

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO UNIVERSITY TRANSFER POLICIES

Revisions are proposed to three Indiana University academic policies affecting transfer of credits:

	Pages
<u>I. Proposed revisions to:</u>	
<u>ACA-56, Transfer of Credit from Two Year Institutions</u>	
Explanation	2-3
Proposed draft of revised policy	4-5
<u>II. Proposed revisions to:</u>	
<u>ACA-55, Undergraduate Intercampus Transfers</u>	
Explanation	6
Proposed draft of revised policy	7-10
<u>III. Proposed revisions to:</u>	
<u>ACA-81 Master Course Inventory Policy</u>	
Explanation	11-14
Current policy	15-18
Proposed draft of revised policy	19-22

IU Articulation & Transfer Committee:

TJ Rivard - Chair Asst. Vice President for University Academic & Regional Affairs Director, University Transfer Officer	University Representatives:
IUB: Dennis Groth, Michael Lundell	USSS: Mandy Bartley, Daniel McDevitt
IUE: James Barbre	UAA: Jeff Johnston
IUK: Mark Canada, Scott Jones	UITS: Todd Neal
IUN: Cynthia O'Dell	UTO: Kimberly Mayfield, Jeffrey Weber, Lisa Wallace
IUPUI: Rebecca Porter, Jeffrey Watt	
IUSB: Johnny Macintosh	
IUS: Annette Wyandotte, Angela Salas	
IPFW: Andrew Downs	

I. Revisions to ACA-56, Transfer of Credit from Two-Year Institutions

Following discussions with the Articulation and Transfer (A&T) Committee of the University Transfer Office, revisions are requested to this regarding the transfer of credit from originating institutions at the 100 and 200 levels. The policy is currently worded as follows:

Transfer of Credit From Two Year Institutions

Credits earned at undergraduate institutions other than Indiana University in courses at first or second-year levels (100/200-level courses or courses completed in two-year institutions) and transferred for IU credit may not be recorded as equivalent to IU course credits at advanced (300/400) levels, or applied to degree requirements normally fulfilled only by advanced level course credits.

(<http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/academic-student-affairs/transfer-credit-two-year-institutions.shtml>)

Our concern is that the title of the policy and the policy itself are ambiguous with regard to what institutions it applies. The A&T Committee offers two options below for consideration:

OPTION #1: Change the title only, in order to eliminate ambiguity in favor of application to all institutions; otherwise retain the text of the policy as is.

The current policy works reasonably well, despite the ambiguity, and it allows for exceptions as needed. It would require that articulation rules from four-year institutions that receive 300+ level credit for 100/200 level work be re-evaluated. The revised title and text follow (changes underscored):

Transfer of Credit Completed at the 100 & 200 Level

Credits earned at undergraduate institutions other than Indiana University in courses at first or second-year levels (100/200-level courses or courses completed in two-year institutions) and transferred for IU credit may not be recorded as equivalent to IU course credits at advanced (300/400) levels, or applied to degree requirements normally fulfilled only by advanced level course credits.

OPTION #2: Change the title to eliminate ambiguity, but *revise* the policy in favor of decision making placed in the hands of degree-granting units. The revised title and text (changes underscored) follow:

Transfer of Credit Completed at the 100 & 200 Level

Credits earned at undergraduate institutions other than Indiana University in courses at first or second-year levels (100/200-level courses or courses completed in two-year institutions) and transferred for IU credit may not be recorded as

equivalent to IU course credits at advanced (300/400) levels. Application to degree requirements normally fulfilled only by advanced level course credits is precluded, unless the degree-granting unit authorizes the equivalency. If the course is on the Core Transfer Library (CTL) and multiple IU campuses offer the course, agreement must be reached across the campuses where the course is taught.

The preferred revision below follows OPTION #1, eliminating ambiguity in favor of application to all institutions:



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Transfer of Credit Completed at the 100 & 200 Level

ACA-56

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

Scope
Policy Statement
Reason for Policy

ADDITIONAL DETAILS
Related Information
History

Effective: *March 27, 2001*
Last Updated: --

Responsible University Office:
*University Transfer Office, Office of the EVP for University
Academic Affairs*

Responsible University Administrator
University Faculty Council

Policy Contact:
TJ Rivard, Director
University Transfer Office
trivard@iu.edu

Scope

All Indiana University campuses, schools and departments.

