

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Transfer Oversight Committee Meeting Notes
November 28, 2007, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul, MN

Members Present: Ray Anschel, Nancy Black, Jordan Brandt, Brad Burns, Monte Bute, Brian Donovan, Jean Evens, Louise Hoxworth, Leeann Jorgensen, Jim Kehoe, Louise Mengelkoch, Greg Mulcahy, Anne O'Meara, Anne-Marie Ryan-Guest, JoAnn Simser, Dan Sperling, Betty Strehlow, Carol Ziehlsdorf.

Members Not Present: Michael Spitzer

Guests present: Jessica Medearis, MSCSA, Graeme Allen, MSUSA.

Manuel Lopez, Associate Vice Chancellor, Continuous Improvement, Academic and Student Affairs, Office of the Chancellor, who has administrative responsibility for Program Collaboration and Transfer

Prior meeting notes:

The group reaffirmed Transfer Oversight Committee Ground Rules/Operating Principles, September 21, 2007 meeting notes. There was discussion of the ground rule, "Keep mystery intact, in some situations it is okay not to have clarity." Some issues are so complex that you cannot spell everything out to the last detail. In some cases institutional autonomy causes variation. No changes were requested to the September 21, 2007 Transfer Oversight Committee meeting notes. Approved 9/21/07 notes will be posted to the Web site www.mntransfer.org.

Transfer Oversight Committee Membership:

New members include Brad Burns representing MSUSA; LeAnn Jorgensen, IFO and Betty Strehlow, college chief academic officers. This is the last meeting for Ray Anschel, MSCF representative who is retiring and resigning from the committee.

Transfer Oversight Committee Charge Statement Revisions: Proposed revisions to the Transfer Oversight Committee Charge Statement were discussed including the following:

1. Linkages to the Strategic Plan: Update to the current Board of Trustees "Strategic Plan 2006-2010. Add Strategic Direction 1: Increase access and opportunity. Goal 1.1 Raise Minnesota's participation and achievement in post-secondary education by meeting the needs of students with diverse backgrounds and educational goals.
2. Consultation process: 2nd paragraph: clarify responsibilities of Associate Vice Chancellor for Continuous Improvement by adding the words "inform system staff of" prior to "final recommendations of the committee."

Recommendation 1:

**Adopt revisions to the Transfer Oversight Committee Charge Document
recommended by the Transfer Oversight Committee 11/28/07.**

The proposed revision as approved by the Senior Vice Chancellor will be posted to the Web site <http://www.mntransfer.org/Councils/OversightComm.html>.

MN Statute limiting baccalaureate degrees to 120 cr. and associate degrees to 60 cr.—effect on transfer and implications for MnTC. The Degree Cap Task Force was formed to get input from students and faculty and identify language for policy and procedure changes before proposing policy to the Board of Trustees, legislatively mandated by January, 2009. Faculty and students need time to consult with the bodies

they represent. Any task force recommendations for policy or procedure changes would go through the system policy and procedure approval process including the Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council and Meet and Confer. The role of the Transfer Oversight Committee is to identify potential implications for transfer and to make recommendations to the task force for their consideration.

Rationale for the legislation: The legislation saves money for the students and the state of Minnesota. Tuition banding at some institutions saves students money, but not the state. It is more in line with University of Minnesota College of Liberal Arts BA at 120 credits; however, this is not true for education degrees in the College of Education and engineering degrees offered by the Institute of Technology. It is more in line with institutions throughout the country. There are variations in credit length in similar programs among institutions and students are looking for consistency. Graduates will be able to get into the workforce quicker to pay taxes. Task force will be collecting examples of how legislation impacts preparation for the workforce, learning and education.

