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Introduction

The following articulation information is a result of annual reporting to the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office by community college Articulation Officers. One hundred-ten colleges\(^1\) reported for year 2012-13.

Please direct any questions to Kimberly Cortijo, Transfer and Articulation Specialist, CCC Chancellor’s Office, 916-327-5192 or kcortijo@cccco.ed. This report is also available for download on the CCC Chancellor’s Office web site (www.cccco.edu), within the Student Services Division / Transfer and Articulation unit’s web page.

Continuing with a format implemented several years ago, the Articulation Addendum report is presented alongside data from previous years to allow comparison. The report provides a rolling five-year history for each response, and will continue to do so for questions that remain active. Also, unless otherwise noted, data throughout this report is by percentage to provide a consistent year-to-year comparison regardless of the number of responses. While this report is not structured to determine the underlying issues influencing the ratings, it does provide a simple evaluation of the articulation functions in the many areas required for successful articulation, from which opportunities can be further investigated and improved through successful intervention.

\(^1\) The following community colleges did not submit a 2012-13 annual report:
LA Southwest, San Mateo
At a Glance…

- 38 percent of Articulation Officers are full time, and 32 percent are half time. 32 percent of AOs are less than one-half time, which increased by 4 percent from the past year.
- 85 percent of the Articulation Officers are faculty/certificated, of which the majority are associated with the Counseling discipline.
- 38 percent of Articulation Officers are on a 10-month schedule, 35 percent on a 12-month schedule, and the remainder on an 11-month schedule. The 11-month schedule increased 6 percent this year, with the difference coming equally from the other categories.
- 60 percent of the Articulation Officers have been in their profession for 4 years or more. This is a 4 percent drop from prior year and continues to trend downward.
- 63 percent of the Articulation Officers report that they do not have any clerical support, which is two percent less than last year.
- 96 percent of the Articulation Officers serve on the Curriculum Committee, of which 72 percent have voting privileges. This is a 4 percent decrease from the past year.
- 26 percent report to the CSSO, 17 percent to the CIO. “Other” is the largest category, commonly the Dean of Counseling.
- 63 percent of colleges have a written articulation plan; this response is consistent from last year and continues to trend in a downward direction.
- 59 percent coordinate articulation goals or activities with the Transfer Center Plan. This is a 5 percent decrease from the prior year.
- CCC Articulation Officers rated the quantity of articulation as unchanged or improved across all categories, a significant improvement from last year.
- Comments provided by articulation officers clearly indicate a workload hardship brought about by Associate Degree for Transfer and C-ID participation mandates.
- Personnel and funding continues to be the top needs to address on campus to enhance the quality and quantity of articulation.
- An average of $86,779 was spent by each college to support articulation functions. In 2011-12 each college received, on average, $2,000 more. This measure is trending upward.
Section 1: Administration Responses

1. The Articulation Officer is: 
   - Full Time 
   - Part Time 
   If part time, what is the full-time equivalency (e.g. .99 or less)?

Fig 1

AO Time Allotted to Articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Half</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Articulation Officer is:

- Classified
- Administration/Management
- Faculty/Certificated (if so, list discipline)

![AO Position Type](image)

Fig 2

91% of the respondents who identified themselves as Faculty/Certificated are counseling discipline.
3. The Articulation Officer’s schedule is: 10 months/yr. 11 months/yr. 12 months/yr.
4. How many years has the Articulation Officer served in this capacity?

- Less than 1
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 4-10
- 10 plus years

**AO Years Served**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LT 1 Yr</th>
<th>1-2 Yrs</th>
<th>3-4 Yrs</th>
<th>4+ Yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How much clerical support do you have as an Articulation Officer?  
(e.g., 1.0=one full time staff; .50=half-time staff; .25=10 hours, .10=4 hours)

![FTE Support: Clerical Staff](image)

**Fig 5**
6. Does the Articulation Officer serve on the curriculum committee?  

- Yes  
- No

6a. And, if yes, is the Articulation Officer a voting member?

