ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
JANUARY 17, 2012
10:30 A.M.

30 7TH STREET EAST
SAINT PAUL, MN

Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.

(1) Minutes of November 15, 2011 (pp. 1-11)
(2) Academic and Student Affairs Division Update
(3) Report to the Legislature on Transfer (pp. 12-31)
(4) Bush Foundation Teacher Education Partnership (pp. 32-47)

<u>Academic and Student Affairs Committee</u>
Christine Rice, Chair
Duane Benson, Vice Chair
Jacob Englund
Alfredo Oliveira
Thomas Renier
Louise Sundin
James Van Houten

Bolded items indicate action required.

MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 15, 2011

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Members Present: Chair Christine Rice; Trustees Duane Benson, Jacob Englund, Alfredo Oliveira, Louise Sundin and James Van Houten.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Members Absent: Thomas Renier

Other Board Members Present: Trustees Brett Anderson, Cheryl Dickson, David Paskach, Scott Thiss and Michael Vekich.

Leadership Council Committee Co-Chairs Present: Interim Vice Chancellor Larry Litecky and Presidents Cecilia Cervantes and Judith Ramaley.

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Academic and Student Affairs Committee held a meeting on November 15, 2011 at Wells Fargo Place, 4th Floor, Board Room, 30 East 7th Street in St. Paul. Chair Rice called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm.

1. **Minutes of October 18, 2011**

    *Trustee Van Houten asked for a correction in the Academic and Student Affairs Committee minutes from October 18, 2011. He said in the second paragraph of Agenda Item **3. Proposed Amendment to Policy 3.36 – Academic Programs (First Reading)** the words "the System Will" should be changed to "the Board of Trustees Shall." With this correction, the minutes were approved.*

2. **Academic and Student Affairs Update – Interim Vice Chancellor Larry Litecky**

    - The Fall Career and Technical Education Conference was held in Plymouth on November 20, 2011. The conference, co-sponsored by the system and the Minnesota Department of Education, was attended by 260 people from secondary and post-secondary institutions. Potential Congressional legislation regarding technical and career education and promising practices and partnerships were conference topics.

    - Century College was awarded a WOW Award from the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications. This award recognizes innovative uses of educational technology in higher education and Century College received it for its use of the GPS LifePlan and E-Folio. Together, these tools help students achieve their educational, career, and personal goals by putting them in charge of creating their own career plans and developing connections with campus resources.

The GPS LifePlan has been adopted by 18 colleges and one university, Interim Vice Chancellor Litecky said. Through partnerships with the state's National Guard, Veterans Affairs, Economic Development and education agencies, additional versions have been created for veterans, workforce audiences and secondary students.

- The annual Academic and Student Affairs fall conference in October was attended by nearly 300 people. Keynote speakers included Chancellor Rosenstone, Steven Spangehl, Vice President for Accreditation Relations at the Higher Learning Commission, and Anna Maravelas, who spoke on incivility in higher education and other organizations. The conference provides an opportunity for campus leaders to hear from one another regarding good/promising practices, to network and to discuss policy issues and mutual concerns.

- Trustee Van Houten asked if it would be possible to get an update on the system's ongoing work with the Bush Foundation to revamp teacher education. Chair Rice said this could be put on a future agenda.

3. **Proposed Amendment to Policy 3.36 – Academic Programs (Second Reading)**

A proposed amendment of Policy 3.36 - Academic Programs was given a second reading.

Chair Rice said the policy was revised to address a concern expressed by Trustee Dickson that it did not emphasize a system priority on preparing students to be creative, well-rounded, innovative citizens.

Language was also added at the request of Trustee Sundin regarding the annual reports submitted to the Board pertaining to academic program actions. This language clarifies that decisions on programs should be based on standards and goals established by the Chancellor. The amendment now also states that statewide data be used in the program approval process to ensure highest priority is given to meeting the needs of the workforce.

Trustee Van Houten said he believes there is a conflict between state statutes and this proposed Board policy. He said in ***Minnesota Statutes 136F.06 Powers and Duties,*** it says: "The Board shall … approve programs of study and requirements for completion of programs..." But in the proposed ***Policy 3.36 Academic Programs, Part 5, Academic Program Approval*** it says: "Approval of the chancellor is required for new academic programs, changes to existing academic programs, suspension of academic programs and closure of academic programs at system colleges and universities."

Trustee Van Houten said since Board policy states approval of the chancellor is required for program approval or changes, that would mean the Board is not approving programs or program changes, as is required according to statute.

He said he believes there is another conflict under ***Minnesota Statutes***, ***136F.30 Courses and Programs:*** "The board shall review and approve or disapprove campus proposals for adding, deleting or substantially changing programs of study, including graduate and undergraduate academic programs, training in professional semi-professional and technical fields and adult education. The board shall avoid duplicate program offerings. The board may initiate activities to close programs…" The proposed policy amendment states "the chancellor shall maintain the academic program inventory and annually report to the Board of Trustees on the status against program goals established by the Chancellor …" Since an annual report only summarizes actions already taken, this represents a conflict with the statute, Trustee Van Houten said.

As public officials, Trustees have the fiduciary responsibility to ensure that system policies and procedures do not violate statute, Trustee Van Houten said. The system is too complicated for the simple language that was developed when the system was created for the Board to do the approval of programs, but this is still the statutory language under which the Board is obligated to operate, he said. He added the Board could resolve these conflicts in one of two ways: 1) By asking legislators to revise the statute; or 2) Endeavoring to come up with the effort, the people and the time to carry out the statutory obligation. He said he does not think they have the option to pass a Board policy that disagrees with the statute.

Trustee Van Houten said before the Committee makes a recommendation to the full Board on the proposed policy amendment, he is asking Legal Counsel Gail Olson to offer an opinion if the proposed policy is in conflict with statute.

Counsel Olson said her response would be an informal analysis of the question. She noted delegation questions have arisen periodically in the past for the Board of Trustees. The Legislature delegates a broad array of responsibilities and authority to the Board and she said it is her view that the Board may delegate functions to the Chancellor and the Chancellor, in turn, can delegate functions to the presidents within the confines of Board authority and limitations. It would be difficult for the Board to take on the administrative responsibility of approving all actions pertaining to academic programs since these actions total more than 1,000 per year. She said it is her opinion that it is within the Board's authority to delegate this responsibility.

She added that the Board has strengthened its role in the process by adding data requirements related to the program approval process and requiring a more detailed annual reporting of actions.

3

Trustee Van Houten said his question was not whether the new policy is better than the old policy, since he believes that is true. He said his question is if the proposed policy language is in conflict with statute. He asked Counsel Olson if she is advising the Board that there is no conflict between current statutes and the proposed policy being reviewed so it is clear that the Board had legal advice on this issue prior to taking action.

Chancellor Rosenstone asked for clarification on delegated authority. Counsel Olson said all legislative authority is given to the Board, and the Board can delegate some – but not all – functions. One example of a delegated function is the conferring of degrees. The Board does not handle the individual conferring of 34,000 degrees each year, but rather sets the standards by which they are conferred. In the same way, the Board has an academic program policy which sets the standards by which programs are approved or not approved, closed and so forth, she said.

