MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Academic and Student Affairs **Date of Meeting:** January 17-18, 2012

Agenda Item: Legislative Report on Transfer

☐ Proposed Policy Change   ☐ Approvals Required by Policy   ☐ Other Approvals   ☐ Monitoring

☒ Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:
Legislation passed in 2010 requires the Board to develop and implement a plan to improve credit transfer within the system. The legislation further requires that the Board submit an annual report on its activities to achieve the goals cited in the legislation. Legislation passed in 2011 requires that the report submitted in 2012 include a study of effective transfer mechanisms in other states and data on the number of students transferring within the system during fiscal year 2011.

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Larry Litecky, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Mike López, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:
The system has made substantial progress in improving credit transfer. Implementation of policies passed by the Board in 2010 and 2011 has made the transfer process more transparent and more navigable by students. Smart Transfer Plan implementation is proceeding, but there has been some slippage of deadlines by some colleges and universities. A review of transfer mechanisms used in other states indicates that the system has implemented most of these mechanisms to at least some extent.

INFORMATION ITEM

LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON TRANSFER

BACKGROUND
Legislation passed in 2010 requires the Board to develop and implement a plan to improve credit transfer within the system. The legislation further requires that the Board submit an annual report on its activities to achieve the goals cited in the legislation. Legislation passed in 2011 requires that the report submitted in 2012 include a study of effective transfer mechanisms in other states and data on the number of students transferring within the system during fiscal year 2011.

The 2012 report to the legislature provides information about transfer mechanisms used in other states. The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System has implemented most of these mechanisms to at least some extent. The report also provides information about the status of implementation of the Smart Transfer Plan. This plan focuses on several areas identified as critical to improving credit transfer- posting of course outlines, maintaining the database on course equivalencies, improvement of the appeal process, monitoring compliance with Minnesota Transfer Curriculum requirements and improving communication about the Transfer Curriculum, and providing increased opportunities for training of transfer staff. Finally, the report provides information about the number of students who transferred from one MnSCU college or university to another during fiscal year 2011.

Successful Transfer of Credit

Report to the Legislature

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities

February, 2012

Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Executive Summary

The Report to the Legislature on Successful Transfer of Credit supports four primary conclusions:

1. The Legislature requested that a study be made of effective mechanisms for transfer in other states. This study reveals that the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities System has implemented almost all of the best practices in transfer identified in the higher education literature, and is recognized as a leader in the area of transfer.

2. A study conducted by the MnSCU Office of Internal Auditing in conjunction with our statewide student associations concluded that 91% of students who transfer within the system do so successfully without experiencing any problems.

3. The Smart Transfer Plan was designed to address the issues leading to the 9% of transfer problems identified by the Internal Auditor's study as well as other issues brought to us by our students and is well on the way to full implementation.

4. Successful credit transfer is a major priority for the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees and will be tracked by a transfer measure on the Accountability Dashboard as well as by annual reports on transfer.

Introduction

Minnesota Session Laws 2010, Chapter 364 Section 38 (a) states that "The Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities must develop and implement a plan to improve credit transfer within the system." Subpart (d) of the same section states that "The board shall report on February 15, 2011, and annually thereafter through 2014, on its activities to achieve the credit transfer goals in this section and the results of those activities."

The first report required by this legislation was submitted to the legislature on February 1, 2011. The report included information on the **Smart Transfer Plan** designed to improve transfer within the MnSCU system. The plan incorporates a number of provisions which address requirements contained in the legislation, including enhanced information on transferring and tracking credits and improved training for all staff involved with credit transfer. Identifying discrepancies in transferring and accepting credits by institutions, devising methods to improve the uniform treatment of credit transfer and requiring institutional, rather than student responsibility to provide documentation for course equivalency determinations are additional aspects of transfer improvement included in the plan. Finally, the plan and subsequent policy actions by the MnSCU Board of Trustees require the availability of system- wide transfer information on the Internet and require each system college and university to post information necessary to determine the transferability of course credits, using a common template, on their institutional websites.

Legislation passed in 2011 (Laws 2011, Chapter 5, Section 14) states:

> "When providing the report required by Laws 2010, chapter 364, section 38, the Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities shall provide information about

progress made toward achieving the goals described in the system's smart transfer plan, and shall provide information about the number of students transferring between and among the system's two- and four-year institutions during the previous fiscal year. In addition, the Board of Trustees shall include a system study of mechanisms for effective transfer in other states."

The current report responds to this mandate by providing the required information on the implementation of the Smart Transfer Plan, data about student transfers, and a review of promising practices in student transfer and articulation across the country.

MnSCU is a National Leader in Best Practices

Represented in the literature on student transfer are several major studies that attempt to identify effective policies and practices to enhance student transfer. Many of these national reviews of student transfer have been conducted since 2008. Studies published by Hezel Associates in 2009 (funded by the Lumina Foundation and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, the Education Commission of the States in 2010, and the Center for the Study of Community Colleges in 201l) are in agreement on many "promising practices" to promote effective transfer and articulation.

