

C-ID/TMC/ADT Handbook

Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup

Fall 2022 | Current Version 1.01 September 26, 2022



ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges
LEADERSHIP • EMPOWERMENT • VOICE



Table of Contents

Chapter 1: History and Background on C-ID.....	1
I. Overview of C-ID.....	1
II. History of C-ID.....	1
III. Who is Involved? Governance and Management of C-ID Projects	5
Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW)	6
C-ID Advisory Committee	7
Intersegmental Faculty Curriculum Workgroup (ICFW)	7
Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG)	7
Discipline Input Groups (DIGs).....	7
Articulation Officers Subgroup	8
C-ID Curriculum Director	8
Primary Reviewer (PR)	8
FDRG Lead.....	8
CSU Discipline Point Person.....	8
Course Outline of Record Evaluator (CORE)	9
Chapter 2: Course Descriptors	10
Overview.....	10
I. Course Descriptor Basics	10
What is a Course Descriptor?	10
What Does a Descriptor Do?	10
What Does a Descriptor NOT Do?	11
How is the Need for Descriptors Determined?	11
C-ID Number	12
Course Description.....	13
Limitations on Enrollment	13
Course Content	13
Course Objectives	13
Methods of Evaluation.....	13
Sample Textbooks.....	14
III. Descriptor Development	14
Initial Descriptor Development	14
Vetting and Adoption of Descriptors.....	15
Ongoing Review and Revisions of Descriptors	15
Archiving C-ID Descriptors	16
IV. Course Submission Review Processes and Standards.....	17
Local Curriculum Processes Prior to Submission	17
Submitting a Course Outline of Record for Review	19
Initial COR Review.....	20
Review Outcomes	20
Appeals on Final Determination	22
Reassessing the Final Determination of the Primary Reviewer	23
Lowering the Status of a Previously Approved Course	24
Course Resubmission.....	25
Chapter 3: Model Curricula and Associate Degrees for Transfer	26
I. Overview.....	26
Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs).....	26
Intersegmental Model Curricula (ISMC)	26
California Community College Model Curriculum (CCCCM).....	27

II. Transfer Model Curricula.....	27
What is a Transfer Model Curriculum?.....	27
What Does a TMC Do?	27
TMC Structure.....	27
Why 60 Units? Regulations and History	28
TMC Discipline Selection.....	29
TMC Development Process.....	29
Number of TMCs per FDRG	30
TMC Development Standards and Criteria	31
TMC Minimum Specifications	32
TMC Final Approval.....	33
CSU Determinations of Similar	33
CCCCO TMC Template Development and Implementation	34
TMC Processes, Standards, and Timelines for Review and Modification	34
TMC 5-year Review - Process.....	34
TMC 5-year Review: Criteria for Approval of Proposed Modifications	35
TMC Out-of-Cycle Modifications	36
TMC Version and Discontinuance Considerations and Timelines	38
Requests for Modifications from Outside an FDRG	39
III. Associate Degree for Transfer	40
Guidelines for Course Substitution in the ADT	40
How A Course Receives C-ID Designation.....	41
Receiving a C-ID Designated Course from Another College	41
ADT Course Substitution Guiding Principles.....	41
IV. Intersegmental Model Curriculum	44
V. CCC Model Curriculum	45
Chapter 4: Policies	46
Archiving Descriptors.....	46
Appeals Process	46
CORE Removal	46
Course Outline of Record (COR) Review Process	46
Course Status Definitions.....	46
Definition of Area of Emphasis	46
Descriptor Development	47
Descriptor Prerequisite/Corequisite Policy	47
Descriptor Review.....	47
ICW and C-ID Advisory Committee Responsibilities and Membership	47
ICW's Ability to Endorse/Validate Incomplete FDRG Recommendations	48
Lowering Course Status	48
Math Pre-requisite Policy	48
TMC Modification, Discontinuation, and/or Consolidation Process	48
Numbering Protocol	48
One TMC per FDRG.....	48
Policy for ICW Committee to serve as FDRG	49
Policy on TMC Discipline Selection	49
Reassessing Primary Final Determination	49
Reciprocity	49
Review and Revision Criteria and Process During 5-year Review	49
Special Request for Modification to a Finalized TMC.....	49
Textbook Date Requirements.....	49
TMC Development Policy.....	50
TMC CCCCCO Template Posting and Availability	50

Chapter 5: Resources and Appendices	50
Appendix A: Resources on C-ID	50
C-ID Glossary	50
Appendix B: Resources on Transfer Model Curricula	53
Appendix C: Legislation	53
Appendix D: Governance and Committee Charters and Responsibility Flowcharts	54
ICW Responsibilities and Membership.....	54
Appendix E: Course Reciprocity and Substitution Guidelines	54
Appendix F: C-ID Policy Archive.....	54

Chapter 1: History and Background on C-ID

I. Overview of C-ID

The Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) is a faculty-driven system developed to assign identifying designations (C-ID subject codes and numbers) to significant transfer courses, addressing the need for common course numbering in the California Community College system. The C-ID process provides a mechanism to identify comparable courses among colleges based on a common course descriptor developed by intersegmental discipline faculty. Most C-ID descriptors identify lower-division transferable courses commonly articulated between colleges in the California Community College (CCC) system and universities, including Universities of California, the California State Universities, as well as with many of California's independent colleges and universities. In addition to the intersegmental work focused on transfer, C-ID has likewise facilitated the development of descriptors for non-transferable courses in career education and basic skills or pre-transfer fields to improve the portability of courses and articulation within the community college system. After the passage of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010), C-ID's robust structure and processes were leveraged to facilitate the development of Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) which serve as templates and structure for the associated local Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT.)

II. History of C-ID

The following text comes from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges white paper on the [history of the C-ID project](#).

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 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 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, funded by the CCC Chancellor's Office, 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 by faculty. 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 associate degree for transfer (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 and professional 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. At that time, 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 SB 1440 degrees, the ASCCC passed Resolution 9.12 F10. (Citation) and the ASCSU passed resolution AS-311-13 in January of 2013 (Citation).

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.

-Excerpt from ASCCC Paper

III. Who is Involved? Governance and Management of C-ID Projects

C-ID is responsible for the development and implementation of two primary work products: course descriptors and transfer model curricula (TMCs). Course descriptors are documents that describe the content, objectives, and standards common to key general education and lower division major preparation courses that are offered at most community colleges, CSUs, and UCs in popular transfer majors. Course descriptors are developed by discipline faculty from all three segments of public higher education in California. Course descriptors are identified by a subject code and course number, like what is found in a college catalog, e.g., ENGL 100, PSYC 100, etc. Community college faculty identify local courses that they feel are comparable to these more general descriptors and submit them for peer review at C-ID to determine if the local courses meet the minimum criteria in the descriptors. When a local course is approved through the C-ID peer review process as comparable to the descriptor, colleges can use the C-ID subject code and number to identify the course in catalogs, websites, and advising sheets. Like its predecessors in CAN and LDTP, the C-ID designator does not replace the local subject code and number but can be listed alongside it in college publications to assist students as they transfer among community colleges and work toward completion of their lower division requirements for transfer to the CSU and UC systems.

The second work product of C-ID is the transfer model curriculum (TMC), a document that outlines the required and elective lower division components of a baccalaureate major. TMCs are the template upon which California community colleges create their associate degrees for transfer (ADTs). Students who earn an ADT at a community college can transfer as a junior in a similar major at a CSU and are guaranteed to complete their baccalaureate degree in no more than 120 units, the equivalent of four years of full-time (15-semester units per term) college attendance. TMCs are built on the C-ID course descriptors, listing the requirements of the degree using the C-ID subject code and course numbers. Both descriptors and TMC are covered in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

C-ID is managed by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) in close collaboration with the intersegmental governing committees and advisory groups charged with oversight for the policies, processes, and scope of C-ID. C-ID is funded through ongoing allocation in the state budget for higher education.

Oversight and governance of the various projects under the umbrella of C-ID is provided by multiple intersegmental committees representing the academic senates of the CCC, CSU, and UC systems, as well as the CCC Chancellor's Office, the CSU Chancellor's Office, and the UC Office of the President. These committees also include articulation officers from all three systems of higher education. As experts in the mechanics of transfer among the three systems, their participation in these processes is critical. These intersegmental committees ensure that the work of C-ID is coordinated among all three systems and is conducted in accordance with intersegmental curriculum workgroup (ICW).

Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW)

The Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) serves as an intersegmental body that reviews and recommends policies, criteria, and processes for developing, reviewing, revising, and deleting intersegmental curriculum including Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs). The ICW was established in 2009 to provide oversight for the implementation of SB 1440. The committee consists of representatives including CCC faculty, CSU faculty, a CCC and a CSU Articulation Officer, the C-ID Curriculum Director, the C-ID Special Projects Director, ASCCC staff, two representatives from the Chancellor's Offices of both the CCC and CSU, a member representing the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU), and a member representing Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). The committee is chaired by a CCC faculty member appointed by the ASCCC.

The ICW is responsible for developing and modifying criteria for new TMC development, providing oversight for the implementation of policies and processes for review, revision, and discontinuance of TMCs, convening of intersegmental stakeholders to implement and align TMCs and Model Curriculum to transfer pathways where appropriate, providing input on processes and policies for determinations of similar and TMC acceptance by the CSU. The ICW functions as the final approval body for Transfer Model Curricula.

C-ID Advisory Committee

This committee was established in 2007 as part of the C-ID pilot project. This intersegmental committee was created to direct the development of the pilot course numbering system and provide guidance for the transition from earlier attempts at common course numbering and supra-numbering systems, like CAN. Today, the committee consists of representatives from the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, CSU Academic Senate, ASCCC C-ID project staff, CCC Chancellor's Office, CSU Chancellor's Office, and the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC).

The purpose of the committee is to provide oversight and direction related to policies and processes for C-ID numbering, descriptor development, review, revision, and deletion. Responsibilities include the development, review, and revision of policies and processes for C-ID; developing and maintaining processes for Course Outline of Record Evaluator and Primary Reviewer training; facilitating communication with intersegmental stakeholders; and providing input on the functionality and efficiency of the C-ID website and interface. The committee is chaired by the C-ID Curriculum Director, a CCC faculty position that is recruited and appointed by the ASCCC. In fall 2021, the C-ID Advisory Committee was reorganized and is now a subcommittee of the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup.

Intersegmental Faculty Curriculum Workgroup (ICFW)

The Intersegmental Faculty Curriculum Workgroup (ICFW) is a subcommittee of ICW composed of the CCC and CSU faculty members of ICW. This subcommittee reviews and considers the recommendations of Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG) when TMCs are developed, reviewed, revised, or deleted. Specific responsibilities include affirming the outcome of FDRG review processes related to TMCs, Intersegmental Model Curricula (ISMCs), and C-ID descriptors; approving new or revised C-ID descriptors and TMCs or TMC discontinuance as recommended by FDRGs; act in lieu of an incomplete FDRG as needed and permitted by policy.

Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG)

Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG) are a key component of C-ID processes for both descriptor and TMC development and revision. FDRGs consist of faculty from each discipline participating in C-ID processes, representing all segments of higher education in California. The FDRGs are responsible for gathering input from discipline colleagues throughout the state to inform the development and ongoing maintenance of course descriptors and transfer model curricula. FDRG members are selected for their experience with curriculum development and intersegmental work.

Discipline Input Groups (DIGs)

Discipline Input Groups (DIGs) are gatherings of discipline faculty from all segments that are formed to initiate the discussion of C-ID course descriptors and transfer model curricula (TMCs). All discipline faculty in the state are invited to attend and participate at DIGs to maximize the breadth of input. The DIG for each discipline is facilitated by the C-ID Curriculum

Director, the lead discipline faculty member from the CCC, and is supported by articulation officers and C-ID staff. The ICW chair may be included when the work impacts other ASCCC or system-level efforts or goes beyond routine C-ID processes. DIGs provide foundations of the first drafts of descriptors and TMC. Some faculty who participate in DIGs go on to participate in the FDRGs.

Articulation Officers Subgroup

The Articulation Officers Subgroup provides input and advice to the ICW chair, C-ID Curriculum Director, and ASCCC staff on C-ID processes and policies, providing a critical link to the broader established articulation processes and bodies among the systems of higher education in California, including the California Intersegmental Articulation Council (CIAC).

C-ID Curriculum Director

The C-ID Curriculum Director serves as the lead of C-ID, under the direction of the ASCCC President and Executive Director, presenting at various venues, and working directly with ASCCC C-ID staff, Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) leads, and the primary reviewers for each of the C-ID disciplines. The C-ID Curriculum Director is charged with ensuring the effectiveness and sustainability of C-ID, as guided by the ASCCC Executive Committee, ICW, and the C-ID Advisory Committee. The faculty member selected for this position is required to meet minimum qualifications including substantive experience with C-ID which may include serving as an FDRG faculty lead, primary reviewer, or a course reviewer as well as substantive experience with curriculum at their local college or district.

Primary Reviewer (PR)

The Primary Reviewer is a CCC discipline faculty member selected from the FDRG to provide leadership for the course submission and evaluation process in C-ID. This faculty member assigns course submissions to COREs and consolidates final determinations for all courses submitted for C-ID articulation. The Primary Reviewer communicates the determination of comparability for each course to the submitting college.

FDRG Lead

The FDRG Lead is the discipline faculty member selected to lead and facilitate DIGs and FDRG meetings and to present finished or revised descriptors and TMCs to the C-ID Advisory Committee or the ICW. The FDRG Lead is a California community college faculty member.