Trustee Van Houten again asked Counsel Olson for representation that there is no conflict between statute and the proposed Board policy before a vote is taken.

Chair Rice said it appears part of the issue is in the interpretation of delegation and what functions, as a Board, they are able to delegate. She said delegation agreements are common and necessary throughout state government.

Trustee Van Houten said Counsel Olson has only said that the Board has authority to delegate certain functions, but she still had not offered an opinion on his question pertaining to potential conflicts between *Statutes 136F.06* and *136F.30* and the proposed policy they are considering*.*

Counsel Olson said she understood the question to be whether the Board has the authority to adopt this kind of policy.

Chair Rice said in her opinion there is not a conflict between statute and Board policy. The Board previously delegated authority pertaining to academic program approval to the Chancellor and this amended policy does not change that.

Trustee Van Houten said if the Board is given legal advice that there is no conflict, then there will be, to some extent, legal protection that Trustees have endeavored to eliminate conflicts between the two.

Chair Rice asked if any other member of the committee had a concern regarding this issue. No other committee member shared a concern.

President Ramaley said *Minnesota Statutes 136F.06 Powers and Duties* states the Board will award appropriate certificates, diplomas and degrees, but conferring degrees is a function that has been delegated to presidents and that works well. She said she does not see a problem with the proposed policy amendment since it only strengths current policy and does not modify it.

A motion was made by Trustee Benson and seconded by Trustee Oliveira that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the amendment to Policy 3.36 Academic Programs. Trustee Van Houten called for a roll call vote. Trustees Rice, Benson, Englund, Oliveria and Sundin voted in favor of the motion. Trustee Van Houten voted against the motion. Motion carried.

4. **Mission Approval and Campus Profile: Northeast Higher Education District**

   Presenters:
   Sue Collins, President, Northeast Higher Education District
   Kenneth Simberg, Provost, Hibbing Community College and Rainy River Community College
   Mike Johnson, Provost, Itasca Community College
   Kathy Burlingame, Interim Provost, Mesabi Range Community and Technical College
   Shawn Bina, Provost, Vermilion Community College

   Board policy requires institutions to have their missions approved by the Board at least once every five years. Institutions also are asked to present campus profiles at this time.

   The Board of Trustees approved the creation of the Northeast Higher Education District (NHED) in 1999. Under this organizational model, the District serves as a governance structure for five independently-accredited colleges in rural northeast Minnesota.

   The District serves more than 4,600 full-year equivalent learners and covers approximately 13,000 square miles consisting of seven counties and many small communities. There is an estimated population of 328,320 in the region and compared to other regions, the District serves an economically disadvantaged population with poverty rates well above state averages.

   Over the past five years, enrollment in the District has seen a growth of 9 percent, an increase of 389 students. Students served by the District are primarily traditional-aged students and white. There is a fairly equal representation of men and women in the student population.

   President Collins said the District boasts an impressive track record of innovation. Examples include:

   - The Applied Learning Institute (ALI) began in 2007 with a legislative appropriate of $1 million. The District partnered with 17 charter member school districts and 26 high schools in launching the institute to renew career and technical education programming focused on the economic drivers of the region. Since its inception, it has awarded more than $3

million to member schools and colleges for programming and equipment. Enrollment has grown to more than 1,400 students.

- The District is a founding member of the Minnesota Center for Excellence in Manufacturing and Engineering (MnCEME). MnCEME serves industry as a first-contact resource for continuing education, emerging technology and workforce development. A new engineering education model – Iron Range Engineering – was established. In this model, MSU, Mankato partners with the District's colleges, businesses and industry to offer the third and fourth year of an engineering program with unique hands-on learning experiences.

- The colleges of the District work collaboratively to secure federal TRIO funding to better serve underrepresented students throughout the region, President Collins said. This grant funding, which totals over $2.67 million annually, provides support for promising practices.

- NHED colleges provided training through customized or continuing education to approximately 30,000 individuals during fiscal year 2011. Collectively, the colleges generate approximately $3 million annually in revenue through customized training.

- For over 20 years, the District has been a part of Arrowhead University to offer bachelor's and master's-level programming in business, education, psychology, nursing, criminal justice, engineering and management programs throughout the region. Partners include Bemidji State University, the College of St. Scholastica and the University of Minnesota-Duluth.

President Collins said NHED is striving to ensure future financial sustainability by maintaining structurally-balanced budgets and allocating resources to the highest priorities. They are focusing on improving overall operating efficiencies in order to stay current with revenue resources. The District's total revenues in fiscal year 2010 were $64 million and expenses were $59 million.

Each of the five District colleges boasts signature programs or "Centers of Distinction," President Collins said. They are:
- Electrical Maintenance, Law Enforcement and Nursing at Hibbing Community College;
- Engineering, Natural Resources, Applied Psychology and Education at Itasca Community College;
- Industrial Mechanical Technology, Welding and Process Automation at Mesabi Range Community and Technical College;
- Industrial Technology Maintenance and Nursing at Rainy River Community College;

- Wilderness Management, Fisheries and Wildlife Management, Natural Resource Technology, Forestry/Wildlife and Wildland/Wildlife Law Enforcement at Vermilion Community College.

Each provost offered a brief presentation on his or her college.

Hibbing Community College (HCC): Provost Ken Simberg
  - Hibbing Community College has a strong technical education focus. More than 20 technical programs at the college account for 55 percent of enrolled students. These programs provide direct pathways for entry into the workforce.
  - A leader in training for workforce development, HCC provides over 123,000 hours of occupational training annually to more than 600 businesses, and generates more than $1.5 million in annual revenue.
  - The college's law enforcement program provides skills training to more than 600 law enforcement officers in northeast Minnesota's Arrowhead Region through Arrowhead Region Law Enforcement Training.
  - The University of Minnesota dental clinic, housed on the HCC campus, offers dental services to community members who may be underinsured. Enhanced teaching and learning opportunities benefit University of Minnesota dental students and HCC dental assisting students through this partnership.

Itasca Community College (ICC): Provost Mike Johnson
  - ICC offers transfer preparation and career programs in a supportive learning community model that fosters retention and success. The college is a national model for learning communities on a small college campus.
  - The college's Engineering Program is nationally recognized for fostering student success in a residential living and learning community. The engineering retention rates exceed 70 percent at the two-year level. The bachelor's completion rate greatly exceeds the national average.
  - ICC has a strong history of partnership with local and regional industries and educational entities. Examples include an industry partnership with Minnesota Power, which resulted in a highly successful power generation program. Another successful partnership is with UPM/Kymenne-Blandin Paper Company, which now requires incumbent workers to obtain an ICC Pulp and Paper diploma as a condition of employment.
  - ICC serves as the Midwest Regional Leader under the National Center for Pulp and Paper Technology and Training.

