

REPORT TO THE JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY HAVING
COGNIZANCE ON MATTERS RELATING TO HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE
ENHANCEMENT
ON
SPECIAL ACT 07-7, *AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
SYSTEM TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION PROCESS*

Executive Summary

Special Act 07-7 requires the following:

(1) The Department of Higher Education, in consultation with the constituent units of the state system of higher education, shall review the status and content of public institution of higher education system transfer and articulation agreements. That review will consist of an examination of the sufficiency of the agreements, including any agreements modified or made on or after July 1, 2007, to

(a) ensure appropriate credit transfer against degree requirements within each constituent unit and

(b) to ensure appropriate credit transfer against degree requirements across the constituent units and identify any disparities between the transfer of credits from the same or similar program, from different colleges or universities of a constituent unit to a college or university of the same or of another constituent unit.

(2) A report on the status or completion of common course numbering within the Community-Technical College system

(3) A report on the plan to implement common course numbering within the Connecticut State University system

(4) A report on the establishment of placement test scores for the Community-Technical College System and the Connecticut State University System that establish specific proficiency levels for all matriculated students entering college level courses.

The results of this work shall be reported by the Commissioner of Higher Education to the Legislature not later than January 1, 2008.

Summary Report on Results

1. The Department of Higher Education reviewed transfer and articulation agreements in force within the public system of higher education in Connecticut. The Department

affirms that such agreements continue to improve the seamless movement of students from public two-year to public four-year institutions.

Transfer and articulation agreements in place include the following:

- General Education Transfer Pattern (Attachment A)
- Agreements in the College of Technology (Attachment B)
- Agreements between the Community College System and the Connecticut State University (Attachment C)
- Agreements between the Community College System and the University of Connecticut (Attachment D)

2. The process of creating a common course numbering system in the Community Colleges has been completed. Highlights of that system include the following:

- The common number system incorporates as many courses as possible. By comparing existing similar courses, and by making an effort to realign the content and catalog descriptions, faculty have reduced unnecessary differences.
- As discipline experts, faculty members must be the individuals to make the judgments as to the comparability of course content, and to develop ways to bring the bulk of the content into consonance.
- Courses that have 80% consonance of content should carry the same designator, number, title, and number of credits. How this consonance is determined is left up to each faculty discipline group. In some cases it is defined as content, in others as outcomes.
- The same three-letter designator identifies all courses in a discipline system-wide.
- All courses in the system have new designators, and in some cases new numbers and titles.

This report includes, in Attachment E, a full report on the process of completion of common course numbering within the Community College system.

3. The process of creating a *plan* for a common course numbering system in the Connecticut State University System has been completed. The timeline for implementing that plan is as follows:

Phase 1

2008-2010 Disciplinary Committees formed

- Transfer counselors review Connecticut State University equivalencies/reciprocity agreements and identify comparable lower division courses
- Disciplinary Committees review courses identified as comparable and recommend lower division courses for common numbering
- Recommendations endorsed by the following: Departments/Deans/Chairs
University Senates, Presidents/Chancellor

- Progress report presented to Legislature
- Registrars, IT personnel, faculty, and others determine numbering system and resolve the technical issues for transcript production
- Common course numbering for lower division courses implemented by Connecticut State University System

Phase 2

2011-2013 Disciplinary Committees identify comparable upper division courses

- Recommendations endorsed by the following: Departments/Deans/Chairs, University Senates, Presidents/Chancellor
- Progress report presented to Legislature
- Common course numbering for upper division courses implemented by Connecticut State University System

This report includes, in Attachment F, a report on the plan to implement common course numbering within the Connecticut State University system.

4. a. The Community College System states that it has completed the development of common placement scores across all of its institutions. The System, though, still maintains some “bands” for placement and prospective institutional score differentials across the system, particularly in mathematics. Highlights of the work are as follows:

- Faculty committees representing Mathematics and English have met and recommended common placement standards, using Accuplacer as the assessment tool. Implementation of these common standards is proposed for implementation in Fall 2008.
- Mathematics Standard
 - * Intermediate Algebra is considered to be a gateway course between developmental and “University Transfer Level”.
 - * All students will begin the Accuplacer Math test with the Elementary Algebra subtest.
 - * To place out of developmental into Intermediate Algebra, the minimum Elementary Algebra score will be in the band between 54 and 66.
 - * Placement out of Intermediate Algebra will require a score of 40 or higher on the College Level Math portion of Accuplacer. The System states, however, that this score will place students into some, but not all, courses above Intermediate Algebra in the system. Some higher level courses will require a higher placement score.
 - * An alternative method of placement out of Intermediate Algebra will be a score of 550 or higher on the Math section of the SAT.
 - * The System states, however, that this SAT score would place students into some, but not all, courses above Intermediate Algebra in the system, similar to the logic on the Accuplacer College level standard.

- * The System notes that common placement standards in mathematics may have programmatic implications, given that some curricula are geared to immediate entry to a career and others are targeted at transfer.
 - * In addition, that System notes that, given that the prerequisite structure differs between colleges, the impact of new placement standards needs to be carefully examined as to enrollment management and Faculty workload.
- English Standard
 - * Initial placement out of developmental into ENG 101, Composition, would be achieved by a student reaching a minimum score of 88 on Accuplacer Sentence Skills and a minimum score of 83 on Accuplacer English Comprehension.
 - * There would be a process for challenging the outcome of these specific Accuplacer tests, through an essay prompt.
 - * Students with a SAT Verbal or SAT Essay score of 500 or higher would be eligible to enroll in ENG 101.
 - Financial implications
 - * The System expects that the developmental/college level enrollment mix will change, that costs will accrue due to the scoring of essays when faculty are off contract, and that additional research, tutoring, academic support services, and targeted professional development as to pedagogy will need to be put in place.

This report includes, in Appendix G, a report on the establishment of placement test scores for the Community College System.

b. The Connecticut State University System has not established a set of common placement scores. Rather, it has outlined a *plan* to review its current policies.

- The CSU System states that it recognizes that Special Act 07-7 provides an impetus for the reexamination of current placement criteria and procedures to achieve consistency in the identification of students for remedial work and to ensure that they are placed at equivalent courses within the CSU System.
- The System further notes that this reexamination can result in a more efficient transfer of early college credits throughout the CSU System.
- In addition, the System notes, the work to standardize placement scores in the Connecticut Community College System will be used to inform the CSU System's efforts so that a coherent framework regarding proficiency is created for the state public higher education system.
- The System provides a complete matrix of the existing placement criteria and procedures at each of our four CSU universities. The System notes that placement for university courses takes place in the context of specific university missions, teaching and learning philosophies, structure of

general education requirements, students' profile, available university resources and development of proven proficiency strategies, which are often home grown.

- This is in keeping with a resolution of the CSU Board of Trustees – BR#03-42 – which requires that all students demonstrate proficiency and complete proficiency courses within their first 24 academic credits. To accomplish this, the resolution also mandates that **each university**: a) determines what mathematics and English proficiencies are necessary for the completion of each bachelor's degree it offers; b) establishes a proficiency curriculum for students identified for remedial work; and c) defines proficiency scores on standardized pre-admission tests.
- The CSU System has the following plan for reviewing placement
 - * *Phase 1*: Research and Analysis – Timeline: Spring 2008 semester
 - * *Phase 2*: Consideration of the CCC System Framework – Timeline: Fall 2008 semester
 - * *Phase 3*: Review of Proficiencies and Course Placements in the CSU System – Timeline: Spring 2009 (Revised proficiency and placement system to apply to students entering in the Fall 2009)
 - * *Phase 4*: Continuous Monitoring and Review – Timeline: Ongoing

This report includes, in Appendix H, a summary of the placement policies at scores at each of the four CSU universities. It also includes a summary report on the plan to establish a specific proficiency levels for all matriculated students entering college level courses in the Connecticut State University System.

Attachment A

GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER PATTERN

The Statewide Advisory Council on Student Transfer and Articulation agreed that the primary goal in developing a general education transfer pattern of courses, for consideration by the respective constituent unit board of trustees, is to provide students with a defined number of credits in specified categories of courses that are fully transferable. While all of the courses do not have to be taken to transfer and completion of the credits will not satisfy all of the general education requirements of the receiving institution, such credits would facilitate transfer and count towards the graduation requirements of the receiving institutions.

