

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Transfer Oversight Committee Meeting Notes
February 2, 2007, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul, MN

Members Present: Ray Anshel, Monte Bute, Joan Costello, Brian Donovan, Louise Hoxworth, Debra Japp, Jim Kehoe, Anne O'Meara, Anne-Marie Ryan-Guest, Annette Schoenberger, JoAnn Simser, Tylor Slinger, Dan Sperling, Michael Spitzer, Carol Ziehlsdorf.

Members Not Present: Nancy Black, Jean Evens, Larry Oveson

Prior meeting notes:

November 3, 2006 Transfer Oversight Committee meeting notes were approved as distributed.

<http://www.mntransfer.org/Councils/OversightComm.html>

Proposed Amendment to Policy 3.21 Undergraduate Credit Transfer and Procedure 3.21.1 and Policy 3.37 Minnesota Transfer Curriculum and related Procedure 3.37.1

<http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/3-21.pdf> As recommended by the Transfer Oversight Committee and others, the Policy for the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum and the Transfer of other course credits have been separated into two separate policies and accompanying procedures. Current drafts are working documents. Reviewed at Chief Academic Officers, Chief Student Affairs Officers, and Deans meetings -- 10/26-27/06 and Academic and Student Affairs Advisory Council—1/23/07. The policy revisions are expected to go to the Board May and April, 2007. Once the drafts have gone out for review and comment they will be posted to the website <http://asapolicy.project.mnscu.edu/>.

Discussion regarding proposed Policies and Procedures:

- MnTC procedures include language requiring colleges and universities to follow criteria in guidelines/checklist/competencies of MnTC
- Once one system institution has accepted credits from regionally accredited institution toward MnTC goal, all must do so. The intent isn't for students to shop around but to attend—need to make sure it's clear in policy or procedure. There is an opportunity for inconsistency: two students from outside—one that goes to another system college or university and receives credit for it; another comes directly to SCSU and doesn't get it to count. This works if system institutions follow criteria—if no agreement on criteria, will have problems with transfer from regionally accredited institutions.
- How credits from a non-regionally accredited institution apply toward the MnTC is determined by the receiving institution.
- How will MnTC goals be designated on the transcript? According to ACCRAO guidelines. Transcript needs to designate what schools which credits come from. Hope transcripts will be clear where credits from, final transcript is comprehensive record; assumption that transcript processes reflect this. Electronic transmission of transcripts would facilitate the evaluation.
- How will MnTC goals be designated on DARS? DARS will take care of it, if regionally accredited would be on MnTC DARS Audit. Should have DARS sent with transcripts; schools are at various places with implementation of DARS—this would push compliance/implementation. It would be helpful to have one continuing DARS audit that follows the student, reduces the danger of reentering things.
- There is a trend in recommendations toward more coherent type of gen eds; Omnibus bill leads us toward a smorgasbord approach—if an institution needs to accept any regionally

accredited courses there is a possibility of having it turned into a nation-wide smorgasbord; will possibly lead to second rate education.

- Don't want heavy mandated courses with same courses and same numbering;
- Doesn't say anything if second institution says first school didn't follow guidelines, so we can kick it out; student will contest it; they could go to court
- "Once a course" (any course), doesn't specify what type of course; Legislature is top down body to mandate—would you feel same way if top was collection of peers? Schools don't have option to move distinctive curriculum instead of consistent curriculum. Tension between system and autonomy.
- Credit for prior learning—not determining CPL, but once it has already been determined, how does it transfer? Every school must accept CLEP with certain score and AP with certain scores; variation—composition with essay and without; A CPL task force is developing proposed policy for CPL—how we'll assess for it; that once one accepts it, all should; CLEP/AP are course equivalencies; what about portfolio that is not turned into course equivalencies?
- In some institutions if a student has completed third semester of world language, can buy credits for first two semesters; Does DARS designate course exemption?
- Under CLEP—humanities, goal 6—should there be humanities, but not specific? What if an institution assigns CLEP credit but doesn't assign it to a course? Science—two different with labs, there is no lab with CLEP--would say it counts for goal 3 but wouldn't meet requirement for two labs. Rochester has a requirement of two science courses with labs for the MnTC; right now Winona has one lab and one that isn't and goes to Rochester, Rochester would have to accept it. CAEL—private university transfer for CLEP or AP but not CPL. this would be reasonable compromise; tell students in advance; hard to side step CLEP and AP;
- A concern was expressed about accreditation requirements, part of gen ed, students must do the following—make it part of gen eds rather than in the program requirements; accrediting bodies can say it's not OK.
- Physics—ABET requires calculus-based physics—a student may have completed physics for gen ed and then they still take calculus-based physics.
- A student can complete MnTC but not program requirements.
- Students should know what counts and what they still need; student decides whether should transfer or not; no limit in CLEP, AP, transfer credits; student thinks it's all going to count, may not count in major, upper division, etc.
- Need to include in procedure that schools have requirements that go beyond this; needs to happen in advising, make sure students are informed; some transfer with 80/90 credits and only need one year left; Some students have 80-90 international credits. Some colleges are offering AA with emphasis—you can build your credits here, receiving is saying "no."
- CAS for equivalencies for lower division, tell students that other will only accept certain #; Students don't always seek advising; receive poor advising or switch majors
- Want policy that protects us
- If things aren't explicit, board and students misinterpret it.
- Required to have x number in upper division; "however, students required # at upper division" to counter the idea they can transfer as much as they can; page 2, part 4, lines 37-41,
- How many students look at policies?
- Why say they can transfer unlimited # if they don't count?
- Need statement that schools have requirements that must be met—make language clear;