Mesabi Range Community and Technical College (MRCTC): Interim Provost Kathy Burlingame
  - Campuses at Eveleth and Virginia serve 1,185 full-time enrolled students. The virtual campus offers 25 percent of the college's courses to learners.
  - The college offers several programs with area high schools which provide college credit to students. Areas of study include medical fields, welding, building trades, graphic arts, CAD and industrial mechanical technology. In 2010, MRCTC provided technical education opportunities to 17 high schools with 694 ALI registrations and 300 concurrent enrollment registrations. The college also

partners with seven high schools to offer courses in Trigonometry, College Algebra, Economics, College Writing, Chemistry, Physics and Human Biology.
- The college has a strong connection with business and industry and a significant amount of program equipment has come from donations. It is common for industry to come back and use the equipment for training. The college also has state-of-the-art simulation equipment, including an electronic mining shovel simulator donated by Bucyrus International, a world leader in the design and manufacture of mining equipment.

Rainy River Community College (RRCC): Provost Ken Simberg
- Located near the Canadian border, RRCC offers post-secondary education opportunities to this rural area where the next closest college campus is 100 miles away.
- The largest academic programs on campus include liberal arts and practical nursing. Unique programs include Green and Sustainable Construction and Industrial Technology (Maintenance).
- The college is working on the expansion of career and technical education programs to better serve the region. A new initiative is the Science and Math Education Program, which focuses on recruitment and retention of students preparing to become science and math educators.
- The College has a North America Immersion Grant. The educators and community work together to ensure the survival of the unique Ojibwe language and culture.

Vermilion Community College (VCC): Provost Shawn Bina
- Vermilion Community College has capitalized on its unique location and the area's abundance of natural resources to evolve into a residential two-year college which focuses on the niche areas of natural resource use and natural resource protection.
- VCC's unique mission and the fact that it is a residential college draws students from all over Minnesota and the Upper Midwest. In 2010, the VCC student body had graduates from over 220 different Minnesota high schools. About 50 percent of the student body is housed on campus and student housing restraints on student housing could challenge enrollment growth in the future.
- The college vision for the next five years is to further increase its distinction as a vital provider of education programming and career preparation in the natural resources and environmental areas. In 2010, VCC was one of only nine colleges in the country certified to offer Seasonal Park Law Enforcement Ranger Training. In partnership with the National Park Service, VCC trains seasonal park rangers, a critical initial career stop to becoming a full-time federal park ranger.

Trustee Van Houten noted that each of the five colleges maintains its own accreditation and asked President Collins if there has been any consideration given to going to one accreditation. That would be a cost-saving measure for the District, he pointed out.

President Collins said this was discussed as a part of the District's strategic planning efforts in 2009. However, it was determined that the culture and heritage of the Iron

Range favors autonomy and independence. The colleges are exploring shared resources and business services, and there is talk of developing an Arrowhead Institute of Technology which would work to consolidate the customized training services offered across the District, she said.

Trustee Benson moved and Trustee Englund seconded that the following five motions pertaining to Northeast Higher Education District be approved:

- *The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the request by Hibbing Community College to reaffirm its vision, mission, purposes, and awards as listed in the executive summary.*

- *The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the proposed vision, mission, purposes and awards of Itasca Community College as listed in the executive summary.*

- *The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the request by Mesabi Range Community and Technical College to reaffirm its vision, mission, purposes, and awards as listed in the executive summary.*

- *The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the vision, mission, purposes and awards of Rainy River Community College as listed in the executive summary.*

- *The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the request by Vermilion Community College to reaffirm its vision, mission, purposes and awards as listed in the executive summary.*

Motion carried.

5. Degree Credit Cap: Report

Session laws passed in 2007-2009 set caps on the number of credits for degrees in the system. The maximum number of credits required for a baccalaureate degree was set at 120 credits and for an associate degree at 60 credits. The law permits the Board of Trustees to grant waivers for specific degree programs in which industry or professional accreditation standards require a greater number of credits.

As of August 1, 2011, the system offered a total of 4,248 academic programs and of that number 4,014 programs (94 percent) were within credit length limits. The remaining 234 system programs (6 percent) exceeded credit length limits, but will be come into compliance by June 29, 2012.

Twenty-five waiver applications have been submitted. Of that number, 12 applications have been approved, one was withdrawn and 12 are under review.

The Degree Credit Cap Report has been sent to the Legislature as required by statute.

6. **Students First Update**

Presenter:
Mike Lopez, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Jonathan Eichten, Students First Director

Over the past few years, the system has been engaged in initiatives to improve students' experiences through the Students First initiative. The Graduation Planner is one project which is intended to provide students with an easy-to-use online tool that enables them to plot out their academic program, make changes along the way or try out different scenarios.

The graduation planning tool software update was received and installed in July. During the months of August and September, two campuses, North Hennepin Community College and Minnesota State University, Mankato, piloted the software.

Several concerns surfaced during the testing period:
- To adequately maintain the tool, campuses would need additional staffing and that may be difficult during times of tight budgets.
- Many students enroll in one or more courses in developmental education. While the software is able to handle very simplistic curriculum models of developmental education, the system has varied and very complex models of developmental education that the software is unable to support.
- Many students pursue both a major and a minor or are in multiple programs and it was found that the software is unable to provide a singular audit again the student's plan. Students would have to track multiple "roadmaps" which are prone to error and contrary to the project goal of providing a clear path to graduation.
- Many students have one or more exceptions to their major or program, such as courses exempted due to military experience or credit for prior learning. The software is able to consider these exemptions in the student plan only if the student had the exception approved prior to creating the plan. This could result in a student registering for courses that they don't need.
- Students expect technology to be fast. The overall performance was of great concern since in the Minnesota State University, Mankato pilot, the response time was on average three minutes when opening a roadmap.

Following the pilot testing, an assessment report was placed on the Students First website for review in October. Several groups, including a Students First Graduation Planner working group, student leaders and the Leadership Council,

reviewed and discussed the report. It was agreed that the system and its students would not receive an adequate return on investment with this software.

Students First Director Eichten said the system is still committed to the original goal of developing an academic planning tool for students that can respond to the diversity of needs in a dynamic environment.

Possible solutions which will be further developed and explored with the Leadership Council and other stakeholders are:

- Enhance the Degree Audit and Reporting Systems (DARS/u.achieve) with planning tools to enable students to:
  - Explore "what if scenarios" with majors/programs;
  - Enter planned courses into DARS/u.achieve so that students can create a customized academic plan;
  - Run a report that reflects their customized academic plan that includes transfer courses, completed courses and planned courses, by term;
  - Explore how to transfer options that could lead to a university degree.
- Explore connections to the GPS LifePlan to support student advising;
- Create an academic report that reflects students; future planned courses that can be used by faculty and administrators to improve curricular planning;
- Building on the GradUate Initiative that encourages degree completion.

Associate Vice Chancellor López said enhancements and development work will not begin until sometime after February 1 because the Information Technology Services puts a moratorium on campus deployment of new technology until after the start of a new semester.

Trustee Englund said he has used Graduation Planner and found it to be a great tool. He said the system should keep simplicity and the end user in mind during the development of its graduation planning tools.

The meeting adjourned at 2:48 pm
Respectfully submitted,
Margie Takash, Recorder

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 2011) 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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES IN TRANSFER AND MnSCU
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS</td></tr>
<tr><td align="center">Best Practice</td><td align="center">MnSCU Implementation of
Best Practice</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">STATEWIDE COLLABORATION</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>

Statewide standing committee focusing on multi-institution transfer and articulation
Involvement of faculty in policy development and implementation

</td>
<td>

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

</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">COMMUNICATION OF POLICIES</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>

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

</td>
<td>

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.

