

TRANSFER SUCCESS SUMMIT

February 18-19, 2008

**Co-sponsored by
the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
and
The University of Texas System**

REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Division of Academic Affairs & Research
June 2008**

**This report is available on the Coordinating Board web site at:
www.thecb.state.tx.us/Events/TransferSuccessSummit**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Report and Recommendations.....	6
Major Emergent Themes.....	8
Next Steps.....	9
Follow-Up.....	12
Appendices	
A. Summary of the Contents of the Resource Binders Provided to Participants	14
1. Surveys of Transfer Student Success Initiatives	
2. Joint Statement on the Transfer and Award of Credit	
3. THECB 2006 Report on an Automatic Admission Policy	
4. THECB 2001 Report of the Transfer Issues Advisory Committee Southern Regional Education Board 2007 Report: Clearing Paths to College Degrees: Transfer Policies in SREB States	
5. Handel, S.J. (2007). Second Chance, Not Second Class: A Blueprint for Community-College Transfer. <i>Change</i> , September/October, 38-45.	
6. Flaga, C.T. (2006). The Process of Transition for Community College Transfer Students. <i>Community College Journal of Research and Practice</i> , 30, 3-19.	
7. IPKIT: Improving Practitioner Knowledge to Increase Transfer	
8. Annotated Bibliography of Research and Research-related Literature on College Student Transfer 2002-2007	
9. Texas in Comparison to National Data	
10. Institute for the Study of Transfer Students	
11. Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors (CPUPC) Draft Reports on Transfer Practices Surveys	
B. Discussion Groups and Recommendations.....	18
C. Summit Agenda	34
D. Structure and Summary of the Summit	37
E. Roster of Summit Attendees	40

REPORT on the TRANSFER SUCCESS SUMMIT

Executive Summary

The summit provided an opportunity for the chief executive officers of Texas college and universities, and their governing boards, to focus their attention on an element of undergraduate education that is crucial to the overall success of the state's higher education plan, *Closing the Gaps by 2015*. Co-sponsored by the Coordinating Board and the University of Texas System, the summit drew about 150 chancellors and presidents together to define issues, identify opportunities, and suggest strategies for improving the transfer success of students across Texas. The summit participants affirmed that the state could facilitate those improvements, support both system and institutional initiatives, and foster the cultivation of a "Culture of Transfer" on college and university campuses that would help students "Know How to Go" in the same way the Go Campaign has increased the "college-going culture" throughout Texas.

The participants divided into discussion groups to address important questions, issues, or problems affecting transfer success. Each group was co-facilitated by a college president and a university president (or their direct designees). The discussions focused on these areas:

- Advising and Counseling
- Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses
- Student Engagement and Success
- Financial Aid
- Developmental Education and College Readiness
- Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention

Some of the discussions yielded formal recommendations, while others offered a rich harvest of issues ripe for further investigation and action. Topics of interest in one discussion group often surfaced in other groups. A number of recurring themes emerged across all the discussion groups. They included:

- Data Collection and Usability;
- Advising and Counseling;
- Financial Aid;
- Accountability and Performance;
- Inter-Institutional Relationships;
- Adult and Non-Traditional Students; and
- Dual Credit Concerns.

Coordinating Board staff concurs with the findings and recommendations of the discussion groups. The proceedings of the groups are summarized with discussion points and recommendations in the appendices to this report. Some of the most important recommendations sampled from the various discussion groups include:

- Implement a state-wide electronic degree audit system or unofficial common transcript (prescribed common course numbers) at all institutions (similar to the Course Applicability System);
- Re-evaluate existing measurements or accountability systems to appropriately distribute recognition for shared success;
- Create a separate metric that takes transfer students into consideration for graduation rates;
- Re-evaluate the Texas Core Curriculum, including a re-evaluation of the statutory requirement for Government and History, and revisions of the Exemplary Educational Objectives of the Core Component Areas;
- Add a release authorization to the Common Transfer Application to facilitate the post-transfer award of associate degrees;
- Convene regional articulation councils or conferences for advisors;
- Fund academic advising centers and secure special funding to explore the effectiveness of different advising models;
- Conduct a study comparing the performance of dual credit students to the overall college student population in the same courses;
- Specify learning outcomes for lower-division courses, especially those courses that are most frequently taught as dual credit courses, to ensure rigor and consistent quality;
- Create new mechanisms for delivering accelerated degree programs that will allow adult students to quickly complete their degrees;
- Assure that basic student and institutional needs are met before incentive funding is distributed;
- Identify financial aid best practices with statewide discussion on issues and solutions;
- The guarantee of financial aid should follow the successful transfer student.

Guided by Raymund A. Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education, and David B. Prior, Executive Vice Chancellor of the University of Texas System, the Summit featured presentations by Edwin R. Massey, President of Indian River Community College, Florida, and Mark B. Rosenberg, Chancellor of the State University System of Florida, as well as remarks from the Honorable Geanie W. Morrison, Texas House of Representatives and Chair, House Higher Education Committee. John N. Gardner,

Executive Director, and Betsy O. Barefoot, Co-Director and Senior Scholar, from the Policy Center on the First Year of College, Brevard, North Carolina gave the concluding presentation of the summit.

Follow-up to the Transfer Success Summit has been prompt and comprehensive. In addition to this report, a web site has been created to provide resources to the leadership that attended the event.

[\[http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/events/transfersuccesssummit\]](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/events/transfersuccesssummit)

Update reports have been offered to the Academic Excellence and Research Committee of the Coordinating Board, as well as to the Coordinating Board itself (April 23 and 24, 2008). Some of the discussion group leaders and key members of the Summit planning committee reconvened at the Coordinating Board offices on August 1, 2008, with the goal of prioritizing items for action through legislative, state policy, or institutional and system means. Several projects are in progress as follow-up to the Summit, including:

- reviving the Transfer Success Advisory Committee;
- creating a “tips for transfer” pop-up window for the online ApplyTexas transfer application;
- creating a handbook for transfer students; and
- considering a special award category in the STAR Awards recognizing outstanding student transfer programs.

Additional long-term initiatives may include:

- Align advising and related student services to increase transfer success, using the vertical teams model currently in use through P-16 Councils for curricular alignment and College Readiness Standards (CRS) development, and including representatives of public schools, colleges, and universities.
- Identify successful transfer bridge programs and extend or strengthen them.
- Initiate a formal investigation of the legal limits of the federal Family Educational Right to Privacy Act (1974), in order to facilitate the awarding of associate degrees even after a student has transferred, through "reverse transfer" mechanisms.
- Step up enforcement of the statewide transferable core curriculum statutes and rules, and promote wider use of the existing transfer dispute procedures.
- Revisit First Year Experience courses and Learning Framework courses, especially determining appropriate ways for colleges and universities to offer these courses to students.

**REPORT on the
TRANSFER SUCCESS SUMMIT**

February 18-19, 2008

**Co-sponsored by
the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board,
and
The University of Texas System,**

The objective of the Transfer Success Summit was to bring college and university presidents and chancellors together so they could discuss issues related to promoting successful academic transfer of students from community colleges to, and graduation from, baccalaureate degree granting universities. The Summit focused particularly on conventional college-to-university transfer enhancement, since many of the students who enroll in three, four, or even more colleges and universities before settling on the institution where they will earn their degree (known as “swirling” in the practice literature) eventually fall within the majority of students who essentially transfer from college to university within the public higher education system in Texas.

Two organizing principles provided structure for the Summit activities. First, several plenary sessions drew the group together through presentations that featured a variety of experts and policy makers. Those large-group sessions alternated with a set of focused discussion sessions that provided the participants with opportunities for direct consideration of issues, and the venue to collaborate in each discussion group on recommendations for better policy and practice to enhance transfer success.