![Curriculum Committee Role](image)

**Fig 6**
7. The Articulation Officer reports directly to:
- Chief Instructional Officer
- Chief Student Services
- Other Director of Counseling

AO Reports To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ClO</th>
<th>CSSO</th>
<th>Other (ie: Couns Dean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 7
Section 2: Articulation Activity

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

Yes  No

![Graph showing Written Articulation Plan/Goals for different years]

Fig 8
2. Are articulation goals or activities coordinated with Transfer Center Plan?  

Yes  No

![Articulation Goals Coordinated with TC Plan](chart.png)

Fig 9
3. Which of the following best characterizes the current status of the articulation process on your campus?

- Seamless
- Well coordinated
- Adequate
- Needs some improvement
- Needs major improvement

### Current Status of Articulation Process on Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seamless</th>
<th>Well Coord</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Needs some improv.</th>
<th>Needs major improv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig 10**

**Comments when “seamless” selected:**
No comments submitted

**Comments when rating "well-coordinated" selected:**
1. The only challenge I see is that we are a three college district with a common curriculum. Challenge - faculty from all 3 colleges to agree and update curriculum sometimes.
2. Articulation Officer serves on the Curriculum Committee, chairs the General Education Committee and updates counselors on a regular basis.
3. Career/Transfer Center was closed Fall 2013. Center was open during AY 12/13
4. TMC and C-ID workload is about to drive me over the cliff!
5. The goals and activities of Articulation is coordinated with the Counseling Department Plan.
6. I am still learning the job, the ADT development has a majority of my time.
7. There is a good working relationship with Instruction. Serving on curriculum and tech review are essential to having a well-coordinated process.
8. The Articulation Officer participates in all campus meetings and initiatives regarding curriculum, transfer and articulation and works closely with faculty
9. Many students are unable to enroll in necessary courses to transfer because of course offering cutbacks.
10. While goals aren’t officially coordinated with the Transfer Plan, Transfer and Articulation units work closely together.
11. Articulation officer serves as dept. chair and does counseling as well.
12. The AO works very closely with the TCD, counselors, curriculum comm. faculty and administrators. Much articulation depends upon the willingness of our university partners.

Comments when rating "adequate" selected:
1. Time/support for articulation increased for 2013-14.
2. We have an informal "articulation plan" driven by timelines for completion of C-ID course approval and the ADT's that were certified to be in place by fall 2014.
3. The process is adequate but the time to work on articulation continued to be a challenge during 2012-13 because of the staffing situation in the Transfer Center.
4. We have been without a Transfer Center Director for some time; therefore, coordination of services is less than ideal.
5. If possible I feel I need more than 20% allocated time to work on the submission of C-ID, along with adequate time to assist Faculty with their SB 1440 degrees.
6. The Articulation Officer is still fairly new to the position and as such is still learning about the articulation process.
7. I am only 80% Articulation. My workload has increased significantly with AD-T and C-ID issues, and working with faculty. I have 2 hourly clerical helpers for about 18 hours a week.
8. Our focus continues to be on mandated statewide articulation efforts such as C-ID & creating ADTs, as well as compliance with Title 5 changes & district curricular alignment.
9. The Articulation Officer is the sole person doing the articulation activities. We also recently picked up the CTE-Articulation. There is not enough time.
10. Not enough time to make goals for Articulation when focus is on ADT degrees C-ID. Need clerical support, supplies, budget. The STEM Grant Articulation was added too without assistance.
11. Since I am serving only 10 months out of the year, there have been challenges in respect to getting the job done while I am off. <College> has to allot some additional funding.
12. If more time were dedicated to the articulation effort, more articulation would be the result. We are limited by assigned articulation time.
13. There is catch up and cleanup work that needs to be done as there has not been a full time articulation officer in place for the last 3 years.
14. We changed Curriculum Committee Chair and membership (4/6 faculty changed), and the Trans Center Dir/Artic Officer has been in this role for now 1 year. Process is improving with time.
15. Good communication with faculty and Curriculum Committee chair. Most time last year spent on curriculum review, C-ID/TMC & repeatability/families. Not much time for requesting additional articulation.
16. The AO participates in counseling registration each year which makes it difficult to fulfill all job duties efficiently; fulltime assistant would improve the articulation process.

