

Present:

Justin Scheller, Arlene Cuthrell, Jim Poole, Shirley Murray, Sue Amos Palmer, Jane Reinke, Dick Hanson, Wendy Walentiny, Lynda Milne, Kevin Parker, Kayley Schoonmaker, Mark Magnuson, Toyia Younger, Jessie Bolin, Julie Guelich, Kelli Steggall, Marilyn Wells, Kevin Parker

Absent: Damon Kapke, Ginny Arthur, Jeff Kolnick, Peggy Kennedy, Lynda Cottrell

Guests: Shannon Ellis, Louise DiCesare, Jason Fossum,

We discussed who was registered for the summit, the agenda for the day, and finalized the team homework for the summit.

Gallery Walk Update: February 27th the team will have the ability to preview our posters to see if we would like to make any changes. This will be from 2-3P via Webex

We reviewed the schedule. Currently all of our slots for the Gallery Walks are filled so we can be there to answer questions as folks come through the Gallery Walks.

There were more highlights from faculty input shared that we will need to make adjustments where it's feasible.

The work is too fast and goes too far – same as the original feedback – we have softened some of the language, but there needs to be a starting point and some guidance as reflected from the conversations with the other states.

The three year timeline to have all 30 programs done is unrealistic.

What does launch mean? Design 1 year, Implement Year 2? The design should be one semester and then begin the campus curriculum processes (1 year) and then implement.

Jane did revise the implementation timeline based upon earlier comments. The current arrow chart does not reflect the full timeline as a result of these changes. We will need to get that changed and possibly add a Gantt Chart to show the progression in two different ways so it's clearer.

Budget is critical to the success of this plan. California spent about \$1 million of which the majority of the extra grant money they received went towards marketing. There wasn't a full cost analysis completed, but a comfortable rough estimate is \$300,000 to support the work of the TPT's over the three year timeline for pathways development plus more money in regards to communication to students. We're looking at roughly \$500,000. This would only include internal communications. External communications/marketing would require additional funding. Also need to think about battling a reputation of challenging transfer. This will not cover the full implementation of the plan. It doesn't include additional advisors, DARS encoder costs to add new programs, training of the advisors, or other costs.

We will put this in the plan as a minimum amount. We may need to break out the costs. A marketing plan is going too far for this plan.

Where does the money come from? A fiscal note from the legislature? Reallocation of funds? Grants? It is unknown at this time. Systems Incentives group will help to figure this out.

How do we compete with other interests? How do we make this priority #1 so that it gets accomplished? This can be challenging with all of the other demands on the system. Expand more on how this will fix 20% of the transfers, that this is a portion of the advising picture. This minimum investment addresses a transfer issue of about 20%. We need to be mindful that additional investment will be needed to address the full spectrum of transfer. This minimum of \$500,000 is an investment. Put under the limitations section in the plan.

The reasons this is a compelling case are

- Completion of Associate and Bachelor degrees
- Improve retention
- Money students are going to save because they won't have to repeat classes

In the first page remove small from the "will serve one small segment" and convert "only about 19% to nearly a fifth. (This sends a more positive tone for the plan).

Our six intended outcomes of this transfer pathways plan are:

1. Reduce confusion over transfer within the system.
2. We expect an increase in the percentage of students using this method of transfer for completion.
3. We expect higher rates of student retention.
4. We expect higher completion rates of associate degrees.
5. We expect higher completion rates of baccalaureate degrees.
6. We expect, from these outcomes, that students will actually save money and graduate sooner across the system.

What will the measures of success of this be? The Transfer Pathways Coordination Team will need to identify the assessment points.

Design Curriculum- appeal- Is 70% of curriculum common good enough? It's currently what policy states for course equivalency. The remaining 30% is at the discretion of the faculty.

- Recommend the greatest degree of course equivalency

Recommendations

1. Really need to take into account how this information gets to students
2. Training for advising staff is critical
3. Consider some structure for TPT group meetings
4. Ask ourselves –where do we need to commit something, and where do we need to create goals
5. How will the decisions at the legislature (cuts to MnSCU budgets) impact this?
6. ROI - what is our goal for degree completion at both levels?
7. What are the unintended consequences? Is this regimenting students?

The Transfer Pathways Coordination Team should set specific goals and measurements.

Should we have a section in our report that this element is one part of the whole, and by fixing this we are fixing 20% of the problems?

