

# ILLINOIS ARTICULATION INITIATIVE

TO FACILITATE INTERINSTITUTIONAL TRANSFER

Illinois Board of Higher Education  
431 East Adams, Second Floor  
Springfield, IL 62701  
tel: 217/557-7356  
fax: 217/782-8548  
[ibhe\\_iai@ibhe.org](mailto:ibhe_iai@ibhe.org)

Illinois Community College Board  
401 East Capitol  
Springfield, IL 62701  
tel: 217/524-5503  
fax: 217/785-0090  
[brisse@iccb.state.il.us](mailto:brisse@iccb.state.il.us)

November 15, 2005

From: Gary Alexander, Illinois Board of Higher Education  
Carol Lanning, Senior Director of Program Planning and Accountability

Re: **Comments Requested on a Preliminary Report and Recommendations from the Evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative.**

You are invited to submit comments concerning the **preliminary** report during the period from **November 15 to December 15, 2005**. Please address them to any one of the following:

Richard Pearce  
Barbara Risse

[ibhe\\_iai@ibhe.org](mailto:ibhe_iai@ibhe.org)  
[brisse@iccb.state.il.us](mailto:brisse@iccb.state.il.us)

**Background.** In spring 2005, the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board charged two education consultants, Dr. Kathleen Kelly and Dr. Ivan J. Lach, with conducting an evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative. This review had been urged by various groups as early as 2002. Not until 2005 were funds available to address the higher education system's requests.

The evaluation, as proposed by Kelly and Lach, included an examination of the structure, principles, and processes of the IAI; an assessment of the roles of various groups and the support required for IAI activities; and an examination of the utilization of IAI resources by students, academic advisors, admissions offices, and others involved in facilitating articulation and transfer.

In the early summer of 2005, the consultants began to review existing documents including annual reports by the agencies, special studies since 1993, and related literature on transfer and articulation. They consulted ICCB and IBHE staff and the IAI Steering Panel. They surveyed IAI panel members, transfer coordinators, and community college and university academic officers. From the document review and interviews, key issues were identified. These comprise the attached report.

This is a **preliminary** report that includes a summary of the consultants' findings and observations, an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of

the IAI, and recommendations for future action. It is being widely disseminated in order to seek input prior to finalizing the report.

**Next steps.** The consultants will review the comments and, in consultation with ICCB and IBHE staff, finalize the report by December 31, 2005. It will be presented to the Boards of both agencies in spring 2006. Staff will discuss implementing the recommendations and transitions will occur in fiscal year 2007.

The consultants and the staffs of the IBHE and ICCB thank you for your participation, cooperation, and continuing support of improving student transfer and course articulation through the Illinois Articulation Initiative.

**Evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative  
Preliminary Report and Recommendations  
November 1, 2005**

Kathleen F. Kelly, Ph.D.  
Higher Education Consultant  
kathleenkelly@insightbb.com

Ivan J. Lach, Ph.D.  
Higher Education Consultant  
IvanLach@insightbb.com

**Part 1**  
**Introduction and Background**

1. Introduction
2. History of Transfer and Articulation Initiatives in Illinois
  - a. Community Colleges Designed for Transfer
  - b. Early Program Articulation Initiatives
  - c. The Articulation Compact and Model Associate Degrees
3. Development of the Illinois Articulation Initiative
  - a. Strengthening Undergraduate Education
  - b. General Education Core Curriculum
  - c. Major Field Articulation
  - d. IAI Development 1993 to 2005
  - e. iTransfer Website
4. Other Transfer and Articulation Processes
5. Transfer Trends and Patterns

**Part 2**  
**Evaluation and Preliminary Recommendations**

1. Approaches to the Evaluation of IAI and Sources of Information
2. Clarifying Purposes of IAI
  - Recommendation 1: Statement of Purposes
3. Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities
4. Roles and Responsibilities – General Education Panels
  - Recommendation 2: Roles and Responsibilities of GECC Faculty Panels
  - Recommendation 3: Course Review
5. Roles and Responsibilities – Major Field Panels
  - Recommendation 4: Roles and Responsibilities of Major Field Panels
  - Recommendation 5: Review of Courses in the Major
6. Roles and Responsibilities – Steering Panel and Technical Task Force
  - Recommendation 6: Statewide Transfer Advisory Committee
  - Recommendation 7: Transfer Advisory Committee Representation
  - Recommendation 8: Charge to the Transfer Advisory Committee

7. Roles and Responsibilities – Colleges and Universities and Coordinating Boards
  - Recommendation 9: Roles and Responsibilities of Colleges and Universities
  
  - Recommendation 10: Roles and Responsibilities of ICCB and IBHE
8. Panel Membership and Participation
  - Recommendation 11: Three-year staggered terms
  - Recommendation 12: Nomination of members
9. Other Considerations and Recommendations
  - a. Acceptance of Incomplete General Education Core
    - Recommendation 13: Completion of GECC
  
  - b. Coordination of IAI and other Transfer Mechanisms
    - Recommendation 14: Consolidated Transfer Website
10. Summary and Implementation Considerations

# Evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative

## Part 1

### Introduction and Background

#### Introduction

Since their establishment, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) and the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) have placed highest priority on providing access to higher education for the state's diverse population. The establishment of the statewide community college system provided college opportunities within an easy commute for all Illinois citizens. Among the primary roles of community colleges is providing the first two years of a bachelor's degree program—a lower cost, convenient, high quality alternative to attending a four-year institution.

However, Illinois also has a tradition of autonomy for public colleges and universities, as well as a large sector of independent colleges and universities. As each of the over 180 colleges and universities develops and improves programs and curricula, the differences among programs increase and the chances decline that the courses students take at one institution will match the degree requirements at another. For this reason, colleges and universities, an organization of transfer coordinators, and the ICCB and IBHE have used several approaches to assist students in transferring among institutions and advancing toward a degree without loss of credit or time, and while protecting institutional autonomy.

This report provides an evaluation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) and preliminary recommendations for consideration by the higher education community. The IAI is one of several efforts to facilitate transfer for students. It is designed to assist students who plan to transfer to pursue a bachelor's degree but who have not chosen a destination institution or a major. The first part of this report provides background about transfer and articulation in Illinois, development of the IAI, and transfer patterns. The second part provides a summary of IAI issues drawn from recent studies of the IAI, interviews with IAI leaders and staff members of the Boards, responses to an informal survey, and meetings with IBHE and ICCB advisory groups. These sources also provided the advice reflected in the preliminary recommendations.

#### History of Transfer and Articulation Initiative in Illinois

##### Community Colleges Designed for Transfer

To understand the Illinois Articulation Initiative it is essential to review a brief history of articulation in Illinois. Articulation of courses and programs in Illinois goes back to the establishment of the first two-year junior college, Joliet Junior College, in 1901. At that time, University of Chicago and the University of Illinois articulated the two-year program of study at Joliet and

accepted the graduates of that program as juniors (Hardin, Thomas L., *The University of Illinois and the Community-Junior College Movement, Illinois Historical Journal, Vol. LXXIX, Number 2, Summer 1986*). The University of Illinois developed similar articulation agreements with the additional junior colleges that were established in Chicago between 1911 and 1915 and in other parts of Illinois in the 1920s. For example, when La Salle-Peru Junior College opened in 1924, examiners from the University of Illinois visited the college and approved the curriculum there as being equivalent to the first two years at the University (Hardin 2).

