At frequent intersegmental meetings and gatherings, Region 8 Articulation Officers and Transfer Center Directors have expressed their concerns about the LDTP and most recently about its related TCSU process.

On March 2, 2007, Region 8 Articulation Officers affirmed their reluctance and even opposition to submitting courses for Phase III\(^1\) of the TCSU numbering project of the LDTP unless and until such time as these concerns below are responded to, concretely and in writing, by the Chancellor’s Office of the California State University.

The current TCSU numbering activities:
- offer no clear benefit to students;
- jeopardize existing articulation and go beyond the scope and intent of the original legislation and CCC-CSU MOU by
  - permitting individual CSU campuses to substitute LDTP determinations for existing articulation;
  - creating an environment for individual CSUs or their faculty to review, unannounced, all existing articulation in particular areas;
  - imposing CSU course standards upon CCC courses that are presently widely articulated with UC and independent colleges and universities, irrespective of their academic demands;
  - implying through COR rejection that CCCs should revise their curriculum; however altering course outlines to conform to CSU expectations may also jeopardize existing articulation with other universities and would require massive re-articulation with those other institutions;
  - expanding the use of TCSU numbers for major preparation agreements outside of LDTP (via faculty resolution);
  - de-emphasizing other, long-successful transfer options/paths;
  - not expressly honoring local articulation;
- result in unfair and inconsistent TCSU determinations by
  - encouraging submission of CORs without adequate opportunity for local faculty to review their CORs’ currency and to make any needed curricular modifications to ensure greater acceptance; (e.g., Phase III descriptors will not be available until six weeks prior to the April submission deadline);
  - not reporting results to colleges in a timely fashion (well in advance of subsequent submission dates);
  - rejecting courses in Phase I, based on elements not clearly substantive or not directly related to course content (esp. formatting errors as a result of difficulties cutting-and pasting into OSCAR);
  - treating differently the same course submitted by two colleges within the same district who were then given different results and different advice or commentary;
  - providing apparently incomplete training of faculty readers, usually without the collaboration of community college faculty who are skilled and experienced in reading course outlines of record (CORs);
  - not issuing advisories or “tips” until after submission of the second phase CORs;
  - not having in place an appeals process;
- have generated ambiguous or patently contradictory information concerning
  - students’ partial completion of LDTP;
  - students’ unwitting completion of LDTP without college articulation in place;
  - denial of a course through regular articulation, but an acceptance of the same course through TCSU.

\(^1\) A number of AOs also recommended withdrawing Phase II submissions; no action was taken on this proposal.