Transfer implications/issues: The 60/120 cr. limit is a tremendous issue for students and transfer:

- Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees were developed to give students a ladder to more education. This breaks the ladder. AAS degree programs must meet industry standards and in some cases accreditation, certification or licensure standards. Many AAS degrees are at 72 credits. Significant reduction in credit has an impact on student learning outcomes measures. The AAS was not initially defined as a transfer degree; however, the transfer function of the AAS is increasing, leading to more articulation agreements.
- Flexibility is provided through ability to grant exceptions on the basis of semester credits required by accreditation. Most accrediting body requirements are stated in terms of learner competencies and outcome measures, not semester credits.
- Granting waivers on credit length on the basis of Advisory Committee recommendations would allow more flexibility, but that is not in the current legislation.
- The number of credits required for graduation varies among institutions and has been growing over time. Consistency for similar programs is desired, not uniformity. The legislation assumes no value is added with additional credits.
- The degree caps will necessitate a full curriculum review of all programs over the 60/120 cr. limit. This will affect transfer and technology e.g. Degree Audit Report and Course Applicability System (course equivalencies). Programs should look at the similar majors or programs across the state or nation and then drill down to look at program requirements. Curriculum needs to be based on competencies and expected learner outcomes.
- Articulation agreements will need to be reviewed and revised.
- Dual counting (counting the same courses towards multiple requirements; requiring specific general education courses for a major) may hurt transfer

students; the courses could count towards general education, but not towards the major.

- The Minnesota Transfer Curriculum was created in response to legislative pressure for seamless transfer. Seamless transfer is difficult in a system with much disparity, offering programs from meat processing to doctoral degrees.
- How will changes on the total number of credits affect the total number of credits in the MN Transfer Curriculum (MnTC) Agreement (currently at least 40 cr.)?
- Health and Physical Education faculty have questions about the implications for the 60/120 credit limits on health/physical education, or wellness requirements (not currently included in the MnTC) for graduation. Some students do not want to pay tuition for health/physical education credits; they don't see a need for instruction in health and PE.
- Reducing degree credits in the associate degree will lead to a demand to renegotiate the technical faculty workload in the contract.

A question was asked whether Procedure 3.36.1 exceptions for an implementation date through 2011 for existing programs to accommodate changes that may be influenced by the 60/120 cr. limits (memo from Linda Baer) would include the 15 credit minimum requirement for MN Transfer Curriculum credits in AAS degrees. The 2011 implementation date was addressing more complex issues, e.g. hidden prerequisites and at least one articulation agreement with a state university. Replacing an applied general education course with a MnTC general education course should be doable in less time. That question will be referred to Ron Dreyer, System Director Program Review and Approval ron.dreyer@so.mnscu.edu.

Recommendation 2:

Distribute Degree Cap Task Force minutes to Transfer Oversight Committee members before the next meeting and add an update on Degree Cap Task Force to the Transfer Oversight Committee agenda 2/15/08.

Implementation of Policy 3.21 and Procedure 3.21.1 Undergraduate Course Credit Transfer and Policy 3.37 and Procedure 3.37.1 Minnesota Transfer Curriculum.

<http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy> . The committee reviewed a clarification document, a list of scenarios or questions related to the new policies and procedures provided by transfer specialists and others and responses according to the new policies and procedures, posted www.transfercenter.project.mnscu.edu.

Scenario 5: The D grade questions submitted on behalf of faculty at Bemidji State University addressed at the 9/21/07 meeting are included in Scenario 5—transfer of courses with D grades toward program requirements is determined by the receiving institution—a course with a D grade may count toward the MnTC, but not count towards major requirements. The receiving institutions need to see transcripts in addition to DARS reports. DARS reports can show the grades earned in courses completed. One way to address the problem is to have the MnTC GPA follow the student and include all credits earned within the system. The transfer of courses with D grades is difficult to explain to a student. The Clarification document with scenarios illustrates the complexity of transfer and resolves issues. Transfer students and native (or direct entry) students need to be treated the same. The sending institution determines what meets the MnTC—if the

sending institution includes a course with a D grade in a MnTC goal area or in the entire MnTC, the receiving institution must accept the MnTC course, MnTC goal or entire MnTC. If the receiving institution requires a C to include the course in the MnTC and the sending institution will accept a course with a D, the institution with the lower standard prevails. The compromise in the procedure was to require the receiving institution to accept courses with D grades as determined by the sending institution and to require a minimum 2.0 MnTC GPA to complete the entire MnTC. A student may be able to transfer in a MnTC course with a D grade when they are admitted to an institution, but may not be able to count that course toward completion of the MnTC because he/she does not have the required 2.0 MnTC GPA. Program or graduation requirements for minimum grades or GPA may be different from requirements for MnTC. The institution's program requirements for a minimum GPA or grade may resolve this issue. Discussion regarding D grades was tabled until Linda Baer is present.