Not all discussion groups produced a set of organized recommendations, but each group identified a number of critical points and issues that represent barriers to successful transfer of either credit or of students themselves. Coordinating Board staff concurs with the findings and recommendations of the discussion groups. The proceedings of the groups are summarized with discussion points and recommendations in the appendices to this report. Some of the most important recommendations sampled from the various discussion groups include:

- Implement a state-wide electronic degree audit system or unofficial common transcript (prescribed common course numbers) at all institutions (similar to the Course Applicability System);
- Re-evaluate existing measurements or accountability systems to appropriately distribute recognition for shared success;
- Create a separate metric that takes transfer students into consideration for graduation rates;

- Re-evaluate the Texas Core Curriculum, including a re-evaluation of the statutory requirement for Government and History, and revisions of the Exemplary Educational Objectives of the Core Component Areas;
- Add a release authorization to the Common Transfer Application to facilitate the post-transfer award of associate degrees;
- Convene regional articulation councils or conferences for advisors;
- Fund academic advising centers and secure special funding to explore the effectiveness of different advising models;
- Conduct a study comparing the performance of dual credit students to the overall college student population in the same courses;
- Specify learning outcomes for lower-division courses, especially those courses that are most frequently taught as dual credit courses, to ensure rigor and consistent quality;
- Create new mechanisms for delivering accelerated degree programs that will allow adult students to quickly complete their degrees;
- Assure that basic student and institutional needs are met before incentive funding is distributed;
- Identify financial aid best practices with statewide discussion on issues and solutions;
- The guarantee of financial aid should follow the successful transfer student.

MAJOR EMERGENT THEMES

The summaries and recommendations that resulted from the six discussion sessions merit close reading. They represent consensus or widely shared opinion within each group of college, university, and governing organization executive officers – chancellors, presidents, and their representatives--as they discussed focused topics related to transfer success. (The full summaries and recommendations from each session are found in Appendix B).

A reflective examination of these individual reports brings into focus a number of strong or recurring themes that cut across the various discussion group topics. The themes that emerge across topics and discussion groups provide additional clarity for the consideration of the various issues proposed as background for the discussion groups. These include:

- Data collection and usability: There is widespread dissatisfaction with the completeness or accessibility of information systems, particularly as they relate to tracking the needs, intentions, and progress of individual students. Discussants felt that they did not have enough information on students' developmental and curricular needs. Neither do they have access to anything like a universal transcript or degree audit system that would facilitate student tracking or allow students to investigate their options in a coherent and organized manner. Too much of the record-keeping and tracking function resides solely with students, and self-reported information may be inaccurate or misleading.
- Advising and counseling: There was universal concern for the quality of transfer advisement, and the ability to provide adequate or sufficient counseling and advising. Whether this function is established at each institution, or is made available through a more comprehensive statewide system or technology that supports individual advisement before and after transfer, presidents and chancellors called for improvements in funding and technical support for advising at all institutional levels.
- Financial aid: Financial aid was frequently discussed, regardless of the "focus" topic of the individual discussion group. The adequacy of state financial aid resources, eligibility standards that exceed good academic standing standards, and the lack of resources dedicated to transfer success emerged as thematic strands. The complexity of the federal FAFSA process and the need for assistance to families, particularly Spanish-speaking families, in completing and submitting it, was a particularly strong concern. Presidents urged the development of special outreach and information efforts, focused on the family and community. Federal policy was discussed, with an emerging focus on the desirability of moving toward tax records as a source for information now gathered through the FAFSA process.

- Accountability and performance: Current accountability performance measures and statewide data collection priorities that fail to acknowledge individual institutions for their partnership role in assisting transfer students to achieve success through baccalaureate graduation became a recurring theme. Institutional representatives perceive that they are not rewarded for successful transfer transition and eventual four-year-degree attainment, creating a lack of incentive to make this an inter-institutional priority.
- Inter-institutional relationships: Partnerships between/among colleges and universities, including the improvement and/or expansion of those essential linkages, were frequent areas of recommendation. These included inter-institutional discussions and articulation agreements at the program level; general partnerships between and among institutions; family and community outreach; and the integration of admission and financial aid functions.
- Adult and non-traditional students: The needs and accommodation of adult and nontraditional learners toward transfer and Bachelor degree completion are largely unaddressed by current policies and practices.
- Dual credit: High school to college dual credit programs need to be better integrated into an overall strategy of completion, including reliability of course content and intensity, and financial structures and incentives.

NEXT STEPS

Faculty and staff from the University of North Texas (UNT) Center for Higher Education and the UNT Institute for the Study of Transfer Students were contracted to provide substantive assistance to Coordinating Board staff with planning and with the preparation of materials for the Summit. As part of that work, these faculty members from UNT were asked to propose an agenda of activities that could help state-level policy-makers and institutional decision-makers determine best practices and effective interventions of projects to stimulate transfer success across Texas. Based on the findings of the Transfer Success Summit, they suggest that additional initiatives would be of benefit in refining successful transfer processes in Texas, with the goal of contributing to the success of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*.

Coordinating Board staff is in agreement that these projects, adequately funded and/or piloted, could lead to better understanding of potential best practices and could improve transfer processes and success across the state:

Targeting Intentionality

There may be a need to identify or develop an instrument that would help determine transfer intentionality among community college students. Currently, there is

relatively little information in existing data about the whether a student actually has an intention to transfer in order to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Such an instrument, interfaced with other available data, could help to identify students who are

- transfer intent, but curricularly misplaced (not enrolled in a transfer-oriented program);
- transfer intent, but who will require special academic support services in order to succeed in that goal; and
- students who have little transfer intentionality, regardless of their curriculum, but who have demonstrated potential to succeed through the baccalaureate level.

The latter group is likely to disproportionately include individuals from underrepresented populations, individuals with currently inadequate personal support systems, and individuals with misconceptions about the attainability of a four-year degree (e.g., “I'm not smart enough,” or “There's no money to support that idea.”)

Developing, piloting, and implementing an instrument to evaluate and cultivate student intention for both transfer and bachelor's degree completion would help individualize advising and provide assistance to community college students about transfer, and could contribute to enhancement of transfer rates and four-year degree attainment in Texas.

Policy Effectiveness

The surveys conducted by the University of North Texas on transfer best practices and beliefs at colleges and universities in Texas demonstrated high institutional commitment to good transfer practices and beliefs that practices within the institutions are effective. These beliefs and commitments should be examined against available quantitative data to identify areas of seeming fit—and misfit—between these beliefs and transfer success.

A few indicators of “less than perfect” circumstances emerged from the surveys, and these generally centered on institutional interfaces with other institutions, and the real world implementation of state policies and transfer agreements. Confidential, in-depth interviews with transfer-responsible individuals at two- and four-year colleges could yield frank and detailed input on these issues, and information helpful to more success policy development and implementation.

Student Voice

The voices of students speaking about their transfer experience is consistently lacking in the research and practice literature, although most people working in the field have had plenty of informal and anecdotal feedback from students about what works and what doesn't in transferring from college to university. It is not usually appropriate to

let such casually gathered input dictate policies and practices in substantial ways, but information that is gathered in appropriate research frameworks could be very helpful.

Individual interviews, focus groups, the analysis of blogs, and other student-generated information could be very helpful in understanding the student experience before, during, and after transfer; in identifying best practices in those processes; and in identifying common and persistent difficult problems and barriers. This information could be used to improve both policy and practice.

African American and Hispanic Transfer Students

As with most of the United States, the educational outcomes of minority populations in Texas lag behind the majority population. But this is not a given that can or should be accepted. The experience of the Community College of Denver suggests that targeted efforts are highly successful.

Case studies of Texas institutions that are highly successful with the out- or in-transfer of minority students would be of interest to others, and would yield recommendations for transferable/adaptable practices.

Likewise, qualitative studies among minority populations would be helpful, perhaps with focus on transfer-intent students at community colleges, or recent transfers to four-year colleges.

Determining Best Practices

Regardless of local demographic, economic, or curricular circumstances, quantitative and other indicators inform us that a number of colleges in Texas give particular emphasis to and experience notable success with transfer education. In-depth studies of institutions nationally on topics such as student engagement and first-year success conclude that such success is not the result of single initiatives—a silver bullet—but instead results from a broad institutional culture and deep commitments.

A focus on best practices at colleges and universities demonstrating extraordinary transfer success would let us “tell the story” of those institutional successes that could be emulated by others. Considered as a whole, the institutions might yield common or frequently observed practices, structures, and philosophies that would constitute a framework for others.

There is an opportunity to pursue this research on a national level. But Texas is large and diverse enough to yield a great variety of institutional success circumstances. Further, focus on Texas puts the study in the specific contexts of the state's policies, circumstances, and ambitions. A Texas focus would facilitate consultation and additional partnerships involving the featured institutions.