Comments when rating "needs some improvement" selected:
1. Processes are not written down and I am still on the reactive side trying to be more organized and proactive.
2. Without clerical support, articulation will continue to need improvements.
3. We need document tracking software for Course Outlines of Record.
4. With additional C-ID knowledge and responsibilities, and the approaching ADT deadline Fall 2014, there is a great deal of work to be done and the position only funded at 20% time.
5. Need additional resources to support articulation efforts at the college level, such as supplies, clerical support, and an adequate travel budget.
6. I am currently running two programs (Articulation and Puente Project) and the ability to keep up with both is challenging.
7. We continue to have many CSU transfer GE and major electives; however, they are decreasing slightly.
8. The Articulation Officer unable to work on articulation 100% time.
9. We have implemented a Curriculum Review for each discipline. Some depts. are slow to respond. Overall, a great improvement from previous yrs.
10. Since I am not a full-time Articulation Officer, there is not enough time to devote to articulation of courses. I need more time to increase articulation with CSU & UC.
11. "Challenges mostly have to do with insufficient time to dedicate to articulation functions.
12. Faculty have become much more engaged in the C-ID process (update from last year)
13. I need clerical support to assist in articulation matters. There is not enough hours in the day to fulfill all the articulation projects.
14. With the multitude of tasks now mandated, there's definitely not enough time budgeted to get these done.
15. The Articulation Officer position needs to be full-time (1.0).

Comments when rating "needs major improvement" selected:
1. The 40% time allocated is insufficient to complete tasks; especially since the addition of C-ID. This year has proven more challenging due to CID & dozens of new courses due to changes in repeatability.
2. It is a full-time job, but I have only .5 FTE, no clerical or other support, and no budget - I pay my own way to CIAC, NCIAC, dues, transportation, etc.
3. 20% release time is definitely inadequate to take care of the volume of articulation and curriculum needs including transfer, articulation and C-ID requirements.
4. Transfer & Articulation Coordinator position needs to be separated. A consistent operating budget needs to be created, and also provide clerical support for articulation projects.
4. For your college, please rate the quantity of articulation in each of the following:

(a) Course to Course with the University of California [Excellent] [Sufficient] [Poor]
(b) Course to Course with the California State University [Excellent] [Sufficient] [Poor]
(c) Preparation for the major with the University of California [Excellent] [Sufficient] [Poor]
(d) Preparation for the major with California State University [Excellent] [Sufficient] [Poor]
(e) General Education (IGETC and/or CSU GE) [Excellent] [Sufficient] [Poor]

![Rating the Quantity of Articulation](image)

