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ABSTRACT

A CASE STUDY OF 2-4 TRANSFER IN NEW JERSEY: IMPLEMENTATION OF A TRANSFER LAW AT THREE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mark Allen McCormick
Laura W. Perna

The purpose of this study was to examine ways in which the 2007 New Jersey transfer law mandating “seamless transfer” between public two- and four-year colleges has been implemented at three community colleges and the state’s flagship research university and the forces that have contributed to and limited the extent to which the law has achieved its expected goals. This single case study with three embedded units involved the analysis of interview data and public documents to address the research questions. The implementation of the law was examined through a combination of Sabatier’s Advocacy Coalition Framework and Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict model.

This research revealed two themes associated with the implementation of the law: (1) areas of cooperation between community colleges and public senior institutions; and (2) areas of conflict between the two sectors. Findings of the research are as follows: (a) failure of Rutgers University New Brunswick to abide fully by the provisions of the law; (b) unwillingness on the part of senior institutions to accept in transfer courses with a technical focus included in A.A. or A.S. degrees awarded by the community colleges; and (c) lack of advisement for some students at community colleges.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

For many students in the United States, the pathway to a bachelor’s degree begins at a community college, as community colleges tend to be more affordable and less restrictive in their admissions policies than four-year colleges and universities (hereinafter referred to as “senior institutions”) (Handel, 2013). A 2015 study of first-time degree-seeking students who began their postsecondary studies in fall 2009 found that 38% of the cohort began at a two-year college (Shapiro et al., 2015, November). During the 2012-2013 academic year, 45% of all undergraduate students in the United States were enrolled in community colleges (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2015). The share of undergraduates attending community colleges increases to 61% when considering only those enrolled in public colleges or universities (Handel & Williams, 2012). Moreover, fully 49% of students who completed a baccalaureate degree at a senior institution during the 2015-2016 academic year were enrolled at a community college at some point in the previous ten years (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017); the percentage varies by state from a low of 26% in South Dakota to a high of 75% in Texas. Clearly community colleges play an essential role in baccalaureate degree completion for a large number of Americans.

Recent estimates indicate that as many as 80% of students who enroll in community colleges express an interest in transferring to a senior institution to complete a baccalaureate degree (referred to hereinafter as “2-4 transfer”) (Handel, 2013; Horn & Skomsvold, 2011; Hossler et al., 2012; Monaghan & Attewell, 2015; Shapiro et al., 2015, July). Transfer by students from one college to another is not limited to 2-4 transfer.
Today’s college students also transfer between community colleges, between senior institutions, and from senior institution to community college (often referred to as “reverse transfer”) (Anderson, L., 2015; Cejda & Kaylor, 2001; DuPont, 2010; Garcia, 2015; Goldhaber et al., 2008; Wellman, 2002). Over a third (37%) of students who entered college for the first time in 2008 transferred to a different institution within six years (Shapiro et al., 2015, July). Many students transfer more than once and bounce between community colleges and senior institutions. Such serial transfer activity has been dubbed “swirling” (Adelman, 2006; Handel & Williams, 2012; LeBard, 1999) and has its own set of issues.

It appears that there are few if any difficulties for students associated with transfer between community colleges or reverse transfer. However, there are long-standing documented problems with 2-4 transfer, such as inadequate counseling and information about transfer and loss of credits in the transfer process (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Handel, 2013; Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985; Knoell & Medsker, 1965; Monaghan & Attewell, 2015). Monaghan and Attewell (2015) found that only 58% of community college students who transferred to senior institutions were able to transfer 90% or more of the college-level credits they had earned at the community college and that 14% of community college students who transferred to senior institutions lost more than 90% of their credits in transfer.

Other researchers have documented consistently low 2-4 transfer rates (Alfonso, 2006; Long & Kurlaender, 2009; St. John et al., 2013). Determining the method for calculation of the 2-4 transfer rate is in and of itself a hotly debated issue (Handel, 2008; Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009; Marling, 2013; Romano & Wisniewski, 2003;
Southern Regional Education Board, 2007), with national 2-4 transfer rates reported as low as 5% and as high as more than 50% (Handel, 2008, see Table 1, pp. 13-15). While many states now maintain state databases tracking transfer of students from in-state community colleges to in-state public senior institutions, there is currently no universal database that captures and compares all such data (Cook & Pullaro, 2010; Romano & Wisniewski, 2003). Even when students do transfer from a community college to a senior institution, they tend to lose academic credits in the process, resulting in increased costs and a delay in time to complete the baccalaureate degree (DuPont, 2010; Handel, 2013; Monaghan & Attewell, 2015; Southern Regional Education Board, 2010; Wellman, 2002).

In light of the emphasis on degree completion by former President Obama and other public policymakers and policy-oriented organizations (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.; Complete College America, n.d.; Lumina Foundation, n.d.; McPhail, 2011; Obama, 2009; Perna & Finney, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2013), 2-4 transfer commands considerable attention in national discussions on higher education policy. Because an increasing percentage of students seeking to complete a bachelor’s degree begin at a community college (Handel & Williams, 2012; National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2015), “community colleges must play a disproportionate role in any significant increase in postsecondary attainment” (Bailey, 2012, p. 76) as community colleges are an indispensable component in the pathway to baccalaureate degree completion for many Americans. This is especially true for underserved populations who are overrepresented at community colleges (Adelman, 2006; Bowen et al., 2009; Carnevale & Strohl, 2010; Dougherty & Reid, 2007). Therefore, 2-4 transfer ranks as “one of the most important
state policy issues in higher education because its success (or failure) is central to many dimensions of higher education performance, including access, equity, affordability, cost effectiveness, degree productivity, and quality” (Wellman, 2002, p. 3).

The ability of students to transfer easily from community colleges to senior institutions is an important factor in degree completion (Jenkins & Fink, 2015; Townsend, 2007). Students who begin at a community college who have all or almost all of their credits transferred to a senior institution are two-and-a-half times more likely to earn a bachelor’s degree than community college students who transfer less than 50% of their credits (Millard, 2014). Other studies have concluded that students who transfer to senior institutions from community colleges are more likely to earn a bachelor’s degree if they first earn an associate degree (Crook et al., 2012; Crosta & Kopko, 2014; Kadlec & Gupta, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2013). It therefore seems likely that reducing or removing barriers to 2-4 transfer (including the transfer of all or most credits earned at the community college) should result in higher baccalaureate degree completion rates (and in less time and at lower cost to the student).

States have implemented a range of policies with the goal of increasing the number of students who transfer from community colleges to senior institutions and to ensure that 2-4 transfer students do not lose academic credit (Bers, 2013; Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009; Lumina Foundation for Education, 2010; Smith, 2010). States – and not the federal government – are largely responsible for most policies affecting higher education (McLendon & Perna, 2014). The role of the state in developing transfer policies has expanded in the last 40 years in large part due to the demands for greater public accountability with regard to the rapidly rising costs of public
higher education (Dougherty et al., 2013; Rifkin, 1996). Recent studies indicate that 72% of community college transfers are to public senior institutions (Jenkins & Fink, 2015, relying upon data from the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics’ Beginning Postsecondary Student Longitudinal Study 2004/2009). With the cost of public higher education increasing much faster than the rate of inflation, many lawmakers at both the federal and state levels have sought to cap the rate by which tuition at public institutions of higher education is allowed to increase and have begun putting in place various accountability measures to help ensure that public tax dollars are being used wisely (Anderson, N., 2015; Bautsch, 2013; Kisker et al., 2012; McLendon et al., 2006). As of 2010, 36 states had legislated some form of statewide articulation agreement between a state’s public two-year and four-year institutions (Education Commission of the States, 2014; Mullin, 2012; Smith, 2010), beginning with Florida in 1971 (Anderson et al., 2006).

Transfer rates remain low, nonetheless, even in states with statewide articulation policies (Anderson et al., 2006; Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Handel & Williams, 2012; Roksa, 2009; Roksa & Keith, 2008). Six of the seven states that posted a graduation rate of under 30% for the 2013-2014 academic year for students who completed a degree at a senior institution and who were enrolled at a two-year college at some point in the previous 10 years were states with statewide articulation agreements in place (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2015).

Focus on New Jersey

One state that has established a particularly important type of transfer policy but does not appear to have experienced substantially improved 2-4 transfer outcomes in
recent years is New Jersey. New Jersey is an important state for study as it is the 11th largest state by population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). According to the state’s Office of the Secretary of Higher Education (2016), 84% of students enrolled in college in New Jersey are attending public institutions, and 52% of students attending public institutions of higher education are in community colleges. New Jersey has the third highest percentage (60%) in the nation of young people enrolling in college within a year after they were scheduled to graduate from high school (Baum et al., 2013). It also boasts an above average bachelor’s degree completion rate (first-time full-time cohort at one four-year public institution): 42% versus 33% nationally for four-year completion, and 67% versus 58% nationally for six-year completion (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2017, using data from the U.S. Department of Education NCES). Nonetheless, for students who begin at a New Jersey community college the bachelor’s degree completion rate is lower than the national average: 46% in New Jersey versus the national average of 49% (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017). The average transfer rate among the 19 community colleges¹ in New Jersey (as reported in Integrated Postsecondary Education Database System, or IPEDS, submissions to the U.S. Department of Education) has remained fairly steady from 2007 to 2013 at about 19% (see Appendix A). One estimate suggests that increasing the 2-4 transfer rate by just five percentage points would boost national production of bachelor’s degrees by 46,000 annually (Shugart & Harrison, 2011).

The Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the “Transfer Agreement”) (2008; see Appendix B for the complete text of the Agreement)

¹ Note that in New Jersey, the terms “community college” and “county college” are used interchangeably.
that is at the heart of the transfer legislation in New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as the “New Jersey Transfer Law” or, more simply, “Transfer Law”) (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46 to 18A:62-51, 2007; see Appendix C for the complete text of the Law) is similar to statewide articulation agreements in place in other states (Education Commission of the States, 2014). As in at least 17 other states, the New Jersey Transfer Law requires in-state public senior institutions to accept at least 60 credits or the entire associate degree in transfer. Many states have specific restrictions—such as only Associate in Arts degrees, only if a specific core block of general education courses is successfully completed, or only for specific academic programs (Education Commission of the States, 2014; Smith, 2010). The New Jersey Transfer Law is limited to Associate in Arts (A.A.) and Associate in Science (A.S.) degrees.

While the Transfer Law does require participating senior institutions to accept in transfer the entire A.A. or A.S. degree awarded by any of the 19 community colleges in New Jersey, it does not guarantee acceptance into any program at a senior institution: transfer students must still meet program-specific admissions requirements and may be admitted to a senior institution but not necessarily in a particular degree program. The Transfer Law also requires each participating senior institution to institute an appeals process “to resolve disputes regarding the transfer of academic credits” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46(1)(c), 2007). In addition, the Transfer Law requires that the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education (or CHE, now the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education) prepare:

an annual report [to the legislature and governor] containing a compilation of the data collected…[and] an analysis of the effect of the agreement on the transfer process and on the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions,

The Transfer Law was enacted with the expectation that its implementation would foster “both a seamless transfer process [from community colleges to public senior institutions] and the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-49(1)(e), 2007). It would appear that neither outcome has been fully achieved to date. According to data reported by the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education (2014) to the New Jersey legislature in 2014, there has not been a significant increase since reporting began in 2008 in either the number of students transferring from New Jersey community colleges to New Jersey public senior institutions (see Figure 1) or the percentage of transfer students who received the full 50% of credits toward a baccalaureate degree as required under the Transfer Law (see Figure 2).

Figure 1. Numbers of students received in transfer by New Jersey public senior institutions, fall 2008 - fall 2013

Source: Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, State of New Jersey (2014, p. 5)
In its first annual transfer report to the governor and state legislature on the “effect of the [Transfer] agreement on the transfer process and on the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions, and…each participating institution’s compliance with the provisions of the [Transfer Law]” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-49, 2007), the CHE staff developed the following five reporting categories:

1. students who transferred and who did not have a NJ community college (NJCC) as their transfer institution (non-NJCC transfer);
2. students with credits from a NJCC and no associate degree;
3. students with an associate degree from NJCC and senior public institution has not reported it;
4. students with an associate degree (A.S., A.A.) from NJCC as reported by the senior public and transferring with an A.A. degree into a B.A. program or an A.S. degree into a B.S. program, i.e., the programs match; and
5. students with an associate degree from NJCC as reported by the senior public
and not transferring with an A.A. degree into a B.A. program or an A.S. degree into a B.S. program, i.e., the programs do not match (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, n.d.).

The first bar segment in Figure 1 (on the left) represents the number of students who completed an associate degree at a New Jersey community college and then transferred to a New Jersey public senior institution where the degrees “matched” (i.e., A.A. to B.A., or A.S. to B.S., in the same field or discipline). After a noticeable upward spike from 1,558 students in 2008 to 2,068 students in 2009 (a 32.7% increase in one year), the number of degree-matching transfer students remained steady at around 2,000 to 2,200 students from fall 2009 to fall 2013.

Figure 2 shows that the percentage of students each year who transfer from a New Jersey community college to a New Jersey public senior institution and were awarded in transfer at least half of the credits required for the baccalaureate degree and received all credits earned at the community college increased from 48.6% in 2009 to 51.2% in 2009 (an increase of only 2.6% in one year, the year after the Law went into effect) and has remained around 52% from 2009 to 2013. The percentage of students each year who transfer from a New Jersey community college to a New Jersey senior public institution and were awarded in transfer less than half the credits required for the baccalaureate degree and did not receive all credit earned at the community college decreased noticeably from 30.4% in 2008 to 25.2% in 2009 (a decrease of 5.2 percentage points in one year) and continued to decrease incrementally after 2009 to 20.1% in 2013 (a decrease of 10.3 percentage points over five years).

This study explores how and why the Transfer Law is and is not working. For many students across the country, including in New Jersey, 2-4 transfer is a critical link
in the pipeline to a bachelor’s degree. The Transfer Law represents an important state initiative to remove barriers to seamless 2-4 transfer in New Jersey. This study provides a window into how the Law was implemented by exploring the following research questions:

1. How has the New Jersey Transfer Law been implemented by three community colleges in New Jersey?

2. What economic, political, and other forces have contributed to and limited the extent to which the New Jersey Transfer Law has achieved its expected goals?

To shed light on how state transfer policies are translated into action at the institutional level and the extent to which the intended outcomes of the legislated policy are met, this study examines the ways in which the Transfer Law has been implemented at three community colleges and Rutgers University New Brunswick, with particular attention to the forces that have contributed to and limited the extent to which the Law has achieved its expected goals. The study employs case study methodology using a single case with three embedded units.

This study was guided by policy implementation theory. Policy implementation has been defined as “the carrying out of a basic policy decision, usually incorporated in a statute” (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989, p. 20) and as those actions directed at the achievement of the objectives set forth in the policy (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1976). Implementation is a key aspect of policymaking. Policy research suggests that policies may not be implemented as intended by the policymakers for various reasons such as lack of resources, conflicts among implementers, and lack of will, capacity, structure or interest of the institutions or organizations charged with policy implementation (Bardach,
1998; Elmore, 1979; Spillane et al., 2002). Attention to implementation is especially needed and valuable when a policy is not fully achieving its stated goal, as may be the case with the Transfer Law.

The findings from this study will inform policymakers in New Jersey about how and why the Transfer Law is and is not achieving its goals. In addition this examination of the implementation of transfer legislation in one state may have implications for policymakers in other states.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Since their establishment, community colleges have played a central role in American postsecondary education (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Community colleges comprise the largest sector in higher education in the United States today, enrolling 49% of all undergraduates in 2015-2016 (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017). From their infancy, community colleges have placed an emphasis on preparation for transfer to senior institutions of higher education (Cohen, 2012; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Eells, 1931). While the mission of the community college has evolved considerably through the years, for most community colleges transfer preparation has remained an essential function (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Handel, 2013; Mullin, 2012).

Over the past fifty years, states have employed a variety of strategies in an attempt to ensure that students transferring from community colleges to senior institutions in a particular state experience little or no loss in credits being transferred (Roksa & Keith, 2008; Smith, 2010). In states with a unified governance structure for public higher education – i.e., where there is one governing board responsible for all public institutions of higher education (including Alaska and Nevada) – the public senior institutions control the 2-4 transfer process and generally accept all courses in transfer (Roksa, 2009). In such states, the community colleges are either branch campuses of the state’s public four-year colleges or universities and/or are essentially the providers of the first two years of a bachelor’s degree. Roksa (2009) observes that “articulation in this case is built in the structure of the system itself (p. 2455).”
The mechanism most often used by states that do not have a unified governance structure is a statewide transfer and articulation agreement (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009; Roksa & Keith, 2008). A statewide articulation agreement typically applies only to public institutions of higher education (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009). In some states, the legislation or directive from the statewide system that created the statewide articulation agreement mandates that the public senior institutions accept either an entire associate degree or a specific core of general education courses in transfer (Bers, 2013; Roksa, 2009). For example, the City University of New York (CUNY) adopted a systemwide policy that stipulates that students who graduate from a CUNY community college with an associate degree – A.A., A.S., or Associate in Applied Science (A.A.S.) – are guaranteed admission to one of the CUNY senior institutions (Bers, 2013; Roksa, 2009). States with a mandated transfer requirement – either by legislation or direction from public higher education system administration – include some with a public higher education system (such as California, Florida, and New York) as well as some that allow public institutions of higher education a greater degree of autonomy (such as Ohio and Virginia).

An alternative approach in place in many states is a request for the community college and senior institution sectors to work together (Education Commission of the States, 2014). States that have employed this less restrictive approach include Arizona and Minnesota. In the statewide articulation agreements in such states, there are generally several exceptions or loopholes that allow the senior institutions to not comply with the agreement, such as restricting the agreement to A.A. degrees only (Florida, Hawaii, and Rhode Island), requiring completion of a specified core or concentration of
courses (Illinois, Louisiana, and Maryland), limiting applicability to specific degree programs at the senior institution (South Carolina, Texas, and Washington), not guaranteeing junior status at the senior institution (Missouri), or allowing the senior institution to require additional courses to complete all first- and second-year requirements at the senior institution (Illinois, Mississippi, and Vermont) (Education Commission of the States, 2014). The less restrictive statewide articulation agreements are often intended by the state legislature to serve as a warning to the senior public higher education institutions and in some cases are never enacted into law (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2010).

There have been numerous analyses of state articulation policies both in specific states (Dougherty et al., 2006 – Florida, New Mexico, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia; Falconetti, 2009 – Florida; Hezel Associates, 2007 – Arizona; Kadlec & Gupta, 2014 – Indiana; Stern et al., 2009 – Washington; Wellman, 2002 – Arkansas, Florida, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, and Texas) and across all 50 states (Ignash & Townsend, 2001; Keith, 1996; Smith, 2010). In the last decade, researchers have begun to evaluate the effectiveness of such policies (Anderson et al., 2006; Hezel Associates, 2007; Roksa & Keith, 2008; Roksa, 2009). There appears to be little research about the implementation of such policies.

This literature review examines the use of statewide articulation agreements as a tool to make the transfer pathway from community college to senior institution as seamless as possible for students. The first section presents an overview of the literature on statewide articulation agreements. The second section focuses on a 2011 study of the implementation of statewide articulation agreements in four states, including New Jersey.
The third section offers a brief history of the literature on policy implementation, followed by a discussion of two frameworks for understanding policy implementation.

**Overview of Statewide Articulation Agreement Transfer Policies**

Several researchers have attempted to catalog the variety of transfer initiatives in place across the country (DuPont, 2010; Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009; Serban et al., 2008; Smith, 2010). One of the most common transfer initiatives is the statewide articulation agreement, often created by state legislation. An “articulation agreement” has been defined as “a formal collaborative agreement between educational institutions enabling students to complete a program of study at one institution and, using accumulated credits, attain a degree at another institution” (O’Meara et al., 2007, p. 10).

Bers (2013) catalogued the variety of articulation agreement models in place – from course-to-course articulation to complete program articulation. Many articulation agreements are simply between two institutions – typically a community college and a senior institution. Others are statewide and offer either the guaranteed transfer of a specified general core of courses or a more comprehensive 2+2 arrangement, wherein students complete the first two years of a baccalaureate degree at the community college and the final two years at a public senior institution in the same state (Education Commission of the States, 2014; Smith, 2010).

Articulation between colleges – whether course to course, program to program, for a specific group of courses, or for an entire degree – has been used as a tool to facilitate a more effective and efficient postsecondary educational system since the early 1900s (Kintzer, 1996). Articulation policies generally consist of an agreed upon set of requirements and commitments that enable students to transfer credits from one college
to another. Kintzer (1996) traces elements of articulation back to 1907 when the University of California Berkeley issued “certificates” indicating successful completion of the first two years of postsecondary study (p. 4). Formal articulation agreements between two-year colleges and senior institutions began to develop, to the extent that a study issued by the Truman Commission in 1947 noted the importance of articulation and transfer in the framework of American higher education (Kintzer, 1996).

Following the rapid expansion of community colleges in the 1950s and 1960s, researchers began to pay attention to issues relating to articulation and transfer (Kintzer, 1996). The 1980s and 1990s witnessed rising interest by states in the development of statewide articulation agreements (Townsend, 2001). As described earlier, today nearly three quarters of the states have some form of statewide articulation agreement in place (Education Commission of the States, 2014; Mullin, 2012; Smith, 2010).

Townsend and Ignash (2000) surveyed executive directors of state higher education and community college agencies in all 50 states to identify core components of articulation agreements. They identified the following four common core components of articulation agreements: mutual responsibility of the faculty at both institutions for maintaining the agreement; provisions for accommodating students who do not complete an associate degree prior to transfer; equal treatment of transfer students by the senior institution; and the inclusion of program-to-program articulation in the agreement.

Researchers are not in agreement on the reasons for the popularity of statewide articulation agreements. Some researchers argue that state articulation policies serve as a needed mechanism to facilitate transfer for students (Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Kintzer, 1996; O’Meara et al., 2007; Roksa, 2009; Roksa & Keith, 2008), while other researchers
contend that such policies are nothing more than political statements of support by state legislatures for public postsecondary education (Anderson et al., 2006). Bender (1990) argues that the primary reason many states have resorted to the enactment of statewide articulation agreements is that community colleges and public senior institutions fail to work collaboratively on improving articulation and transfer.

Several studies have concluded that statewide articulation agreements are generally not effective (Anderson et al., 2006; Gross & Goldhaber, 2009; Roksa & Keith, 2008). Anderson et al. (2006) studied the proliferation of statewide articulation agreements in the 1980s and 1990s. From 1985 to 1995, articulation policies were developed or significantly revised and enhanced in 23 states (Townsend & Ignash, 2000). By 2001, 30 states had statewide articulation agreements in place (Gross & Goldhaber, 2009), and by 2010 the number had increased to 36 (Education Commission of the States, 2014; Mullin, 2012; Smith, 2010).