FOLLOW-UP

As follow-up to the Transfer Success Summit, a web page was created to provide direct access to summit materials, including direct links to the agenda, much of the binder material in its entirety, and the plenary presentations:

1. Presentation by Edwin R. Massey, President, Indian River Community College, Florida
2. Presentation by Mark Rosenberg, Chancellor, State University System of Florida
3. Remarks by the Honorable Geanie W. Morrison, Texas State Representative and Chair of the House Committee on Higher Education
4. Presentation by John N. Gardner and Betsy O. Barefoot, Policy Center on the First Year of College.

Audio files of those presentations are also available at the website.

The Transfer Success Summit page can be found here:

<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/events/transfersuccesssummit/>.

Update reports have been offered to the Academic Excellence and Research Committee of the Coordinating Board, as well as to the Coordinating Board itself (April 23 and 24, 2008). Some of the discussion group leaders and key members of the Summit planning committee reconvened at the Coordinating Board offices on August 1, 2008, with the goal of prioritizing items for action through legislative, state policy, or institutional and system means. Several projects are in progress as follow-up to the Summit, including:

- reviving the Transfer Success Advisory Committee;
- creating a “tips for transfer” pop-up window for the online ApplyTexas transfer application;
- creating a handbook for transfer students; and
- considering a special award category in the STAR Awards recognizing outstanding student transfer programs.

Additional long-term initiatives may include:

- Align advising and related student services to increase transfer success, using the vertical teams model currently in use through P-16 Councils for curricular alignment and College Readiness Standards (CRS) development, and including representatives of public schools, colleges, and universities.
- Identify successful transfer bridge programs and extend or strengthen them.

- Initiate a formal investigation of the legal limits of the federal Family Educational Right to Privacy Act (1974), in order to facilitate the awarding of associate degrees even after a student has transferred, through "reverse transfer" mechanisms.
- Step up enforcement of the statewide transferable core curriculum statutes and rules, and promote wider use of the existing transfer dispute procedures.
- Revisit First Year Experience courses and Learning Framework courses, especially determining appropriate ways for colleges and universities to offer these courses to students.

APPENDIX A.

Summary of Resource Materials Provided to Summit Participants

(Prepared for distribution in binders for the use of Summit participants by the Institute for the Study of Transfer Students, University of North Texas)

Surveys of Transfer Student Success Initiatives

The University of North Texas Institute for the Study of Transfer Students (ISTS) and the UNT Center for Higher Education undertook two parallel surveys in late 2007 in preparation for the Summit. One survey was conducted among transfer-responsible officers/administrators and staff at two-year public colleges; the other survey was conducted among such officers/administrators and staff at public universities. The surveys asked for levels of support for best practices in transfer education, as identified in research and professional literature, and then asked for an assessment of how well the function was executed at the institution. Rates of return were high, more than half at universities, and about two-thirds at community college. Not surprisingly, institutions rated themselves highly on best practices. Some deterioration in evaluations were evidenced, however, when best practices involved inter-institutional cooperation. The survey authors recommend qualitative follow-up to probe these relationships, as well as examination of available data to better assess institutional performance.

Joint Statement on the Transfer and Award of Credit

This is the joint statement signed by representatives of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in 2001. The statement, which is still in effect, is intended as a guide for institutional discussions and policies regarding transfer of credit, with consideration of equity for students and the maintenance of institutional and disciplinary standards.

THECB 2006 Report on an Automatic Admission Policy

The report was prepared in response to the Texas Senate's call for an analytical report on the feasibility of implementing an automatic admission program for students who earn an associate degree, certificate, or other credential (such as completion of the statewide general education core curriculum) from a community college, and who apply to transfer to a university. The conclusions of the report include: most community college graduates who apply to universities are accepted; the number of community college students who actually apply to universities is relatively low; and an automatic admissions policy with high standards might serve as an application incentive, but should also allow universities to accept additional transfer students.

THECB 2001 Report of the Transfer Issues Advisory Committee

The Commissioner of Higher Education appointed a Transfer Issues Advisory Committee to assess the transfer of academic credit among institutions in Texas and to recommend any steps that should be taken to ensure that Texas has a responsive and academically sound transfer system. The committee examined thousands of transcripts of transfer students at five Texas universities.

There were two subcommittees. The Data Subcommittee found that there is no significant difference in the academic performance of transfer and other students; that the transfer of undergraduate credit is generally efficient; that the assignment of credit to upper- or lower-level requirements, and the treatment of “academic” versus “technical” credit, are issues needing more examination; that certain academic fields are more likely to yield transfer problems than others; that the state should develop and require a standard reporting format on transfer performance for the benefit of sending institutions; and that health science centers should be included in further discussions of transfer.

The Information Tools Subcommittee found that transfer patterns are complex, and so must be the approaches to facilitation of the transfer process; that academic advisors are key to the success of the transfer process, and should have access to and should use available technological support; that a high priority need is the development of an automated degree audit system; and that improved inter-institutional communications would facilitate transfer.

[NB: Between 2001 and 2006, the Transfer Issues Advisory Committee addressed a number of the recommendations from the 2001 report. The committee was disbanded in 2006 and will be re-constituted during the fall 2008 as the Transfer Success Advisory Committee.)

Southern Regional Education Board 2007 Report: Clearing Paths to College Degrees: Transfer Policies in SREB States

The SREB Report starts with this statement: “Students in SREB states need clearer paths—not just better maps—to college degrees.” Further, the document states that “nearly all SREB states report that there have been improvements in the transfer process in the last 10 years.” The report asserts a number of factors essential to successful transfer programs: statewide transfer/articulation committees, a statewide core curriculum, a common course numbering system, the availability of transfer guides, guarantees of transfer, transfer counselor networks, appeals procedures, monitoring and auditing systems, and faculty involvement in these processes. An inventory of state practices is included within the body of the report.

Handel, S.J. (2007). Second Chance, Not Second Class: A Blueprint for Community-College Transfer. Change, September/October, 38-45.

Stephen J. Handel is director of the National Office of Community College Initiatives at the College Board. Prior to that, he was director of transfer-enrollment planning and outreach for the University of California System. He lists “the seven habits of highly effective transfer,” which include: (1) insist on academic preparation; (2) communicate first things first (e.g., financial aid availability); (3) support community-college counselors; (4) implement articulation policies that help most students most of the time; (5) admit community-college applicants first; (6) set transfer targets for students at community colleges; and (7) establish a “transfer-going” culture.

Flaga, C.T. (2006). The Process of Transition for Community College Transfer Students. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30, 3-19.

A study that tracked students throughout their first year at a four-year university helped Catherine Flaga identify five dimensions of transition. Learning Resources are the tools that students use to learn about the environment and academic system. Connecting is concerned with the development of relationships with others in academic, social, and physical environments. Familiarity developed as students became more comfortable with systems and their environments. Negotiating involved students adjusting their behaviors and surroundings to be successful. Integrating often included a shift in perceptions or personal identity. Recommendations are included to guide institutions toward facilitation of each of these dimensions.

IPKIT: Improving Practitioner Knowledge to Increase Transfer

This section includes basic documentation and audit materials for the IPKIT process—Improving Practitioner Knowledge to Increase Transfer. This process of self-audit of institutional practices, policies and structures to support successful transfer and success of students was developed by Dr. Barbara Townsend of the University of Missouri, through grant support from the Lumina Foundation.

Annotated Bibliography of Research and Research-related Literature on College Student Transfer 2002-2007

Developed by the UNT Institute for the Study of Transfer Students (ISTS) and the UNT Center for Higher Education, this annotated bibliography of research on transfer listed nearly 100 indexed sources at the time of the summit. It is being expanded and improved on an ongoing basis, and is available as a web-based resource.

Texas in Comparison to National Data

This ISTS document is a brief analysis of Texas transfer data as compared to the nation. Difficulties of comparison arise because of inconsistent definitions, but

essentially, Texas transfer and success rates are comparable to national averages. As with the nation, minority and historically disadvantaged student lag behind general population comparisons in educational success rates. Texas success tends to be highly variable based on region.

Institute for the Study of Transfer Students

This briefing sheet describes the purposes and activities of the ISTS at the University of North Texas, its successful annual conference, and publishing efforts that included the book *The College Transfer Student in America: The Forgotten Student*, edited by Dr. Bonita Jacobs of UNT.

Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors Draft Reports on Transfer Practices Surveys

This report from the Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors (<http://www.cpupc.org>) concerns surveys recently conducted among vice presidents of student services, registrars, and admission officers. The surveys identify key issues of difficulty in the transfer process and culture, but also identify a number of promising and rewarding programs to address these issues.