**Fig 11**

**Comments related to question #4, Segment Articulation:**

1. I have literally had to beg to have time to do C-ID; now I just do what I can. This Fall I have been given less than 1 week to work on C-ID; there is lots of outstanding work.
2. The quantity of course-to-course articulation is increasing because CSU AO's are creating articulations based on C-ID.
3. CSU course-to-course and major preparation articulation improving due to C-ID submissions. Not all CSUs participate or articulate with out of service area CCCs.
4. Need clerical support in order to have the time to focus on articulation other than C-ID or ADTs.
5. There could be a more active pursuit of articulation agreements for major preparation but due the time constraints we are just trying to maintain status quo.
6. More universities are requesting syllabi for articulation and not following ICAS recommendations.
7. We do not have updated articulation with some CSUs. One UC has not updated their articulation agreements.
8. There has been some improvement with major prep articulation, but I would like to see more. I know I need additional time to assist in the process as well.
9. All efforts/time allotted for articulation went to creation of families, C-ID and ADTs. I had no time for articulation.
10. There are two issues- (1) the need to increase the Articulation Officer to full-time; (2) the need to be able to create articulation with all UCs and CSUs.
11. 50% time for articulation duties limits time that could be spent moving A-E above from sufficient to excellent. Also, some CSU's will not articulate courses with our college.
12. C-ID should be added to the list above. C-ID articulation consumed a good portion of my time and resources, though the end result was relatively "poor".
13. We are encouraged that CSU Fresno offered to establish articulation after an 11-year hiatus! CSU & UC need to participate more with C-ID since we are urged to submit courses for our campus in order to be direct matches in case students take courses at other CCC.
14. Anything that deals with curriculum (i.e. how to use CNET) I'm assisting faculty with. Thus, sometimes I do not have time to do the above as much as I would like to.
15. Limited articulation with CSU Fresno: CSU Channel Islands does accept articulation requests. UCI does not articulate by department so articulation approval can be confusing.
16. No current major prep articulation agreements exist with some CSU's (e.g. SDSU most current is 02-03, Cal Maritime, Fresno most current is 03-04 etc.). Need course to course articulation with my closest 2 UC's.
17. The challenge with articulation with CSU's is where <my college> is not primary feeder school, for example, SDSU has not articulated with <my college> since 2007.
18. I am concerned about the push to comply with C-ID. There is conflicting, illogical information coming out from C-ID.
19. A few CSUs do not articulate statewide in any major. We have no by major articulation with CSU Stanislaus and only 2 majors with Sonoma State. Fresno just asked to do articulation with us.
20. Out of area CSUs have really old and outdated ASSIST agreements, for example, SDSU.
21. Articulation by major for new TCA courses from last year were deeply impacted due to the lack of time and increased workload from C-ID, SB1440 degrees, and new repeatability.
22. There is lots to be done in terms of articulating with the UCs, CSUs, and private. Several lower division majors need to be articulated with these schools.
23. SDSU limits its articulation to their top 50 feeder schools. These leaves a lot of college counselors having to cross reference their courses to articulation from other CCC's.
24. It has been hard to devote time to expanding individual CSU and UC articulation agreements for ASSIST and to do all of the CID and ADT work as well.
25. As mentioned above, I do not have enough time to initiate all the new major prep and course-to-course articulation requests that I should. I count on CSU/UC review and requests for CORs.
26. CSU/UC AOs control articulation updates for 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d above. CSUs are uncommitted to major prep articulation for CCCs outside their local area or top transfer schools.
27. Some of the CSU's have not updated the agreements; I am still seeing articulation from the early 2000 period.
28. SB 1440 implementation/C-ID has consumed a significant portion of my time, which leaves far less time to establish articulation agreements.
29. There are a few CSUs (like SDSU) that state they will not articulate with us because we are not in their service area.
30. Several CSU campuses are unable to review requests for course-to-course articulation and/or publish preparation for major agreements due to staffing limitations.
31. Agreements with CSU campuses slowly improving.
32. Fresno State reached out to <my college> for articulation for AY 13/14.
33. Many UC Campuses want Syllabi in addition to COR.
34. I still have a problem articulating with some of the CSUs and UCs.
35. I began full articulation with Fresno State, and a beginning step in the southern CSU's.
36. Some CSU's have a limited the number of CCC's they can articulate with due to a lack of resources as well as the current C-ID process.
37. Course to course is getting better with some CSUs as they are articulating courses approved by C-ID.
38. We are working on establishing articulation with the two CSU campuses which have not articulated with us in the past due to the fact that we are outside of their service area.
40. It would be beneficial if all the UCs did course-to-course articulation.
41. Preparation for the major with local CSU's is good, but less so for CSU's further out. In regards to course to course, not sure about that, most is major preparation.
42. Many UC/CSU's are excellent in all of the above areas while others rate poor. It would be extremely helpful for our college if UCI and UCLA provided course to course articulation.
43. Great to work with these campuses!
44. Some CSUs are rolling over their articulation agreements to the new year without updating changes for both their side and the CCC side of agreement (CSU LA, Fullerton, etc).

Comments related to question “What other hats do you wear besides Articulation Officer?”

