

To: UFC  
From: Alex Tanford, Chair of Policy Review Committee  
Date: March 9, 2021  
Re: ACA-55, Intercampus Transfers

**A. The UFC Policy Review Committee has reviewed ACA-55, Undergraduate Intercampus Transfers, and finds:**

1. The policy dates from 2000 and was last updated in 2016.
2. Intercampus transfer of grades is regulated in part by Indiana law.
3. The policy was reviewed by the University Transfer Office directed by Assistant Vice President Carolyn Gentle-Genitty and all updates recommended by her office.
4. The revision places the current policy into the university's policy template and aligns it with revisions to other transfer policies recently updated by the UFC (ACA-56 and ACA-82). It makes no substantive changes.
5. The update has been reviewed by the chief policy officer and the Policy Review Committee.

**B. The Committee moves that the UFC Amend ACA-55, Undergraduate Intercampus Transfers, to read as follows:**

**Scope**

A. This policy applies to intercampus transfers (ICT) at all Indiana University campuses, schools, and departments. ICT refers to degree-seeking students who are permanently changing their home campus.

B. This policy does not apply to intercampus enrollment, which includes temporary, visiting, and transfer/concurrent enrollment. Intercampus enrollment refers to degree-seeking students who take coursework for their degree objective at one or more IU campus(es) while maintaining degree-seeking status at their home IU campus. Course treatment through intercampus enrollment is addressed in the Undergraduate Master Course Inventory policy (ACA-81 [link]).

**Policy Statement**

**A. Course Equivalencies and Degree Requirements**

1. Courses at the 100 and 200 levels that are identically numbered should apply to degree requirements on any campus equivalently, regardless of the campus of origin. Distribution requirements should be treated with flexibility as long as intended campus goals are met.
2. For identically numbered courses at the 300 and 400 level, units on all campuses shall review the university's equivalency rules to assess the equivalency of such courses.

a. The University Transfer Office (UTO), working with the affected faculty governance organization(s), should coordinate this review. Judgments of specific course equivalencies should be determined by faculty in appropriate units on each campus, and differences of views among campuses should be adjudicated through the Course Conflict Resolution process set forth in ACA-81 [link].

b. Courses whose content does not meet the university's 80/20 rule (i.e., that 80% of the content is equivalent) and the master course inventory procedures shall be renumbered as non-equivalent.

3. For courses at any level that are not identically numbered, the Recorders' Offices for each campus, school, or division shall record non-equivalencies in the centralized Master Course Inventory.

a. Prospective ICTs may request a review of the equivalency indications for specific courses from the campus to which they wish to transfer. The review should be made by the appropriate degree-granting unit.

b. Positive equivalency decisions should be reported to unit Recorders and coded. Once a course has been used at least three times by the recording campus or another IU campus, a new equivalency rule shall be created.

c. A substantive explanation of any negative decision should be recorded, and campuses should designate an appropriate faculty committee to which negative decisions may be appealed.

d. Equivalency reviews and appeals should be conducted as expeditiously as possible, within 48 hours when possible and in no event later than one week. A sustained negative review decision will not be subject to further appeal for a period of five years.

e. If an equivalency decision involves changing the equivalency group for the course and the campus, the Recorder will inform the University Transfer Office and their own Admissions Office.

4. All equivalency decisions should be made by the most appropriate school, division, department, or program on a campus, and should apply for all programs on that campus. Courses that fulfill similar educational goals in terms of content and proficiency training should fulfill degree program requirements regardless of the campus on which they are offered. When substantive curricular changes occur in courses that may affect equivalency decisions, corresponding programs on other IU campuses should be notified. Equivalency designations will apply between courses as offered on specific campuses.

5. Equivalency decisions shall be recorded in the centralized Master Course Inventory to provide consistent implementation among campuses and to provide for efficient adoption.

6. An ICT student is responsible for meeting all specific requirements for the major field as defined by the degree-granting unit on the receiving campus; departmental and school residency requirements may necessitate the completion of additional hours beyond the normal minimal requirement. Exceptions granted to students prior to transfer should, whenever possible, be honored by the degree-granting school.

## **B. Administrative Principles**

1. Each campus shall develop and publish appropriate application procedures, forms, and deadlines for students wishing to transfer home campus within the IU system and shall exchange such information.
2. Each campus shall designate and publish an office to provide initial information to students considering transfers to other campuses to ensure that prospective incoming ICTs are provided with appropriate procedural and academic guidance and advising.
3. Approval decisions concerning ICT applications to any campus are determined by the appropriate office on the receiving campus and are governed by criteria approved by that campus.
4. ICT applicants are expected to give notification of decisions to accept or decline ICT approval according to deadlines set by the receiving campus. Offices on both the home and receiving campuses of an ICT student shall share information concerning ICT approval and student decisions to transfer campuses.
5. Wherever specified procedures fail to apply to individual cases, decisions should be based on the best educational interests of the student; exceptions granted on the basis of individual cases shall not constitute precedents.

## **Reason For Policy**

To facilitate and to support student intercampus transfer, the faculty of Indiana University support the equivalent application of comparable courses toward degree requirements, regardless of the campus where the course was completed.

## **Procedure**

### **Monitoring Ongoing Comparability**

If data concerning student performance in sequential courses indicate a divergence in ICT and non-ICT student performance, such that ICT students who apply specific courses equivalently appear to be placed at a disadvantage, the units involved shall report this divergence to the UTO for possible action through the [Course Conflict Resolution process](#). In the event that the UTO through its own monitoring of equivalencies finds such a divergence, the UTO may report this to the affected campuses.