

COTA Meeting Minutes February 2003

**Committee on Transfer and Articulation
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, Missouri
February 5, 2003**

MINUTES
Approved March 28, 2003

Participants:

Jack Magruder, Karen Herzog, Jeanie Crain (for Julio Leon), R. Alton Lacey, Don Doucette (for Henry Shannon), Walter Nolte, Stephen Lehmkuhle

DHE Staff: Robert Stein, Laura Vedenhaupt

Observer: Arlen Dykstra

Jack Magruder called the meeting of the Committee on Transfer and Articulation (COTA) to order at 6:35 p.m.

Dual Credit Implementation

COTA distributed a survey in April 2002 requesting information about dual credit practices during FY 2001. At the October 31, 2002 meeting, COTA requested that the Department of Higher Education (DHE) staff forward the analysis of each institution's self-reported information and asked for compliance clarification from the institutions.

COTA members reviewed the compliance results at the February 5, 2003 meeting and set minimum policy thresholds. Institutions reporting less than the minimums will have the opportunity to submit information to COTA justifying a lower percentage threshold. Institutions failing to submit justifications satisfactory to COTA will not be placed on a public list of institutions that are in compliance with CBHE guidelines.

Question thirteen of the survey requested the percentage of dual credit students having a minimum high school GPA of 3.0 or higher. Some members indicated that GPA should not be the only consideration for compliance; in some cases, there may be good reasons to permit access to dual credit when GPA is below a 3.0. COTA members agreed that institutions should be allowed to use professional judgment in permitting access to dual credit courses in some cases.

Walter Nolte made the motion, seconded by R. Alton Lacey, to establish an acceptability threshold of 95% for the student eligibility guideline. The motion carried unanimously.

Question fourteen of the survey requested the percentage of dual credit students meeting the same requirements for admission to individual courses as those required of on-campus students. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question fifteen requested the percentage of freshmen/sophomores enrolled in dual credit courses having scored in the 90th percentile or above on the ACT or SAT. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question sixteen requested the percentage of dual credit courses approved for dual credit status by the faculty of the appropriate academic department or unit of the college. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question seventeen requested the percentage of courses with course content and course requirements comparable to those of equivalent on-campus courses with the same titles. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question eighteen requested a comparison of cost per credit hour of dual credit and the on-campus equivalent course, in and out of district. COTA determined that the data submitted was not relevant as presented. COTA requested that DHE staff forward to each responding institution a new survey question(s) as follows:

For four-year institutions: "What percent of dual credit courses use a consistent tuition fee (per credit hour)? For dual credit courses at two-year institutions within district: What percentage of dual credit courses uses a consistent fee (per credit hour) within your taxing district? For dual credit courses delivered by two-year institutions outside their taxing district: What percentage of dual credit courses uses a consistent fee (per credit hour) outside your taxing district?"

Question nineteen requested the percentage of high school dual credit instructors that meet requirements for faculty teaching in institutions of higher education. The members agreed that institutions should be permitted to use professional judgment in allowing faculty that do not meet all requirements for higher education instruction to teach dual credit courses in some cases.

Karen Herzog made the motion, seconded by Don Doucette, to establish an acceptability threshold of 90% for the faculty eligibility guideline. The motion carried unanimously.

Question twenty requested the percentage of new dual credit high school instructors participating in orientation activities provided by the college/academic department. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-one requested the percentage of dual credit high school instructors participating in both professional development and evaluation processes as those expected of adjunct faculty on the college campus. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-two requested the percentage of college academic departments participating in dual credit that provide high school dual credit instructors with support services, including on-campus liaison. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-three requested the percentage of responsibility for the assessment/evaluation measure development of dual credit courses residing with on-campus faculty. COTA agreed on a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-four requested the percentage of dual credit courses using similar methods of assessment as on-campus courses. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-five requested the percentage of comparability of dual credit courses ensuring a common standard of grading. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-six requested if the maximum numbers of dual credit courses are accepted in transfer from all public and independent/proprietary signatory institutions. COTA agreed to a threshold of 100%.

Question twenty-seven requested if institutions are imposing limits on other credits that may be earned by high school juniors and seniors. COTA took no action on this item. All responding institutions reported compliance with the guideline.

COTA requested that two additional indicators be collected from the institutions:

1. A list of all high schools in which your institution offers dual credit courses.
2. The maximum distance between the home institution and a high school site in which the institution offers dual credit. What dual credit program is furthest from your institution, and how far from your institution is it located?

COTA members requested that DHE staff supply a list of all responding institutions for review at the next meeting.

COTA will develop a process through which an institution may appeal the committee's decision to leave an institution off of the compliance list that will be publicized.

Implementation Status of 42-hour Block of General Education Credit for Transfer

Several institutions have notified COTA that they have a 42-hour block of general education credit for transfer that is being implemented. The University of Missouri - Kansas City has requested an exemption for two of its programs. COTA appointed Stephen Lehmkuhle to review the topic with campus personnel. Mr. Lehmkuhle will report his findings at the next COTA meeting.

Next Meeting

The University of Missouri Transfer Meeting is being held on March 27 - 28, 2003 at the University of Missouri - Columbia. Transfer and Articulation Officers from each institution have been invited to attend a meeting with COTA. The attendees may submit written questions to COTA, which will be answered at the COTA meeting scheduled for March 28, 2003 at 3:15 p.m.

COTA members will meet at 2:15 p.m. in order to review the presented questions. After the questions have been addressed, COTA members will enter into breakout sessions with small groups of attendees to take note of any additional concerns that are raised.

Transfer Conference

COTA members have been asked to consider ways to re-institute a statewide transfer/articulation conference that would be held every other year.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.