CSU Discipline Point Person

The Academic Senate for CSU, working with the Executive Vice Chancellor, appoints a discipline faculty member to serve as the lead for the CSUs on each FDRG. This faculty member facilitates communication with the discipline throughout the CSU system, disseminates copies of draft or revised TMCs to CSU discipline chairs, and coordinates the work of CSU FDRG members.

Course Outline of Record Evaluator (CORE)

COREs are the discipline faculty members who evaluate CCC course outlines of record submitted for C-ID designation. COREs are appointed by the Academic Senates of each segment of higher education to serve in this role and are selected based on their experience with curriculum development and review processes.

Chapter 2: Course Descriptors

Overview

This chapter focuses on course descriptors, providing background on what a descriptor is and what they do, as well as an overview of development and review processes, submission procedures, C-ID designation and approval standards and criteria, local considerations and function, and policies and procedures related to approval and ongoing review of descriptors.

I. Course Descriptor Basics

What is a Course Descriptor?

C-ID Course Descriptors are the foundational document and work product of C-ID. Descriptors are developed by teams of intersegmental faculty to define the common minimum elements of key discipline courses. These elements include a course description, course content, lab activities, co- and pre-requisites, objectives, evaluation methods, units of credit, and typical textbooks. Descriptors do not define every possible element or scope of content that could be covered in a specific course at an individual college; rather, they describe the *minimum* elements that would be common to a given course in *any* college or university. Descriptors allow discipline faculty to establish a common understanding of the purpose and scope of key courses as defined in a written descriptor. Course descriptors are identified by a C-ID subject code and number, e.g., ARTS 110, and a course title.

What Does a Descriptor Do?

The primary purpose of C-ID descriptors is to facilitate student transfer among all segments of higher education in California by establishing a type of intersegmental course articulation that supplements existing articulation processes among colleges and universities. Traditionally, individual colleges have pursued course articulation—defined as the process of developing a formal, written agreement that identifies courses (or sequences of courses) on a ‘sending’ campus that are comparable to, or acceptable in lieu of, specific course requirements at a ‘receiving’ campus—with other colleges and universities by submitting articulation requests on a college-by-college, program-by-program, or course-by-course basis. By contrast, C-ID descriptors allow for individual receiving institutions (CSU, UC, independent colleges and universities, or other CCCs) to articulate the single course descriptor and by extension to the many community college courses that have been deemed comparable to that C-ID descriptor through the C-ID review process. C-ID articulation is intended to supplement traditional articulation, providing another means to ease the transfer process for students as they move among the segments of higher education in California.

Local colleges submit their courses outlines of record to C-ID for review by discipline faculty who review the local COR against the C-ID descriptor to determine if the local COR is comparable to the C-ID descriptor. Courses deemed “comparable” by peer reviewers can then be advertised to students or listed in the college catalog with the local course subject code and

number with the C-ID subject code and number listed alongside. A key principle in this process is that C-ID descriptors do not replace local course outlines of record or dictate how local CORs are written. The review process ensures that courses are comparable to C-ID descriptors, not identical. Descriptors are general lists of common course attributes in higher education but only represent minimum common elements. Local discipline faculty can construct curriculum that goes beyond the minimum elements on C-ID descriptors to meet the needs of their specific student population or emphases within the curriculum at local transfer institutions.

C-ID course descriptors are also used in the development of transfer model curricula (TMCs), where faculty define the primary required and elective components the transfer curriculum in terms of established or proposed descriptors. Course descriptors and TMC are frequently developed in tandem by the same groups of discipline faculty at regional DIGs and FDRGs. With the TMC built on C-ID descriptors, local colleges can develop local Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) with courses that have been deemed comparable to the C-ID descriptors. All of this allows colleges to communicate the requirements for ADTs to students using common C-ID numbering in addition to local catalog numbering.

Since 2007, C-ID has expanded the scope and function of course descriptors beyond transfer to include basic skills course sequences and levels, non-transfer-oriented career education fields, and for courses not included in transfer model curricula. The development and approval process for these descriptors is similar to those used for transfer, except that only community college faculty are involved in the development and review processes.

What Does a Descriptor NOT Do?

C-ID Descriptors are not the basis for establishing common curriculum in the California Community College system. They do not dictate the content, structure or scope of local course outlines of record at community colleges. While descriptors facilitate another type of articulation among community colleges and other segments of higher education, C-ID designation granted to a local course does not guarantee course-to-course articulation or general education applicability. While the descriptors developed through C-ID are given a C-ID subject code and number, this does not dictate where a course is housed in a local community college or the local subject code and number. Local courses are awarded a C-ID designation based on the comparability of the local COR to the C-ID descriptor, not on the local department or discipline to which the course is assigned.

How is the Need for Descriptors Determined?

The need for new descriptors is determined by the ICW upon the recommendation of the C-ID Advisory Committee and the discipline FDRG for each participating discipline, including transfer, career education, and basic skills disciplines. The policy governing the decision to develop new descriptors grants authority to the individual FDRGs to make the initial determination but does not place a cap on the number of descriptors in any given discipline. FDRGs can develop and recommend as many descriptors as needed for their discipline but are given the basic guideline that descriptors should be limited to the required components of a TMC when a specific course

is articulated by 30% or more of CSUs (for TMCs) as part of the lower division of the major or as major preparation.

Because of the dynamic nature of this work, the number of descriptors fluctuates over time. At the time of writing this handbook in 2022, C-ID includes roughly 400 course descriptors from over 81 disciplines, including transfer, career education, and basic skills fields.

II. Components of a Course Descriptor

C-ID course descriptors are composed of multiple components that identify minimum discipline standards. Descriptors are similar to California Community College course outlines of record, but are not as detailed or robust. Each descriptor is composed of the following elements:

- C-ID Number
- Course description
- Prerequisites or co-requisites
- Advisories on Recommended Preparation
- Course content, separated into lecture and lab components if needed
- Course objectives
- Methods of evaluation
- Sample textbooks, manuals, or other support materials

C-ID Number

A C-ID number is comprised of up to four components, including: a discipline abbreviation or subject code, a course number, a course title, and an optional suffix. The discipline abbreviation and course title are determined by the FDRGs with input from articulation officers and follow standard academic nomenclature. Course numbers are categorized in three levels depending on the level and function of the course:

- 50 – 99 for basic skills, pre-collegiate courses
- 100 – 199 for introductory or elementary college-level courses
- 200 – 299 for advanced courses or those with prerequisites

Suffixes are added to courses if needed to convey the following:

- L indicates that the course is a lab course
- B indicates that the course is a lecture and lab course combined
- S indicates that the course is a sequence (e.g., one semester may be numbered 125, a second semester 130, while the combination of 125 + 130 would become 135 S)
- X indicates that the course is intended for use within the CCC system (intra-segmental) and was developed by CCC faculty. Courses with the suffix X and those numbered 50 – 99 will be reviewed by a team consisting of CCC faculty only. If the course is intended

for use within the CCC system, the use of this suffix is required.

Course Description

Course descriptions are brief statements outlining the nature, scope, and level of the course. Course descriptions need to be detailed enough to allow colleges to assess alignment with local courses but general enough to allow for local variation. While included in the descriptor, the description is not part of the COREs review process.

Limitations on Enrollment

Limitations on enrollment include prerequisites, co-requisites and other requirements for prior knowledge, course completion, or experience that students must meet to enroll in the course. This can include course sequences within a discipline or out-of-discipline requirements such as a completion or eligibility for a certain level of math or English. C-ID policy requires that any proposed out-of-discipline limitation on enrollment must be required by at least half of all CSUs or UCs for comparable courses. If the limitation requires completion of a course below the level of transfer, the FDRG must provide a content review that validates the need for the prerequisite or corequisite by delineating the skills or knowledge that must be obtained by completion of the prerequisite or corequisite course. Even if a C-ID descriptor includes a limitation on enrollment, local colleges must follow their own policy that is compliant with title 5 regulations governing limitations on enrollment.

Course Content

Course content is a listing of the topics, theory, practices, and concepts typically covered in a given term. The content listed on descriptors should only include the minimum discipline content that is commonly found in that course. Local course outlines may contain more content and details about the content covered in the course. Courses that typically include a lab or activity component will list that content separately on the descriptor to indicate the minimum body of knowledge and practices essential to the course.

Course Objectives

Course objectives are statements describing what a student should be able to demonstrate or know as a result of completing a course aligned with the descriptor. Objectives typically begin with an action verb, e.g., produce, write, perform, construct, etc. followed by the skill or knowledge to be demonstrated by the student. As with all other aspects of the C-ID descriptor, course objectives should only include the minimum necessary to determine alignment among comparable courses in the discipline.

Course objectives are used in the descriptor; Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are not as title 5 requires objectives, while the ACCJC requires SLOs.

Methods of Evaluation

This section of the descriptor will list the types of evaluations typically expected in the course. This can include quizzes, tests, papers, oral exams, performance, production, critique or other

methods used to evaluate students' knowledge or abilities relative to the course content and objectives.

Sample Textbooks

All descriptors will list sample textbooks or other course material typically used by instructors for the described course. The standards for textbooks are described later in this chapter. Local colleges are not required to use the textbooks listed on the descriptor or any textbook, particularly in the case of zero-textbook-cost courses. This section will include examples of manuals or other typical instructional materials commonly used for the course.

III. Descriptor Development

The processes for descriptor development and ongoing review are recommended by the C-ID Advisory Committee and established and governed by the ICW. Discipline FDRGs determine the need for new or revised course descriptors in consultation with the C-ID Curriculum Director and input from articulation officers. The following pages outline the development and approval process after that decision has been reached.

Initial Descriptor Development

The development of C-ID course descriptors begins with convening of Discipline Input Groups (DIGs). DIGs are large, facilitated meetings open to all discipline faculty members in the CCC, CSU, and UC systems. Given the size of these meetings, C-ID frequently holds two sequential DIGs for every discipline, one held in northern California, one in southern California. Prior to convening the DIG, C-ID staff and the ASCCC identify and appoint a CCC faculty member to serve as the Faculty Lead to facilitate the dialogue and work conducted at these gatherings. Once the DIGs have completed the work of recommending descriptors and, frequently, initiating drafts of those descriptors, the work is passed along to the Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRGs). The FDRG, under the guidance of the FDRG Lead, consolidate the input and descriptor drafts from the DIGs and develop final drafts for all descriptors. This process takes into consideration the considerable range of local variations on courses in all segments of higher education and seeks to establish a descriptor that accurately captures the minimum standards expected of courses in all institutions and segments.

For intersegmental descriptors, this conversation and process frequently includes discussion and analysis of the variations in how courses are classified as lower or upper division in baccalaureate programs. In some disciplines, there are courses that are offered for lower division in some universities but are considered junior or senior level courses at others. Likewise, some community college discipline faculty have developed local curriculum that is aligned with a specific transfer institution where the lower division curriculum is significantly different from other transfer institutions. These variations are frequently regional in nature and thus can show up in draft descriptors that have been developed at multiple DIGs in specific geographic areas. The FDRG is responsible for reconciling these variations and discrepancies in writing final drafts.

Vetting and Adoption of Descriptors

Once the discipline FDRG has finalized draft descriptors they are posted on the C-ID website for public review. C-ID staff work with the academic senates of the respective segments of higher education, articulation officers, and with system-level administrators to communicate with discipline faculty throughout California that the draft descriptors are available for review and comment. All feedback on the draft descriptors is gathered through the C-ID website. This vetting process can take several weeks to a few months, depending on the volume of feedback received from faculty statewide.

When sufficient feedback has been received, C-ID staff forward all comments, questions, and suggestions to the FDRG Lead and FDRG. The FDRG convenes again to review all feedback and determine what, if any, revisions need to be made to the descriptors. The FDRG then finalizes the descriptors and sends the final versions to C-ID. The final descriptors are submitted to the C-ID Advisory Committee and then ICW for review. The FDRG Lead from the FDRG may be called to attend a meeting of the committee to summarize the statewide feedback and answer questions from the committee. Once all of these steps have been completed, C-ID staff publish the final descriptors on the C-ID website, allowing local colleges to begin the process of reviewing local course alignment to the descriptors and submitting courses for C-ID articulation.

Ongoing Review and Revisions of Descriptors

All intersegmental C-ID descriptors are scheduled for regular review and potential revisions on a five-year cycle. Discipline FDRGs are convened to begin five-year reviews in the fourth academic year after the initial approval date for a majority of discipline descriptors. All descriptor reviews are initiated in the fall semester, even in instances where a descriptor has a spring expiration date. In some instances, the review cycle for descriptors is modified to correspond to the review period for an associated Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC). C-ID staff notify the FDRG and the Faculty Lead when it is time to begin the five-year review process and send out a “call for comment” to all discipline faculty and to articulation officers. Likewise, the faculty currently serving as Course Outline of Record Evaluators (COREs) are invited to participate in the comment process. Their direct experience in reviewing local course outlines against the descriptors and recommending C-ID articulation approval provides an important perspective on what is working and what needs to be updated. The review process is conducted via SurveyMonkey and the C-ID website.

The purpose for the five-year review cycle is two-fold. First, the review cycle ensures that descriptors are current and reflect changes in the field that would impact course curriculum or expectations. Second, the review cycle provides an opportunity to fine-tune and revise elements of descriptors that have turned out to be misaligned with discipline standards or otherwise problematic for the field since the original approval. This can include course pre-requisites, minimum unit values, specificity and scope content, or other aspects of the descriptors. Prior to the five-year review process, FDRGs are re-trained on the general review process, descriptor standards, and are asked to consider the impact of any suggested revisions on local course articulation with C-ID and are advised to only make necessary changes.