</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" align="center">ACADEMIC POLICIES</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>

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

</td>
<td>

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.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

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

Agenda Item: Bush Foundation Teacher Education Partnership

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

☒ Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda: Board of Trustees requested an update on the project which is now in Year 2.

Scheduled Presenter(s):
Steven Rosenstone, Chancellor
Earl Potter, President, St. Cloud State University
Judith Ramaley, President, Winona State University
Richard Davenport, President, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Ann Blackhurst, Provost, Minnesota State University Moorhead

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:
The goal the Bush Foundation established for increasing educational achievement is ambitious:
By 2020, we will increase by 50 percent the number of students in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, from pre-kindergarten through college, who are on track to earn a degree after high school, and eliminate disparities among diverse student groups.

Background Information:
The Bush Foundation committed $40 million over ten years to produce highly qualified and effective teachers. The selection and education of "Change Makers" to become P-12 teachers is viewed by the Bush Foundation as a key strategy in meeting that goal. Research shows that teacher effectiveness is strongly linked to student learning. Bush defines effectiveness as follows: *An effective teacher ensures that each child learns at least a year's worth of knowledge for every year spent in the classroom.* Four state universities – Minnesota State University, Mankato; Minnesota State University Moorhead, St. Cloud State University and Winona State University – were among the 14 institutors in MN, North Dakota and South Dakota to receive funding. The four state universities will provide an update on how this project has transformed teacher education.

INFORMATION ITEM
BUSH FOUNDATION TEACHER EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP

BACKGROUND

In 2010 four Minnesota State Universities joined a partnership with ten other institutions in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota funded by the Bush Foundation. The project called *Network for Excellence in Teaching (*NExT) represents a ten year commitment of the foundation and partner colleges to produce a cadre of highly effective teachers who will be able to dramatically improve student performance and eliminate disparities among diverse student groups. As a provider of half of Minnesota's teacher education graduates, the state universities are key to the partnerships success.

The goal of this Bush initiative is *to increase by 50 percent the number of students in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, from pre-kindergarten through college, who are on track to earn a degree after high school, and eliminate disparities among diverse student groups.*

Research shows that teacher effectiveness is the most important factor in the classroom for improving student performance and reducing the disparities among diverse student groups. That is why the strategies focus on **teacher effectiveness**, especially on reforming how teacher-preparation programs recruit, prepare, place and support the next generation of teachers. The Bush Foundation has committed $40 million over ten years to accomplish the following:

- Partner with higher-education institutions to transform teacher-preparation programs and to guarantee the effectiveness of the teachers they prepare.
- Recruit high-caliber students to pursue teaching.
- Engage with public officials to reform public policies that affect teacher quality.
- Launch innovative support programs for school leaders and teachers.

The focus of the presentation to the Board of Trustees will be on the first and second of these priorities. Representatives from Minnesota State University, Mankato; Minnesota State University Moorhead, St. Cloud State University and Winona State University will each describe the transformational nature of the work by focusing on one particular aspect of their program. A description of each university program as well as the overall NExT program that will provide trustees with additional context and background will be sent under separate cover. Ample time will be provided for trustee questions and discussion.

Increasing Educational Achievement

Increase by 50 percent the number of students in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota, from pre-kindergarten through college, who are on track to earn a degree after high school, and eliminate disparities among diverse student groups.

Over the next 10 years, Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota will need 25,000 new, effective teachers. To address this need, the Bush Foundation and 14 higher education institutions announced a partnership in 2009 focused on transforming teacher-preparation programs (see list on page 5) in those three states.

These 14 colleges and universities, working together as the Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT), have five key strategies:

- *Recruit* those most likely to succeed as effective teachers.
- *Prepare* them to be effective educators.
- *Place* them in schools led by leaders who will support them in those first critical years in the classroom.
- *Support* the new teachers on an ongoing basis after they graduate.
- *Measure* the effectiveness of their graduates through value-added assessment and other means.

"New teachers who enter classrooms with NExT training and support behind them will be the key to increasing educational achievement for students across the region," said Susan Heegaard, Bush Foundation vice president and Educational Achievement team leader. "Our courageous partners are changing the way they do their work to better serve the needs of their graduates and, ultimately, the P-12 students they teach."

Partners achieved progress in all five strategic areas in 2010. The stories on the following pages highlight just a few of their accomplishments.

TEACHERS MAKE A DIFFERENCE
Graduates from St. Cloud State University and teacher candidates from the University of Minnesota aim to increase educational achievement.

BUSH FOUNDATION

Preparing a Community

Faculty and administrators at the **University of Minnesota–Twin Cities** (UMN) spent 2010 overhauling their entire teacher preparation curriculum. "We didn't just tweak syllabi," said Lisa Jones, executive director of the Educator Development and Research Center in the College of Education and Human Development. "We rethought all of it."

Also crucial in creating new curriculum is breaking down the barriers that challenge most teacher-preparation programs. UMN's new curriculum is based on concepts that are broader than those historically used in the teaching profession—acknowledging the impact of racial and cultural diversity on learning, and embracing family and community

> *"We needed to get to every level to talk about what we were trying to do. This meant going to every department meeting, all college meetings, going to the school districts and scheduling meetings with superintendents."*
>
> **~ Becky Krystyniak, Ph.D., co-director of the Teacher Preparation Initiative, St. Cloud State University**

Key to the new curriculum is continuity, and the timeline of learning starts even before students arrive on campus. Over the summer of 2012, the first cohort of students who will be trained using the new curriculum will complete a teacher identity study—essentially an educational autobiography—that leads them through a series of reflections about their cultural experiences, values and attitudes about school, as well as their family life. "Students really get this idea—a grounding of where they come from and who they are," said Jones. "They recognize that their background will impact how they teach."

assets, for instance. Faculty, teaching staff and P-12 partners developed these concepts, what the college calls the "Eight Great Lessons," during a year-long process. "We wanted to identify what our students need to learn, as well as how they will use that learning in the field," said Jones. "We used to present courses in silos and thought students would make these types of connections automatically. This integrated approach makes the lessons more intentional and obvious for them." Students will be introduced to the concepts that comprise the lessons as they enter UMN, and continue to revisit them throughout

NEW CURRICULUM DRIVES TEACHER PREPARATION
Many voices are involved in redeveloping teacher training programs for all NExT partners, including higher ed faculty and students, as well as the teachers and students in P-12 partner districts.

their program. Jones believes the lessons will extend beyond UMN's teacher-preparation program and into graduates' teaching classrooms.

Faculty members at **St. Cloud State University** (SCSU) are also working to break down silos. "All of the teacher-education programs are housed within the college of education, but all secondary education programs also have additional content courses," said Becky Krystyniak, Ph.D., co-director of the Teacher Preparation Initiative at SCSU and chemistry professor. She acknowledges this can lead to "a struggle for ownership."

Krystyniak said, "We needed to get to every level to talk about what we were trying to do. This meant going to every department meeting, all college meetings, going to the school districts and scheduling meetings with superintendents." As the conversations started to happen, so did the changes. Now SCSU has five separate working groups with representation across SCSU colleges and from its P-12 partners. Besides improved communication and collaboration across silos, SCSU is now finding ways to implement two key recommendations from the working groups—a pronounced increase in clinical experiences at SCSU and more time for student teaching in the classroom.