Policy Statement

Credits earned at undergraduate institutions other than Indiana University in courses at first or second-year levels (100/200-level courses or courses completed in two-year institutions) and transferred for IU credit may not be recorded as equivalent to IU course credits at advanced (300/400) levels, or applied to degree requirements normally fulfilled only by advanced level course credits.

Reason for Policy

This policy is intended to ensure that transfer students do not receive Indiana University credit at inappropriate levels.

Related Information

List other Transfer Policies.

History

This policy was established in 2001 ([link that version here](#)).

Revised 2016.

II. Revisions to ACA-55, Undergraduate Intercampus Transfers

In an effort to align transfer policies with current practice and to update processes referenced in the policy, the University Transfer Office in consultation with the Articulation & Transfer Committee offers the following proposed revision. The most substantial revisions that the Committee suggests include removing references to outdated systems, such as INSITE, connecting this policy more directly with the Master Course Inventory policy, and the inclusion of the University Transfer Office as a coordinating and facilitating body for any issues that might arise as a result of the policy. The primary operational difference is the inclusion of the Course Conflict Resolution Process.

For comparison, the current version of the policy can be found at:

<http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/academic-student-affairs/undergraduate-intercampus-transfers.shtml>



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers

ACA-55

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

Scope	Effective: November 14, 2000
Policy Statement	Last Updated: --
Reason for Policy	Responsible University Office:
Procedures	<i>University Transfer Office, Office of the EVP for University Academic Affairs</i>
ADDITIONAL DETAILS	Responsible University Administrator:
Related Information	<i>University Faculty Council</i>
History	Policy Contact:
	<i>TJ Rivard, Director</i>
	<i>University Transfer Office</i>

Scope

All Indiana University campuses, schools and departments.

Policy Statement

I. Administrative Principles

- A. Each campus shall develop appropriate application procedures, forms, and deadlines for students wishing to transfer home campus within the IU system, and exchange such information.
- B. Each campus shall designate an office to provide initial information to students considering transfers to other campuses, to ensure that prospective incoming Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers (ICTs) are provided with appropriate procedural and academic guidance and advising, ~~including guidance on the appropriate use of INSITE (particularly, the Advising option within INSITE, also known as IUCARE) in~~

~~exploring ICT options, and to coordinate receipt of and action on incoming ICT applications.~~

- C. Approval decisions concerning ICT approval applications to any campus are determined by the appropriate office on the receiving campus, and governed by criteria approved by that campus.
- D. Students will be 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.
- E. Wherever specified procedures fail clearly 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.

II. Course Equivalencies and Degree Requirements

- A. Computerized records shall be maintained so as to allow students to ~~use IUCARE to use the university's student records system~~ assess, at the time of ICT application and with the greatest possible predictability, how inter-campus transfer will affect their progress towards a degree. Each campus shall develop procedures for course equivalency decisions that will ensure that prospective ICTs will be fully aware of how courses will apply towards degree progress at the time of transfer approval.
- B. Courses at the 100 and 200 levels 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.
- C. Courses with Identical Numbers
 - 1. Courses offered on different campuses with identical numbers should be comparable enough in content and requirements to allow equivalent applicability towards degree requirements on any campus. In the event that faculty on a campus or campuses question the equivalency of a course at another campus, the course(s) in question will be sent through the Course Conflict Resolution process.
 - 2. Beginning with the fall term 2001 and forward, identically numbered courses at the 100 and 200 levels shall be treated as equivalently applicable towards degree requirements on any campus. ~~If, prior to that date and in exceptional cases, degree granting units identify specific courses at these levels that are so uniquely articulated with major requirements on their campus that they must propose that these courses be distinguished through renumbering, then the UFC Agenda Committee shall appoint a special ICT Committee to evaluate such requests. This committee shall communicate with all relevant IU departments. Their judgments shall be binding.~~