Hezel Associates conducted a review of the literature on transfer and articulation and compiled a comprehensive taxonomy of what they described as Promising Practices in Statewide Transfer and Articulation Systems. The taxonomy consists of five broad sets of policies and practices: Statewide Collaboration, Communication of Policies, Academic Policies, Use of Data, and Additional Promising Practices. The following paragraphs discuss the promising practices listed by Hezel Associates, and provide an indication of the extent to which these policies and practices are in place within the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system.

1. STATEWIDE COLLABORATION

Statewide Collaboration is described as having two key components. The first is *a statewide, standing committee focusing on multi-institution transfer and articulation*. This committee may propose policies, review their effectiveness, monitor statewide data on transfer, and other tasks.

- ✓ The Hezel report cited MnSCU's Transfer Oversight Committee as being a notable example of this type of committee. Massachusetts and Rhode Island were mentioned as being among other states having effective statewide standing committees.

The second component of effective statewide collaboration cited in the report is *the involvement of faculty in policy development and implementation.* The report notes that faculty buy-in is critical to effective implementation of transfer policy, and this is best achieved when faculty are involved in the development of these policies.

- ✓ The MnSCU system is notable because faculty are included in both the Transfer Oversight Committee and the Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council, which is the body that reviews all system-wide academic and student affairs policy proposals and recommends all new policies and policy amendments. At the campus level, faculty are similarly involved in review and development of academic policies.

2 . COMMUNICATION OF POLICIES

Communication of Policies is key to having effective transfer and articulation. Students must have accurate information about the transferability of courses, and advisors must have accurate information about transfer regulations, course equivalencies, and other aspects of transfer. The establishment of *a state-level office or official whose sole or primary purpose is to facilitate a statewide approach to transfer and articulation* is noted as a promising practice to achieve effective communication. Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi are among the states that have such an office or official.

> ✓ Within MnSCU, the Office of Transfer and Collaboration is responsible for assisting colleges and universities in achieving their goals for effective transfer, and engages in a number of other activities noted below. This Office is also charged with responsibility for assuring full implementation of the Smart Transfer Plan.

Designation of campus or state-level personnel as contact persons for transfer and articulation is an important component for effective communication of policies.

> ✓ Within MnSCU, at the system level, the System Director for Transfer and Collaboration heads the Office of Transfer and Collaboration and is the primary contact person for all aspects of transfer. The System Director maintains communication with a statewide network of campus Transfer Specialists, at least one at each college and university, who are responsible for implementing policies and practices related to transfer at their respective campuses and ensuring that students and advisors are provided appropriate information. Ohio, Nevada, and New York have similar designations of personnel at the campus level.

Policies may also be effectively communicated by *maintaining a presence at fairs, summits, conferences, and meetings to communicate with students and their families about transfer and articulation.*

> ✓ Within MnSCU, at the campus level this function is generally filled by the Transfer Specialists, who may be part of a college or university presence at College Fairs. At the System level, individuals with knowledge of transfer represent the system at the annual National College Fair held in Minneapolis. Beyond this, Office of Transfer and Collaboration convenes a number of meetings annually to provide training and workshops for Transfer Specialists, advisors, and others to ensure that they are being provided the latest information on transfer.

Effective communication may be enhanced by *building a strong presence for articulation and transfer on the web.*

> ✓ MnSCU has been a leader in this area, having been one of the first states to establish a web portal for transfer, MnTransfer.org. On this system portal, system-level information about transfer is available for both students and educators. Educators have access to all policies and documents related to transfer. Students are provided tools for transfer planning, including links to the system's web-based course equivalency tool, u.select. In addition,

Board policy and the Smart Transfer Plan include requirements that colleges and universities place prominent links to transfer information for students on the home page of their websites.

Finally, the Hezel Associates report suggests that communication may be improved by including *student feedback in articulation and transfer policies and practices.*

✓ Again, MnSCU provides a model for other states, as students are included as full members of both the Transfer Oversight Committee and the Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council, so that student input into transfer policies and practices is provided at the very highest levels. The System also partnered with the student associations in conducting a survey of student satisfaction with transfer that led to the development of a number of policy revisions aimed at improving the transfer experience for our students.

3. ACADEMIC POLICIES

Academic Policies that promote effective statewide transfer have been adopted in a number of states. *Statewide articulation agreements between program majors* have been implemented in Alabama, Colorado, and New Mexico.

✓ MnSCU has begun the development of similar articulation agreements with the recent adoption of a statewide articulation agreement for a broad field major in Health Sciences. Work is currently proceeding on another statewide articulation agreement for a broad field major in Engineering. The statewide agreements are a significant improvement over individual college to university agreements because they allow a student who completes the program at a community college to transfer to any state university included in the agreement, rather than be limited to the single partner in the individual articulation agreement.

Common General Education core requirements provide a way for community college students to meet the general education requirements of a university and be granted credit for having completed them as a package upon transfer, with or without a completed associate's degree.

✓ The Minnesota Transfer Curriculum was one of the early examples of such a common general education core program. Other versions have been developed in Arkansas, Oregon, and Utah.

The Hezel report notes that *Common Course Numbering* has been implemented in a number of states. However, the report cautions that common course numbering of lower-division courses can be quite difficult to implement, possibly referring to an earlier report by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities which stated that for two-year to four-year transfers, a common general education core is preferable to common course numbering because it is more flexible and much less complex.

