

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Transfer Oversight Committee Meeting Notes

January 20, 2006, Wells Fargo Place, Conference Room 306B, St. Paul, MN

Members Present: Ray Anshel, Nancy Black, Nicki Bottko, Joan Costello, Brian Donovan (phone), Jean Evens, Louise Hoxworth, Betsy Ingram-Diver (ITV), Greg Mulcahy, Anne O'Meara, Larry Oveson, Annette Schoenberger, JoAnn Simser, Dan Sperling, Michael Spitzer, Steve Whipple, Carol Ziehlsdorf, **Guest:** Cyndy Crist, Linda Lade

Members Not Present: Monte Bute, Derek Hudyma, Debra Japp. Scott Wrobel has resigned from the committee.

1. Review Transfer Oversight Committee (TOC) October 21, 2005 meeting notes:

October 21, 2005 meeting notes were approved with the following addition: Someone raised the issue of reviewing and amending/updating the actual Minnesota Transfer Agreement (1994).

The possibility of posting handouts and proposed agendas on a website was discussed with mixed reactions and no consensus to do so.

Recommendations:

- 1) Send out the draft of meeting notes sooner after the meeting.
- 2) Send out the proposed agenda sooner prior to the meeting.
- 3) Change the Transfer Oversight Committee webpage on MnTransfer.org to list Meeting Notes rather than Meeting Minutes.

2. Workgroup Recommendations :

Transfer Oversight Committee members recommended October 21, 2005 that a small workgroup be formed to provide recommendations to the Transfer Oversight Committee on the following items:

1. Develop framework for system discussions on general education
2. Review Self Evaluation of the MNTC timeline including general education discussion and Guidelines
3. Prepare recommendation for Transfer Oversight Committee review January 20, 2006.

The workgroup met on January 12, 2006 and prepared Recommendations to the Transfer Oversight Committee, summarized as follows:

1. Conduct system-wide conversations on core values for graduates in FY07
2. Delay TOC initiated institutional self evaluation of MnTC until after conversations FY08
3. Continue commitment to addressing transfer issues.

There was discussion at the workgroup concerning the purposes of the workgroup and the discussion continued at the Transfer Oversight Committee meeting. The workgroup members present at the committee meeting agreed that the 1-12-06 recommendations reflected the work of the workgroup, but there was discussion about the work the workgroup was to do.

The committee continued the discussion about purposes and where we should go from here. A variety of viewpoints were expressed:

- Steve Whipple had circulated a draft of an introduction to the MnTC review and Brian Donovan had circulated comments that precipitated questions about larger issues.
- One approach is to have institutional self-evaluation in a systematic way.