Students are advised to consult early and often with an academic advisor to determine which specific courses for an intended major are appropriate for transfer at the receiving institution.

As part of the process for identifying the courses under the respective categories, the committee agreed that: courses must be college level; and courses must bear credit that counts toward the degree in the sending institution. The agreed upon categories and credit totals are as follows:

	<i>Credits</i>		<i>Credits</i>
<i>Category 1</i>	3	<i>Category 6</i>	3
Freshman Composition		Choose from:	
<i>Category 2</i>	7-8	Art History or Appreciation	
Choose two from:		Music History or	
General Biology		Appreciation	
General Chemistry		Theater History or	
General Physics		Appreciation	
<i>Category 3</i>	3-4	Drama History or	
Choose from:		Appreciation	
Calculus		<i>Category 7</i>	3
Statistics		Philosophy	
Lower level math		<i>Category 8</i>	3
<i>Category 4</i>	3	Choose from:	
		Introduction to Literature	
		Western or World Literature	
		American Literature	
		British Literature	

Choose from: Psychology Sociology Anthropology		<i>Category 9</i>	3
		Western Civilization II	
<i>Category 5</i>	3	<i>Category 10</i>	
Choose from: Political Science Geography Economics		Foreign Language--under discussion	
		TOTAL 31-33 credits	

Attachment B

COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

Engineering Science Pathway Degree Program

The Engineering Pathway program consists primarily of course work in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences. This program prepares the student for entry into the University of Connecticut's School of Engineering, Fairfield University's School of Engineering, University of Hartford College of Engineering, University of New Haven School of Engineering, and Charter Oak State College.

Technological Studies Pathway Degree Program

The Technological Studies Pathway program consists of three Pathway options: Industrial Technology, Technology Education, or Engineering Technology. All three options provide for a Bachelor of Science degree from Central Connecticut State University or Charter Oak State College.

Attachment C

CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CSUS) REPORT ON THE STATUS OF TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS

Signaling a renewed determination to ease the transfer of students, an overarching memorandum of understanding between the Connecticut State University System (CSUS) and the Connecticut Community College (CCC) System was signed on March 30, 2007 by the Chancellors of the two systems and the Presidents of the four State Universities and twelve Community Colleges.

The agreement is the result of discussions initiated a year earlier by the Chancellors of the two systems, Dr. David G. Carter of CSUS and Marc S. Herzog of the CCCs, that involved the college and university presidents in establishing guiding principles that will streamline the process for students from any of the twelve community colleges throughout the state in transferring to the institutions within the Connecticut State University System.

This agreement represents a major step forward in strengthening the partnership between the two largest systems of public higher education in Connecticut. It is also a significant expansion of access to the opportunities offered by higher education for Connecticut students interested in continuing their educations beyond the associate degree (2-year) level at the 4-year baccalaureate level.

The principles established in the agreement will guide the collaborative efforts between the colleges and the universities in developing guaranteed admissions agreements that will apply to all twelve community colleges and allow a community college student, prior to completing 15 credits of coursework, to apply for guaranteed admissions to Central, Eastern, Southern and Western Connecticut State Universities.

Upon completing an associate's degree, within a maximum of five years, with a 2.0 average, the student will be able to transfer a minimum of 60 credits to enter the University as a junior or third-year student, as long as the transfer takes place within two years of the completion of the associate degree. Transfer students must complete the general education requirements of the receiving institutions, but will be able to transfer as many as 36 general education credits in eight discipline areas including Humanities, History, and Science. The agreement calls for the establishment of an oversight committee, with representatives of both college and university systems, which will meet periodically and make recommendations for improvement of the agreements and to establish a process for review of admissions and appeals practices in general and in individual cases.

Jointly enrolled students will be considered as continuing students at Central, Eastern, Southern and Western Connecticut State Universities and will have access to advising,

transfer counseling, library resources, and coordinated communications about their progress towards fulfilling agreement requirements, degree completion, and transfer.

The partnership between the institutions will be strengthened through on-going communication about changes to curricula that would affect the transfer pathway and by sharing of student information as allowed by privacy requirements. Community College students choosing to transfer to a State University prior to completion of their associate degree who do not choose the Guaranteed Admissions approach will benefit from a course-by-course transcript evaluation done in accord with the Guaranteed Admissions guidelines.

The first agreement (attached) following this MOU occurred in June, 2007 when Western Connecticut State University (WCSU), Naugatuck Valley Community College (NVCC) and Norwalk Community College (NCC) signed an agreement that will allow students at both colleges to transfer easily to the university to work toward a bachelor's degree.

MOU Implementation: November 28, 2007 Transfer/Articulation Meeting

On November 28, 2007, representatives from the Connecticut Community College System and the Connecticut State University System met at Eastern Connecticut State University to discuss the March 29, 2007 Memorandum of Understanding (attached) signed by the Systems' Chancellors and Presidents. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the implementation of the MOU and to facilitate conversations between each CSU institution and their primary "feeder" community colleges about the ways to improve transfer and articulation. The meeting was also an opportunity for the Oversight Committee (that committee mandated by the MOU) to meet and plan its work for the next year.

Issues raised at the meeting will be addressed by all necessary parties under the direction of the Oversight Committee. An update report including this list of identified issues and how they are being addressed will be submitted to the Department of Higher Education in the spring 2008.

The overarching strategy for advancing transfer and articulation is spelled out in the MOU:

"The ultimate goal is to arrive at one System-to-System agreement. Each of the four Connecticut State University System universities, working with its 'partner' Community Colleges, will create a Guaranteed Admissions Agreement. It is agreed that:

- The four agreements will be as similar as possible in both content and format.
- Each of the four agreements will be designed to apply to all twelve Community Colleges."

Each CSUS university is working with their feeder Community Colleges to create drafts of regional agreements. Once sufficiently developed, these drafts will be circulated throughout the CCC System colleges with the expectation that all (or most of the) 12 community colleges will join. Out of the four regional agreements or compacts a master

“system-to-system compact” will emerge and be adopted by the year 2010. At the same time, expansion of program level agreements is continuing. Periodic reports on the progress of this work can be made available to the legislature and other entities. An increasing trend in higher education which is still to be fully understood is the growing number of students who because of economic need, life circumstances or simple choice enroll in several institutions (concurrently or sequentially), stop their studies temporarily to gain experience in the workforce, or prefer to explore several academic interests not necessarily constituting a direct path to a university degree. Such patterns of multi-institutional college attendance are often referred to as “student swirl”. A responsive higher education system needs to take into account the interests of these students, especially when their academic betterment still contributes (although in ways more difficult to measure) to the economy and well being of the State.

Existing Transfer/Articulation Agreements

Attached for review is a compendium of the existing system, institutional and program level agreements between the CSUS, and its universities, with the Connecticut Community College (CCC) System, and its colleges.

The agreements are (in chronological order):

General System to System Agreements

Resolution and excerpt from the minutes of the January 15, 1973 minutes of the BOT for Regional Community Colleges meeting concerning transfer students between institutions in the State System of Higher Education; 6/4/1973

Resolution and text of the Joint Statement on Transfer and Articulation between CSU and the Community and Technical College System; 4/5/1991

Connecticut State University System Transfer Policy for Associate Degree Graduates of the CC-TC System, 3/29/1996

Resolution and text of the Guaranteed Admissions Agreement between CC-TC System and CSU, 4/4/1997

Articulation and Transfer Agreement between the Connecticut State University System and the Connecticut Community College System for a Pathway to Teaching Careers, 9/2004

Memorandum of Understanding between CCC and CSU, 3/29/2007

Individual University/College(s) Agreements

General Articulation Agreement between CC-TC and **Eastern** Connecticut State University, 8/11/1993

Articulation Agreement for Transfer of Selected Associate's Degree Programs as Minors for Degree Programs in the School of Arts and Sciences between **Central** Connecticut State University and CC-TC System, 8/1993

Articulation Agreement for Transfer of Associate Degree Programs in Industrial and Engineering Technology to Degree Programs in the School of Technology between **Central** Connecticut State University and the CC-TC System, 8/1993

Articulation Agreement for Human Services Programs and the B.A. major in social work between CC-TC and **Central** Connecticut State University 12/22/1993

Southern Connecticut State University Transfer Articulation for Selected Associate's Degree Programs as Minors for Degree Programs in the School of Arts and Sciences, 6/2/1994