What have researchers meant by “effective”? For Anderson et al. (2006), it was whether the statewide articulation transfer policies were “likely [to] increase student transfers from two-year to four-year institutions” (p. 264). Gross and Goldhaber (2009) opined that “Effective transfer and articulation policies between schools should improve this situation for students by limited [sic] the number of credits lost through transfer” (p. 4). In order to determine the effectiveness of statewide articulation transfer policies, Roksa and Keith (2008) examined “the relevant outcomes…related to the preservation of credits as students make the transition from community colleges to four-year institutions” (p. 244) which Roksa and Keith determined to be the “intent…legislated by articulation policies” (p. 247).
Roksa and Keith (2008) analyzed the specific language used in articulation policies in relation to the impact of the policies on student outcomes such as total credits completed, length of time for degree completion, and completion of a bachelor’s degree. The study identified a disparity in the intent of the policies compared with the language actually used in the statutes. Roksa and Keith (2008) concluded that the primary purpose of the language in such policies was to make the 2-4 transfer process easier for students who planned to transfer and to prevent the loss of academic credits in transfer as opposed to actually improving student transfer outcomes: “Their stated intention is not to induce students to transfer but to assist the transition of students who have already decided to transfer” (p. 239).

Gross and Goldhaber (2009) examined whether the existence of a statewide articulation transfer agreement mattered in terms of transfer and graduation for students seeking a baccalaureate degree who begin their studies at a community college. They found only small effects, primarily for Hispanic students, “that state transfer and articulation policies are related to the transfer of students between sectors, and no evidence that these policy [sic] correspond with an increase in bachelor’s degrees earned by transferring students” (p. 3).

Gross and Goldhaber (2009) further noted that one reason that many statewide articulation agreements did not improve transfer outcomes was that most of them lacked authority from legislation. The researchers further speculated that “weak implementation” of articulation polices may account for the poor transfer outcomes (p. 26). Gross and Goldhaber (2009) cite as an example a 2006 study of the Illinois Articulation Initiative in which the researcher found that the process for implementation
of the statewide transfer policy afforded the state’s flagship university the power to
determine which community college courses to accept in transfer thus seriously
weakening the ability of many community college students to transfer all credits earned
at a state community college to the University of Illinois:

If receiving institutions are not confident that the courses in the sending
institutions are of comparable quality to their own, the receiving institution will
be reluctant to accept credits from these sending institutions and the students will
lose valuable credits, time, and money. A recent examination of transfer and
articulation policies in Illinois illustrates how such a situation seemed to
undermine the state’s policy efforts. In this case, the state’s largest state university
questioned the quality of courses taken at other colleges and, as a result,
continued to use its own transfer guidelines instead of those specified in the state
transfer and articulation agreements (Gross & Goldhaber, 2009, p. 3).

**Implementation of Statewide Articulation Transfer Agreements**

Only one known published study has examined the implementation of 2-4 transfer
policies. Kisker *et al.* (2011) examined the process of implementation of a statewide
transfer policy in four states: Arizona, New Jersey, Ohio, and Washington. They
conducted a case study in each of the four states, reviewing relevant documents and
interviewing policymakers, system leaders, college presidents, and administrators and
faculty members. Interview questions focused primarily on processes used to develop
and implement transfer associate degrees (Wagoner & Kisker, 2012). Kisker *et al.*
(2011) found that in Arizona, Ohio, and Washington, community colleges played a role
in the process for students to appeal a decision by a senior institution concerning transfer
of credits, but in New Jersey the public senior institutions “fought to exclude community
colleges from participating in formal appeals processes [on behalf of their students]” (p.
17).
The data gathered for the Kisker et al. (2011) study dates to 2010 – less than three years after the enactment of the New Jersey Transfer Law. As admitted by Kisker et al., their study of New Jersey showed little in the way of early positive outcomes. The Kisker study focused on the mechanics of the articulation agreement and how the policy was developed and not how implementation of the policy by the colleges may affect transfer outcomes.

Development of Policy Implementation Theory

O’Toole (2000) describes policy implementation as “what develops between the establishment of an apparent intention on the part of government to do something, or to stop doing something, and the ultimate impact on the world of action” (p. 266). Over the past fifty years, the study of policy implementation has evolved through three distinct generations of scholarship (deLeon & deLeon, 2002; Schofield, 2001). The first generation viewed the process of policy implementation as rational and linear, focusing primarily on policy outputs (i.e., success or failure of program execution). The most recognized theory developed during this generation is the “top-down” approach, which views the policy implementation process as hierarchical, rational, and linear (Elmore, 1979; Schofield, 2001). Policymakers are considered the primary individuals responsible for the carrying out and success of policies. Top-down scholars argue that policy outcomes will be achieved as long as implementers correctly follow the program protocols and guidelines established by policymakers (Schofield, 2001). The major critique of this approach is the assumption that policymakers somehow control all key processes that affect implementation of a policy (Elmore, 1979).
The second generation of policy implementation theorists moved from a systematic rational decision-making process to one that acknowledges the complexity of putting policy into action, focusing on policy variables. Second-generation policy implementation researchers recognize the impact of local-level bureaucrats (often referred to in the literature as “implementers” or “street-level bureaucrats”) in the implementation process (Lipsky, 1980; Matland, 1995; McLaughlin, 1987). They advocate that the failure or success of a policy often lies with local-level implementers – more of a “bottom-up” approach to policy implementation (Berman, 1980; Hill & Hupe, 2002; Schofield, 2001). This shift away from policy outputs to the variables that affect program success or failure identifies implementers as playing a key role in successful implementation.

The third generation of policy implementation scholars has attempted to synthesize the first two generations, focusing more on the dynamic nature of the policy implementation process (Hill & Hupe, 2002; Schofield, 2001). The synthesized approach of the third generation of policy implementation scholars combines the first-generation concern with effective policy execution with the second-generation emphasis on the role of implementers to analyze the complex relationship between policymakers and implementers. It also views implementation as an iterative process (McLaughlin, 1987). Moreover, many third-generation scholars focus on the role of implementers’ sensemaking in the cognition process (Coburn, 2001; Spillane et al., 2002). This third generation also concentrates on the sociocultural influences of policy implementation, which can provide insight into how the multiple meanings of a policy as interpreted by institutional stakeholders can influence the implementation of the policy (Sutton &
Levinson, 2001). One way in which third-generation policy implementation researchers have done this is by utilizing multiple locations and observations (Schofield, 2001).

**Policy Implementation Frameworks**

Policy implementation researchers have developed several frameworks, models, and theories, including the Advocacy Coalition Framework (Sabatier, 1986; Sabatier, 1988; Sabatier, 1991; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). Paul Sabatier’s Advocacy Coalition Framework posits that policy change takes place with coalitions of individuals, interest groups, and government agencies that form around a particular policy domain or issue. Different – often competing – advocacy coalitions may promote competing solutions or suggested implementations of a particular issue or policy. Dougherty *et al.* (2013) observes that “advocacy coalitions cohere primarily around the belief structures of their members…[including] ‘policy core beliefs,’ which reflect coalition members’ deep core beliefs as applied to specific policy areas” (p. 6). The Advocacy Coalition Framework focuses less on the stages of policy development and implementation and more on the key actors in policy development and implementation who form coalitions based on common sets of beliefs (Shakespeare, 2008). Sabatier (1998) holds that actors share a “set of normative and causal beliefs and engage in a non-trivial degree of coordinated [sic] activity over time” (p. 103). Several researchers have successfully used the Advocacy Coalition Framework in higher education implementation research (Kohoutek, 2013; Shakespeare, 2008; Weible *et al.*, 2011).

As part of the third generation of researchers, Richard Matland (1995) developed the Ambiguity-Conflict model as a policy implementation heuristic. In the 2x2 matrix in Figure 3, Matland theorizes that all policy implementation processes fit into one of four
categories. The matrix is intended to shed light on the expected difficulties in implementation under different policy auspices and expectations.

*Figure 3. Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict matrix: Policy implementation processes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMBIGUITY</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Administrative Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Experimental Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextual Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example: Headstart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Matland (1995, p. 160)*

The four quadrants in Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict matrix are Low Policy Ambiguity/Low Policy Conflict, Low Policy Ambiguity/High Policy Conflict, High Policy Ambiguity/Low Policy Conflict, and High Policy Ambiguity/High Policy Conflict. Matland defines these quadrants as follows:

*Low Policy Ambiguity/Low Policy Conflict (Administrative Implementation)*

Simple policies designed to be easily implemented fall into this category, such as motor/voter laws, under the terms of which registered drivers are automatically registered to vote. Few people would disagree with either the goal or the means.

*Low Policy Ambiguity/High Policy Conflict (Political Implementation)*

Policies on which there is disagreement about the need for the policy but not necessarily the means fall into this category – for example, vouchers for K-12 education. While most
citizens would agree that an educated citizenry is a worthwhile goal, there is likely to be a wide range of opinion as to whether a policy allowing families to have a taxpayer-funded voucher to apply to the costs of a private education is a sound policy to help achieve that goal. The need for the policy itself is in question.

*High Policy Ambiguity/Low Policy Conflict* (Experimental Implementation)

In this category fall policies on which there is little conflict about the value of the policy but potentially great ambiguity about the methods – e.g., policies related to the environment. Most Americans would espouse a desire to have a clean environment, but there is a wide array of opinions about what restrictions on human and corporate activity are necessary in order to achieve that goal. The policy itself is not in conflict but rather the means to achieve the policy are in question.

*High Policy Ambiguity/High Policy Conflict* (Symbolic Implementation)

Policies that fall in the high ambiguity/high conflict category are considered the most difficult for any implementation strategy as there is disagreement about the need for the policy itself and – even among supporters of the policy – a variety of opinions as to the best means to achieve the policy. Complex social policies such as the reformation of American health care fall into this category. Other policy implementation researchers have labeled this category as “anarchic” (deLeon, 1998, p. 552).

Matland (1995) contends that “policy conflict will exist when more than one organization sees a policy as directly relevant to its interests and when the organizations have incongruous views” (p. 156). There appears to be a history of conflict between the community colleges and public senior institutions in New Jersey as to how 2-4 transfer should operate, so it is logical to assume that the implementation of legislation mandating
a model of 2-4 transfer on both the community college and public senior institution sectors of higher education might well spark conflict between the two sectors. Richard Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict model provides a framework for viewing that conflict and its role in how the Transfer Law has been implemented.

The policy framework selected for this study – for viewing the implementation of the New Jersey Transfer Law by community colleges – is a combination of Sabatier’s Advocacy Coalition Framework and Matland’s Ambiguity-Conflict model. Shakespeare (2008) notes that the Advocacy Coalition Framework “attempts to capture policy making’s organic nature without a focus on specific stages of policy development, but with a primary focus on policy actors who form coalitions” (p. 877). The Advocacy Coalition Framework is an appropriate framework for approaching the research questions as coalitions of dedicated staff members at each community college are the “street-level” actors who implemented the Transfer Law. Moreover, the policy may be viewed with some ambiguity, and the implementation has in all likelihood not been without conflict. Therefore, Matland’s matrix should serve well as a guide for analyzing how the level of ambiguity in the Transfer Law’s language and the inherent conflict between the approach to 2-4 transfer as practiced by community college faculty and staff members and the faculty and staff members at public senior institutions may have affected the implementation of the Transfer Law at different institutions.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODS

This dissertation uses a single case with embedded units to address the research questions (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2009). The single case is New Jersey, and one reason to select New Jersey for study is that it has implemented this Transfer Law. As can be seen from Appendix A, overall transfer rates (as reported by the 19 New Jersey community colleges to the U.S. Department of Education in IPEDS) have not changed significantly from before the enactment of the New Jersey Transfer Law in 2008 until 2013. The average and mean transfer rates are roughly the same for the 2004 first-time full-time cohort (observed as of fall 2007) and the 2010 first-time full-time cohort (observed as of fall 2013). As seen in Figure 1, the total number of students transferring from community colleges to public senior institutions in New Jersey did not increase significantly from 2010 through 2013.

The embedded units are three community colleges in New Jersey, each with a fairly similar profile in terms of enrollment and metropolitan status (per the Carnegie classification) but different changes in 2-4 transfer rates since the state adopted the Transfer Law. One community college has a 2-4 transfer rate that has increased since the implementation of the Transfer Law (Ocean County College), one has a 2-4 transfer rate that has decreased (Raritan Valley Community College), and one has a 2-4 transfer rate that has remained relatively stable but low (Union County College). Ocean County College experienced the fourth-largest increase in reported transfer rate between 2007 and 2013 based on IPEDS data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (see Appendix A). The community colleges that posted greater increases are three of the
smallest community colleges in New Jersey based on enrollment. Raritan Valley Community College posted the second-largest decrease in reported transfer rate for the same time period. Union County College’s reported transfer rate was unchanged from 2007 to 2013. By enrollment standards, the three selected institutions are roughly the same size, with reported enrollments for fall semester 2013 of 8,405 (Raritan Valley); 9,477 (Ocean); and 11,969 (Union). The three institutions are all classified under the Carnegie classification system as Associate’s – Public Suburban-serving (as reported on the current Statement of Accreditation Status for each institution on the Middle States Commission on Higher Education website) (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, n.d.).

Ocean County College is a two-year public community college serving Ocean County in southern New Jersey. Its main campus is in Toms River. The current President, Jon Larson, was appointed in 2000. Enrollment for the fall 2013 semester was 9,477 students. Raritan Valley Community College is a two-year public community college that serves two contiguous counties in central New Jersey: Hunterdon and Somerset. Its main campus is in North Branch (in Somerset County). The current President, Michael McDonough, was appointed in 2014. Enrollment for the fall 2013 semester was 8,405 students. Union County College is a two-year public community college serving Union County in northeastern New Jersey. Its main campus is in Cranford. The current President, Margaret McMenamin, was appointed in 2010. Enrollment for the fall 2013 semester was 11,969 students.

Because the focus of the study is transfer from community college to public senior institution, Rutgers University New Brunswick was also included as it is a primary
transfer partner for all three community colleges. Rutgers University is the largest comprehensive public institution of higher education and the premier research university in New Jersey. It maintains four campuses, of which New Brunswick is the primary and largest campus. The current President, Robert Barchi, was appointed in 2012. Enrollment at Rutgers University New Brunswick for the fall 2013 semester was 43,967 undergraduate students and an additional 14,821 graduate students.

This case study incorporates a single phenomenon: the implementation of the Transfer Law from 2007 to 2015. Case study research can provide insight into how policy is translated in the process of implementation. Policies, like laws, are neither self-explanatory nor self-executing (Spillane et al., 2002). Case studies are appropriate in research that is designed to answer "how" questions and for trying to determine rather than if a program was effective how something happened (Yin, 2009; Yin, 2012). Case studies have value when the contemporary phenomenon is a real-life situation that is not in the researcher's control (Yin, 2009).

Yin (2012) notes that one of the strengths of case study research is its requirement to use a variety of forms of evidence. Multiple data sources help to increase the validity and reliability of the study. In addition, qualitative analysis is the most appropriate method for addressing the questions posed in this proposal as they deal with individual perceptions of a contemporary phenomenon. A better understanding of the complex thought processes and perceptions of individuals who were present for the phenomenon are best uncovered through a qualitative study that allows the researcher to elicit individual experiences and recollections (Duemer & Mendez-Morse, 2002).
The single-case study with embedded units allowed for in-depth study of the phenomenon over a series of different units (Creswell, 2007). As Baxter and Jack (2008) note:

The ability to look at sub-units that are situated within a larger case is powerful when you consider the data that can be analyzed within the sub-units separately (within case analysis), between the different sub-units (between case analysis), or across all of the sub-units (cross-case analysis). The ability to engage in such rich case analysis only serves to better illuminate the case (p. 550).

This type of case study design proved to be particularly useful in focusing on a process such as the implementation of a statute and was especially helpful in answering the questions of “how” and “why” (Yin, 2009). Case study methodology afforded direct access to multiple different perspectives on the implementation of the Transfer Law and provided a unique opportunity to gain a contextual understanding that could not be gained by other qualitative or quantitative methods.

For this study, a variety of data sources were collected and analyzed. In qualitative research, the researcher is the key instrument used in collecting and analyzing the data (Creswell, 2009). Case study researchers collect data through the examination of documents and the observation of behavior and interviewing of individuals who are integral to the case under consideration.

Documents

Document and archive data, such as the statute itself (see Appendix C), various documents related to the implementation of the statute at a statewide level, annual reports by the CHE to the governor and legislature on data collected by the CHE on 2-4 transfer in New Jersey, and newspaper articles related to the enactment of the statute, provided fertile ground for understanding the original intentions and purposes of policymakers in
enacting the Transfer Law and how the community college and senior institution sectors of higher education in New Jersey went about the process of implementing the Law.

Two of the key documents – A General Education Foundation for Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Specialized Associate, and Certificate Programs in New Jersey’s Community Colleges (see Appendix D; hereinafter referred to as the “General Education Foundation”) and Transfer Articulation Principles for New Jersey Colleges and Universities (see Appendix E; hereinafter referred to as the “Transfer Articulation Principles”) – predate the enactment of the Transfer Law in September 2007. The General Education Foundation was developed and approved in 1997 and revised and reaffirmed in August 2007 by the community college presidents and the New Jersey Presidents’ Council (NJPC). The Transfer Articulation Principles were approved by the Executive Board of the NJPC in May 1997. Two other documents related to the implementation of the Transfer Law were developed after the enactment of the Law: the Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement (see Appendix B) and the Guiding Principles for Affirming Gen Ed Course Status (see Appendix F). Data from the 2007 revision of the General Education Foundation and the development of the Guiding Principles are used to triangulate and describe findings presented in Chapter Four. A review of documents also informed the interview protocol (see Appendix G).

**Interviews**

After a thorough examination of the documents, in-depth interviews were conducted with key players in the development and passage of the law – including the Senior Policy Advisor on Higher Education to the Governor and Executive Director of the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education at the time of the enactment of the law,
and three of the four state legislators who sponsored the New Jersey Transfer legislation – as well as key administrators (primarily academic vice presidents and transfer counselors) at the three community colleges under study and Rutgers University New Brunswick Campus (a primary transfer partner of all three colleges). A total of 16 participants were interviewed: four people who played a role in the development and passage of the law; four administrators at Rutgers University New Brunswick; and eight administrators from three different community colleges in New Jersey (see Table 1).

Table 1. Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Role</th>
<th>Policy-makers (developed Transfer Law)</th>
<th>Rutgers University New Brunswick</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean County College</td>
<td>Raritan Valley Community College</td>
<td>Union County College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ State Legislator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ State Official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Student Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview questions were developed that were designed to elicit each interviewed individual’s experience in the process of the implementation of the Transfer Law at his or her institution. I created three sets of interview questions, each tailored to the target audience: one for individuals who played a role in the development of the Transfer Law; another for administrators at the three community colleges under study who were involved in the implementation of the Law at each institution; and a third for administrators at Rutgers University New Brunswick who were involved in the
implementation of the Law. Open-ended questions for each group were used to probe the interviewed individual’s understanding of the Transfer Law (including its components and goals), assessment of whether the Law had been effectively implemented and achieved its goals, and thoughts about positive and negative outcomes of the Law. With the permission of the participant, I recorded each interview and took extensive field notes as well. After each of the interviews, I transcribed the interview and confirmed the participant’s responses to ensure they were accurately transcribed through the process of member checking (Creswell, 2007). This process also allowed each participant the opportunity to add any additional information that he or she may have not provided during the interview. See Appendix G for the interview protocol and question sets.

**Data on 2-4 Transfer in New Jersey**

In addition to examining documents related to the Transfer Law and interviewing key players in the Law’s development and implementation, transfer data from each of the three community colleges under study was analyzed. The data was obtained from the website of the New Jersey Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, which compiled the data from submissions by each institution to IPEDS and to the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education via the state’s Student Unit Records system. Data provided by Rutgers University on students who transferred from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers University New Brunswick was also analyzed.

**Data Analysis**

Merriam (2009) describes the goal of data analysis as “making sense out of the data” (p. 175). Merriam (2009) continues: “Making sense out of the data involves consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher
has seen and read – it is the process of making meaning” (p. 176). This study resulted in more than 100 pages of transcribed interviews, an additional 100 pages of field notes, hundreds of pages of documents, and a wide variety of relevant quantitative data that yielded rich findings related to the research questions.

Data analysis was conducted in an iterative fashion with the goal of coding the data by identifying words, phrases, and expressions commonly used by the participants as well as experiences commonly described by the participants (Creswell, 2007). Initial coding of the interview data allowed for the data to be broken down into discrete parts to be examined and then compared for similarities and differences (Saldaña, 2009). I assigned codes in the margins of the interview transcripts and field notes, starting with 32 distinct codes and slowly condensing them into larger themes.

Role of the Researcher

All research has some level of bias within it based upon the researcher’s prioritization of certain thoughts and ideas that come from the data (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). In a qualitative study, because the researcher becomes the instrument for collecting data in the study, the role of the researcher is significant (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Patton, 2002). To this point, I wish to disclose that I have some connection to the implementation of the New Jersey Transfer Law. From November 2005 until February 2007, I served as the Acting Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs at Mercer County Community College, one of the 19 community colleges in New Jersey. In that role, I was a member of the Academic Officers Association (AOA), an affinity group of the New Jersey Council of County Colleges (NJCCC) that was comprised of the chief academic officers from all 19 community colleges in New Jersey. I attended monthly
AOA meetings and was therefore in regular contact with the chief academic officers from the other 18 community colleges in the state. In February 2007, I returned to my role at Mercer as Dean of the Division of Business and Technology. I was appointed to serve on the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC) – a subgroup of the AOA established to review and update general education courses at all 19 community colleges – in September 2007 as a representative from Mercer County Community College and served until the group concluded its work in May 2009.

Also in my roles as Dean and Acting Vice President at Mercer (2004-2009) and later as Vice President for Academic Services and Chief Academic Officer at Salem Community College (2009-2014) and now as Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs at Middlesex County College (2014-present) – two other community colleges in New Jersey – I heard from graduates of those three institutions about their experiences in transferring to public senior institutions in New Jersey, both positive and negative. Having served in the New Jersey community college sector prior to and since the enactment of the Transfer Law, I have naturally formed some opinions about how the Law is working. Given my acknowledged biases, I attempted to approach this research with an open mind and to “come to the transcript prepared to let [each] interview breathe and speak for itself” (Seidman, 2013, p. 120).

Validity, Trustworthiness, and Limitations

This study involves the implementation of a legislated policy in one state from 2008 to 2015. For findings from a case study to be considered transferable, they must contain sufficient detail for an external reviewer to understand the details of the context and phenomenon and relevance to similar situations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I engaged
in a variety of procedures and strategies to ensure and increase the validity and
trustworthiness of the results of this study. One method of ensuring trustworthiness was
built into the research design: using multiple sources of data with different perspectives
for understanding the cases that could be triangulated. By interviewing more than one
individual at each case study site, different perspectives were uncovered and used to
challenge and probe subsequent interviewees. Alternative explanations, themes, and
patterns were explored and shared to show that all sides of the issue were considered.