✓ The public higher education systems in Minnesota have twice been required to report on the feasibility of implementing common course numbering, and both reports concluded that it would be too complex and too expensive.

Finally, Hezel Associates note that several states have recently enacted *policies that guarantee admission to a state university for students who have completed an associate's degree.* These

are generally states where the public universities have been forced to limit enrollments, a situation that does not exist within MnSCU. It should be noted that these policies do not usually guarantee admission to any specific campus, only to a public university within the state system.

4. USE OF DATA

The Use of Data to support transfer and articulation policy implementation is a relatively recent innovation in several states. *Assessment of transfer initiatives, including evaluation of transfer and articulation policies and transfer students' progress* is essential in order to understand what is and what is not working.

- ✓ The MnSCU Office of Internal Auditing conducted such an assessment in 2010, and the results of this assessment have guided the development of the Smart Transfer Plan and recent enhancements of MnSCU transfer policies.

Assessing student success through quantitative measures of individual student-level indicators of performance is something that few states are able to do.

- ✓ The Integrated Statewide Record System used by MnSCU provides this ability, and it was this that allowed the study conducted by the Office of Internal Auditing to proceed in such detail.

The report also urges *expansion of reporting of results of transfer and articulation assessments.*

- ✓ The MnSCU system is in the process of developing a Transfer measure that will be posted on the system's Accountability Dashboard website, in order to provide a public indication of achievement and accountability related to transfer. In addition the system for a number of years produced an annual Transfer Student Profile report that provided information about the number of students who transfer within the system, the number of credits transferred, and measures of transfer student performance, persistence and graduation. Due to budget cuts within the system o, production of this report was placed on hiatus following the publication of the 2009 report; however, funding has now been made available so that production will be resumed and a report on 2010 transfers will be available later this fiscal year.

5. ADDITIONAL PROMISING PRACTICES

The Hezel Associates report notes several additional promising practices that do not fit easily within any of the other four categories. The development of *a transfer student bill of rights* may ease the uncertainty that students may experience as they attempt to navigate transferring from one institution to another. Florida and Colorado are mention as being among the states that have such a covenant with students.

- ✓ In Minnesota, responding to a proposal from the statewide student associations, the Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council has developed a new system policy on Transfer Rights and Responsibilities. The proposed new policy has been forwarded to theChancellor for his approval prior to review by the Board of Trustees.

Development and dissemination of statewide principles related to transfer and articulation can guide decision making on transfer and can support the development and implementation of effective transfer policies and practices.

- ✓ Within MnSCU, the Office of Transfer and Collaboration has developed system-wide principles and guidelines for transfer, and these resources are posted on the MnTransfer.org website.

The development of ***alternate pathways for degree completion*** provides options for students who may have transferred from a community college to a university prior to completing an associate's degree and who then drop out of the university without having completed the bachelor's degree. Nevada has developed a program called "reverse transfer" which allows a student in this situation to transfer credits earned at the university back to the community college, thereby completing the degree requirements for the associate's degree.

- ✓ Similarly, MnSCU has obtained funding from the Lumina Foundation for Graduate Minnesota, a project in which students who have left college after earning a significant number of credits are encouraged to return so that all their credits can be evaluated to determine how many additional credits they need to earn a degree or whether they have actually completed the requirements for a degree.

As the preceding paragraphs have demonstrated, there are a variety of promising practices for statewide transfer and articulation that have been implemented by different states across the country. Given the emphasis that has been placed on improving transfer by the Minnesota legislature, by the Board of Trustees, and by students, it should come as no surprise that most of these promising practices have also been implemented by the MnSCU system. A summary of these promising practices and how MnSCU is responding to these is provided as Table 1. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the system will continue to explore additional ways to improve the transfer experience of our students.

Implementation of the Smart Transfer Plan

The report submitted to the Legislature in February of 2011 described the Smart Transfer Plan that was developed in order to respond to mandates to improve transfer. The Plan focuses on policies and practices in five areas: Course Outlines, DARS and Course Equivalencies, Appeals, Compliance and Communication about Transfer, and Training. These areas were selected because they responded directly to recommendations made in a study of transfer within the system that was conducted by the Office of Internal Auditing during 2010. The Internal Auditor's report was quite revealing, because it demonstrated that 91% of the students who transfer within the system do so successfully, experiencing no problems. About one third of the problems experienced were related to acceptance of Minnesota Transfer Curriculum courses, while another one-third of the problems were related to the determination of course equivalencies. In addition, the Internal Auditor's report noted that almost 90% of students who appealed a transfer award determination had some or all of the contested credits accepted, but also noted that in many cases students were not aware of their right to submit an appeal. The Smart Transfer Plan therefore focuses very directly on these areas of the transfer process. For example, the credit evaluation that students receive when they transfer now contains a message informing them of their right to appeal if they disagree with any of the credit transfer decisions.