APPENDIX B.

DISCUSSION GROUPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

Notes from the Six Discussion Groups

Chancellors, presidents and their representatives who attended the Transfer Success Summit were assigned to one of six groups to discuss questions relating to: (1) advising and counseling; (2) Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses; (3) Student Engagement and Success; (4) Financial Aid; (5) College Readiness and Developmental Education; and (6) Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention.

Each group was led by a team of two institutional presidents representing a college and a university. The leadership teams met in advance with Coordinating Board staff members, who prepared problem statements and a brief summary of background information to orient each group to the issues. Those staff members accompanied the presidential leadership teams through the discussion group sessions, while a second Coordinating Board staff member stood by to take notes and record important discussion points or recommendations that were formulated during the proceedings. The materials presented in this appendix are relatively “raw” versions of those notes. Because of the different note-taking styles and variations in the trajectory of different discussions, some of these summaries include recommendations, while others simply raise issues for further research. The discussion summaries reflect these differences in their formatting and presentation.

Group Discussions: Topics and Questions

Group 1: Advising and Counseling

Group leaders: **Dr. Larry Phillips, President, Angelina College;**
 Dr. James Gaertner, President, Sam Houston State University

Problem Statement on Advising and Counseling

Curricular alignment has been a central focus for improving student success in Texas. P-16 Councils and College Readiness Standards are moving forward on this initiative for secondary to post-secondary student transition. But for students who enter community colleges with the intention to eventually transfer and earn a bachelor’s degree, the academic counseling and advisement they receive at the institutions they will attend may not provide a coherent or collaborative experience designed to allow the student access to information at appropriate decision points. How can we most effectively and efficiently support the alignment of academic advising programs in

colleges and universities in ways that will improve student retention across institutions; provide students with relevant information about themselves, their curricular choices, and the potential consequences of those choices throughout their undergraduate careers? What initiatives would support effective academic advising that will best help students who intend to transfer achieve their goal of graduation with a bachelor's degree?

Background for Discussion on Advising and Counseling

Recent studies indicate that the transfer of credit among public universities in Texas generally works well. But a recent study indicates that many more students are qualified to transfer from a community college to a university than are actually choosing to make that move. Just as Texas has been engaged since 2000 in a campaign to create a "college-going culture" throughout the state, colleges and universities should be working more closely together to create a "culture of transfer" that will encourage more students to complete a bachelor's degree. Advising and counseling at colleges and universities should provide "para-academic" support to students who intend to transfer, particularly by providing consistent information about state mandates, policies, and opportunities, in addition to consultation about curriculum and degree program choices. More focused programs for the advisement of transfer students before and after the transfer transaction are needed. The development of advising and counseling resources relies on funding streams, and often this crucial function is forced to compete for funds otherwise devoted to faculty salaries or other innovative curricular initiatives.

Recommendations: Advising and Counseling

- For the purposes of student information, implement a state-wide electronic degree audit or unofficial common transcript (prescribed common course numbers) at all institutions (similar to the Course Applicability System).
- Convene regional articulation councils or conferences for advisors.
- Fund academic advising centers and secure special funding to explore the effectiveness of different advising models.
- Re-evaluate existing measurements or accountability systems to reflect accomplishments and contributions of all institutions, as well as appropriately distributing success (shared success).
- Add a release authorization to the Common Application in order to facilitate a reverse articulation system leading to the post-transfer award of associate degrees.

Group 2: Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses

Group leaders: Thomas Baynum, President, Coastal Bend College
Flavius Killebrew, President, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

Problem Statement on Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses

Studies of student transfer patterns indicate that “traditional” college students—those who graduate high school and then immediately attend just one institution in order to earn their degree within four years—now represent the minority of those attending higher education. This suggests that transferability—not just of course credits, but also of student outcomes—is more important than ever. Are lower-division transfer courses giving students the knowledge and skills they need to be sufficiently prepared for upper-division courses in their major? Are there disciplines in which state-wide articulation agreements (or other tools to assist the transfer process) need to be developed in order to insure consistent preparation of students at the lower-division level?

Background for Discussion on Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses

The legislation and rules that govern the core curriculum in Texas were passed in 1999, giving us almost a decade of experience with this widely-used curricular transfer tool. It reaches every student in higher education, and serves as the foundation of every academic degree program. How well is the Core Curriculum functioning in Texas? How could it be improved?

CB data show a clear and steady increase for dual credit utilization by high school students. As more and more school districts form partnerships with colleges and universities to serve growing numbers of students, what should the higher education community do to insure that all dual credit courses, including those taught by qualified high school faculty, meet the expected student learning outcomes? What can be done to meet the challenge of overseeing instruction at a high school location which may be many miles from the main campus?

Recommendations: Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses

(1) Are lower-division transfer courses giving students the knowledge and skills they need to be sufficiently prepared for upper-division courses in their major.

- The group recommended a two-stage process: (1) Using the college readiness standards model, have local faculty groups by discipline talk and come to agreement student learning outcomes. Then have representatives from local groups come together at the state to determine course outcomes. (2) Then amend the Academic Course Guide Manual based on those recommendations. (Any process created needs to feed into SACS.)

(2) Are there disciplines in which state-wide articulation agreements or other tools to assist the transfer process need to be developed in order to insure consistent preparation of students at the lower-division level?

- Good advising and good counseling is critical. The indispensable assistance that advisors can give to students is the key.
- A learning skills course that is funded and provides academic credit should be considered for inclusion in the Academic Course Guide Manual.

(3) How well is the Core Curriculum functioning in Texas? Could it be improved?

- The Core Curriculum should be reevaluated for relevance to global conditions, rigor for transfer preparation, and consistency between and among institutions including reconsideration of statutory 12 credit-hour requirement for Government and History. This reevaluation should include possible revisions of the educational objectives of the Core.

Dual Credit Issues/Discussion

(4) What should the higher education community do to insure that all dual credit courses, including those taught by qualified high school faculty, meet the expected student learning outcomes?

- As in the first issue above, the first step is to specify learning outcomes for lower-division courses. That will address the issue of dual credit learning outcomes.

(5) What can be done to meet the challenge of overseeing instruction at a high school location which may be many miles from the main campus?

- A study should be conducted to determine how dual credit students compare in performance to the larger student population. Variables should include location, method of delivery, and type of faculty.

workforce development credit to increase the ease of transferability, b) develop part-time degree programs, c) develop year-round, accelerated degree programs, and d) improve degree mapping and advising to assist students in timely graduation.

Recommendations: Student Engagement and Success

Issue 1: Increasing faculty involvement in and out of class, including creating faculty incentives and increased professional development opportunities

Issue 2: How do we develop effective partnerships among institutions that will help students succeed?

Issue 3: How do we develop effective use of internal and external data instruments? This includes data sources, use of data for planning and redesign, and data sharing between institutions.

Problem 1: Non-inclusion graduation rate metric

- Solution 1: Redefine or create a separate metric that takes transfer students into consideration for graduation rates.

Problem 2: Lack of data on student intention (i.e. degree seeking or not)

- Solution 2: Refine the statewide data system so that it takes into account individual student characteristics.

Problem 3: Lack of individual student data

- Solution 3: Determine non-degree completers and reason for non-completion.
- Solution 4: Assist institutions in using external data such as National Student Learning Clearinghouse, NSSE, CSSE.

Issue 4: How do we redefine the entering college student who may already have college credit and provide appropriate support services for those students?

Issue 5: Ensuring the credibility of Associate's Degrees and the core curriculum so that students have incentives to complete Associate's Degrees.

Problem 1: Diversity in the means of fulfilling core curriculum may create transfer difficulty with pre-requisite courses

- Solution 1: Revisit and complete Field of Study plans.

Problem 2: Little student incentive to complete the Associate's Degree

- Solution 2: Urge institutions to enter into articulation plans that take major pre-requisites into consideration by universities.
- Solution 3: Make reverse transfer easier in order to allow students to earn Associate's Degrees.

Problem 3: Concerns that students completing an Associate's Degree may incur excessive hours in trying to complete a baccalaureate degree

- Solution 4: Revisit the Academic Course Guide Manual and deal specifically with upper- and lower-level course distinctions.
- Solution 5: Revisit the 6-course drop limit and determine whether or not it is an advisable best practice.
- Solution 6: Examine the feasibility of creating new upper-level and lower-level excess credit policies that would not hurt students who move from technical/vocational programs into academic programs.