In addition to limited external validity, there are several other limitations of this
study. First, this study attempts to focus on the implementation of one particular law at a
time when other changes were occurring and other policies being implemented. These
external factors and forces may have also influenced transfer outcomes for students in
New Jersey over this time period.

On a national level, the so-called Great Recession also influenced the findings,
through its influence on college enrollments. The National Bureau of Economic
Research dates the recession from December 2007 through June 2009 (National Bureau
of Economic Research, 2010), although many economists recognize that economic
recovery was slow for the following two years or even longer (Bivens et al., 2013; Center
on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2017). Researchers in higher education have noted that
enrollment in higher education is countercyclical to the economy – i.e., in difficult
economic times, enrollment in higher education tends to increase, especially in the public
sector, and conversely tends to decrease during economic boon times (Long, 2013;
Longmire & Company, 2009). Community college enrollments are particularly sensitive
to this phenomenon (Lumina Foundation for Education, 2009).
The findings may also be influenced by other state policy changes. Of particular relevance, in 2004 then-Governor James McGreevy (2002-2004) signed into law the New Jersey Student Tuition Assistance Reward Scholarship (NJ STARS) program. This program was designed to provide tuition assistance to graduating students from New Jersey high schools who enroll in one of New Jersey's community colleges.

Under the original iteration of the NJ STARS program, students who graduated in the top 20% of their high school class were awarded free tuition and fees at any New Jersey community college for up to five semesters as long as the student completed at least 12 credits each semester and maintained a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.0. The program was expanded in 2006 to include a scholarship for continuing college at the public senior institutions (dubbed NJ STARS II). Under the first version of the NJ STARS II program, students who earned an associate degree under the NJ STARS program with a minimum 3.0 GPA and who were accepted in transfer at a New Jersey public senior institution were awarded full tuition at the senior institution (with the state paying $4,000 in tuition for the student for each of the last two years of college, and the senior institution covering the remainder of tuition).

The NJ STARS programs were revised in 2008: NJ STARS eligibility was restricted to the top 15% of high school graduating classes, and the minimum entering GPA for NJ STARS II eligibility was increased to 3.25. At the same time the NJ STARS II scholarship at the senior institutions was reduced to $3,000 per semester for students with a GPA equal to or greater than 3.25 but less than 3.50, and $3,500 per semester for students with a GPA of 3.50 or greater (with the senior institution and the state splitting the remaining cost of tuition).
The NJ STARS programs were revised again in 2012. NJ STARS no longer covered fees at the community college (just tuition), and the NJ STARS II scholarship was further reduced to $2,500 per year (with the state covering the full amount) and was limited to students whose annual family income is less than $250,000. For the first time, independent senior institutions in New Jersey were invited to participate. It is unclear what effect, if any, the ever-changing NJ STARS scholarship program may have had on 2-4 transfer in New Jersey during this period of time.

A second limitation pertains to the reliance of this study on interviews with individuals. There are inherent questions as to the motives and agendas of the individuals interviewed. While such concerns may have been mitigated by talking to individuals with differing perspectives on the topic of the implementation of the Transfer Law, this reliance on the thoughts and opinions of individuals is nonetheless a limitation of this study.

Despite these limitations, this study uncovers important information about the implementation of a state transfer policy. The case study method offers a well-tested, reliable way to gather such information, including the richness and full understanding that case studies afford. Thus, despite the limitations of this study, it is a useful approach to increasing understanding of educational policy implementation.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

This research study explores how three community colleges in New Jersey implemented the Transfer Law enacted in 2007 and the various forces that have contributed to and limited the extent to which the law has achieved its expected goals. Two themes emerged from the data analysis: (1) there are several areas of cooperation between community colleges and public senior institutions in New Jersey regarding 2-4 transfer, and – unsurprisingly – (2) there are several areas of conflict between community colleges and public senior colleges and universities in New Jersey regarding 2-4 transfer. I identified multiple subthemes within each theme, as well as variation by case. This chapter draws from the multiple sources of data to present the themes that emerged from the cross-case analysis.

Higher Education in New Jersey

The variety of public institutions of higher education in New Jersey is similar to that in many other populous states. New Jersey has a three-tier model of publicly-funded higher education with three public comprehensive research universities, eight public four-year colleges and universities, and 19 public two-year (or community) colleges. Each college has its own Board of Trustees and is autonomous.

New Jersey has never had a true unified system of higher education. From 1968 to 1994 public higher education in New Jersey was relatively decentralized but with strong state regulatory control under a state Department of Higher Education. Under that model, the state Department of Higher Education maintained tight control over many aspects of college decision-making, including final approval of all new or significantly
revised academic programs (McGuinness, 1995).

The Effects of Decentralization on Higher Education in New Jersey

Former Governor Christine Todd Whitman (1994-2001) signed into law the Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994 in June of that year, which decentralized higher education in New Jersey by eliminating the state Board of Higher Education (that formerly regulated the state colleges and universities but not Rutgers University or the community colleges) and the state Department of Higher Education (Greer, 1998; N.J.S.A. 18A:3B-1 to 18A:3B-36, 1994). The 1994 Restructuring Act replaced the state Department of Higher Education with a new Commission on Higher Education (or CHE), composed largely of lay members appointed by the governor (Greer, 1998; McGuinness, 1995). The CHE was subsequently transformed in two steps between 2009 and 2011: a statute elevated the Executive Director of the CHE to a new cabinet-level Secretary of Higher Education (N.J.S.A. 18A:3B-47, 2009), and the entire CHE was abolished and replaced by the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education by executive order of Governor Chris Christie (2010-present) in 2011 (Christie, 2011).

With the dissolution of the state Board of Higher Education and Department of Higher Education, a level of state bureaucratic review was removed and a concomitant significant increase in authority and responsibility was accorded to each institution’s governing board, including full responsibility for the establishment of student tuition and fees, admission standards, and degree requirements, determination of personnel decisions, investment of institutional funds, and the conduct of legal affairs (N.J.S.A. 18A:3B-6, 1994). The CHE was assigned responsibility for higher education master planning and advocacy as well as general coordination, planning, and policy development.
in cooperation with the NJPC, created by the 1994 Restructuring Act. The CHE (now the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education) recommends higher education initiatives and incentive programs to the governor and state legislature and has administrative responsibility for proposed changes in programmatic mission, institutional licensure, university status, and new degree programs referred by the NJPC (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, 1996, July; N.J.S.A. 18A:3B-13, 1994).


The 1994 Restructuring Act accorded the CHE significantly less power over the state colleges and universities and community colleges than the former state Board of Higher Education. For example, new and significantly revised academic degree programs are now initially reviewed by the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) of the NJPC. The members of the AIC review proposals for new and revised degree programs and recommend approval or rejection to the full NJPC. Once the NJPC has approved
new or revised academic degree programs, the CHE (now the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education) simply maintains the list of officially approved programs for each institution. Therefore, what was essentially a state regulatory process for approval of new academic degree programs from 1968 to 1994 has been largely replaced with a collegial peer review process post-1994 (although, technically, under the law, the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education has the final say on all such matters).

Critics of the decentralized model of higher education in New Jersey, including some Democrats in the state legislature and the New Jersey chapter of the NAACP, decried the potential for lack of state oversight, planning, and coordination (Greer, 1998). They were concerned that “the politically stronger institutions would receive disproportionately favorable treatment, particularly with the budget,” there could be a proliferation of degree programs, and that “community college students transferring to four year [sic] public colleges and universities would face increased difficulties in transferring credits earned at the community college” (Marcus & Hickman, 1998, p. 8).

In a more recent example, critics point to the NJPC’s approval in 2015 of a new architecture program at one public senior institution when another public senior institution six miles away has long offered a well-respected architecture program as evidence of diminished oversight of academic programs by the NJPC (Alex, 2015).

**History of 2-4 Transfer Issues in New Jersey**

Fairly soon after its formation, the NJPC took up the topic of 2-4 transfer by engaging in a series of discussions (from 1995 to 1996) concerning how to improve the 2-4 transfer process in New Jersey (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, 1996, October). Under the 1994 Restructuring Act, the NJPC has the statutory duty to:
encourage the formation of regional or other alliances among institutions including interinstitutional transfers, program articulation, cooperative programs and shared resources and develop criteria for ‘full faith and credit’ transfer agreements between county colleges and other institutions of higher education (N.J.S.A. 18A:3B-8(d), 1994).

A CHE report issued in October 1996 noted that as the NJPC “develops criteria for full faith and credit transfer agreements between community colleges and senior institutions of higher education, the Presidents’ Council should strive for a seamless transition from associate to baccalaureate degree programs” (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, 1996, October, see Critical Issue I: Effective and Efficient Use of Resources – Transfer and Articulation, second paragraph). As a result of these discussions, the NJPC charged a task force “to review thoroughly the current status of transfer articulation …[and to] make recommendations by June 1997 to enhance articulation and transfer agreements and eliminate disincentives” (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, 1996, October, see Critical Issue I: Effective and Efficient Use of Resources – Transfer and Articulation, second paragraph). In an update to the 1996 CHE report issued less than three years later, the CHE reported the following State Response to the 1996 recommendation that the NJPC “should make recommendations to enhance articulation and transfer agreements”:

The Presidents' Council adopted transfer and articulation principles stipulating that all New Jersey college students who complete an associate degree and meet the established institutional requirements used to allow native students to achieve junior status shall not be denied transfer to a New Jersey senior college or university, unless there is insufficient capacity. So far, 40 institutions have formally adopted the principles (New Jersey Commission on Higher Education, 1999, June, see Critical Issue One: Effective and Efficient Use of Resources – Transfer and Articulation, State Response, first paragraph).
The NJPC also charged a statewide committee of community college faculty and staff from across the state’s 19 community colleges to develop a common general education framework. That committee produced the General Education Foundation (see Appendix D) in 1997, that was then adopted by the NJPC as the standard general education framework for all associate degrees and academic certificates offered by any of the 19 community colleges in New Jersey (Kisker et al., 2011). The General Education Foundation expressly applied to all public senior institutions in New Jersey as well as any private (referred to as “independent” in New Jersey) senior institutions that elected to participate. In addition a committee of the NJPC led by the presidents of Rider University (a private senior institution) and Mercer County Community College developed a document entitled “Transfer Articulation Principles for New Jersey Colleges and Universities” (hereinafter referred to as the “Transfer Articulation Principles”) (see Appendix E for the complete text) that was approved by the Executive Board of the NJPC in May 1997. The committee also developed an Interpretive Statement (included as part of Appendix E) as an addendum to the set of Transfer Articulation Principles in order to clarify the intent of the Principles; this second document was approved by the Executive Board of the NJPC in May 1998.

Ten years after approval by the NJPC of the Transfer Articulation Principles, despite efforts by the NJPC to address the issues affecting 2-4 transfer, some of the public senior institutions in New Jersey were continuing to deny transfer credit to courses in the common general education core, requiring students to repeat courses upon transferring to the public senior institutions in the state (Kisker et al., 2011). Greer (1998) notes in 1998 that “tension is rising among some two-year colleges and the state colleges over transfer
and articulation practices” (p. 97). Nine years later, David Baime, Senior Vice President for Government Relations at the American Association of Community Colleges, acknowledged ongoing issues with 2-4 transfer in New Jersey at the occasion of the signing of the Transfer Law by then-Governor Jon S. Corzine (2006-2010) in September 2007: “New Jersey incidentally has been one of the states where students have historically had a very hard time transferring credits, [because of] a lot of resistance on the part of senior institutions” (Redden, 2007, paragraph 8), in an apparent reference to long-standing 2-4 transfer issues in New Jersey. Frustrated with the lack of cooperation in 2-4 transfer on the part of some of the public senior institutions, the presidents of the community colleges in New Jersey, through the auspices of the NJCCC, lobbied state legislators early in 2007 to draft legislation that would require the public senior institutions in New Jersey to accept in transfer the entire degree (i.e., all courses comprising the degree) for Associate in Arts (A.A.) and Associate in Science (A.S.) degrees awarded by any of the New Jersey community colleges (Kisker et al., 2011).

**Enactment of the Transfer Law**

Four members of the New Jersey General Assembly – Assemblywoman Pamela R. Lampitt (D – Camden County), then Assemblyman (now State Senator) Patrick J. Diegnan, Jr. (D – Middlesex County), then Assemblyman (now State Senator) Michael J. Doherty (R – Warren and Hunterdon Counties), and (now former) Assemblyman Craig A. Stanley (D – Essex County) – co-sponsored New Jersey Assembly Bill 3968 (nicknamed the “Lampitt Bill,” after its primary sponsor) in 2007. The so-called Lampitt Bill (herein referred to as “the Transfer Law”) (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46 to 18A:62-51, 2007; see Appendix B for the complete text of the law) unanimously passed both houses of the
New Jersey state legislature and was signed into law by Governor Corzine on September 13, 2007. The Transfer Law requires that all public institutions of higher education in the state enter into a collective statewide agreement providing for seamless transfer of credits from a completed associate degree program to a baccalaureate degree program. The Law provides that “independent [i.e., private] institutions may enter into [the] agreement,” but – unlike the public seniors institutions – were not required to do so (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-48, 2007).

Shortly after the enactment of the Transfer Law in 2007, a committee appointed by the NJPC comprised of faculty members from both community colleges and public senior institutions revised and reaffirmed the 1997 General Education Foundation (Kisker et al., 2011). Over a two-year period after enactment of the Law (2008-2010), the NJPC convened discipline-based groups of faculty members from both community colleges and senior public institutions in the northern and southern regions of the state to discuss better alignment of common general education courses as well as foundational courses in high-enrollment programs that nearly every college offered. (Kisker et al., 2011). At the same time, the community colleges also entered into sector-wide discussions about the adoption of common tests and cut scores for placement into developmental education at all 19 community colleges in New Jersey (Maliszewski et al., 2012).

The Transfer Law mandated the adoption by the community colleges and public senior institutions of a Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement (adopted by the NJPC in September 2008; see Appendix B) that recognizes the community colleges’ common general education core (45 credits minimum for an A.A. degree and 30 credits minimum for an A.S. degree). As a result an A.A. or A.S. degree from a New Jersey
community college would be fully transferrable as the first two years of a baccalaureate
degree program at all participating senior institutions in the state. In other words, the
Transfer Law requires that the first two years of college (fully half of a baccalaureate
degree – up to 60-64 credits) must be counted towards a bachelor’s degree at any public
senior institution in New Jersey. The Transfer Agreement includes the following stated
purpose: “Seamless transition from public associate to public baccalaureate degree
programs and supporting the successful acquisition of baccalaureate degrees by transfer
students” (Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement, 2008, p. 1). The Transfer
Law provides that the Transfer Agreement was to go into effect in fall 2008 for
community college graduates who had earned an A.A. or A.S. degree in January 2005 or
later and were applying to enter the senior institution for the first time in fall 2008 or
later.

Goals and Purpose of the Transfer Law

To understand how the Law was implemented, a review of its history and goals
and purpose is needed. As articulated in the Transfer Law, its purpose is to “provide for
the seamless transfer of academic credits from a completed associate of arts or associate
of science degree program to a baccalaureate degree program” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-
46(1)(a), 2007) and to “foster both a seamless transfer process and the academic success
of transfer students at the senior institutions” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46(1)(e), 2007). The
Transfer Law mandated that the community college and public senior institution sectors
The stated goal of the Transfer Agreement is “Seamless transition from public associate
to public baccalaureate degree programs and supporting the successful acquisition of
baccalaureate degrees by transfer students” (Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement, 2008).

The four policymakers interviewed for this study identified a number of issues with 2-4 transfer that were discussed as the idea for legislation was being seriously considered in 2007, including loss of credit in transfer (especially with the general education core), the requirement by some senior institutions for a student transferring from the community college to repeat a course at the senior institution that was successfully completed at the community college, cherry-picking by some senior institutions of courses to accept in transfer when the transfer student had successfully completed an associate degree at a New Jersey community college, lack of a common course numbering system for all community colleges and public senior institutions, and disagreements between community colleges and senior institutions about which core Education courses may be offered by the community colleges in a 2+2 transfer arrangement for Education majors seeking a bachelor’s degree.

In the interviews, all four policymakers focused mostly on the idea of promoting “seamless transfer” for students seeking to transfer from a community college to a senior institution. One of the Law’s sponsors added that the “goals of the legislation were to help students to complete a bachelor’s degree without having to repeat courses and also to increase the number of community college graduates along the way.” The consensus among the four policymakers about the meaning of the term “seamless transfer” as used in the Transfer Law is that a student transferring from a community college to a senior institution with an earned associate degree (A.A. or A.S.) should have the entire associate
degree accepted in transfer by the senior institution and therefore be at the status of a junior at that institution.

The four policymakers and the community college administrators all shared what one lawmaker referred to as “horror stories” about students whose credits earned at a New Jersey community college were not accepted in transfer by public senior institutions in New Jersey. Even though a student had passed a similar course at one of the 19 New Jersey community colleges, he or she was required to repeat the course at the public senior institution, resulting in students and their families paying more for a student to earn a bachelor’s degree and increasing the time to completion.

One reason why credits were not accepted in the transfer process was a perceived lack of rigor of the community college courses on the part of faculty and admissions officers at some of the senior institutions in New Jersey. The policymakers reported that during the development of the Transfer Law administrators and faculty members at several of the public senior institutions expressed a lack of confidence in the academic rigor and level of instruction at community colleges. Participants in the study from Rutgers University corroborated that the reason that faculty members at several of the schools at Rutgers University New Brunswick would not allow some community college courses to be accepted in transfer as course equivalents was because of the Rutgers faculty’s concerns about the level of academic rigor. One of the Vice Presidents interviewed at Rutgers University recalled being at legislative hearings about the proposed transfer legislation. He recounted that a state legislator remarked (to the best of the interviewed Vice President’s recollection) that:
there is a white elephant in the room and it is the fact that students are not being well prepared [by the community colleges] when they transfer, which is why the Rutgers people are worried about the potential effects of this legislation.

The policymakers were clear that the Transfer Law was unlikely to solve all of the problems with 2-4 transfer in New Jersey; however, all four believed that the Law was needed to help students transferring from a community college to a public senior institution complete a bachelor’s degree without encountering unnecessary barriers in the transfer process. In the end some ideas, such as requiring a common statewide course numbering system for all public institutions of higher education and resolving the debate about which core Education courses could be offered at the community colleges, were not addressed by the final version of the Transfer Law.

**Perceived Outcomes of the Transfer Law**

To a person, the policymakers and the community college administrators interviewed in this study reported that the implementation of the Transfer Law had resulted in positive outcomes for students transferring from a community college to one of the public senior institutions in the state. The policymakers focused primarily on the positive outcome that requiring the public senior institution to accept the entire A.A. or A.S. in transfer resulted in significantly less loss of credit, thereby resulting in faster completion of a bachelor’s degree and at less cost. The policymakers also believe that the numbers of students completing associate degrees has increased since the enactment of the Transfer Law. Interviewees from the community colleges uniformly articulated the belief that more community college students who have earned an A.A. or A.S. degree are able to transfer to a public senior institution as a junior and with the entire associate degree counting toward their major at the transfer institution “with no questions asked.”
One community college administrator interviewed for this study categorized the Law as a “win-win for students, institutions, and taxpayers” since students no longer had to repeat courses and could graduate from the baccalaureate institution in less time.

Interviewed administrators from Rutgers University pointed to a few positive outcomes from the implementation of the Transfer Law. One positive outcome offered by one of the Rutgers administrators is that time to completion for an incoming community college transfer student seems to be decreasing since students entering with an A.A. or A.S. are no longer asked to repeat courses. While the data in Table 2 does not support that claim, it does show that greater numbers of students are being admitted to Rutgers University New Brunswick with an associate degree awarded by a New Jersey community college.

Table 2. Bachelor’s degree completion by students who transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick with an associate degree awarded by a New Jersey community college, Academic Years 2007/2008 - 2014/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Started at RU-NB</th>
<th>Students Graduated</th>
<th>Non Graduates</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The NJ Transfer Law was enacted in September 2007; however, “The policies and procedures set forth in the transfer agreement [were mandated to] be fully operational by September 1, 2008” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46, 2007).

Source: Rutgers University (2017)

Table 2 shows that the number of students who transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick with an associate degree from a New Jersey community college and completed a bachelor’s degree within two years increased steadily from 160 for the fall
2007 cohort to 336 for the fall 2013 cohort. The number within three years also increased, rising from 125 for the fall 2007 cohort to 265 for the fall 2012 cohort. The total number of students attending Rutgers University New Brunswick who transferred in with an associate degree from a New Jersey community college also increased from 273 for the fall 2006 cohort to 877 for fall 2013.

Table 3 shows that the number of students who previously attended a New Jersey community college and transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick without an associate degree increased from fall 2006 (n = 290) to fall 2008 (n = 455) and then remained in the range of 450-500 students from fall 2008 to fall 2013.

Table 3. Bachelor’s degree completion by students who transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick without an associate degree awarded by a New Jersey community college, Academic Years 2007/2008 - 2014/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Started at RU-NB</th>
<th>Students Graduated from RU-NB</th>
<th>Non Graduates</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The NJ Transfer Law was enacted in September 2007; however, “The policies and procedures set forth in the transfer agreement [were mandated to] be fully operational by September 1, 2008” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46, 2007).

Source: Rutgers University (2017)

A Rutgers administrator saw the encouragement of students attending community colleges to complete an A.A. or A.S. prior to transferring to a public senior institution as a positive step. She believed that students who completed an associate degree prior to transferring generally performed better at Rutgers than students who transferred after only a year at the community college and tended to complete a bachelor’s degree at a
higher rate. Table 4 shows that students who transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick with an associate degree from a New Jersey community college completed a bachelor’s degree within three years at an average rate of 72% over the period of time from fall 2006 to fall 2012 compared with an average completion rate of 54% over the same period of time for students who transferred without earning an associate degree first. This disparity in completion rate has also been found in other studies (Hezel Associates, 2007; Townsend, 2002).

Table 4. Bachelor’s degree completion within three years by students who transferred to Rutgers University New Brunswick from a New Jersey community college, for students transferring in from fall 2006 - fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transferred in to RU-NB</th>
<th>Cohort that Started at RU-NB in</th>
<th>7-year average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With an associate degree</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without an associate degree</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The NJ Transfer Law was enacted in September 2007; however, “The policies and procedures set forth in the transfer agreement [were mandated to] be fully operational by September 1, 2008” (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46, 2007).
Source: Rutgers University (2017)

Another Rutgers administrator was less positive, saying “The only good thing that came out of Lampitt was the NJ Transfer website.” NJ Transfer is a project funded by the NJCCC that maintains an up-to-date website that, among other things, indicates whether a particular course at one of the 19 New Jersey community colleges will be accepted in transfer at each of the public senior institutions in New Jersey. The project began in 2001 (before the enactment of the Transfer Law), but with the enactment of the Transfer Law, all public colleges and most independent colleges in New Jersey (except Princeton University, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Stevens Institute of Technology) now participate actively by reviewing all courses submitted to NJ Transfer.
to determine how those courses would transfer to the senior institution (per e-mail exchange with John Scott, Executive Director of NJ Transfer, April 13, 2017).