Course outlines were the major focus of attention during the first year of Smart Transfer Plan implementation. Changes to Board Policy established course outlines as being the primary documentation of course content to be used in establishing the equivalency of courses to be transferred, and also established a common format to be used by all colleges and universities in the development of course outlines. This would eliminate the requirement that students track down professors to obtain the syllabus used in an individual course and subsequently finding that a professor's idiosyncratic syllabus did not contain all the information necessary to determine a course equivalency. The Smart Transfer Plan established a requirement that all colleges and universities post course outlines on their websites for all lower-division courses included in their Minnesota Transfer Curriculum no later than the end of fiscal year 2011, making them publically available for viewing by any interested parties. All but two institutions were able to meet this deadline. The Plan calls for course outlines of all remaining lower-division courses to be posted on institutional websites by the end of this fiscal year.

In the area of **DARS- Course Equivalencies**, the expectation of the Smart Transfer Plan was that every institution would complete the evaluation of all Minnesota Transfer Curriculum courses to determine equivalencies and encode those courses to display in u.select, the publicly-available course equivalency database which can be accessed through the MnTransfer.org website or directly. This was to be accomplished by the end of the 2011 calendar year. The colleges and universities expended a great deal of time, effort, and human resources to accomplish this task, but given the enormous amount of work required at a time when budgets were being cut and staff in Registrar's and other administrative offices were being laid off, not all the institutions were able to meet the deadline. Nevertheless, more than three-fourths of the colleges and universities within the system had posted their Minnesota Transfer Curriculum course equivalencies on u.select by the end of the year.

Appeals of transfer decisions were a major concern for the students who provided input into the development of the Smart Transfer Plan. Accordingly, the Plan requires enhancements to the information provided to students about their right to appeal transfer decisions, including a notification placed on a student's transfer evaluation, notification that if an appeal at the institution is unsuccessful an appeal at the system level is available, and posting of information related to transfer appeals on college and university websites. The Degree Audit form generated by the ISRS system has been modified so that it automatically prints a notification to students of their right to appeal the transferability or application of credits earned at previous institutions. A survey of institutional websites conducted in December confirmed that all but seven of the colleges and universities had posted information about transfer appeals on their websites, including information about the option to appeal at the system level in certain cases where a campus-level appeal is unsuccessful. A recent survey of college and university websites indicated that all but seven of the colleges and universities had fully met the requirement of having readily available information about transfer appeals posted on their websites.

Objectives in the Plan related to **Compliance and Communication about Transfer** centered on the expectation that information provided to students about the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum would be readily available on college and university websites and would be consistent and accurate. Another primary goal in this area was that every college and university would have links to transfer information posted on their institutional home pages, making transfer information highly visible and accessible. A survey was conducted by the Office of Transfer and Collaboration to identify instances where college and university websites did not have information about their Minnesota Transfer Curriculum courses that was accurate and consistent. The results of this survey were

provided to the individual colleges and universities with the expectation that changes be made to the items identified. The colleges and universities are currently in the process of making appropriate changes. Similarly, college and university websites were reviewed to determine whether links to transfer information were posted prominently on their home pages, or readily accessible from the home page. This review determined that all but three institutions have transfer information that is accessible from the home page with three or fewer clicks.

Training of advisors and other staff involved in transfer is critical in order to make transfer and articulation as effective as possible. The Smart Transfer Plan establishes an expectation that the Office of Transfer and Collaboration and the DARS/u.select unit in the System Office will make training available so that every MnSCU staff member involved in transfer is able to attend at least one training session annually. Due to staff turnover and changes in technology and institutional curriculum, ongoing training is vital to this effort. The DARS/u.select team has provided training in large conference sessions, in smaller regional Drop-In Lab sessions, in training sessions for individual campuses, and in regularly scheduled Wednesday and Thursday Open Lab sessions held in the system office. The Transfer and Collaboration staff also provided training including the large annual conference for Transfer Specialists, and a smaller orientation conference for new Transfer Specialists. In addition, four regional conferences for Transfer Specialists and other staff involved in transfer were provided across the state, reducing the necessity for campus staff to travel to one central location for training. Providing training for college and university staff members will continue to be a priority for the System Office.

In summary, implementation of the Smart Transfer Plan is on track. Colleges and universities have for the most part achieved the objectives called for in the different components of the Plan. System office staff will call attention to situations where colleges and universities are still lagging behind. During this next year, with the resumption of publication of the annual Transfer Student Profile, we will be able to provide more objective information about the impact of the Smart Transfer Plan on student transfer.

Increase in Transfer Students and the Transfer of Credit

Data tables 1 and 2 beginning on page 13 provide information about the number of students transferring to MnSCU colleges and universities, both from within the system as well as from institutions outside the system, for fiscal years 2008 through 2011. The tables also provide information about the full- year equivalent of credits transferred during these years. (One full-year equivalent represents 30 credits.) Both the number of students transferring within the system and the number of credits transferred have increased steadily and significantly over this time period.