Issue 6: How do we develop programs that will assist returning adult students in completing their degrees?

Problem 1: Programs are not focused on returning adults

- Solution 1: Consider the viability and expansion of Bachelor of General Studies, Applied Baccalaureates, and other non-traditional degree programs for adults.

Problem 2: Difficulty in identifying adult students with substantial number of credit hours but who have not completed degrees

- Solution 2: Create new mechanisms for delivering accelerated degree programs that will allow adult students to quickly complete their degrees.

Issue 7: How do we best apportion resources to assist institutions with at-risk students?

- Solution 1: Re-examine the funding formula to increase funding to institutions that serve at-risk students .
- Solution 2: Assure that basic student and institutional needs are met before incentive funding is distributed.

Group 4: Financial Aid

Group leaders: William Holda, President, Kilgore College
Rodney Mabry, President, University of Texas at Tyler

Problem statement on Financial Aid

Recent studies show that student retention and success hinge upon numerous nonacademic and academic factors including adequate financial aid and targeted student support services. How can we design and fund an effective financial aid program that will encourage and facilitate success (at community colleges and universities), and transfer of community college students to four-year institutions?

Background for Discussion on Financial Aid

Adequate financial resources are an important factor when a student is deciding whether or not to enroll in or continue in higher education. Students and families hear from the media that the cost of going to college is rising at an alarming rate. They do not hear about the true cost of college, and that the cost of attendance at a community college is about sixty percent less than the cost of attendance at a university. In Texas, the average cost of tuition and fees for a university student is over three times that of a community college student (\$3278 compared to \$11,038).

To change the perception we need to do three things:

- Ensure that students and families understand that a community college is a less expensive option;
- Ensure that students have and can count on adequate financial support if they attend a community college; and
- Encourage students (who attain an associate's degree or complete the core curriculum) to continue their education at a university.

If we can inform students and families that college is affordable, in particular if a student starts his education at a community college, and provide adequate and innovative financing we can facilitate success and encourage community college students to transfer to a university when the time is right.

Recommendations: Financial Aid

1) Federal Financial Aid Background

- Federal Financial Aid is difficult to navigate (e.g. FAFSA); need to better adapt form to meet need student needs.
- Hispanic serving institutions have a difficult to get students/parents to fill out federal paperwork.
- Hard for Hispanic families to provide tax information

- FAFSA very complex even for knowledgeable applicants
- Need better working arrangement with Treasury and U.S. Department of Education
- Need to work better with public schools—free lunch program is a good barometer for who should qualify
- Consolidate forms for federal aid/taxes that accomplish multiple purposes
- Consider using ombudsman to assist people in dealing with process
- Dual-credit costs—who covers and when? If no school district support, why not federal/state programs start earlier to cover such costs? Pell Grants, etc?
- Rural community colleges don't have faculty or tax base to provide free services for dual-credit.
- Need to complete application of Seniors in high school and write off previous year's Pell Grant and get enrolled in summer.

2) State Financial Aid Background

a. Total cost vs. Tuition/Fees

Transportation, living expenses are part of cost—not always factored in—need to factor in total costs.

b. Unmet need

All community college costs aid only hits 50% of total cost—General Academic Teaching Institutions and private institutions have much higher percentage financial aid layer.

c. State vs. Federal funds balance

Don't reallocate funds—creates more problems than solutions
Ninety-four percent of community college aid coming from federal
closer split of state vs. fed at General Academic Teaching Institutions
need to grow pool of funding

d. Major state programs

- Five programs: Texas Equal Opportunity Grant (TEOG), TEXAS Grants, Texas Equalization Grant (TEG), and Work-Study
- Community colleges get very little TEXAS Grants; community college students would benefit if restructure the program and provide incentives for transfers
- Community colleges get less than 10% of all state aid
- TEXAS Grants not pushed out fast enough
- Grade point average requirements a barrier (2.5 GPA too high)—2.0 is good standing at most institutions.
- TEOG is not a guarantee of TEXAS Grant if transfer—maybe provide a direct link and allow for guarantee.
- Recommended High School Program creates a barrier to TEXAS Grants and that is a problem
- Need institutions to help keep cost down

- Guarantee tuition and fees for all 4 years...freeze tuition to provide planning horizon—some have tried and want to get away from it.
- Is there waste in the curriculum...need to change the way we think to look for waste and cut costs in operations, etc.
- Books are an issue on cost and financial aid impact—consider reform to cut costs.

e. Statewide solutions

Texas Public Education Grant (TPEG) money very important and should be able to use as appropriate and needed.

3) Individual/Partnering Strategies

- FAFSA counseling in Spanish
- Counseling to facilitate carrying financial aid between institutions
- Community college financial aid personnel interaction with General Academic Teaching Institution financial aid personnel—facilitate discussion of problems and solutions
- CB developing financial aid module on common application to facilitate financial aid information flow for new and transfer students
- Work closer with high schools; both community colleges and four-year institutions must present united message on transfer policy and financial aid
- Cost-share on employees between community colleges and four-year institutions; e.g. employee at 4-year is financed in part by feeder community colleges and help with transfer/financial aid issues
- Shared counseling program with high schools that works with community colleges and four-year institutions
- Need to make process more “human” for those cultural backgrounds that mistrust institutions that create natural barriers to getting students to apply; create relationship with these populations (e.g. counselor and parents)
- Create endowments for transfer students from feeder community colleges
- Set specific financial aid levels that reward transfers on a tiered system
- Community colleges need to work with four-year institutions to develop more BAS programs that can be co-located at community colleges
- Synergy with feeder community college and four-year institutions—early contact between student and advisors
- Short term money a problem for many first-generation students; community college foundation is important to help deal with these student issues
- Include financial aid for middle-income transfers
- Provide scholarship information to students to increase awareness
- Go to community groups and churches to promote funding opportunities
- Increase marketing of federal programs
- College presidents and other key staff need better understanding of financial aid—cross training
- Integrate admissions and financial aid

- Training recipients on money management
- Look at disbursement of money—all up front or issued over semester
- Develop intuitive online financial aid applications that help generate student financial aid packages that incorporate federal, state, and institutional aid; also create online verification form as well
- Need to identify financial aid best practices with statewide discussion on issues and solutions.
- Do financial aid training sessions at key conferences and meetings around state for key constituency—focus on best practices.

Group 5: College Readiness and Developmental Education

Group leaders: Gretchen Bataille, President, University of North Texas
Shirley Reed, President, South Texas College

Problem Statement on College Readiness and Developmental Education

The lack of college readiness among college students is a significant challenge in higher education. Too many high school graduates are entering higher education under prepared for college-level courses and too few under prepared students successfully complete developmental education courses and transfer into four year institutions. These challenges indicate three critical transfer points for under prepared students' academic progression—(1) from high schools into higher education, (2) from developmental courses into college-level courses, and (3) from community colleges into four year institutions. Until Texas College Readiness Standards are fully integrated into public and higher education curriculum and instruction, what policies and strategies would be necessary to assist the public schools and public colleges and universities in addressing the immediate needs of students not college ready? Address the question in terms of the following: What research would Texas need to conduct in the area of college readiness and developmental education (or other topics) in order to inform the discussion? What are the public and higher education curricular issues? What issues would be important to the discussion in terms of traditional vs. non-traditional student populations?

Background for Discussion on College Readiness and Developmental Education:

Under Prepared Students Transferring From High School to Higher Education:

Of the entering high school graduates who enter HEIs and are exempt or have met the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) standards for the academic years of 2002-2005, 62 percent met all parts, 68 percent met the math standard, 84 percent met the writing standard, and 79 percent met the reading standard. It is important to note that these data do not reflect how many high school graduates actually enroll into higher education.

Under Prepared Students Transferring From Developmental Education Into College-Level Courses:

In math, few under prepared students earn credit in college-level math courses within two years (CC=16%, Univ.=32%, TSTC/LA=15%).

In reading, few under prepared students earn credit in related college-level courses within two years (CC=45%, Univ.=53%, TSTC/LA=23%).

In writing, few under prepared students earn credit in college-level English courses within two years (CC=38%, Univ.=59%, TSTC/LA=24%).