Administrators interviewed at both the community colleges and Rutgers University view the NJ Transfer website as an invaluable resource for advising students who begin at a community college and plan to transfer to a senior institution. Table 5 shows the number of visits and hits to the NJ Transfer website from 2007 to 2015. Between 2009 and 2015, the number of visits to the NJ Transfer website each year has remained in the range of 400,000 to 450,000; however, the number of visits declined by about 15% between 2011 and 2012 and has then remained in the range of 19,000,000 to 20,000,000 from 2012 to 2015. Perhaps the decline in hits is related in part to the decrease in college enrollment. However, the decrease in enrollment has been steady from 2010 to the present, and the sizable drop-off in hits\(^2\) to the NJ Transfer website in 2012 has been followed by relatively level usage at the new lower annual rate of hits.

**Table 5. Annual usage statistics for NJ Transfer website, 2007 - 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>383,369</td>
<td>427,194</td>
<td>432,786</td>
<td>407,810</td>
<td>420,963</td>
<td>445,350</td>
<td>441,801</td>
<td>431,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hits</td>
<td>23,022,469</td>
<td>24,088,994</td>
<td>24,079,278</td>
<td>23,279,503</td>
<td>20,086,034</td>
<td>20,571,448</td>
<td>18,996,121</td>
<td>19,069,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** John Scott, Director of the New Jersey Statewide Transfer Initiative (2017)

\(^2\) John Scott, Director of the New Jersey Statewide Transfer Initiative reported that NJ Transfer uses the definitions of website "visits" and "hit" as defined by WebTrends (www.webtrends.com):

*Visits* – Number of times a visitor came to your site. If a visitor is idle longer than the idle-time limit, WebTrends assumes the visit was voluntarily terminated. If a visitor continues to browse your site after they reach the idle-time limit, a new visit is counted. The default idle-time limit is thirty minutes.

*Hit* – A single action on the Web server as it appears in the log file. A visitor downloading a single file is logged as a single hit, while a visitor requesting a Web page including two images registers as three hits on the server; one hit is the request for the .html page, and two additional hits are requests for the downloaded image files. While the volume of hits is an indicator of Web server traffic, it is not an accurate reflection of how many pages are being looked at.
Every college that participates in NJ Transfer has a link to the NJ Transfer website on its website that encourages students who are considering transferring from a community college to a senior institution in New Jersey to consult NJ Transfer to help in making decisions about what courses to take at the community college. All of the community college transfer administrators interviewed for this study all reported that new students are made aware of NJ Transfer during new student orientation. Nonetheless, many students at community colleges – indeed, if not a majority – decide what courses to take without consulting an academic advisor. It is not known how many students are not consulting NJ Transfer when planning their schedules.

The Transfer Law was enacted in September 2007, but it provides that the Transfer Agreement “shall be fully operational” by September 2008 (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46, 2007). This timing meant that students admitted in transfer to public senior institutions for the 2008-2009 academic year were accepted under the admissions procedures, including protocols for transcript evaluation and the transfer of credits, that were in place before the Transfer Law. The first transfer students to receive the benefits of the Transfer Law were students who were accepted in transfer beginning in 2009. Available data from the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education for New Jersey shows that enrollment at New Jersey community colleges climbed steadily from fall 2008 to its peak in fall 2010 and then tapered off to pre-2008 enrollment levels in fall 2015 (see Table 6). But, the production of associate degrees continued to climb from fall 2008 to fall 2015 (see Table 7).
Table 6. Enrollment at New Jersey community colleges, 2008 - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>7-yr % change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean County College</td>
<td>9811</td>
<td>10415</td>
<td>10367</td>
<td>10317</td>
<td>10048</td>
<td>9477</td>
<td>9296</td>
<td>8663</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raritan Valley Comm College</td>
<td>7110</td>
<td>7888</td>
<td>8484</td>
<td>8370</td>
<td>8398</td>
<td>8405</td>
<td>8214</td>
<td>8099</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County College</td>
<td>11866</td>
<td>12751</td>
<td>12874</td>
<td>12416</td>
<td>12146</td>
<td>11969</td>
<td>11781</td>
<td>11220</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NJ community colleges</td>
<td>164236</td>
<td>177173</td>
<td>180406</td>
<td>177225</td>
<td>172788</td>
<td>167580</td>
<td>162837</td>
<td>155832</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Associate degrees awarded by New Jersey community colleges, Academic Years 2007/2008 - 2014/2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean County College</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raritan Valley Comm College</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County College</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All NJ community colleges</td>
<td>15207</td>
<td>16090</td>
<td>17984</td>
<td>19622</td>
<td>19756</td>
<td>19786</td>
<td>20437</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The increase in the number of associate degrees awarded by the state’s 19 community colleges from the 2007/2008 academic year to the 2014/2015 academic year was 38%. [Note: In sync with the national Great Recession (2007-2009), the enrollments at nearly all New Jersey community colleges increased until around 2010 when they generally began to decrease each year thereafter.] All three of the community colleges under study exceeded the statewide average rate of increase for all 19 community colleges over the seven-year period. Ocean County College experienced a 46% increase. Raritan Valley Community College experienced a 69% increase. Union
County College experienced a 85% increase. These data confirm the perceptions of the policymakers, community college administrators, and Rutgers University New Brunswick administrators interviewed for this study that one of the primary outcomes of the Transfer Law has been an increase in the number of associate degrees awarded.

**Perceived Remaining Challenges**

I interviewed four administrators from Rutgers University: the Vice President for Enrollment Management, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Director of Applicant Services for University Undergraduate Admissions. They identified the following issues as challenges that remain from the implementation of the Transfer Law: (1) lack of preparedness on the part of some community college graduates; (2) acceptance of the entire A.A. or A.S. degree in transfer sometimes includes courses that Rutgers University would otherwise never accept in transfer; and (3) the perceived lack of enforcement of the requirement that students seeking admission into a B.A. degree program have completed a A.A. degree program in the same field of study (and the same for A.S. to B.S.). Each of these perceived outcomes is described in further detail below.

All four Rutgers University administrators interviewed for this study expressed a concern that some students transferring to Rutgers with an A.A. or A.S. were unprepared for the level of academic rigor at Rutgers. The administrators recounted numerous examples of community college transfer students into the School of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers University New Brunswick who they found were unprepared for college-level course work and were therefore unsuccessful. One Rutgers administrator recounted a story of a transfer student from Raritan Valley Community College who had earned a 4.0
GPA at Raritan Valley but was not performing well in some of her courses in her first semester at Rutgers University:

I tried to get her to see that she still had a long way to go [to earn better grades in her courses at Rutgers] and that her grades at Rutgers were not because of any failure on Rutgers’ part – or on RVCC’s part. She was competing with a different pool of students [at Rutgers], virtually all performing at her level or above. I got the sense that she (and many others like her) felt that since she had earned all A’s at the community college, then [her academic performance at Rutgers] must be due to a prejudice against community college students by Rutgers faculty members.

The same administrator also offered that: “Lampitt painted with so broad a brush that it put us in the position of being uneasy about ever saying ‘you are not ready for this course.’”

Other Rutgers administrators complained that some non-general education courses included in an A.A., and more often an A.S., awarded by one of the community colleges in New Jersey are courses for which there is no equivalent at Rutgers University. Admissions staff members at Rutgers University New Brunswick must categorize such courses in transfer as electives (dubbed “dummy courses” by administrators at Rutgers).

By counting courses as electives, transfer students are then required to take some first- and second-year courses at Rutgers for which there was no equivalent course transferred in from the student’s community college. Requiring these additional courses sometimes causes full-time transfer students to spend more than four semesters at Rutgers University in order to fulfill all requirements for graduation.

The Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement (2008) provides that an A.A. shall transfer into a B.A. and that an A.S. will transfer into a B.S. (section A. General Principle 2.). One problem is that some degree programs (such as Business
Administration and Criminal Justice) are not uniformly designated as an A.A./B.A. or A.S./B.S.; rather, they vary in degree designation from college to college. For example, although most New Jersey community colleges offer an A.S. degree in Criminal Justice, four of the community colleges offer an A.A. degree. The public senior institutions in the state are split almost evenly between B.A. and B.S. degree programs in Criminal Justice. Until recently most of the public senior institutions have accepted either an A.A. or A.S. in Criminal Justice in transfer regardless of the designation of the bachelor’s degree at the senior institution. Effective fall 2017 Rutgers University New Brunswick will accept only A.A. degrees in Criminal Justice in transfer to its B.A. degree in Criminal Justice. While the Transfer Agreement does allow for such an action, until now all senior institutions have accepted in transfer an A.A. to B.S. and an A.S. to B.A. in Business Administration and Criminal Justice. Suggesting the continued differences in treatment of transfer credit across public senior institutions, Rutgers University New Brunswick’s sister institution, Rutgers University Newark, continues to accept both A.A. and A.S. degrees in Criminal Justice in transfer into its B.S. degree in Criminal Justice.

Community college administrators interviewed for this study perceived that, even after enactment of the Law, Rutgers University New Brunswick has continued to cherry-pick courses in the transfer process even for students who have earned an A.A. or A.S. degree at one of the 19 New Jersey community colleges. This view is articulated by the following comments from community college administrators who were interviewed for this study: “Some transfer institutions decide that certain courses taken at the community college are not applicable to the program at the four-year college and end up counting those courses as electives” and “Rutgers University New Brunswick still nitpicks courses
in transfer.” There was a consensus among the community college administrators interviewed that, as one of them articulated: “Rutgers may be following the letter of the Lampitt Law, but they are definitely not adhering to its spirit.” Nonetheless, as demonstrated by the data presented earlier in this chapter, this perception is not consistent with trends in transfer before and after enactment of the Law.

In addition to the perceived remaining challenges identified by the Rutgers administrators, administrators at all three community colleges also complained about the “lack of a real appeals system.” They felt that the existence of an appeals process for denial of transfer credit is deliberately difficult to discover and, in any case, “ultimately the appeal process is solely the province of the four-year institution.” The lack of a meaningful appeals mechanism galled the community college administrators as they felt that transfer students who were denied courses in transfer were left with no recourse. Moreover, some of the administrators believe that the appeals process at some senior institutions is so difficult to discern that many transfer students never even bother to appeal.

**Actual Outcomes and Trends in Transfer Before and After Enactment of the Transfer Law**

Data from the most recent available report, *2013 Annual Transfer Credit Report to the Governor and Legislature* (hereinafter referred to as the “Annual Transfer Credit Report”) (Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, 2014), do not support the perception that Rutgers University New Brunswick has cherry-picked transfer courses. In this report, the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education reported that the percentage of students accepted in transfer from New Jersey community colleges to
Rutgers University New Brunswick from fall 2008 to fall 2009 (first year after the Transfer Law became effective) ticked upward by 16.7% and has continued to increase (with one minor backward step from fall 2011 to fall 2012) since (see Table 8). As a percentage of the total undergraduate enrollment at Rutgers University New Brunswick, the percentage of students accepted in transfer from New Jersey community colleges to Rutgers University New Brunswick increased from 3.7% in fall 2008 to 4.2% in fall 2009 and has hovered around 4.5% every year from 2009 to 2013, which is not significant.

The number of students who earned an associate degree at a New Jersey community college prior to transferring to Rutgers University New Brunswick for whom all credits earned at the community college transferred and Rutgers awarded 50% or more of the credits required for a bachelor’s degree increased from 27.5% in fall 2008 to 37.6% in fall 2009. This percentage remained in the range of 41% to 44% until fall 2013 when it dropped to 36.4%. This would appear to be in contradiction to the data in Figures 1 and 2 in Chapter One, which also comes from the CHE/Office of the Secretary of Higher Education. The charts in Figures 1 and 2 reflect data from all senior public institutions in the aggregate, while the data in Table 8 are specific to transfer to Rutgers University New Brunswick from all 19 community colleges.
Table 8. Enrollment at Rutgers University New Brunswick, 2008 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total undergraduate</strong></td>
<td>28031</td>
<td>29095</td>
<td>30351</td>
<td>31268</td>
<td>31593</td>
<td>33432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers from NJ community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges (% of total undergraduate)</td>
<td>1050 (3.7%)</td>
<td>1225 (4.2%)</td>
<td>1344 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1436 (4.6%)</td>
<td>1402 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1547 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Earned associate degree at a NJ community college and RU-NB awarded 50% or more of credits toward bachelor’s degree and all credits earned at the community college transferred (% of total NJ community college transfer students)</td>
<td>289 (27.5%)</td>
<td>460 (37.6%)</td>
<td>563 (41.9%)</td>
<td>594 (41.4%)</td>
<td>623 (44.4%)</td>
<td>564 (36.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Earned associate degree at a NJ community college and RU-NB awarded less than 50% of credits toward bachelor’s degree and not all credits earned at the community college transferred (% of total NJ community college transfer students)</td>
<td>121 (11.5%)</td>
<td>22 (1.8%)</td>
<td>80 (6.0%)</td>
<td>7 (0.5%)</td>
<td>8 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Office of the Secretary of Higher Education, State of New Jersey (2014)

Table 8 shows that, since enactment of the Transfer Law, a greater percentage of students accepted in transfer to Rutgers University New Brunswick from the New Jersey community colleges have received all credits earned at the community college in transfer and been awarded 50% or more of the credits required for the bachelor’s degree.

Looking at it from a different perspective, the number of students who earned an associate degree at a New Jersey community college prior to transferring to Rutgers University New Brunswick for whom not all credits earned at the community college transferred and Rutgers awarded less than 50% of the credits required for a bachelor’s degree declined from 11.5% in fall 2008 to 1.8% in fall 2009 (from 11.5% to 1.8%).

Except for a one-year upward spike in fall 2010 (to 6.0%), this percentage has remained at less than 1% of students (single digit numbers of actual students affected) from 2011 to
2013. These data suggest that Rutgers University New Brunswick made a radical change in admission policy regarding community college transfer students between the incoming class of fall 2008 and the incoming class of fall 2009 – the year that the Transfer Law took effect (for new students transferring in fall 2008 and after).

**Forces that Contributed to Outcomes of the Transfer Law**

As suggested by comments attributed to the policymakers interviewed for this study and others, there has been a longstanding tension between the community college and public senior college sectors in New Jersey, especially regarding the 2-4 transfer process. Interviews and documents reveal how each sector reacted to and implemented the Transfer Law and how implementation of the Law by each sector influenced the outcomes of the Law.

In anticipation of the passage of the Transfer Law, the New Jersey community college presidents sent a team of seven administrators and faculty members from six of the 19 community colleges to the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ annual national General Education Institute in May 2007. The New Jersey delegation was dispatched to investigate current thinking about what constitutes general education in order to update the General Education Foundation (originally developed and approved in 1997). The General Education Foundation was initially developed by a committee of the NJPC, with equal representation from the community college and senior institution sectors, that outlines the framework for general education in all associate degrees, including total number of general education courses (in credits) and required distribution among eight general education categories. While attending the Institute and in meetings shortly after the Institute concluded, the seven-member New Jersey community college
team updated the general education goals and objectives that form the basis of the General Education Foundation and drafted guidelines for determining whether courses satisfy the requirements for each goal category in the General Education Foundation.

Review of General Education

In August 2007 the AOA voted to accept the recommendations of the team and proposed the creation of a General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC) to oversee the certification of general education courses at the community colleges. The idea was, as one community college administrator succinctly put it, that: “we wanted to get our house in order before the Law went into effect.” Between the time the NJPC originally adopted the General Education Foundation in 1997, another community college administrator admitted that “there had been some drift and bloat in terms of courses that were designated by some of the community colleges as general education.”

In September 2007, each community college appointed one faculty member to GECC. In selecting members, the chief academic officers sought to include representation with expertise from all the general education categories. In addition the AOA appointed several chief academic officers. The first GECC meeting convened in October 2007 with 25 members, representing all 19 community colleges in New Jersey. The AOA charged Gary Porter, chief academic officer at Bergen County College and a member of the team that participated in the AACU General Education Institute earlier that year, with leading GECC. In the initial organization, the members were divided into six subgroups, representing combinations of the eight general education categories in the General Education Foundation. The groups met once a month for three months to discuss how the various community colleges interpreted and applied the General Education
Foundation to their curricula. For example, some colleges had quite short lists of courses approved for general education whereas others were very liberal in designating courses as general education.

During these early meetings of GECC, the subgroups reviewed course descriptions for all courses designated as having general education status at all 19 community colleges in light of the language of the General Education Foundation to determine whether the courses would be affirmed by GECC as maintaining general education status. During this first round of reviews, only those courses for which there was a unanimous consensus from among the GECC membership were approved as general education. All other courses were categorized as “No Action.”

In Spring 2008, the GECC members developed procedures for the re-submission of courses to GECC that were not affirmed in the initial review. Each college had to submit a “Request for Reconsideration Form” that provided not just the catalog description but also the student learning outcomes and a detailed course outline. GECC reviewed the “Reconsideration” forms and followed a consistent process: (a) application of a narrow interpretation of the General Education Foundation; (b) consideration of prerequisites and course numbering (e.g., 100-level vs. 200-level); (c) provision of a rationale for courses not affirmed as general education; and (d) formulation of recommendations as needed.

By the end of the 2007/2008 academic year, GECC had met seven times and submitted to the AOA its recommendations for affirming general education courses and an initial version of the Guiding Principles for Affirming Gen Ed Course Status (see Appendix F), which was approved by the AOA in June 2008. A major issue that GECC
members wrestled with was parsing the language of the original General Education Foundation (originally drafted in the mid- to late 1990s). The General Education Foundation qualified general education Social Science courses as “introductory” and general education Humanities and History courses as “broad-based.” GECC members spent many hours defining these terms. In the end, there was agreement that there is a continuum of general education in courses and that every 100- and 200-level course likely has some general education content. The intent of GECC was to determine, within the wording of the original General Education Foundation, the threshold that separates a course that merits general education status from one that does not.

The Guiding Principles document was also intended to provide chief academic officers at the community colleges (members of the AOA) with objective and consistent criteria for affirming the general education status of courses at their institutions going forward. The purpose of the Guiding Principles was to clarify the understanding of the criteria for each general education course category in the General Education Foundation so that faculty and administrators at all 19 community colleges in New Jersey would be consistent in their internal determination of which courses qualify as general education.

The work of GECC continued for a second year (academic year 2008/2009). In the second year, GECC members continued the review of resubmitted courses as well as newly-submitted courses. Some institutions revised curricula and resubmitted courses for general education approval multiple times. New courses included both brand new courses as well as existing courses that an institution did not submit initially but later decided to submit on the basis of GECC’s approval of a similar course submitted by another institution. The courses that were affirmed as general education by GECC and
approved first by the community college academic vice presidents and then the community college presidents were included on a comprehensive spreadsheet. For a number of courses, the GECC members found it difficult to reach consensus. In one example, the members debated whether a survey course on Shakespeare, which had long held general education status in Humanities at eight of the 19 community colleges, would continue to fit the definition of a general education course in Humanities. The GECC subgroup on Humanities courses deemed survey courses that focus on a genre (such as Survey of Poetry) or a geographic area or major time period (such as Survey of British Literature or Survey of Western Literature Since 1800) to be general education; therefore, a course that focuses on a single author (or even a small group of authors) did not seem to fit the definition of general education for Humanities courses, although many members of the subgroup argued that such targeted literature courses can be vehicles for a broad-based examination of literature – e.g., Shakespeare or Women's Literature. The Humanities subgroup members eventually decided to solicit input from the English Departments at each community college and to research whether a course on Shakespeare was considered to be general education at the public senior institutions in New Jersey or within the general education frameworks in place in other states. The research was discussed at a GECC meeting and resulted in a recommendation from GECC to the AOA to accept courses focusing on Shakespeare as general education.

A final updated list of affirmed general education courses was sent to a subcommittee of the AOA for its decision (which was not subject to appeal). The AOA Standing Committee on General Education continued to revise and update the Guiding Principles based on on-going discussions at AOA meetings. From the inception of
GECC through the end of the spring semester 2009, GECC members served as an available resource to train faculty and administrators at their home institutions on the appropriate and consistent application of the Guiding Principles.

By May 2009, the work of GECC was largely completed. All of the general education courses from each of New Jersey’s 19 community colleges had been reviewed and a determination was made (“affirmed” or “not affirmed”). The community college academic vice presidents decided that since the volume of new and revised general education courses going forward would be much smaller than the initial review, a subcommittee of the AOA would handle all further general education approvals.

The result of a review process of all general education courses offered by the community colleges conducted by GECC and affirmed by the AOA and the New Jersey community college presidents was that at many of the community colleges, a rather sizable number of courses that had long held general education status lost the status. There was often significant pushback at the individual college level when a course lost general education status, but the presidents and chief academic officers at the community colleges stood firm that these determinations needed to be completed in order to move forward with legislation mandating a fairer 2-4 transfer process. One community college administrator interviewed for this study recalled that “several community colleges strongly resisted having common course content and course descriptions for general education courses.” Two main categories where all courses were removed from the approved general education list were studio art courses and courses primarily involving performance (e.g., in dance and theater). Other areas that were deemed no longer to be general education included courses on topics such as creative writing, journalism,
introduction to communication, mass media, nutrition, criminal justice, and specific computer languages and programs. Some colleges lost more general education courses than others. While a few colleges with modest general education offerings (such as Salem Community College and Warren County Community College) lost no general education courses, several colleges with much more robust general education lists lost a large number of courses. Camden County College, for example, lost 141 courses in the areas of art, dance, theater, photography, music, and graphic design, and County College of Morris lost 174 courses, including some particularly narrowly focused courses in political science, psychology, sociology, and history that were no longer deemed to be general education under the Guiding Principles.

The three community colleges examined in this study varied in terms of general education courses lost in the general education review process through GECC: Ocean County College lost 17 courses; Raritan Valley Community College lost 31 courses; and Union County College lost 167 courses. The average loss among the 19 community colleges was 71 courses.