STUDENTS TRANSFERRING WITHIN MnSCU					Change 2008-2011	
Students transferring to:	2008	2009	2010	2011	Number	Percent
colleges	8,647	9,660	11,507	12,491	3,844	44.5%
universities	6,510	6,680	7,092	7,822	1,312	20.2%

FYE CREDITS TRANSFERRING WITHIN MnSCU					Change 2008-2011	
FYE credits transferring to:	2008	2009	2010	2011	Number	Percent
colleges	7,505	8,580	10,359	11,242	3,738	49.8%
universities	10,391	10,879	12,049	13,464	3,073	29.6%

The number of students transferring to state colleges increased by 44.5% from 2008 to 2011, while the number of students transferring to state universities increased by about 20%. At the same time, the number of credits transferred to state colleges increased by almost 50% and the number of credits transferred to state universities increased by almost 30%. Clearly, more students are transferring more credits within Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.

As previously noted, the Integrated Statewide Record System within MnSCU allows tracking of individual student performance. In subsequent reports to the Legislature, this capability will make it possible to include information about the performance of students at colleges and universities following transfer. Student success, of course, is the true test of the effectiveness of a system of transfer and articulation.

Conclusion

Smooth transfer of credit is a top priority for Chancellor Rosenstone and the Board of Trustees. They have set elimination of barriers to transfer as one of the objectives toward the achievement of in the system's Strategic Framework. The Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs, Douglas Knowlton, has been charged with assuring that this objective is achieved and will be devoting considerable time and effort toward this end. We look forward to reporting to the Legislature in 2013 on the steps we have taken toward the elimination of barriers to transfer.

Table 1

SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES IN TRANSFER AND MnSCU IMPLEMENTATION STATUS	
Best Practice	**MnSCU Implementation of Best Practice**
STATEWIDE COLLABORATION	
• Statewide standing committee focusing on multi-institution transfer and articulation • Involvement of faculty in policy development and implementation	• Transfer Oversight Committee has responsibility for system-wide transfer issues; faculty are majority of membership • Faculty are involved in policy development at the system level by membership on the ASA Policy Council and on the campuses through campus-specific committees
COMMUNICATION OF POLICIES	
• State-level office or official responsible for facilitating transfer • Designation of campus or state-level personnel as transfer contacts • Maintaining a presence at conferences and meetings to communicate about transfer • A strong presence for transfer on the web • Include student feedback in transfer policies and practices	• System Director for Transfer and Collaboration has responsibility for system-wide transfer issues. Each campus has one or more Transfer Specialists, who are the campus experts and contacts on transfer. • Transfer is an ongoing presence at all system-wide Academic and Student Affairs conferences. Smart Transfer Plan and Board Policy require transfer information to be readily accessible on each college and university website. • Students are members of the ASA Policy Council. Responses from a student association survey on transfer informed the development of the Smart Transfer Plan and revisions to Board Policy on transfer.
ACADEMIC POLICIES	
• Statewide articulation agreements between program majors • Common General Education core requirements • Common Course numbering • Guaranteed admission to a state university for students with an associate's degree	• Broad field major in Health Sciences recently approved, work begun on Engineering. • The Minnesota Transfer Curriculum was one of the early examples of a common core. • Common course numbering has been studied twice and not recommended due to cost and complexity. • Current Board Policy on admission makes a separate guarantee unnecessary.

Table 1 (cont.)

SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES IN TRANSFER AND MnSCU IMPLEMENTATION STATUS	
Best Practice	**MnSCU Implementation of Best Practice**
USE OF DATA	
• Assessment of transfer initiatives • Assessment of transfer student success • Reporting results of transfer assessments	• The Office of Internal Auditing conducted an assessment of transfer, recommendations from this assessment guided policy changes MnSCU's student record system allows assessment of individual student performance, which will be reported in future annual Transfer Student Profiles. Overall transfer assessment will be reported as a dashboard on the System Accountability website.
ADDITIONAL PROMISING PRACTICES	
• Transfer Student Bill of Rights • Statewide principles related to transfer • Alternate pathways for degree completion	• The ASA Policy Council has developed a proposed Board Policy on Transfer Rights and Responsibilities, currently under review. Board Policy and Procedure establishes system-wide principles and guidelines for transfer. The Graduate Minnesota initiative provides alternate pathways for degree completion.

DataTable 1: Unduplicated Headcount of New Transfer Students								
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities								
Fiscal Years 2008 to 2011 Preliminary								