Scenario #6 a minimum 2.0 MnTC GPA is required to complete the MnTC. Each institution must create a MnTC Audit and calculate a MnTC GPA when the MnTC is completed.

Scenario 11 concerns the MnTC course, goal or entire MnTC certified on the basis of transfer appeals. The MnTC DARS audit would indicate that a student met a MnTC requirement via a waiver or an appeal decision. If the group took a position that certification of the MnTC via an appeal decision should be accepted by other MN state colleges and universities would that invite comparison shopping by prospective students? Students are already comparing potential colleges and universities for where they might receive the most transfer credits. By policy a college or university must evaluate credits for transfer when the student is admitted. Some institutions evaluate transcripts earlier, when the student is accepted or when the student applies. If a student had completed an appeal process regarding the MnTC at one college or university in the system it would be unfair to require them to go through a similar process for the same purpose again at another system institution.

Scenario 12 refers to Goal 2 requirements: Some colleges and universities require completion of the entire MnTC to complete goal 2; others require specific courses.

Scenario 14: the nomenclature is inadequate. The student transfers twice, so using the term sending for the second institution is ambiguous. Don't lose sight of the first MnSCU institution determining the goal area from the non MnSCU institution. The language needs clarification.

Recommendation 3:

Provide the following response to Scenario 11:

If an appeal is approved at a system institution that completes a course, goal area or the entire MnTC, do other system institutions have to accept it in transfer?

Response: Yes, once the sending institution has certified that a MnTC course, goal or the entire MnTC fulfills the criteria in the procedure and that the MnTC requirements have been met through an appeal process, any other system institution must accept it towards MnTC requirements. The receiving institution is not required to accept credits in transfer granted through an appeals process for program or college or university graduation requirements.

University of Minnesota

First Year Written Composition: In a meeting with Office of the Chancellor transfer staff, 11/9/07, Linda Ellinger, Assistant to the Provost of Undergraduate Education, reported that the College of Liberal Arts first year composition requirements have been implemented. They do not consider writing skills course (WRIT 1201) developmental; it does not count toward

freshman composition requirements or MnTC. WRIT 1201 is based on General College courses GC 1421 and GC 1422. Transfer staff shared committee concerns about the level of WRIT 1201 writing studio, course description “to develop skills,” transferability of the course; and concern with the law that requires all MN state colleges and universities to accept the course in the MnTC if one institution accepts it. The U of M has not yet determined how MnSCU courses would be treated for transfer to the new requirements because they have just implemented the curriculum. Linda Ellinger is willing to be a contact and identify faculty from U of M and Duluth to discuss the changes. Linda Milne, Center for Teaching and Learning is willing to put together English discipline group to discuss written composition.

Continuing concerns were identified by the committee:

- How would MnSCU courses be treated for transfer?
- If institutions go by course number to determine level of the course, what impact would that have on accepting WRIT 1201 in transfer?
- Would writing faculty at U of M determine whether one or two courses from a MN State College or University complete MnTC?
- Is the content sub freshman composition? The content used to be freshman composition; the University of MN has upped the ante: some MN State College departments are trying to mirror process; research has become central to everything; some are developing a bridge course--- a hybrid—not developmental but not composition;
- GC courses were not equivalent to composition for some colleges. Some colleges were accepting GC 1421 and 1422 as written comp 1
- Applying WRIT 1201 from U of M to one MnSCU school and then the student goes to another; if first says yes, second has to accept it. This would be the case if the student was coming from a non MnTC school. In this situation, the U of M is MnTC school—they said it is not MnTC.
- If student A and student B take 1201, student A goes to Institution A and appeals it to meet to composition—both go to the next school—student A gets it and student B doesn't.
- If satisfied comp 1101, completes entire, U of M has to take it; if don't complete entire MnTC, it doesn't transfer; 1101 is equivalent to 1201 at the U of M