3. For identically numbered courses at the 300 and 400 level, units on all campuses shall review lists of all such courses to assess their equivalence, and to renumber as non-equivalent courses whose content significantly diverges on different campuses. The University Transfer Office Academic Officers Committee, working with faculty governance, 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 ~~by the UFC ICT Committee, whose judgments shall be binding. This review and any necessary renumbering shall be complete before the Fall 2002 term.~~ through the Course Conflict Resolution process.
 4. ~~The UFC EPC shall review the process whereby the Master Course Inventory is maintained and used, and recommend to the UFC changes that will ensure that identically numbered courses taught on different campuses will be adequately equivalent in content and requirements to allow equivalent applicability towards degree requirements on any campus. A new MCI policy will be determined before the end of the 2000-1 academic year.~~
 5. ~~In cases where a unit's external accreditation can be shown to UFC ICT Committee to be affected by ICT policy, that unit may limit the applicability of courses taken on a campus other than its own to the minimal degree necessary to maintain compliance with accreditation standards.~~
- D. For courses that are not identically numbered, Recorders' Offices for each campus, school, or division shall maintain lists of equivalencies for courses on all IU campuses. 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 were offered. When substantive curricular changes occur in courses that may affect equivalence decisions, corresponding programs on other IU campuses should be notified. Equivalency designations will apply between courses as offered on specific campuses.
- E. Prospective ICTs may request reviews of ~~IUCARE~~ 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, and a substantive explanation of any negative decision should be recorded. Positive equivalency decisions should be reported to unit Recorders and coded. Campuses should designate an appropriate faculty committee to which negative decisions may be appealed. Equivalency reviews and appeals should be conducted in a timely fashion. A sustained review judgment will not be subject to further appeal for a period of five years. If the decision involves changing the articulation rule for the course and the campus, the Recorder will inform the University Transfer Office or their own Admissions Office, depending on which office maintains the rules for that campus.
- F. 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.

Reason for Policy

To facilitate student inter-campus 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.

Procedures

Procedures to monitor 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 University Transfer Office 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 University Transfer Office may report this to the affected campuses.

Related Information

[Link to Course Conflict Resolution Process](#)

[Add related Transfer Policies](#)

History

This policy was established in 2000.

Revised 2016.

III. Proposed Revisions to ACA-81, Master Course Inventory Policy

A Framework for Indiana University Master Course Inventory Reform

In 2002, the UFC passed the Indiana University Master Course Inventory Policy with the explicit goal of ensuring “that identically numbered/titled courses on multiple IU campuses are comparable enough that their full inter-campus transferability for all degree requirements poses no problems to students and instructors.” The 2002 policy is reprinted below and can be found at:

<http://www.iu.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/MasterCourseInventory.pdf>. This policy document laid out an ambitious plan for creating faculty panels to compare, discuss, and align many of the courses offered at various IU campuses, beginning with 100- and 200-level courses and eventually extending to upper-division courses as well. Although the plan called for completion of this process within approximately three years, the desire to develop a fully rationalized Master Course Inventory was never realized. In fact, the faculty time and resources required to implement such a plan seem, in hindsight, entirely unrealistic. The increasing numbers of students enrolling in courses at one campus in fulfillment of degree requirements at another campus, however, highlight the importance of revisiting the IU MCI policy, especially since a lack of equivalence between courses with the same course number and title can seriously undermine student success.

1. To ensure comparability among identically numbered courses, the UFC called for the creation of a “model framework” for each IU course, which should specify
2. the content of the course,
3. the “nature of prerequisite qualifications” for students taking the course,
4. the student learning outcomes for the course, and
5. “any other agreed upon features essential to assure the comparability of course offerings.”

As we have been reminded in recent years through the creation and ongoing review of the Indiana Core Transfer Library, specifying course content, prerequisites, and learning outcomes is not sufficient to ensure comparability of similarly titled courses. Standards of required (or expected) competency with regard to learning outcomes can vary widely among what at first appear to be comparable courses. And as the Higher Learning Commission has recently clarified, instructor qualifications, training, and credentials do matter for college courses at all levels—even when offered as dual credit courses in the high schools. Standards of competency and instructor qualifications both surely belong among the unspecified additional features to assure comparability mentioned by the UFC in 2002, and as we revisit the 2002 policy, these should be made explicit. It should be noted that the A&T Policies Subcommittee and the Articulation and Transfer Committee were split on whether this section on instructor qualifications should be included in this document. To be sure, this is not to imply that IU should place into policy the scrutiny of individual faculty records other than to ensure that faculty hold appropriate credentials to teach in a particular field.

