

October 9, 2005

TO: Members of UCA

FROM: Committee for the Revision of E5.209

In Spring, 2005, Mike Rota, Associate VP for CC, Academic Affairs, convened a committee of faculty, advisors, and academic administrators to review E5.209 (University of Hawaii System Student Transfer and Inter-campus Articulation). He charged the committee to (1) examine current practices and policies regarding student transfer, credit transfer, and articulation, (2) review if the existing practices and policies were congruent with E5.209, and (3) draft appropriate language for E5.209 which would reflect agreement on current practices and policies. Attached is the revised E5.209.

The committee was composed of:

flo wiger, Dean of Instruction, Maui Community College  
Doric Little, Professor, Speech, Honolulu Community College  
Linda Currivan, Professor English, Language Arts, Leeward Community College  
Mary Tiles, Professor, Philosophy, University of Hawaii, Manoa  
Carolyn Brooks-Harris, Academic Advisor/Department Chair, Arts and  
Sciences Student Academic Services, University of Hawaii, Manoa  
Janice Heu, Interim Director, Admissions and Records, University of Hawaii,  
Manoa  
Kelly Aune, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of  
Hawaii, Manoa  
Joanne Itano, Director, Academic Support Services, UH System

It should be noted that even though the committee members came from specific campuses, they did not represent their individual campuses; rather they represented the larger UH system, being particularly cognizant of the challenges faced by students.

The committee spent a number of meetings examining current policies and practices and found them somewhat different than what was expressed in E5.209. We determined that in most cases the policy simply had not been updated to reflect current practices. An example of this has been the creation of the CCAO (Council of Chief Academic Officers) group and its responsibilities in the area of curriculum. Hence in carrying out our charge we attempted to reflect the spirit of E5.209 policies and procedures but also updated the language to make it more understandable, transparent, and current. Our committee feels that our work does NOT represent a substantive change in the policies and procedures of E5.209 but is rather (1) an update based on administrative changes and (2) a reflection of current practices.

The committee decided at one of its early meetings to adopt a set of principles, which would guide the work of the committee.

**(1) The philosophy of being student-centered and as much as possible to “hold students harmless” in the process of transfer and articulation.** This would include allowing students to follow whatever guidelines were in place at the time of entry to the institution should they choose to do so. It also included providing a framework whereby students become active participants in the advising and transfer process.

**(2) The idea of transparency.** The committee would like to point out that within the UH system there are a variety of institutions with varying missions. As such, there was concern that using the word, “seamless” to describe the transfer and articulation policy would continue to create unrealistic expectations for the various publics being served. In reality, the committee felt it was more appropriate and descriptive to focus on the concept of transparency. Whatever policies and practices are currently in place must be obvious to students, faculty, staff, and the larger community in order to facilitate making appropriate academic decisions.

**(3) The necessity of consultation across campuses and within campuses prior to curricular decisions being made.** Often these decisions have programmatic impact beyond the individual course, program, or degree. This information must be communicated in a timely manner and mechanisms must be developed for this to occur.

Over the course of the committee deliberations, it became clear that much has been accomplished regarding transfer and articulation. For example, there are a number of inter-campus agreements being promulgated. This has the added advantage of bringing together faculty from different campuses to discuss curricular issues and the building of curricular paths. There are also program committees, which meet on a regular basis to assess curricular offerings and in some cases to devise common curriculum. All of these activities have a positive impact on the ability of students to move more appropriately between campuses.

However, there is much yet to be done. There must be an allocation of resources, both personnel and fiscal, if we are to fully achieve transparency as a system. At present, there is no official mechanism in place to easily ascertain curricular equivalencies/applicability of transfer credits among programs, schools, and campuses. The community colleges have developed a process whereby curricular information is being shared across campuses and common courses are being developed but this process is still limited to the community colleges. There are software programs available that could facilitate such a mechanism throughout the UH system if resources were committed to this task. (An example is the California Articulation Number System.) In addition, the committee is recommending that specific personnel be tasked with responsibilities for carrying out the recommendations in the attached policy. We also ask that the UCA propose a mechanism to provide for consistency in course alphas, numbering and titling for new or revised courses.

We believe that the changes in the attached policy are reflective of current and accepted academic practices and we submit this for your consideration.

Thank you.