FDRGs determine if any descriptor revisions are warranted based on the feedback gathered through the call for comment and draft revised descriptors as necessary. When an FDRG recommends revisions, the revised descriptor is posted for vetting on the C-ID website and then finalized by the FDRG after all feedback is considered. The FDRG is responsible for determining whether any revisions are substantial or non-substantial. Substantial revisions to descriptors require all community colleges to resubmit their local courses for continued C-ID articulation. In some cases, the FDRG will recommend that resubmitted courses can use an expedited review process conducted by the Primary Reviewer for the discipline, rather than going through a full review process with multiple peer reviewers. All revisions, whether substantial or not, are communicated to local faculty through the articulation officers and through discipline-specific ASCCC listservs.

In addition to the scheduled five-year review process, the ICW has established policies and procedures for out-of-cycle descriptor reviews as needed to address emerging issues that would negatively affect students. The process for out-of-cycle reviews begins with the FDRG Lead requesting an out-of-cycle review and revision. The FDRG Lead and C-ID staff are required to compile evidence to support the change, including queries or requests for change from the field, an explanation of why the change is needed, documentation of the FDRG's consensus around the proposed change, and an analysis of the potential impact of the change. This documentation is forwarded to the C-ID Curriculum Director who reviews the submitted documentation to ensure it is complete. The proposal and evidence are then forwarded to the C-ID Articulation Officer Subgroup for review and input. The C-ID AO Subgroup may recommend to approve, deny, or modify the request for revision and communicates that recommendation to the C-ID Curriculum Director who submits it to the ICW for consideration. The ICW makes the final determination regarding the request for out-of-cycle revisions.

Archiving C-ID Descriptors

C-ID descriptors are reviewed by each discipline every five years. Descriptors and TMCs can also be reviewed out-of-cycle. When this review process indicates that a descriptor is no longer needed, the following process will be used to review the proposal for archiving.

A proposal for archiving a C-ID descriptor will be considered by the ICW when either of the following criteria are met:

- The five-year review process, as stated in policy, concludes with a written recommendation from the FDRG for archiving a descriptor.
- An out-of-cycle descriptor review, that includes a statewide review and comment period, results in a written recommendation from the FDRG for archiving a descriptor.

The written recommendation must then be submitted to the C-ID Curriculum Director who will review the recommendation and endorse or deny the recommendation after consultation with the discipline faculty and/or the Primary Reviewer.

When a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) has met the criteria for consideration of archiving a descriptor, the C-ID Curriculum Director will take the following steps:

- Present the recommendation to the C-ID Articulation Officers Subgroup.
- Work with AO Subgroup and the discipline Primary Reviewer to analyze the impact of the change.
- Develop a written report outlining the proposal and the potential impact on existing TMCs, ADTs, and C-ID processes.
- Submit a final recommendation to ICW.

IV. Course Submission Review Processes and Standards

When the C-ID descriptor development process is completed and final descriptors are available on the C-ID website, local faculty, articulation officers, and curriculum committees begin the work of reviewing local course curriculum and determining which local courses are comparable to the C-ID descriptors. Local courses are then submitted to C-ID to begin the peer review process. Once a local course is approved for articulation with a C-ID descriptor, colleges may include the C-ID designator in their college catalog and begin to advertise its comparability to other approved courses. Locally, this also means that colleges with an approved C-ID designator must accept other college courses with the same approval. C-ID designation can be included on transcripts as well, thereby allowing colleges to determine course acceptance in lieu of the native course.

Local Curriculum Processes Prior to Submission

When local discipline faculty are notified that a new or revised descriptor has been posted on the C-ID website they can begin the work of evaluating local courses and preparing CORs for submission to C-ID as they deem appropriate or as needed to meet the requirements of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). Discipline faculty work with AOs to review local CORs against descriptors to determine if courses meet the minimum requirements of the descriptor. This process includes holistic review of local COR to determine where and how it meets the descriptor. In this context, a holistic review refers to one that determines the alignment of a COR to a C-ID descriptor that considers alignment with an element of the descriptor from any area of the local COR, not just the section where it is listed on the descriptor, e.g., a topic listed in the descriptor under the “content” section might be found in the assignments or student learning outcomes section on the COR. Articulation Officers work with faculty to ensure that the specific C-ID standards are met by the local courses. This includes a review of all the following areas for alignment, keeping in mind the underlying principle of holistic review.

1. Prerequisites and Corequisites

The outline must have the same prerequisite or corequisite as is listed on the descriptor. Course outlines may contain a prerequisite or corequisite where there is none required by the descriptor. Prerequisites or corequisites in addition to or at a higher level than

those required by a descriptor are also permitted. Descriptor advisories are strong recommendations only.

2. Course Content

The COR does not have to include the exact same number of content areas listed in the descriptor, or the exact language. However, holistically, the COR must address the content required by the descriptor. An element that is contained in one part of the descriptor may be inferred from another component of the COR. There is no expectation that any element of the COR will be consistent with the descriptor in a word-for-word manner.

3. Course Objectives/Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The COR does not have to include the exact same number of objectives listed in the descriptor, or the exact language. However, holistically, the COR must address the requirements of the descriptor objectives. Although all C-ID descriptors are written using objectives, CORs may contain objectives, SLOs, or a combination of both. For the purposes of review, the SLOs will only be utilized as a benefit and not as an area for improvement or required addition. For example, if a COR from a college contains both objectives and SLOs and does not have an objective from the descriptor in the objective area of the COR, but, the topic or theme is covered in the SLOs or elsewhere in the COR, then that topic/theme has been met as part of the holistic review. If, however, for that same COR, the topic or theme is in the COR objective area (or another area in such a way as it can be determined this requirement is met) but not covered on the SLOs, there will not be a request that it be added to the SLOs since the descriptor requirement was met elsewhere and C-ID descriptors do not contain SLO requirements.

4. Course Units

The descriptor units are the minimum units required. The course outline may contain more units, but not fewer units as indicated on the descriptor.

5. Methods of Evaluation

The methods of evaluation listed on a descriptor are examples unless otherwise indicated. Course outlines must indicate methods of evaluation that validate the course content. However, there may be methods of evaluation listed on the descriptor that are inherently necessary for the content of a particular course (e.g., essays for an English course).

6. Textbooks

Textbooks listed on a descriptor are examples unless otherwise indicated. Course outlines submitted to C-ID must include material in this area as appropriate for the discipline and course. In keeping with established articulation policies, the expectation is that at least one of the textbooks will have a publication date within seven (7) years of the course outline approval date. There may be cases in which a more recent text is

expected (e.g., a technology course), the publication date is less relevant (e.g., classic primary sources in literature, philosophy or history) or an exception exists relevant to the particulars of the discipline in question.

7. Approval Date

Local CORs must have a local board of trustee's approval date within five years of the date of submission to C-ID. Courses with an approval date that is not within the five-year standard will not be considered for approval.

Local discipline faculty and articulation officers engaged in this review process should keep in mind that descriptors are not the same as course outlines of record. Local faculty should not revise local CORs to be identical with descriptors as they are not as robust as local CORs. Descriptors should be treated as minimum conditions for course alignment. Local courses can go beyond the minimum content or objectives listed on the descriptor, may carry more units of credit, or use recent textbooks that are not identical to the suggested textbooks listed on the descriptor. C-ID is not designed to establish common curriculum among community colleges.

Once the above review and revision processes have been completed and approved through the local curriculum process, the AO submits the course outlines of record for consideration by C-ID discipline faculty reviewers.

Submitting a Course Outline of Record for Review

Local articulation officers, or their designee, are responsible for submitting course outlines of record for review through the C-ID website. C-ID has published an extensive guidance document for Articulation Officers that explains the technical aspects of the submission interface and standards for submission and review. A link to this document is included in the resources section at the end of this handbook. The following course review process and standards describe the process for the first time a course is submitted to C-ID for review. Resubmissions go through parts of this process, depending on the reason for resubmission, e.g., local COR was substantively changed, C-ID descriptor was updated, etc.

After the peer review process with multiple discipline faculty, the Primary Reviewer will consolidate the recommendations into a final decision. The Primary Reviewer can find for any one of three potential outcomes:

1. Approved
2. Conditionally approved
3. Not approved

Additionally, a fourth determination of "Not Approved COR" can be assigned to a submission when the primary reviewer determines that a COR was submitted in error that does not match the descriptor in any way. Because each COR is reviewed by more than one faculty member, it is possible that reviewers may reach different determinations and make conflicting recommendations to the primary reviewer for the discipline.

Initial COR Review

After a course is submitted to C-ID by the articulation officer, or their designee, the C-ID platform alerts the Primary Reviewer (PR) that a new course is available for review. The PR is a community college discipline faculty member who has been selected to oversee the course review process for that discipline. The PR has access to all course submissions for their discipline in the C-ID system and is responsible for assigning two Course Reviewers (COREs) to review the local courses outline of record for comparability with the C-ID descriptor. The PR assigns one CORE from the pool of community college discipline COREs and one from the pool of CSU discipline COREs. The two assigned COREs separately evaluate the comparability of community college course to the descriptor and reach one of three determinations after their initial review: approved, conditionally approved, or not approved for C-ID designation. COREs are required to provide specific feedback to support their determination for each element of the descriptor and the course as a whole.

Review Outcomes

After each local course has been reviewed by at least two discipline faculty members, the PR evaluates the recommendations and must make a final determination. There are several scenarios with distinct processes to guide the PR.

1. When the Review Process Returns a **Determination of “Approved”**: The independent recommendations of the COREs are submitted to the primary reviewer for evaluation. If both COREs reached the same determination, the PR would perform a short review of the course outline of record (COR) to ensure that all elements have been met and that the course meets all technical standards, including approval and textbook dates, and then finalize the determination in accordance with the findings of the course reviewers. If the course is deemed comparable, the PR will submit a final determination of “Approved” for the course, completing the review process in C-ID. The articulation officer from the submitting college is notified of the course approval.

2. When the Review Process Returns a **Determination of “Conditional Approval”**:

In instances where both reviewers recommend “conditional approval” of the course, the PR will conduct an evaluation of the comments from both reviewers and scan the COR to validate or dispute the findings of the COREs. The PR is then responsible for consolidating the feedback from the COREs, entering the consolidated comments in the C-ID system, and finalizing the determination. The C-ID system will notify the local Articulation Officer who can then communicate the determination with discipline faculty for consideration.

Conditional approval indicates that the local COR was substantially aligned with the descriptor but may have had a few areas where the reviewers did not find alignment. COREs and PRs are trained to provide clear, specific feedback about where and how the COR did not align with the descriptor to guide local faculty if they choose to revise the course and resubmit for full approval. When a course is

given conditional approval local colleges have 18 months to address the findings of the reviewer and resubmit a revised COR for evaluation. Resubmitted courses are assigned to the original reviewers to ensure consistency in the review process.

3. When the Review Process Returns a **Determination of “Not Approved”**:

In instances where both reviewers recommend “Not Approved” for a course, the PR will conduct an evaluation of the comments from both reviewers and scan the COR to validate or dispute the findings of the COREs. The PR is then responsible for consolidating the feedback from the COREs, entering the consolidated comments in the C-ID system, and finalizing the determination. The C-ID system will notify the local Articulation Officer who can then communicate the determination with discipline faculty.

“Not Approved” indicates that the submitted COR has significant, fundamental variations from the C-ID descriptor that cannot be addressed by simple revisions to the local course outline. COREs and PRs are trained to provide clear, specific feedback about where and how the COR did not align with the descriptor. A course that receives a designation of “not approved” may be submitted to C-ID as a new course if the COR is substantively revised to align with the descriptor.

4. When the Review Process Returns a **Split Decision between Reviewers**:

The review process is intended to ensure the integrity of the courses receiving C-ID designations by ensuring that all courses are approved by both a CCC and a CSU reviewer. The recommendations of the two reviewers will typically be accepted as final unless the PR finds specific reasons for reconsideration or there is a split determination between two reviewers.

If the determination is split between “approved” and “conditional approval”, the PR will evaluate the comments from the “conditional approval” reviewer and either validate or dispute the findings and make a final determination on approval. If the PR determines that it should be granted full approval, they will communicate this decision to the CORE who recommended conditional approval with an explanation of the rationale for the final determination.

If a course is “not approved” by one or both reviewers, C-ID policy provides that the course will not be approved. The PR will simply consolidate the responses and enter the final determination and comments into the C-ID system. However, PRs are empowered to conduct an additional, independent evaluation of the comments from the reviewer and the alignment of the COR with the descriptor if they feel that there is reason to do so. In the case where one reviewer has returned a determination of “not approved” and the PR believes that an explanation or discussion would enable the not approving reviewer to reconsider, the PR may return the course to the not approving reviewer for further evaluation and reconsideration. If the denying CORE agrees with the rationale provided by the PR,

the CORE will indicate the change in status and send it back to the PR for final determination.