Received by State Colleges					Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011	
Sending Institution Type	2008	2009	2010	2011	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Community Colleges	2,262	2,359	2,843	3,157	895	39.6%	314	11.0%
Community and Technical Colleges	2,534	3,049	3,792	4,590	2,056	81.1%	798	21.0%
Technical Colleges	1,418	1,458	1,708	1,343	(75)	-5.3%	(365)	-21.4%
State Universities	2,433	2,794	3,164	3,401	968	39.8%	237	7.5%
Total Transfer Students from Within System	8,647	9,660	11,507	12,491	3,844	44.5%	984	8.6%
State College New Student Headcount	80,443	84,399	90,969	86,715	6,272	7.8%	(4,254)	-4.7%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	10.7%	11.4%	12.6%	14.4%	3.7%		1.8%	
University of Minnesota	1,530	1,713	1,756	1,506	(24)	-1.6%	(250)	-14.2%
Other Minnesota	1,809	2,451	2,932	2,580	771	42.6%	(352)	-12.0%
Border States	2,577	2,666	2,800	2,534	(43)	-1.7%	(266)	-9.5%
All Other	2,509	2,035	2,443	2,317	(192)	-7.7%	(126)	-5.2%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	8,425	8,865	9,931	8,937	512	6.1%	(994)	-10.0%
Total Transfer Students	17,072	18,525	21,438	21,428	4,356	25.5%	(10)	0.0%
State College New Student Headcount	80,443	84,399	90,969	86,715	6,272	7.8%	(4,254)	-4.7%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	21.2%	21.9%	23.6%	24.7%	3.5%		1.1%	
Received by State Universities					Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011	
Sending Institution Type	2008	2009	2010	2011	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Community Colleges	2,040	2,156	2,278	2,468	428	21.0%	190	8.3%
Community and Technical Colleges	2,571	2,725	2,929	3,680	1,109	43.1%	751	25.6%
Technical Colleges	656	613	708	335	(321)	-48.9%	(373)	-52.7%
State Universities	1,243	1,186	1,177	1,339	96	7.7%	162	13.8%
Total Transfer Students from Within System	6,510	6,680	7,092	7,822	1,312	20.2%	730	10.3%
State University New Student Headcount	28,874	29,638	30,185	30,296	1,422	4.9%	111	0.4%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	22.5%	22.5%	23.5%	25.8%	3.3%		2.3%	
University of Minnesota	810	713	812	710	(100)	-12.3%	(102)	-12.6%
Other Minnesota	832	1,171	1,216	1,165	333	40.0%	(51)	-4.2%
Border States	1,654	1,581	1,606	1,436	(218)	-13.2%	(170)	-10.6%
All Other	1,442	1,023	1,017	948	(494)	-34.3%	(69)	-6.8%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	4,738	4,488	4,651	4,259	(479)	-10.1%	(392)	-8.4%
Total Transfer Students	11,248	11,168	11,743	12,081	833	7.4%	338	2.9%
State University New Student Headcount	28,874	29,638	30,185	30,296	1,422	4.9%	111	0.4%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	39.0%	37.7%	38.9%	39.9%	0.9%		1.0%	

