

2001-2002

# Executive Summary

As reported in last year's annual report, the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project originated in the Intersegmental Committee of Statewide Academic Senates (ICAS) of the California Community College (CCC), University of California (UC), and California State University (CSU) systems. IMPAC is a unique faculty project designed to assist the student transfer process from the community colleges to the UC and CSU systems in their chosen major. The project, as explained in the introduction that follows, is funded by a \$2.75 million grant that supports for five years the development of an infrastructure for faculty from the three higher education systems to meet regionally at regular intervals to discuss issues, concerns, and academic procedures that impinge upon the transfer process for students between the community college and the UC and CSU systems. Specifically, the grant funds faculty discipline and interdisciplinary dialogues that address prerequisite and lower division courses students must complete prior to transfer to either the CSU or UC systems.

In its second fully-funded year, the IMPAC Project faculty participation across the state continued to expand as more faculty discussed the project on their campuses and encouraged their colleagues to attend the discipline meetings. The project's Steering Committee continued to contact faculty and administrators in all three higher education segments to engage them in the on-going faculty-to-faculty dialogues and to consider ways to "institutionalize" this project within the on-going work of their departments. The effort to request department representatives from each UC, CSU and community colleges resulted in many new faculty attendees who had been so designated. Steering Committee members promoted IMPAC's efforts in more than 25 formal presentations to professional gatherings of faculty, to systemwide administrators, to student support service providers, to governing boards, and to state legislators.

This year, in an effort to ensure that as new lead discipline faculty are informed and trained about the IMPAC project, an IMPAC handbook was developed. This handbook provides lead faculty with important information about their responsibility as faculty leaders as well as how to facilitate regional and statewide meetings.

The project's work was communicated through personal contact from faculty involved in the project, by the IMPAC newsletter, and by numerous mailings. In addition, the IMPAC website is updated on a regular basis with discipline notes, lists of participants (both by segment and by discipline), annual reports, as well as contact information for current faculty discipline leaders and coordinators. This year an online participation form was created to expedite the registration process for regional and statewide meetings.

During 2001-2002, 382 (274 community colleges, 74 CSU and 34 UC) faculty attended the regional and statewide meetings (see Meeting Rosters). Their findings, in turn, have been reviewed by them and other of their discipline faculty colleagues across the state. As a result of the IMPAC discussions, both Agriculture and Earth Sciences/Geology have reached statewide consensus and will now meet only annually to review their curricular recommendations. Those recommendations will appear on the IMPAC website under a section called Final Recommendations.

#### DISCIPLINE ISSUES, TRENDS, AND CONCERNS

More than 52 issues and concerns are identified by the faculty in the 14 disciplines and are reported in this report. Across the disciplines, faculty identify such concerns as these:

- ▶ Faculty in all segments continue to share concern for standards and seek to ensure rigor.
- ▶ Faculty partnership between the four-year universities and community colleges is critical to meet the needs of Tidal Wave II.
- ▶ Faculty in community colleges cannot simply require prerequisites (either a single course or series of courses) without the validation called for by statute; this validation process needs to be better understood by members in all segments so that four-year institutions provide adequate lead time and notification when changing their own prerequisites.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPECIFIC ACTION

To address these issues and concerns, faculty in the groups made specific recommendations for further action. For example:

- ▶ Publish and disseminate more widely a document explaining what IMPAC is and is not.
- ▶ Meet with legislative aides and Round Table participants to further their understanding of IMPAC's objectives.
- ▶ Urge four-year institutions to maintain close contact with their area community colleges to alert them early in the process about proposed changes in the curriculum, including major course modifications. This communication is especially important if the proposed changes could affect articulation agreements.
- ▶ Work with Articulation Officers (both new to the project and continuing) to design an "on-site" articulation mechanism.
- ▶ Strongly urge transfer students to complete most, if not all, preparatory courses at the community college level.
- ▶ Ensure that community colleges' CAN numbered courses are articulated to four-year universities.

Recommendations brought forward from last year's report ask for:

- ▶ Greater communication with potential transfers, using websites and brochures.
- ▶ Posting of university syllabi on web as indicators of changed approaches, new textbooks, or new emphases that should be monitored and considered by community college faculty.

In addition, several of the disciplines have developed or are developing general statements and recommendations for community college faculty and counselors. These statements contain

recommendations about sequencing of courses and specific topics and elements students should encounter (see Mathematics Annual Report Appendix A).

#### CROSS-DISCIPLINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The faculty continued to recommend in this category the call for greater collaboration and joint study for resolution, and a new examination of related coursework that can be viewed as complementary but not necessarily required in the major. Again, these recommendations will become the nucleus of discussions among the disciplines in the next year.

#### INTERSEGMENTAL TRANSFER INITIATIVES

The discipline faculty made recommendations to several intersegmental organizations. Last year CAN accepted the recommendations of the IMPAC Project for 16 new CAN course descriptors and 6 revised descriptors and one core curriculum for biology. In addition, disciplines made specific recommendations about increased collaboration with the CAN and ASSIST projects.

Last year during many of the regional discussions, questions arose about the articulation process and agreements, establishment of local requirements, and the problems associated with prerequisites or case management approaches; moreover, representatives of some colleges and universities appear ready to form or revise articulation agreements but are uncertain as to how to formalize the new understandings they have reached. The Steering Committee felt it was vital to connect the discipline faculty on campuses to the articulation process. At the beginning of the year, the Steering Committee, working with the California Intersegmental Articulation Council, appointed one articulation officer to serve on each of the sixteen discipline clusters for 2001-2002. These Articulation officers were recruited and assigned to discipline discussions, resulting in at least 20 new articulation agreements between colleges and universities. As mentioned in last year's annual report, the faculty have also called for a uniform statewide articulation process (and form) to ease their review work. This effort is currently being sponsored by ASSIST, and IMPAC faculty hope to have an opportunity to review their work. The addition of the Articulation Officers will assist in this statewide articulation process.

This year, participating faculty discussed a new proposal calling for a general education (GE) transfer pattern to provide science and engineering students an alternative to the IGETC pattern. The proposal attempts to address the problems specific to science and engineering majors who follow the IGETC pattern. For example, science students who complete IGETC often transfer with severe deficits in the math and science requirements for the major. This outcome for students occurs because the minimum math and science requirements stated in IGETC were designed, and work well for, most non-science majors but are not suitable for most science majors (see Biology Annual Report Appendix C for proposal information).

This report concludes with a look toward next year's efforts and appendices that validate this year's valuable progress.