If the denying CORE does not agree with the rationale for changing the determination provided by the PR and maintains their original determination of “Not Approved”, the PR has the option of referring the evaluation to the segmental designee. The “segmental designee” is a faculty member appointed by their segment to coordinate reviewers. The segmental designee is expected to address the issue with the course reviewer within two weeks. The process with the segmental designee has three possible outcomes:

- The designee may confer with the reviewer and seek to clarify the determination made. If the reviewer revises their determination, the designee will contact the PR to request re-routing of the course to the reviewer for approval.
- The designee may specify that the course should be sent to a new reviewer from that segment.
- The designee may specify that the course should be sent back to the college to address the identified issues.

After the process with the segmental designee has concluded, the PR will approve, conditionally approve, or not approve the course in the C-ID system based on the final outcome.

Appeals on Final Determination

If the articulation officer or faculty member disagrees with a “conditionally approved” or “not approved” finding on a course submission, they have a right to appeal the final determination and seek another review of the course. Articulation Officers initiate the appeal process by contacting C-ID staff and providing detailed information to dispute the final determination. The AO submitting the appeal complies an appeal package that contains:

- A copy of the C-ID evaluation form that shows the comments and recommendations of all three discipline reviewers
- A copy of the local COR
- A copy of the descriptor in question
- Rationale for the appeal.

This packet of information is then forwarded to the PR. The PR assesses the comments provided by the AO and conducts another detailed review of the COR considering the new information. This review process can result in the PR either upholding the previous final determination on the course or recommending a new determination. If the PR recommends a new determination that is inconsistent with either of the initial reviewers, the course will either be returned to the review queue for the reviewer(s) or the PR will consult with the reviewer(s) prior to making a final recommendation to change the determination. In either case, if the recommendation of

the PR overturns the determination made by either of the reviewers, the overturned determination is communicated to the review along with the reason for the decision.

Reassessing the Final Determination of the Primary Reviewer

Primary reviewers make the final determination on the status of all course submissions for their discipline in C-ID. Existing C-ID policy covers the criteria for making this determination, the standards for review, and the process by which the initial determinations of the Course Reviewers (COREs) are synthesized into the final determination by the Primary. This document is intended to provide a structured process for instances where the final determination of the Primary Reviewer is called into question at any point in the approval process, including the review of appeals.

Questioning the final determination of a primary reviewer is an extraordinary measure that will only be initiated when the following criteria have been met:

- The accuracy of the final determination has been challenged on formal appeal by the local CCC faculty, through their Articulation Officer, according to established C-ID policy.
- The appeal has completed the review process specified in policy.
- The final determination on appeal, after review by the C-ID Curriculum Director, is found to be incorrect for any of the following reasons:
 - Determination exceeded scope of C-ID descriptor elements or review process.
 - Errors of fact in review, e.g., statements that elements are missing from the COR that are clearly present, even if they are included in an area that differs from the descriptor.
 - Failure to follow other established C-ID policies, including policies on pre-requisites, textbooks, and holistic reviews.

If the C-ID Curriculum Director determines that the overruling process needs to be engaged, they will take the following steps:

- Analyze the comments on the original reviews and the final determination as recorded in the C-ID review system.
- Provide written explanation to Primary Reviewer outlining the specific concerns with the review and how it meets the criteria for initiating this process.
- Schedule meeting (in-person or phone) with Primary Reviewer and COREs.
- Attempt to find resolution through dialogue with the Primary Reviewer.

After completing these steps, if the C-ID Curriculum Director is unable to resolve the concern with the PR, the C-ID Curriculum Director will make a final determination and report the action to the ICW as an information item.

Lowering the Status of a Previously Approved Course

The C-ID review process frequently includes the submission of similar or identical course outlines of record from local colleges who use multiple subject codes for the same course or who offer honors and non-honors sections of a course. Additionally, some community college districts use district-wide course outlines of record, with each college maintaining a COR that is identical to those at all other colleges in the district. While the review process strives to have such courses reviewed together, this does not always happen and can lead to the same or similar course receiving two different final determinations. Likewise, the final determinations for other courses can be made in error, requiring re-review at a later date after a formal appeal or question from the field. This can result in the Primary Reviewer determining that the course should not have been either “approved” or “conditionally approved.”

The concern in all instances is that the same or similar courses have received differing final determinations. This policy specifies the way these instances will be handled but will not result in the status of any course being lowered beyond “conditionally approved.”

Reversing the final determination on a course is an extraordinary measure that can have a significant impact on local curriculum, Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) approval, and students’ catalog rights at a local college and will only be initiated when the following criteria have been met:

- The final determination on one of the identical or similar courses has been raised on formal appeal by the local CCC faculty, through their Articulation Officer, according to established C-ID policy.
- A primary basis for the appeal is that one course received a higher status.
- In the appeal process it is determined by the Primary Reviewer that one course was approved or conditionally approved in error.

If the primary reviewer determines that a course has previously received an approval or conditional approval in error as outlined in the criteria above, the following steps will be taken:

- The Primary Reviewer will contact the C-ID Program Manager and C-ID Curriculum Director and alert them of the contradictory determinations.
- The C-ID Curriculum Director will schedule a meeting with the Primary Reviewer to discuss the differing determinations.
- C-ID Curriculum Director and Primary Reviewer will develop a written explanation of the error.
- Written explanation will be sent to the Articulation Officer at the submitting institution for review and response.

This process will not lower a course status beyond “conditionally approved.” Colleges will have up to 18 months to make any necessary corrections.

Course Resubmission

In instances where a course has received a final determination of “conditionally approved”, colleges have the option of resubmitting the course for consideration of full approval once local faculty have made necessary modifications to ensure better alignment between the COR and the C-ID descriptor. Courses that have been conditionally approved must be resubmitted within 18 months or the course status will be downgraded from “Conditionally Approved” to “Not Approved.”

The processes for course resubmissions are outlined in the Articulation Officers guide to course submissions. Resubmissions can take one of two review paths: resubmissions that require uploading a new or revised COR will go through the full review process as described previously in this handbook or a “textbook only” review path that only requires review and action from the Primary Reviewer.

Chapter 3: Model Curricula and Associate Degrees for Transfer

I. Overview

Senate Bill 1440, passed in 2010, mandated the development of transfer degrees between CCCs and CSUs. Since the content of community college degrees is an academic and professional 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. At the time, 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) that described the required and elective lower division courses students must complete before transferring to a CSU undergraduate major. Since the effort required intersegmental cooperation, leadership for the Academic Senates of the CCC and CSU agreed that the established infrastructure of C-ID would be the best implementation vehicle as the technology and faculty expertise were already in place.

As the work on Transfer Model Curricula progressed, the committees responsible for SB 1440 and C-ID implementation determined that other types of statewide model curricula were needed to address gaps in transfer models and the specific needs in career education fields in the community colleges. As a result, the processes and structures used to develop TMCs were broadened to include these additional types of model curricula. To date, this structure has been used to create the following types of model curricula:

Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs)

A TMC is a template developed by intersegmental faculty for the required and elective major components of an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) as defined in Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010). A TMC includes a minimum of 18 lower division semester units of required and elective courses that students must complete to fulfill major preparation and transfer requirements. TMC-aligned degrees developed by local community colleges must be designed such that a student can complete the ADT in no more than 60 semester units. The required courses in a TMC are typically identified by C-ID designations. TMCs are developed for most common majors among students transferring from community colleges to the CSU system.

Intersegmental Model Curricula (ISMC)

Developed for transfer majors or areas of study that do not fit into the parameters required for TMCs but where a common description of lower division requirements benefiting transferring students. This includes high unit majors such as Engineering, where the distribution of units between upper and lower division requirements do not align with the standards developed for TMCs. Intersegmental discipline faculty may agree to provide statewide benefits upon transfer to students who have completed an ISMC-aligned community college degree.

California Community College Model Curriculum (CCCCMC)

Developed for certificates and or degrees in the California Community Colleges by CCC faculty but may have some intersegmental participation where appropriate. There is no expectation that MCs are designed or intended for transfer. The CCCMCs are typically developed for career education and professional licensure programs in the CCCs.

This section of the handbook covers the definitions, standards, and processes for all types of Model Curricula associated with C-ID and provides an overview of how these model curricula are translated into degrees at community colleges.

II. Transfer Model Curricula

What is a Transfer Model Curriculum?

A Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) describes the major component of a CCC associate degree for transfer. TMCs consists of a minimum of 18 semester units of coursework that prepares a student for transfer into a CSU major (or majors) and consists of courses that comprise the major component of a CCC degree. While some courses in a TMC may also be double-counted for lower division general education requirements, TMCs only include the required and elective lower division components of the major. General education requirements are defined when the TMC is translated into an Associate Degree for Transfer at a community college.

What Does a TMC Do?

The primary function of the Transfer Model Curriculum is to establish a statewide consensus among intersegmental discipline faculty on the lower division requirements of a baccalaureate major, allowing community college faculty to develop local Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) that align with the TMC. TMCs establish the minimum required courses, but frequently allow for variations in the specific courses that can be included in the ADTs at community colleges. Not every campus in the CCC system will offer every possible course in a TMC so local faculty are able to craft a degree that corresponds to the scope and depth of the local curriculum. Each community college develops and approves their own ADTs—either an Associate in Arts for Transfer or an Associate in Science for Transfer—but are required to submit them to the CCC Chancellor’s Office for review and approval to ensure that they meet the requirements of the TMC.

TMC Structure

TMCs define the major requirements of an associate degree among specific course categories, beginning with a defined “core” composed of courses that are required for all students in the major. Core courses are considered universal requirements by discipline faculty for that major. Core courses can be a sequence of linked courses or independent courses that collectively prepare students for further study in the major. The core on TMCs does not allow for selection among groups of courses.

TMCs define additional course options beyond the core, typically grouping courses together into discrete “lists” that include several courses from which students can choose to complete a specific number of units. TMCs designate these groupings of courses as “Lists”, e.g., List A, List B, etc. It is expected that these lists be of decreasing specificity. For example, the core might consist of three 3-unit courses. List A might be a list of three to five 3-unit courses with an indication that the degree would consist of one course from List A. List B might be a longer list of 3-unit courses that includes List A and also “any course articulated at a CSU as major preparation in the discipline” with an indication that the degree would consist of one course from List B.

The final List C might again be a “select one” list and consist of courses from List A, List B, and any CSU-transferable course in the discipline. Such a structure is intended to ensure that each CCC can develop a degree that will serve their local CSU well and introduces flexibility within the TMC that will facilitate degree portability, as is encouraged by the legislation. The number of core courses and “lists” varies widely among TMCs as deemed appropriate by each discipline.

Why 60 Units? Regulations and History

California education code and regulations require that students earn a minimum of 60 semester units of credit to receive an associate degree. This 60-unit requirement includes at least 18 units of courses in a defined major or area of emphasis, general education courses, and any elective units of credit needed to reach the minimum unit total. Associate degrees must require at least 60 units but may, and frequently do, require more. The state regulation mandating a minimum of 60 units is consistent with federal requirements and standard practices in higher education for the associate degree.

Since the inception of the credit hour system in the late 1800s, baccalaureate degrees have typically required successful completion of at least 120 semester units of credit. However, some disciplines have traditionally required more than 120 units for specialized baccalaureate majors, including the Bachelor of Fine Arts, some Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Music degrees. SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010), the legislation behind TMCs and the Associate Degrees for Transfer, followed the traditional 60-unit associate and 120-unit baccalaureate thresholds but set these minimum requirements as the maximum allowable units for each component of the ADT. As a result of SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010), California Education Code stipulates that a CCC student is eligible for an Associate Degree for Transfer at 60 units (with at least 18 units in a defined major or area of emphasis, plus completion of general education) and that the receiving CSU must then award a bachelor’s degree at 120 units that is similar to the student’s community college TMC aligned ADT, as determined by the California State University Campus to which the student is admitted. Given the limit of 120 units for the baccalaureate degree, the ASCCC and ASCSU agreed early on that the community colleges would strictly limit the ADT to 60 semester units, allowing the CSU programs a full 60 units for the upper division components of the degree.

TMC Discipline Selection

When Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla, 2010) was passed, the academic senates of the California Community Colleges (CCCs) and the California State University (CSU) came together to select disciplines for the development of Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) that are now the basis for Associate Degrees for Transfer. Several factors were considered as disciplines were prioritized, most prominently the number of students transferring from CCCs into a given major at the CSU. Other factors were given priority because much of the work needed to develop a TMC had been completed during projects that focused on the identification of major preparation coursework, such as Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) and Lower-Division Transfer Project (LDTP). In addition, some disciplines were brought into this effort due to their role in supporting a wide variety of majors (such as mathematics), the recognition that they serve a critical role in supporting disciplines identified as being in high demand (e.g., elements of science technology engineering and math or “STEM” majors), and their status within the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID). In addition, some disciplines were selected due to their status as career technical education (CTE) majors, though this emphasis came later in the project. The STEM TMCs included Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics, and Physics. CTE disciplines for which TMCs were created include Administration of Justice and Agriculture (3 TMCs).

As work progressed and efforts proceeded well-beyond the first 20 majors, analyses were done to determine whether TMC development made sense for any major that served at least 200 transfer students based on the available data. For TMC development to make sense, the major had to be available at a minimum of four CSUs and there had to be some element of consistency in the lower division preparation for the major across the CSU campuses. In some instances, disparate programs of study were identified as being a single transfer major for TMC development. The results of this analysis led to the identification of at least 20 more majors where students would benefit from the development of a TMC, resulting in the current total of 40 TMCs.