Data Table 1: Unduplicated Headcount of New Transfer Students								
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities								
Fiscal Years 2008 to 2011 Preliminary								
Received into the System					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Sending Institution Type	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Community Colleges	4,302	4,515	5,121	5,625	1,323	30.8%	504	9.8%
Community and Technical Colleges	5,105	5,774	6,721	8,270	3,165	62.0%	1,549	23.0%
Technical Colleges	2,074	2,071	2,416	1,678	(396)	-19.1%	(738)	-30.5%
State Universities	3,676	3,980	4,341	4,740	1,064	28.9%	399	9.2%
Total Transfer Students from Within System	15,157	16,340	18,599	20,313	5,156	34.0%	1,714	9.2%
System New Student Headcount	109,317	114,037	121,154	117,011	7,694	7.0%	(4,143)	-3.4%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	13.9%	14.3%	15.4%	17.4%	3.5%		2.0%	
University of Minnesota	2,340	2,426	2,568	2,216	(124)	-5.3%	(352)	-13.7%
Other Minnesota	2,641	3,622	4,148	3,745	1,104	41.8%	(403)	-9.7%
Border States	4,231	4,247	4,406	3,970	(261)	-6.2%	(436)	-9.9%
All Other	3,951	3,058	3,460	3,265	(686)	-17.4%	(195)	-5.6%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	13,163	13,353	14,582	13,196	33	0.3%	(1,386)	-9.5%
Total Transfer Students	28,320	29,693	33,181	33,509	5,189	18.3%	328	1.0%
System New Student Headcount	109,317	114,037	121,154	117,011	7,694	7.0%	(4,143)	-3.4%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	25.9%	26.0%	27.4%	28.6%	2.7%		1.3%	
Summary of Within System Transfer by Institution Type: Headcount					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Transfer From To:	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Colleges to Colleges	6,214	6,866	8,343	9,090	2,876	46.3%	747	9.0%
Colleges to Universities	5,267	5,494	5,915	6,483	1,216	23.1%	568	9.6%
Universities to Colleges	2,433	2,794	3,164	3,401	968	39.8%	237	7.5%
Universities to Universities	1,243	1,186	1,177	1,339	96	7.7%	162	13.8%
Total	15,157	16,340	18,599	20,313	5,156	34.0%	1,714	9.2%
Summary of Within System Transfer by Institution Type: Percent Distribution								
Transfer From To:	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**				
Colleges to Colleges	41.0%	42.0%	44.9%	44.7%				
Colleges to Universities	34.7%	33.6%	31.8%	31.9%				
Universities to Colleges	16.1%	17.1%	17.0%	16.7%				
Universities to Universities	8.2%	7.3%	6.3%	6.6%				
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Table 2: Full Year Equivalent of Credits Accepted in Transfer								
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities								
Fiscal Years 2008 to 2011 Preliminary								
Received by State Colleges					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Sending Institution Type	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011***	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Community Colleges	1,837	1,856	2,402	2,594	758	41.2%	192	8.0%
Community and Technical Colleges	2,104	2,610	3,234	3,931	1,828	86.9%	697	21.6%
Technical Colleges	1,214	1,278	1,462	1,131	(83)	-6.8%	(331)	-22.6%
State Universities	2,351	2,837	3,261	3,586	1,235	52.5%	326	10.0%
Total MNSCU	7,505	8,580	10,359	11,242	3,738	49.8%	884	8.5%
State College New Student Headcount	84,654	87,797	97,550	99,103	14,449	17.1%	1,553	1.6%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	8.9%	9.8%	10.6%	11.3%	2.5%		0.7%	
University of Minnesota	2,039	2,282	2,487	2,189	150	7.4%	(298)	-12.0%
Other Minnesota	2,540	3,117	3,529	3,097	557	21.9%	(432)	-12.2%
Border States	2,898	3,146	3,251	2,965	67	2.3%	(286)	-8.8%
All Other	2,843	2,574	2,973	2,768	(76)	-2.7%	(205)	-6.9%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	10,321	11,119	12,240	11,020	699	6.8%	(1,220)	-10.0%
Total Transfer Students	17,826	19,699	22,599	22,262	4,436	24.9%	(337)	-1.5%
State College New Student Headcount	84,654	87,797	97,550	99,103	14,449	17.1%	1,553	1.6%
Transfer HC as % of New Student HC	12.2%	12.7%	12.5%	11.1%	-1.1%		-1.4%	
Received by State Universities					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Sending Institution Type	**2008**	2009	2010	2011*	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Community Colleges	3,395	3,628	4,106	4,536	1,141	33.6%	431	10.5%
Community and Technical Colleges	4,457	4,706	5,215	6,458	2,001	44.9%	1,243	23.8%
Technical Colleges	880	850	1,021	546	(334)	-37.9%	(475)	-46.5%
State Universities	1,659	1,695	1,707	1,923	264	15.9%	216	12.7%
Total MNSCU	10,391	10,879	12,049	13,464	3,073	29.6%	1,415	11.7%
State U FYE	55,231	56,127	57,872	58,799	3,568	6.5%	927	1.6%
Transfer FYE as % of Actual FYE	18.8%	19.4%	20.8%	22.9%	4.1%		2.1%	
University of Minnesota	1,418	1,238	1,428	1,343	(74)	-5.2%	(84)	-5.9%
Other Minnesota	1,580	2,320	2,458	2,624	1,044	66.1%	166	6.7%
Border States	2,672	2,495	2,660	2,618	(55)	-2.1%	(42)	-1.6%
All Other	2,874	2,022	2,122	2,030	(843)	-29.3%	(92)	-4.3%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	8,544	8,076	8,668	8,615	72	0.8%	(53)	-0.6%
Total Transfer Students	18,934	18,955	20,717	22,079	3,145	16.6%	1,362	6.6%
State U FYE	55,231	56,127	57,872	58,799	3,568	6.5%	927	1.6%
Transfer FYE as % of Actual FYE	34.3%	33.8%	35.8%	37.6%	3.3%		1.8%	

Table 2: Full Year Equivalent of Credits Accepted in Transfer								
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities								
Fiscal Years 2008 to 2011 Preliminary								
Received into the System					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Sending Institution Type	**2008**	2009	**2010**	**2011***	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Community Colleges	5,232	5,484	6,508	7,130	1,899	36.3%	622	9.6%
Community and Technical Colleges	6,561	7,316	8,450	10,390	3,829	58.4%	1,940	23.0%
Technical Colleges	2,093	2,128	2,483	1,677	(416)	-19.9%	(806)	-32.5%
State Universities	4,010	4,532	4,968	5,510	1,500	37.4%	542	10.9%
Total MNSCU	17,896	19,459	22,408	24,706	6,811	38.1%	2,298	10.3%
Total MNSCU FYE	139,885	143,924	155,422	157,902	18,017	12.9%	2,480	1.6%
Transfer FYE as % of Actual FYE	12.8%	13.5%	14.4%	15.6%	2.9%		1.2%	
University of Minnesota	3,457	3,520	3,915	3,533	76	2.2%	(382)	-9.8%
Other Minnesota	4,120	5,437	5,987	5,721	1,601	38.9%	(266)	-4.4%
Border States	5,570	5,641	5,911	5,583	13	0.2%	(328)	-5.5%
All Other	5,717	4,597	5,095	4,798	(919)	-16.1%	(297)	-5.8%
Total Transfer Students from Outside System	18,864	19,195	20,908	19,635	770	4.1%	(1,273)	-6.1%
Total Transfer Students	36,760	38,654	43,316	44,341	7,581	20.6%	1,025	2.4%
Total MNSCU FYE	139,885	143,924	155,422	157,902	18,017	12.9%	2,480	1.6%
Transfer FYE as % of Actual FYE	26.3%	26.9%	27.9%	28.1%	1.8%		0.2%	
Summary of Within System Transfer by Institution Type					**Change 2008-2011**		**Change 2010-2011**	
Sending Institution Type	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011***	**Number**	**Percent**	**Number**	**Percent**
Colleges to Colleges	5,154	5,744	7,098	7,656	2,502	48.6%	558	7.9%
Colleges to Universities	8,732	9,184	10,342	11,540	2,809	32.2%	1,199	11.6%
Universities to Colleges	2,351	2,837	3,261	3,586	1,235	52.5%	326	10.0%
Universities to Universities	1,659	1,695	1,707	1,923	264	15.9%	216	12.7%
Total	17,896	19,459	22,408	24,706	6,811	38.1%	2,298	10.3%
Summary of Within System Transfer by Institution Type: Percent Distribution								
Transfer From To:	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**				
Colleges to Colleges	28.8%	29.5%	31.7%	31.0%				
Colleges to Universities	48.8%	47.2%	46.2%	46.7%				
Universities to Colleges	13.1%	14.6%	14.6%	14.5%				
Universities to Universities	9.3%	8.7%	7.6%	7.8%				
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Works Reviewed