Articulation Agreement for Transfer of Associate Degree Programs in Business at Community and Technical Colleges to Bachelor of Science degree programs in business at **Central** Connecticut State University, 6/7/1995

Articulation Agreement for the Hospitality Management Program at Manchester Community Technical College and BA in Special Studies International Hospitality and Tourism Studies at **Central** Connecticut State University, 2/10/1998

Articulation Agreement between Tunxis Community College and **Central** Connecticut State University, 4/14/2005

Articulation Agreement between **Central** Connecticut State University and Northwestern Community College regarding Northwestern's Liberal Arts and Studies: Biology Concentration and Central's B.S. in biomolecular Sciences, 8/30/2005

Naugatuck Valley Community college and **Western** Connecticut State University Transfer Compact, 6/19/2007

Norwalk Community College and **Western** Connecticut State University Transfer Compact, 6/19/2007

Southern Connecticut State University School of Nursing Articulation Agreement between Associate's Degree in Nursing/Diploma programs and the BSN Program at SCSU, unsigned and undated

Articulation Agreement between Department of Communication **Central** Connecticut State University and Interpreting for the Deaf Program, Northwestern Connecticut Community College, undated

The Transfer Compact between **Eastern** Connecticut State University and the CC's of Asnuntuck, Capital, Manchester, Quinebaug, and Three Rivers, brochure

Attachment D

ARTICULATION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT AND
CONNECTICUT COMMUNITY COLLEGES
JANUARY 2008

Pathway	Participating Community Colleges	Eligible majors/degrees	Participating UConn campuses	Open majors/degrees
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Guaranteed Admission Agreement	Asnuntuck C.C. Capital C.C. Manchester C.C. Quinebaug Valley C.C. Northwestern C.C. Three Rivers C.C. Tunxis C.C. Naugatuck Valley CC Middlesex CC Norwalk CC Housatonic CC Gateway CC	Associate Degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences	Storrs Stamford Avery Point Tri-Campus Hartford Torrington Waterbury	All CLAS Majors. Students planning to pursue Journalism or Communication Processes will enter as pre-journalism and pre-communication.
School of Business: B.S. in Business and Technology	Asnuntuck C.C. Capital C.C. Housatonic C.C. Middlesex C.C. Naugatuck Valley C.C. Norwalk C.C. Northwestern CT C.C. Tunxis C.C.	Business Administration Management Business Business Administration Business Management Business Administration Business Administration Business Administration	Stamford Tri-Campus Hartford Torrington Waterbury	Bachelor of Science in Business and Technology
School of Engineering - College Of Technology: Engineering Science	All community colleges	Engineering Science - Eligibility is based on the completion of specific course work in the math and sciences	Storrs	Chemical Engineering Civil Engineering Computer Science & Engineering Electrical Engineering Materials Science & Engineering Mechanical Engineering
College of Agriculture and	Asnuntuck C.C. Capital C.C.	Associate Degree in Liberal Arts and	Storrs	Agriculture & Natural Resources

Attachment E

CONNECTICUT COMMUNITY COLLEGES COMMON COURSE NUMBERING

Background

Over a decade ago the Connecticut Community Colleges began a project to develop a common course number system. A massive project, progress was slow, leading to the reorganization and expansion of the work in the summer of 1999. It has involved hundreds of professional staff members: faculty, directors, deans, and System Office staff. The impetus for this project came from students and the Board of Trustees, and it will primarily benefit students.

A number of reasons make a common course number system sensible.

- It makes comparisons easier between colleges in the system.
- It facilitates course comparisons and the transcript evaluation process for students transferring among our colleges or from our colleges to baccalaureate institutions.
- It also facilitates the negotiation and implementation of articulation agreements between the community colleges, the Connecticut State University system, The University of Connecticut, and independent institutions.

Authorization and Overview

On October 16, 2000, the Board of Trustees authorized the implementation of a common course number system for Connecticut's community colleges. The Board's resolution further authorized the Chancellor or Chancellor's Designee to take such actions as may be required to this end, and to establish such policies, procedures, and instruments as may be required to maintain the new system. This authorization includes, but is not limited to, assigning and coordinating numbers and titles for new courses and programs, promoting the further development of common course numbers, and resolving discrepancies.

Moving from the previous situation, with each college determining its own course numbers and titles, to the common course number system required careful monitoring and managing to ensure that the process was as smooth as possible. During the transition period, clear "stop" dates for the courses and titles being replaced, and "start" dates for the new/common course designations, were established. Also developed was a procedure for resolving discrepancies, and for handling new courses that would be developed at the colleges. Once the new/common system was fully implemented, there needed to be a set of procedures in place that would maintain it, and prevent the development of separate, unaffiliated course numbers and titles.

Special mention must be made of Banner, a single instance of a student information management system (now known as an ERP: Enterprise Resource Planning System)

serving the system office and all twelve colleges. This means that all changes could be implemented centrally, thus saving considerable work on the part of individual college staff members, particularly in the registrar's office. It also means that the new common courses that were developed were activated instantly for all colleges, rather than by each college individually. Were this not the case, it would have been next to impossible to carry out the project, since there would have been differences in scheduling, staff availability, action priorities, etc., at each college.

Course Conversion Project Guidelines

With project reorganization and expansion came a new set of guidelines for faculty and staff. As the project progressed, these guidelines were modified and expanded as necessary.

1. The common number system should incorporate as many courses as possible. By comparing existing similar courses, and by making an effort to realign the content and catalog descriptions, faculty have reduced unnecessary differences.
2. As discipline experts, faculty members must be the individuals to make the judgments as to the comparability of course content, and to develop ways to bring the bulk of the content into consonance.
3. Courses that have 80% consonance of content should carry the same designator, number, title, and number of credits. How this consonance is determined is left up to each faculty discipline group. In some cases it is defined as content, in others as outcomes.
4. The same three-letter designator identifies all courses in a discipline system-wide. An asterisk (*) in the fourth position distinguishes the new courses from those in the previous course inventories. For example, English = ENG*, Physics = PHY*, Business Office Technology = BOT*, etc. Each new/common course has a three-digit number in addition to a three-letter-plus-asterisk subject designator. The numbers have meaning, as follows:
 - First digit indicates the level:
 - 0xx - a credit course that cannot be used to meet degree requirements.
 - 1xx - a course usually taken as part of the first year of study, or which is a prerequisite for other, more advanced, or more professional courses.
 - 2xx - a course usually taken as part of the second year of study, or which has prerequisites, or is taken by students matriculated in a certificate or degree program of which this course forms a professional requirement.
 - Second digit, within many of the disciplines, designates an area of study or interest.
 - Third digit is sequential, and usually carries no meaning.
5. All courses in the system have new designators, and in some cases new numbers and titles.

How the Project was Carried Out

1. In September 1999, at the system professional day held for all faculty and staff members, the plans for the reorganized and expanded project were presented. This was followed by meetings of faculty members, by discipline, working as committees to carry out the project.
2. Since total agreement by everyone on everything remains an elusive goal, and since there is no obvious solution to every issue, the committees endeavored to develop a sensible, workable, and inclusive system that would meet the needs of the project. Such a system inevitably includes compromises regarding titles, numbers, and sequencing.
3. Responsibility for managing the transition rested with the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). The daily operation of the transition was delegated to the Associate Academic Officer (AAO).
4. The common course number discipline/area committees submitted their final reports to the AAO, who put them into final format and sent them to the colleges through the academic deans. This final format included the new/common course numbers and titles, and the numbers and titles of all of the courses that were being replaced, by college. It also included any unique courses.
5. The academic deans sent the reports to the appropriate faculty members at their colleges. It was likely that one or more of the faculty members would have served on the common course number committees – the contents of the reports would therefore have been familiar to them, and the process move quickly. In some cases, the contents of the reports would be new to the faculty reviewing them. In any case, the review included identifying any courses that may have been overlooked by the committees and suggesting where they should be included, as well as further identifying any disconnects or problems.
6. The colleges, via the academic deans, provided responses and comments to the AAO for each of the area/discipline lists. The AAO worked with the colleges to resolve any problems or disconnects. In some rare instances, a follow-up final review was needed.
7. The final approved lists were sent by the AAO to the CAO for review and approval. If the CAO identified a problem with a list, it was returned to the AAO for further work and resolution of the problem. If there was no problem, the CAO approved the list and authorized its implementation and use.
8. The Academic Department/AAO worked with the Banner Student Team, which entered the new lists and data into the Banner system, developing a single script applicable to all colleges and reducing the workload at the colleges. A notice showing the effective date for the new courses was sent to all academic deans, who disseminated it

at their colleges, as appropriate. If problems were identified, the AAO worked with the Banner Student Team, or the colleges, to resolve them.