Additional institution-to-institution articulation of courses and programs were established with the four-year colleges and universities as the two-year colleges produced more and more transfer students. These institution-to-institution agreements were and continue to be very useful to students who transfer to a particular four-year college or university.

After the establishment of the Illinois public community college system in 1965, the number of community colleges in the state more than doubled. Community colleges were sending their transfer students not just to one specific university but to several four-year colleges and universities throughout the state. While the institution-to-institution articulation was useful to some students and to some extent to the community colleges in designing their courses, it was not useful to students who were undecided about their major field of study and/or their transfer institution. In addition, colleges were often unable to provide the very different courses required by the various four-year colleges and universities. As a result, the need to articulate courses and programs with a group of four-year colleges and universities at the same time became a high priority.

### **Early Program Articulation Initiatives**

To address this need the Illinois Community College Board created articulation panels during the 1970s and 1980s in a number of discipline areas consisting of faculty members from various universities and community colleges. The panels were asked to develop guidelines for courses and programs within each discipline that would be accepted for transfer by all of the participating universities. While community colleges were not required to conform to the guidelines developed by these panels, and universities were not required to accept courses meeting these guidelines, the work of these panels was generally accepted by both community colleges and universities. This was a major step moved forward for articulation among multiple institutions.

In 1971, the Transfer Coordinators of Illinois Colleges and Universities was formed to address and resolve transfer problems among colleges and universities. This group continued to use the articulation panels of community college and university faculty to address the articulation of

general education and major field courses in specific disciplines throughout the 1970s and the 1980s.

One example will illustrate how these articulation panels operated. In 1985, the community colleges had a problem with the computer course for business majors required by the public universities. Each university specified a different computer language. The ICCB and the Transfer Coordinators formed an articulation panel of business and computer faculty to resolve this problem. In just one meeting, this panel recognized that graduates of business programs would encounter the use of a variety of computer languages in businesses and industries and no one language is the best preparation. The faculty agreed that it is important for students to have experience with a structured computer language so that these concepts could be used in working with a variety of computer languages in the future. As a result, the panel recommended that the universities should accept, in transfer, any introductory computer course for business majors that uses a structured computer language. This recommendation was accepted by all the universities and the community colleges. It is important to note that the articulation panels developed general guidelines for courses and programs that were accepted by universities without related review of all individual courses offered by the colleges.

### **The Articulation Compact and Model Associate Degrees**

In the late 1960s, there was an even broader articulation initiative among the community colleges and the public universities in Illinois (commonly called *The Articulation Compact*) to better address the needs of the large proportion of community college transfer students who are undecided about their major field of study and/or their destination institution. The Articulation Compact proposed that community college transfer students who complete the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degrees be accepted as juniors and as having satisfied the general education requirements of the public universities in Illinois. The Articulation Compact was formally approved as an Illinois Board of Higher Education Resolution in 1970.

The Articulation Compact was accepted by nine of the 12 public universities in Illinois. This articulation initiative enabled students to complete the AA or the AS degree at the community college, while they were deciding on a major, and to have all their general education requirements completed when they transferred to a regional public university. It was a great move forward in serving the transfer needs of students who were undecided or unsure about their major or their destination institution, the four-year institution to which they planned to transfer. It is important to note that the universities accepted the community colleges' AA and AS degrees as satisfying their own general education degree requirements without any guidelines and without the review of individual courses.

By the late 1980s, the public universities accepting the Articulation Compact were making major changes in their general education requirements and would not continue to honor the compact unless the community colleges upgraded their general education requirement for the AA and AS degrees. As a result, the ICCB, working with its Program Advisory Committee and the Transfer Coordinators, developed the Model AA and AS Degrees that contained general education requirements, comparable to those at Illinois public universities. The community colleges adopted the model AA and AS degree guidelines, and the public universities, destination institutions for most of the community college students, continued to honor the compact with the provision that the colleges followed the AA and AS model degree guidelines.

Although the regional universities that enrolled the large majority of the transfer students honored the Articulation Compact, the University of Illinois campuses in Urbana-Champaign and Chicago never honored the compact. Many community college leaders wanted to expand and enhance the transfer articulation to include not only the University of Illinois but also the independent colleges and universities in the state.

## **Development of the Illinois Articulation Initiative**

### **Strengthening Undergraduate Education**

In addition to concerns about acceptance of the Compact, two factors influenced the development of the Illinois Articulation Initiative. First, strengthening undergraduate education became a high priority both nationally and in Illinois during the 1980s. As part of this effort, many Illinois universities strengthened and focused the general education component of their programs. Second, during the same period, higher education was serving increasing numbers of non-traditional students—part-time commuter students with family and work responsibilities; students who were not well prepared for college and needed remedial work; and students who delayed entry or “stopped out” and re-entered college. Community colleges offered significant opportunities to these students, but many of them had not formulated a plan to complete a bachelor’s degree.

In 1992, the IBHE received a status report on transfer articulation issues prepared by the staff. Following a discussion of this report, the IBHE directed the IBHE staff to address transfer articulation among Illinois colleges and universities and to develop a system that would include the participation of all public colleges and universities and as many of the independent colleges and universities as possible.

The Illinois Articulation Initiative was developed in response to this IBHE directive. It was designed to expand and improve the previous multi-institutional articulation efforts in Illinois. Although not clearly stated, the Illinois Articulation Initiative was designed to serve the students who start

college being undecided or unsure about their major field of study and/or the destination institution, as well as the many students who change their major and/or decide to transfer to a different institution than they originally planned to attend. It was also designed to help community colleges meet the many different specific course requirements of multiple four-year colleges and universities by being able to offer the courses that would be acceptable for transfer by all colleges and universities in Illinois.

The development of the IAI was divided into two major segments: a General Education Core Curriculum (GECC) and lower-division courses in each major field that would meet the degree requirements in that major at all universities offering that degree.

### **General Education Core Curriculum**

The General Education Core Curriculum was intended to contain the basic core requirements to meet the general education objectives at all Illinois colleges and universities so that this curriculum would be accepted as satisfying the lower-division general education requirements for transfer students at all colleges and universities. Each institution could have its own unique general education curriculum, but would be expected to accept the IAI GECC as satisfying its lower-division general education curriculum for transfer students.

Just as faculty are primarily responsible for developing the general education requirements at colleges and universities, the IBHE and the ICCB decided that faculty panels from Illinois colleges and universities should have the primary responsibility for developing the IAI GECC. Panels consisting primarily of faculty members, academic administrators, and transfer coordinators were formed in each of the general education disciplines to identify the core requirements in each discipline. A Steering Committee, consisting of the chairs of each discipline panel and a few additional members at large, was formed to coordinate the construction and development of the GECC.