TMC Development Process

The development of a TMC begins with either a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) or a Discipline Input Group (DIG) meeting. An FDRG is a small group of discipline faculty appointed by their respective senates, typically three CCC and three CSU faculty. A DIG is a meeting where all interested faculty in the selected discipline are asked to participate in the discussion. When possible, DIGs are convened in the north and the south within a few weeks of one another. DIGs meet to review, revise, and develop C-ID descriptors. After identifying the course descriptors to be developed and, ideally, developing draft descriptors, the DIG members discuss a possible TMC. Absent a DIG meeting, the FDRG may also be charged with developing a TMC by the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup.

Any TMC that was developed by an FDRG is posted for vetting. Any TMC that was developed in a DIG is reviewed by the FDRG – reconciling any differences – and then it is posted for vetting. At the conclusion of the vetting period, the FDRG convenes to review comments, modify the

TMC as necessary, and finalize the TMC. The final product of the FDRG will consist of the following:

- TMC (the list of required courses with C-ID descriptor designations or, if a C-ID descriptor will not be developed and a course is specified, a description of the course obtained from a CCC catalog and a clarification of what articulation for that course is required).
- Report of who responded to the TMC (prepared by C-ID staff).
- Responses to comments, as deemed appropriate by the FDRG. The FDRG's response to the feedback received is critical and provides a mechanism for the FDRG to explain the choices made in the TMC development and, if appropriate, to offer guidance with respect to degree development.

When the FDRG's work on a TMC has been completed, a subcommittee of the ICW, the ICFW is convened to review the work of the FDRG and to determine whether all processes have been followed. The subcommittee consists of 3 faculty from the CCC and 3 faculty from the CSU that are members of the ICW. Typically, the FDRG Lead will attend the meeting to address questions about the finalized TMC. If it is determined that all processes were followed and all TMC criteria are met, the finalized TMC is formally accepted and the TMC development process is deemed completed.

Once a TMC is finalized, it is sent to the CCCCCO for the development of a template to be used by colleges submitting TMC-aligned degrees. In addition, the CSU Chancellor's Office forwards the finalized TMC to CSU campuses for determination and coding of "similar" majors. The timeline and standards for the CCCCCO Templates are discussed later in this chapter.

Number of TMCs per FDRG

Since the inception of the TMC development process the goal has been to achieve appropriate compromises during TMC development to ensure the widest applicability of a given TMC. When an FDRG is convened, unless otherwise specified, it is tasked with developing a single TMC.

In an existing policy titled "[Number of Transfer Model Curricula Per Discipline](#)", it is stated that

Disciplines that were desirous of more than one TMC due to an interest in specifying one or two unique courses were instructed to create just one TMC. In rare instances, the ICW may approve the development of more than one TMC in a single discipline or related disciplines.

The ICW may permit and FDRG to create an additional TMC or TMCs, or may convene a new FDRG for TMC development purposes, in the event that a case can effectively be made for substantially divergent options within a given discipline or group of related disciplines.

The criteria to be considered when approving the development of an additional TMC or TMCs in a discipline, or for determining whether or not to accept a new TMC in a major or related majors are:

- Are the required courses a significant departure from the required courses in all

- other TMCs? Most commonly, a significant departure would require a difference of at least two courses (minimum of 6 units) in the required core.
- Is the proposed TMC likely to create one or more new pathways into a highly
- enrolled (high transfer volume) major and more pathways into additional CSUs?
- Does the proposed TMC substantially increase the number of students served by
- SB 1440?

The Transfer Alignment Project Workgroup (TAP WG) has two overarching goals

- 1) Align Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) with University of California Transfer Pathways (UCTP), where feasible, i.e. only non-substantive changes to the TMCs would be needed.
- 2) For those TMCs that need more changes, convene discipline faculty from all three systems, every attempt is made to align the pathways with two possible outcomes:
 - a) Pathways aligned with substantive changes to TMC and/or UCTP (currently, only TMCs have been considered for changes).
 - b) If the pathways cannot be aligned, then clear documentation on the rationale and benefits of separate pathways to students and public is communicated broadly.

Through the work of the TAP WG, a desire to explore more than one TMC per discipline emerged, as a way to address the varying pathways that students may consider taking within a given discipline. In particular, there are instances where it may make sense for specific pathways be called out for transfer to a CSU or UC (e.g. Psychology, Business Administration, and mathematics), so that students are aware from the beginning which Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), which is created using the TMC, they are taking and which system will accept them. Other ways in which having more than one TMC would be beneficial to students would also be considered.

TMC Development Standards and Criteria

TMC-aligned degrees consist of courses that are appropriate for an AA or AS in a major and would be sufficient preparation for transfer into a given major or group of majors at the CSU. Faculty convened for the purpose of developing TMCs apply the following standards and criteria to determine the components of each TMC.

Discipline faculty:

- Identify, ideally, a minimum of 6 units of “core” courses for the TMC. The “core” of the TMC must be consistent across all colleges that develop degrees aligned with the TMC.
- Specify the additional components of the TMC (a minimum of 18 semester units, total, in the major are required).
- Are sensitive to local limitations and provide options for colleges that allow for flexibility, where possible.

- Make efforts to minimize student unit accumulation by providing an opportunity to “double-count” courses for the major and other requirements (i.e., general education and, where appropriate, CSU graduation requirements such as American history and institutions). Where such possibilities exist, double counting should be noted (please see the sample at the end of this document).
- Include titles and C-ID designations to identify courses in the TMC. In those instances where no C-ID descriptor will be developed, sample course descriptions must be submitted when the FDRG chooses to identify specific courses. When specific courses are identified the general education or major preparation articulation that will be required must be explicitly indicated. Actual course descriptions of articulated courses from community college catalogs should be used.

TMC Minimum Specifications

All TMCs must meet the following minimum specifications:

- The TMC must describe a major that is a minimum of 18 semester units. The TMC may consist of more than 18 units but must be designed to be a minimum of 18.
- A TMC must be designed such that a TMC-aligned degree can be completed within 60 units. Without double-counting, a student would typically accumulate at least 57 units when working towards a degree with a major of 18 units (39 units for CSU GE breadth + 18 units in the major). If there are opportunities for double counting, the units in the TMC may exceed 21.
- There is a specified “core” of at least 6 semester units consisting of required courses or selection from a list of courses with restricted options.
- The 120 CSU unit limit must be considered. California Education Code (CEC) §66748 states that “The California State University may require a student transferring pursuant to this article to take additional courses at the California State University so long as the student is not required to take any more than 60 additional semester units or 90 quarter units at the California State University for majors requiring 120 semester units or 180 quarter units.” Faculty developing a TMC, and responding to the TMC during the vetting process, should consider whether TMC-aligned degrees will prepare students sufficiently for the completion of the major at the CSU within an additional 60 semester units.
- All courses in a TMC must be CSU transferable. (CEC § 66746)
- Only one course (3-4 units) may be permitted in either of the categories below:
 - Unarticulated OR
 - Left unspecified as a general list that does not specify articulation as preparation for the major, such as “any course in the discipline” or “any CSU GE area D course”
- Double-counting opportunities should be considered and indicated.

TMC Final Approval

Following the development of a draft TMC by a DIG, the FDRG is convened to reconcile any differences before the TMC is posted on the C-ID website for statewide vetting. Vetting is typically conducted for a period of at least one month and during periods when faculty are available (September – May). FDRGs are responsible for preparing the TMC for vetting, reviewing, and responding to the feedback obtained during the vetting process, and preparing the final TMC recommendation for review by a faculty subcommittee of the SB 1440 Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW). The ICW is charged with making curricular determinations with respect to the implementation of SB 1440. A faculty sub-group of the ICW will make the final determination as to the status of the TMC based on the criteria specified in this document. This subgroup is comprised of six faculty, three appointed by the CSU academic senate and three appointed by the CCC academic senate.

In preparing a TMC for review by the ICW, the FDRG will review and respond to the “TMC Criteria Checklist” and provide the following with the recommendation for acceptance:

- The TMC with C-ID designations or sample catalog descriptions of all specified courses.
- A list of the proposed CSU major or majors for which the TMC is designed as preparation for.
- An overview of the vetting process. Every effort should be made to reach discipline faculty in the CCC and CSU. The FDRG lead will write a narrative explaining the efforts made. The ASCCC office will prepare a summary of the responses.
- A narrative responding to concerns raised in the vetting process. It should be evident that identified issues were considered and handled in a manner deemed appropriate by the FDRG.
- If the recommended TMC is a significant departure from the TMC as vetted, an explanation as to the efforts made to vet the revised version should be provided.
- The FDRG should identify whether the degree will be an AA-T or an AS-T. An AS-T designation should be selected for majors in the sciences, mathematics and CTE fields. An AA-T designation is for all other majors.

CSU Determinations of Similar

The TMC is used by discipline faculty in the CSU system to determine which major or majors are “similar” to the TMC, a process that involves comparing the lower division requirements of the specific CSU majors to the courses and structure of the TMC. Faculty then determine if a student completing a degree aligned with that TMC would be prepared to enter their program as a junior and be able to graduate after completing 60 units. When they declare a major to be “similar” to the TMC, students completing an approved ADT based on that TMC can apply for transfer with junior standing into that major, along with the other benefits conferred on students transferring with an ADT.

CCCCO TMC Template Development and Implementation

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community College system (CCCCO) is responsible for review and approval of all local transfer degrees developed to align with transfer model curricula. After the ICW has given final approval for a new or revised TMC, the CCC Chancellor's Office works with C-ID staff, the AO Subgroup, and discipline faculty to develop a TMC Template that local colleges use to develop aligned Associate Degrees for Transfer, either an Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) or an Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T). While these templates are based on the TMC approved by the ICW they contain additional information that colleges need to know for final approval by the Chancellor's Office, including the types of documentation required for the inclusion of courses in an ADT and other standards required by regulations for associate degrees in the California Community College system.

CCCCO templates are published twice a year: September 1 and February 1. This publication date is critical for colleges as subsequent legislation, including SB 440 (Padilla, 2013) requires colleges to create and implement Associate Degrees for Transfer within 18 months of the publication of completed TMCs. The publication date of the CCCCCO template starts the clock for local compliance with this provision of California Education Code.

TMC Processes, Standards, and Timelines for Review and Modification

All Transfer Model Curricula are periodically reviewed to ensure that the structure and content of TMCs reflect current requirements within the discipline and provide appropriate transfer preparation for students. The following section outlines the types of reviews; standards, criteria, and processes for revision; and other considerations around TMC revisions.

TMC 5-year Review - Process

All Transfer Model Curricula are reviewed on a staggered five-year cycle. The Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) normally begins to review a TMC in the fourth academic year after its initial approval date. Due to the need to review the content of the TMC and assess the impact of any changes made to it, the TMC review is conducted over a two-year period. Typically, the review of the TMC and its associated descriptors are initiated in the same cycle. During the fall term, the C-ID staff will alert the FDRG lead and FDRG members of the need to initiate the review. In addition, a "call for comment" message and survey will be sent out via all appropriate discipline listservs and the CIAC listserv that is used by articulation officers. C-ID and CSU will collaborate on development and distribution of surveys and on collection and dissemination of survey results. The review cycle will be reinitiated every fourth year after the completion of the previous review cycle. After the initial review period, the C-ID system will indicate when a TMC was last reviewed and when it is scheduled to be reviewed again.

The five-year review process may conclude with no request to modify the original TMC. If the FDRG determines that a TMC must be modified, then notification of the intent to revise will be communicated to C-ID staff before the end of the review cycle. The FDRG considers all information gathered via the "call for comment" process and any relevant data about adoption of the TMC at community colleges and awarding of TMC-aligned ADTs. The FDRG will present a draft of the proposed changes to the TMC and descriptors before the C-ID AO Subgroup, to gain

additional CCC and CSU system-wide feedback, particularly concerning articulation and impact of changes to the TMC or descriptors on colleges or students. If the changes are substantial, the revised TMC is re-vetted and finalized by the end of spring of the fifth year.

When an FDRG determines that a TMC should be modified, they will review and include in their recommendation whether the revision will:

- Require existing degrees to be revised
- Impact determinations of similar

If the revision affects either, then the FDRG must provide a rationale for the change and the resulting impact. The impact on determinations of similar will be determined prior to the review of the rationale. A member of the AO subgroup may prepare a report of lower-division prep courses for the FDRG to help assess impacts on determinations of similar. In addition, CSU faculty and AOs are highly encouraged to raise these concerns during the vetting process. The rationale will be reviewed and accepted or denied by the faculty subgroup of the ICW. If the rationale for modification is accepted by the ICFW and existing degrees will need revision, CCCs will have one year from the determination to make the required degree modification. If the rationale is accepted by the ICFW and the change will affect determinations of similar will, a plan will be developed to determine how students will be impacted and the revised TMC will need to be resubmitted to the CSU for determinations of “similar” and will necessitate recertification of all currently approved transfer degrees.

TMC 5-year Review: Criteria for Approval of Proposed Modifications

The processes for the development and approval of a Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) are intended to ensure that the developed TMC effectively delineates the major component of an associate degree that rightfully stands on its own as a discipline major at the associate degree level and appropriately prepares students for transfer to the California State University (CSU). Discipline faculty from the CSU and the California Community Colleges (CCC) work together to design TMCs that are then used at the CCC to create Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). They are used at the CSU to evaluate whether they fit the criterion that a student can graduate in 60 units at the CSU.

The Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup (ICW) recognizes that any change to a TMC could significantly affect the ADTs already approved at the 115 CCCs and the designations of similar by the 23 campuses of the CSU. Depending on the changes sought, even apparently non-substantive changes to a TMC, such as adding additional courses to a TMC, might lead to changes in ADTs, and could affect the designation of similar by the CSU campuses. Substantive changes to a TMC, such as changing required courses, would almost certainly necessitate that each CCC with an ADT revise their degree and that each CSU re-examine their designation of similar. Yet, the ICW also recognizes that education is a dynamic enterprise, that knowledge evolves, and that the needs of students come before the need to preserve current transfer requirements. The ICW has developed the following criteria to guide deliberations on whether to accept a proposal to modify an existing TMC. These criteria apply for five-year reviews and out-of-cycle reviews.

The ICFW may decide to accept a proposal to modify a TMC if CCC and/or CSU faculty present compelling arguments calling for revision to the TMC. Data supporting a compelling argument may include but is not limited to:

- Percentage of ADTs developed at CCCs that could potentially have the degree.
- Percentage of CSUs with the major who have indicated that the TMC is “similar” to their major.
- Percentage of “options” that CSUs with the major have indicated are “similar” and/or not similar.
- Number of students transferring from all CCCs to the CSU in the discipline.

Discipline faculty can also argue that qualitative developments in the discipline, and/or demands by accreditation agencies, or recognize that the original TMC may have missed something and therefore changes to the TMC are warranted. In considering requests to revise approved TMCs, the ICFW may also take into consideration the following data:

- The number of students who completed the ADT.
- The number of units student with the ADT complete at CCCs prior to transfer.
- The number of units students complete in earning their degree after transferring to a CSU institution.
- The number of students transferring in the major without the ADT. e.g., Number of students graduating in the major with a bachelor’s degree after earning the ADT.

The “percentage” and “number” for the above criteria are deliberately NOT specified as there may be multiple explanations. Instead, such data might be used to make compelling arguments for change or for not approving a request to revise a TMC.

TMC Out-of-Cycle Modifications

All TMCs are reviewed on a 5-year cycle. Once finalized, a TMC and its associated C-ID descriptors can generally not be changed in a substantive manner until its 5-year review date. While every effort is made to ensure that a finalized TMC and its associated C-ID descriptors are clear, consistent, and free of errors and concerns, the ICW recognizes that there may be times when a TMC requires a modification or clarification outside of the regular cycle of review. It is critical that the impact of all modifications be considered prior to making any changes.

If a Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) believes a non-substantive and non-disruptive change is needed to an existing TMC, the following process is followed to ensure that the change proposed is truly non-substantive and non-disruptive. If an FDRG believes a substantive out-of-cycle revision to the TMC is necessary due to some significant change in the discipline that diminishes the usefulness of the TMC, then the following process will be used. No TMC may be modified more than three times within the 5-year timeframe.

Step 1 – Initiation of Request

The request for the change must be initiated through the FDRG. The FDRG lead and/or C-ID staff will compile evidence in support of the change including queries or requests for change from the field, an explanation of why the change is needed, and documentation of the FDRG's consensus around the proposed change. An analysis of the potential impact of the change should also be provided.

Step 2 – C-ID Review of Request

Once the request is documented and supporting evidence is compiled, the documentation will be forward to the C-ID Curriculum Director for review. Upon a determination that the documentation is complete and no further information is required, the documentation will be forwarded to the C-ID AO Subgroup.

Step 3 – Articulation Review of Request

The C-ID AO Subgroup will review the request and provide a recommendation for action such that they approve, deny, or modify the request. Their recommendation will be communicated to the C-ID Curriculum Director. If the C-ID AO Subgroup recommends that the request be approved, it will be forwarded to the ICW for consideration. If the request is denied or modified, the recommendation will be communicated to the FDRG. If the FDRG concurs with a proposed modification, the revised request will be forwarded to the ICW for consideration. Denied requests may only be reconsidered if indicated concerns are addressed and the process reinitiated.

Step 4 – ICW Review of Request

ICW's consideration of the request may happen via email, phone, or in-person meeting. Efforts will be made to ensure that the ICW consideration of the finalized request is conducted within two weeks of the request. In most instances, the ICW's role will be to ensure that appropriate consultation has been conducted and that the change is clearly both "non-substantive" and "non-disruptive". If the proposed change is critical due to some significant change in the discipline that diminishes the usefulness of the TMC and is substantive, the ICW's role will be to determine whether the change is critical, and the proposed change appropriately justified.

A "substantive change" is defined as a change that would require the CSUs to revisit their determinations of similar and/or render existing TMC-aligned degrees no longer TMC- aligned. Typical potentially non-substantive changes would be the addition of a course option in a list that is relatively open, the addition of a C-ID reference, or the removal of an option that no CCC has chosen. If the proposed change is substantive, the TMC will be subject to re-vetting.

Step 5 – Approval and Criteria for Review of Request

Criteria to be considered:

- Criticality
- Disruptive impact

Upon ICW approval of a non-substantive and non-disruptive change, the change will be made. Denied requests may only be reconsidered if indicated concerns are addressed and the process reinitiated. ICW will consider the proposed change for final acceptance of a substantive change following the vetting process using the existing process for such determinations.

Step 6 – Communication of Decision

The change will be communicated, at a minimum, via the discipline list-serv, the CIAC list-serv, and the Curriculum Chair list-serv. The CCC and CSU Chancellor's Office will also be informed via E-Mail. The potential impact of the change on the field will also be communicated.

TMC Version and Discontinuance Considerations and Timelines

A proposal to modify or discontinue a TMC can come from either five-year cycle or an out-of-cycle review. Modification or discontinuance of a TMC will be considered as part of the TMC review processes outlined above. Substantive modifications to a TMC arising from the review process—including discontinuation—require local colleges to revise or discontinue their TMC-aligned ADTs. The process of moving from an old to a new version or completing a discontinued TMC can create complexities for students pursuing an ADT in the transition period.

Modifications resulting in new TMC versions can also create complexity for the California Community College and the California State University systems and the Chancellor's Offices of both systems as phase-in and phase-out timelines between versions must be agreed to among the segments, guidance documents and memos must be updated, and versions of CCCCCO ADT templates must be developed, published, and tracked. Accordingly, modifications will only be implemented when there is an impactful change in the discipline or when the changes will be beneficial to students.

To facilitate orderly transition between TMC versions or during the discontinuance process, all proposals for TMC modifications and discontinuance approved by ICW will include a proposed timeline for implementation and "teaching out" the local ADTs based on the discontinued or revised TMC. ICW will make a final determination on the proposed timeline for discontinuance or modification based on the information provided by the FDRG and discussion among intersegmental partners, keeping in mind student catalog rights and requirements for program discontinuation in state regulations and accreditation standards.

While CCCs have their own internal processes for discontinuing a degree option, the CSUs have the right - and ability - to cease the acceptance of a given TMC as similar. While the CCCs may have a desire to keep degrees aligned to the original TMC available as long as possible, the CSUs are under no obligation to continue to honor those degrees as similar. Because of the complexity of implementing modifications, the internal processes of both systems will be honored to ensure that students are not disadvantaged in the transition. These processes include:

- CCC established processes for ensuring catalog rights are honored determines the timeline for changes at the CCCs.

- Existing CSU timelines and processes regarding determinations of similar may impact student options with respect to transfer destinations.
- Both the CCC and CSU Chancellor's Offices may also play a role in determining the timelines for changes as the systems must coordinate and share data to ensure the transfer pipeline operates smoothly.

The timeline for the discontinuance and version migration process is published by the CCCCCO and is included in the appendices to this handbook.

Requests for Modifications from Outside an FDRG

At the present time, the decision to modify a TMC can only be made by the FDRG and is initiated only when there is ample justification. Likewise, the decision to discontinue a TMC can only be made by the FDRG associated with that TMC. There is currently no formal policy for an external entity to call for the modification of a TMC and, by extension, the discontinuation of a TMC. However, the ICW recognizes that this situation might arise and has approved the following standards and criteria for considering such a request.

If an entity other than the FDRG wishes to request a TMC change or discontinuation. ICW would review the provided information and, if the proposal warrants discussion, then forward the request to the FDRG. ICW will ensure that all proposals forwarded to the FDRG have merit and are consistent with established criteria for making a substantive change to a TMC (per the policy already outlined).

Required Data

- Names and affiliations of individuals submitting the request. CCC and CSU faculty are required.
- Impact of the TMC as it currently stands, including:
 - Determinations of similar
 - ADTs awarded
 - Transfer volume
 - # Of colleges with the ADT
 - Students served (transfer volume)
- Potential impact of any changes
 - Impact on existing ADTs
 - Impact on determinations of similar
 - Students served (transfer volume for CSU major destinations)
- Reasons for change

If the request is deemed to have merit, the FDRG's status will be reviewed and actions taken to ensure the FDRG is complete (i.e., members appointed). The FDRG will then engage in a review

of the request – considering all the data and making a recommendation. ICW can accept, deny, or modify the recommendation made by the FDRG.

III. Associate Degree for Transfer

The Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) was developed in response to SB 1440 (Padilla, 2010) which mandated the development of transfer degrees between CCCs and CSUs. ADTs, like most associate degrees in the California Community College system, are developed by each local college, approved by local governing boards, and then submitted for review and approval by the CCC Chancellor's Office. ADTs are based on the transfer model curricula (TMCs) approved by ICW.

Under California Education Code and subsequent policy guidance, colleges are required to develop an ADT for any discipline where they currently offer an AA or AS degree. ADTs can either be an Associate in Arts for Transfer (AA-T) or an Associate in Science for Transfer (AS-T) depending on the discipline. The AA-T and AS-T development and approval process, standards, and criteria are established and described in the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) published by the CCCCCO and developed in partnership with the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) through the California Community Colleges Curriculum Committee (5C). The PCAH serves as expanded regulatory guidance for community colleges on all requirements for curriculum development and approval.

Once approved, ADTs are published in the catalog for each community college. Students who pursue and earn either an AA-T or AS-T are provided with specific benefits for transfer to the CSU system. Because these degrees are developed and confer benefits intersegmentally, ADTs have specific standards of scholarship that are different from other associate degrees in the CCC system. This includes strict unit completion and GPA requirements in the major or area of emphasis and requirements to complete specific transfer general education patterns, including CSU-GE Breadth, IGETC, or IGETC for STEM. These standards of scholarship ensure that students completing an ADT meet the CSUs minimum eligibility requirements for transfer. Students successfully completing an ADT are guaranteed priority admission to a CSU campus in a program that was deemed similar to the TMC upon which the ADT was based. Students who enter are guaranteed to earn their bachelor's degree after completing an additional 60 units and meeting all graduation requirements at the CSU.

Guidelines for Course Substitution in the ADT

The challenges surrounding Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) course substitutions have become very complicated with the number of ADT degrees now available and an ever-increasing number of transfer students desiring an ADT degree. Even with course descriptors developed as part of the Course Identification Numbering System project (C-ID) in place for the ADTs, there are still many ADT course substitution challenges associated with C-ID-approved courses. These challenges only increase when the substitution of community college non-C-ID approved courses or comparable courses not from community colleges are proposed for an ADT course substitution. Therein lies the ADT course substitution challenges being faced by

articulation officers, transfer center directors, counselors, faculty and, especially transcript evaluators.

To assist the field to make these determinations, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) produced the document “Reciprocity, Course Substitution, and Credit by Exam—in light of AA-T and AS-T degrees” in 2013 to assist colleges with ADT course substitutions. The Reciprocity Document has been the guide that colleges have used for ADT course substitutions for the past several years, but some in the field still struggle with applying the broad statements made in the document to the variety of situations that arise at local campuses and have requested more guidance.

The full history of C-ID is included in an earlier section of this handbook. Likewise, the development and approval process for C-ID course descriptors is explained in detail in Section 2 of this handbook. This background information is a critical framework for guidance on approving course substitutions in the awarding of local ADTs. However, some information in this section repeats earlier sections to ensure clarity.

How A Course Receives C-ID Designation

Local college discipline faculty interested in or required to submit their courses for a C-ID designation work with their college’s articulation officer to determine if the course is equivalent to the C-ID descriptor. If it is determined that the course does align with the C-ID descriptor, the articulation officer submits the course outline of record (COR) to the C-ID review process for a determination. If the C-ID review results in a conditional approval or denial, recommendations are provided for modification(s) to make the course approvable. Faculty make the appropriate modification(s) and submit the revised COR to their college’s curriculum committee. When the curriculum committee approves the modifications, the articulation officer submits the revised COR to the C-ID for additional review.

Receiving a C-ID Designated Course from Another College

If a receiving college has the same course C-ID designation as a course coming from the sending college, the receiving college must automatically accept it as equivalent to the local course. The automatic acceptance is required not only for the application of the course within the context of the ADT, but for every local application of the comparable course.

ADT Course Substitution Guiding Principles

The two basic criteria to consider when deciding on Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) course substitutions are legislative and regulatory directives, and ASCCC guidance documents. In addition, there have been several statewide discussions regarding specific applications of the directives and guidance documents. The most common topics and any resulting guidelines or clarification have been included in this section; however, the basic principle advocated by the ASCCC 2013 “Reciprocity, Course Substitution, and Credit by Exam—in light of AA-T and AS-T degrees” continues to be the foundation for these guiding principles and practices: **the ASCCC urges colleges to allow all reasonable course substitutions that are consistent with the parameters of the TMCs.**

1. Legislative and Regulatory Directives for Course Substitutions in ADTs

The primary criteria for determining course substitution are the legislative and regulatory directives. In addition, California Education Code, section 66746, states, “Community colleges are encouraged to facilitate the acceptance of credits earned at other community colleges toward the associate degree for transfer pursuant to this section.”