Under Prepared Students Transferring From Two-Year Colleges Into Four Year Institutions:

Transfer students are more likely to have taken developmental education courses. When comparing students who had taken developmental courses prior to transfer with those who had not taken developmental courses, developmental students were nearly as likely to have earned a 2.0 GPA or better in their first year, and were as likely to persist into their second fall semester.

Recommendations:

- Testing and diagnostics – want to know where student is deficient so we can provide necessary instruction.
- Alignment of college readiness and curriculum
- Partnerships – high school, transfer, higher education
- New funding to replicate pilots and bring to scale

Group 6: Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention

Group leaders: Charles Cook, Vice Chancellor for Educational Development,
Houston Community College System
Molly Woods, Vice President for Academic Affairs and
Provost, University of Houston-Downtown

Problem statement/Background for Discussion on Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention

As a result of the demands of a 21st century job market, there is growing consensus among policymakers, the business/economic development community, and educational leaders that we must raise the achievement of our students. This dialogue has led to the college readiness movement which is grounded in the belief that all high school students should graduate with the knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary education success. Prior to the development of college readiness standards, several levels of selectivity were developed to ensure that students admitted to certain universities were prepared to succeed at the institution. Currently, about 50% of the nation's entering freshmen do not meet institutional placement standards and are not ready for college-level work. By adjusting admissions standards and policies, policymakers, institutions, and individual departments can determine what type of student is provided access to their educational programs.

How can admissions policies impact what type of students attend a university/community college?

Legislative/Statewide policy

Percentage Plans—i.e., Top 10% in Texas, Top 4% in California, Top 20% in Florida
Recommended High School Program mandatory for admissions into public university

Institutional/System-wide policy

Articulation agreements for Transfer students (i.e., University of Texas at Dallas' Comet Connection)
Highly-selective vs. open-admissions institutions

Departmental/College policy

Different admissions standards for certain academic programs
More rigorous academic standards (i.e., higher GPA, SAT/ACT test scores)
More rigorous course-load (i.e., higher level math, etc.)
Rehearsal/audition (i.e., music, band, theatre)

Other

Freshman class caps
Fixed percentage of yearly admits composed of transfer students

Recommendations: Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention

- Started a specific set of scholarships for high-achieving community college students. Might be a transfer culture—once you have students who transfer, get more students.
- Have a transfer center at university but that happened because there were a lot of transfers not necessarily to get transfers.
- Accountability: increased accountability, such as focusing on AP and dual credit issues and weighted.
- Marketing—KIPP Academy as example. Central idea of marketing around families. Need a narrow campaign that would look like something that a specific population would do.
- Statewide tracking system: Need to address limitations in system, e.g. class rosters, grades.
- Recommended High School Program: Incorporate career advising, added flexibility, curriculum alignment
- Mechanisms for implementation—common transcript, resources, common degree audit. This lifts burden off of students.
- Revisit the top 10%
- Guaranteeing admissions to those students who go to university with an AA
- Need to get input on recommendations from other stakeholders—public education, business, etc.
- Issue: Stakeholders missing—public education

Dr. Charles Cook offered supplementary notes that he requested be added to the Coordinating Board staff notes from the session. Those notes are offered here *verbatim*:

- Provide incentive funding (additional, not replacement) to reward all segments of the pipeline for accomplishing greater numbers of transfer
- Align the public ed and post-secondary ed accountability systems. Currently, there are "mixed" signals with counterproductive results - e.g., high schools rewarded and choosing locally to promote AP programs differentially than dual credit programs.
- Implement statewide mechanisms to help everyone (as FL and other states)- common electronic transcripts, advising guides, degree audits, course applicability systems, student tracking that includes class roster and grade information. (The debate about "which is better?" between advocates of AP and dual credit could be laid to rest if we could track the students from these programs to determine their later success.)
- Add flexibility to the HS curriculum - to incorporate roles for career and technology education, career advising, the arts, and other electives.
- Revisit the "top 10%" program to see if it has produced intended results (CA uses top 4%)

- Engage in greater statewide marketing of the need for students to pursue post-secondary training/education immediately after high school (NOTE: post-secondary training/ed - not "college" which many interpret as the four-year baccalaureate only)
- Expand specific programs that "work": Transfer Centers, Bridge Programs, Joint Admission Agreements, Program Articulation Agreements, etc.

APPENDIX C.

AGENDA

2008 TRANSFER SUCCESS SUMMIT

February 18-19, 2008
Omni Hotel Downtown

Purpose: To provide a forum for institutional presidents and chancellors to align their knowledge and thinking about how to encourage the adoption of good practices that contribute to creating a “Culture of Transfer” at colleges and universities. The focus will be on those institutional activities and practices that will foster collaborative partnerships among colleges and universities for the purpose of facilitating the persistence and success of transfer students and actively encouraging students to continue their post-secondary education through the acquisition of the bachelor’s degree.

Format: Beginning after breakfast on the second day, institutional presidents and chancellors will be assigned to one of six break-out groups to discuss questions relating to: (1) advising and guidance; (2) consistency in student achievement; (3) student engagement; (4) financial aid; (5) developmental education and college readiness standards; and (6) who attends colleges or universities.

Monday, February 18, 2008

Dinner (*Longhorn Room*)

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions:

Raymund A. Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education
Mark G. Yudof, Chancellor, The University of Texas System

Speakers:

Edwin R. Massey, President
Indian River Community College
Florida’s Community College System

Mark B. Rosenberg, Chancellor
State University System of Florida

Question and comment period.

Tuesday, February 19, 2008

Registration (*Foyer*) 7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Continental Breakfast (*Longhorn Room*) 7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Representatives from the University of North Texas Transfer Institute will be available to discuss the Course Applicability System as well as their research on Texas transfer data.

Convening Session (*Longhorn Room*) 8:30 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.

Welcome and Introductions:

Raymund A. Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education

Texas Legislative Perspective:

Representative Geanie W. Morrison, Chairman
House Higher Education Committee
Texas House of Representatives

Explanation of Group Discussion Sessions:

Raymund Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education

Group Discussions 9:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Topic and Co-Leaders Listed Below:

1. Advising and Guidance (*Cellar Room*)
James Gaertner, President, Sam Houston State University
Larry Phillips, President, Angelina College

2. Consistency in Student Achievement (*Rotunda Room*)
Thomas Baynum, President, Coastal Bend College
Flavius Killebrew, President, Texas A&M University-Corpus
Christi

3. Student Engagement and Success (*Senate Room*)
Maggy Smith, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies,
University of Texas at El Paso
Dennis Brown, Vice President, El Paso Community College

4. Financial Aid (*Liberty Room*)
William Holda, President, Kilgore College
Rodney Mabry, President, University of Texas at Tyler

5. Developmental Education and College Readiness (*Executive Room*)
Gretchen Bataille, President, University of North Texas
Shirley Reed, President, South Texas College
6. Who attends colleges and universities (*Bouquets Room*)
Charles Cook, Vice Chancellor for Educational Development,
Houston Community College System
Molly Woods, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost,
University of Houston-Downtown

Break 10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.

Group Discussions Continue (Action Reports) 10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

Luncheon and Speakers (*Longhorn Room*) 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Facilitators: John Gardner and Betsy Barefoot
Policy Center on the First Year of College
Brevard, North Carolina

Group Discussion Reports:
Group Co-Leaders

Next Steps Raymund A. Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education

Adjournment 1:00 p.m.

APPENDIX D.

Structure and Summary of the Summit

Co-sponsored by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the University of Texas System, the Transfer Success Summit was convened on February 18 and 19, 2008, at the Austin Omni Downtown Hotel. Planning and preparation for the Summit was coordinated by staff from the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board ([www.http://theccb.state.tx.us](http://theccb.state.tx.us)); the University of Texas System (<http://www.utsystem.edu>); the Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors (<http://www.cpupc.org>); and faculty representing the Center for Higher Education (<http://www.coe.unt.edu/cdhe/highered/Center.htm>) and the Institute for the Study of Transfer Students (<http://www.unt.edu/transferinstitute/>) both at the University of North Texas. Institute staff undertook original research and compiled resource materials in preparation for the Summit. They also took responsibility for organizing and reproducing the resource materials and assembling the binders that were distributed to all Summit participants for use on their campuses or in their governing board offices. The Transfer Committee of the Council of Public University Presidents and Chancellors also performed two related surveys regarding transfer processes, and provided a summary of the results for use during the Summit.