### **Major Field Articulation**

The IAI major field articulation was intended to identify the lower-division general education and major field course requirements in each major that students should complete prior to transfer. The IAI major field articulation did not start until the IAI GECC was completed. The IAI Steering Panel that was formed to coordinate the development of the GECC also coordinated the work of the major field panels.

### **IAI Development 1993 to 2005**

The Illinois Board of Higher Education's annual progress reports on the Illinois Articulation Initiative provide a history of the development and

implementation of the program since it was launched in 1993. These reports show steady progress and substantial cooperation and participation by colleges and universities and the staffs of the ICCB and IBHE. (See attached chronology of reports and policy statements.)

During 1993 and 1994, the General Education Core Curriculum was developed by faculty panels—in communications, humanities/fine arts, mathematics, physical and life sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. The GECC was approved by the Steering Panel, and subsequently endorsed by the IBHE and ICCB. Public and private colleges and universities were then invited to participate in the initiative, and by March of 1995, the presidents of all community colleges and public universities and 37 private institutions had indicated an intention to participate in the implementation of the GECC. In 2005, 48 community colleges, 6 private 2-year colleges, 12 public universities, and 44 4-year independent institutions were participating in the IAI.

The transferable GECC became effective for students entering college as first-time freshmen in the summer of 1998. In 1999-2000, faculty panels conducted fifth-year reviews of the five general education subject areas. A key component of the IAI was the development of a web-based information system available to students, advisors, faculty, and academic administrators throughout the state.

Between 1994 and 2005, 206 generic course descriptions were developed and refined in the five general education subject areas. These descriptions have been used to identify specific courses offered by colleges and universities that meet the guidelines for inclusion in a transferable core. Over 7,000 general education courses have met these guidelines and are listed by participating institutions on the ITransfer website.

In 1994 the first panels were established to develop recommendations for “course essentials for students transferring into specific baccalaureate majors.” The first models for majors—nursing and engineering—were endorsed in 1995. Additional models were developed and endorsed each year. By 2005, guidance for students in 27 major fields had been developed.

### **[iTransfer Website](#)**

In advance of the implementation of the GECC, the iTransfer Website became available to the public in May of 1997. The site provided course descriptions for the GECC and opportunities for them to identify the courses at each college that met the requirements. As the major panels completed their work, course descriptions and lists of approved courses were added in each field. In 2005, the site provides information for students, parents, and college and university faculty and advisors. It serves as a central site for communications and resource materials for members of panels and committees.

## **Other Transfer and Articulation Processes**

The IAI did not replace other transfer processes. During the past 13 years, colleges and universities have continued to develop and improve 2 + 2 arrangements, which serve students who have decided on a major and destination institution. Dual admission programs have been developed that allow students to be admitted simultaneously to a community college and to bachelor's degree granting institution to pursue a specific curriculum.

The usefulness of 2 + 2 and other articulation agreements has been enhanced by the development of the Course Applicability System (CAS). This system provides detailed information to individual students about the transferability of courses between specific institutions. Updated annually, CAS allows students to identify the specific courses at their home college that have been approved by their destination college for the degree program they have selected. Currently, 29 community colleges and seven public universities have course descriptions and articulation information available on the transfer.org website. All public universities and five independent institutions have been licensed and are developing articulation guides for inclusion in the system.

IAI faculty panels found that the traditional transfer degree programs, the Associate in Arts and Associate in Science, did not allow students in some fields to take lower division prerequisites in the major and still complete a full GECC. Typically, these majors were very structured and required sequences of courses that needed to be taken in freshman and sophomore years. To meet the needs of students majoring in these fields, specialized associate degrees have been developed, including the Associate in Fine Arts, the Associate in Engineering Science, and the Associate in Art in Teaching.

## **Transfer Trends and Patterns**

It is difficult to assess directly whether IAI has been effective in assisting students with transferring smoothly from one Illinois institution to another. The initiative was founded on anecdotal evidence that students were losing credit, particularly those who transferred from a community college to a public university. While there are no quantitative measures of credit transfer, people involved with the initiative—faculty, transfer coordinators, academic administrators, and IBHE and ICCB staffs—believe that students have benefited from the initiative, particularly from the development of the GECC.

As shown in Table 1, in fall 1991 prior to the January 1992 launching of the IAI, over 48,000 students transferred into Illinois public and private colleges and universities. About 16,200 transferred to an Illinois institution from "Other Institutions" including out-of-state, foreign, and unknown institutions. Therefore, over 32,000—about two-thirds of these students—were known to have transferred from one Illinois institution to another. Between 1991 and

2004, the total number of transfer students enrolling for the first time in Illinois institutions declined only slightly. However, transfers from community colleges to public universities (initially the focus of the IAI) declined 10%.

Since the IAI was implemented in the fall of 1998, the total number of students transferring into Illinois institutions has increased 8%. Much of the increase may be attributed to substantial increases in transfers from "Other Institutions" to community colleges and to independent for-profit institutions. There was also a substantial increase in the number of students transferring from one community college to another. In contrast, transfers from community colleges to public universities and not-for-profit independent institutions declined -8% and -5% respectively.

Basic transfer data shown in Table 1 does not reveal changes associated specifically with the beginning of the IAI or its implementation in 1998. There are many factors that influence transfer patterns. Enrollment trends provide a partial explanation. Table 2 shows the substantial increase in undergraduate enrollment in independent for-profit institutions that parallels the increases in transfers to and from these institutions shown in Table 1. However, the increases in enrollment in community college baccalaureate transfer programs are not reflected in the numbers of transfers from community colleges.

**Table 1**  
**Patterns of Inter-institutional Undergraduate Transfer**  
**Fall 1991, 1998, and 2004**

	Fall 1991 Total	Fall 1998 Total	Fall 2004 Total	% Change 1991 to 2004	% Change 1998 to 2004
<b>Total Transfers</b>	<b>48,359</b>	<b>43,726</b>	<b>47,165</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>From Public Universities</b>	<b>6,755</b>	<b>5,976</b>	<b>5,329</b>	<b>-21%</b>	<b>-11%</b>
To Public Universities	1,681	1,304	1,129	-33%	-13%
To Community Colleges	3,697	3,426	3,051	-17%	-11%
To Independent NFP Institutions	1,350	1,172	955	-29%	-19%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	27	74	194	619%	162%
<b>From Community Colleges</b>	<b>19,990</b>	<b>20,702</b>	<b>20,405</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>-1%</b>
To Public Universities	10,999	10,807	9,937	-10%	-8%
To Community Colleges	4,014	3,481	3,969	-1%	14%
To Independent NFP Institutions	4,844	6,126	5,844	21%	-5%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	133	288	655	392%	127%
<b>From Independent NFP Institutions</b>	<b>5,360</b>	<b>4,141</b>	<b>4,203</b>	<b>-22%</b>	<b>1%</b>
To Public Universities	1,317	1,005	928	-30%	-8%
To Community Colleges	2,726	2,048	2,071	-24%	1%
To Independent NFP Institutions	1,285	981	993	-23%	1%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	32	107	211	559%	97%
<b>From Independent For-Profit Institutions</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>77%</b>
To Public Universities	45	30	30	-33%	0%
To Community Colleges	229	120	203	-11%	69%
To Independent NFP Institutions	116	140	235	103%	68%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	21	24	88	319%	267%
<b>From Other Institutions</b>	<b>15,843</b>	<b>12,593</b>	<b>16,672</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>32%</b>
To Public Universities	3,938	3,730	3,896	-1%	4%
To Community Colleges	6,603	4,582	7,417	12%	62%
To Independent NFP Institutions	4,582	3,948	4,224	-8%	7%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	720	333	1,135	58%	241%
<b>Total From All Institutions</b>					
To Public Universities	17,980	16,876	15,920	-11%	-6%
To Community Colleges	17,269	13,657	16,711	-3%	22%
To Independent NFP Institutions	12,177	12,367	12,251	1%	-1%
To Independent For-Profit Institutions	933	826	2,283	145%	176%