"We're exploring where we're missing the boat in preparing our students," said Krystyniak. "If our P-12 partners tell us that something we taught didn't stick, we're now finding ways to teach it differently." ◼

EDUCATION PARTNERSAND MEMBERS OF THE NETWORK FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (NExT)

Minnesota State University, Mankato
University of Minnesota–Twin Cities
St. Cloud State University
University of South Dakota
Winona State University

Valley Partnership
   Minnesota State University Moorhead
   North Dakota State University
   Valley City State University
Twin Cities Teacher Collaborative
   Augsburg College
   Bethel University
   Concordia University, St. Paul
   Hamline University
   St. Catherine University

BUSH FOUNDATION

courageous LEADERSHIP / *sustainable* SOLUTIONS / *vital* COMMUNITIES

36

MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, MANKATO

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Innovative | Effective | Collaborative | Relevant

Minnesota State University, Mankato NExT Project

Project Summary

The teacher education unit is implementing a new program designed to create pipelines of strong candidates by identifying, involving, mentoring, and advising increasingly diverse candidates with great potential in middle schools, high schools, community colleges, our university, and other career pathways.

Our program's vision involves 2 years of school experience, with nearly all teacher preparation instruction in the schools, taught by teams of master teachers and university faculty, and focused on the real instructional needs of K-12 learners for whom the candidates have responsibility. The candidates will serve on sustained instructional teams, deploying instruction as a team, with increasingly sophisticated responsibilities as they are taught more about teaching. This teamed model of instruction will improve the school's effectiveness in generating K-12 student learning, and will increase the productive use of data to improve instruction. We are working with eight schools districts currently and are launching additional suburban and urban partnership sites over the next two years. In addition, all candidates will experience a minimum of 6 weeks of uniquely divergent field experience (urban, international, etc.) to shift perspective while building resilience and resourcefulness.

We will guarantee the effectiveness of our graduates, follow graduates with three years of professional development and mentoring, and will monitor their success with E-12 learners. Content courses (our teacher education candidates take at minimum the same major requirements as majors who do not plan to teach) will be taught on line and after school responsibilities each day. We have constructed and launched a data system that will include high quality performance assessments and surveys as well as growth and value-added E-12 student learning data for candidates and graduates. Predictive studies will allow informed refinement of our programs.

Early Achievements

- **Focus on Quality**
  Partner superintendents have validated, within the first eighteen months of the project, the level of impact Mankato candidates and graduates have on their students' academic achievement and have noted the success that the Co-teaching model, as a singular strategy, has brought to their entire school communities – not only impacting our candidates success but also career-level teachers as well through high quality professional development that accompanies the Co-teaching model.

- **Focus on Diversity**
  Our project set an ambitious target of 25% candidates of color within our teaching pool by the project's close in 2020. In 2009, 2.9% of our students enrolled in teacher preparation were from diverse backgrounds – in 2011, the metric has shifted to 6.9%. Our recruitment strategies are showing fruit, and all though we are still a long way from achieving our percentage goal, we are very encouraged.

Key Statistics

First Enrolled Students: Fall 2010
First Graduates Teaching: Fall 2014
First Effectiveness Data: Fall 2015
2009 Proposed Education Program
Annual Graduates: 700
Grant Awarded: $4.75 million 2010-2014 for program transformation; $1.5 million available for deemed "guaranteed graduates" at 2017 and 2020 checkpoints.
P-12 Public School Partner Districts (54 sites): Bloomington, Faribault, Mankato, LeSueur-Henderson, Owatonna, St. Peter, Sibley East, and Waseca

Project Components

Recruitment
- Creation of the Maverick Teacher Recruitment Center to facilitate and manage efforts in partnership with community colleges and P-12 schools
- Established a goal that 25 percent of its prospective teachers be students of color

Preparation
- Exposure to diverse settings (regionally, nationally, and internationally) for a minimum of 6 weeks
- Field work integration with content courses and class schedules
- Co-teaching field experience and student teaching model
- "Just-in-Time" instruction allowing reflection and feedback immediately after relevant classroom experience

Placement
- To ensure its graduates' success, Minnesota State Mankato will partner with P-12 schools that fully support new teacher development and will develop a shared vision and responsibility for these teachers. These efforts include jointly developed strategic plans that identify short-, medium-, and long-term employment needs by subject
- PDS Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Alliance (first P-20 AVID partnership in the nation)

Support
- Mankato's Center for Mentoring and Induction will significantly increase the availability of its quality services to all districts, delivering skilled mentors individually matched with each program graduate
- National partnership with New Teacher Center

Assessment & Research
- Development of high caliber data system to interface candidate performance data and K-12 student achievement data
- Minnesota State Mankato chosen as host institution/grant recipient to enhance the capacity of the higher education partners at the MnSCU campuses to collect, compile, and analyze data of the NExT initiative

MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY. MANKATO

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Innovative | Effective | Collaborative | Relevant