Preliminary Report of the Council on Liberal Education recommendations

<https://www.myu.umn.edu/metadot/index.pl?iid=826509> (cut and paste into browser line)

The Council recommended an additional Theme area in Technology and Society at the U of M—run into 60/120 issue—The University of Minnesota is not impacted by the legislation. Recommendations will go through their senate and faculty senate and University curriculum approval processes. Public hearings were held for a limited time. Comments may be sent to Linda Ellinger. In a prior review, Environmental area came through public comment period. A discussion about why the Council did not recommend the addition of a health and PE requirement may be found in Appendix A.

Transfer Orientation for Faculty Advisors—A Web based Transfer Resource Center is available at www.transfercenter.project.mnscu.edu. Two session proposals were submitted for the Realizing Student Potential/ I Teach Conference Feb 28-March 1, 2007—Transfer Matters...(about advising students) and a roundtable about MN Transfer Curriculum.

2007 Core Student Outcomes Study Report <http://coreoutcomes.project.mnscu.edu>

An early release of the report is available on web site—each institution determines core competencies—CTL did a survey of what they are. System commonalities across institutions are identified, p. 34-47. There are some consistencies—communication, critical thinking and technology and information literacy—definitions of them may vary. What do we do with the study? We don't want to use list by translating it in terms of value or importance; humanities is at the bottom. AACU affirms value of humanities and fine arts. We don't want it to be a hit list—basis for cutting areas. This is a compilation of all institution's areas. The Board has identified critical thinking, reading, writing, math in the system workplan. Members were asked to review the report and discuss possible uses at the next meeting.

Senior Vice Chancellor Academic and Student Affairs 2-15-08.

- a. Institutional MnTC Review www.transfer.project.mnscu.edu—process for proposed changes; faculty discipline/dept. meetings for written composition, mathematics, world languages, health/physical education (Reports due January 30, 2008)
We have received proposal from Health/PE faculty for changes in Guideline # 4. The concern about math is that intermediate algebra should be prerequisite for any MnTC course and is in goal 4. The guidelines reinforce that intermediate should be prerequisite for college-level math. Practice in the system varies with liberal arts math e.g. Contemporary Math, World of Math—many require intermediate, many don't. Is technical math college level? Is technical math occupational?
- b. Transfer policy and procedure implementation—acceptance of D grades
- c. What is the MnTC at the present time—The MN Transfer Curriculum Agreement, 1994, board policies, legislation, memorandums and related information are posted on the MnTransfer web site. There is no document that supercedes original document (1994 Minnesota Transfer Agreement, but that document is no longer entirely valid. Everyone needs a place to go for reference. Perhaps we need to build in continuous process similar to AQIP to add in any changes that have occurred. There is not one document with all the amendments; it hasn't been reaffirmed by entire group including the U of M since 1994.

Student Success measures The Office of Internal Auditing has identified problems with institutions including system level appeals in their transfer appeal process. Policy now calls for institutions to identify course equivalencies in DARS. Institutions must implement DARS by June, 2008.

FYI:

1. System 2007 Transfer Student Profile
<http://www.mntransfer.org/Educators/transferreport.html> Institution 2007 Transfer Student Profiles emailed to college or university
2. MnTransfer.org Web site redesign and articulation agreement database update
3. Reimbursement of Travel Expenses for Campus Employees

Next meeting: Friday, February 15, 2008 Room 3304, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul MN

FY08 Meetings
September 21, 2007, WFP 7703
November 28, 2007, WFP 3304
February 15, 2008, WFP 3304
April 18, 2008, WFP 3304