1. Counselor.6; Tech Review; Pre-req committee member
2. I am TC coordinator, on 3 committees, see students
3. Transfer Center Director, Honors Counselor
4. Transfer Center Coord. & Career/Transfer Supervisor
5. Transfer center coordinator/ faculty/counselor
6. Counselor and Chair of the Graduation Committee
7. Counselor, Curriculum Committee voting member
8. CTE Counselor and Assessment Coordinator
9. Counselor, Div. Chair, Prof., Ath. Counselor.,
10. Webmaster, Distance Ed Dir, Assoc Faculty
11. Counselor and Counseling Department Co-Chair
12. currently reassigned to Degreeworks 50%
13. GE Co-Chair, SCIAC Region 6 Co-Chair, etc.
14. 50% Puente Project Coordinator/Counselor/Instructor
15. Counselor
16. General Counseling
17. General Counselor/Counseling Department Co-Chair
18. Counselor
19. Counselor, Evaluator, outreach, GE certification,
20. Vice President of Student Services
21. Counselor
22. TCD, VA counselor, Curriculum Chair, general counselor
23. 50% Transfer Counselor
24. Counselor, Transfer Director, and Instructor
25. .5 in institutional effectiveness/accreditation
26. Manage Office of Instructional Management
27. Co-Chair Stud. Succ. Serv. & Progs Committee
28. Distance Ed counselor; GE Committee-Co-Chair
29. SLO Coordinator
30. 0.5 General Counselor
31. Transfer Services, Transfer Center coverage (unofficial)
32. Honors Program Director
33. Transfer Center & Univ. Partnerships Coordinator
34. Counselor
35. Academic Counselor and serve on several committees
36. Counselor / Curriculum Co-Chair
37. 20% Counseling
38. Curriculum Co-Chair, GE Co-Chair, catalog editor
39. General Counselor, Instructor
40. Counselor. Curricunet management
41. Dean, Science and Technology
42. Counselor and Human Services Program Coordinator
43. Counseling faculty
44. Director, Curriculum and Scheduling
45. Curriculum Co-Chair
46. Title V HSI project coordinator
47. Trnsfr Cntr Coord, Honors/ Gen. Counselor, Senate Exec
48. Counselor
49. Counselor, EOPS
50. EOPS counselor 27%
51. Director of Counseling, Transfer Center Director
52. Catalog Ed./MIS Crse/Prog Data/DegreeWorks Scribe
53. none
54. General counselor, General Studies faculty
55. Counselor, H.S. outreach, curriculum developer
56. Counselor
57. SLO committee, Honors Advisory Board,
58. Adhoc Commts & Implementation of PSDegrAudit
59. counselor
60. Serve on multiple committees on campus.
61. MOU Cmte Chair, Curriculum Cmte member (coll/dist)
62. Assessment & Assessment Research
63. Counselor and co-department chair
64. General Counselor, Honors Counselor
65. Counselor
66. Associate Professor, Counseling
67. Curriculum tech review, GE committee Chair,
68. Variety of committee assignments
69. Chair of General Education Committee.
70. Transfer Counselor
71. Supervise the Office of Instruction
72. 20% counseling faculty
73. Academic Counselor, Transfer Center Director
74. None
75. Counselor and College Success Professor
76. Academic Serv Manager (scheduling/academic rec)
77. Part of Curriculum Committee Technical Review Team
78. Counseling, Faculty Advisor
79. University Programs Coordinator
80. Counselor, committee member on various projects
81. I am on many committees
82. Counselor
83. Academic Program Review & Catalog
84. Matriculation Technician
85. Counselor (50%)
86. Also work on college catalog.
87. Office of Instruction work - catalog, policy, etc.
88. Faculty Evaluation Coordinator
89. Honors Director; Degree Audit; SB1440 and C-ID
90. Vice Chancellor, Educational Planning and Services
91. Vice Chancellor, Educational Planning and Services
92. See comment for #3 above.
93. Counselor, Honors Project Coordinator
94. Counselor
95. Academic Serv Manager (scheduling, academic rec)
96. Counseling Department Coordinator
97. Accred Steering Comm CoChair, Senate VP
98. Honors Counselor
99. Counselor
100. Transfer Center Coordinator
101. None
102. Associate VP, Academic Affairs
103. Chair, GE Subcommittee
Section 3: Challenges

1. The following is a list of commonly reported challenges to Articulation.
   (a) Only mark the challenges that your college currently experiences, if a challenge is not applicable, do not select anything in that row.
   (b) Indicate if the challenge is new this year or the status compared to last year.