Minnesota State University, Mankato NExT Project

Transformation Milestones – The First 18 Months

- **RECRUITMENT:** Hiring of full-time Maverick Teacher Recruitment Coordinator; establishment of a targeted recruitment fund for teacher candidates of color within the College of Education; establishment of Teachers-of-Tomorrow Club; and development of teacher recruitment partnerships with 2-year Community Colleges.
- **PREPARATION (Curriculum Redesign):** Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA*) - digital module development to support candidates and faculty along with curriculum alignment to TPA; Minnesota Teacher Licensure Exam (MTLE) candidate support – test strategies, tutoring, advocacy, and data analysis; Shared Wiki among University teacher education faculty (Content-area and KSP faculty specifically) - lesson design, theorists, technology, and academic literacy; creation of Advising Maps; development of Professional Learning Teams with K-12 Faculty.
  - ***TPA** – Minnesota State Mankato was an "early adopter University" within the TPA Accelerated States consortium led by Stanford University. All candidates in student teaching participate in this formative assessment tool of teaching effectiveness, while University faculty and supervisors are receiving intensive professional development for the support of candidates during their TPA task-experiences. Support includes online resources and training modules for students and teachers. These online tools were developed by Minnesota State Mankato faculty and P-12 partner educators as one component of our curriculum redesign efforts.
  - **Market-driven program options in development/pending approval:**
    - ABS licensure (Special Education)
    - STEM certificate (Elementary)
    - Middle-school endorsements to initial licensure (Elementary):
      - Science
      - Mathematics
      - Communication/Arts/Literature
- **PREPARATION (Field Experiences):** Co-teaching model within student teaching/capstone experience - 16 week experiences (70% co-teaching, 30% solo-teaching); Expanded duration field experiences within the semesters of methodology coursework (i.e.: elementary education majors spend a minimum of 4 weeks, full-day experiences during the 3 semesters PRIOR to student teaching); Long-term field placement options – Teacher candidates placed in same field site for both their final pre-service experience semester and student teaching experience semester – in essence, one academic year in same K-12 site ("deep roots" for greater impact on K-12 student achievement). Approximately 20% of candidates are participating in the long-term field placement option within its second semester of offering; expanded international placement options that now include formalized partnerships with Universities in Australia, Costa Rica, and the United Arab Emirates.
- **PLACEMENT:** Expansion of Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships to the Twin Cities – CSUP at 7700 France - including the formation of beginning partnerships with Bloomington, Inver Grove Heights, and Shakopee Public Schools; scaling of the Teacher-on-Special-Assignment / Graduate Teaching Fellowship Program (resource/personnel sharing between University and PDS Districts) encompassing professional development (supervision, mentoring, PDS advancement, and leadership), delivered through Integrated Field Services (IFS); development of the AVID Alliance with 6 PDS Districts (AVID is a college readiness system. The mission is to close the achievement gap by preparing all students for college readiness and success in a global society. As part of the collaboration, Mankato students, many of them teacher candidates, will be trained as AVID tutors, and conduct tutorials in the AVID classrooms in the partner districts.)
- **SUPPORT:** Articulation of comprehensive induction components and systems; engagement locally, regionally, and nationally via: local Mentor Network, State-wide Bush Mini-Summit (facilitator), and New Teacher Center Partnership; and establishing a seamless continuum of "support" (i.e. Mentoring & Induction) that begins in pre-service education through career-level support in partnership with P-12 schools. Minnesota State Mankato is finalizing a partnership between the New Teacher Center (UC-Santa Cruz) and our own Center for Mentoring & Induction to move this innovative continuum forward – this partnership is a significant "value-add" to our recruited teacher candidates as a "culture of mentoring" becomes part of pre-service experiences as opposed to traditional models that reserve mentoring/induction for in-service teachers only.
- **ASSESSMENT & RESEARCH:** Formation of the "new" COE Assessment Committee comprised of faculty representatives from each department in the College involved in licensure. The group was charged with assisting their departments in gathering, analyzing and/or accessing relevant data regarding program effectiveness and candidate competence; building of a data system and hiring of a Research System's Liaison; formation of a faculty group to study best practices for improving growth along a continuum of intercultural competence via The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI); Minnesota State Mankato chosen as host institution/grant recipient to enhance the capacity of the higher education partners at the MnSCU campuses to collect, compile, and analyze data of the NExT initiative.

For More Information

Ginger L. Zierdt, Ph.D.   (507) 389-5444 | ginger.zierdt@mnsu.edu
Director, Center for School-University Partnerships   Project Director, Minnesota State Mankato NExT

MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
MOORHEAD™

In the fall of 2009, Minnesota State University Moorhead (MSUM), North Dakota State University and Valley City State University teamed up to form the Valley Partnership. The purpose of this partnership is to allow these three Universities to work collaboratively, while still retaining our separate identities and unique specialties, to prepare teachers for our region. In 2010, the Valley Partnership was awarded 5.1 million dollars to transform teacher education over a ten-year period.

At MSUM, this transformation ultimately will impact over 1,000 elementary education pre-service teachers, many of whom will remain in the Valley following graduation. The central emphasis of our work in teacher preparation is to focus candidates' attention and skills on the impact their teaching has on student learning. In order to do this, we have revised existing courses and added new courses to create a strong focus on making instructional decisions based on formal and informal assessment. We also infused the majority of our special education standards into the coursework so that candidates will be able to add a special education licensure to their elementary degree with ease.

In addition to curriculum changes, we have fine-tuned our field experiences. Rather than place students all over the region, we now cluster students in schools for each field experience. The instructors of the complementary courses go to the sites and reinforce what candidates are learning in the classroom. Additionally, university liaisons are onsite daily, working with the cooperating teachers and candidates to ensure that the intended outcomes of each experience are realized. MSUM currently works extensively with six partner schools. The administrators and classroom teachers of the schools have been overwhelmingly positive about this new approach.

This close mentorship does not end with graduation. During the first three years of teaching, our graduates will receive follow-up and support from MSUM faculty via one-to-one communication, discussion groups with peers, and/or our technology portal.

If you would like more information, please visit www.teachers2be.org.

Early Achievements

MSUM hosts "Connecting Theory to Practice: Embedded Field Experiences" forum with university faculty, K-12 administrators and teachers to discuss embedded field experiences. Roundtable visits are very beneficial to develop embedded field experience logistics and protocols for MSUM preparation program, university supervisors, K-12 administrators and teachers. Approximately 50 faculty, administrators and teachers participated in this forum.

MSUM begins work on STL restructuring to integrate Bush grant initiatives into teacher preparation program organization framework. Restructuring process brings forward needs for additional faculty and program realignment to include embedded field experiences and increased collaboration between IHE and K-12 schools.

MSUM places first University Liaisons in Ellen Hopkins Elementary in Moorhead, Minnesota, Bennett Elementary in Fargo, North Dakota and Glyndon Elementary in Glyndon, Minnesota in pilot project to supervise candidates in student teaching and practicum experiences.

MSUM partners with NDSU to offer first co-teaching training event in Fargo, North Dakota facilitated by Dr. Nancy Bacharach and Dr. Teresa Heck from St. Cloud State University. Training is attended by approximately 35 Minnesota service area administrators and teachers.

MSUM Liaison program is expanded to include S.G. Reinertsen Elementary in Moorhead.

MSUM Elementary Inclusive Education (EIE) Program is approved by the Minnesota Board of Teaching

MSUM STL hosts an art show in partnership with service area K-12 schools to "Celebrate the Art of Teaching Through Art." K-12 students are asked to describe their perspectives about teaching through art which is displayed in MSUM STL and juried by the MSUM Art Department. Activity provides K-12 classroom teachers and MSUM faculty opportunities to visit with teacher candidates and K-12 students about the importance of teaching and teacher education.

MSUM pilots common assessment of student teaching and exit survey prepared in collaboration with NDSU and VCSU field experiences cross-institutional work group. Results are evaluated and reported for revisions in developing final assessments in 2011-2012.

MSUM hosts "Focus on Effectiveness" assessment conference at Moorhead High School for approximately 100 service area administrators and teachers to provide training in the integration and use of assessments in K-12 curriculum. Presenters included Mike Schmoker, Larry Ainsworth and Kent Pekel.

MSUM STL partners with Detroit Lakes Public School District students enrolled in future educator's cohort curriculum track to provide preparation program exploratory activities.

MSUM works together with newly hired data systems architect to develop program area electronic data records site for common storage of teacher preparation information. Site will facilitate Mac and PC communications and will provide a much needed common record-keeping option regardless of changes in programs or personnel. Site will also facilitate learning connections between self-study programs, NCATE, Bush Grant and other work in various strands of the Grant Initiative.

MSUM University Liaison Program is expanded to include McKinley, Lincoln and Jefferson Elementary Schools in Fargo and Robert Asp Elementary in Moorhead.

Plans are developed to bring secondary and K-12 program on board with Bush Grant.

MSUM implements common assessment for student teaching with revisions. Common assessment entry survey is administered to all Education 205 (Introduction to Education) students in STL Program.
MSUM surveys all prospective students attending Dragon Days exploratory visits about their interest in Teaching and Learning and MSUM teacher preparation program.

Elementary Inclusive Education (EIE) program is fully implemented with addition of third phase of program. EIE program faculty initiate plans to implement student advisory group.

