

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities**  
**Transfer Oversight Committee Meeting Notes**

April 28, 2006, Wells Fargo Place, Conference Room 306B, St. Paul, MN

**Members Present:** Ray Anschel, Nicki Bottko, Monte Bute, Joan Costello, Brian Donovan, Jean Evens, Louise Hoxworth, Betsy Ingram-Diver, Debra Japp, Greg Mulcahy, Anne O'Meara, Larry Oveson, Annette Schoenberger, JoAnn Simser, Michael Spitzer, Steve Whipple.

**Guest:** Cyndy Crist

**Members Not Present:** Nancy Black, Derek Hudyma, Dan Sperling, Carol Ziehlsdorf,.

**Prior meeting notes:** January 12, 2006 workgroup and January 20, 2006 Transfer Oversight Committee meeting notes were approved as distributed.

**Institutional Self Evaluation for the MnTC**

Criteria for review—members revised the Checklist of evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC 9-8-06 to incorporate Faculty Workgroup Recommendations 2-6-06. The revised Checklist of evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC was approved by members present with the request that it be sent to IFO and MSCF Presidents for final approval before being sent to the Senior Vice Chancellor. (This was obtained via email 5-10-06.)

- The Guidelines for the Review and Design and of the MnTC are in effect. The committee and institutions do not have the authority to ignore them. Institutions should make the argument for why certain courses should be included in the MnTC. If the committee or anyone else wishes to see changes in the guidelines, recommendations need to be submitted to Senior Vice Chancellor Baer. Recommendations must then be reviewed with the University of Minnesota. Guidelines may change as a result of the MnTC review. However, institutions need to be in compliance with the guidelines as they exist at the time of the review. The committee will address the Guidelines at the September 22, 2006 meeting to identify areas of concern and additional areas that need to be addressed. World language and computer science courses are problematic.
- Assessment of student outcomes of the MnTC competencies were not included in the checklist because it is the responsibility of each institution to assess student achievement. General education committees and departments have an obligation to ascertain whether students are engaged in achieving the competencies.
- Each college and university determines the process for the review. The system-wide institutional review is not meant to replace or usurp existing institutional processes for reviewing MnTC courses. The checklist of evaluation criteria are provided for guidance and direction.
- A definition or further description of “occupational courses” would be helpful. Larry Oveson has shared an initial definition with the working group for input and discussion.
- The discussion on core skills of a Minnesota graduate was removed from the plan and timeline. The discussion is broader than transfer and should reside somewhere else, perhaps CTL. Faculty do have interest in the conversation and outcomes. There may be implications for transfer. It will be referred to CTL.
- Working assumptions MnTC are based on guidelines and MnTC agreement. Assumptions are used by Office of the Transfer staff in conducting a system-wide review of MN Transfer Curriculum. It is legitimate to have service learning and study abroad. Content (competencies) supersedes the course descriptor. It is confusing to have more than one set of criteria—only the Checklist should be used. There was mixed reaction to sharing the transfer staff review with institutions. Institutions should review all courses

included in the MnTC. Some found it helpful in identifying troublesome courses; some found the system perspective helpful in providing rationale for conducting an institution review. The role of the Office of the Chancellor is to assist in setting up the institutional review process.

- Each institution should submit a plan for how they will review their MnTC by December, 2006. If there are any concerns about the planning, the TOC could address it at their next meeting after Dec. 15, 2006.
- After everyone has done the review we may wish to collate it to determine the anomalies from a system perspective, e.g. world languages.
- Every institution must implement the MnTC as appropriate to the degrees they offer. Associate and baccalaureate degrees have minimum MnTC requirements; certificates and diplomas do not, but may include MnTC requirements.
- Presidents and CAOs have been informed (see plan). Linda Baer will send a memo to CAOs, copied to Presidents, requesting the review. Presentations are planned for the May and October, 2006 CAO/CSAO/deans meetings.
- System-wide workshop could provide resources and best practices. Location at a Brainerd area resort may increase attendance. Lake Superior College faculty and administration have conducted a review with support from Academic Affairs and Standards Council.