Given this framework, the following criteria supported by legislation should guide college personnel as they make ADT course substitution decisions:

- Accept courses included in another community college’s approved ADT
- Accept courses from another community college’s ADT if the colleges share the same C-ID number and/or listed in the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC)
- Accept courses to satisfy your ADT requirements even if they are not listed in another community college’s ADT if the course fits the intent of the TMC, and the discipline faculty should make the decision regarding substitutions

2. Academic Senate for California Community Colleges Criteria for Course Substitutions in ADTs

Additional criteria to consider in approving course substitutions is guidance provided by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). The September 2013 “ADT Reciprocity, Course Substitution, and Credit by Exam” statement provides the foundation for the following six guidelines:

- Substitute/accept courses that are part of another college’s ADT where deemed reasonable
- Honor C-ID articulation between California community colleges
- Where C-ID descriptors are not in place and/or where the substitution does not involve deeming two courses comparable, the discipline faculty should make the decision regarding substitutions
- Ensure substitutions are consistent within the TMC parameters (some TMCs allow more flexibility in course substitutions than others)
- Allow substitutions based on external examinations for credit (e.g., AP, IB, CLEP) and apply those substitutions toward GE requirements and major requirements using statewide documents and local policies for such determinations (e.g., CCC GE AP Policy, CSU memo ASA-2017-13 and IGETC Standards)
- Utilize existing local credit by exam policies

If the above options are not applicable, employ local policies and practices for course substitutions

Regarding the use of external credit, the ASCCC has passed numerous resolutions endorsing the use of external credit and has even created statewide templates to recommend the use of external credit in manners consistent with policies regarding CSU GE and IGETC (see ASCCC

Resolutions 9.01 S10, 9.05 F10, 9.06 S07, 9.03 S05, 4.02 S08, 4.03 S08, 4.04 S08, 4.01 S09, 9.04 F10, 9.01 S11). The reasoning in these resolutions applies to AA-T and AS-T degrees as fully as it does to all other degrees and include other methods of earning external credit, such as credit for prior learning (e.g., military service). Recent legislation such as AB 1985 (Williams, 2016) also provides additional requirements for accepting AP scores when applied to general education credit that may be relevant to course substitution conversations.

3. Other Guidelines/Considerations

While the legislative directives and ASCCC documents provide broad guidance for making course substitution decisions for ADTs, statewide discussions have delved deeper into the application of the guiding principles for other degrees as well. These discussions have included:

a. Minimum Grade Requirement for Associate Degree Graduation Requirements in English and Math and Courses in the Major: California Community Colleges must award a grade of C or better (“P” or “CR” acceptable if College defines as “C” or better) for the Associate Degree graduation requirements in English, Math and/or toward major courses per Title 5 § 55063 (d). Some colleges have determined that California Community Colleges cannot apply (“Pass Along”) an incoming C- grade from another accredited institution toward satisfaction of the Associate Degree graduation requirements in English, and Math or toward major courses based on the Title 5 § 55063 (d). Other colleges have been allowing C- course from another accredited institution for the English and Math graduation requirements if the course “would reasonably be expected to meet or exceed the standards of section 55002(a)”. There was language in the recent Title 5 revision of section 55063 that addressed this issue, but it was taken out. So, as it stands now, C- grades from another accredited institution are not directly addressed in Title 5. For now, it will have to be left to local interpretation. However, the C- minus grade could be applied toward satisfaction of other graduation requirements wherever a grade of D is permissible.

b. CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC: The guidelines established by CSU and UC also apply to verifying completion of CSU GE-Breadth and IGETC requirements for ADTs. However, there is an inconsistency between CSU GE-Breadth and Title 5 guidelines when accepting a C- grade for “Freshman Composition” to meet a requirement for the associate degree. CSU GE-Breadth certification guidelines allow a C- to meet the Area A2 requirement, but Title 5 § 55063 states that the “Freshman Composition” graduation requirement must be completed with a satisfactory grade. Because the CSU **will** accept a grade of C- to satisfy a Golden Four class, including math and English, a student with a C- in those courses could receive CSU GE certification; however, that student could not earn an associate degree prior to transfer (unless the course was subsequently completed with a C or better) because awarding the associate degree is the purview of the CCC, not of the CSU. Please note that a grade of C- still may not be used to satisfy IGETC.

c. Internal Substitutions: When a course at a college has not been included in an ADT at that college, it may still be possible for it to meet an ADT requirement. This substitution

should be done carefully, based on the guiding principles indicated in this document. Allowable course substitutions could include:

- A course approved for a C-ID descriptor that is listed in the TMC, and A course without a C-ID descriptor and not required in the TMC that fits the intent of the TMC.

If a course is frequently used as an internal substitution, the college should revise the ADT to add the course and submit a program non-substantial change proposal to the Chancellor's Office for approval.

d. Quarter Units and C-ID Descriptors: C-ID descriptors establish minimum unit requirements in semester units. However, 4-quarter-unit courses are common. While 4 quarter units translates to 2.66 semester units, a 4-quarter-unit course may be substituted for a 3-unit C-ID-approved course as indicated by the following guidance given to C-ID reviewers:

- For the purposes of reviewing courses, you may use the standard application of one additional unit for the quarter than the semester, rather than a strictly mathematical unit conversion.

e. Referencing Existing Articulation on ASSIST: When uncertain if a course should be substituted, existing articulation may further inform the decision. A substitution should be considered when the following conditions apply:

- A course substitution should be considered if a course was articulated to a CSU identified "similar" major before the C-ID process was in place. A course substitution should be considered if the course is articulated to a CSU identified "similar" degree at the CSU campus.

The California State University maintains a website to assist articulation officers and faculty to identify TMCs that are similar to existing CSU degrees.

f. Upper Division Courses: It is a local Community college's decision to permit the substitution of upper division courses for lower division requirements for the ADT. Guidelines outlined above should be used to determine allowable course substitutions.

IV. Intersegmental Model Curriculum

Intersegmental Model Curriculum (ISMC) are developed for transfer majors or areas of study that do not fit into the parameters required for TMCs but where a common description of lower division requirements benefits transferring students. This includes high unit majors such as Engineering, where the distribution of units between upper and lower division requirements do not align with the standards developed for TMCs. Intersegmental discipline faculty may agree to provide statewide benefits upon transfer to students who have completed an ISMC-aligned community college degree. Degrees that are aligned with ISMCs are not part of the ADT

program mandated by SB 1440/440 and do not confer the same benefits to students. As such, community colleges are not required to develop ISMC-aligned degrees except as it benefits students in their programs.

The development process and standards for approval for ISMCs mirror the process for TMCs, including review and approval by the Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup. Discipline faculty from the community colleges, CSU, and UC come together at a Discipline Input Group (DIG) meeting to discuss the courses students need to take to be prepared for transfer. Input from the DIG meeting is reviewed by the Faculty Discipline Review Group (FDRG) to determine what the ISMC should look like. As with the FDRGs used to develop TMCs, each FDRG will consist of three community college and three CSU faculty. Once the FDRG has completed the ISMC, it is sent out to discipline faculty for feedback. Following the feedback process, the finalized ISMC is brought to the Intersegmental Curriculum Faculty Workgroup (ICFW). Finalized ISMCs are posted to the C-ID website (c-id.net).

At present, ISMCs have been developed for Engineering, Nursing, and Information Technology. ISMCs are subject to the same 5-year review and out-of-cycle review processes previously described for TMCs.

V. CCC Model Curriculum

California Community College Model Curricula (CCCMC) are statewide model curricula developed for internal use within the CCC system. These model curricula are developed in Career Technical Education (CTE) areas where the Associate Degree or a professional certificate is the appropriate preparation for employment in a career field. Because they are internal to the CCC system, the process for development and approval are a bit different from the TMC and ISMC processes.

Like the process for TMCs, CCCMCs development begins with Discipline Input Groups (DIGs) that are gathered for regional meetings to work on identifying core competencies and program learning outcomes for the discipline. Faculty in the DIGs then draft C-ID course descriptors and related CCCMCs. Faculty Discipline Review Groups (FDRG) complete the work of the DIGs and consolidate descriptor drafts and finalize Model Curricula. Faculty are selected to serve on the FDRG based on nominations from local Academic Senates. After FDRGs have finished the drafting process, the descriptors and CCCMCs are posted on the C-ID website for statewide review and feedback. The FDRG reviews the feedback and makes any necessary changes. Additional statewide review and vetting will take place if the FDRG feels that any final revisions are substantive. The final draft of the CCCMC is submitted to the C-ID Advisory Committee for review and approval.

Once the CCCMC is approved and posted, local faculty work with their articulation officer to submit relevant courses to C-ID for peer review and approval against the C-ID descriptor. Once approved for C-ID designation, faculty can begin development of local certificates or associate degrees that are aligned with the CCCMC. Courses approved for C-ID designation will articulate to any CCC that has C-ID approval for the same descriptor.

Chapter 4: Policies

The development, review, and approval processes for descriptors are governed by the policies and procedures established by the ICW and include the following policies summarized below. The full text of each policy is available on the C-ID website under the Policies and Guidelines tab.

Archiving Descriptors

This policy provides criteria and process for circumstances where an FDRG feels that a descriptor is no longer needed by the field and can be archived. The full process is included in in Chapter 2, section III.D of this handbook.

Appeals Process

This policy covers instances where local faculty or articulation officers disagree with a final determination of “Not Approved” or “Conditionally Approved” for a course. The specific process is included in this chapter of the handbook.

CORE Removal

This policy provides criteria and a process for removing a Course Outline of Record Evaluator in certain, specific circumstances in instances where a reviewer’s work or lack thereof necessitates that the CORE no longer be assigned courses to review or that they be removed from the review process all together.

Course Outline of Record (COR) Review Process

This policy covers the standard for final approval of C-ID alignment when any reviewer does not approve the submission. If the Primary Reviewer agrees with one or both reviewers that a COR is not approved, then the final determination of not-approved is rendered. The COR Review Process is intended to ensure the integrity of the courses receiving C-ID designations by ensuring that all courses are approved by both a CCC and a CSU reviewer. If a course is not approved by one or both reviewers and the Primary Reviewer (PR) believes an explanation would enable the not approving reviewer(s) to approve, the PR may provide an explanation and return the evaluation and an explanation to the not approving reviewer(s) for reconsideration. The details of the process for reconsideration are included in this chapter.

Course Status Definitions

This policy clarifies the submission status nomenclature for course outlines of record submitted to C-ID for review.

Definition of Area of Emphasis

Several TMCs have been developed for academic programs that are broader than a specific major but more specific than general education. These TMCs have been grouped under the heading “Area of Emphasis” and are designed to permit multiple local ADTs to be developed

from a single Area of Emphasis TMC. The primary example for this type of TMC is the Social Justice Studies TMC that can translate into numerous local ADTs in areas covering ethnic studies, women and gender studies, and social justice studies. SB 440 (Padilla, 2013) required the development of ADTs for CCC-defined Areas of Emphasis. This policy was developed as a result and specifically states that an area of emphasis is “...an interdisciplinary TMC that is developed to serve multiple majors at the CSU. Such a TMC may not have a clear department of origin at the CCC and would be designed to prepare the student for an array of majors at the CSU.”

Descriptor Development

This policy covers the relationship between C-ID descriptors and Transfer Model Curricula, including how each section of the TMC may or may not require the development of descriptors.

Descriptor Prerequisite/Corequisite Policy

As a matter of standard practice, some disciplines require students to demonstrate specific skills or knowledge prior to enrolling in a course. This policy provides guidance and criteria for establishing course pre or corequisites from outside of the discipline. If an FDRG wishes to establish an out-of-discipline prerequisite or corequisite for a course descriptor, justification for the requirement must include establishing that at least half of the CSUs or UCs that offer a comparable course require that prerequisite or corequisite.

If the prerequisite or corequisite course is at a level below transfer and therefore may not be justified by reference to transfer requirements, the FDRG must provide a content review that validates the need for the prerequisite or corequisite by delineating the skills or knowledge that must be obtained in the prerequisite or corequisite course and how they will be used in the target course.

In general, the implementation of a statewide requirement should reflect statewide practice. Typically, a majority of the CCCs should currently have the proposed prerequisite or a higher prerequisite in place. Furthermore, colleges will be required to follow their local policies and practices when establishing prerequisites or corequisites for courses as may be necessary to obtain a C-ID designation.

Descriptor Review

This policy governs the timelines and process for the 5-year descriptor review process, including the specific steps for review, the overall timeline for review and implementation, and out-of-cycle descriptor reviews.

ICW and C-ID Advisory Committee Responsibilities and Membership

This policy outlines the membership, structure, and responsibilities of the two intersegmental bodies guiding the C-ID, TMC, and ADT processes, policies, and standards. This information is included in the text of this handbook.

ICW's Ability to Endorse/Validate Incomplete FDRG Recommendations

Incomplete FDRGs are not able to make a final recommendation to ICW for consideration. Under specified circumstances (e.g., specified time period has passed, urgent need to act, no representatives from CCC or CSU for at least one year), the ICW can endorse/validate a recommendation from an incomplete FDRG, allowing the ICW to consider the recommendation and complete the approval process. ICW approval of this endorsement/validation requires 2/3 affirmative vote of the voting members of ICW, and majority support of the voting members of both the ASCCC and ASCSU representatives.