Teacher Preparation Initiative

St. Cloud State University

Project Summary: St. Cloud State University (SCSU) will strengthen its teacher preparation program through a strong, active collaboration with Arts and Science faculty, Education faculty, and P-12 school districts and communities. Together we are exploring many initiatives, including but not limited to co-teaching, diverse and numerous clinical experiences, and strong P--16 partnerships in the four areas of teacher preparation: Recruit, Prepare, Place and Support. The Teacher Preparation Initiative (TPI) was created to spearhead teacher preparation reform at SCSU.

The Teacher Preparation Initiative (TPI) was created to lead this work at SCSU. The vision of a teacher graduating from St. Cloud State University is of a candidate who along with having a deep understanding of their core content area and pedagogy, will also have developed pedagogical content knowledge, will be able to use assessment and technology to successfully promote the learning of content and 21st Century skills as well as meeting the social/emotional needs of ALL students. The ideal teacher from SCSU will also have operational knowledge and skills to support the improvement of P-12 student achievement and on closing the achievement gap. TPI currently has over 125 University and P-12 participants on five different Working Groups and a Task Force that are investigating and making recommendations regarding best practices for teacher preparation and support to achieve this vision.

P-16 Partnerships

The Teacher Preparation Initiative has 6 partner districts that are actively involved with the work of the initiative. The districts include: Holdingford, Monticello, ROCORI, Sartell – St. Stephen, Sauk Rapids – Rice , and St. Cloud Area.

Working Groups

The Teacher Preparation Initiative represents an attempt to transform all teacher preparation programs from the ground up, with as many stakeholders as possible. Our approach is to create Working Groups, which include faculty, staff and administrators from across the University and P-12 school districts. The members of all Working Groups represent existing structures (departments, offices, committees, schools, licensure areas, etc.) to provide a communication bridge, provide a structure for sustainability, and not duplicate existing efforts.

Program Information:

First Enrolled Students at SCSU: Fall 2012

First Graduates Teaching: Fall 2016

First Effectiveness Data: Spring 2018

Annual Graduates: 375

New Teacher Preparation Program Components:

University-wide involvement: Our program will be integrated and university wide. We are making changes not only to courses within the teacher preparation program but also to the liberal education program. For example, we are recommending the incorporation of national technology standards (ISTE-NETS) into our general education courses across the university.

P-12 Partnerships: We are working in strong partnership with P-12 teachers and administrators. We have participants from 6 districts that are actively involved on all of our Working Groups and are shaping the direction of our new preparation program. While we have always had partnerships with P-12, these new relationships are deeper, more focused, and directly involve P-12 teachers, staff and administration.

Co-Teaching: We are changing how our curriculum will be delivered. We will be expanding our nationally recognized co-teaching approach from student teaching to our courses. We anticipate that students will take courses that are co-taught by a combination of SOE faculty, content faculty, and P-12 teachers.

Focus on Recruitment: SCSU has never intentionally recruited students into teaching. We are now planning to offer scholarships for targeted populations and areas of study (STEM, ELL, SPED, Teachers of Color). We have also created Future Educators Clubs at SCSU and in our 6 partner districts and will kick off in Fall 2012. We are also actively marketing our Teacher Education Program, including an upcoming ad in "Seventeen" magazine this Spring.

Common Education Core: We are investigating a new Educational Foundations core that will be taken by all students regardless of their intended license. Currently there are four different introductory courses, with students having little interaction with folks pursuing licenses outside of their own (elementary, CFS, SPED, secondary).

Induction and Support: Currently we do not have any infrastructure in place to support the induction of our teacher candidates after they graduate into their classrooms. The Support Working Group (university faculty, induction and mentoring experts, as well as P-12 teachers and administrators) is working on identifying an integrated and collaborative model of 3-year support for new teachers. This model will build on the current programs in place at our P-12 partner districts and investigate ways to share resources across districts and with the University.

Assessment: We have adopted the ILAT Passport system for collecting, analyzing and reporting data regarding our teacher candidates for program improvement. We will also be able to use this system for analyzing pupil value-added assessment data to support the effectiveness of our teacher graduates. We have also created an Assessment Director position for the Teacher Education Unit and are in the midst of a national search.

Guiding Principles for Curricular Reform

We are utilizing input from our stakeholders and the research regarding preparation needs and have developed guiding principles for our new program:

- A partnership in teaching, learning, research and assessment to prepare and retain P12 teachers through closer, ongoing, amicable and mutually-respectful connection between university and P12 faculty and students.
- A strong social justice model that addresses achievement gaps, connects educational practice to the community and family and promotes equal access to a high quality P12 education for all students.
- Formative and supported educational field experiences with collaboration between college and P-12 faculty with the student candidate from pre-service through in-service practice extending into three years of employment.
- Programs developed iteratively with formative feedback from college and P-12 faculty and students.
- A theory and evidence based model with clear foundations in research and assessment that leads to improving P12 student achievement and simultaneous renewal of P16 programs.
- Strong rigorous content knowledge and pedagogical preparation for teacher candidates.
- Enhancement of global and cultural competencies in the preparation of teachers, as well as the development of skills and training for working in demographically, linguistically, and culturally diverse classrooms.

Contact Us:

Rebecca Krystyniak, Co-Director

rakrystyniak@stcloudstate.edu

Gabriela J. Silvestre, Co-Director

Gjsilverstre@stcloudstate.edu

TPI Website:

www.stcloudstate.edu/tpi

Sustainability –University Commitment

In order to be successful, the changes to teacher preparation must be sustainable beyond the grant itself. We are making major organizational changes to teacher preparation as well as in the University existing structures. For example, TPI assessment components are part of the evaluation and assessment within the SOE's programs. A new teacher support structure is being developed through the New Teacher Meetings created and sustained by TPI. The enhancement and increment of clinical experiences for all teacher candidates is being designed and will be implemented from next academic year.

Governance Structure for Teacher Preparation: We are changing the organizational structure of the governance of teacher preparation. We have developed a new group called the SCSU TEAC – Teacher Education Advisory Council that consists of representatives from all of the teacher licensure areas, as well as additional representatives from centers that support teacher preparation (Student services, Office of field experiences). We will also have P-12 representation on this group. In addition, we are planning to expand the executive decision making beyond the Dean of the School of Education, to include all of the Deans across the institution as well as three Superintendents through a Teacher Education Executive Council (TEEC). This helps to sustain the university–wide focus of the program and the P-12 partnership component. Finally, we will also be working with our P-12 partners to develop an advisory council that consists of P-12 staff development personnel that will provide a communication avenue back to districts, and provide representatives to TEAC.

University Reorganization: As part of the University reorganization, a Center for secondary education and research was envisioned. We are working to identify ways to expand the functionality of this center to be a hub for teacher professional development, outreach, assessment, and to continue the collaboration of faculty across the university and with our partner districts. We strongly believe that the organizational structure of the Teacher Preparation Initiative (TPI) will morph into the leadership of this Center. Also through the University reorganization a new School of Education was developed to focus solely on teacher preparation. There will be a reallocation of resources to support new ideas and initiatives that promote effective teaching. One such resource is a new Office of Student Services in the School of Education that focuses on supporting students through the progress of their license, including the Minnesota Teacher Licensure Exams (MTLE), developing the new assessment system for tracking student progress through their programs (ILAT), and other licensure requirements.