Sources: IBHE, *1992 Data Book*, Table V-1; *1999 Data Book*, Table V-1; and *2005 Data Book*, Table V-1)

**Table 2**  
**Fall Enrollment of Undergraduate and Baccalaureate Transfer Students by Sector**  
**1991, 1998, and 2004**

	<b>Fall 1991</b>	<b>Fall 1998</b>	<b>Fall 2004</b>	<b>% Change 1991 to 2004</b>	<b>% Change 1998 to 2004</b>
Public University - Undergraduate	151,189	145,903	149,355	-1%	2%
Community College - Baccalaureate Transfer	114,006	111,126	127,321	12%	15%
Independent NFP - Undergraduate	112,743	115,647	127,967	14%	11%
Independent For-Profit - Undergraduate	12,241	15,287	26,782	119%	75%

Sources: IBHE, *1992 Data Book*, Tables I-2, II-9, I-4; *1999 Data Book*, Tables I-2, II-10, I-4; and *2005 Data Book*, Tables I-5, II-10, I-7)

Because Northern Illinois University annually accepts more students in transfer than any other university, their study of 805 transfer students provides some useful insights. The study indicated that most students are satisfied with their transfer experience and that both their community college and the University provided appropriate assistance. As Table 3 shows, a majority of students did the following: planned to transfer when they entered the community college, completed an associate degree, and transferred credit in the major. While only 22% of the NIU transfer students were aware of IAI specifically and only 3% had used the website, they seemed to have benefited from the development of the GECC. Among students who transferred before receiving an associate degree, a substantial number had completed some or all of the GECC. Despite the overall satisfaction with the transfer process, a substantial proportion of students reported that they had some lost credit in transfer, and most of them did not know why.

<b>Table 3</b> <b>Selected Results of NIU Study</b> <b>of Transfer Students</b>	
	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Planned to transfer	92
Aware of IAI	22
Completed an Associate Degree	69
Completed the GECC but no degree	30
Completed part of the GECC but no degree	58
Transferred credit in the major	72
Lost some credit in transfer	43

## **Part 2**

### **Evaluation and Preliminary Recommendations**

The Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) is a significant statewide cooperative effort among all colleges and universities in Illinois designed to facilitate the transfer process for the many college students who are undecided about their major, who change their major during the first two years of college, who are undecided about their destination institution, or who transfer to an institution different than the one they initially planned to attend. With the increase of non-traditional students at all colleges and universities, the number of students who transfer from one institution to another for a variety of reasons is very significant.

While there are a number of other very important articulation efforts in Illinois designed to facilitate the transfer of students from one institution to another, most of these serve only students who know their major and their destination institution and who do not change either of those decisions. Secondly, the IAI is the only articulation initiative that involves the cooperation of all Illinois colleges and universities in developing standards for a common general education core curriculum at the lower division that is accepted for transfer by all public universities and many independent colleges and universities in Illinois. This is a remarkable accomplishment that is worth preserving and continually improving.

#### **Approaches to the Evaluation and Sources of Information**

The following evaluation and preliminary recommendations are based on information drawn from several sources. Recent studies of the IAI were reviewed. Of particular interest was the *Review of Baccalaureate Major Panel Roles*, a report submitted to the IAI Steering Panel in April 2005. A list of other studies is attached. Information was also drawn from IBHE policy studies and IAI status reports listed in the attached chronology.

In addition to formal studies, the consultants met with IBHE and ICCB staffs, advisory committees of both boards, and selected college and university representatives who have provided leadership throughout the initiative. In addition, both college and university representatives provided written responses to informal discussion questions distributed at meetings. Some colleges convened meetings of people responsible for transfer activities and provided summaries of their comments.

The preliminary recommendations are intended to support the elements of the IAI that best serve students and streamline the processes for institutions

and the staffs of the coordinating boards. Recommendations include the following:

- ◆ Clarifying the purposes of the Illinois Articulation Initiative (Recommendation 1)
- ◆ Shifting responsibility to faculty at individual colleges and universities for certifying that courses meet guidelines (Recommendations 3 and 5).
- ◆ Refining the role and responsibilities of the GECC panels to focus on developing content guidelines and learning outcomes rather than approval of individual courses (Recommendations 2 and 3).
- ◆ Refocusing the roles and responsibilities of the major field panels (Recommendation 4 and 5).
- ◆ Reorganizing the Steering Panel and the Technical Task Force to form a statewide transfer advisory committee that would advise the boards on all transfer initiatives, and development of a single website that would guide students to the appropriate transfer tools. (Recommendation 6, 7, 8 and 14)
- ◆ Defining the roles and responsibilities of participating colleges and universities, the Illinois Community College Board, and the Illinois Board of Higher Education, consistent with changes to the roles of the panels (Recommendations 9 and 10)
- ◆ Improving representation and participation in panels. (Recommendations 11 and 12)
- ◆ Encouraging institutions to expand options for students who have not completed the GECC prior to transfer. (Recommendation 13)

These recommendations are offered for consideration by the IAI Steering Panel, the Technical Task Force, staffs and advisory groups of the ICCB and IBHE, and others who are interested in the Illinois Articulation Initiative. Based on feedback received, the recommendations will be amended and refined. A report will then be submitted to the ICCB and IBHE for consideration and implementation as appropriate.

### **Clarifying Purposes of IAI**

There is general consensus that the primary purpose of the IAI is to facilitate students' transfer from one institution to another without loss of credit. IBHE policies state that transfer students "should be able to progress toward baccalaureate degree completion at a rate comparable to that of students who entered the baccalaureate institution as first-time freshman."

IAI was designed primarily to serve undecided and self-advising students who planned to transfer but had not selected an institution or a major. Students who have selected their next institution and major (or narrowed their choices) are better served by other transfer tools—2+2 inter-institutional agreements, dual admission plans, specialized transfer degree programs, and the Course Applicability System (CAS). Despite the original purpose and the continued development of other transfer tools, IAI is seen

by some as the primary conduit for transfer information and the primary solution for nearly all transfer problems.