Insufficient articulation officer time

![Challenges - Insufficient AO Time](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 12
Insufficient clerical/support time

### Challenges - Insufficient Clerical/Support Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig 13]
Insufficient/inconsistent funding

Fig 14

Challenges - Insufficient/Inconsistent Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Insufficient/inefficient software

Fig 15

Challenges - Insufficient/Inconsistent Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UC unwillingness due to low transfer numbers

Challenges - UC Unwillingness Due to Low Transfers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU unwillingness due to low transfer numbers

**Challenges - CSU Unwillingness Due to Low Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 17
UC Articulation process (slow, inconsistent, inadequate)

Challenges - UC Articulation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSU Articulation process (slow, inconsistent, inadequate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 19
UC lack of Major Prep Articulation

Challenges - UC Lack of Major Prep Articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 20
Fig 21

Challenges - CSU Lack of Major Prep Articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack articulation with AICCU institutions

![Challenges - AICCU Lack of Articulation](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSIST confusing to faculty, students and staff

**ASSIST Ease of Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig 22*
ASSIST slow, inefficient or lacking in features

Challenges - ASSIST Performance/Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 23
Lack of up-to-date course outlines on your campus

Fig 24

Challenges - Outdated Course Outlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty uninformed, uninvolved, or disinterested in articulation process

**Fig 25**

### Challenges - Faculty Disengaged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 1440 (AA-T/AS-T) process inefficient, difficult.

**Challenges - SB 1440 Process Inefficient / Difficult**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig 26*

**User defined challenges:**

1. Need clear guidelines for ADT
2. C-ID slow in responding to submissions
3. Inconsistent IGETC/CSU GE evaluations & standards
4. C-ID processes, communication, approval-frustrating!
5. C-ID seen as difficult & not aligned to state GE rules
6. SB 1440 and C-ID take up too much of my time.
7. C-ID
8. C-ID-related work takes up way too much time
9. C-ID process time-consuming and slow
10. AA/AS-T development took much AO time.
11. Transfer Center needs overshadow articulation
12. Difficult C-ID submissions & TMC creation/submission
13. C-ID is creating more work w/ few tangible results
14. C-ID inefficient, difficult process
15. C-ID an inefficient, difficult process
16. Introduction of requirement for C-ID for ADT
17. Faculty unfamiliar with TMC and C-ID
18. The C-ID review process takes much too long
19. Additional work continues with C-ID and AD-T
20. SB 1440 Degrees & C-ID
21. C-ID process is very slow
22. Articulation budget non-existent
23. CCCC0 TMC template changes
24. C-ID, Repeatability/course leveling
25. Hard to find course outlines & not in one place
26. C-ID process
27. C-ID time consuming
28. C-ID approval process
29. C-ID course denials
30. C-ID approval process/deadlines
31. c-id is a problem, inconsistent, contradictory
32. C-ID
33. Funding....need it to support articulation efforts
34. Additional duties of STEM Grant Articulation
35. C-ID - slow, inefficient process
36. C-ID decisions can take much too long
37. C-ID approval is a very slow process
2. Select and rank only the top two priorities that would enhance the quality and/or increase the quantity of your articulation.

