

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Transfer Oversight Committee Meeting Notes
September 29, 2006, Wells Fargo Place, St. Paul, MN

Members Present: Ray Anshel, Brian Donovan, Jean Evens, Louise Hoxworth, Debra Japp, Maggie Jonas (for Jessica Medearis, MSCSA), Jim Kehoe, Justin McMartin, Anne O’Meara, Larry Oveson, Anne-Marie Ryan-Guest, Annette Schoenberger, JoAnn Simser, Dan Sperling, Carol Ziehlsdorf.

Members Not Present: Nancy Black, Monte Bute, Joan Costello, Michael Spitzer

Membership and purpose:

Membership is as listed on the 2006-2007 Transfer Oversight Committee 9-29-06 list with the exception of Greg Mulcahy—his name will be removed from the list.

The purpose of the committee to review credit and student transfer issues and information and to provide recommendations for enhancement of credit and student transfer to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Student and Academic Affairs. This includes oversight of the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum as originally developed and amended by the faculty collaborative process (transfer oversight committee charge).

Prior meeting notes:

April 28, 2006 Transfer Oversight Committee meeting notes were approved as distributed.

Institutional MnTC Review

Nancy Black, Debra Japp, Larry Oveson, Anne-Marie Ryan-Guest, Louise Hoxworth and JoAnn Simser met in June, 2006 to plan assistance to institutions in conducting the MnTC Review. A format for the Institution MnTC Review Plan-due 12-15-06 and Institution MnTC Review Report-due 1-30-08 were developed. Transfer staff developed an Institutions MnTC Review website www.transfer.project.mnscu.edu in response to suggestions of the group.

The committee reviewed the website. Comments/suggestions included:

- Underline Checklist of evaluation criteria for courses to be included in the MnTC at the bottom of the Plan. Add a link to the Checklist on the Plan document on the website.
- Only have information in one spot on the website (repository) and link to it from other locations. Use the original source url link where possible.
- Replacing the @ sign in email addresses with the word “at” reduces the incidence of spamming.
- Suggestions for FAQ’s:
 - What definition of general education should institutions use? According to the Checklist, each college or university should use its own definition/philosophy of general education for the MnTC review.
 - What’s the role of transfer specialists and student services staff in the review? CAOs facilitate process in agreement with faculty. Faculty will lead review; many in Academic Affairs and Standards Council. Recommend consultation with transfer specialists—Carol asked if she could participate as non-voting member—they welcomed her.
 - Several institutions include “international” business courses and physical education in the MnTC. When this done and schools don’t change, what happens? When the review is completed we will have more info about what

schools are doing. One of the reasons for doing the review is to improve consistency. The Transfer Oversight Committee can make recommendations to Senior Vice Chancellor Linda Baer. One of reasons we have the 2001 Omnibus Bill as law is because of what's been perceived by receiving institutions as abuse; abuse can also occur by sending institutions. The credibility of the institution is at stake. The review is an effort to self-police. Each school has its own gen eds and the MnTC; not all gen eds meet MnTC.

- What about including physical education courses in the MnTC? Physical education courses in the MnTC are a problem (see guidelines). Institutions can have institutional requirements for degrees in addition to the MnTC. A course in the MnTC is a problem when it clearly doesn't belong here.
- Can an Institution have general education requirements in addition to their own MnTC? Can additional general education requirements be lower division and not in the MnTC? How does this relate to the principle of transfer and non-transfer students being treated comparably? Completely different requirements for direct entry at 4 year would cause problems for transfer from 4 to 2 year colleges.

A listserv will be provided for institutional contacts and anyone else that would like to be a member. The listserv and the process will provide other items to post to the website or FAQs. Please send suggestions for either to JoAnn or Louise.

Definition of Occupational Course

The NCA 1997 document on general education has been replaced by a Higher Learning Commission General Education Statement, 2003. (www.higherlearningcommission.org) The 2003 statement is less specific concerning occupational education.

Recommendation:

Post the following definition to the MnTC Review website:

Definition of Occupational Course: An occupational course has as a core objective the development of skills, expertise, or knowledge relative to a single occupation or career cluster. It uses course material, exercises, and examples that are for the most part aimed at or derived from that occupational area.

Guidelines for Review and Design of a MnTC and MnTC goals/competencies

Discussions with U of M: Office of the Chancellor staff, Associate Vice Chancellors Leslie Mercer and Manuel Lopez, Louise Hoxworth and JoAnn Simser met with Craig Swan, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Linda Ellinger, Assistant to the Vice Provost, the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities to explore discussion of the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum in June, 2006. The group will meet again in January, 2007.