The 2002 Master Course Inventory Policy envisions the creation of a repository for the model frameworks of all existing IU courses, and it specifies the process for adding a new course to the MCI, for adopting a course offered on another IU campus, and for monitoring ongoing comparability of identically numbered courses across campuses. The process for adding courses essentially follows the long-standing course remonstrance process, which in recent years has been enhanced through the development of CARMIn (the Course Approval, Remonstrance, Maintenance, and Integration system). Similarly, CARMIn facilitates the process for filing a Matching Course Request in order to add a new offering of an existing IU course (i.e., offering an existing course on a new campus). Since model frameworks for all courses were never created, the Matching Course Request process does not precisely adhere to what is outlined in the 2002 policy document, but the spirit of this process is generally followed. The basic principle is that a campus wishing to add an offering of an existing course must demonstrate the comparability of its proposed offering through the remonstrance process. Disagreements about comparability of the proposed course are to be adjudicated by the UFC Committee on Course Comparability. It is not clear that such a committee has ever been convened, nor is the intended composition of its membership defined in the MCI document. It also seems unlikely that a committee made up of UFC members could adequately adjudicate a disagreement outside of their own disciplines.

Recently, based on the principles outlined in the 2002 MCI policy document, the Indiana University Articulation and Transfer Committee (IU A&T) has proposed a process for resolving situations where identically numbered IU courses appear not to be sufficiently comparable. The proposed process is as follows (please note that this process has been used in a few instances – Business Law and the Introduction to Creative Writing being the most prominent examples:

Course Conflict Resolution

Inevitably, discrepancies become apparent from time to time in already established courses with the same name and number. The process for communicating any incompatibilities should follow usual academic hierarchies, i.e., faculty report to chairs who report issues to the Dean, etc. Incompatibilities should be well-documented before this process is engaged. When offerings of identically numbered courses are found to be incompatible in terms of content, requirements, and standards, the following procedure will be followed (this will take the place of the UFC Committee on Course Comparability stipulated in the original MCI policy:

- 1) Any discrepancy among or between identically numbered courses offered at different campuses of Indiana University will be reported to the appropriate school and campus officials, who will notify the University Transfer Office (UTO). The UTO will in turn report the discrepancy to the IU Articulation and Transfer Committee (IU A&T) for discussion.

- 2) The members of IU A&T who represent the affected campuses will consult with representatives of the appropriate academic unit and with one another regarding possible resolution of the discrepancy. These discussions will be facilitated through the UTO.
- 3) If no solution can be reached through discussion by the IU A&T representatives, the UTO will gather pertinent information and documents, including but not limited to syllabi, statement of course goals and learning outcomes, schedule of topics covered, readings, assignments, and a brief summary of the issue and will convene disciplinary faculty from all IU campuses to establish the scope, purpose, and outcomes of the course within their program and for their curricular needs. These faculty may also recommend actions on course names and numbers to UFC as appropriate.
- 4) The UTO will inform the UFC of the issue and present the summary, documentation, and recommendation to the UFC.
- 5) The UFC shall vote on the recommendation, and their decision will be binding.
- 6) The UTO will inform the appropriate academic officers, the IU Records Office, track necessary changes, and report the results to IU A&T.
- 7) Appeals on the UFC decisions will be submitted to the UTO and the UFC campus representative for consideration at UFC. The appeal can only be based on a breach of process rather than substance. The UTO will also be informed of the appeal for information purposes.

Recommendation

IU A&T now recommends that the UFC consider approving an updated Master Course Inventory Policy—one that reflects the use of new university-wide systems (such as CARMIn), the administrative offices and structure that have been established since 2002, and the new realities of the state-mandated Core Transfer Library, Statewide Transfer General Education Core, and Single Articulation Pathways, along with the Course Conflict Resolution Process recommended by the A&T Committee.

We recommend, first and foremost, that the new policy document include the following:

1. a clear list of MCI principles,
2. a clear outline of criteria for judging comparability of course offerings,
3. clearly delineated procedures for establishing comparability of course offerings, and
4. a clear process for resolving conflicts and apparent lack of comparability among identically numbered courses.

We also offer the following list of MCI principles for consideration:

1. Identically numbered courses must be sufficiently comparable to allow substitution/interchangeability.
2. Identically numbered courses should be treated equivalently on all campuses. (This is not to suggest that degree requirements be the same across campuses.)

Requirements must remain in the hands of the degree-granting academic units. The intent, however, is that if a given course is determined as appropriate to fulfill a given requirement, that determination should apply to every offering of the given course, regardless of the campus of enrollment.)