The chart below shows how each category ranked as first, each year:

![Priorities to Enhance Articulation Quality/Quantity](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Op Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

User defined challenges:

1. The replacement for the OA3 position that supports CSU/UC articulation has greatly increased efficiency this past year.
2. No Staff support makes researching and data entry for different Curricular updates a major problem. In addition, wearing multiple makes it challenging at times, but doable.
3. For Travel, I definitely think we need to have around $5,000 to cover the most important conferences (i.e. CIAC, Curriculum Institute, UC, CSU, Academic Senate Plenary, Other).
4. Work load has increased significantly due to SB 1440, C-ID, and last year's dealing with curriculum changes to address repeatability. There is a lack of time to do any other articulation.
5. Under "Operating Expenses" our campus would like to have additional funding be considered for the state mandates (i.e. SB 1440 and SB 440, C-ID, etc.).
6. I have no budget for articulation. My salary and benefits are paid from Prog.100 Counseling Dept. budget. The now defunded CCCCO Articulation grant was my only operating budget.
7. The implementation of SB1440 is taking too much time away from Faculty and Articulation Officers with few benefits for the majority of students.
8. The implementation of C-ID and SB 1440 has been chaotic. Conflicting interpretations on the listserv and from the CCCCO undermines credibility. C-ID implementation and review a disaster.
9. Since I no longer have funds earmarked for articulation, I have to continue requesting.
10. The tremendous amount of work generated to update courses for C-ID compliance has made it difficult to complete regular, necessary articulation tasks without assistance.
11. I have requested a printer/scanner but have not been approved yet. Limited access to the community printer and no clerical support.
12. Changes to the TMC and C-ID submission process required a major change of priorities for articulation. There is no operating budget to cover costs for meeting and conference attendance.
13. The data entry could be done with clerical help, and Curricunet data problems resolved by a Curriculum/Articulation assistant so that I can focus back on main Articulation duties.
14. Having more clerical help on my campus wouldn't help me if the CSUs and UCs AOs didn't also have clerical help to respond/coordinate/update increased articulation requests.
15. I have a budget for the first time since the state removed our funding.
16. When will the CCCCO issue a follow-up to the 11/30/12 memo about ADT and C-ID deadlines? Those are unrealistic deadlines, especially since the C-ID process is problematic.
17. Because of a STEM Grant, we were able to hire an adjunct counselor to assist with STEM fields and articulation/counseling.
18. Involvement in the development of ADTs has made it more difficult to invest time in developing new articulation agreements with public institutions, and especially with privates.
19. The Articulation community is great, but a second year training class would be reinforcing and helpful.
20. The college president cut my budget and there are inadequate funds for the CIAC conference.
21. As the largest CCC in the region & one of the largest in the State, full-time staff is needed, especially given the significant increase in duties with the SB 1440 implementation.
22. CurricUNET is strongly requested to be added to the Articulation/Curriculum program for efficiency, effectiveness and accessibility. The articulation unit requires dollars to operate.
23. Development of AA/AS-T degrees has consumed large portions of AO time. This is time taken away from articulation agreement development and maintenance.
24. Incorporating AICCU schools on ASSIST would help tremendously our articulation efforts with California private institutions.
25. Having SB 1440 degrees linked with C-ID has caused issues with the ability to efficiently develop AA/AS-T degrees. C-ID review process is slow and inconsistent.
26. The C-ID process needs to improve, I would like direct communication with discipline faculty when course outlines are not approved or unconditionally approved.
27. The lack of time for 2012-13, but shows significant improvement for 13-14. C-ID and ADT’s have improved the importance of the articulation function.
28. Getting some grant money would enable an increase in quality and quantity of articulation, especially if it could be used to hire some clerical support.
29. SB 1440 and C-ID take up too much of my time because of the changes and inconsistencies.
30. Lack of funds limits my travel to regional & statewide meetings/conferences where pertinent information is distributed as well as networking with colleagues.
Section 4: Articulation Expenditures

Average Dollars Spent per Object Code

![Average AO Expenditures by Object Code](Fig 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acad Sal</th>
<th>Class Sal</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Supplies</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Cap Outlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>53343</td>
<td>13238</td>
<td>17170</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>51764</td>
<td>12225</td>
<td>19168</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>49820</td>
<td>9934</td>
<td>17465</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>52750</td>
<td>11812</td>
<td>19357</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>54359</td>
<td>10928</td>
<td>20527</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Dollars Spent on Articulation

Average Articulation Office Allocation per College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>85552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>84387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>78089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>84834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>86779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 29
Total Income Breakdown by Percent

![Average Income Source by Percentage](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gen Fund</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 30