- Another approach is to have conversations on campuses to have an organized way of looking at it.
- There was concern about doing a self review of MnTC or general conversations without an identified purpose and expected outcomes, not wasting people's time.
- Some felt we were spinning our wheels, not coming to agreement about how to proceed.
- Transfer specialists want to have consistency across MnSCU, a set of criteria to determine whether courses inside MnSCU and from other states meet MnTC goals. Decisions are made on some campuses by faculty, on some by counselors and on some by AFSME workers.
- Evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC which was approved by the TOC 9/8/06, included the institution's definition of general education.
- When the MnTC agreement was put together in 1994, there was more consistent agreement about what general education was; that is no longer the case. There is a need to help faculty with what general education is, to provide resources.
- The workgroup was an opportunity to put together a piece to explain how and why we would do a self review of MnTC.
- With respect to general conversations (recommendation # 1) college faculty felt the conversations should begin with faculty. Faculty are willing to open their work to review and comment from a broader group after faculty have looked at it.
- Some questioned why CTL was involved in the workgroup meeting. The suggestion had been made at the October TOC meeting. CTL has been involved with previous conversations on liberal education, general education and the 2010 Futures conversations.
- The vision, mission and guiding principles in the System Strategic Plan 2060-2010 (approved by the Board of Trustees 1/19/06) led the workgroup to recommend proactive, larger conversations across the system regarding the meaning of a successful Minnesota graduate and the role of liberal education or general education and core values for graduates. The workgroup did not have the strategic directions and goals at the meeting.
- It is the President's job to set the agenda, faculty's job to find out what work is to be done and the Senior Vice Chancellor's to fund it; the Strategic Plan provides a reason to do it.
- It appears anecdotally that the MnTC is working 90% of the time. "Seamless" creates the perception that transfer works 100% -that is not the case. MnTC creates a framework for determining what does and what does not transfer. There are movements to have more credits transfer, e.g. online, federal legislation, consumer mentality. The old mindset -- you change colleges, you change majors, you lose-- is not the case anymore. Academics continue to have conversations about MnTC and general education; it is not a static concept.
- Liberal education or general education is a national issue—AAC&U, Oregon, Utah. One scenario is to reproduce documents from other groups about what general education is and send them to faculty to enforce what we have and to initiate a new look at the rules. Academic affairs could be charged with the review.
- Concerns were expressed that an institution may not make any changes to be in compliance because there is no reward for doing so or an institution may not be in compliance because they do not agree with the rules.
- Conversations concerning general education as a basis of MnTC in academic affairs committees vary at different institutions—state universities have ongoing conversations about whether courses meet general education or not; some colleges discuss general education in academic affairs committees-some focus on competencies and do not discuss general education. Some colleges plug into general education as determined by regional state universities. Some colleges and universities determine general education requirements beyond the MnTC. Each institution must address general education as part

- of its Higher Learning Commission accreditation process. Institutions must have general education reflective of their mission and that comply with MnTC.
- Some colleges have conducted self reviews of courses in MnTC. One model process included a college workshop about the MnTC to determine what it is and what it is not, using the two HLC definitions of general education (1997 and 2003); if it is General Education is it MnTC? They found many courses that were MnTC, but not general education. Faculty were concerned that not having a course included in the MnTC was the kiss of death to the course. The course may still be taken as a program requirement or as an elective for an associate degree. Transfer Oversight Committee member compared the courses in the college's MnTC with those courses in other institutions' MnTC and identified anomalies with Office of Chancellor staff. The academic dean presented the list of anomalies to the faculty as questionable MnTC courses. Faculty were asked to consider whether they were general education or not and why the courses were in the MnTC. Faculty either revised the courses to be general education and consistent with the MnTC or the dean of the liberal arts division, the TOC member and the Academic Affairs and Standards Council pulled them from the MnTC. 55 courses were pulled from the MnTC. The fear of battle was worse than the reality.

Since the workgroup meeting Transfer and CTL have been required to submit initial FY07 budget requests. Transfer and CTL included requests for funds to support recommendations of the 1-12-06 workgroup for two system-wide meetings and staff to support facilitation, listening, and analysis of the campus conversations equivalent to 2 part-time faculty on release 2 days per week for 30 weeks. Academic and Student Affairs Associate Vice Chancellors have suggested adding conversations on the core skills of graduates (Goal 2.2) to the FY07 ASA workplan. The workgroup scheduled a meeting February 6, 2006 to consider recommendations of the Transfer Oversight Committee and to flesh out plan for conversations, participants, how work was to be done and develop questions to be discussed. Faculty felt they needed to agree on a direction among themselves.

Leslie Mercer, Associate Vice Chancellor of Planning and Research has contacted Craig Swan, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Academic Affairs, University of Minnesota who has indicated that the University of Minnesota Twin Cities will be reviewing its general education in FY07. It would be appropriate to revisit the Minnesota Transfer Agreement and the Guidelines in FY08.

The next Transfer Oversight Committee meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2006. Recommendations need to be considered by the Transfer Oversight Committee and implemented before April. Communications to institutions from Linda Baer should go out in March or early April to be implemented in FY07. For recommendations to be considered in the FY07 ASA workplan and budget, requests need to be finalized by February. Institution academic affairs divisions and curriculum committees would need to include activities in their planning for FY07, usually considered in March or April, 2006.