One hundred forty seven participants considered these issues over the two days of the Summit. Although the Summit was open to administrators and others with direct reporting responsibility to the chief executive officer, attendance by presidents and chancellors themselves was high.

The Summit began with a dinner on February 18. Raymond A. Paredes, Commissioner of Higher Education, and David B. Prior, Executive Vice Chancellor of the University of Texas System, welcomed the audience. Commissioner Paredes explained the charge to the Summit participants, and outlined the need for greater transfer success in order to achieve the participation and success goals of the Texas higher education plan, *Closing the Gaps*. Vice Chancellor Prior outlined the initiatives that governing board or system offices can take to improve transfer, and affirmed the University of Texas' commitment to improving transfer success across the state, be increasing transfer initiatives at the UT institutions and by partnering with the Texas A&M University System to achieve a more comprehensive result.

The dinner speakers set the stage for the Summit. Edwin R. Massey, President, Indian River Community College, Florida, spoke on the topic "Articulation: Unlocking the Door of Opportunity in Florida." Florida has a statewide articulation system with several "critical components" contributing to transfer success: definition of the Associate of Arts degree as the "transfer degree;" guaranteeing transfer of the general education ("core curriculum") component of undergraduate education; establishing a common college transcript; establishing a statewide common course numbering system; calling for a common academic calendar; creating the Articulation Coordinating Committee; and providing for "articulation research studies."

Mark B. Rosenberg, Chancellor, State University System of Florida. Florida, provided an overview of transfer in Florida, including the fact that about 80% of students transfer with an Associate of Arts degree, but only about 3% of students transfer with an Associate of Science degree. Some 17% of students in Florida currently transfer without completing an associate's degree, but Chancellor Rosenberg pointed to statewide fiscal challenges that have resulted in an ever-increasing limitation on the ability of universities to accept students in transfer. The financial limitation on per-student funding in Florida has led to more students staying at community colleges to complete their associate degrees as a condition of transfer to a university; unfortunately, some students will not be accommodated through transfer to a university even though they have completed their Associate of Arts degrees.

Florida currently ranks 46th in the number of bachelor's degrees per 1,000 residents, and needs more students to graduate from high school, more students to transfer in order to pursue the baccalaureate degree, and more students to graduate in a timely manner. Both presentations underscored initiatives similar to ones that also exist in Texas. The complementary perspectives of a community college president and a governing board chancellor, so similar to the roles of the executive officers in the audience, brought immediacy to the wise counsel offered through the two presentations, and provided a thought-provoking foundation for the discussions that followed on Tuesday.

Tuesday morning opened with remarks from the Honorable Geanie W. Morrison, Texas House of Representatives and Chair, House Higher Education Committee. Representative Morrison affirmed the Legislature's continuing commitment to fostering "seamless transfer" and reminded the audience that the enabling Legislation that created the Coordinating Board more than forty years ago included responsibilities for the facilitation of transfer. Her remarks pointed to examples of good practices, addressed the six discussion group topics individually, and summarized charges from the Interim Committees that call for attention to the essential role of good transfer practices in meeting the goals for participation and success in *Closing the Gaps*, Texas' 15-year higher education plan.

After Rep. Morrison's spoke, Commissioner Paredes explained the agenda for the rest of the Summit, inviting the presidents and chancellors to re-convene in six discussion groups to address important questions, issues, or problems affecting transfer success. Each group was led in tandem by a college president and a university president who shared interest and experience in the particular topic of the group's discussion, and were thus especially well-prepared to lead discussion on the topical focus of the group. The leadership teams had met with Coordinating Board staff prior to the Summit to discuss issues, strategies, and tactics for leading the groups. In some cases, special presentations were requested and organized, as with the showcase of the Course Applicability System (CAS) presented to the group on Advising and Counseling by a team from the University of North Texas and the University of Texas at Dallas. Two Coordinating Board staff members were on hand in each discussion group

to support the presidential leadership team in facilitating the session, and to annotate the proceedings.

The discussions focused on these areas:

- Advising and Counseling
- Assuring Rigor in Undergraduate Courses
- Student Engagement and Success
- Financial Aid
- Developmental Education and College Readiness
- Institutional Opportunities and Student Intention

Each group was provided with a problem statement and a brief background summary to orient the discussion. Tuesday morning was primarily devoted to meeting in the discussion groups, formulating a clearer picture of the issues, challenges, and best practices associated with the topics as they applied to undergraduate transfer of credit and transferring students, and in some cases, formulating recommendations for action or research. At the Summit's concluding luncheon, the group leaders briefed the audience about their group's key discussion points and recommendations. Each group's problem statement, background, further discussion points, and recommendations are included in the third section of this report.

The Summit was capped with a concluding call to action through a presentation by John N. Gardner, Executive Director, and Betsy O. Barefoot, Co-Director and Senior Scholar, both representing the Policy Center on the First Year of College, Brevard, North Carolina. Gardner challenged the presidents and chancellors directly, urging them to, "Make transfer success YOUR issue!" He encouraged them to go back to their campuses and system offices with the question in mind, "What steps can YOU take to overcome institutional prejudice against transfer students?" To support their inspirational call for placing transfer initiatives at the heart of each institution's mission, Gardner and Barefoot also offered pragmatic suggestions for actionable items and proposed the development of a research agenda to identify and promote good practices related to transfer success.

Appendix E.

Roster of Participants

First	INI	Last	EMAIL	TITLE
Michael		Acosta	meacosta@lake.ollusa.edu	Vice President for Enrollment Management
Robert		Aguero	robert.aguero@tccd.edu	Vice Chancellor for Learning Support Services
Roberto	R.	Alonzo	jesse.bernal@house.state.tx.us	State Representative
Pamela		Anglin	panglin@parisjc.edu	President
John	C.	Baldwin	john.baldwin@ttuhsc.edu	President
Darlene		Bannister	bannistr@schreiner.edu	University Registrar and Assistant Provost
Betsy		Barefoot		Presenter
Glenda	O.	Barron	glenda.barron@thecb.state.tx.us	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Staff
Gretchen	M.	Bataille	gbataille@unt.edu	President
Linda		Battles	linda.battles@thecb.state.tx.us	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Staff
David	R.	Bauske	dbauske@odessa.edu	Vice President for Student Services
Thomas	B.	Baynum	baynum@coastalbend.edu	President
Judith		Bean	bbays@twu.edu	Associate Vice President
Yvette	M.	Bendeck	Bendeck@uhcl.edu	Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
Adolfo		Bermeo	jengle@mac.com	Senior Scholar
Adrianna		Bernal	abernal@malc.org	Executive Director
Jesse	R.	Bernal	jesse.bernal@house.state.tx.us	State Representative
Sharon	L.	Blackman	sblackman@dcccd.edu	President
Monte		Blue	monte.blue@sjcd.edu	President
Dennis		Brown	DennisBr@epcc.edu	Vice President of Instruction

Susan		Brown	susan.brown@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Delores		Brydson	delores.brydson@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Don	W.	Byars, II	dobyars@pvamu.edu	Associate Provost for Enrollment Management
Von		Byer	von.byer_sc@senate.state.tx.us	Senate Education Committee
Emerson		Capps	emerson.capps@mwsu.edu	Associate Provost
Dominic		Chavez	dominic.chavez@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Jacqueline		Claunch	jclaunch@mail.accd.edu	President
Natalie		Coffey	natalie.coffey@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Michael		Coleman	coleman@utdallas.edu	Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Charles		Cook	charles.cook@hccs.edu	Vice Chancellor for Instruction
Marc		Cutright	Marc.Cutright@unt.edu	Professor
Carla		Dando	carla.dando@lsc.edu	Dean of Instruction
Larry		Darlage	larry.darlage@tccd.edu	President
Vanessa		Davis	vanessa.davis@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Leonardo		de la Garza	elida.galvan@tccd.edu	Chancellor
Margaret		Dechant	margaret.dechant@tamucc.edu	Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
Agnes		DeFranco	adefranco@uh.edu	Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Studies
Roxanne		Del Rio	rdelrio@nctc.edu	Associate Dean, Student Services
Sheila		DeLeon	sheila.deleon@lbb.state.tx.us	Analyst, Higher Education Performance Review
Jackie		Diaz	Jackie_Diaz@baylor.edu	Assistant Vice President for Student Financial Services
James		Dilling	james.dilling@lbb.state.tx.us	Manager, Higher Education Performance Review
Mike		Dreith	<u>mdreith@wtc.edu</u>	President
Martha		Ellis	mellis@lee.edu	President