### **RECOMMENDATION 1: Statement of Purposes**

**The general goals of the Illinois Articulation Initiative are as follows:**

- a) To enhance the transfer among all colleges and universities in Illinois for students who change or are undecided about their destination institution or major.**
- b) To promote cooperation among all community colleges, all public universities, and many independent colleges and universities in this articulation effort.**
- c) To involve faculty in discussion and consideration of developments in disciplines and learning outcomes for college students.**
- d) To enable community colleges to streamline their course offerings and to develop general education courses that may be accepted by all receiving institutions.**
- e) To provide comprehensive information on the equivalency of courses for college and university advisors.**
- f) To identify the minimum content and performance standards for a general education curriculum that will be accepted as meeting the lower-division general education requirements at all Illinois colleges and universities.**

### **Clarifying Roles and Responsibilities**

As the purposes of IAI have evolved, so too have the roles and responsibilities of the organizations contributing to the success of the initiative. Three groups might be considered—the coordinating boards and their staffs; the colleges and universities including their faculties, and academic leadership; and the IAI panels and committees. In addition, the Transfer Coordinators have played a major role in solving transfer and articulation issues and in developing the IAI and other transfer tools. During the 1990s, IBHE's Academic Leadership Group provided policy leadership during the implementation of IAI and was available to assist in the resolution of transfer problems between institutions when needed.

As the IAI has taken on additional purposes, responsibility has shifted from the boards and their staffs and the colleges and universities to the IAI panels and committees. Some of those interviewed raised concerns, not about what

each group was doing, but about the apparent lack of definition and common understanding about the respective roles and responsibilities.

Coordinating Boards	IAI Units	Colleges and Universities
Board of Higher Education IBHE Staff Community College Board ICCB Staff	Steering Committee Technical Committee 5 General Education Panels 24 Major Field Panels Website staff	Faculties Academic leadership Student services personnel
Transfer Coordinators IBHE Academic Leadership Group		

### Roles and Responsibilities - General Education Panels

Our evaluation revealed that the IAI GECC was well accepted by the institutions and that the goals and objectives of the GECC are being achieved. The IAI GECC is serving many transfer students very well, especially those who are undecided about a major and/or their transfer institution. The IAI GECC discipline panels consist primarily of faculty, but also include transfer coordinators and chief academic officers. This seems to be a good balance of faculty and academic administrators that has enabled the IAI GECC panels to be very effective. These panels were successful in developing the IAI GECC which is being accepted as satisfying the lower-division general education requirements for transfer students by all Illinois public universities, all public community colleges, and many independent colleges and universities in the state. In addition, the panels identified the courses in each discipline area that would meet the objectives of the GECC.

While the goals and objectives of the IAI GECC are being achieved, there are a number of processes and functions that need to be improved to make the articulation of general education courses more efficient and more objective.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 2: Roles and Responsibilities of GECC Faculty Panels**

**The roles and responsibilities of the IAI GECC panels should be the following:**

- a) Provide a forum for faculty from public and private colleges and universities to guide the transferable General Education Core Curriculum, to develop common understandings about general education objectives and curriculum content, and to monitor changes and developments in the disciplines.**
- b) Develop the general content guidelines and learning objectives for courses to meet the GECC requirements in the particular discipline area. The content guidelines and learning objectives should identify the essential concepts, objectives, and competencies to meet minimum standards for courses in this area.**

- **The descriptions should be clear enough for any faculty or department chair in this discipline at the local institution to easily determine whether or not a local course meets these guidelines.**
  - **These descriptions should be specific enough to ensure that the courses in this category meet the minimum standards for satisfying the GECC requirements, but should be general enough to allow for local institutional diversity.**
- c) Articulate the rationale for the content guidelines and learning objectives for courses to meet the GECC in this discipline area to faculty in this field at all Illinois colleges and universities**
- d) Assist the IBHE and ICCB staffs with the review of courses by clarifying and/or revising the content guidelines and learning objectives for courses in this discipline area when requested.**
- e) Identify new trends in the discipline area that go beyond meeting the standards of the GECC and disseminate these as suggestions to colleges and universities in Illinois.**

Currently the IAI GECC panels review all courses submitted by the institutions to determine if the courses are equivalent to those already described by the panel or, in the case of unique new courses, to determine if they satisfy the content guidelines and learning objectives for the GECC requirements in that discipline. While this process is working, it is often very inefficient and courses are frequently not reviewed in a timely manner. It is not uncommon for the process to take a year or longer. During the first half of 2005, each of the general education faculty panels met once. The decision reports from these meetings show that the panels considered 144 courses and approved 67 for inclusion in the GECC. For 42 of the 77 courses not approved, the panels indicated that more information or clarification was needed.

Part of the problem is caused by some panels not having clearly written content guidelines, learning objectives, and course descriptions. In such cases, the panels spend a lot of time rehashing the same issues each time a new course is submitted for review. The decisions may be very subjective and inconsistent. For this reason, it is essential that all panels spend the necessary time to develop clearly written content guidelines, learning objectives, and course descriptions for the courses that they have already approved.

Some panels seem to dictate the courses with too much specificity, prohibiting local college and university faculty to meet course objectives in diverse ways. The panels should ensure that the content guidelines and learning objectives for the GECC are met by all courses but should also

recognize that these can be accomplished in many different ways by creative faculty.

Poor attendance at panel meetings and lack of participation in the course review process was frequently cited as a problem. As a result, some of the course review decisions are made by only a few of the panel members. Finally, while some panels have been successful in using electronic means to review courses, other panels have had great difficulty in utilizing this method.

While each of the above problems could be addressed separately to improve the course review and approval process somewhat, statewide panels are not efficient for performing routine functions such as course review and approval in a timely manner. Secondly, review and approval of individual courses is not an appropriate role and responsibility of the IAI panels. The primary responsibility for ensuring that courses meet the content guidelines and learning objectives developed by the IAI panels for meeting the requirements of the IAI GECC should be that of the faculty at the local colleges and universities. By understanding the IAI content guidelines and learning objectives the local faculty can not only develop good course descriptions and course syllabi, but they can also incorporate good materials and lesson plans to enhance these objectives in their courses.