9. During the conversion process, which is now completed, the most current Master Course Conversion List for the entire system was available at the system's Common Course Numbering website: <http://www.comnet.edu/co/academic/common-numbers.htm>. This list is still available, although with the process completed it now has only historical value. See Appendix A for a more extensive description of this list.

10. The new numbers and titles could not be used by any college before the official start date named by the CAO in the transmittal notice. Once a new common Subject Designator was available in Banner's Production instance, the "old" subject designator for that discipline could never be used to create new course records.

11. During the transition period, colleges developing new courses needed to be aware of and sensitive to the transition process. The academic deans, or their representatives developing the courses, were responsible for coordinating with the AAO regarding the proper number and title to be used. Since not all disciplines would be implementing the new numbers/titles at the same time, it was critical that the process be carefully monitored; new numbers could not be used prematurely, and old ones could not be used after the start date for the new ones. The AAO was responsible for ensuring that the numbers and titles selected for use were compatible with either the current or new systems, as may be appropriate.

12. Upon adoption of common numbers and titles, all courses recognized as common took the new/common designator, number, and title. This occurred on the effective date of each new uploaded dataset's implementation in Banner's Production instance. The former designators/numbers/titles were no longer available for the creation of new course records, although the Banner system retains them for historical purposes, transcript entries, etc.

How the System Operates

1. The CAO is responsible for maintaining the common course number system. This includes approving the numbers and titles for new courses, and any necessary and associated actions required to maintain the system. The daily operation of all or part of the system has been delegated to the AAO.

2. When new courses are developed for use at the colleges, it is imperative to maintain the integrity of the system. The following procedure is used for instituting new courses:

- a) Faculty members/colleges develop a new course. They are responsible for all of the usual work as to format, content, etc., required by the college's course approval process. They are also responsible for consulting the current Banner Course Catalog to determine whether the course they propose is offered already

by another college in the system. Instructions on accessing the Banner Course Catalog are available to faculty and staff members on the system website. See also Appendix B, below.

- b) If it is obvious from consulting the Catalog that a course that is 80% or more congruent with the proposed course exists, then the college must adopt the common designator, number, and title.
- c) If there is some question as to whether the proposed course meets the 80% content rule, the faculty proposing the course should contact their colleagues at the other college or colleges offering the course to determine whether the course they are proposing does, in fact, meet the 80% rule. If it does, then the faculty should so advise the academic dean, who will then approve the adoption of the common designator, number, and title.
- d) If it does not meet the 80% rule, then a new course number and title are needed. Proponents are responsible for consulting the Common Course Number Inventory on the system website, which is arranged alphabetically by discipline. The Inventory shows which course numbers are in use, and whether or not there is a system within that discipline for assigning numbers. Once the proponents decide where they believe the new course belongs in the existing inventory for that discipline, they inform the college's academic dean.
- e) In either case, the academic dean will contact the AAO and request activation of the new course, which can only be done from the system office.
- f) The AAO will review the request from the college, ensuring that the designator, number, and title selected are compatible with the system adopted by the appropriate common course number committee, after which time an activation message is sent to the Banner Student Team.
- g) Upon receipt of a message for course activation, the Banner Student Team ensures that all of the attributes necessary (number of credits, contact hours, delivery modes, etc.) have been built by the college in Banner preparatory to activation. If all is in order the Banner Student Team activates the course for the college. This decision is communicated to the college, and the appropriate addition is made to the master inventory so that it is available for use by other colleges.

Maintaining the System

The common course number system has now been in effect for several years, and it has been helpful in developing articulation and transfer agreements with four-year institutions. However, the system office has received reports from time to time from one or more institutions that courses that have been shown as being common do not appear to be so, and that there are variances that exceed the 80% comparable content guidelines. These concerns have been brought to the attention of the system's Academic Deans

Council, which in the spring of 2007 established a task force to recommend a way to maintain the common course number system. The task force may or may not continue as part of whatever mechanism is finally adopted. At its initial meeting the task force took up a number of items, summarized below.

- A policy must be developed to maintain commonality at colleges between courses that have the same number and title. However, several participants stated that procedures requiring each campus to review course proposals from other campuses would be unwieldy and impractical.
- The purpose of this commonality in numbering and content is to facilitate the transfer of courses to four-year colleges and universities as well as between our colleges. Therefore, the issues of common course numbering should focus on the information that four-year schools most often require for transfer. These areas generally include topics covered in a class and the pre-requisites.
- There was a discussion on the 80% Rule and how it should be applied. Should it mean that the course content must be 80% consonant? Could the 80% consonance be defined in outcomes or student expectations? If the latter, how might these be verified as having been attained?
- It was agreed that the faculty members of a particular discipline must be the ones to determine which courses are to be considered common.
- The following was suggested:
 - Each academic discipline with representation from all campuses (or their designees) will develop the 80% “core curriculum” that represents the topical areas for each course. It is recommended that each discipline choose the most relevant courses to start reviewing.
 - A mechanism should be developed to allow the core curriculum to be maintained in a database available to each campus, perhaps using the Banner system.
 - The Curriculum Committee and Governance structure on each campus will ensure that changes to courses and new courses maintain commonality with the core curriculum for existing courses within the system.
 - Representatives from each discipline will meet periodically to discuss issues pertaining to core curriculum and development as needed. The periodic system professional days could be the best venue for such meetings.
- It was acknowledged that certain disciplines (e.g. math and English) already have cross campus committees. It is encouraged that these committees be folded into this process and that participation in such committees should be acceptable for satisfying the “Additional Responsibilities” requirements for faculty.
- In addition, it should be acknowledged that the system currently in place requires faculty to consult the course descriptions on other campuses when deciding if a new course, or a course change, is within the 80% rule. Faculty adhering to this policy have found that the course descriptions often do not have the necessary information to make those determinations and detailed syllabi/course outlines are

not readily available. Also, there is no consensus on what the 80% syllabus for specific courses within most disciplines should be.

- It was agreed that the task force members need to meet with their college colleagues and/or college curriculum committees before having another meeting to complete working and come up with a recommendation to the Academic Deans Council, to be forwarded to the Council of Presidents for review and adoption. In view of this, a follow-up meeting will be scheduled for September.

Appendix A – The Master Conversion List – Now a Historical Document

The Master Conversion List is presented by broad discipline. This report was generated from the Access database being used to enter, track, and check the conversions of old to new courses. Grouped by new Subject Designator, the report lists each new course number and title, followed by the courses that are being replaced, showing each old course's college, old subject designator, and old course number. The lists show both the common and the unique courses, and all courses offered by all colleges are included in this report. Here is a typical entry, taken from that list.

HIS* 233 - TWENTIETH CENTURY RUSSIA

GW	HIS	205 – Twentieth Century Russia
NK	HI	106 – Russia and the World Today
TR	HIS	217 – Soviet Russian History in the Twentieth Century

What this means is that the History Common Course Number Committee determined that the three courses shown here offered by Gateway, Norwalk, and Three Rivers Community Colleges respectively, although carrying the different designators, numbers, and titles shown, are at least 80% consonant in content. They were, therefore, all converted to the new common designation, HIS* 233 - TWENTIETH CENTURY RUSSIA. This means that the course designators, numbers, and titles shown for the three colleges are no longer in use, and all now use the new designation. There is no longer a “Russia and the World Today” course at Norwalk, for example, but instead there is a “Twentieth Century Russia” course, as there is at any other college offering this course. The old designators, number, and titles remain available for transcript purposes, but cannot be used again.

And later, the list shows:

HIS* 285 - THE MIDDLE EAST

TR	HIS	222
----	-----	-----

This means that only one college, Three Rivers, offers this course. However, in order to keep all course designations consistent within an area or discipline, the designator changes from HIS to HIS*. The title remains the same. The number has been changed because the committee developed a numbering scheme for categorizing courses, and the number had to change to fit that pattern: advanced courses in African and Middle Eastern history will carry numbers between 280-289.