Jennifer		Engle	jengle@mac.com	Senior Research Analyst
Jo-Carol		Fabianke	jfabianke@mail.accd.edu	District Director for Achieving the Dream
Kim		Faris	blountl@grayson.edu	Director of Admission and Records
Charles	B.	Florio	cflorio@ntcc.edu	President
Glendon	S.	Forgey	gforgey@tvcc.edu	President
William (Bill)		Franz	william.franz@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
James	F.	Gaertner	gaertner@shsu.edu	President
Rey		Garcia	rgarcia@tacc.org	President and CEO
John	N.	Gardner		Presenter
David		Gardner	david.gardner@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
James		Goeman	james.goeman@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Donetta		Goodall	goodall@austincc.edu	Vice President, Academic Transfer & General & Developmental Education
Jimmy		Goodson	jimmy.goodson@victoriacollege.edu	President
Charles		Grant	Charles.grant@sjcd.edu	President
Kathleen		Grimmett	kat@austincc.edu	Articulation Director
Ana	M.	Guzman	scarey5@mail.accd.edu	President
Daniel	J.	Harper	Daniel.Harper_SC@senate.state.tx.us	Legislative/Executive Staff
Lynette		Heckmann	lynette.heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Fred	W.	Heldenfels IV		Coordinating Board Member
Melissa	I.	Henderson	melissa.henderson@house.state.tx.us	State Representative
Eleanor		Hewitt	scott.daigle@house.state.tx.us	State Representative
Evie		Hiatt	evie.hiatt@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Georgia		Hodde	georgia.hodde@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
William "Bill"		Holda	bholda@kilgore.edu	President

Stephanie		Holley	JoAnn_Chapin@tamuc-commerce.edu	Dean of Enrollment Management and Retention
Lois		Hollis	lois.hollis@theccb.state.tx.us	THECB
Donna		Howard	scott.daigle@house.state.tx.us	State Representative
Martha		Hughes	mhughes@dcccd.edu	Vice President of Academic Affairs
Lee	F.	Jackson	thomson@unt.edu	Chancellor
Bonita		Jacobs	bjacobs@unt.edu	Vice President for Student Development
Dan	R.	Jones	mesparza@tamiu.edu	Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dawn		Jones	djones@utsystem.edu	Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor
Janette		Keen	keen@uta.edu	Associate Director, Advising
Rand	W.	Key	Rand.Key@lonestar.edu	Senior Vice Chancellor
Flavius	C.	Killebrew	Flavius.Killebrew@tamucc.edu	President/CEO
Conrad		Krueger	ckrueger@mail.accd.edu	Dean of Arts and Sciences
Suzanne	V.	LaBrecque	labrecques@uhv.edu	Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs
Debra	R.	LaCour	debra.lacour@blinn.edu	Vice President Academic Affairs
Kevin		LaMountain	klamountain@devry.edu	President
Donna		Lang	langd@tamug.edu	Asst. Vice President for Academic Affairs
Susan		Lara	lara_s@utpb.edu	Vice President for Student Services
Gilbert		Leal	jgleal@harlingen.tstc.edu	President
Paul		Lede	Lede_PB@tsu.edu	Instructor
Gloria Ann		Lopez	glopez@delmar.edu	Dean, Arts & Sciences
Mark		López	mark.lopez@theccb.state.tx.us	THECB
Rodney		Mabry	president@uttyler.edu	President
Juan	L.	Maldonado	president@laredo.edu	President
Edwin	R.	Massey		Presenter

Dennis	P.	McCabe	mcendree@tarleton.edu	President
Steve		Mittelstet	stevem@dcccd.edu	President
Lizette		Montiel	lizette.montiel@theqb.state.tx.us	THECB
R.	Vic	Morgan	rvmorgan@sulross.edu	President
Maureen		Murphy	Maureen.murphy@sjcd.edu	President
Douglas		Murphy	Murphyd@uthscsa.edu	Assoc Dean Of The School Of Allied Health Sciences
Robert		Nelsen	nelsen@utdallas.edu	Vice Provost at The University of Texas at Dallas
Drew		Nelson	DNelson@alvincollege.edu	Dean of Administrative Programs
J. Patrick		O'Brien	pobrien@mail.wtamu.edu	President/CEO
Matt		Orem	matt.orem@theqb.state.tx.us	Director of Policy and Communication
Raymund	A.	Paredes	raymund.paredes@theqb.state.tx.us	Commissioner of Higher Education
Catherine		Parsonault	catherine.parsonault@theqb.state.tx.us	THECB
Ty		Pate	typate@wcjc.edu	Senior VP of Instruction
Baker		Pattillo	bpattillo@sfasu.edu	President
Antonio		Pecina	Apecina@dcccd.edu	College Community Outreach Coordinator
Larry		Phillips	phillips@angelina.edu	President
Rob		Pocklington	rpocklin@mail.smu.edu	Associate Dean for Academic Advising
Rissa		Potter	rpotter@cpupc.org	Executive Director
Harry	C.	Powell	bpowell@mclennan.edu	Dean, Arts & Sciences
William		Powers	president@po.utexas.edu	President
David	B.	Prior	djones@utsystem.edu	Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Diana		Ramey	Diana_Ramey@baylor.edu	Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Management
Shirley	A.	Reed	yolandao@southtexascollege.edu	President
Alice		Reinarz	areinarz@tamu.edu	Assistant Provost for Enrollment

Eric		Reno	ereno@mail.accd.edu	President
Pedro		Reyes	djones@utsystem.edu	Associaet Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning & Assessment
Betty		Reynard	betty.reynard@lit.edu	Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs
Richard		Rhodes	ppayne1@epcc.edu	President
Mark		Rosenberg		Presenter
Paul		Sale	psale@utpa.edu	Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs
Gilbert		Sanchez	sanchez_g@utpb.edu	Director of HIS Grant
Marshall		Schott	mschott@uh.edu	Assistant Vice President Instructional Support and Outreach
Myles		Shelton	cbiggers@gc.edu	President
Colleen		Smith	colleen.smith@cjc.edu	President
Mary		Smith	mary.smith@theeb.state.tx.us	THECB
Barbara		Smith	Barbara.Smith@utsa.edu	Executive Director of Advising
Maggy		Smith	msmith@utep.edu	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
Bobby		Soto	bobby@dbu.edu	Director of Transfer Recruitment
Sandra	K.	Speed	skspeed@schreiner.edu	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid
Joseph (Joe)		Stafford	joseph.stafford@theeb.state.tx.us	THECB
Helena		Stangle	hstangle@devry.com	Corporate Director of Government Relations
Linda		Stegall	Linda.M.Stegall@lonestar.edu	President
MacGregor		Stephenson	SKing@tamu.edu	Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Rosanne		Stripling	shannon.miller@tamut.edu	Vice President Academic Affairs
James	D.	Studer	jstuder@utsystem.edu	Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Ken		Tasa	Ken.tasa@brazosport.edu	Dean, Educational Programs
James		Templer	jtempler@com.edu	Vice President of Instruction (CIO)

Ernest	L.	Thomas	el.thomas@tccd.edu	President
Steve		Thomas	steve@vernoncollege.edu	President
Don		Tomas	dtomas@wc.edu	Senior Vice President of Instruction and Student Affairs
Denise	M.	Trauth	mm02@txstate.edu	President
Ken		Tunstall	drktunstall@ranger.cc.tx.us	President
Arthur		Tyler	art.tyler@hccs.edu	Deputy chancellor/COO
Terry		Walch	twalch@mail.accd.edu	Transfer Center Director
Marina		Walne	mwalne@utsystem.edu	Executive Director
Dale		Wasson	<u>slandau@uta.edu</u>	Senior Vice President of Student Enrollment Services
David		Watts	watts_d@utpb.edu	President
Lora		Weber	lora.weber@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Jon		Whitmore	lucy.lanotte@ttu.edu	President
Adena		Williams Loston	aloston@mail.accd.edu	President
Jennifer		Wimbish	jwimbish@dcccd.edu	President
Molly		Woods	woodsm@uhd.edu	Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost
Mark		Zafereo	mark.zafereo@thecb.state.tx.us	THECB
Felix	A.	Zamora	fzamora@dcccd.edu	President