**Variation in Implementation Across the Three Community Colleges**

For the most part, the implementation of the Transfer Law at the three community colleges under study proceeded along similar lines: all three colleges participated in the sector-wide review of general education; administrators informed faculty and staff members about the Transfer Law; and mechanisms were put in place to educate students about their rights under the Transfer Law. Where there was some variation in implementation across the three colleges was in how faculty were involved in the process of reviewing associate degree programs to ensure that they were in compliance with the
revised General Education Foundation. The processes for faculty involvement at two of the three colleges (Ocean County College and Raritan Valley Community College) were described by the administrators at those colleges as collegial and respectful of the faculty’s role in developing and revising curricula, whereas the process at Union County College was described by the Union County College administrators as more adversarial. One administrator at Ocean County College reported that the implementation effort at Ocean involved “everyone, including the registrar, academic advisors, transfer counselors, and especially faculty” in the process. At Raritan Valley, the implementation process fell to the College’s “cross-campus governance body where faculty, staff, and non-professional staff discuss issues of college-wide importance.” Administrators at both colleges reported that faculty were actively involved in the review of academic programs to ensure compliance with the updated General Education Foundation.

At Union County College (with a stable but low transfer rate), there was a change in presidential leadership in 2010. Longtime president Thomas Brown was succeeded by Margaret McMenamin who within a year after her arrival at Union hired all new vice presidents. The recounting of how implementation of the Transfer Law occurred at Union County College by one of the vice presidents reveals the way in which the new Union County College administration viewed the faculty and what had been done with regard to implementation of the Transfer Law from 2007 to 2010:

When Dr. McMenamin assumed the presidency of UCC in 2010 – and remember this is a full three years after Lampitt – she discovered a large number of associate degree programs with 65 and even 70 credits. It was what we now say was educational malpractice. It might even be considered a criminal act. So Dr. McMenamin hired [a new] VPAA and said, “If only 60 credits are transferring, then all these programs need to be 60-credit programs.” And it has been
painstaking work over the last four or five years to take each program, review it and pare it down to 60 credits.

The Union County College Vice President for Academic Affairs described the process of working with faculty at Union to revise the curricula for A.A. and A.S. degree programs to reduce the total number of credits to 60: “Faculty were often highly reluctant to let go of their specialized courses and started looking for loopholes to make sure that students took esoteric courses that [the faculty] thought were essential.”

Union County College administrators and faculty were clearly involved in the general education review process that occurred statewide from 2007 to 2009. The incumbent Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the time was actively involved in GECC, and – like the other 18 community colleges – Union submitted all of its general education courses for review (and lost 167 general education courses in the process). So to at least some extent the administration in place at Union County College from 2007 to 2010 appears to have engaged in a process of implementing the Transfer Law, despite the impression shared by the current administrators at Union County College who were interviewed for this study, three of whom arrived at Union in 2011. Only one administrator of the four interviewed from Union County College worked at Union in 2007. The Director of Advising, Career, and Transfer was an advisor at Union County College in 2007 and claimed to have played no role in the original implementation of the Transfer Law at Union shortly after the Law was enacted. She reported that the then Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Director of Advising played the lead roles in implementation of the Transfer Law at Union at that
time. Since her promotion to Director of Advising, Career, and Transfer in 2012, she has been more involved in the implementation of the Transfer Law. She offered that:

The challenges at UCC have involved cleaning up our academic programs. We are doing a lot of curriculum changes now to streamline our programs. Many of our degree programs once had 67 credits. Now we are bringing them all down to 60 credits by looking carefully at the required courses in each program.

What is most telling about the descriptions of the implementation of the Transfer Law by the Ocean (which has experienced an increasing transfer rate) and Raritan Valley (which has experienced a decreasing transfer rate) administrators compared with the descriptions from the administrators at Union is the how they describe faculty involvement in the process of implementation. One of the Ocean administrators described faculty involvement in this way: “All academic departments were involved. The dean of each department recruited a team of faculty to work on the course descriptions to ensure that they clearly were aligned with the revised General Education Foundation agreement.” He also praised “the committed OCC faculty [as] the main thing that eased implementation” of the Transfer Law at Ocean. From the interviews with the administrators at Raritan Valley Community College, it is also clear that faculty were invested in the implementation process, especially with the general education review. In the interviews with the four Union administrators, on the other hand, the faculty are almost never mentioned.

It would appear that the variation in implementation may have had more to do with the administrative culture in place at each institution at the time of the enactment of the Transfer Law and less to do with the transfer rate at each college. Administrators at Ocean (which has experienced an increasing transfer rate) and Raritan Valley (which has...
experienced a decreasing transfer rate) both reported that implementation of the Transfer Law at their institutions shortly after the enactment of the Transfer Law went fairly smoothly. Conversely at Union (which has experienced a low but stable transfer rate) the administrators in place since 2011 report that little in the way of real implementation occurred in the early years after the enactment of the Transfer Law; rather, only since Dr. McMenamin became president in 2010 has implementation really begun to take place. The data on transfer rates discussed in Chapter Three (see Appendix A) that was used to select the three community colleges for this study showed that Ocean County College’s transfer rate was increasing (from 11% in 2007 to 19% in 2013), Raritan Valley Community College’s transfer rate was decreasing (from 25% in 2007 to 20% in 2013), and Union County College’s transfer rate was flat and low (at 15% in both 2007 and 2013). Table 7 shows that all three colleges have seen a dramatic increase in the number of associate degrees awarded over roughly the same period of time (2007-2015): Ocean’s associate degree production has increased 46%; Raritan Valley’s associate degree production has increased 69%; and Union’s associate degree production has increased 85% – all well above the average of 38% for all New Jersey community colleges.

**Perceived Reasons for Remaining Challenges**

None of the four policymakers interviewed harbored any illusions that the Transfer Law had resolved all barriers to seamless 2-4 transfer in New Jersey. It would appear that every participating senior institution has complied with the Transfer Law to a large extent. One policymaker remarked that:
The bill signing was a happy event. I am sure that behind closed doors there were some four-year college presidents who were not happy [about the Transfer Law], but I would say publicly everyone appeared to be singing in the choir.

From the day the legislation was enacted, there were grumblings. It should therefore come as no surprise that nearly ten years later, administrators interviewed at both the three community colleges and Rutgers University New Brunswick identified ongoing difficulties with 2-4 transfer in New Jersey. Data collected across sources suggest at least three forces contribute to the remaining challenges to full implementation of the Transfer Law: (a) failure of Rutgers University New Brunswick to abide fully by the provisions of the law; (b) unwillingness on the part of senior institutions to accept in transfer courses with a technical focus included in A.A. or A.S. degrees awarded by the community colleges; and (c) lack of advisement for some students at community colleges.

Failure of Rutgers University to Fully Honor the Transfer Agreement

The consensus of the policymakers and community college administrators was that the remaining barriers to transfer were a result of the way in which some of the public senior institutions elected to implement the Law. One of the policymakers interviewed for the study articulated this view, stating: “From what I can see, a lot of the remaining problems lie with the public four-year colleges continuing to erect barriers to seamless transfer,” including continuing to deny transfer credit for a course taken at a community college that is similar to a course offered at the senior institution. Some of the policymakers were much more pointed in their criticism, pointing to Rutgers University as the primary offender: “Overall I believe the Lampitt Law has been implemented effectively. However, I still harbor some continuing concerns that not all
barriers to transfer have been eliminated, especially for students transferring to Rutgers University.” Community college administrators echoed this sentiment. One administrator opined that “The law has had positive benefits for community college students, [but] transfer to Rutgers University New Brunswick is still as difficult as it ever was.” Table 6 suggests this may be less of an issue that it was pre-Transfer Law.

One community college administrator complained that Rutgers still put up “bureaucratic barriers” to seamless transfer for community college students, such as selective denial of transfer credit and/or transferring courses as electives rather than as courses that fulfill required general education courses or courses in the major. Another community college administrator added that “rather than wholesale denial of transfer [as was the case pre-Lampitt], now Rutgers University focuses on particular courses – such as Introduction to Psychology – or modes of delivery – such as online or short-term courses – to deny transfer.” Another community college administrator indicated that most of the senior institutions – both public and private – were cooperative transfer partners with the community colleges prior to the enactment of the Transfer Law: “The Lampitt Law did not make transfer any easier with our primary transfer partners (such as Georgian Court University or Kean University) as we already had such good working relationships with them.” The same administrator had harsh words for Rutgers University as an outlier from the more cooperative senior institutions in that, in his impression, “Rutgers fought the implementation [of the Law] and spent more time trying to find reasons to reject courses than work to abide by the Law.” This administrator pointed to numerous examples since the implementation of the Transfer Law where graduates from community colleges reported either having several standard first- and
second-year courses denied in transfer – even when they had earned an A.A. or A.S. – or having the courses transferred as general or free electives and not as the equivalent course. These practices require students to take courses at Rutgers University that they had already completed at the community college and/or complete more than the fifty percent of the bachelor’s degree credits at the senior college, contrary to the promise of the Transfer Agreement.

Unwillingness on the Part of Some Senior Institutions to Accept Some Community College Courses in Transfer

A second challenge to full implementation of the Transfer Law pertains to the technical focus of some courses offered at the community colleges that are included as part of the associate degree in transfer. There seems to be a continued conflict between the community college and senior college sectors as to course offerings and whether first- and second-year course offered by the community colleges align sufficiently with courses with similar names and course descriptions offered by the senior institutions. The Transfer Agreement mandates that all A.A. degrees are to be comprised of a minimum of 45 credits of general education courses and A.S. degrees a minimum of 30 credits of general education courses. That leaves a minimum of 15 credits in the A.A. and 30 credits – fully half the total required for an associate degree – in the A.S. of courses that are not necessarily general education. By regulation in New Jersey’s Administrative Code, the “A.S. degree nomenclature is appropriate for programs in mathematics, the sciences, business, or in allied health fields if the program is intended as prebaccalaureate work; such programs are transfer-oriented” (N.J.A.C. 9A:1-2.3, 2016).
The Rutgers administrators interviewed for this study complained about the type of courses that are sometimes included in an A.A. or A.S. degree as part of the non-general education portion of the degree. One administrator summed up her concerns this way:

The other thing that troubles me about the Lampitt Law is that once students meet the exact [general education] requirements as far as the 45 credits for the A.A. or the 30 credits for the A.S., then the rest of the courses just come in whether they are truly college level or not.

Rutgers administrators offered several examples of courses included in a A.S. degree which Rutgers University would not count toward a B.S. degree for a native student, including First Aid, Healthful Living, Medical Terminology, Office Software, and Physical Education. Rutgers administrators perceived that such courses are more technical than academic in nature and would be more appropriate as part of an A.A.S. degree than a transfer degree like an A.A. or A.S.

When admissions officials at Rutgers University New Brunswick attempt to abide by the Transfer Agreement by accepting the course in transfer but according it elective status rather than transfer credit as a particular required course in the bachelor’s degree curriculum, they are accused by the community colleges of cherry-picking courses and not honoring the spirit of the Transfer Law to accept the entire degree in transfer. Rutgers officials feel that they are safeguarding the integrity of their bachelor’s degree programs. One administrator at Rutgers University declared that, with the B.A. degree in particular, “We want students at Rutgers – especially our B.A. students – to feel that we’ve given them a liberal arts education that has a breadth to it to help them live their lives.”
Lack of Advisement for Some Transfer Students from the Community Colleges

A third challenge in implementation pertains to the lack of sufficient advisement of some students at community colleges. At most community colleges in New Jersey, as well as across the country, the student/advisor ratio is extremely high due to limited resources, so students – while strongly encouraged – are not required to meet with an advisor before being allowed to register for courses. Community colleges with annual student enrollment in the range of 8,000 to 12,000 – like Ocean, Raritan Valley, and Union – often employ only a handful of full-time academic advisors with an additional modest number of part-time advisors. At many if not most of the community colleges in New Jersey, full-time faculty are not required to advise students as part of their full-time faculty responsibilities. They are paid an additional stipend if they elect to advise. Even if you counted all full-time faculty as advisors, the ratio would be in the range of 100/1 (i.e., 100 students to one advisor). The reality is that the student/advisor ratio at most community colleges in New Jersey is substantially higher. A national study on academic advisement found that the median number of advisees for an academic advisor at a community college was 441, about twice the rate for four-year colleges and universities (Robbins, 2013).

Some students meet with an advisor and receive incorrect information as to which courses to take to fulfill graduation requirements, while many students “self-advise” and sometimes get lost in the thicket of elective choices. Studies on transfer advisement at community colleges indicate that students at community colleges are often frustrated by the complexity of the transfer process and the difficulty in finding accurate information (Booth et al., 2013; Jaggars & Fletcher, 2014).
The administrators at all three community colleges admitted that some graduates still complete “excess credits” at the community colleges, defined as credits that do not count toward the associate degree. One community college administrator was embarrassed to admit that he had met more than one student at his college who had completed over 100 credits but had still not fulfilled all requirements for an associate degree.

Community college administrators interviewed for this study offered a few reasons for how excess credit accumulation by community college students can still occur, including too many elective choices in some associate degree programs, self-advising by students or improper advising by staff members, and/or students changing majors. One community college administrator offered the hope that “there would be more advising [for] students – earlier and often – including having representatives from the four-year colleges come in early rather than waiting until the students’ last semester at the community college.”

Participants from each of the three colleges under study reported that their institutions had thoroughly reviewed all structures and processes involved in advising students about transfer to ensure that students understood their rights and responsibilities under the Transfer Law. Officials at Rutgers University New Brunswick reported a similar internal review of its processes with meetings of key personnel who touched incoming transfer students in any way, including admissions and advising staff and the staff members in the Office of Undergraduate Education and the individual Deans’ offices.
Strengths and Flaws of the Transfer Law and Statewide Articulation Agreement

Legislation is formed through compromise and therefore generally displeases everyone to some extent. Bers (2013) expresses well the lack of effectiveness of most statewide articulation agreements:

The intent is admirable: to facilitate transfer, minimize the loss of credits, and help students make wise decisions about course registrations and transfer. The reality is different: the variety of policies and agreements; the absence of a centralized, official resource of information concerning them; and continuing changes in curricula and students’ choices of transfer institutions and majors render the policies and agreements less effective than desired. (pp. 24-25)

The policymakers who developed the Transfer Law would be the first to admit that it is far from perfect. One of the policymakers admitted that “we could not fix everything that was broken about transfer in New Jersey” and “there were some issues that we simply could not tackle in the initial legislation.” The primary strength of the Law is the mandate that all public institutions of higher education in New Jersey enter into a statewide articulation agreement that includes “a guarantee” that an A.A. or A.S. awarded by a New Jersey community college “shall be fully transferable and credited as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program at the public four-year institution of higher education in the State to which a student is admitted (N.J.S.A. 18A:62-46(1)(b), 2007).” That central tenet was memorialized in the Transfer Agreement developed and adopted by the NJPC in 2008 (see Appendix B) under General Principles: “An A.A. or A.S. degree from a New Jersey community college will be fully transferable as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program at New Jersey public four-year institutions” (A, General Principle 1).

Notwithstanding its guarantee that an A.A. or A.S. degree will be “fully transferrable,” the Transfer Agreement also expressly allows for three exceptions for
participating senior institutions that compromise its effectiveness in facilitating seamless 2-4 transfer for students: (1) students may be required to take missing prerequisite courses for any required course at the senior institution in addition to all third- and fourth-year courses (Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement, 2008, A, Corollary Principle 2); (2) admission to the senior institution is not guaranteed and “admissions decisions are not appealable” (Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement, 2008, C, General Principle 1); and (3) the process for appealing the denial of credit in transfer rests entirely within the jurisdiction of the senior institution, and “the decision of the baccalaureate institution is final” (Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement, 2008, F).

Perhaps the greatest limitation in the Transfer Law is the lack of accountability in the appeals system for denial of transfer of credit. The appeals process is different at each school within Rutgers University, the largest public four-year system in the state, making it difficult for students to find and follow the process. The senior institutions are not required to maintain records of transfer of credit appeals. The Rutgers University administrators interviewed for this study all asserted that very few appeals of decisions by Rutgers University about the transfer of credits from community colleges had been lodged by incoming transfer students. One administrator reported that, “We have very few appeals that I'm aware of. The only appeals I know of are ones that have been in the School of Arts and Sciences. I've not heard of any other appeals to any other School [at Rutgers University New Brunswick].”

Such claims are in stark contrast to the allegations by administrators from the three community colleges. Administrators at all three colleges assailed the appeals
system as lacking teeth. One administrator succinctly summed up the situation from the perspective of the selected community colleges:

One major problem is the lack of a real appeals system. If a [community college] graduate wishes to appeal the denial by Rutgers University or any four-year college of a course in transfer, it is not easy for that student to find out how to appeal, and ultimately the appeal process is solely the province of the four-year institution.

A report by the Southern Regional Education Board (2013) recommends that statewide transfer policies include an appeals system that includes a neutral party or committee as the final arbitrator, not the transfer institution.

**Viewing the Implementation of the Transfer Law through a Policy Implementation Lens**

Both Sabatier’s (1986) Advocacy Coalition Framework and Matland’s (1995) Ambiguity-Conflict model are useful lenses for viewing the implementation of the Transfer Law in New Jersey over the past ten years. Both models derive from policy implementation theory and attempt to explain how policies are implemented in different situations.

In examining the implementation of the Transfer Law through the Advocacy Coalition Framework, the actors in the implementation process fall neatly into two groups or coalitions: administrators and faculty members at the community colleges and administrators and faculty members at the public senior institutions. It appears that each coalition approached the task of implementation with its own motivation and perspective.

The community college coalition, having long railed against some of the public senior institutions for denying transfer credit for many community college courses, viewed the task of coming into compliance with the terms of the Transfer Agreement as a
means to force all public senior institutions to accept in transfer the entire A.A. or A.S. degree. Through the auspices of the NJCCC, the 19 community colleges worked together to complete a thorough review of general education courses to ensure alignment with the 1997 General Education Foundation that the senior institutions had agreed to. The community college administrators and faculty members wrestled with establishing clear guidelines for community college courses to qualify for general education status and ensuring that all associate degree programs included the correct distribution and number of general education courses. Faculty and administrators at many if not most of the 19 community colleges also took a hard look at the total number of credits required for every associate degree program offered, often paring back the total to 60 credits. Such work was also done at all three of the community colleges under study. However, it appears that there was greater collaboration between administration and faculty in the program review and revision process at two of the three colleges.

The interviews with policymakers who developed the Transfer Law suggest that many colleges and universities in the public senior institution coalition approached the process of implementing the Transfer Law with concern. Some senior institution administrators spoke openly at state legislative hearings while the Transfer Law was being debated in the New Jersey General Assembly regarding their concerns about the level of academic rigor at community colleges. One administrator from Rutgers University interviewed for this study said of the Transfer Law: “There are problems with Lampitt. I mean I won’t say we [at Rutgers] like Lampitt. We don’t like it.” Administrators at all three of the community college under study indicated that they
believe that some of the public senior institutions – Rutgers University, in particular – engage in practices in the 2-4 transfer process that are not in line with the Transfer Law.

Each coalition operated based on beliefs – shared by the majority of the members of their own coalition – that were formed before the enactment of the Transfer Law and that were reinforced by experiences during the implementation of the Law. Sabatier (1998) proposes that coalitions use information to “buttress and elaborate” their beliefs about policy (p. 104). In this case the two coalitions have solidified in their beliefs. The community college coalition believes that some public senior institutions are flouting the Transfer Law while the senior institution coalition believes that some community college courses are unworthy of being accorded credit in transfer (at least not as the equivalent course). The formation of and division between the two coalitions were arguably predictable and provide a useful tool for analyzing how the Transfer Law was implemented.

Using the Ambiguity-Conflict model (Matland, 1995), I would argue that the implementation of the Transfer Law falls in the Low Policy Ambiguity – High Policy Conflict quadrant. The stated goal of the Transfer Law – seamless transfer – is one that is ostensibly shared by the entire higher education community. However, whether the most appropriate avenue to achieve that goal is through legislation is debatable. The community college sector in New Jersey finally turned to the state legislature for a legislative solution to what the sector perceived to be longstanding and seemingly intractable issues with 2-4 transfer in the state. The senior institution sector is far from uniform in its view of the Transfer Law, but a few senior institutions have consistently voiced concerns about the academic rigor of some community courses and have
continued to find ways to be selective in granting transfer credit. Matland (1995) theorizes: “The central principle in political implementation is that *implementation outcomes are decided by power*” (p. 163; emphasis in original). In this case, individuals from the community college sector who were interviewed for this study believe that the four-year public sector (and particularly Rutgers University, as the state’s flagship public research university) holds the balance of power in the relationship with community colleges in terms of political pull with the state legislature. The community college administrators point to vastly greater state funding per student in the four-year public sector and the fact that a large number of state legislators are alumni of Rutgers University. Conversely, all four administrators at Rutgers University believe that the balance of power lies with the community college sector. As one administrator wryly noted: “I believe that the members of the state legislature are always really ready to listen to the community colleges, because there is a community college in every district.”

Policies that fall into the Low Ambiguity – High Conflict quadrant of Matland’s model are often difficult to implement unless a compromise can be forged between the competing factions. In this case, despite evident cooperation between the two sectors in working on course alignment in the early years of implementation of the Transfer Law, the two sectors seem unable to reach consensus about some of the remaining details of the implementation, particularly whether the senior institutions that participate in the Transfer Agreement must accept the entire associate degree in transfer and accord every course received in transfer an equivalency on the student’s transcript at the senior institution.
In line with third-generation policy implementation theory (Schofield, 2011), by examining the implementation of the Transfer Law at three different locations, I was able to observe whether significant variation occurred that affected implementation. The only variation of note involved the process of reviewing and revising associate degree programs to ensure that they were in compliance with the revised General Education Foundation and were close in total credits to the magic number of 60 – i.e., half of the minimum number of credits required for most bachelor’s degrees in New Jersey. The administration at one community college appears to have been more heavy-handed and prescriptive in that process than the administration at the other two community colleges.

The two theoretical frameworks may be viewed as complementary perspectives of different aspects of policy processes. The most striking difference is the unit of analysis: the Advocacy Coalition Framework focuses on policy subsystems (in this case the “street-level” actors who were responsible for implementation of the Transfer Law at each college), and the Ambiguity-Conflict framework focuses on action – i.e., how the policy is implemented. The two frameworks dovetail nicely in this case. The Advocacy Coalition Framework helps to explain how the two coalitions (administrators and faculty members at community colleges and senior institutions) implemented the Transfer Law in different ways in each sector and yet continued to hold some of their pre-Transfer Law perceptions and biases, leading to claims that the Law is not working. The implementation of the Transfer Law fits neatly into the Low Ambiguity – High Conflict construct of the Ambiguity-Conflict model since the Transfer Law has arguably not been well implemented because of the conflict that exists between the community college and senior institution sectors about how to achieve seamless 2-4 transfer in New Jersey.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine implementation of the New Jersey Transfer Law at three community colleges and the state’s flagship research university as well as the forces that have contributed to and limited the extent to which the Law has achieved its expected goals. This chapter provides a summary of findings, contributions to the literature on transfer, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Findings

Two major themes emerged from the analysis of key documents and rich interview transcripts: (1) there are several areas of cooperation regarding 2-4 transfer between community colleges and public senior institutions in New Jersey; and (2) there remain areas of conflict regarding 2-4 transfer between the community college and public senior college sectors in the state.