In addition to developing a “conversion” list of courses, the committees for some disciplines also agreed on a numbering framework. For example, for History (new subject designator HIS*), the following numbering guidelines have been developed:

100s	Survey courses
201-202	U. S. history survey courses
210-229	Advanced U. S. history courses
230-249	Advanced European history courses
250-259	New approaches
260-269	Advanced Latin American history courses
270-279	Advanced Asian history courses
280-289	Advanced Africa and Middle Eastern history courses
290-299	Independent Study, special topics, seminars, and similar courses

What this means is that courses have been grouped by topic and numbered accordingly. The framework tells where they can be found, and is also a guide as to where to place new courses that will be developed in the future.

Appendix B – The Banner Course Catalog

a. General. The Banner Course Catalog is set up by college, using the alphabetical designators (see b below), and then alphabetically by subject designators under each college listing.

b. College Codes. Colleges were assigned letters based on their dates of establishment. These letters are incorporated in each course designator in the FIFTH position, which is actually the first position of the Banner course number. If you were to look in a typical BANNER form that contained Catalog information (such as the Basic Course Information Form [SCACRSE] for a course that’s been converted to a new Subject Designator, you might see the following:

Basic Course Information Form SCACRSE 5.1.0.1 (PROD) [X_TKRUTT]

Subject: Dance Course: Term:

Course Information

From Term: Copy To Term:

Course Title:	<input type="text" value="HIST & APPREC OF WORLD DANCE"/>	----- Hours -----
College:	<input type="text" value="08"/> Naugatuck Valley CC (7708)	Low Or/To High
Division:	<input type="text" value=""/>	CEU/Cred: <input type="text" value="3.00"/>
Department:	<input type="text" value="0014"/> Arts & Humanities	Billing: <input type="text" value="3.00"/>
Status:	<input type="text" value="A"/> Active	Lecture: <input type="text" value="3.00"/>
Approval:	<input type="text" value=""/>	Lab: <input type="text" value=""/>
CIP:	<input type="text" value="500301"/> Dance	Other: <input type="text" value=""/>
Preq Waiv:	<input type="text" value=""/>	Contact: <input type="text" value="3.00"/>

----- Repeat Information -----

Limit: Max Hours:

Repeat Status:

Continuing Ed
 Tuition Waiver
 Additional Fees
 CAPP Areas for Pre-requisites

Where:

- DAN* is the area designator (Dance),
- is the indicator that this course is part of the new Banner Course Catalog,
- H is the college letter code, indicating that the course is offered by Naugatuck Valley Community College,
- 101 is the number of the course.

The college codes are as follows:

B	Manchester
C	Northwestern Connecticut
D	Norwalk
E	Housatonic
F	Middlesex
G	Capital
H	Naugatuck Valley
I	Gateway
J	Tunxis
K	Three Rivers
L	Quinebaug Valley
M	Asnuntuck

c. Accessing BANNER Catalog Information.

The new SWICRSE form was developed by the Banner Student Team as a user-friendly, quick-and-easy search mechanism whereby you can identify all of the courses offered in a discipline at all of the colleges. All Banner account holders have access to SWICRSE. For information and step-by-step instructions on how to perform queries using this form, go to <http://www.comnet.edu/co/academic/common-numbers.htm> and click on the “How to do system-wide BANNER catalog course searches using the new SWICRSE form” link. You are not limited to searching only your own college’s records. For example, if you are proposing a new course in Political Science, you’ll be able to see all of the Political Science courses offered at all twelve colleges. You can then see if there’s a course title that seems to be the same as the one being proposed.

Attachment F

CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM COMMON COURSE NUMBERING PLAN

Introduction

Pursuant to Special Act No. 07-7, *An Act Concerning Public Institution Of Higher Education System Transfer and Articulation Process*, the Department of Higher Education, in consultation with the constituent units of the state system of higher education, shall review the status and content of public institution of higher education system transfer and articulation agreements. Such review shall consider “a plan to implement common course numbering within the Connecticut State University System.” The four comprehensive universities that comprise the Connecticut State University System—Central Connecticut State University, Eastern Connecticut State University, Southern Connecticut State University, and Western Connecticut State University—share the goal of providing affordable, accessible, high quality learning opportunities, offering baccalaureate, graduate and professional programs in more than 160 subject areas, as well as a wide range of opportunities for internships, community service, and cultural engagement.

Faculty and other officials in the Connecticut State University System have for some time worked toward creating a more seamless process of credit transfer for the benefit of all students. The Connecticut State Universities have developed lengthy matrices of “transfer equivalencies” with some counterpart institutions; therefore, a student may determine which of their courses taken at a particular Connecticut State University is equivalent to a similar course at another Connecticut State University or at a Connecticut Community College. These equivalency matrices will be updated and utilized in the common course numbering implementation.

Also, faculty who teach basic skills in Connecticut State Universities have held regular meetings over the past few years to determine how best to teach the knowledge and skill sets required in such courses as basic math and introduction to writing. Their work in aligning course content and objectives between Connecticut State University institutions and other post-secondary schools provides valuable groundwork to further our common course numbering plans.

We believe this plan will continue the process of review and will benefit students by establishing a more seamless process for the movement of students from one institution of higher education to another without loss of credit or the need to repeat subjects already completed elsewhere.

Guiding Principles

The following principles provide a foundation for this plan:

The plan is developed as a means of supporting the best interests of students pursuing higher education, while ensuring that the unique mission of each Connecticut State University institution is preserved.

The plan assumes an initial focus on courses primarily at the freshman/sophomore level. This is because courses at this level are generally targeted to meeting general education requirements and are often taught at both two and four-year institutions.

The plan recognizes that faculty, who are the content experts, will develop criteria for determining course comparability and judge which are appropriate for common numbering, titling, pre-requisites, and/or number of credits.

The plan is a means to facilitate transfer and not as a means to standardize curricula, to stifle innovation or creativity, to impede course and curriculum redesign, or to restrict use of unique methodologies.

The plan considers the experience of Connecticut's Community College System and the common course numbering processes implemented in states such as Colorado, California, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, North Dakota, and Texas.

The plan includes a timeline for implementation which is necessary to ensure the integrity of students' educational programs and responsibilities of faculty and the Universities to ensure a quality academic program.

Proposed Plan

General Approach

Courses will be examined and evaluated for comparability and/or equivalency by committees comprised of faculty from similar disciplines, subject matter, and departments. These committees, which are referred to later in this document as "disciplinary committees," will recommend which courses are candidates for common numbering. Faculty will examine such aspects as course titles, descriptions, objectives, expected outcomes, and standards.

At times it may be necessary to seek the opinion and counsel of other faculty, departmental chairpersons, deans, or University curriculum committee members. The objective is to identify as many courses with common numbers as possible in order to meet the letter and spirit of the legislation and facilitate the transfer process for students. There will nonetheless remain many courses that are "unique" and not appropriate for common numbering.

During this process, it may be desirable to utilize technology to help in the identification of course equivalencies, standards, and objectives. This is, for example, the route taken

by states such as Pennsylvania. Additional resources could be required to purchase and/or support the appropriate software to accelerate the process to shorten our timeline. The disciplinary committees' recommendations will be presented to the Connecticut State University System Office after receiving the endorsement of Departments/Deans/University/ Faculty Senates and/or University Presidents.

Phase One

Under the leadership of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs at the Connecticut State University System Office, several disciplinary committees will be formed and charged with determining which courses in that particular discipline/department are appropriate for common numbering.

Each committee will be comprised of faculty from the four Connecticut State Universities. These faculty will have content expertise in the particular discipline/department being reviewed. When appropriate, other personnel such as transfer counselors, academic advisement coordinators, or registrars will be called upon to serve as consultants/advisors to the committees. If questions arise regarding committee composition at one or more institutions, or if there are issues regarding the number of committees needed, the Vice President(s)/Provost(s) of each involved University will be charged to resolve the issue.

A committee comprised of transfer counselors from each of the four Connecticut State Universities will complete a review of existing Connecticut State University transfer equivalencies and identify all lower division courses that have previously been designated as "comparable." The committee will ensure that there is transfer reciprocity in all identified credits for common course numbering. Starting points for this phase will be the existing course equivalency tables as follows:

Central Connecticut State University:

https://ssb.ccsu.edu:4443/pls/ssb_cPROD/transfer_equivs_pkg.p_ask_parms

Eastern Connecticut State University:

Comprehensive course equivalency tables exist for feeder Community Colleges (CSUS equivalency tables to be built).