Transfer is a bigger issue than this plan addresses. We need to be upfront of the costs to implementation. This type of proposal, which involves systemic change, carries huge operational and

organizational implications. The transfer pathway is broken- little fixes will not make it better- we need to make an overhaul. The student enrollment patterns are completely different than they were 20 years ago.

Student Affairs Council Input

How would dually enrolled students go through these transfer degrees?

We need to make it very clear what is expected from 2 years if they have a program already. This should be a question the TPT's or the Transfer Pathways Coordination Team will address.

Different delivery styles need to be an option.

MSCF wanted it very clear what's expected of the two year colleges if their degrees are different.

This will be up to the TPT's to determine. It may vary from degree to degree.

Reviewed a mock-up of the binder to go with our Gallery Walk posters. It was okay to proceed with the documents adding the table of contents.

Section 4 – Listen to our constituents and incorporate what we can. Add Reason for selection to the title on the chart.

4.2 – Project Launch Meetings - Who will launch the meetings?

Should number 4 be merged into number 2? Move this to section two which is the creation of process.

Section 5 – Talking about the institutions in this section. All universities and the colleges that offer the AA, AS, and AFA. Good to go.

Section 6 – Reworked the section extend it to deal with campus catalog and curriculum timelines.

Need to expand the arrow chart to show the extended timeline – full implementation by Fall 2019. All will be designed by year three.

Section 7 - 7.1 was changed to read Operational and procedural issues need to be identified and addressed by the Coordination Team and TPTs to ensure that the receiving universities have the knowledge the student is transferring under these pathways.

7.2 Changes to Evaluation tools and processes should be developed so that the pathways may be reviewed regularly to maintain or enhance quality and student success outcomes.

7.3 Changed to: Budget for ongoing TPTs meetings, travel expenses is not included in this plan.

7.4 Delete by ____.

7.5 Change to: To most effectively and efficiently optimize faculty and staff.

7.5.1 Change to college and university curriculum procedures will be followed.

7.5.2 OK as is

7.5.3 Change to read TPTs must publish their work and notify all stakeholders

7.5.4 Change folks to staff.

7.6 Change project launch team to coordination team; add 7.6.1 Regular MnSCU governance bodies are responsible to ensure conflicts are resolved.

7.7 - becomes 7.6.1 and changed to the above statement. Make 7.7 to read The Degree Audit Reports (DARS) system will be updated to support the inclusion of Pathways. (Changes to current 7.8) (This feeds Transferology.)

7.8 Transfer Pathways will be incorporated into an easy to use prominent website including Transferology. (This answers 7.9 question.)

7.9 (7.10 changes) Standing committees and technology groups will be responsible for coordination to ensure the sustainability of transfer pathways

7.11.

7.12 Change to 7.10 – Annually, the enrollment and graduation numbers for pathway degree transfers and cohort degree completion will be reviewed and reported to the campuses, student associations, and other system stakeholders.

Add: TPTs are encouraged to identify additional ways to streamline transfer process.

What do we call the Project Launch Team? Decided on Transfer Pathways Coordination Team.

Summary:

Needs to be rewritten. First sentence is pretty good. Include the six benefits and outcomes mentioned earlier. Needs a volunteer(s) – Jessie, Kevin, and Shirley. Three to four sentences, strategic in nature.

Things to be included somewhere list. What should we include or at least talk about?

Communication needs to be expanded. Discussed communication in relation to the budget, but that it's not included in our budget. Communication is integral to making this successful. Have internal already addressed, need to bring in external somewhere. Add Section 8.0 Communications Plan

Sub group to work on the Communication plan. Jim and Kelli will work on this portion of the document.

Timeline to get everything in would be by prior to Thursday morning at the Summit. We can finalize at the Summit.

Other items that should be elevated to the plan: TPT develop the approval process of their work. Coordination team will develop the guiding principles. (4.2)

Add to the Coordination team section – The chancellor or designee will be responsible for the formation of this team.

AAS to BAS is part of the Limitations section.

The report goes to MnSCU to send through the regular legislative reporting procedures.

Made every good faith effort to include all of the feedback we have received that fits within our current charge.

Three Key Points:

1. Completed the review of the draft of the legislative plan.
2. Incorporated the last of the feedback that was true to our legislative charge.
3. The document will be finalized at the CTF Summit on February 19th.