3. Differences in mode of delivery are not, in and of themselves, always indicative of incomparability, but for some courses (e.g., lab courses, language courses), differences in mode of delivery may be an impediment to sufficient comparability
4. Courses that are not sufficiently comparable must have different course numbers.
5. When identically numbered courses are determined not to be sufficiently comparable, the original offering (i.e., the campus that created the course) has precedence for retaining the current number.
6. Substantive changes proposed for existing courses offered on multiple campuses must be discussed with the appropriate faculty on all affected campuses prior to the remonstrance period. (This important principle is explicitly spelled out in the instructions on the Course Request Form that was used for decades prior to the creation of CARMIn. It should be reiterated in current systems and procedures.)

And finally, we suggest that a revised MCI policy should address the following questions:

1. Should a “model framework” as envisioned in the 2002 MCI Policy document be created for some or all IU courses? Is there a practical way to do so? If so, how could such model frameworks be established? And what system should serve as the repository?
2. Is the faculty panel process outlined in 2002 workable? If not, who should determine the parameters of comparability? The faculty who originated the course? A group of faculty from all campuses that offer the course? If the latter, on what basis should proportional representation of such a panel be determined, e.g., departments that require the course within a degree program are likely to have more at stake than departments that offer the course as an elective? What rights belong with the faculty of the department that created a course? How far do the prerogatives for the creation of a course extend? What if the originating campus no longer teaches a course or only teaches it sporadically?
3. Should the Course Conflict Resolution Process proposed by IU A&T be implemented? If not, how should it be revised?
4. The present MCI Policy and the Course Conflict Resolution Process identify a UFC Committee on Course Comparability as the final step in resolving intercampus disputes with regard to courses with the same name and number. Is this binding? Should there be an appeal process? If so, what would that look like? Should there be a time-frame for deliberations with a default if the time-frame lapses?
5. Also, the make-up of the UFC Committee on Course Comparability is not specified. How can the policy ensure that subject matter experts from across the University are consulted?

The original policy and a revised version are included below:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

UNDERGRADUATE MASTER COURSE INVENTORY POLICY

(Approved by the University Faculty Council: April 24, 2001; by action of the University Faculty Council: April 23, 2002)

The UFC Educational Policies Committee proposes the following policy to reform the IU undergraduate Master Course Inventory. This policy would supersede the "Plan for Reform of the IU Master Course Inventory," adopted by the UFC in April 2001. The recently passed "Interim Reform of the Master Course Inventory" is accommodated in this document.

Policy for Reform of the IU Undergraduate Master Course Inventory

Currently, the IU Master Course Inventory (MCI) includes about 20,000 undergraduate courses. The information provided includes course number and title, credit hours, whether an S/F option exists, information about format (lecture/non-lecture), and other data of minimal usefulness to faculty. The goal of this plan is to outline a process whereby the web-based list can be converted to a useful and updated tool that will ensure that identically numbered/titled courses on multiple IU campuses are comparable enough that their full inter-campus transferability for all degree requirements poses no problems to students and instructors. (A web-based version of the current MCI is located at: <http://reg.iupui.edu/mci-all/default.html>).

The outcome of MCI reform should be the production of a more useful MCI resource base and of clear procedures for adding new courses to the MCI and for adopting an existing MCI course on a campus where it has not previously been taught.

[Comment: Wherever the future MCI is referred to as a "web-based document," it should be understood that some or all components of the future MCI may be located within the PeopleSoft course inventory. It is not yet clear in what respects the MCI will employ the PeopleSoft course inventory to accomplish the goals of this policy.]

Stage 1 (substantial completion by August 2003)

During 2002-03 units on different campuses that currently offer sections of identically numbered IU courses will be asked to arrive at a mutually agreed upon "model framework" for the course, that will apply systemwide. This model framework should specify through a brief but informative description the content of the course, the nature of prerequisite qualifications for enrollment, the anticipated learning outcomes, and any other agreed upon features essential to assure the comparability of course offerings. The degree of detail may reflect the degree of concern with variability of learning outcomes for specific courses. The model framework will be linked to the MCI web listing for each course. That listing will also specify basic data such as course number and title, credit hours, specific course prerequisites agreed on in the review process, and a listing of IU campuses on which the course is offered, which will be kept current. Units should initially request the assistance of the campus Registrar to identify courses historically most frequent on the transcripts of ICT students, and make revised MCI listings for

such courses the highest priority. It unlikely that time will allow such treatment of all multiple-campus 100/200 level course offerings during 2002-03, and the process will continue in subsequent years until all such 100/200 level courses have been covered.