Southern Connecticut State University:

<http://www.southernct.edu/bannerweb/transfer.php3>

Western Connecticut State University

Comprehensive course equivalency tables for all Community Colleges (CSUS equivalency tables to be built from existing files)

<https://webapp2.wcsu.edu/transfer/>

The appropriate disciplinary committee will review those courses identified above that fall within their department/discipline and identify those appropriate for common course numbering. The committees shall develop criteria to identify course comparability and apply those criteria in their deliberations and evaluations. The disciplinary committees

will also review the remaining lower division courses for comparability and identify said courses.

Phase Two

The disciplinary committees will review all upper division courses to identify those eligible for common numbering. The committees shall develop criteria to identify comparable courses and thus follow the same procedures as with lower division courses. At the conclusion of phases one and two, all upper and lower division courses recommended for common numbering will have been identified.

Operational Development and Support

The actual new common numbers will be assigned utilizing a system to be developed in consultation with faculty, registrars, University and System Office IT personnel, departmental chairs, deans, and vice presidents. The numbering system developed should communicate to those reviewing one of our University transcripts the University offering the course, the course level (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior, graduate), and the discipline or department that taught the course.

This operational development and support process will be undertaken simultaneously with phases one and two.

Resource Considerations

The process for identifying courses for common numbering will require significant IT support in terms of data entry, software configuration, and creative problem solving. Because the curriculum undergoes continuous change, ongoing human and IT resources will be needed to keep the system current. Individual campuses of Connecticut State University will identify and prepare for these additional resource needs.

Timeline: Plan Development/Approval

11/15/2007 Committee Completes Plan

12/5/2007 Plan submitted to following for review/comment:

Chancellor

Council of Presidents

Board of Trustees Academic Affairs Committee

University/Faculty Senates

12/10/2007 Plan reviewed by each University

12/15/2007 Plan accepted by Chancellor

12/20/2007 Plan submitted to DHE for transmittal to legislature

Plan Implementation

Phase 1

2008-2010 Disciplinary Committees formed

Transfer counselors review Connecticut State University equivalencies/reciprocity agreements and identify comparable lower division courses
Disciplinary Committees review courses identified as comparable and recommend lower division courses for common numbering
Recommendations endorsed by the following:
Departments/Deans/Chairs
University Senates
Presidents/Chancellor
Progress report presented to Legislature
Registrars, IT personnel, faculty, and others determine numbering system and resolve the technical issues for transcript production
Common course numbering for lower division courses implemented by Connecticut State University System

Phase 2

2011-2013 Disciplinary Committees identify comparable upper division courses
Recommendations endorsed by the following:
Departments/Deans/Chairs
University Senates
Presidents/Chancellor
Progress report presented to Legislature
Common course numbering for upper division courses implemented by Connecticut State University System

Maintenance

Since University curricula are continuously changed and under review, a system for maintaining the common course numbers needs to be developed and implemented. Periodic review should be instituted by each University, preferably through the existing curricular approval process.

When departments/faculty propose a new course, they are responsible for all of the usual course development such as content, title, objectives, credits, pre-requisites, budgetary impact, and other items required by the University faculty and management. They are also responsible for determining whether the course they propose is comparable to another Connecticut State University course(s) and thus appropriate for common numbering. Registrars and the Connecticut State University database need to be consulted to make this determination.

Finally, as stated in the resource section above, an appropriate IT system needs to be planned and implemented to assure both efficiency and effectiveness in maintaining common course numbering among the Connecticut State University institutions.

Attachment G

CONNECTICUT COMMUNITY COLLEGES PLACEMENT STANDARDS

Special Act 07-7 requires a review of placement test scores that establish specific proficiency levels for matriculated students entering college level courses.

The Connecticut Community Colleges have conducted a comprehensive review of placement standards. Faculty committees representing Mathematics and English have met and recommended common placement standards, using Accuplacer as the assessment tool. The Board of Trustees, Chancellor, Presidents, Deans, Faculty and Community College Professional Staff are studying these specific recommendations as to implementation Fall 2008. If unique situations exist at particular colleges, Presidents will be able to submit a plan to the Chancellor for implementation Spring 2009 or Fall 2009.

The Connecticut Community Colleges have approached the development of common placement standards under a proactive Student Success Model, which is being supported by the Chancellor and the Council of Presidents using the Achieving the Dream Public Policy Initiative as the platform. It is clear that in order to develop strategies and document progress on eliminating the disparity in achievement between socioeconomic classes, and between racial groups, that harmonizing the placement standard is essential across the system. In addition, it is clear that the Community College transfer curricula must align with baccalaureate curricula, and that the articulation requires a common understanding of the academic skill requirements for high-school graduates enrolling in college level classes.

On November 16, 2007, the Connecticut Community Colleges convened a conference on basic skills to present the results of research studies and faculty exploration of student success in English and Math including courses at the developmental level. The Commissioner of Higher Education, Valerie Lewis, and the Community College System Chancellor, Marc Herzog, welcomed those assembled and described the pressing need to prepare students to be successful in college-level work and in careers in the emerging economy. Growing populations in Connecticut, primarily low-income, minority, immigrant, and educationally disadvantaged groups, must be able to access, enter and succeed in college courses of study, continue successfully at advanced levels of higher education through transfer and enter the workforce prepared for the state's highly competitive knowledge economy. This issue is of particular relevance for community colleges as the growing demand for access to higher education is visible in the increased enrollments and increased needs of academically under prepared students.

The November 16, 2007 conference was moderated by Dean Susan Huard from Quinebaug Valley Community College. Presenters included Davis Jenkins from the Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University; Matt Gandal from Achieve, Inc. on the American Diploma Project; and Professors Ken Klucznik and James Gentile (Manchester Community College) and Mark Leach

(Housatonic Community College). In addition, panelists at breakout sessions included Professors Patricia Hirschy (Asnuntuck Community College) and Patrick Sullivan (Manchester) and Matt Zeidenberg from Community College Research Center. Corby Coperthwaite, Director of Planning, Research and Assessment, Connecticut Community Colleges coordinated the conference. Faculty and staff from each of the twelve Community Colleges participated in addition to representatives from the Office of Workforce Competitiveness, Connecticut Employment and Training Commission, Department of Economic and Community Development, Department of Higher Education and Jobs For the Future.

Specific recommendations from the Connecticut Community College Math Issues Committee and the Connecticut Coalition of English Teachers follow. These specific recommendations are being examined at each Community College and specific feedback from Mathematics and English Departments will be discussed from February, 2008 though April, 2008 by the Faculty Committees, Deans, Presidents, Chancellor and Board of Trustees. Adjustments to these recommendations may be made during this period of review.

Following are the results of the discussions by the Math Issues Committee on placement out of developmental into Intermediate Algebra and placement out of Intermediate Algebra into “University Transfer Level” courses. In order for Community Colleges to meet both the career and transfer mission, and in order for transfer articulation agreements to baccalaureate institutions to be successful for the student, Intermediate Algebra at Connecticut Community Colleges is considered to be a gateway course between developmental and “University Transfer Level”. All students will begin the Accuplacer Math test with the Elementary Algebra subtest. An Arithmetic score should be available adaptively, for students placing below MAT 095, to allow selection into an array of developmental courses, which are configured differently at various colleges. To place out of developmental into Intermediate Algebra, the minimum Elementary Algebra score will be in the band between 54 and 66. Placement out of Intermediate Algebra will require a score of 40 or higher on the College Level Math portion of Accuplacer. This score will place students into some, but not all, courses above Intermediate Algebra in the system. Some higher level courses will require a higher placement score. An alternative method of placement out of Intermediate Algebra will be a score of 550 or higher on the Math section of the SAT. This SAT score would place students into some, but not all, courses above Intermediate Algebra in the system, similar to the logic on the Accuplacer College level standard.

Following are the results of the discussions by the Connecticut Coalition of English Teachers on placement standards. Initial placement out of developmental into ENG 101, Composition, would be achieved by a student reaching a minimum score of 88 on Accuplacer Sentence Skills and a minimum score of 83 on Accuplacer English Comprehension. There would be a process for challenging the outcome of these specific Accuplacer tests, through an essay prompt. The prompt proposal is to read, summarize and respond to a text. This essay would be scored using the New Jersey rubric. In

addition, students with a SAT Verbal or SAT Essay score of 500 or higher would be eligible to enroll in ENG 101.