#### Recommendations:

1. Forward draft of Institutional Review of Courses Included in MnTC memo from Senior Vice Chancellor to CAO's with suggestions made by committee to SVC Baer upon approval by MSCF President and IFO President. Memo should be sent in May (attached).
2. Send out Checklist of evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC as revised 4-28-06 to institutions to be used in the Review of the MnTC upon approval by MSCF President and IFO President (attached).
3. Revised plan and timeline includes requirement for institutions to submit plan for institutional self review by December 15, 2006 and to submit a report on January 30, 2008. (attached)
4. Add the following items to the September 22, 2006 TOC meeting agenda for discussion:
  - a. Guidelines for the Review and Design and of the MnTC
  - b. "occupational courses" definition—distribute Larry Oveson's initial definition to committee
5. Recommend Best Practices for Communicating MnTC to institutions. Distribute to Transfer Specialists.
6. Make sure correct documents and resources regarding MnTC are available on the MnTransfer.org website.

#### **Transfer of "D" grades**

Discussion points on D grade transfers were presented (attached). Institutional policies regarding grade requirements have implications for transfer.

#### Recommendations:

1. Add the following item to the September 22, 2006 TOC meeting agenda for discussion:  
Transfer of D grades.

**Federal legislation** Pending Higher Education Reauthorization language may effect institutions that require regional accreditation of the sending institution for transfer of credits.

**Proposed Revision Policy 3.21 Undergraduate Credit Transfer and Procedure 3.21.1**

<http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/3-21.pdf> , One suggestion was received from the TOC, policy on life of credits. The policy needs to make it clear that institutions can have general education requirements beyond the MnTC. Remove the term “lower division” in the MnTC definition because we have established that state universities may include upper division courses in their MnTC. This was supported by the University of MN. (see L Baer memo regarding Upper Division).

Recommendations:

1. Committee members send recommended changes to JoAnn Simser.
2. Add the following items to the September 22, 2006 TOC meeting agenda for discussion:
  - a. Policy 3.21 and Procedure 3.21.1 Credit Transfer—current draft

**CLEP and AP Policy and Procedure—implications for transfer**

TOC reviewed implications for transfer. If one institution assigns results of a CLEP or AP as meeting an MnTC goal, should another MnSCU institution accept it? Practices currently vary across institutions. An institution would not know from a transcript that an MnTC goal area has been addressed or met. We need a better system-wide process to communicate MnTC goals met. A DARS report sent with a transcript would indicate MnTC goals met. Legal counsel is uncomfortable with International Baccalaureate—staff are sorting out standard and higher level exams.

- Policy 3.15 Advanced Placement (AP) <http://asapolicy.project.mnscu.edu>
- Procedure 3.15.1 Advanced Placement (AP)
- Policy 3.33 College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) <http://asapolicy.project.mnscu.edu>
- Procedure 3.33.1 College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)
- Reference Websites:
  - CLEP <http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/clep/about.html>
  - AP <http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/ap/about.html>

**Future TOC Meeting dates FY07:**

The next meeting will be September 22, 2006. Fridays are the best day of the week for meetings. Avoid MEA weekend October 19-20, 2006. Meet in early April to avoid March breaks. Debra will send dates of IFO meetings. Every member will send JoAnn what dates work for him/her.

FYI :

Proposed federal legislation  
[http://www.aacrao.org/transcript/index.cfm?fuseaction=show\\_view&doc\\_id=3114](http://www.aacrao.org/transcript/index.cfm?fuseaction=show_view&doc_id=3114)  
Transfer for Veterans/Military Personnel-Governor’s Order and proposed legislation  
Credit for Prior Learning Survey Results and Policy update  
Accounting Transfer Project Update  
Transfer/articulation agreements—Project Lead the Way  
System Transfer Data—FY2000-2004  
Clarification of MnTC Goal and Course Transfer L Baer 4/26/06

**Next meeting:** Friday, 9/22/06

<u>FY07 Meetings</u>	<u>Possible dates</u>
September 22 , 2006	
October, 2006	10/20—MEA—only available Friday in October. Fr Nov. 3 is available
January, 2007	no Friday in January available; Fr Dec. 8, 2006 or Fr Feb. 2, 2006 are available.
March, 2007	Replace with date in early April; April 6, 2007.

Attachments:

Checklist of evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC approved 4/28/06

Institutional Review of Courses Included in MnTC, L. Baer 5/19/06

Proposed Institutional Self Evaluation of the MnTC 4/28/06

Occupational definition—proposal L. Oveson 4-1-06