A secondary review at the state-level is the appropriate role of the IBHE and ICCB staffs. The IBHE and ICCB have the authority and responsibility for coordinating statewide efforts in higher education in Illinois. Using the course content guidelines and learning objectives developed by the IAI panels, the IBHE and ICCB staffs could do a statewide review of the courses submitted by the colleges and universities before the courses are listed on the iTransfer website. The IBHE and ICCB staffs could seek assistance from the IAI panels in clarifying content guidelines and learning objectives when the need arises; however, the large majority of new courses could be reviewed jointly by the IBHE and ICCB staffs in a very timely manner.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: The IAI Course Review and Approval Process should be revised as follows:**

- a) **The primary responsibility for determining if courses developed by local institutions satisfy the content guidelines and learning objectives developed by the IAI panels should belong to the faculty at the local institutions.**
- b) **The IBHE and ICCB staffs should jointly perform a secondary review of courses submitted by the colleges and universities prior to posting the courses on the iTransfer website to ensure that the courses meet the content guidelines and learning objectives for the courses developed by the IAI panels.**

- c) **The IAI panels should assist the IBHE and ICCB staffs in interpreting and/or clarifying the content guidelines and learning objectives for courses in the discipline when requested.**
- d) **Colleges and universities should develop appropriate local process for faculty to review courses and certify that they meet the IAI content guidelines and learning objectives prior to submission for posting on the iTransfer website if such a process is not currently in use.**
- e) **The IBHE and ICCB staffs should maintain a log on their websites showing the status of all courses submitted for approval by colleges and universities.**

### **Roles and Responsibilities - Major Field Panels**

The original charge given to the IAI major field panels as stated in IBHE and ICCB documents was:

“Each baccalaureate major panel is charged to develop a recommendation for prospective students who have decided upon their major but who have not yet decided upon their destination institution. Each panel needs to identify those courses that incoming transfer students would have completed in order to be admitted as a junior into the baccalaureate major. The panel should identify and describe:

1. Any additional general education courses beyond those in the GECC that students need to complete to meet degree or college requirements (e.g., should students have completed a foreign language?)
2. Any courses in the major or related discipline that “native” students commonly take as freshmen and sophomores.
3. Any other information the prospective student should know about transfer into the major (e.g., what sub fields or disciplines does the major include? Is there a minimum GPA required for admissions? Are there entry exams? Is there a performance criteria required-audition, portfolio, etc.?)”

While the charge to the major field panels is subject to some different interpretations, it appears that the IBHE and ICCB staffs expected similar results from the major field panels as from the GECC panels. The fact that a list of IAI courses was developed in each major field area and the major field panels reviewed and approved courses indicates that the intent was to articulate major field courses on a statewide basis.

This intent, however, had two major problems. The first major problem was that IBHE policy allowed universities to decide whether or not to participate in each IAI major field articulation. As a result, many public universities chose not to participate in certain major field panel recommendations. Second, agreeing on what courses satisfy general education requirements is quite different from determining what courses are equivalent to courses required for a degree in a particular major. While there seems to be consensus on the objectives and structure of general education, there is considerable diversity in the objectives, structure, and course sequences among baccalaureate majors. As a result, many universities that accept the GECC as a package may not accept an individual course as being equivalent and for this same reason do not accept many major field courses as equivalent to their courses.

Because of these two problems, the significant work that the major field panels accomplished has been seriously compromised. While identifying a recommended program of study for students who have decided on a major (but not upon a destination institution) has been very valuable to students, advisors, and community colleges, the listing of IAI major field courses has been incomplete at best and misleading to individual students. Since not all universities participate, many IAI major field courses are not accepted. Even universities that have courses with the same IAI number may not accept a given course as being equivalent to their course. Furthermore, many universities who do not submit their courses for posting on the iTransfer website have equivalent courses and will accept similar courses for transfer.

While it would be ideal if all colleges and universities accepted the recommendations of the panels for transfer courses, this option is not viable for the following reasons:

- While the general education requirements at colleges and universities are relatively similar, the baccalaureate degrees in many of the majors are very different and unique. As a result, the first two years of these programs have very different requirements. This diversity among the various degrees in a given major enables students a greater selection among programs to better meet their individual choices. Having a set statewide lower division curriculum in each major would compromise this diversity.
- The many students undecided about their majors greatly benefit from the IAI GECC. However, by the time students decide on a major, most have identified one or two destination institutions. As a result, the program articulation with the specific university provides much better information for these students. The new Course Articulation System (CAS) when fully developed will provide very good information for these students.

- Transfer coordinators have indicated that the IAI major guidelines are often not the best advice for the majority of students, particularly students who not only know their major but have narrowed their choices of degree institutions. The grid of courses in the major has been removed from the iTransfer website because of fears that the information was misleading students. There are also reports that some four-year institutions have been slow to submit courses for approval by the major panels in order to avoid having to accept all other panel-approved courses in substitution for their own. (Marshall and Kerber)

For these reasons, the charge to the IAI major field panels needs to be focused on providing the best advice for students who know their major but are undecided about a transfer institution rather than developing specific IAI course descriptions and reviewing major field courses.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4: Roles and Responsibilities of Major Field Panels**

**The charge to the IAI major field panels should be revised to include the following:**

- a) Providing a forum for faculty from public and private colleges and universities to develop common understandings about lower-division objectives and curriculum content in the majors, and to monitor changes and developments in their respective fields that may affect students' preparation for upper division work.**
- b) Providing the best advice for students who know their major (but are undecided about a transfer) institution by identifying the lower division courses in the major or related discipline and any additional elective courses that are generally expected of native students as freshmen and sophomores in that major at most universities in Illinois.**
- c) Developing general content guidelines and learning objectives for lower division courses in the specific major that identify the essential concepts students should learn and the competencies they should develop.**
- d) Considering statewide articulation issues and problems with particular courses in the major field (i.e., those courses for which each university has developed unique requirements that cannot be accommodated by community colleges) and advising colleges and universities on appropriate options or resolutions.**

Field panels may also work to identify unique differences in lower division course and admission requirements among the baccalaureate degrees in the major at the various universities. They might assure that students are

provided with any other information about transfer into the major (i.e., GPA requirements for admission, entry exams, required auditions or portfolios, etc.). Panels might also identify new and/or innovative trends in the lower division curriculum in the major field and disseminate these trends to colleges and universities in Illinois.

During 2005, 16 major field panels met and took action on courses that had been submitted for approval. Reports from these meetings indicate that collectively the panels reviewed 195 courses, 55% were approved, 26% returned, and clarifications or specifications were requested for 19%. The number of courses and approval rates varied considerably among panels.

In responses to a survey, over 70% of the faculty participating in major field panels indicated that course review was extremely important that should be conducted annually. The survey indicated that faculty panelists consider course review to be most important role of the major panels. (Marshall and Kerber) However, as with the general education panels, several concerns were identified:

- Participation in meetings and online course review for some panels is low. Decisions may be made by a small number of faculty, who may not be representative, and approval may take months, sometimes more than a year.
- Decision criteria have not been developed for all panels. Even with criteria, decisions may be inconsistent from one meeting to the next because of participation levels.
- Information about the status of course approvals and other decisions are not communicated effectively by some panels.
- There are differing opinions among panels and within panels about the materials to be submitted for approval of courses.
- New panel members, board staff members, and college personnel do not receive sufficient orientation

Given these concerns, a study of the role of the major panels concluded, "...the efforts required to process and maintain the data on the IAI major course-to-course equivalencies does not warrant continuing the process as it has evolved. Much of the time and effort now spent on administering IAI, both by the institutions and the board staff, is used in dealing with the course-to-course equivalencies in the majors." The course matrix for the majors has been removed from the iTransfer website in response to concerns that the information was misleading to students. Because of these concerns, the following is recommended:

#### **RECOMMENDATION 5: Review of Courses in the Major**

**The review and approval of major field course by the IAI panel should be discontinued and IAI lower-division major field courses should not be maintained on the iTransfer website. Community**

**colleges should articulate new major field courses with the three universities to which most of the students from that community college transfer.**

### **Roles and Responsibilities – Steering Panel and Technical Task Force**

The IAI Steering Panel was established to coordinate the development of the IAI GECC and to ensure that the work of the IAI GECC faculty panels were consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the IAI. For this reason the Panel included the co-chairs of each of the five GECC panels along with other representatives from colleges and universities in Illinois. After the IAI GECC panels developed their recommendations they were reviewed and acted upon by the IAI Steering Panel. Sometimes the Steering Panel sent the recommendations back to the panels for revisions prior to approving them and forwarding them to the ICCB and IBHE for action. Since the Steering Panel included the co-chairs of all the IAI GECC panels, it was ideally constituted to address the overall and consistent goals of the IAI GECC.

