
- A "Forum" permitting review of drafted descriptors for Biology (10); Chemistry (6) Psychology (8), English (7); Child Development/ECE (9). Still under discussion over the summer are drafts of descriptors for 4 other disciplines: Physics (5); Philosophy (4), Political Science (4) and History (3). Those 16 descriptors will be posted as soon as they are ready.
- A "Descriptor" section, presently containing the 105 Agriculture descriptors
- A "Resources" section with links to other groups to further curriculum development
- A "Contacts" section providing contacts for Advisory Committee members and project leadership.

ASPIRATIONS

As the project enters the second year of this pilot project, several tasks remain:

Appoint FDRG leads and form and train FDRGs to develop, review, and revise course descriptors according to priorities established [for the remaining 10 disciplines]. At least two more sets of FDRGs will be convened in the fall and spring. Five subsequent disciplines for review in Fall 2008 have already been identified. They are:

- English (Creative Writing)
- Geology
- Psychology (Part II)
- Sociology
- Theatre/Drama

Finalize plans for cycle of subsequent discipline review and qualification. Strategies for subsequent course validation and qualification will be finalized and approved by the Advisory Committee during Fall 2008. At present, plans include using former CAN numbers as a trigger for validation of existing courses and, as necessary, for submission of new courses. The online review process includes a question inquiring whether respondents have such a course on their own campuses. This information, too, will aid the course validation process once it begins.

Devise a process for necessary revisions to new course descriptors. Drafted plans will be tested as revisions to descriptors as necessary during this pilot project. These plans will be beta-tested by the Agriculture faculty who have indicated an interest in revising some of their posted descriptors.

Develop a database of participants: The project has begun to draw upon existing databases of other projects (Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum-IMPAC, Curriculum Alignment Project [CAP], etc). The on-line course review process will also generate a database for subsequent notification and additional contact. UC and CSU representatives have also promised to secure names and current department chairs.

Increase the visibility and use of the C-ID website to review templates, participate in forum discussions among discipline participants and down-load templates for local curriculum development. The Agriculture faculty already hope to use C-ID to gain the participation of other community colleges who offer courses comparable to those contained on the website, even though those colleges may not have developed agriculture programs or majors. Community college AOs have agreed to forward notices of C-ID postings during the 2008 summer and early fall review periods. Word of mouth following the website's unveiling at the July Curriculum Institute indicates a growing awareness already.

Devise a process to qualify new or revised courses on an on-going basis in keeping with the CCC 5-6 year curriculum cycle. Focus groups of AOs suggested preliminary plans for the initial validation or qualifying process that were reviewed by the Advisory Committee; the process will be tested and implemented following faculty review of the first bank of

descriptors during summer and fall 2008. In the future, one feature of the website data base might be an automatic trigger to signal reviews necessary within a 2-6 year time period as determined by the faculty. Submissions of course outlines using ASSIST's Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review (OSCAR) System function will depend on future agreements with ASSIST. The project will continue to rely on the advice of UC Office of the President (UCOP) representatives as to when to pursue such discussions.

And finally, and most significantly:

Identify possible sources of on-going funding to continue the project at the completion of this grant. While other funding options will be explored, the general reception of this project within the community college community to this point has been very positive and increasingly enthusiastic. Such support should make it apparent to the CCC System Office that this project is valued and should continue to be funded and even expanded—ultimately to non-transferable courses as well, including remedial and career technical education courses.



SAMPLE DESCRIPTOR

Discipline: BIOL	Proposed Sub-discipline: DIVR
General Course Title: BOTANY/PLANT DIVERSITY	
Minimum Units: 4	
<p>General Course Description: This course, designed for biology majors, covers photosynthesis, algae, protists, fungi, comparative plant structure and function, homeostasis, development, evolution, phylogeny, and taxonomy of plants. Principles of population and community ecology and ecosystem interactions are emphasized.</p>	
Proposed Number: 155	Proposed Suffix: B
<p>Any rationale or comment DIVR = Diversity, B=Lecture and Laboratory combined for one grade</p>	
Required Prerequisites or Co-Requisites none	
Advisories/Recommended Preparation none	
<p>Course Content: Plant Systems Structure: Anatomy Plant Systems Function: Physiology Homeostasis Plant development Systematics and Taxonomy: Classification Phylogeny and Evolution Ecology</p> <p>Laboratory Activities: (if applicable) Lecture related laboratory activities Greater than 80% of activities to be hands-on (wet) labs</p>	
<p>Course Objectives: <i>At the conclusion of this course, the student should be able to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify major groups of plants and arrange them within currently recognized taxa 2. Describe the structural organization of major plant groups 3. Identify and describe plant structures and relate them to their functions 4. Compare and evaluate different phylogenies in terms of organization of plant groups 5. Describe how plants are organized into populations and communities, and propose how these communities would interact in larger ecosystems 	
<p>Methods of Evaluation: Objective and subjective midterm and final examinations, term papers, projects, homework problems, laboratory reports, laboratory practica</p>	
<p>Typical Textbooks, Manuals, or Other Support Materials Current (within 5 years) college level text Current (within 5 years) laboratory manual</p>	
FDRG Lead Signature: Mary Nolan-Riegle	Date: May 13, 2008
[For Office Use Only]	Internal Tracking Number