The overall goal for the establishment of placement standards is student success. In the Fall 2007 semester, 26% of all credit students were enrolled in one or more developmental courses. Given that the provision of developmental educational services is a significant part of the community college mission, and given that success in this endeavor is required in order for the student to proceed, consideration of new placement standards has significant implications. In addition to establishing a “common cut score”, there are a number of related, complex issues which need to be considered. These policy matters include: (1) which students should be required to be assessed; (2) what the specific essay challenge protocol should be; (3) what are the placement protocols for students who completed the Accuplacer under prior college-specific standards (grandfathering); (4) what is the testing protocol with respect to use of the calculator; (5) how can high-school transcripts best be used to augment placement decisions; and (6) what are the appropriate educational strategies for students who place three or more levels below college level. Creation of Accuplacer workshops prior to testing, expanded summer programs and a policy on “retakes” also need to be considered.

Programmatic implications are significant. The system needs to discuss the applicability of common placement standards in mathematics given some curricula are geared to immediate entry to a career and others are targeted at transfer. In addition, given that the prerequisite structure differs between colleges, the impact of new placement standards needs to be carefully examined as to enrollment management and Faculty workload.

The broad goal of student success requires a comprehensive commitment to institutional research. All Colleges will enter placement scores and “waiver codes” into Banner using a standard approach by census date (frozen file) each semester. Research will be conducted on a continuing and systematic basis to determine the efficacy of the placement standards. Standards will be adjusted over time based on the results of the research studies.

In order for the English and Mathematics curricula to be aligned, Faculty are committed to establish outcomes for college level and developmental courses within the Community College system. In addition, the academic community continues to discuss standards for high-school graduates, that is, exactly what it means to be prepared for College, as well as expectations for transfer students at the junior level at baccalaureate institutions.

Finally, there are financial implications from setting these new placement standards. It is expected the developmental/college level enrollment mix will change, that costs will accrue due to the scoring of essays when faculty are off contract, and that additional research, tutoring, academic support services, and targeted professional development as to pedagogy will need to be put in place.

Attachment H

CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM REPORT ON PROFICIENCY FOR COLLEGE LEVEL COURSES

Background

Pursuant to Special Act No. 07-7, *An Act Concerning Public Institution of Higher Education System Transfer and Articulation Process*, the enclosed materials are submitted to the Department of Higher Education to assist in their consideration of (3): “placement test scores for the community-technical college system and the Connecticut State University system that establish specific proficiency levels for all matriculated students entering college level courses.”

Attached is a complete matrix of the existing placement criteria and procedures at each of our four CSUS universities. This matrix was developed by a committee of CSUS faculty leaders who teach basic skills and who have met regularly over the past few years to discuss matters related to this aspect of our curricular offerings. Placement for university courses takes place in the context of specific university missions, teaching and learning philosophies, structure of general education requirements, students’ profile, available university resources and development of proven proficiency strategies, which are often home grown.

While it is recognized that such distinctiveness among universities exists, the enacted legislation provides an impetus for the reexamination of current criteria and procedures to achieve consistency in the identification of students for remedial work and to ensure that they are placed at equivalent courses within the CSUS. This reexamination can result in a more efficient transfer of early college credits throughout the CSUS. In addition, because of current legislative action, the Connecticut Community College (CCC) System is now completing the standardization of their placement criteria and processes throughout its 12 colleges. The result of such standardization will be used to inform the CSUS so that a coherent framework regarding proficiency is created for the state public higher education system.

It should be noted that the need for proper remediation and placement to ensure student success in university programs has been acted on by the Board of Trustees of the CSUS through BR#03-42. This resolution requires that all students demonstrate proficiency and complete proficiency courses within their first 24 academic credits. To accomplish this, the resolution also mandates that *each university*: a) determines what mathematics and English proficiencies are necessary for the completion of each bachelor’s degree it offers; b) establishes a proficiency curriculum for students identified for remedial work; and c) defines proficiency scores on standardized pre-admission tests.

The current plan is submitted to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the legislation while taking into considerations all the factors above.

CSUS Placement Review Plan

Phase 1:

Research and Analysis – Timeline: Spring 2008 semester

Determine the results of current practices at the four CSUS universities to answer the following critical questions: a) To what extent are current criteria and practices equivalent? b) To what extent are students being identified for remediation consistently and/or placed in courses that are equivalent? c) To what extent are current remediation and placement approaches contributing to the success of students in university programs?

Phase 2:

Consideration of the CCC System Framework – Timeline: Fall 2008 semester

The CSUS will meet with the CCC System leadership early in 2008 to discuss the specifics of the standardization of proficiencies that is underway. The CCC System has tentatively scheduled the implementation of its plan beginning the incoming class of 2009-10. Since the legislative intent is to develop more seamless transfer process to benefit Connecticut students, it is worthwhile to consider how the CSUS and CCC System test cut-off scores and procedures are aligned to ensure a proper level of congruence. It is important to note, for example, that students whose only goal is to obtain associate level degrees should not be required to demonstrate the same proficiency level that bachelor level programs require at the CSUS universities.

This phase will also include examination of placement procedures and instruments used in other states, and the possibility of replacing the Accuplacer examination currently in use. Minnesota, for example, has a standardized system used across all public Universities and Community Colleges.

Phase 3:

Review of Proficiencies and Course Placements in the CSUS – Timeline: Spring 2009

(Revised proficiency and placement system to apply to students entering in the Fall 2009)
Based upon the results of the previous work, an equivalent set of proficiencies and course placements will be developed. This work will also take into account the work in response to legislation in the areas of common course numbering and transfer and articulation with the CCC System colleges.

Phase 4:

Continuous Monitoring and Review – Timeline: Ongoing

The CSUS Basic Skills faculty group will conduct biennial reviews in consideration of the above phases. This continuous review will be particularly relevant to the state higher education system as a whole in light of the current efforts by the State Board of Education to reform secondary schools in the state. The proposed reform includes

changes in the required courses for high school graduation that intend to incorporate college preparation curriculum and end-of-course assessments.

Cut-off Scores for Placement into English and Mathematics Courses
in the Connecticut State University System

This report has been compiled in accordance with Special Act No. 07-7 approved by the Legislature on June 11, 2007. Its purpose is to report on the current status of placement in English and Mathematics courses for students matriculating at the four constituent universities in the CSU System: Central, Eastern, Southern, and Western Connecticut State Universities.

Differences among the universities reflect differences in curriculum as well as in the instruments used to place students.

As Table 1 shows, a variety of instruments are used to place students.

Table 1 Tests Used (See Guide to Acronyms in the Appendix)

Institution	English	Mathematics
CCSU	SAT Writing , SAT Verbal, ACT, Accuplacer for transfer students, TOEFL or TSWE for ESL students, and diagnostic essay on the first day of class for all students.	SAT Math and Accuplacer
ECSU	Essay	SAT Math and Accuplacer
SCSU	Essay	Accuplacer
WCSU	SAT Critical Reading and Essay	SAT Math and Accuplacer

The writing requirements at the four universities are different. CCSU and ECSU each require a one semester composition course. Students who are not prepared for that course must either take a remedial course (ENG 099 at CCSU) or a more intensive version of the standard course (ENG 100P at ECSU). SCSU has a two semester sequence ENG 111 and 112, although a few extremely well prepared students may place out of ENG 112. Less prepared students may be required to take ENG 99 or 110. At WCSU the General Education writing requirement is fulfilled by taking a “W” course. WRT 101 (Composition I) is a prerequisite for “W” courses. Less prepared students at WCSU take a remedial course WRT 098 or WRT 099.