Perceptions of administrators at both the community colleges and Rutgers University of the outcomes of the Transfer Law skewed primarily to the negative. Interviewees believed that neither the numbers of students earning associate degrees nor the numbers of students transferring from a community college to a public senior institution with associate degrees being awarded half the credits toward a bachelor’s degree had increased significantly since the enactment of the Transfer Law. Data from the state Office of the Secretary of Higher Education and Rutgers University indicate otherwise. Tables 6 and 7 show that the overall increase in the number of associate degrees awarded by the state’s 19 community colleges from the 2007/2008 academic year to the 2014/2015 academic year was 38% while overall enrollment at the community
colleges declined by 5% during the same period of time. Table 8 shows that since enactment of the Transfer Law, a greater percentage of students accepted in transfer to Rutgers University New Brunswick from community colleges in New Jersey have received all credits earned at the community college in transfer and been awarded 50% or more of the credits required for the bachelor’s degree (from 28% in fall 2008 to an average of 40% over the five-year period 2009-2013). These are two positive outcomes of the implementation of the Transfer Law: more students are completing associate degrees, and a greater percentage of students transferring from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers University New Brunswick are being awarded all credits earned at the community college in transfer by Rutgers. Table 4 suggests that students who first complete an associate degree at a New Jersey community college prior to transferring to Rutgers University New Brunswick complete a bachelor’s degree at Rutgers within three years at a higher rate than students who transfer in to Rutgers from a New Jersey community college without having earned an associate degree.

Data collected across sources suggest at least three forces contribute to the remaining challenges to seamless 2-4 transfer in New Jersey: (a) failure of Rutgers University New Brunswick to abide fully by the provisions of the law; (b) unwillingness on the part of senior institutions to accept in transfer courses with a technical focus included in A.A. or A.S. degrees awarded by the community colleges; and (c) lack of advisement for some students at community colleges. Since the enactment of the Transfer Law, Rutgers is awarding a greater percentage of transfer students from New Jersey community colleges all credits earned at the community college. But, there are still lingering concerns by policymakers and administrators at the community colleges
under study about whether Rutgers University is honoring both the letter and the spirit of the Transfer Law in some of its transfer practices, particularly in assigning elective status at Rutgers to community college courses for which Rutgers claims there is no equivalent. Rutgers administrators admitted that this practice continues in order to safeguard the integrity of a Rutgers bachelor’s degree.

Likewise the Rutgers administrators affirmed that Rutgers still refuses to accept in transfer community college courses that Rutgers faculty members deem to be too technical or occupational in nature and not appropriate as part of a bachelor’s degree. This lack of full compliance by Rutgers University is due in part to the deference University administrators accord the faculty in each college and department in the University over curriculum. This finding is consistent with a conclusion by Lumina Foundation for Education (2010) that: “institutional pride often comes into play, with faculty at the institution to which a student wants to transfer believing that the courses taken at another institution can’t possibly measure up to theirs” (p. v). The lack of full compliance by Rutgers University is also consistent with another conclusion from the Lumina Foundation for Education (2010) about “the lack of broad trust within academe, particularly between types of institutions. Four-year institutions often simply don’t believe community colleges offer a real college experience” (p. v).

This study finds that Ocean County College, an institution that experienced an increase in its overall transfer rate from 2007 to 2013, and Raritan Valley Community College, which experienced a decrease in its transfer rate for the same time period, both witnessed an increase in their production of associate degrees from 2007 to 2015: 46% increase for Ocean and 69% increase for Raritan Valley. Union County College, which
posted a stable transfer rate from 2007 to 2013, witnessed the largest increase (85%) in associate degree production from 2007 to 2015. Data collected for this study do not explain fully the difference in outcomes at the three community colleges under study, especially with regard to transfer rates for each institution to Rutgers University and bachelor’s degree completion rates for the graduates of each institution who transfer to Rutgers University and complete a bachelor’s degree.

The sector-wide numbers are nonetheless quite encouraging: the number of students who transferred from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers University New Brunswick who were awarded 50% or more of credits toward a bachelor’s degree (and all credits earned at the community college) nearly doubled (from 289 to 564) from fall 2008 to fall 2013. Since the enactment of the Transfer Law that number represents roughly 40% of all students transferring in from New Jersey community colleges (compared with 28% in fall 2008).

**Contributions to Research and Implications for Future Research**

This study sheds light on 2+4 transfer in one state and the circumstances that led a state legislature to develop legislation to mandate a particular model for 2+4 transfer. The study also informs the understanding of the implementation of a state-legislated transfer policy at the institutional level by examining the implementation of the New Jersey Transfer Law at three of the state’s 19 community colleges and the state’s flagship research university. While much of the literature on transfer policies focuses on the effectiveness of such policies (Roksa & Keith, 2008), this research focused on policy implementation.
The purpose of the Comprehensive State-wide Transfer Agreement (2008) is “Seamless transfer from public associate to public baccalaureate degree programs and supporting the successful acquisition of baccalaureate degrees by transfer students.” This study focused on the implementation of the Transfer Law and primarily on aspects of the Law relating to 2-4 transfer. As Roksa and Keith (2008) point out in their study of statewide articulation agreements: “The relevant outcomes for evaluating articulation policies thus are those that occur after students transfer to four-year institutions, particularly those related to the preservation of course credits” (p. 248). To the extent that data were available, this study analyzed the “preservation of credits” in 2-4 transfer from New Jersey community colleges to Rutgers University New Brunswick. To truly understand whether transfer policies are meeting their goals of preventing loss of credit in transfer, further studies would be helpful, especially using transcript-level data. Future research should identify the community colleges that tend to have all of their credits awarded in transfer by a senior public institution, and the reasons for this success. Future research should also examine the community college courses that senior institutions reject in transfer (or reclassify as electives) and the reasons for these determinations. Examinations of these issues would yield valuable additional information about the 2-4 transfer process and would provide insights needed to guide statewide discussions aimed at improving the 2-4 transfer process.

Data presented in this study suggest that earning an associate degree before transferring increases bachelor’s degree completion rates for students transferring from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers University New Brunswick. Future research should examine whether this pattern holds at all senior institutions. Further study is
required to understand the reasons for these different rates, including whether factors like advisement at the community college prior to transfer affects bachelor’s degree completion rates. Shugart and Harrison (2011) suggest that increasing the transfer rate by five points could boost annual national bachelor’s degree production by 46,000 degrees. Future research might also take into account students who transfer across state lines and students who “swirl” in attendance between colleges and sectors. How does the transfer process work for these students? What is the role of state policy in improving the transfer and bachelor’s degree completion rates for such groups of students?

This dissertation also has several policy implications as it yields insights about potential impediments to full and effective implementation of transfer legislation. Among the important issues that emerged was the lack of a reliable mechanism to ensure course alignment between the community college and senior institution sectors. Despite some collaboration between the faculties of the community college and senior institution sectors shortly after the enactment of the Transfer Law in New Jersey, it is apparent from the findings of this study that lack of complete alignment between some community college courses and the first- and second-year courses offered by the senior institutions is still an impediment to seamless 2-4 transfer. The community college coalition believes that their courses – especially the core general education courses that make up 50% of an A.S. degree and 75% of an A.A. degree – are college-level creditworthy courses. The faculty and academic administrators in the community college sector spent more than two years evaluating the general education course offerings at all 19 community colleges in New Jersey, and the community college coalition believes their general education course offerings meet the revised General Education Foundation. The senior institution coalition
believes that some community college courses are more appropriate for a technical
degree (such as an A.A.S.), that is not designed for transfer, and that when such courses
are part of a student’s community college transcript – even when part of an A.A. or A.S.
– that the senior institution risks tarnishing the integrity of its bachelor’s degrees by
awarding such courses credit in transfer. In a state where the public colleges are
autonomous and not part of a system, it is difficult to mandate course alignment across
colleges or sectors. Some mechanism – perhaps more discipline-focused conversations
between the faculties from both sectors – is needed in order to end this stalemate.

Finally, this study adds to theory building in higher education policy
implementation studies. This study explores the utility of Sabatier’s (1986) Advocacy
Coalition Framework and Matland’s (1995) Ambiguity-Conflict model for explaining the
implementation of this particular higher education policy. The Advocacy Coalition
Framework fits well with the circumstances this study found in the implementation of a
state policy by two different sectors or coalitions. Each coalition held strongly to its
beliefs developed before the enactment of the policy, even when – as this study has found
– some of those beliefs are not supported by the data. The Ambiguity-Conflict model
helps to explain how the street-level actors (primarily the faculty and academic
administrators at each institution) in each sector (or coalition) implemented the policy
differently, pointing out the need for a compromise to be brokered between the two
sectors in order to implement the policy fully.

Ensuring an efficient transfer process between community colleges and four-year
colleges and universities is an essential piece of the puzzle of how to increase
baccalaureate attainment. New Jersey’s Transfer Law is one example of how states are
experimenting with policies to achieve a more seamless transfer process. In drafting such policies, policymakers would be well advised to learn from the implementation of the New Jersey Transfer Law by ensuring that sufficient communication between potentially conflicting coalitions occurs in order to forge a working compromise that may lead to a policy that can be implemented and that will achieve its goals. To be sure, the context of the Transfer Law in New Jersey is unique, which will limit the direct transferability of the findings from this study to states with different characteristics and different higher education structures. An additional recommendation for future research would be to examine whether the findings from this study may apply to other states.
APPENDIX A

Change in Reported Transfer Rates of New Jersey County Colleges, 2007 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Reported Transfer Rate</th>
<th>Percentage Point Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 cohort*</td>
<td>2010 cohort**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Cape Community College</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen Community College</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookdale Community College</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington County College***</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden County College</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County College of Morris</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland County College</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County College</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester County College***</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County Community College</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer County Community College</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County College</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean County College</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County Community College</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raritan Valley Community College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Community College</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex County College</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County College</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Community College</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2004 First-time Full-time student cohort for the three-year period fall 2004 - summer 2007

**Fall 2010 First-time Full-time student cohort for the three-year period fall 2010 - summer 2013

***Since 2010, Burlington County College has been renamed Rowan College at Burlington County, and Gloucester County College has been renamed Rowan College at Gloucester County.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (data submitted via the Integrated Postsecondary Education Database System, or IPEDS)
APPENDIX B

COMPREHENSIVE STATE-WIDE TRANSFER AGREEMENT
(Adopted by NJPC – 9/22/08)

PURPOSE: Seamless transition from public associate to public baccalaureate degree programs and supporting the successful acquisition of baccalaureate degrees by transfer students.

A. TRANSFER – with an A.A. or A.S. degree

General Principles:

1. An A.A. or A.S. degree from a New Jersey community college will be fully transferable as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program at New Jersey public four-year institutions.

2. Students transferring with an A.A. degree into a B.A. program or an A.S. degree into a B.S. program will have accepted for transfer exactly half of the credits required for the basic four-year degree and will have exactly half of the credits to complete at the four-year institution. Such students will have Junior status upon enrollment at the four-year institution. [For example, at William Paterson, where the basic four-year degree is 128 credits, the transfer student’s A.A. or A.S. degree will transfer in exactly 64 credits, and the student will have exactly 64 credits remaining to complete at William Paterson for the degree. At Montclair State, where the basic four-year degree is 120 credits, the transfer student’s A.A. or A.S. degree will transfer in exactly 60 credits, and the student will have exactly 60 credits remaining to complete at Montclair State for the degree.]

3. Such transfer students will be considered to have completed all lower division General Education requirements.

Corollary Principles:

1. It is up to the four-year institution to identify for the student upon admission any requirements in regard to the remaining half of the credits. [For example, where half of the degree program is equal to 64 credits, the receiving institution might say that the student must complete 36 credits for the major, 6 credits in foreign languages, and 22 elective credits, but the total requirements cannot be more than 64 credits or half of the total degree requirement.]

2. The only reason a student would be required to take more than the standard half of credits for the four-year degree is if entrance into a required course at the four-year institution requires a prerequisite course which the student has not completed at the community college, and the student cannot fit that prerequisite within the remaining credits to be taken at the four-year institution. The four-year institutions will make such prerequisite information clear so that students can take appropriate coursework at the community college.
3. Transfer students must meet the specific graduation requirements of the four-year institution to which they seek to transfer (for example, foreign language proficiency). In most instances, it is expected that, by careful planning, the transfer student will be able to meet these requirements within their two years’ of study at the community college or within the remaining two years’ of study at the senior institution. It is the responsibility of the senior institutions to make sure that their specific graduation requirements are clearly announced in catalogs and other relevant materials.

4. 100 and 200 level courses at the community college that deal with the same subject matter as 100 and 200 level courses at the four-year institutions will be accepted as equivalent. [For example, if Calculus II (a 200 level course) is a prerequisite for enrollment in Linear Algebra (a 300 level course) at the four-year institution, and if the transfer student has taken Calculus II at the community college, they will be able to enroll in Linear Algebra at the four-year institution, no questions asked.]

5. By definition, 300- and 400-level courses at four-year institutions have no course equivalents at the community colleges. For the purposes of this Agreement, a 300-level course is one that has a prerequisite of 200-level coursework or equivalent prerequisite, such as a placement exam.

6. It is in transfer students’ best interests that community college courses be well aligned with the courses offered at the four-year institutions. This alignment is best accomplished by faculty-to-faculty discussions across the institutions in all sectors. To insure that students can prepare themselves well to succeed in baccalaureate coursework, course evaluations that now take place as part of NJTransfer will continue, and the community colleges will advise their students as to which courses will best prepare them for transfer. [For example, Calculus II, whether taught at a four-year institution or a community college, should generally address Riemann integral applications, transcendental functions, techniques of integration, improper integrals, L'Hospital's rule, and infinite series.]

7. For five-year programs or other specialized programs where the degree requires more than the standard four-year credit requirement, the transfer student will be required to complete all credits in excess of the 60/64 credits transferred to the institution at the four-year institution, in exactly the same manner as native students. [For example, for a student transferring to Montclair State into the B.S. program in Physical Education with dual teacher certification in Physical Education and Health, the credit distribution would be 60 credits at the community college and 84 credits at Montclair State to reach the required program total of 144 credits. For a student transferring to Rowan into a Chemical Engineering program the credit distribution would be 60 credits at the community college and 72 credits at Rowan to reach the required program total of 132 credits. As noted in corollary principle 2, above, students who have not completed required prerequisite courses as part of their community college program might have to take additional credits.]
8. Where program requirements are closely defined by accrediting organizations, regular communication and consultation shall occur between program faculty at the two-year and four-year institutions to facilitate effective and seamless transfer.

9. All decisions made with respect to the transfer process shall be based on the principle of equivalence of expectations and requirements for native and transfer students. [For example, if a 'D' grade earned by a native student in a specific course is accepted for credit in a specific program, then a 'D' grade earned by a transfer student in the same course would also be accepted for credit in that program. If the 'D' grade is not accepted for native students or for transfer students from other four-year institutions, then it will not be accepted for transfer students from community colleges. Similarly, if a “4” is the minimum AP grade accepted for course credit at a senior institution, then a “4” will be the minimum AP grade accepted by that institution as transfer credit from a community college.]

10. Transfer students and community colleges are responsible for providing with their transfer applications, through NJTransfer or some other mechanism, transcripts that clearly and accurately designate the specific degree earned by the student, the major, and all courses and course levels and grades attained by the student. All institutions participating in this Agreement are expected to keep course descriptions, prerequisites, and course equivalencies current.

B. TRANSFER – without an A.A. or A.S. degree

General Principle: Credits taken at a NJ community college that are applicable to an A.A. or A.S. degree program, up to a maximum of 60-64 credits, shall be transferable to a NJ four-year institution toward a baccalaureate degree program.

Corollary Principles:

1. The admitting senior institution shall designate which of the transfer credits shall be applied to general education requirements, major requirements, graduation requirements, or electives.

2. Once the designation specified in 1. above has occurred, the transfer student will be required to take as many credits as are necessary to complete the general education, major, graduation, and elective requirements remaining and applicable to the particular program of the particular senior institution. The number of remaining credits is, in most instances, likely to exceed 60-64 credits depending on the number of credits eligible for transfer and the applicability of those credits to the particular program the student seeks to enter.

3. For students who submit fully completed applications and associated fees by the senior institution's established admissions deadline, the senior institution shall notify the student, within thirty days of admission, as to the acceptance and designation of transfer credits and as to the remaining credits required for graduation in a specific baccalaureate degree program.
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C. ADMISSION

General Principles:

1. Admission to a four-year college or university will depend, as do all admissions, on the four-year institution’s assessment of the overall strength of the student’s academic record and the availability of places in the receiving institution. Senior institutions are not expected to exceed their enrollment goals to accommodate transfer students. Admissions decisions are not appealable through the Appeal Process set forth in this Agreement.

2. A transfer student’s admission into a particular major will be subject to the specific requirements for admission to that major, consistent with such requirements for native students. (See also A. 1. above.)

D. GENERAL EDUCATION

General Principle: The community colleges shall require for transfer students a general education program that conforms to parameters that are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Goal(s) addressed</th>
<th>Course Categories (Goal Categories)</th>
<th>AA credits</th>
<th>AS credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Communication (Written and Oral Communication)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mathematics – Science – Technology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social Science (Society and Human Behavior)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Humanities (Humanistic Perspective)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 History (Historical Perspective)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Diversity courses (Global &amp; Cult. Awarness)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned general education credit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General education foundation total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen. Ed. Foundation Course Categories</th>
<th>NJCC Goal Categories*</th>
<th>Course Criteria: Below are brief descriptions of the course criteria for satisfying the requirements. For fuller description see the NJCC GE Course Criteria (August 15, 2007).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Communication</strong></td>
<td>Written and Oral Communication</td>
<td>An array of courses which prepare students to speak, read, and write effectively. At least two of these must be composition courses for A.A. and A.S. degrees. At least one of these must be a composition course for specialized degree programs and certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Any college level mathematics course including statistics, algebra, or calculus course(s). These courses should build upon demonstrated proficiency in basic algebra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Science</strong></td>
<td>Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning</td>
<td>Any course(s) in the biological or physical sciences – or non-majors survey course. At least one of these courses must have a laboratory component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Technology</strong></td>
<td>Technological Competency or Information Literacy</td>
<td>Any course that emphasizes common computer technology skills (e.g. computer science, information technology) that helps students to access, process, and present information. This component is not required for students who can demonstrate competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Social Science</strong></td>
<td>Society and Human Behavior</td>
<td>Any introductory course(s) from among anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, or sociology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Humanities</strong></td>
<td>Humanistic Perspective</td>
<td>Any broad-based course(s) in the appreciation of art, music, or theater, literature, foreign language, history, philosophy and/or religious studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 History</strong></td>
<td>Historical Perspective</td>
<td>Any broad-based course(s) or sequence of courses in World, Western, non-Western, or American History.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity courses</th>
<th>Global and Cultural Awareness</th>
<th>possibly within the context of non-introductory study of a foreign language. If this goal is integrated into one or more general education course(s), the three credits may be moved from this category to another general education category.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Ethical Reasoning and Action</td>
<td>This ethical reasoning and action goal may be infused in any of the above categories. These courses should include the ethical implications of issues and situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This document should be used in conjunction with the NJCC GE Learning Goals & Suggested Individual College-wide Learning Obj. (8-15-2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Allocation Notes: The credit allocation below is consistent with the 1997 NJCC Gen. Ed. Foundation grid.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>The Associate in Arts (AA) program requires 45 semester credits hours of general education coursework from among the indicated categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>The Associate in Science (AS) program requires a minimum of 30 semester credits hours from among the indicated categories, with minimum distributions as shown. Beyond these minimums, any 10 credit subpart of the AA program credit distribution will be accepted. General education coursework in excess of the 24 credits listed should follow the AA distribution limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Provisions for Transfer of Mathematics Courses:

- For students transferring with an A.A. or an A.S. degree, General Education mathematics courses that have a prerequisite of basic algebra shall be included among the courses for which students pursuing non-mathematics-intensive programs are awarded General Education transfer credit.
- In all other circumstances, the policies that apply to native students at the baccalaureate institution shall be applicable to transfer students and shall determine whether a baccalaureate institution does or not accept a specific mathematics course as meeting general education, major, graduation, or elective requirements.
- Each participating institution must ensure that its students are fully advised of the impact of their mathematics course selections in their planning for a major and for transferring credits.

E. **ASSESSMENT**

1. The Presidents’ Council and the Commission on Higher Education will exercise responsibility for monitoring the effectiveness of the Agreement and its implementation.

2. The Commission on Higher Education shall annually collect such data from all participating institutions of higher education as will enable the Commission and the Presidents’ Council to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of this Agreement in fostering a seamless transfer process and the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions. The Commission shall share the data it collects with the Presidents’ Council.

3. The Presidents’ Council Transfer Committee will assume expanded responsibilities, as set forth in 4. below, and shall include: 3 representatives from among the state colleges and universities; 1 representative from Rutgers; 1 representative from NJIT; 5 representatives from among the community colleges; 1 representative from the proprietary institutions; and one representative from the Commission on Higher Education. Representatives shall be a president, a chief academic officer or an associate chief academic officer, and must be from institutions that are signatories to this Agreement or a related companion agreement. A majority of the representatives from the four-year and from the two-year sectors shall be presidents.
4. Based on the data provided by the Commission on Higher Education, the Transfer Committee will be responsible for:
   a. In collaboration with the Commission, assessing the effectiveness of the implementation of the Agreement, in particular: (a) the rates of achievement of baccalaureate degrees by transfer students, and (b) the actual implementation of the terms of the Agreement by participating institutions;
   b. In collaboration with the Commission, recommending to the Presidents’ Council any modifications to the Agreement or related procedures;
   c. Hearing appeals from institutions on behalf of students, as described in the Appeals procedure set forth in Section F below.
   d. Impaneling ad hoc sub-committees, if and when necessary, to research and make recommendations in regard to specific issues related to transfer.

5. Each institution participating in the Agreement shall appoint and identify a specific individual responsible for overseeing that institution’s implementation of the Agreement.

F. **STUDENT APPEAL PROCESS**

Each baccalaureate institution shall have a procedure through which a transfer student can appeal a decision that he/she believes is not consistent with this Agreement. The procedure shall be published in the institution’s catalog, student handbook, and website. A student who wishes to appeal a decision must file that appeal with the baccalaureate institution through that procedure. Such appeal must be submitted by the student within 30 days of receiving the decision in question. The baccalaureate institution will provide a decision to the student within 60 days of receipt of the appeal. The decision of the baccalaureate institution is final. The relevant community college will be informed of the nature of the appeal and the decision by the baccalaureate institution.