Recommendations:

1. Receive the recommendations from the workgroup.
2. Convene faculty from the workgroup, Presidents of the faculty unions and any other faculty the Presidents of the faculty unions wish to include on February 6, 2006. The workgroup is to exclude transfer specialists and Office of Chancellor staff. The faculty workgroup is to establish direction and consider:
 - a. Mutual agreement about general education

- b. Institutional self review of MnTC to be mandated by Senior Vice Chancellor and completed within one year
 - c. Harvesting the results of the MnTC review.—is the MnTC working or not? Are the old rules working or do they need to change?
 - d. Documents and resources to assist faculty on campuses. (Larry Oveson will provide sample documents and references to Nancy Black).
 - e. System wide conversations, process and questions.
 - f. Agreement on outcomes.
 - g. Bring set of recommendations to Transfer Oversight Committee about conducting conversations and review process.
3. Distribute faculty workgroup recommendations to Transfer Oversight Committee electronically for review and comment. If general consensus, proceed with recommendations in February or March.

3. Proposed Policy Revisions and Development

- a. Policy 3.15 Advanced Placement (AP)— Proposed Board submission April, May, 2006 <http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/315.html> --Cyndy Crist
- b. Policy 3.16 International Baccalaureate Credit (IB), Proposed Board submission April, May, 2006 <http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/316.html>—Cyndy Crist
- c. Policy 3.33 and Procedure 3.33.1 College Level Exam Program (CLEP)—Linda Lade

The primary driver for changes in policy for AP, IB, and CLEP is legislation enacted in last session. New legislation directs colleges and universities to accept credit for any AP of 3 or higher and IB of 4 or higher. The system needs to make changes in existing policies for AP and IB. There is a current initiative to shorten policies to policy and put other information, specifics and process into procedures. The original board and first chancellors didn't like procedures. The current board and chancellor have returned to separating the two; language to be struck from policy has been put in procedure. Changes are not as significant as might appear. In IB, there are two levels of exams. One college had a policy with the local high school to count the lower level exam only toward diplomas and the higher level toward associate degrees. Institutions have not seen many IB credits. The push is to increase them. When districts look at the options and see how complex IB is, faculty training, grading, etc, it may be that there won't be many high schools that want it, AP is easier, don't know about CLEP. Where is the score of 50 to accept in terms of percentile? It is equivalent to "C" or above; <http://www.collegeboard.com/CLEP> .

On procedure 3.33.1 for CLEP, MnSCU has provided recommendations for scores to Department of Education commissioner. The acceptable scores will be set by the commissioner—we have not yet heard what that decision is. The CLEP score of 50 (except for languages-- higher); seems to be acceptable to faculty unions. These scores are recommended by American Council on Education.

The policies and procedures will go to policy council next week; moving quickly due to legislation. Faculty, CAO, CSAO and student representatives have an opportunity to review policies and provide input in the Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council.

- d. Policy 3.21 Undergraduate Credit Transfer <http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/3-21.pdf>
The proposed dates for taking Policy 3.21 changes to the Board have been changed from November, 2005 and January 2007 to January and March 2007. Procedure needs to be separated from policy. Procedure goes through system process and is approved by the Chancellor, not the

Board. The timeline on the plan for review has been adjusted to allow for affected groups to have opportunity for input. The Transfer Oversight Committee has requested early input on the draft.

Recommendations:

- 1) Remove academic forgiveness from the list of issues to be addressed in transfer policy.
- 2) Add recommendation that institutions include life of credit (e.g. 5 years for technical credits) in institutional policy and procedures.
- 3) Committee members to send suggestions for changes and issues to be addressed in policy and procedure to JoAnn Simser.
- 4) Office of the Chancellor transfer staff to create an initial draft of Policy 3.21 and Procedure 3.21.1 in legislative format, including underlines and strikeouts, and distribute electronically to committee members in March 2006 for comment (with a reminder of what it is about).