Lowering Course Status

This policy covers the criteria and process for lowering the C-ID status of a course that had previously received an “approved” or “conditionally approved” status as the final determination after the review process was completed. There are limited circumstances where this would be warranted but the action can have significant consequences for local colleges. The criteria and process are described in detail in this handbook.

Math Pre-requisite Policy

C-ID descriptors may list a mathematics prerequisite that indicates either a course or a level of preparation prior to enrollment in the target course. It is the intention of C-ID to allow flexibility in local wording of prerequisites so a preparation level as opposed to a course may be listed in a prerequisite field. Colleges may use their professional judgment when adjusting prerequisites on their course outlines of record (COR) that have been reviewed by C-ID. As long as the prerequisite on a modified COR is at the same level or higher, no resubmission to C-ID is necessary. Course outline of record evaluators will continue to use their professional judgment when reviewing submitted CORs (including prerequisite language) against the C-ID Descriptor.

TMC Modification, Discontinuation, and/or Consolidation Process

This policy governs the standards and processes for TMC modifications and is covered in detail in previous sections of this chapter.

Numbering Protocol

This policy outlines the standards for assigning a number to a course descriptor consistent with general practices in higher education. C-ID follows the numbering convention that designates courses below 100 as pre-collegiate, 100-level courses as introductory or elementary, and 200-level courses as intermediate or advanced. Some colleges and universities use a system that starts with 001 instead of 100 to indicate introductory courses. The standards for numbering established in this policy do not require local colleges to alter their own number system or standards.

One TMC per FDRG

Early in the development of TMCs it was determined that each faculty discipline review group (FDRG) convened for descriptor and/or TMC development would be limited to creating a single

TMC pathway. This policy covers this practice and criteria for circumstances where the ICW may permit an FDRG to deviate from the one-TMC-per-FDRG rule.

Policy for ICW Committee to serve as FDRG

This policy allows for the ICW Committee to provide final approval for a revision to a descriptor in cases where there is an incomplete FDRG or when necessary to enact time-sensitive changes if failing to act would negatively impact students.

Policy on TMC Discipline Selection

This policy outlines the process and criteria for selecting which disciplines will develop TMCs. This policy is included in the text of this handbook.

Reassessing Primary Final Determination

This policy governs the conditions and process by which the C-ID Advisory committee would take the extraordinary act of reassessing the final determination of a discipline primary reviewer on a submitted course. This includes the criteria by which the decision to overrule would be made.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity refers to the practice of colleges accepting courses transferred from other community colleges toward an Associate Degrees for Transfer when the transfer course in question was approved for the same C-ID designation as the local course on the ADT. This document outlines the expectations and standards for reciprocity among community colleges for these circumstances.

Review and Revision Criteria and Process During 5-year Review

This policy outlines the criteria and full process for the cyclical review of approved TMCs. The full text of this policy is included in this handbook.

Special Request for Modification to a Finalized TMC

This policy covers instances where an FDRG wants to request an out-of-cycle modification to a TMC that is based on emergent issues and provides a step-by-step process for considering this type of modification. The specifics of this policy are included in the text of this handbook.

Textbook Date Requirements

This policy outlines the requirements for textbooks in the C-ID approval process, including recency requirements. In keeping with established articulation policies, it is expected that at least one of the textbooks on a COR submitted to C-ID will have a publication date within seven (7) years of the course's submission. There may be cases in which a more recent text is expected (e.g., a technology course) or the publication date is less relevant (e.g., classic primary sources in literature, philosophy or history). It is helpful to include a reference to the use of such exceptional materials with the C-ID course submission.

TMC Development Policy

This policy outlines the entire process for TMC development and is included in this handbook.

TMC CCCC Template Posting and Availability

This policy provides a consistent timeline for posting CCCC TMC templates to help colleges conform to the timelines imposed by SB 440 (Padilla, 2013). It is included in the text of this handbook.

Chapter 5: Resources and Appendices

Appendix A: Resources on C-ID

C-ID Glossary

AAM: Articulation Agreement by Major. Describes the lower division preparation in a major at a California State University.

AICCU: Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. www.aiccu.org **AOE:** Area of Emphasis. Area of Emphasis is a TMC that is interdisciplinary and intended to serve a number of majors at the CSU.

ADT: Associate Degree for Transfer. The ADT is a degree that awards students with an Associate Degree from the California community college, and prepares for special benefits upon transfer to CSU.

AA/AS: Associate in Arts/Associate in Science.

AA-T/AS-T: Associate in Arts for Transfer/Associate in Science for Transfer.

ASSIST: Articulation System Stimulating Intersegmental Student Transfer.

ASCCC: Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. The ASCCC is a nonprofit organization created to promote and advance the public community college education in California.

Articulation: As defined by the 2009 CIAC handbook: “Articulation refers specifically to course articulation: the process of developing a formal, written agreement that identifies courses (or sequences of courses) on a ‘sending’ campus that are comparable to, or acceptable in lieu of, specific course requirements at a ‘receiving’ campus. The CIAC handbook can be found at <http://ciac.csusb.edu/ciac/handbook.html>

AO: Articulation Officer. The process of faculty review leading to the articulation of courses between institutions is coordinated and facilitated by the articulation officer on each campus. The campus articulation officer has a vital, professional-level role that requires an extensive academic knowledge base, highly developed communication skills, and the ability to facilitate and coordinate every aspect of the complex and detailed articulation process on the campus.

CAN: California Articulation Number System (a project that is no longer active or utilized since 2005, but has informed the work of C-ID)

CCC: California Community College.

CCCCO: California Community College Chancellor's Office.

CCCMC: California Community College Model Curriculum. Developed by a faculty discipline review group (FDRG) comprised of only CCC faculty, the CCCMC may be developed for certificates and/or degrees in the California community colleges.

CIAC: California Intersegmental Articulation Council. A professional organization of California college and university articulation personnel that meets regularly.

C-ID: Course Identification Numbering System. The supranumbering system designed to ease the transfer and articulation burden on the California community college system.

C-ID Course Descriptor: A description of a lower-division course commonly offered, developed by a team of intersegmental discipline faculty.

C-ID Designation and Identifier: The alphabetical identifier (example: ENG) and numerical identifier (example: 100) for each course descriptor (ENG 100).

CIP: Classification of Instructional Programs.

COR: "Course Outline of Record" The official course outline that is submitted by a CCC Articulation Officer to the C-ID website for review and potential assignment of C-ID designation.

CORE: Course Outline of Record Evaluator, consisting of full-time discipline faculty with curriculum experience from all higher education segments in California appointed by their segment academic senate to review courses.

COT: Chancellor's Office Template. The COT is the template used by California community colleges to design degrees aligned to the Associate Degree for Transfer.

CSU: California State University.

CSUCO: California State University Chancellor's Office.

CSU GE Breadth: According to CSU Mentor: "As part of the general education requirements for a bachelor's degree, all CSU students must meet the minimum of 48 semester units of general education breadth requirement. The general education requirement includes 39 semester units of lower-division (GE-Breadth) and at least nine units of upper-division courses, completed after transferring to the CSU."

CTE: Career Technical Education.

DIG: Discipline Input Group. A meeting of faculty from all segments formed to initiate the discussion of C-ID course descriptors and a Transfer Model Curriculum. All faculty are welcome to attend and provide feedback.

DSN: Deputy Sector Navigator. Part of the Doing What Matters Initiative, DSNs belongs to a network of Deputy Sector Navigators within the same sector that is led and coordinated by the Sector Navigator (SN). The Chancellor's Office communicates to the Deputy Sector Navigators through the Sector Navigators.

DWM: Doing What Matters. Doing What Matters for jobs and the economy is a four-pronged framework to respond to the call of our nation, state, and regions to close the skills gap. The DWM framework is working in partnership with C-ID to create descriptors and model curriculum for CTE disciplines.

FDRG: Faculty Discipline Review Group. The FDRG consists of full-time discipline faculty with curriculum experience from all higher education segments in California appointed by their segment academic senate. This group is responsible for developing C-ID course descriptors and Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) or Model Curriculum (ISMC or CCCMC).

GE: General Education - A required pattern of courses covering a breadth of subjects thought to be useful for all college students regardless of major.

GECC: CSU GE Certification Course List by Area.

ICFW: Intersegmental Curriculum Faculty Workgroup. Faculty oversight committee that accepts and finalizes proposed transfer model curriculum (TMC) for a discipline. The committee is comprised of CCC and CSU faculty members.

ICW: Intersegmental Curriculum Workgroup. The ICW is the oversight committee responsible for the implementation of the SB 1440 mandate. The committee is comprised of CCC and CSU faculty, ASCCC, CCCCCO, CSUCO, and CIAC representatives.

IGETC: Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum. A GE curriculum, comprised of specific courses at all California community colleges, whose approval placement in IGETC is published on the ASSIST website. Students who complete the IGETC pattern of coursework are exempt from additional, lower-division general education requirements at the majority of public California universities.

IMPAC: Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (a project that is no longer active or utilized, but has informed the work of C-ID)

ISMC: Intersegmental Model Curriculum. Developed by a faculty discipline review group (FDRG) comprised of CCC and CSU faculty, the ISMC may be developed for degrees in the California college system. Developed ISMCs may provide statewide benefits upon transfer to students who have completed an ISMC-aligned degree.

LDTP: CSU's Lower Division Transfer Pattern Project. C-ID has worked in collaboration with LDTP and has incorporated several LDTP descriptors into C-ID. LDTP is no longer active, but has greatly informed and assisted the work of C-ID.

MC: Model Curriculum. A model curriculum provides a framework for the development of certificates or degrees that have some level of consistency.

OSCAR: Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review. OSCAR is a repository for California Community College course outline information to streamline CSU and UC review and update cycles.

PR: Primary Reviewer. The PR serves as the lead for existing disciplines undergoing the course review process.

SB 1440: [Senate Bill 1440. Also referred to as the STAR Act.](#)

SB 440: [Senate Bill 440.](#)

SN: Sector Navigator. Part of the Doing What Matters Initiative, SNs assist the community college system – its various advisories, consortia, and network – in connecting with industry associations and major employers and tracking industry trends that have workforce development implications.

STEM: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math.

TOP Code: Taxonomy of Programs Code.

TMC: Transfer Model Curriculum. A Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) describes the major component of a CCC associate degree. Each TMC consists of a minimum of 18 semester units that is intended to describe coursework that prepares a student for transfer into a CSU major (or majors) and consists of courses that comprise the major component of a CCC degree.

UC: University of California.

UCOP: University of California Office of the President.

UC TCA: UC Transfer Course Agreement. The UC TCA are the baseline for establishing transferability of community college courses to UC. Courses approved for UC TCA count as advanced standing elective credit toward an undergraduate degree at any UC campus, and may also be submitted for campus-specific articulation for IGETC. UC Transfer Preparation Paths: This UC initiative identifies common lower division major preparation essential for transfer and outlines additional campus-specific requirements or conditions for admissions.

Appendix B: Resources on Transfer Model Curricula

[I can go to college webpage](#)

[CCCCO TMC/ADT Templates](#)

Appendix C: Legislation

[SB 1415](#) (Brulte, 2004)

[SB 1440](#) (Padilla, 2010)

[SB 440](#) (Padilla, 2013)

[AB 928 \(Berman, 2021\):](#)

[AB 1111 \(Berman, 2021\):](#)

Appendix D: Governance and Committee Charters and Responsibility
Flowcharts

ICW Responsibilities and Membership

Appendix E: Course Reciprocity and Substitution Guidelines

[Academic Senate Statements on Reciprocity, Course Substitution, and Credit by Exam – in light of AA-T and AS-T degrees.](#)

[ADT Substitution Guidelines with Scenarios](#)

[Effective Practices for Determining Course Substitution for Associate Degrees for Transfer \(ADT\)](#)

Appendix F: C-ID Policy Archive

[C-ID Appeals Process \(April 15, 2014\) FINAL](#)

[C-ID Textbook Date Requirements and the C-ID Review Cycle](#)

[C-ID COR Review Process Modification](#)

[C-ID Course Status Definitions](#)

[C-ID Descriptor Development](#)

[C-ID Descriptor Review Process](#)

[C-ID Descriptor Prerequisite/Corequisite Policy](#)

[Reciprocity – September 12 2013](#)

[C-ID Numbering Protocol \(Revised September 20, 2018\)](#)

[C-ID Archiving Descriptors](#)

[C-ID Policy- Reassessing Primary Determination Final](#)

[C-ID Policy- Lowering Course Status Final](#)

[C-ID Policy- CORE Removal Final](#)

[TMC Modification, Discontinuation, and/or Consolidation Process](#)

[ICW's Ability to Endorse/Validate Incomplete FDRG Recommendations](#)

[ICW Policy on Model Curriculum Definitions](#)

[ICW Statement on the General Education Component of Associate Degrees for Transfer](#)

[ICW Working Definition of Area of Emphasis](#)

[Number of Transfer Model Curricula Per Discipline Approved by ICW](#)

[Special Request for Modification to a Finalized TMC Adopted by ICW](#)

[TMC Development Guidelines](#)

[TMC Development Process – TMC Posting and CCCC Template Availability](#)

[TMC Development – An Overview of Discipline Selection](#)

[TMC Review and Revision Criteria and Process During 5-Year Review](#)

[ICW and C-ID Advisory Committee Responsibilities and Membership](#)