The criteria for placing students in writing courses are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 Writing Courses

Institution	Courses	Criteria for Initial Placement
CCSU	ENG 099 Remedial English	SAT Writing and SAT Verbal both below 450 or ACT below 21 or Accuplacer Sentence Skills below 86 (transfer students), TSWE below 35 of TOEFL below 173 (for ESL students), and a diagnostic essay on the first day of class for all students.
	ENG 110 Freshman Composition	SAT Writing or SAT Verbal at least 450 or ACT at least 21 or Accuplacer at least 86 (transfer students), either TSWE 35 or better or TOEFL 173 or better (for ESL students) and a diagnostic essay on the first day of class for all students.
ECSU	ENG 100 (regular 3 hour course)	Self selection plus essay
	ENG 100P (English “plus”) Intensive five-hour course	Self selection plus essay
SCSU	ENG 99 (for ESL speakers)	Self selection plus essay
	ENG 110 (native speakers with significant weaknesses)	Self selection plus essay
	ENG 111 (incoming students with competent writing skills)	Self selection plus essay
	ENG 112 (extremely well prepared students)	Self selection plus essay
WCSU	WRT 098 (or 099 for ESL) Written Communication	Writing placement test (essay) for students scoring below 510 on SAT Critical Reading
	WRT 101 Composition I	SAT Verbal of 510-590 or writing placement test
	Writing intensive courses for general education	SAT Verbal of 600 or higher or writing placement test

In mathematics there is more uniformity at the level of remedial courses than at the level of general education courses. Each university offers a non-credit course in elementary algebra and a credit-bearing course in intermediate algebra that does not satisfy a general education requirement. There are some variations to this pattern, however. CCSU offers an intensive course that combines elementary and intermediate algebra in one semester to students with placement scores in a certain range. ECSU offers intensive “workshop” courses for both elementary and intermediate algebra. SCSU has both a one semester intermediate algebra course as well as a two semester sequence for less well prepared students.

All four universities use the Accuplacer examination package, which consists of three mathematics exams: Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra, and College Level Mathematics. Most students taking the exam start with Elementary Algebra, and if they score sufficiently high they are given the opportunity to take the College Level Mathematics Exam.

At ECSU and WCSU students with Math SAT scores of 600 or above are exempt from taking Accuplacer. At CCSU initial placement is determined by Math SAT. Students who believe they have been misplaced are invited to take Accuplacer and if necessary their placement is adjusted.

Tables 3 and 4 show the criteria for placement into Elementary and Intermediate Algebra courses. EA refers to the Elementary Algebra Accuplacer Test. CLM refers to the College Level Math Accuplacer Test.

Table 3 Elementary Algebra

Institution	Course	Criteria for Initial Placement
CCSU	MATH 099 Elementary Algebra	SAT Math 450 or below or EA + CLM < 80
	MATH 099/101 combination (an intensive course)	SAT Math 460-490 or $80 \leq EA + CLM < 110$
ECSU	MATH 098W Elementary Algebra with Workshop	SAT Math < 600 and (EA < 28 or $28 \leq EA < 30$ and number of high school math courses < 4)
	MATH 098 Elementary Algebra	SAT Math < 600 and ($28 \leq EA < 30$ and number of high school math courses ≥ 4 or $30 \leq EA < 40$)
SCSU	MATH 095 Elementary Algebra	EA < 60
WCSU	MATH 098 Remedial Level	SAT Math < 500 or (SAT Math < 600 and EA ≤ 70)

Table 4 Intermediate Algebra

Institution	Course	Criteria for Initial Placement
CCSU	MATH 099/101 combination (an intensive course)	SAT Math 460-490 or $80 \leq EA + CLM < 110$
	MATH 101 Intermediate Algebra	SAT Math 500-540 or $110 \leq EA + CLM < 125$
ECSU	MATH 101W Intermediate Algebra with Workshop	SAT Math < 600 and $40 \leq EA < 55$
	MATH 101 Intermediate Algebra	SAT Math < 600 and ($55 \leq EA < 70$ or $70 \leq EA < 75$ and number of high school math courses < 4)
SCSU	MATH 100 Intermediate Algebra A and B	$70 \leq EA < 85$ and $CLM < 63$
	MATH 101 Intermediate Algebra A	$60 \leq EA < 70$
WCSU	MATH 100 Intermediate Algebra	$500 \leq SAT \text{ Math} < 600$ and $71 \leq EA \leq 90$ and $CLM < 42$

All four universities require students to take at least one course in mathematics above the intermediate algebra level. Students typically qualify for these courses either by passing intermediate algebra or by placement scores. (An exception is three courses at WCSU indicated in Table 5 for which an A in elementary algebra is sufficient.) At all four universities Calculus I requires a prerequisite course in pre-calculus or placement scores significantly above the general education level. Therefore Calculus I placement will be described in a separate section below.

Table 5 shows the criteria used to place students in general education courses. At SCSU there are three different cut-off points as the courses are arranged in tiers. At the other three universities the same criteria are used to place students in all general education courses below Calculus I.

Table 5 General Education Mathematics Courses (excluding Calculus I)

Institution	Courses	Criteria for Initial Placement
CCSU	MATH 105, 106, 110, 113, 115, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, STAT 104, 200, 215 all satisfy general education requirement (Choice depends upon major)	SAT Math ≥ 550 or $EA + CLM \geq 125$

ECSU	MATH 130, 135, or 139 all satisfy general education requirement (Choice depends upon major)	SAT Math ≥ 600 or ($75 \leq$ EA and $CLM < 60$) or ($70 \leq$ EA < 75 and number of high school math courses ≥ 4)
SCSU	MATH 108 or below (including MATH 103, 105, 106, 107)	$85 \leq$ EA < 108 and $CLM < 63$
	MATH 122 or below (including MATH 120 and those listed in the box above)	(EA ≥ 108 and $CLM < 63$) or $63 \leq CLM < 86$
	MATH 139 or below (including MATH 124 and those listed in the two boxes above)	$86 \leq CLM < 103$
WCSU	MATH 110, 113, 127 (prerequisite A in MATH 098 or pass in MATH 100)	SAT Math ≥ 600 or EA ≥ 91 or $CLM \geq 42$
	MATH 105, 106, 115, 118, 120 (prerequisite C or higher in MATH 100)	
	MATH 133, 135 170 (prerequisite B or higher in MATH 100)	

All four universities offer a four-credit Calculus I course. This course is generally required of students majoring in mathematics, computer science, engineering, and the physical sciences. The criteria for placement into Calculus I are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6 Courses Requiring Qualification for Calculus I

Institution	Courses	Criteria for Initial Placement
CCSU	MATH 135 Applied Engineering Calculus I MATH 152 Calculus I (or any course in Table 5)	SAT Math ≥ 600 and calculus or pre-calculus in high school with a grade of B or higher or EA + CLM ≥ 165
ECSU	MATH 243 Calculus I	SAT Math ≥ 600 or (EA ≥ 75 and $CLM \geq 60$)

SCSU	MATH 150 Calculus I MATH 178 Elementary Discrete Mathematics MATH 221 Intermediate Applied Statistics (or any course in Table 5)	CLM \geq 103
WCSU	MATH 181 Calculus I	(SAT Math \geq 600 or EA \geq 91 or CLM \geq 42) and permission of math faculty advisor

Appendix: Guide to Acronyms

ACT = American College Test

CLM = College Level Mathematics section of the Accuplacer Test

EA = Elementary Algebra Section of the Accuplacer Test

ESL = English as a Second Language

SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test, consisting of three sections: Verbal (or Critical Reading), Writing, and Mathematics

TOEFL = Test of English as a Foreign Language

TSWE = Test of Standard Written English

Connecticut Transfer and Articulation Committee

The Department of Higher Education convened the Connecticut Transfer and Articulation Committee, whose membership is listed below, to take the necessary steps to prepare this report. Representatives of the constituent units were asked to prepare reports for their specific institution or system.

Connecticut Transfer and Articulation Committee

Charter Oak State College

Shirley Adams, *Vice President for Academic Affairs*

College of Technology

Karen Wosczyzna-Birch, *Coordinator*

Community College System

Paul Susen, *Chief Academic Officer*

Philip Cocchiola, *Associate Academic Officer*

Connecticut State University System

Rhona Free, *Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, ECSU*

Roy Stewart, *Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Connecticut State University System*

Abbey Zink, *Assistant Dean of Arts & Sciences, WCSU*

University of Connecticut

Dolan Evanovich, *Vice Provost for Enrollment Management*

Hedley Freake, *Professor of Nutritional Sciences & Molecular and Cell Biology*

Deborah Rice, *Associate Director of Admissions*

Standing Advisory Committee to the Board of Governors for Higher Education

Sharon Braverman, *Assistant Dean, School of Business, CCSU*

Department of Higher Education

John Walters, *Director of Evaluation and Planning*

Jonas Zdanys, *Associate Commissioner for Academic Affairs, Chair*