G. **INSTITUTIONAL RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES REGARDING THE AGREEMENT**

1. If the community college believes the decision of the baccalaureate institution was not consistent with this Agreement, the community college shall consult with the baccalaureate institution and seek to achieve resolution of the matter. If the community college cannot achieve resolution of the matter with the baccalaureate institution, the community college may submit the matter for consideration and recommendation to the Special Transfer Agreement Panel established by the Presidents’ Council, as set forth in Section G.2. below. The Panel shall receive relevant documentation and opinions from the baccalaureate institution and the community college, and, if so requested, they shall provide timely response to any additional requests for information from the Panel. The Panel shall make any recommendations in the matter which it deems advisable. Those recommendations shall be forwarded to the institutions concerned and to the Transfer Committee. The Transfer Committee shall report on any Panel recommendations to the Presidents’ Council.
2. A Special Transfer Agreement Panel comprised of three persons and three alternates shall be appointed to serve each year by the Presidents’ Council. One member and alternate of the Panel shall be former academic officers nominated by the baccalaureate institutions; one member and alternate of the Panel shall be former academic officers nominated by the community colleges; and one member and alternate of the Panel shall be nominated by the Commission on Higher Education. The alternate member shall serve whenever the regular member is unavailable or has a current or prior affiliation with one of the institutions involved in the dispute. The costs of the dispute resolution process shall be borne equally by the institutions involved in the appeal.

H. IMPLEMENTATION DATE AND APPLICABILITY

This Agreement will take effect for fall term 2008 and will be applicable only to all transfer students entering the senior institution for the first time in Fall 2008 or thereafter and who have earned an A.A. or an A.S. degree from a New Jersey community college in January 2005 or thereafter or who have not earned a degree but seek to transfer credits earned at a New Jersey community college in 2003 or thereafter. Further, the Agreement applies only to students from institutions that conform to the provisions of this Agreement.
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SYNOPSIS

Provides for the transfer of certain college credits.

CURRENT VERSION OF TEXT

As reported by the Assembly Higher Education Committee on February 8, 2007, with amendments.

(Sponsorship Updated As Of: 6/19/2007)
AN ACT concerning the transfer of certain college credits and
supplementing chapter 62 of Title 18A of the New Jersey
Statutes.

BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State
of New Jersey:

1. Each public institution of higher education, in consultation
with the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education and the
New Jersey Presidents’ Council, shall establish and enter into a
collective Statewide transfer agreement that provides for the
seamless transfer of academic credits from a completed associate
"of arts or associate of science" degree program to a baccalaureate
degree program. The transfer agreement shall include:
   a. "curriculum standards for] a listing of the general education
   [programs at the associate degree level] core courses as stipulated
   by the Presidents’ Council;"
   b. policies and procedures for the "seamless" transfer and
   application of academic credits from a completed associate degree
   program to a baccalaureate degree program, including a guarantee
   that an associate of arts degree or an associate of science degree
   awarded by a county college established pursuant to chapter 64A of
   Title 18A of the New Jersey Statutes shall be fully transferable and
   credited as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program at
   the four-year public institution of higher education in the State to
   which a student is admitted;
   c. policies and procedures for the implementation of "a student"
   and appeals process "for students and institutions" to resolve
   disputes regarding the transfer of academic credits;
   d. policies and procedures for the annual review and update of
   the agreement; and
   e. policies and procedures for the collection of data by the
   commission to ensure that all participating institutions of higher
   education are in compliance with the provisions of this act and to
   ensure that the agreement is fostering both a seamless transfer
   process and the academic success of transfer students at the senior
   institutions. The commission shall annually determine the data to
   be collected and shall notify each participating institution in a
   timely manner.

The policies and procedures set forth in the transfer agreement
shall be fully operational by September 1, 2008.

2. On or before January 1, 2008, each "participating" public
institution of higher education shall, in consultation with the

EXPLANATION – Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill is not enacted and is intended to be omitted in the law.

Matter underlined thus is new matter.
Matter enclosed in superscript numerals has been adopted as follows:
Assembly AHJ committee amendments adopted February 8, 2007.
Commission on Higher Education 'and the Presidents' Council',
develop and adopt as part of the collective Statewide transfer
agreement established pursuant to section 1 of this act policies and
procedures for the transfer of credits earned by a student who has
not completed his associate degree program prior to transferring
into a baccalaureate degree program.

3. An independent institution of higher education in the State
may elect to enter into the agreement.

4. The Commission on Higher Education shall prepare an annual
report containing a compilation of the data collected pursuant to
subsection c. of section 1 of this act 'an analysis of the effect of
the agreement on the transfer process and on the academic success
of transfer students at the senior institutions,' and an analysis of
each participating institution's compliance with the provisions of
this act. The commission shall submit the report to the Legislature
'and the Governor' by [August 31st] November 15th of each
year.

5. The cooperation of each public institution of higher education
in abiding by the terms of the agreement shall be reviewed and
considered by the Governor and the Legislature when making the
annual appropriation for the institution.

6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any public or
independent institution of higher education to admit a student or to
waive its admission standards and application procedures.

7. This act shall take effect immediately.
CHAPTER 175

AN ACT concerning the transfer of certain college credits and supplementing chapter 62 of Title 18A of the New Jersey Statutes.

BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

C.18A:62-46 Transfer of academic credits from associate degree program to baccalaureate program.

1. Each public institution of higher education, in consultation with the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education and the New Jersey Presidents’ Council, shall establish and enter into a collective Statewide transfer agreement that provides for the seamless transfer of academic credits from a completed associate of arts or associate of science degree program to a baccalaureate degree program. The transfer agreement shall include:
   a. a listing of the general education core courses as stipulated by the Presidents’ Council;
   b. policies and procedures for the seamless transfer and application of academic credits from a completed associate degree program to a baccalaureate degree program, including a guarantee that an associate of arts degree or an associate of science degree awarded by a county college established pursuant to chapter 64A of Title 18A of the New Jersey Statutes shall be fully transferable and credited as the first two years of a baccalaureate degree program at the public four-year institution of higher education in the State to which a student is admitted;
   c. policies and procedures for the implementation of an appeals process for students and institutions to resolve disputes regarding the transfer of academic credits;
   d. policies and procedures for the annual review and update of the agreement; and
   e. policies and procedures for the collection of data by the commission to ensure that all participating institutions of higher education are in compliance with the provisions of this act and to ensure that the agreement is fostering both a seamless transfer process and the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions. The commission shall annually determine the data to be collected and shall notify each participating institution in a timely manner.

The policies and procedures set forth in the transfer agreement shall be fully operational by September 1, 2008.

C.18A:62-47 Adoption of policies, procedures regarding certain transfers.

2. On or before January 1, 2008, each public institution of higher education shall, in consultation with the Commission on Higher Education and the Presidents’ Council, develop and adopt as part of the collective Statewide transfer agreement established pursuant to section 1 of this act policies and procedures for the transfer of credits earned by a student who has not completed his associate degree program prior to transferring into a baccalaureate degree program.
C.18A:62-48 Independent institutions may enter into agreement.
   3. An independent institution of higher education in the State may elect to enter into the agreement.

   4. The Commission on Higher Education shall prepare an annual report containing a compilation of the data collected pursuant to subsection e. of section 1 of this act, an analysis of the effect of the agreement on the transfer process and on the academic success of transfer students at the senior institutions, and an analysis of each participating institution’s compliance with the provisions of this act. The commission shall submit the report to the Legislature and the Governor by November 15th of each year.

C.18A:62-50 Cooperation considered relative to annual appropriation.
   5. The cooperation of each public institution of higher education in abiding by the terms of the agreement shall be reviewed and considered by the Governor and the Legislature when making the annual appropriation for the institution.

   6. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any public or independent institution of higher education to admit a student or to waive its admission standards and application procedures.

   7. This act shall take effect immediately.

Approved September 13, 2007.
APPENDIX D

A General Education Foundation for
Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, Specialized Associate, and Certificate Programs
in New Jersey’s Community Colleges
(1997 Adoption, 2007 Reaffirmed, August 15, 2007 Revision)
APPROVED BY PRESIDENTS – 9/6/2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Goal(s) addressed</th>
<th>Course Categories (Goal Categories)</th>
<th>AA credits</th>
<th>AS credits</th>
<th>AAS, AFA, AS Nursing credits</th>
<th>Certificate credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication (Written and Oral Com.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mathematics – Science – Technology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics 3-4 cr. (Quant. Knlg. &amp; Skills)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science 3-4 cr. (Sci. Knlg. &amp; Rang.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technological Competency 0-4 cr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Science (Society and Human Behavior)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Humanities (Humanistic Perspective)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>History (Historical Perspective)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Diversity courses (Global &amp; Cult. Aware.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unassigned general education credit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General education foundation total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gen. Ed. Foundation Course Categories**
- **Communication**
- **Mathematics**
- **Science**
- **Technology**
- **Social Science**
- **Humanities**
- **History**
- **Diversity courses**

**NJCC Goal Categories**
- Written and Oral Communication
- Quantitative Knowledge and Skills
- Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning
- Technological Competency
- Society and Human Behavior
- Humanistic Perspective
- Historical Perspective
- Global and Cultural Awareness

**Course Criteria:** Below are brief descriptions of the course criteria for satisfying the requirements. For fuller descriptions, see the NJCC GE Course Criteria (September 6, 2011).

**Communication**
- Written and Oral Communication
  - An array of courses which prepare students to speak, read, and write effectively. At least two of these must be composition courses for A.A. and A.S. degrees. At least one of these must be a composition course for specialized degree programs and certificates.

**Mathematics**
- Quantitative Knowledge and Skills
  - Any college level mathematics course including statistics, algebra, or calculus course(s). These courses should build upon a demonstrated proficiency in basic algebra.

**Science**
- Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning
  - Any course(s) in the biological or physical sciences – including non-majors survey courses. At least one of these courses must have a laboratory component.

**Technology**
- Technological Competency
  - Any course that emphasizes common computer technology skills (e.g. computer science, information technology) that helps students to access, process, and present information. This component is not required for students who can demonstrate competency.

**Social Science**
- Society and Human Behavior
  - Any introductory course(s) from among anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, or sociology.

**Humanities**
- Humanistic Perspective
  - Any broad-based course(s) in the appreciation of art, music, or theater; literature; foreign language; history; philosophy and/or religious studies.

**History**
- Historical Perspective
  - Any broad-based course(s) or sequence of courses in World, Western, non-Western, or American History.

**Diversity courses**
- Global and Cultural Awareness
  - Any course whose purpose is to expose students to a multicultural society or people, possibly within the context of non-introductory study of a foreign language. If this goal is integrated into one or more general education course(s), the three credits may be moved from this category to another general education category.

**General Education Integrated Course Goal**

**Ethical Reasoning and Action**
- This ethical reasoning and action goal may be infused in any of the above categories. These courses should include the ethical implications of issues and situations.

**Information Literacy**
- These courses include the requirement for students to address an information need by locating, evaluating and effectively using information.

**Note:** This document should be used in conjunction with the NJCC GE Learning Goals & Suggested Individual College-Wide Learning Obj. (9-6-2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Allocation Notes: The credit allocation below is consistent with the 1997 NJCC Gen. Ed. Foundation grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>The Associate in Arts (AA) program requires a minimum of 45 semester credit hours of general education coursework from among the indicated categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>The Associate in Science (AS) program requires a minimum of 30 semester credit hours from among the indicated categories, with minimum distributions as shown. Beyond these minimums, any 30-credit subset of the AA program credit distribution will be accepted. General education coursework in excess of the 24 credits listed should follow the AS distribution limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Associate AAS, AFA, &amp; AS Nursing</td>
<td>The specialized associate degrees shall include Applied Associate in Science (AAS), Associate in Fine Arts (AFA), and AS in Nursing. These programs shall require no fewer than 20 semester credit hours of General Education. Notwithstanding any articulation agreements, the general education courses should support career preparation. General education coursework in excess of the 12 credits listed should follow the AS distribution limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

109
NJCC General Education
Learning Goals and Suggested Individual College-Wide Learning Objectives
(1997 Adopted, August 15, 2007 Revision, September 6, 2011 Revision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NJCC Goal Categories (Course Category)</th>
<th>NJCC Gen. Ed. Learning Goals Critical thinking is embodied</th>
<th>Suggested Individual College-Wide Learning Objectives: Colleges have discretion in the establishment of Individual College-Wide Learning Objectives that support the achievement of the NJCC Learning Goals. The following is a list of examples.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Written and Oral Communication (Communication) | Students will communicate effectively in both speech and writing. | a. Students will explain and evaluate what they read, hear, and see.  
b. Students will state and evaluate the views and findings of others.  
c. Students will logically and persuasively state and support orally and in writing their points of view or findings.  
d. Students will evaluate, revise, and edit their communication. |
| 2 Quantitative Knowledge and Skills (Mathematics) | Students will use appropriate mathematical and statistical concepts and operations to interpret data and to solve problems. | a. Students will translate quantifiable problems into mathematical terms and solve these problems using mathematical or statistical operations.  
b. Students will construct graphs and charts, interpret them, and draw appropriate conclusions. |
| 3 Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning (Science) | Students will use the scientific method of inquiry, through the acquisition of scientific knowledge. | a. Applying the scientific method, students will analyze a problem and draw conclusions from data and evidence.  
b. Students will distinguish between scientific theory and scientific discovery, and between science and its scientific technological applications, and they will explain the impact of each on society. |
| 4 Technological Competency (Technology) | Students will use computer systems or other appropriate forms of technology to achieve educational and personal goals. | a. Students will use computer systems or other appropriate forms of technology to identify, collect, and process information.  
b. Students will use appropriate forms of technology to identify, collect, and process information. |
| 5 Society and Human Behavior (Social Science) | Students will use social science theories and concepts to analyze human behavior and social and political institutions and to act as responsible citizens. | a. Students will analyze and discuss behavioral or societal issues using theories and concepts from a social science perspective.  
b. Students will explain how social institutions and organizations influence individual behavior.  
c. Students will describe and demonstrate how social scientists gather and analyze data and draw conclusions.  
d. Students will apply civic knowledge both locally and globally and engage in activities that exercise personal, social, and civic responsibility. |
| 6 Humanistic Perspective (Humanities) | Students will analyze works in the fields of art, music, or theater; literature; and philosophy and/or religious studies; and will gain competence in the use of a foreign language. | a. Students will describe commonly used approaches and criteria for analyzing works*.  
b. Students will analyze works* and applying commonly used approaches and criteria.  
c. Students will demonstrate a value added competence in the production and comprehension of a foreign language.  
d. Students will understand the importance of a global perspective and culturally diverse peoples. |
| 7 Historical Perspective (History) | Students will understand historical events and movements in World, Western, non-Western, or American societies and assess their subsequent significance. | a. Students will state the causes of a major historical event and analyze the impact of that event on a nation or civilization.  
b. Students will discuss a major idea, movement, invention or discovery, and how it affected the world or American society.  
c. Students will demonstrate how writers’ interpretations of historical events are influenced by their time, culture, and perspective. |
| 8 Global and Cultural Awareness (Diversity courses) | Students will understand the importance of a global perspective and culturally diverse peoples. | a. Students will link cultural practices and perspectives with geographic and/or historical conditions from which they arose.  
b. Students will explain why an understanding of differences in people’s backgrounds is particularly important to American society.  
c. Students will recognize and explain the possible consequences of prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory actions.  
d. Students will recognize and assess the contributions and impact of people from various nations and/or cultures. |
### NJ CCC Integrated Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ethical Reasoning and Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Information Literacy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand ethical issues and situations.</td>
<td>Students will address an information need by locating, evaluating and effectively using information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Students will analyze and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives on an ethical issue or a situation.</td>
<td>a. Students will identify and address an information need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students will take a position on an ethical issue or a situation and defend it.</td>
<td>b. Students will access information effectively and efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students will evaluate and think critically about information.</td>
<td>c. Students will analyze and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives on an ethical issue or a situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Students will use information effectively for a specific purpose.</td>
<td>d. Students will take a position on an ethical issue or a situation and defend it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students will use information ethically and legally.</td>
<td>e. Students will identify and address an information need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This document should be used in conjunction with the General Education Foundation (9-6-2011) and the NJCC GE Course Criteria (9-6-2011).

---

### NJCC General Education Course Criteria In Summary

**for Satisfying the NJCC Gen Ed Foundation**

(September 6, 2011 Edition)

#### New Jersey Community College Educational Philosophy:
Students are empowered to meet twenty-first century challenges by achieving learning that involves knowledge acquisition, skills mastery, critical thinking, and the exercise of personal, social, and civic responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NJCC Goal Categories</strong></th>
<th><strong>NJCC Learning Goals</strong></th>
<th><strong>Course Criteria:</strong> These criteria for satisfying requirements are consistent with 1997 NJCC Gen. Ed. Foundation. Neither this nor preceding updates have modified the NJCC Gen. Ed. Foundation and their course criteria.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Written and Oral Communication (Communication)</td>
<td>Students will communicate effectively in both speech and writing.</td>
<td>An array of courses which prepare students to speak, read, and write effectively. At least two of these must be composition courses for A.A. and A.S. degrees. At least one of these must be a composition course for other programs and certificates. This category is typically limited to courses such as English Composition I, English Composition II, and a Speech / Human Communications course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quantitative Knowledge and Skills (Mathematics)</td>
<td>Students will use appropriate mathematical and statistical concepts and operations to interpret data and to solve problems.</td>
<td>Any college level mathematics course including statistics, algebra, or calculus course(s). These courses should build upon a demonstrated proficiency in basic algebra. Students are expected to demonstrate proficiency in basic algebra as part of the AA and AS degrees. Institutions are free to determine a basic algebra proficiency requirement for specialized associate degrees and certificates on an individual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning (Science)</td>
<td>Students will use the scientific method of inquiry, through the acquisition of scientific knowledge.</td>
<td>Any course(s) in the biological or physical sciences for science majors. Survey courses in biology, chemistry, and physics fulfill this requirement for non-science majors. At least one of the courses taken must have a laboratory component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Technological Competency (Technology)</td>
<td>Students will use computer systems or other appropriate forms of technology to achieve educational and personal goals.</td>
<td>Any course that emphasizes common computer technology skills (e.g. computer science, information technology) that helps students access, process, and present information. This component is not required for students who can demonstrate competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Society and Human Behavior (Social Science)</td>
<td>Students will use social science theories and concepts to analyze human behavior and social and political institutions and to act as responsible citizens.</td>
<td>Any introductory course(s) from among anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, or sociology. Typically this category is limited to broad-based courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Humanistic Perspective (Humanities)</td>
<td>Students will analyze works in the fields of art, music, or theater; literature; and philosophy and/or religious studies; and will gain competence in the use of a foreign language.</td>
<td>Any broad-based course(s) in the appreciation of art, music, or theater; literature; foreign language; history; philosophy and/or religious studies. This category may include any broad-based course which is fundamentally the appreciation of a performing or a creative art. Typically studio arts courses, both performing and creative, involve predominately performance and creation, and therefore do not satisfy this requirement. This category also includes any broad-based course which is fundamentally a literature course. Typically journalism, creative writing, and other specialized writing courses involve predominately writing, and therefore do not satisfy this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Historical Perspective (History)</td>
<td>Students will understand historical events and movements in World, Western, non-Western or American societies and assess their subsequent significance.</td>
<td>Any broad-based course(s) or sequence of courses in World, Western, non-Western, or American History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global and Cultural Awareness</strong> (Diversity courses)</td>
<td>Students will understand the importance of a global perspective and cultural diverse peoples.</td>
<td>Any course whose primary purpose is to expose students to a multicultural society or people possibly within the context of non-introductory study of a foreign language. If this goal is integrated into one or more general education course(s), the three credits may be moved from this category to another general education category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Reasoning and Action</strong></td>
<td>Students will understand ethical issues and situations.</td>
<td>These courses in each category include the ethical implications of issues and situations. This ethical reasoning and action goal may be infused in any of the above categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Literacy</strong></td>
<td>Students will address an information need by locating, evaluating and effectively using information.</td>
<td>These courses in each category underline the research process through the inclusion of information-based assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Colleges maintain responsibility for offering a general education program whose learning objectives facilitate attainment of all NJCC Learning Goals. Local general education courses must be consistent with NJCC Course Criteria for satisfying requirements. (Course-level learning objectives must also be consistent with the Individual College-wide Learning Objectives that fulfill the NJCC Gen Ed Learning Goals.)

** The NJ Academic Officers Association has the responsibility of affirming individual course classifications approved by institutions based upon the NJCC General Education Learning Goals and the NJCC General Education Course Criteria for Satisfying the NJCC Gen Ed Foundation.

Note: This document should be used in conjunction with the General Education Foundation (September 6, 2011) and the NJCC GE Learning Goal & Suggested Individual College-wide Learning Objectives (September 6, 2011).
APPENDIX E

TRANSFER ARTICULATION PRINCIPLES FOR NEW JERSEY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
(Approved by the Executive Board of the NJ Presidents' Council, May 19, 1997)

The ability to transfer credits from one institution to another is a matter of particular importance to students and the State because it saves both money and time by eliminating unnecessary duplication and repetition of courses. It is The Presidents' Council's responsibility to encourage inter-institutional articulation of programs and transfer of credits among colleges and universities. The public policy that guides the principles for transfer should assure a smooth, productive transfer of students from community colleges to senior institutions. This policy represents the most critical partnership between higher education institutions because enhanced transfer agreements can affect cost, time to degree completion, graduation rates, and out-migration.

The Presidents' Council should strive for a seamless transition from associate to baccalaureate degree programs. In order to accomplish this goal, the following principles will be followed by participating institutions.

Institutional Admission [See Interpretive Statement below, pp. 3-6]
New Jersey college students who have completed an associate degree and meet the established institutional requirements used to allow native students to achieve junior class status shall not be denied transfer to a New Jersey participating senior college or university. The associates in art or science degrees will be viewed as a transparent part of the first two years of a four-year program. Students who have completed at least 56 semester hours and meet the same standards the senior college/university applies to associate degree transfer students will be given preference in transfer to New Jersey public senior colleges and universities. Transfer students who have met the conditions of the published articulation agreement between the sending and receiving institutions will not be asked to take a higher number of credits for the baccalaureate degree than the indigenous students of the senior institution. Capacity limits of the senior college or university may limit admission to the institution.

Acceptance of General Education
The general education credits (a minimum of 30 credits for A.S. degree graduates and 45 credits for A.A. degree graduates) of approved transfer programs shall be accepted in their entirety towards the general education requirements of the participating colleges and universities. Students who have completed the general education requirements for an associate degree, but have not attained the degree, will be afforded the same acceptance of credits.

Program Admission
Admission to a specific curriculum and acceptance of transfer credits in that curriculum at a participating college or university shall be determined by the college or university based upon the same established criteria which it imposes upon its own students. Capacity limits of the program of study may restrict acceptance.
Automated System
The policies and associated procedures for this articulation system will be the core elements for a publicly accessible, computer-based information system linking all participating colleges and universities in New Jersey. The system will provide electronic transmission and automated assessment of transcript services.