The IAI Technical Task Force was established to address the technical aspects of implementing the IAI GECC recommendations at the local institutional level and to provide assistance in developing the iTransfer website. The IAI Technical Task Force consisted of college staff members who were very involved with the more detailed aspects of working with transfer students and prospective transfer students such as transfer coordinators, admission officers, registrars, and academic advisors. The IAI Technical Task Force made a great contribution to the success of the IAI by developing many needed processes for local institutions that enabled the IAI GECC recommendations to be implemented and, as a result, to serve transfer students.

While the IAI Steering Panel was well constituted to coordinate the development of the IAI GECC, the composition of the Panel was not changed when the IAI addressed the major field articulation. As a result, it was less effective in coordinating the development of the major field recommendations and evaluating the usefulness of the recommendations major field panels for transfer students. In addition, the IAI Steering Panel is not appropriately constituted to deal with many policy issues associated with the transfer and articulation that involve administrative processes and procedures, although they have been asked to do so. While the IAI Technical Task Force has been a great help in addressing many of these administrative procedures and processes, the policy decisions of the IAI Steering Panel could be greatly enhanced if the Panel members would have a better understanding and appreciation of some of the administrative processes and procedures.

The work and role of the IAI Steering Panel has greatly changed since the IAI GECC was developed over ten years ago. Currently, the IAI Steering Panel is being requested to address and resolve a variety of transfer articulation

issues and problems that are only slightly related to the IAI. While this is a very important function, the IAI Steering Panel was not constituted to serve this very important role.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 6: Statewide Transfer Advisory Committee**

The IBHE and ICCB should merge the IAI Steering Panel and the IAI Technical Task Force into one statewide transfer advisory committee that would advise to the IBHE and the ICCB about the IAI, the development and implementation of CAS, and all other transfer articulation efforts. The committee would also advise the boards on restructuring the iTransfer website to include information about all types of articulation efforts in Illinois in a format that will help guide students to the most appropriate information to address their particular needs.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 7: Transfer Advisory Committee Representation**

The composition of the IBHE/ICCB Transfer Articulation Advisory Committee should include faculty, students, presidents, chief academic officers, student service administrators, and transfer coordinators from all three sectors of higher education in Illinois (community colleges, independent colleges and universities, and public universities).

#### **RECOMMENDATION 8: Charge to the Transfer Advisory Committee**

The charge of the IBHE/ICCB Transfer Articulation Advisory Committee should be to advise the IBHE and ICCB on the following matters:

- a) Statewide policies and articulation efforts that would enhance the transfer process for students.
- b) Resolution of statewide transfer articulation issues.
- c) Coordination of the work of the IAI panels and the implementation of the IAI policies and recommendations.
- d) Development and implementation of CAS.
- e) Development of an easy-to-use information system about all transfer information for students and academic advisors.
- f) Planning and development of future transfer initiatives.

## **Roles and Responsibilities – Colleges and Universities and Coordinating Boards**

Given the proposed changes to the roles of the GECC and major panels, the roles of colleges and universities and the ICCB and IBHE need to be amended and clarified. Consistent with recent practices, the recommendations call for a shift in responsibility from the panels to the faculty of individual colleges and universities. In addition, the IBHE and ICCB staff will collaboratively support the process and handle the listing of courses using content guidelines and learning objectives developed by panels.

### **RECOMMENDATION 9: Roles and Responsibilities of Colleges and Universities**

**Colleges and universities participating in the Illinois Articulation Initiative and other articulation initiatives should:**

- a) Maximize students' opportunities for successful transfer either as a receiving institution, sending institution, or both.**
- b) Assure that students are well informed of transfer opportunities and options.**
- c) Consider IAI guidelines in developing new general education or major courses.**
- d) Develop a process for campus faculty to certify that a new course meets statewide guidelines prior to submission of the course to the IBHE or ICCB.**
- e) Support time and travel for faculty serving on panels and committees.**
- f) Designate a contact person for IAI communications.**

### **RECOMMENDATION 10: Roles and Responsibilities of ICCB and IBHE**

**The IBHE and ICCB and their staffs should coordinate statewide efforts to serve students who transfer among Illinois institutions including:**

- a) Develop policies on transfer and articulation in consultation with public and private colleges and universities and coordinate and support implementation of these policies.**
- b) Conduct orientation session for all new panel members so they are clear about their roles and responsibilities on the IAI panels.**

- c) **Provide staff support and facilitate communications among members of faculty panels, advisory groups, and individual colleges and universities.**
- d) **Regularly evaluate the effectiveness of transfer and articulation policies, identify issues that need to be addressed, and seek the advice of advisory committees in resolving problems and concerns.**
- e) **Regularly evaluate the effectiveness of transfer and articulation tools, such as iTransfer.org and CAS, identify issues that need to be addressed, and seek the advice of advisory committees in resolving problems and concerns.**
- f) **Provide information about transfer and articulation efforts to governmental leaders and the general public as appropriate.**
- g) **Support transfer and articulation initiatives in budget development, program approvals, and grant administration.**
- h) **Jointly review courses submitted by colleges and universities for posting on the iTransfer website to ensure that the courses meet the content guidelines and learning objectives developed by the IAI panels.**

### **Panel Membership and Participation**

Currently, the IBHE and ICCB do not have policies governing the appointment and length of service expected for IAI panel members. In the absence of policies, the practice has been lifetime appointments unless someone resigns, and in that case the position is filled by a faculty or staff from the same institution. This practice is not ideal for either the panel members or for prospective panel members from other Illinois colleges and universities. It is also not the best policy for obtaining statewide input and commitment on important academic decisions. Individuals are much more willing to serve on panels for a definite period of a few years. Having a rotating term of service for panels enables the IBHE and ICCB to get different institutional representation on panels gradually and still maintain a majority of members for consistency. While the IBHE and ICCB should generally appoint new members when the term of an exiting panel member expires, they can reappoint some panel members who continue to show interest and provide leadership for the work of the panel.