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (July, 2005). *Policy Matters: Developing Transfer and Articulation Policies That Make a Difference.* Washington, DC: AASCU. Accessed at : www.aascu.org/uploadedFiles/AASCU/Content/Root/PolicyAndAdvocacy/PolicyPublications/Transfer%20and%20Articulation.pdf

Gross, B., & Goldhaber, D. (April, 2009). *Community College Transfer and Articulation Policies: Looking Beneath the Surface.* Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education . Accessed at: http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/wp_crpe1R_cc2_apr09.pdf

Hanover Research. (2010). *Credit Tranfer Processes and Programs in Higher Education.* Washington, DC: Hanover.

Hezel Associates. (February, 2009). *Best Practices in Statewide Articulation and Transfer Systems: Research Literature Overview.* Boulder, CO: WICHE. Accessed at: http://www.wiche.edu/info/publications/ATlitOverview.pdf

Hezel Associates. (June, 2010). *Promising Practices in Statewide Articulation and Transfer Systems.* Boulder, CO: WICHE. Accessed at: http://www.wiche.edu/info/publications/PromisingPracticesGuide.pdf

Hezel, R. (May, 2010). *Overview of State Promising Practices.* Paper presented at the WICHE Commission Meeting, Portland, OR. Accessed at: http://www.wiche.edu/info/agendaBook/may10/presentations/hezel.pdf

Johnson, N. (February, 2011). *Three Policies to Reduce Time to Degree.* Washington, DC: Complete College America. Accessed at: http://www.completecollege.org/docs/Three%20Policies%20to%20Reduce%20Time%20to%20D egree%20-%20Nate%20Johnson.pdf

Kisker, C. B., Wagoner, R. L., & Cohen, A. M. (April, 2011). *Implementing Statewide Transfer and Articulation Reform: An Analysis of Transfer Associate Degrees in Four States.* Oak Park, CA: Center for the Study of Community Colleges. Accessed at: http://centerforcommunitycolleges.org/index.php/projects-and-publications/current-projects/

Lorenzo, G. (October, 2011). *Transfer and Articulation from Community Colleges to Four-Year Institutions: Hope on the Horizon.* Clarence, NY: Lorenzo Associates. Accessed at: http://www.edpath.com/images/Transfer.pdf

McGill, M. (September, 2010). *Higher Education Web Portals: Serving State and Student Transfer Needs.* Boulder, CO: WICHE. Accessed at: http://wiche.edu/info/publications/higherEdWebPortals.pdf

Michelau, D.K. (May, 2010). *All Roads Lead to Graduation? A Conversation about State Articulation and Transfer Policy.* Paper presented at the WICHE Commission Meeting, Portland, OR. Accessed at: http://www.wiche.edu/info/stas/presentations/Michelau110628.pdf

Moore, C., Shulock, N., & Jensen, C. (August, 2009). *Crafting a Student-Centered Transfer Process in California: Lessons From Other States.* Sacramento, CA: Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy. Accessed at: http://www.csus.edu/ihelp/PDFs/R_Transfer_Report_08-09.pdf

Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability. (March, 2009). *State Universities Are Generally Following the Statewide Course Numbering System in Awarding Appropriate Transfer Credit.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Legislature. Accessed at: http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/MonitorDocs/Reports/pdf/0920rpt.pdf

Smith, M. (December, 2010). *Transfer and Articulation Policies.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Accessed at: http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/90/70/9070.pdf

Smith, P. P. (May, 2010). *You Can't Get There From Here: Five Ways to Clear Roadblocks for College*

Transfer Students. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Accessed at: http://www.aei.org/files/2010/05/06/05-EduO-May-2010- g.pdf

Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). *Clearing Paths to College Degrees: Transfer Policies in SREB States.* Atlanta, GA: SREB. Accessed at: http://publications.sreb.org/2007/07E06_Clear_Paths.pdf

Wellman, J. V. (August, 2002). *State Policy and Community College-Baccalaureate Transfer.* Washington, DC: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education and The Institute for Higher Education Policy. Accessed at: http://www.highereducation.org/reports/transfer/transfer.shtml

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. *State Summaries Articulation, Transfer and Alignment Database* (2011). Accessed at: http://higheredpolicies.wiche.edu/content/policy/state/summaries/31