- Develop guidelines outside of this; training for Transfer Specialists, TS conference; MnTransfer.org, tutorials, tell students to plan ahead, don't put everything in policy; if transfer to 4-year, need to check with them; need guidelines for transfer students—on Web site.
- Suggestions: Training for faculty/admin/admissions counselors; adapt efolio for transfer at their schools

D grades—

- Middle of 4th paragraph—should be “courses with grades” not “courses and grades”
- MnTC guided by native institution—treat transfer the same; if D's count, transfer D's count.
- Comparable is not same as equal; has to be clearly stated that doesn't mean natives will be treated identically;
- Some institutions strip them of grade—if below 2.0, transfer of grades attached to course;
- Transfer course, not grades;
- 4th paragraph—if followed premise, would have to calculate GPA for own students as well (for the MnTC);
- comparable or equal—if 2.0 or higher, don't need 2.0 in GPA of gen ed or MnTC; don't want to have 2.0 in MnTC only;
- At end of degree, has student met 2.0, if don't have 2.0 requirement, could have less than 2.0 in MnTC and 2.0 in general; not against this but wants additional statement;
- If receiving requires C for all, must accept D in transfer; Student is better off not to complete it;
- It is not clear that 2.0 relates to MnTC—need to connect 2.0 GPA within the MnTC;
- calculate MnTC GPA, if less than 2.0, strip courses?; if have 5 MnTC courses, 2 Bs and 3 Ds, GPA or 1.8, strip one D? strip all Ds; policy is not reflected in procedure
- have Ds in gen ed, but 2.0 in overall; transfer—Ds are not counted in GPA; natives have Ds count, transfer don't;
- Some schools calculate cum GPA for certain programs (transfer GPA, Winona GPA, cum GPA);
- Schools are doing it differently, some don't strip—what do we want to do; can we create a minimum allow schools to have above the minimum;
- Like D Grade Draft 1/12/06 better than proposed procedure; procedure isn't clear; disadvantaging native with policy that must accept grades.
- How much work is it to compute MnTC separately? DARS can compute it; goal areas have GPA; provide preamble;
- Students resent that could fail at one and honor at the next—correlation between lower and upper, grades go up; trying to control for this—can we do it?;
- We need something to provide consistency;
- Not discussed by CAOs; opinion based on prior experience—only accept Ds if part of associate's degree; wouldn't object if complete program
- Trying to ensure everyone has a 2.0 or above;
- What about GPA for goal or courses?; student: transfer all D's or F's and need to repeat them?
- Don't use D's or F's but lose them; native counts them;
- could say this is an institutional decision; student—transfer with or without degree—what's the difference—law made it difficult;
- System determined it's the sending institution, criteria is determined by sending institution, we could as a system set parameters for what's included in MnTC; so

- consistent across system; e.g. all grades for MnTC have to be Cs are better; accept C-; requirement for C- for all MnTC;
- Doesn't want situation where they need C for every course; if entire MnTC done, 2.0 GPA seems reasonable, what do if not done with it; if have to have 2.0 for MnTC, native has to have 2.0 in MnTC? Or gen ed curriculum?
 - Don't think it should because of different ways count GPA;
 - Frees receiving institution—prior to complete MnTC below 2.0—not successful, receiving can be free to take or not; entire isn't done, look at course by course, not goal by goal;
 - If AA and MnTC 2.0 is done; don't want to have two GPAs,
 - Email concerns to JoAnn

Institutional MNTC Review

Plans were submitted by 37 of 37 colleges and universities; 29 are posted on the MnTC Review website www.transfer.project.mnscu.edu. Summaries of the suggestions and comments institutions submitted with their plans for the Guidelines, MnTC Goals and Competencies and requests for Office of the Chancellor support were distributed. Members were asked to review the summaries and come prepared to discuss any recommendations at the next meeting

Next meeting: Friday, April 6, 2007. The date scheduled is Good Friday but members saw no problem with having the meeting on that date.

FYL:

- Institutional MnTC Review:
 - Institutional MnTC Review Plans 29 posted to website: www.transfer.project.mnscu.edu; items added to Best Practices
 - OOC staff: Hennepin TC 11/9/06, Northland CTC 11/15/06, MSCTC 12/20/07, Normandale CC 3/9/07
- Articulation agreements (transfer staff consultation by invitation)
 - Project Lead the Way, Centers of Excellence—High school to college/university and associate to baccalaureate articulations in engineering, engineering and manufacturing technology, St. Cloud SU, January 19, 2007