44

Winona State University, Teach21 Project

funded by the Archibald Bush Foundation: Network for Excellence in Teaching (NExT)

Project Summary

Teach21 is the name we've given to the Bush-funded trans- formations of our teacher education programs and the process in which we are engaged. It is predicated on our Statement of Core Beliefs, that we exist to prepare "*professionals to continuously improve Birth-to-Grade 12 student learning in twenty-first century schools*." **Our partnerships with B-12 professionals are central to how we plan, implement, lead and establish accountabilities for Teach 21**.

Essential elements of our Teach21 model include:

Early and often instructionally integrated clinical experience for candidates

Candidate cohorts designed to support (a) integrated instruction and (b) sustained field projects

The co-teaching model of student teaching

Cognitive Coaching

Authentic and reflective assessment (including Value Added [VARC], Common Metrics [NExT] and Teacher Performance Assessment [MDE])

Integration of distinctly WSU resources for teacher education, including our Wellness and the National Child Protection Training Centers.

Early Achievements

In year 2, faculty engaged in creating both opportunities and resources for faculty members to work together at developing innovations and improvements in: Instruction, Clinical Experience, Recruitment & Admission, Advising, Assessment & Data Management and more. In doing so, we:

- adopted a Conceptual Framework and Core Beliefs Statement,
- developed a theory of change,
- introduced a model of collaboration among University cohort instructors,
- engaged in two extensive curriculum retreats,
- established new recruitment strategies and admissions policies,
- examined current advising structures and processes,
- developed the Teach21 identity and logo,
- adopted co-teaching and cognitive coaching as essential program components,
- expanded instructional technology resources,
- provided important professional development for teachers in the Winona Area Public Schools new STEM K-4 Options Program,
- supported Unit members' participation in professional development programs,
- designed and implemented a new Assessment Fellows program to lead change through assessment, and
- launched a second cohort of candidates in Winona and a new cohort in Rochester

Key Statistics

First Enrolled Students: Fall 2010
First Graduates Teaching: Fall 2014
First Effectiveness Data: Fall 2015
Annual Graduates: 240
Grant Awarded: $3.5 million 2010-2014 for program transformation; $540,000 available for deemed "guaranteed graduates" at 2017 and 2020 checkpoints.
B-12 Public School Partner Districts (46 sites): Winona, LaCrescent-Hokah, Rochester and Austin.

"Charge Statements" of select Teach21 Project Teams

Recruitment
Develop and guide the implementation of a recruitment plan to attract highly qualified, learner centered teacher leaders into the Bush Foundation cohorts in Winona and in Rochester, with an eye toward increasing diversity in the teaching profession, recommending holistic admission procedures, focusing efforts on high demand teaching areas in the region, building partnerships with promising feeder schools and building a foundation for successful and sustained relationships with entering students.

Preparation
Collaboratively develop, provide leadership to, and continuously improve a process that broadly engages University and field partners in designing and delivering a coherent instructional strategy, including an integrated course sequence that is both supportive of and supported by clinical practice. This model will challenge and intentionally prepare pre-service teachers to effectively meet the needs of the 21st century P-12 learner in an increasingly interconnected, diverse and global society.

Placement
Create a triadic relationship between the University/Unit, beginning teachers and B-12 schools, by building *B*-12 placement partnerships that offer graduates with the opportunity for placement in districts and teaching positions that provide professional development support specific to the needs of beginning teachers.

Support
Co-develop and implement induction programs that support beginning teachers' development as effective educators who are able to ensure that their B-12 students are achieving at least one year's academic growth in one year's time. Utilize continuous improvement tools and assessments of the beginning teachers' experiences, growth and performance that inform both pre-service in induction programs.

Assessment
Develop and provide leadership to an assessment and data management system for the Teach21 project.

Transformation Milestones- The First 18 Months

RECRUITMENT:
- First Bush Cohort (43 candidates) selected from those who submitted early application to WSU
- Recruitment Team hires marketing consultant who facilitates design process for WSU's logo and identity (Teach21) as well as a marketing and communications plan
- Recruitment Team designed an application to Teach21 process
- Recruitment Team designed and lead new candidate admissions process for Teach21 applicants, reviewed 43 applications, accepted 30 candidates for Cohort II.

PREPARATION (CURRICULM REDESIGN):
- Rochester curriculum redesign process (started in 2008) proposed for University approval
- 1st Bush Cohort arrived and began new sequence of cohorted courses, including early clinical experience; content included required seminars offered by the National Child Protection Training Center (NCPTC) as well as wellness experiences
- Instructional Planning and Design Team held 1 week-long retreat in February focused on curriculum redesign (B12 partner district representatives, Unit faculty and candidates participated in the retreat) and included video conference with Linda Darling Hammond, with follow-up sessions in March, April, and May

- Preparation for Cohort II ensued on Winona campus; redesigned curriculum for Rochester vetted and approved as a one-time course offering for Fall 2011; Rochester preparation for its Cohort I ensued
- Winona Area Public Schools (WAPS) announced plans to open STEM option at Jefferson Elementary School; members of the Science, Math, and Education Department faculty met regularly and collaboratively provided professional development needed

PREPARATION (FIELD EXPERIENCE):

- Clinical Experience and Student Teaching Team designed a Continuum of Clinical Practice proposal based on research and evidence (including the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report)
- Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) in one B-12 partner district began teaching methods courses on site in a district school classroom
- 10 trainees (B-12 partner district representatives and Unit faculty) participated in Co-Teaching training. All attendees unanimously agreed to bring Co-Teaching to WSU as capstone student teaching model

PLACEMENT:

- Director of Community Partnerships and Development (a TOSA) hired; work in serving as a bridge between University and area school districts began
- Collaboratively designed professional development workshops offered to newly hired STEM teachers, as well as other area teachers; ongoing support of the Science faculty is offered and accepted by STEM teachers in WAPS district.
- First Teach21 Leadership Summit held; 75 people (B-12 partner district representatives, WSU faculty, administrators and students) in attendance; focus of Summit is partnership and shared responsibility for teacher preparation
- Co-Teaching and Cognitive Coaching approved by Education Department and Unit faculty; 10 Co-Teaching pairs formed and trained for Spring 2012 Co-Teaching pilot
- Letter of Agreement (LOA) approved by WAPS and WSU at all levels; anticipate LOAs with other partner districts to follow

SUPPORT:

- Career Placement and Induction Team established focus on pre-service and in-service partnerships
- Team members attended induction conferences
- Team lead participated in MN Induction Network meetings

ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH:

- VARC visit with review of district data occurred
- Examined and redesigned comprehensive Unit Assessment System (UAS)
- Assessment Capacity Grant awarded by Bush Foundation; Assessment Fellows began Professional Development
- TPA training, protocols developed and began

For More Information

Carrie Brouse Ph.D. Assistant Dean for Teach21 Project Administration; (507)457-2447; cbrouse@winona.edu
Hank Rubin Ph.D. Dean of Education at Winona State University; (507)457-5570; hrubin@winona.edu