At the Uof M, TC liberal education and MnTC are the same; there is no additional general education requirement. The curriculum council has reviewed courses in MnTC over last 4 years; this coming year an expanded council will embark on a review of their liberal education requirements. High school prerequisites including a quantitative literacy requirement are being discussed; they don't expect changes in liberal education or MnTC. Recommendations from the Council review will go to faculty and are expected to come out this spring.

The University of Minnesota had an agreement with state universities developed prior to 1995 as to what admission requirements should be for public universities in MN. A concern was expressed that the prerequisites are: not enforced. A student can take courses if the student doesn't meet the prerequisites and the courses count toward grad requirements, e.g. world languages.

Questions/Potential areas for change in the Guidelines:

- Guideline #2: goal area is what is being referred to “in an area”
- Guideline #3: minimum # of credits should be 40 credits; students can choose to take more than 40, but need at least 40.
- Guideline #5:
 - “Some courses are excluded because they are required for admittance to college study in Minnesota.”—is this true? We don't have good data on it. Should we recommend that such data be sought? A document was created by state universities and the University of Minnesota about what a high school graduate should have. If we don't enforce it; not sure if we can gather data. Admission requirements for certain courses would only apply to state universities; 2-year can't have such admission criteria. It would be helpful to know what the agreement and the courses are; Cyndi Crist-could provide information. There is a big push from governor's association, Get Ready, Get Credit, through Higher Education Office.
 - “Intermediate Algebra is considered to be a developmental course.” Many colleges have versions of an intermediate algebra course 2 cr that is not a developmental course any more; count it as an elective, it doesn't satisfy MnTC. Some institutions include a Contemporary Math in the MnTC that doesn't need Intermediate algebra as prerequisite. College algebra is first college level course; intermediate is high school algebra 2. It is better to look at content than title. Math faculty are clear—intermediate algebra is not college level.
- Guideline #6: what's a lab-like experience? The Association of Physics Teachers about 10 years ago gave as an example a situation where a teacher would set up experience in front instead of each student doing experiments. How do you provide a lab online—Are online experiences are lab like, not lab? How can you do Anatomy and Physiology lab online? Sophisticated simulations are available online. #6 is confusing, “natural science lab requirements”; should say “natural science courses...” strike “requirements” In courses like observational meteorology or astronomy—what is lab like or lab?

The committee can recommend changes in the guidelines that go to Senior Vice Chancellor Linda Baer; she will consider recommendations with rationale and system-wide support. We would then contact U of M to request changes. There is not support to throw out the MnTC. Can we recommend changes now? Timing may be issue. The 2003 Guidelines are to be used for the institutional MnTC Review. We got in trouble when institutions put competencies first; certain disciplines aren't in it; some institutions are clean and some have gone to competencies. The checklist addressed this; we have guidelines— we don't have an opportunity to change them for the review. The 2003 guidelines are operative for this review process. The review plan and report will provide a signal as to what courses or guidelines we need to do something about.

Proposed Amendment to Policy 3.21 Undergraduate Credit Transfer and Procedure 3.21.1

<http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/3-21.pdf> Current drafts are working documents. They have been presented to ASA Policy Council, but not carefully discussed. Drafts will be presented for input at transfer specialists and CAO/CSAO/Dean's meetings. How students would like to be involved?

Discussion regarding proposed Policy:

- Part 7: do we really want institutions to have policy and procedures or just policy; should we say they should also have procedures?
- Do we need system wide policy about graduate transfer? The suggestion came out of discussions from graduate council—if they don't think it needs to be there, it wouldn't be. Previously the policy was silent concerning transfer of graduate credit. The council felt there should be something written—more after graduate council discusses it.
- The policy revision and procedure are an opportunity to incorporate concepts in clarification memos from Linda Baer
- Upper division courses can go into MnTC.
- Should we propose policy and procedure on gen ed? That: would require definition of gen ed which won't get us anywhere.
- The MnTC as completion of general education..." Is it possible to say it is MnTC, but not enough for lower-division gen ed? The proposed procedure allows for additional gen ed. There was a discussion about whether institutions should require general education beyond the MnTC with varying opinions. We are begging for a problem when students says, my gen eds are done with the MnTC completed but the student has additional general education requirements. It warrants discussion somewhere. The MnTC in the 1994 Agreement was envisioned to be the general education, not just the lower-division gen ed. If MnTC doesn't meet lower division gen ed, then we don't have agreement; what purpose does it serve if complete gen ed at one institution and it doesn't meet it at others? We should try to be consistent with policy and procedure; students may challenge having to take additional gen ed.
- There was general agreement that institutions could require additional courses for degrees e.g. Physical Education as a university requirement or college requirement for a degree. State universities call their other requirements "university requirements" A state university can't do much if someone transfers with more than 40 cr, of general education. Only 64 cr. transfer for grad requirements at WSU. Not what happens at SCSU; e.g. a student with 90 cr. from Rochester requests the university take all toward graduation—can't; only need 40 in upper division. It is hard for a student to complete a major with specific lower division requirements. It is not an advantage for a university to have a lot of additional gen ed requirements; not advantage in attracting students if have a lot or extra credits to take. If students have extra requirements, students complain about them.
- Is the MnTC "the" lower division general education? The word "the" is in original 1994 MnTC agreement document in some places, but not in others. Students like the word "the." The agreement on the inside front cover states "all lower-division;" it was lower division at the time. We did get agreement on inclusion of upper division courses in the MnTC. Is it still in statute that public institutions are supposed to have transfer curriculum that satisfies lower division requirements (from 1991?) In 1993, legislators said get it done or we're giving you common course numbers, were serious about consistency, Students say it is a hassle to transfer, can see how the MnTC being the general education requirement benefits students. By having university requirements—can require students to take its own courses—not part of the MnTC or general education; university requirements—doesn't conflict with the law; change label of what they call their courses; RCTC has a 4 credit health/PE requirement—more than university; key word is "reasonable" how much are we going to exaggerate? How far are we going to

- go? If a course is part of that institutions gen ed, native would already meet university-required course; transfer student with MnTC wouldn't have opportunity to have taken them. Most universities have same gen ed and MnTC, some don't.
- o Metropolitan SU requires College Algebra in MnTC; if a student completed MnTC at Century and didn't take algebra, can Metropolitan SU require it? If the student has completed MnTC or the Goal 4 Mathematics or logical thought, Metropolitan can not require an additional math course.
 - o When student transfers from an institution where a 4 credit English completes Goal 1 communications competency to an institution with an 8 credit English requirement; the law says writing requirement is done—should we have them take more in goal 1 electives or from anywhere? Consensus was that the student could be required to complete MnTC electives in any goal area to complete 40 MnTC credits, but should not be required to take electives in Goal 1 since the student had already completed goal 1.
 - o Many institutions require written composition and speech in Goal 1. At Bemidji SU speech not required in Goal 1, go to SCSU and goal 1 is done without speech.

Recommendations:

1. Committee members send recommended changes to JoAnn Simser.
2. Add the following items to the November 3, 2006 TOC meeting agenda for discussion:
 - a. Procedure 3.21.1 Credit Transfer—current draft

Transfer of “D” grades

Discussion points on D grade transfers were presented. A number of institutions don't accept Ds. The recommendation for consistent grading policies came out of BPac group. Institutions handle it differently. MSU Mankato computes grades from transfer credits into the institution's GPA. At one institution if the GPA from sending under 2.0 GPA, drop grades off until the GPA hits 2.0, some Ds accepted and some don't. At WSU need 2.4 or above to be admitted. At others a course with D, doesn't transfer.

Financial aid implications: 2 year colleges don't have the option of transferring everything due to financial aid implications; could harm students, large number won't get financial aid. At RCTC a student transferring with a suspension at another institution may appeal, accepted first time, then probation, then if don't meet standards, they lose financial aid. Is it in Policy Satisfactory Progress for Financial Aid? Don't want financial aid to wag academic decisions.

Comparable: Can't treat Ds truly similar to native students. If treat transfers exactly like natives, come in with all grades, wouldn't be able to get into major (grades would be too low); start fresh, can get into major; can't treat exactly. Transfer students have advantage over natives; not fair to natives. Where is requirement to treat the same come from? Provisions applied to all students came from 1991 Appendix. Transfer and non transfer students should be treated comparably. What does comparable mean? Identical? Probably not. Comparable means similar, not just that you can compare them. We don't have to be consistent across system with grades. It doesn't say comparable across system; institution has to treat them comparably. The suggestion is to leave it up to institutions to treat students comparably.

FYI:

- o World Language Courses in MnTC, consistency with guidelines and memos—34/37 separately accredited institutions consistent by fall, 2006.
- o Transfer for Veterans/Military Personnel- webpage available at http://www.mntransfer.org/military/Military_information.html

Transfer Oversight Committee Notes 9-29-07

- Proposed federal legislation re: requiring regional accreditation for transfer HR609 undecided, language in the house bill inconsistent
- Transfer/articulation agreements—Project Lead the Way, Centers of Excellence—next meeting 10/9/06
- Program Collaboration and Transfer FY07 Workplan

Next meeting: Friday, 11/03/06