4. **Pending Federal Legislation**

http://www.aacrao.org/federal_relations/position/Accreditation.pdf (see references)

A proposal for language that prohibits an institution from denying credit transfer solely on basis of regional accreditation remains in proposed Higher Ed Reauthorization language. The pending legislation has been supported by for-profit institutions. Similar language has recently been removed from federal legislation to provide Katrina relief. The Katrina relief language also required institutions to report percentage of transfers and institutions with which they had articulation agreements. The HLC Transfer Policy states each institution should have a transfer policy which indicates how they transfer credits from accredited and non accredited institutions. HLC good practices refers to CHEA, ACE and AACRAO joint statement that recommends institutions not use the accrediting organization as the sole criteria for determining transfer of credits. Many institutions currently make it a practice to require regional accreditation. Changing the practice will increase the workload of faculty and staff and potentially be more restrictive to students. AACRAO states institutions should decide criteria not the federal government.

Recommendations:

- 1) Revise system and institutional policies consistent with HLC Policy and Good Practices on Transfer of Credit <http://www.ncahlc.org/download/GoodPracticeTransfer.pdf>
 - 2) Stay informed on the legislation.
 - 3) Inform others at institutions.
 - 4) Add to spring CAO, CSAO, deans agenda.
 - 5) Put on the leadership council agenda to inform Presidents.
 - 6) Write congressmen if you do not support legislation; encourage others to write.
5. **Including world languages in the MnTC** What are institutions doing? Members responded that they are including second year languages in goal 8 only. Some institutions are requiring first year world languages as general education requirements for a degree, but are not including them in the MnTC; they communicate to students that other institutions may not accept the first year world languages as general education. This is sometimes a problem for students who complete the general education curriculum that is different from MnTC and expect it to transfer to other institutions.
6. **Transfer Oversight Committee Agenda April 28, 2006**
- a. Guideline #6 MnTC traditional lab course and lab-like experience. D. Japp
 - b. Transfer of "D" grades
 - c. Credit for Prior Learning Survey Results and Policy Recommendations

7. **Proposed meeting dates in FY07** Jan. to April is too long a period in between; April is too late, move one to March. Early September is difficult for faculty, late September would result in better attendance; need September and October meetings.

Recommendation:

Schedule FY07 transfer oversight committee meetings 4th or 3rd week September, 2006; 3rd wk October, 2006; 3rd wk in January, 2007 and March, 2007.

FYI:

8. Recommended Transfer Oversight Committee Charge Document Revision.
9. Transfer Oversight Committee meeting notes revised and posted to website http://www.mntransfer.org/Councils/minutes/September_8_2005.html
10. Accounting Transfer Project Plan and results of review-posted to www.MnTransfer.org accounting dept.discipline articulation council
11. Inclusion of World Languages in MNTC-Office of Chancellor Review in process

FY06 Meetings

(TOC Workgroup Faculty 1:30-3:30 pm, IFO offices, Feb. 6, 2006)

TOC 10:00 am-3:00 pm, WFP Rm 306B, Friday, April 28, 2006

References:

Pending Federal Legislation

14. Bollag, Burton. "Congress Stops Giving Heartburn to Accreditors" The Chronicle of Higher Education 12/9/2005 Web reference for subscribers: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i16/16a00101.htm>

15. Contreras, Alan "Giving Credit Where Credit is Due" The Chronicle of Higher Education 10/14/2005 Web reference for subscribers: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i08/08b01201.htm>

Workgroup recommendations:

16. Background for the Minnesota Transfer Agreement, Draft 11/7/05 Steve Whipple with Comments provided by Brian Donovan 11/15/05.

17. Bok, Derek "The Critical Role of Trustees in Enhancing Student Learning", The Chronicle of Higher Education 12/16/2005 Web reference for subscribers: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i17/17b01201.htm>

18. Cronon, William J. "Qualities of the Liberally Educated Person", Liberal Education , Vol 85:No. 1 Winter, 1999.

19. Commission Statement on General Education, 2003 and Criterion 4, Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge, The Handbook of Accreditation, 3.2-12—3.2-15., Higher Learning Commission. <http://www.ncahigherlearningcommission.org>