Non-attendance at panel meetings and/or non-participation in panel discussion via the Internet has been cited as a problem. While absence from meetings can occur for a variety of good reasons, there are ways that continued absence can and should be addressed. First, when nominating

faculty and/or staff to serve on IAI panels the chief academic officer should make sure that the individual selected is not only well qualified academically but is also willing to attend 3 to 4 meetings each year. Secondly, when new job or personal commitments do not enable an individual to attend panel meetings the chief academic officer should appoint a replacement panel member to complete the term of appointment of the original member. The IBHE and ICCB staff can assist the academic officers by notifying them of excessive absences on IAI panels by members from their institutions. Finally, the three year term of appointment should lead to better participation of all members on IAI panels because individuals are more likely to stay interested if they know that they have a limited time of service and the IBHE and ICCB can appoint new members to replace those that have not been attending and/or participating in IAI panel meetings.

**RECOMMENDATION 11: The IBHE and ICCB should implement a policy for three-year staggered term of appointment for all IAI panel members.**

**RECOMMENDATION 12: The chief academic officers should nominate individuals to IAI panels who are willing to attend as many as 3 to 4 panel meetings each year if needed and replace individuals serving on panels who are not attending and/or participating in panel meetings.**

### **Other Considerations and Recommendations**

#### **Acceptance of Incomplete General Education Core**

The GECC is accepted as a package in lieu of a receiving institution's general education curriculum. While this policy works well for many, some students transfer before completing the GECC and many universities only accept the GECC in place of their own general education requirements if the entire GECC is completed by the transfer student. This is a particularly significant problem for students in major fields that require many major-specific courses at the lower division. In these fields, students are not able to complete all general education requirements and lower division requirements in the major in two years of full-time study. Students at community colleges should be able to complete similar course patterns during the first two years as native students in a particular major without being penalized. Since all community colleges' general education requirements meet the GECC requirements, the universities need to recognize a partial GECC for these students.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 13: Completion of GECC**

**All institutions in Illinois should allow transfer students who have completed at least one half of the GECC prior to transfer the option to complete the GECC after transfer to satisfy the institution's general education requirements.**

## Coordination of IAI with other Transfer Mechanisms

While the IAI is designed to serve students who are undecided about their major and/or the transfer institution, there are several other excellent articulation efforts in Illinois designed for students who know their major and transfer institution. Many universities in Illinois have articulated Two-Plus-Two Agreements with community colleges. These agreements specify two years of courses at the community college followed by two years of courses at the university that leads to a baccalaureate degree in four years without any loss of credit. These articulation agreements are ideal for students seeking these particular degrees from those particular universities. Dual admission programs have extended two-plus-two agreements to enable students to be admitted to a college and a university simultaneously, providing students with specific guidance and guaranteed admission to upper-division programs.

Almost all universities in Illinois have articulated their courses and programs with individual community colleges for decades. These institution-to-institution articulations are used extensively by students and academic advisors. For years, this type of articulation information has been available in paper documents such as articulation handbooks. Recently, some institutions have made this information available electronically. Finally, this institution-to-institution articulation is being combined with a degree audit and is being made available on a statewide basis via a website. This system, called the Course Articulation System (CAS), promises to provide excellent information for students who know their major and their transfer institution.

It is important to keep in mind that no single articulation effort is best for all students. In fact, all of these efforts are serving individual transfer students very well. Academic advisors know they need to use different articulation information to meet the different needs and objectives of individual students. To facilitate the transfer for students, each of the various types of articulation efforts need to be developed and continually enhanced. In addition, the information about each of these articulation efforts needs to be easily accessible to prospective transfer students. Currently, the iTransfer website contains excellent information about the IAI, and the CAS website contains course and program articulation information for the institutions that are in this system. Information about 2 + 2 articulation agreements is generally available in documents and on the websites for the two institutions involved. Since the IAI articulation is best for students who are undecided about their major and transfer institution, and the CAS and 2 + 2 information is best for students who are decided about their major and transfer institution it would be ideal if all of the state's articulation information was merged onto one website. This website would need to be well designed so that it would be very easy for students to use. It would guide students to the most appropriate transfer information for their particular situations.

**RECOMMENDATION 14: Consolidated Transfer Website**

**A consolidated transfer website should be developed that would guide students to the most appropriate transfer information for their particular needs.**

## **IAI Studies**

1. Bartlett, Carolyn; Huber, Yvonne, and Reimer, Tricia (April 2002). *Transfer Study of Enrollments, General Education Component, Graduation and Course Articulation for Selected Fall Enrollments and Graduation Sessions at Illinois State University.*
2. Hardin, Thomas L., The University of Illinois and the Community-Junior College Movement, *Illinois Historical Journal, Vol. LXXIX, Number 2, Summer 1986*
3. IBHE. *IAI Website Visibility Study.*
4. Marshall, Marilyn M. M. and Kerber, Joan E. (April 2005). *Review of Baccalaureate Major Panel Roles.* Presented to the IAI Steering Panel, April 29, 2005.

## **Illinois Board of Higher Education and Illinois Community College Board Policy Documents and Status Reports**

1. IBHE (December 1970). *Resolution on Transfer Equivalency*
2. IBHE (July 1990). *Improvement of Minority Student Baccalaureate Achievement through Transfer: SHEEO Grant Project Final Report*
3. IBHE (September 1990). *Report of the Committee on the Study of Undergraduate Education*
4. ICCB (May 1991). *Model Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degrees*
5. IBHE (May 1992). *Undergraduate Education: Transfer and Articulation.*
6. IBHE (September 1992). *Transfer and Articulation*
7. ICCB (October 1992) *A comparison of Illinois Community College Associate in Arts and Associate in Science Degree Requirements with the Illinois Community College Board Models*
8. IBHE (September 1993). *Articulation Initiative Progress Report*
9. IBHE (May 1994). *Undergraduate Education: Transfer and Articulation Reexamined*
10. IBHE (July 1994). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: The Transferable General Education Core Curriculum*
11. <sup>1</sup>IBHE (September 1994). *Policies on Transfer and the General Education Core Curriculum*
12. IBHE (March 1995). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Implementation of the General Education Curriculum*
13. IBHE (May 1995). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Articulation in Baccalaureate Majors*
14. IBHE (November 1995). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Articulation in Baccalaureate Majors*
15. IBHE (July 1996). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Status Report and Additional Endorsements*
16. IBHE (May 1997) A. *Student Transfer in Illinois Higher Education*
17. IBHE (May 1997) B. *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Status and Endorsements*

18. IBHE (May 1997) C. *Undergraduate Education: Policies on Transfer and Articulation*
19. IBHE (January 1998). *Higher Education Policy Initiative on Undergraduate Education: 1986 to 1998*
20. IBHE (June 2000). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Revised General Education Core Curriculum and an Additional Baccalaureate Major Endorsement*
21. IBHE (August 2001). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Annual Report*
22. IBHE (August 2002). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Annual Report 2001-2002*
23. IBHE (October 2003). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Annual Report 2002-2003*
24. IBHE (October 2004). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative, Annual Report 2003-2004*
25. IBHE (October 2005). *The Illinois Articulation Initiative: Annual Report 2004-2005*