Rights and Responsibilities
Supporting this articulation system will be a Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities describing the procedures for access and management of the network. Students will have clear descriptions of the responsibilities of institutions participating in the system, the students' responsibilities in the system, and the students' rights and process for appeal.

Assessment
Annually, a statewide assessment report on the effectiveness of the articulation system (student outcomes) will be made to the Council of Presidents as input for the improvement of the system. Included in the assessment report will be a survey of transfer students to insure the process is meeting their needs.

Institutional Coordination
A clearly identified office or person will be designated in each participating college or university to manage the articulation and transfer processes internally and provide the contact point for external communications.

Statewide Curriculum Coordination
Coordination of curriculum and discipline matters will be the responsibility of representatives of the participating colleges and universities who will hold statewide meetings on a regular basis. Recommendations for the improvement of the state articulation system will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Council of Presidents for consideration and action.
INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT
(Approved by the Executive Board of the NJ Presidents' Council, May 26, 1998)

This document provides interpretative commentary to the Institutional Admission section of the Transfer Articulation Principles for New Jersey Colleges and Universities. Participation in the New Jersey transfer system implies adherence to the provision of this document.

New Jersey college students who have completed an associate degree and meet the established institutional requirements used to allow native students to achieve junior status shall not be denied transfer to a New Jersey senior college or university.

Interpretive Statement:

New Jersey community college graduates who have earned an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree shall be given priority consideration for admission. For example, if a participating institution must choose between two equally qualified students, one with an AA or AS degree from a New Jersey community college and the other from another institution, the AA or AS degree student from a New Jersey community college shall be admitted.

Transfer students, who apply to a senior college/university with intention to graduate with an AA or AS degree prior to the semester of matriculation at a senior college or university, shall receive priority consideration for admission. This admission will be contingent upon certification of the AA or AS degree. Additionally, this admission may be subject to the same certification of high school graduation or its equivalent and fulfillment of specified academic units at the secondary level required of all applicants. Receiving institutions may opt to waive certification of high school graduation or its equivalent for New Jersey community college AA or AS graduates.

Admitted students shall be afforded the same rights and privileges and be subject to the same obligations regarding academic standing, academic degree requirements, course transfer and course progress as native students—those students whose initial enrollment commenced at the senior college or university. For example, if a native student retains all grades for course progression to the next level or for the determination of academic standing, then all grades earned by the transfer student at the community college shall be applicable at the senior college/university. Furthermore, if native students register for courses without the aid of placement tests, then placement tests may not be administered to AA or AS graduates.

Students wishing to transfer to a senior college or university must send a completed application along with all requested documentation and application fee by the announced deadline for admissions consideration. Applications received after established deadlines may not be given priority consideration for admission.

1 The term “community college” in this document covers all public, private and proprietary institutions of higher education operating in New Jersey that grant AA, AS or both degrees.
The associates in art or science degrees will be viewed as a transparent part of the first two years of a four-year program.

Interpretive Statement:

The AA or AS degree student will receive maximum transfer credit for all courses taken at the community college provided he/she fulfills the 1) general education requirements established in the statewide articulation agreement, and 2) completes the other academic courses which have been approved in an articulation agreement with the senior college or university.

The AA or AS degree student is responsible for searching the statewide articulation program guide to determine what community college courses have course equivalencies at the senior college or university of their choice and what community college courses will transfer into their intended major at the senior college or university.

The transition from a New Jersey community college to a senior college or university shall be transparent provided the AA or AS graduate follows the guidelines described above. In these cases, the transfer student should receive full credit for courses taken during his/her first two years of collegiate study. He/she will be positioned to commence his/her third year of collegiate study (junior status) at a senior college or university.

Should a transfer student complete courses that do not have equivalencies at a senior college/university, then he/she may risk losing transfer credit for these courses. In this case, a transfer student may need to take additional courses at the senior college/university to earn junior status. Transfer students are responsible for seeking the appropriate academic advice in selecting the appropriate number, type, level and mix of courses that will ensure a smooth transition to a senior college/university with junior status.

Students who have completed at least 56 semester hours and meet the same standards the senior college/university applies to associate degree transfer students will be given preference in transfer to New Jersey public senior colleges and universities.

Interpretive Statement:

Students with at least 56 semester hours, inclusive of completion of the general education requirements for the AA or AS degree program, will be given preference over another equally qualified student from another institution. Should a student from another institution have completed more degree credits and/or have earned a more competitive academic record, the senior college/university may admit this student over the New Jersey community college student. Only in cases where the student is a New Jersey community college AA or AS degree graduate will the senior college/university give priority consideration for admission. Thus, for purposes of admission into a senior college/university, it is in the best interest of the student to complete his/her AA or AS degree at a New Jersey community college.

Students wishing to transfer to a senior college or university must send a completed application along with all requested documentation and application fee by the announced deadline for
admissions consideration. Applications received from students with at least 56 semester hours after established deadlines may not be given preferred consideration for admission.

Students who have not completed their AA or AS degree, or who have completed some or all of the associate in applied science degree program, will be subject to the regular criteria for admissions into a senior college/university. These students will not enjoy the same academic rights, privileges, and obligations as native students. For instance, a senior college/university may impose placement tests, disregard marginal grades for course transfer and admissions purposes, and limit course registration at the upper division.

Students who have not obtained their AA or AS degree prior to matriculation to a senior college/university may be required to submit the proof of high school graduation or its equivalent when applying for admission. If admitted, they may be expected to satisfy high school course deficiencies in the first year of study at a senior college/university.

Transfer students who have met the conditions of the published articulation agreement between the sending and the receiving institutions will not be asked to take a higher number of credits for the baccalaureate degree than the indigenous students of the senior institutions.

Interpretive Statement:

Students are expected to refer to the published articulation agreements, contained within the statewide articulation program guide, prior to registering for courses at New Jersey community colleges. Students are encouraged to register for those courses that have been approved for course equivalency credit at a senior college/university. If planned in accordance with the articulation agreement, a transfer student will receive courses credit for all degree credits—general education courses and major course of study courses—taken at his/her New Jersey community college upon matriculation at a senior college/university.

With a carefully selected program, the community college graduate shall enter a senior college/university with the first two years of a baccalaureate degree completed. This status is contingent upon completion of the general education requirements, a major course of study and the continuation of this course of study into the junior and senior years. Transfer students may opt to change their major once enrolled at the senior college/university. This change of majors may require the student to complete additional courses to satisfy the course requirements of a new major. Native students may also be required to complete additional course credits once they opt for a different major during matriculation at the senior college/university.

Transfer AA or AS degree graduates shall be subject to the same degree requirements as native students provided all previously mentioned conditions are satisfied, i.e., general education requirements, major course of study courses and continuation of the major at the senior college/university.
Capacity limits of the senior college/university may limit admission to the institution.

*Interpretive Statement:*

Admission to a senior college/university will depend on the number of open seats available each cycle, the priority, preferred or regular status assigned to the transfer applicant and the overall strength of the academic record.

Senior colleges/universities will not be expected to exceed enrollment capacity to accommodate the needs of transfer students from New Jersey community colleges or any other institution of higher education.

A transfer student's acceptance into the major may be subject to the review of an academic department/unit after institutional admission has been issued. However, criteria or processes will not differ for transfer students in acceptance or retention from those used with native students. Standards and principles of the statewide articulation agreement will not be superseded by department/unit decisions.
APPENDIX F

NJCC General Education
Guiding Principles for Affirming Gen Ed Course Status

APPROVED BY PRESIDENTS – 9/6/2011

Introduction and Background

These guidelines result from discussions by the 2007-2008 New Jersey General Education Coordinating Committee. The task of the committee was to develop specific, objective criteria to evaluate community college General Education courses from the guidelines of the New Jersey General Education Foundation. Congruence with the “foundation” criteria is to be used as the dominant consideration in affirming, or not affirming, acceptance of submitted courses. The committee considered courses found to be compatible with the “foundation” criteria as being, in almost all cases, transferable to senior institutions. However, in the absence of a course by course guarantee of transferability, the priority in determining general education affirmation was based more on congruence with “foundation” criteria than with consideration of perceived transferability.

Some courses were affirmed as General Education in more than one category (e.g., Humanities and Diversity). Furthermore, some courses that were submitted for multiple General Education categories were only affirmed as General Education in a single category. In some cases, courses with similar or identical titles as approved General Education courses at some institutions were not approved for General Education at all institutions because the learning objectives were substantially different. In all categories, special studies/special topics courses were not affirmed as General Education as it is not possible to determine that all iterations of these courses meet the General Education guidelines for the category.

Individual Category Guidelines

1. Communication (Written and Oral Communication)
   a. This category is limited to these courses:
      • Composition I
      • Composition II
      • Speech, Public Speaking, or Human Communication
   b. No other courses fit the criteria for this category.
   c. Technical Writing courses satisfy this general education category for specialized associate degree (e.g., AAS, ADN, and AFA) programs only.
   d. Other mass communication, mass media, and communication courses do not satisfy this general education category.
2. **Mathematics** (Quantitative Knowledge and Skills)
   All college-level math courses that build on basic or elementary algebra satisfy this general education category. It is not sufficient for the course to require basic or elementary algebra as a prerequisite; the course must use, and demonstrably build upon, algebraic principles.

3. **Science** (Scientific Knowledge and Reasoning)
   a. Any course whose primary focus is the scientific method and the exploration of scientific principles and theory satisfies this general education category.
   b. Generally these courses are biological sciences and physical sciences (chemistry and physics) courses.
   c. Sub-disciplines (e.g., astronomy, meteorology, forensics) may be acceptable as satisfying this general education category when they are physics- or chemistry-based.

4. **Technology** (Technological Competency or Information Literacy)
   a. **Technological Competency**
      o Courses which include computer technology skills needed to access, process, and present information satisfy this general education category.
      o Courses cannot be limited to one application or programming language.

5. **Social Science** (Society and Human Behavior)
   a. Courses in anthropology, economics, geography, political science, psychology, and sociology satisfy this category.
   b. The course concepts are viewed as gateway concepts into a discipline, as opposed to the notion of "introductory."
   c. “Introductory” is not viewed as being limited to concepts that are simple in their content.
   d. Given the "introductory" requirement, courses that require prerequisites, some 200-level courses, and courses that are "applied" are not considered as satisfying this general education category. (Applied courses are defined as those which are dependent on the theories and principles taught in the "introductory" courses and are not Gen Ed.)
   e. Three of the fields that comprise Anthropology (Archaeology, Cultural Anthropology, and Physical Anthropology) are acceptable as satisfying this general education category provided they reference culture (as opposed to science).
   f. Introductions to the four fields of Political Science are acceptable as satisfying this general education category: American Government, International Relations, Comparative Government, and Political Theory.
g. Psychology courses which satisfy this general education category include the following areas: psychology as a form of scientific inquiry, the biology of behavior, states of consciousness, learning, memory, cognition, motivation/emotion, life span, personality, and psychological disorders.

h. Sociology courses which satisfy this general education category include courses whose primary focus is on the major sociological perspectives and the sociological imagination.

i. Discipline categories that do not satisfy this general education category include: Business, Communication, Criminal Justice, Education, Urban Studies, and Women’s Studies.

6. **Humanities** (Humanistic Perspective)

   The core criterion for all Humanities courses is that they meet the standard of “broad-based.”

   **a. Appreciation of Art, Music, or Theater**

   In addition to “broad-based,” a core criterion for courses in this subcategory is that the goal of appreciation is the primary purpose or focus.

   - **Appreciation of Art**
     - Aesthetic appreciation and history of art fulfill this general education category. (Note: An art history course satisfies Humanities general education under this Fine Art, Music or Theater category but not under the History category.)
     - Ethnic-based art is too specialized to satisfy this category of general education.
     - Courses which are predominantly studio arts are too skills-based to satisfy this category of general education. Courses which satisfy this general education category may have a studio component. However, that studio component should support the goal of appreciation and should not be the primary purpose or focus of the course.
     - Computer graphics courses do not fulfill this general education category.
     - Aesthetic appreciation and history of photography courses satisfy this general education category.
     - History of architecture does not satisfy this category.

   - **Appreciation and History of Music**
     - Music appreciation and music history courses satisfy this general education category. (Note: A music history course satisfies Humanities Gen Ed under this Art, Music or Theater category but not under the History category.)
     - Surveys of music genres as a reflection of a social or cultural era (e.g., Jazz, Pop) fulfill this general education category.
     - Music theory does not fulfill this general education category.
• Performance courses which are predominantly skills-based do not satisfy this general education category.

• **Appreciation of Theater**
  - Appreciation of the Performing Arts, including Dance, and Cinema courses are considered part of this subcategory of Humanities.
  - Appreciation and history courses fulfill this general education category. (Note: A theater history course satisfies Humanities Gen Ed under this Art, Music or Theater category but not under the History category.)
  - Performing Arts courses where the students are predominantly the performers are skills-based and therefore do not satisfy this general education category.
  - Specialized topics (e.g., African-American film, Latin American Lit in Film, Women in Film, Film and Pop Culture) do not satisfy this general education category.

b. **Literature**
  - Survey courses that study a genre satisfy this general education category (e.g., drama, fiction poetry, the novel).
  - Generally surveys of cultural or social groups do not satisfy this general education category.
  - Literature courses like American Literature, African-American Literature, Women’s Literature, and Shakespeare, which can be vehicles for a broad-based examination of literature, satisfy this general education category.
  - The study of large geographical areas or major time periods (continents, civilizations, etc.) satisfies this general education category.
  - The study of non-survey courses (e.g., the Holocaust, AIDS, Vietnam, Puerto Rico, science fiction, and detective fiction) does not satisfy this general education category.
  - Special studies or special topics courses do not satisfy this general education category. (It is assumed that the content of these courses changes. Therefore, it is not possible to affirm that every iteration of these courses satisfies this general education category.)

c. **Foreign Language (World Language)**
  - All foreign language courses whose content is delivered in the target language satisfy this general education category.
  - American Sign Language satisfies this general education category.
  - Foreign language literature courses satisfy this general education category.
  - Foreign language literature courses in translation do not satisfy this general education category.
o “Practical” Foreign Languages whose purpose appears to be to learn enough Berlitz-type “Foreign Language for travelers” do not fulfill this general education category.

d. **History** (as Humanities)
o Courses affirmed in this category are the same as those affirmed in the Historical Perspective category (see below).

e. **Philosophy and/or Religious Studies**
   - *Philosophy*
o Courses that treat broad areas of philosophy (e.g., Introduction to Philosophy, Ethics, Moral Choices, Critical Thinking, and Logic) satisfy this general education category.
o Business and professional ethics courses are too specific to fulfill this general education category but may satisfy the ethics requirement.
o “Topics” courses are not sufficiently specific in their description to satisfy this general education category.
   - *Religious Studies*
o Courses that are broad in scope satisfy this general education category.
o Courses based on a single text (even if it is the Hebrew Bible, New Testament, or Qur’an) are too narrowly focused and do not satisfy this general education category.

f. **Interdisciplinary**
o This category is represented by courses that fulfill requirements in multiple disciplines within the humanities and satisfy the Humanities general education category.

g. **Communication** *(further review of this subcategory is pending)*

7. **History** *(Historical Perspective)*
The core criterion for all Historical Perspective courses is that they meet the standard of “broad-based.”
o Survey courses of a major time period or continent (Asia, Europe, and Africa) satisfy this general education category.
o Courses that focus on a single ethnic, cultural, or social group are too specific to satisfy this general education category. (These courses may be accepted as satisfying the Global and Cultural Awareness category).
o History courses like African-American History and Women in History, which can be vehicles for a broad-based examination of historical perspectives, satisfy this general education category.
o Regional history is generally too specific and does not satisfy this general education category.
o Special studies or special topics courses do not satisfy this general education category.

8. Diversity (Global and Cultural Awareness)
o Courses in this category support the examination of multicultural societies or peoples and help engender a richer understanding of the diverse life experiences of societal subgroups.
o Diversity courses need not be "introductory" or "broad-based." Thus, course levels, specific discipline identity, prerequisites, and the "introductory" or "broad-based" criteria are not considered.
o Societal groups are identified as – but are not limited to – race, class, gender, ethnicity, language, and religious orientation.
o The absence of other criteria limits decision making to case-by-case analysis.
o These courses may also be used to satisfy the requirements in the unassigned general education credit category for the AS and specialized associate degrees.

Integrated Goals Guidelines

These two goals, ethical reasoning and action and information literacy, will be integrated into select courses in each of the above general education categories.

Ethical Reasoning and Action
o These courses include the study of the ethical implications of issues and situations.
o Courses that integrate ethical reasoning and action must be included in each individual category. For example a philosophy course in ethics which integrates ethical reasoning and action may also satisfy the requirement in the Humanities - philosophy and/or religious studies category.

Information Literacy
o These courses include the requirement for students to address information need by locating, evaluating and effectively using information. These courses should underline the research process through the inclusion of information-based assignments that require students to:
- Identify and address an information need;
- Access information effectively and efficiently;
- Evaluate and think critically about information;
- Use information effectively for a specific purpose; and
- Use information ethically and legally.
- A specific breakdown of information literacy skills for the above learning outcomes can be located at: Information Literacy Progression Standards for NJ Colleges & Universities. Courses selected by individual institutions should focus on the Gateway/Developing skills as identified in the Progression Standards.
- Courses that integrate information literacy must be included in each individual category.
APPENDIX G

Interview Guide

Interview Protocol

• Introductions

• Request permission to electronically record the interview

• Review and have the interviewee sign the informed consent form (and provide a copy of the form to the interviewee) [Note: This step will be taken in advance of a telephone interview.]

• Ask interview questions with appropriate probing additional questions

• Exchange contact information with the interviewee

• Thank the interviewee and discuss timetable for reviewing the transcript

Interview Questions for Public Officials Involved in the Development of the Transfer Law

1. Describe the position you held in 2007.

2. Describe your understanding of the Lampitt Law. What are its key components? What do you believe were the goals of the Law?

3. Describe the role you (and your staff, if appropriate) played in the development and passage of the Lampitt Law in 2007.

4. Describe your understanding of the Lampitt Law. What are its key components? What do you believe were the goals of the Law?

5. Do you believe that the Lampitt Law has been implemented effectively? Why or why not?

6. Do you believe the Lampitt Law has achieved its goals? Why or why not?

7. Has the Lampitt Law had any positive outcomes? Any negative outcomes?

8. If you could change one thing to improve transfer outcomes for students in New Jersey, what would it be?
Interview Questions for Administrators at the Community Colleges

1. Describe the position you held at your institution in 2007 and the position you currently hold. If you were not employed at your current institution in 2007, were you employed in higher education in New Jersey at that time? If so, in what capacity and where?

2. Describe your understanding of the Lampitt Law. What are its key components? What do you believe were the goals of the Law?

3. What in your opinion have been the outcomes of the Lampitt Law – i.e., how has it affected 2-4 transfer at your institution and how transfer actually occurs between your institution and public four-year colleges and universities in New Jersey?

4. Describe how your institution went about implementing the Lampitt Law. What departments and positions were involved in the process of implementation?

   • Areas for potential probing: collaboration with other institutions; issues relating to trust, leadership, and communication

5. Describe what takes place now at your institution with regard to the Lampitt Law and 2-4 transfer:

   • How are faculty and staff made aware of the Lampitt Law and the part your institution plays in facilitating “seamless transfer” under the Law for students from your institution who wish to transfer to a public four-year college or university in New Jersey?
   • How are prospective students made aware of the Lampitt Law and the part your institution plays in facilitating “seamless transfer” under the Law for students from your institution who wish to transfer to a public four-year college or university in New Jersey? How are students made aware of the Law and the part your institution plays in facilitating “seamless transfer” under the Law for students from your institution who wish to transfer to a public four-year college or university in New Jersey prior to graduation from your institution?
   • If a student at your institution is preparing to transfer to a public four-year college or university in New Jersey with an A.A. or A.S. degree and encounters difficulties in the transfer process, what resources are available to the student at your institution?
6. Now that the Lampitt Law has been in existence for over eight years, has your institution done anything different or is your institution considering doing anything differently with regard to the Lampitt Law?

- **Areas for potential probing**: curriculum changes, new academic programs, new or revised one-to-one articulation agreements with public four-year colleges or universities in New Jersey, advocating for different state legislation, new processes

7. Is there anything I did not ask you that you think would be important to know regarding the Lampitt Law and 2-4 transfer at your institution since 2007?

8. Is there anyone at your institution that you think may have important information or insight into the Lampitt Law and 2-4 transfer since 2007 that you would recommend I should interview?

**Interview Questions for Administrators at Rutgers University New Brunswick**

1. Describe the position you held in 2007 and the position you currently hold. If you were not employed at Rutgers University in 2007, were you employed in higher education in New Jersey at that time? If so, in what capacity and where?

2. Describe your understanding of the Lampitt Law. What are its key components? What do you believe were the goals of the Law?

3. What in your opinion have been the outcomes of the Lampitt Law – i.e., how has it affected 2-4 transfer at Rutgers New Brunswick and how transfer actually occurs between community colleges in New Jersey and Rutgers New Brunswick?

4. Describe how Rutgers New Brunswick went about implementing the Lampitt Law. What departments and positions were involved in the process of implementation?

- **Areas for potential probing**: collaboration with other institutions; issues relating to trust, leadership, and communication

5. Describe what takes place now at Rutgers New Brunswick with regard to the Lampitt Law and the admission of incoming transfer students from New Jersey community colleges:

- How are faculty and staff at Rutgers New Brunswick made aware of the Lampitt Law and the part Rutgers New Brunswick plays in facilitating
“seamless transfer” under the Law for students who wish to transfer from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers New Brunswick?

• How are prospective transfer students to Rutgers New Brunswick made aware of the Lampitt Law and the part Rutgers New Brunswick plays in facilitating “seamless transfer” under the Law for students transferring from a New Jersey community college to Rutgers New Brunswick?

• What records are maintained of appeals by transfer students regarding the credits transferred to Rutgers New Brunswick from New Jersey community colleges? Approximately how many appeals are lodged each year?

6. Now that the Lampitt Law has been in existence for over eight years, has Rutgers New Brunswick done anything different or is Rutgers New Brunswick considering doing anything differently with regard to the Lampitt Law?

• Areas for potential probing: curriculum changes, new academic programs, new or revised one-to-one articulation agreements with community colleges in New Jersey, advocating for different state legislation, communications with incoming transfer students, new or revised processes

7. Is there anything I did not ask you that you think would be important to know regarding the Lampitt Law and 2-4 transfer at Rutgers New Brunswick since 2007?

8. Is there anyone that you think may have important information or insight into the Lampitt Law and 2-4 transfer since 2007 that you would recommend I should interview?
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