At the completion of 2002-03, this body of reviewed courses will constitute the first portion of what this plan will refer to as the "Examined Course Inventory" (ECI). The ECI will be the form of the reformed Master Course Inventory. The process described here will largely convert the entire current MCI to the ECI over a period of time. The portion of the MCI that has not yet been converted through a review process will be referred to as the "Unexamined Course Inventory" (UCI). "ECT" and "UCT" are meant as conceptual terms for the purposes of this plan only.

By September 2003, the MCI should substantially have the following form:

Master Course Inventory (MCI)		
Unexamined Course Inventory (UCI)		Examined Course Inventory (ECI)
a) 300/400	b) 1-Campus	c) Lapsed (100/200 multi-campus)

The three subcategories of the UCI, as of 9/03, represent, a) all 300/400 level courses, which will not have gone through this form of comparability review, b) courses at all levels currently offered on only one campus, c) courses that have not been offered in recent years and are no longer listed in Bulletins on any IU campus, but which remain on the MCI, and remain eligible for adoption on any IU campus. There will initially be no easy way to distinguish between UCI categories b) and c).

Stage 2 (substantial completion by August 2004)

During 2003-04, campuses will be asked to do a substantive review of 300/400 level courses in order to allow them to move onto the ECI, under the same principles as Stage 1.

At the completion of Stage 2, the MCI structure will substantially be:

Master Course Inventory (MCI)		
Unexamined Course Inventory (UCI)		Examined Course Inventory (ECI)
b) 1-Campus	c) Lapsed	(100/200, 300/400 multi-campus)

Stage 3 (substantial completion by August 2005)

The Office of Vice-President for Academic Affairs will, during the period 2002-05, survey the UCI for courses in category b, and as these are identified, request that the single campus offering the course develop a model framework, moving the course to the ECI. Although it may not be possible to complete this work fully, the goal would be that by August 2005, the UCI should consist only of courses in category c, which will become a bank of titles that may be adopted in the future through MCI course-adoption procedures.

Procedures for adding new courses to the MCI

Beginning in Fall 2002, the Course Review and Remonstrance Process will require the department processing a new IU course to submit the course number, course title, credit hours, prerequisites, and other basic course information, along with a model framework of the course to assure compatibility across campuses. The new course proposal will be reviewed on the originating campus using the review process on that campus. During the remonstrance period, departments on other campuses will review the submission solely for clarity, to determine if sufficient information is provided to enable the reviewing department to offer the course if the department should chose to do so in the future.

Procedures for adopting existing courses from the MCI

Campuses that adopt existing IU courses from the MCI have a responsibility to ensure adequate comparability with existing offerings on other campuses. Campuses wishing to adopt an MCI course will follow the UFC Policy on Interim Reform of the Master Course Inventory, adopted in March, 2002, which reads:

Units planning to initiate new campus offerings through the adoption of course listings from the Master Course Inventory must request that the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs report which, if any, IU campuses currently offer the course in question, and that the VPAA collect and forward examples of syllabi and other pertinent information about recent offerings of the course on relevant IU campuses. The initiating unit will formulate a proposed syllabus in awareness of practices on other campuses, to be circulated for remonstrance among campuses currently offering the course. Disagreements as to whether the proposed offering is adequately comparable to existing offerings to be designated with an identical number will be adjudicated by the UFC Committee on Course Comparability (formerly known as the UFC ICT Committee).

As MCI reform proceeds, information concerning campuses offering MCI courses and model frameworks will increasingly be provided directly by the MCI. Where such information is available, the VPAA office may be bypassed, and the interim policy will be interpreted to imply the following procedures:

Units planning to initiate new campus offerings through the adoption of course listings from the Master Course Inventory (MCI) must consult the MCI to determine which, if any, IU campuses currently offer the course in question, and to consult the model framework indicated on the MCI. The initiating unit will formulate a proposed syllabus in awareness of practices on other campuses, to be circulated for remonstrance among campuses currently offering the course. Disagreements as to whether the proposed offering is adequately comparable to existing offerings to be designated with an identical number will be adjudicated by the UFC Committee on Course Comparability.

Once MCI reform is complete, this shall replace the interim procedure as UFC policy.

Procedures to monitor ongoing comparability

If data concerning student performance in sequence 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 Vice-President for Academic Affairs and notify the UFC Agenda Committee that this report has been made

Revisions of MCI information

Once information of the nature of the ECI is posted on the MCI, it is the responsibility of units on campuses offering the course periodically to review the information to assure that it is current and represents a standard for comparability. Substantial changes in course content, method, or requirements that may affect comparability should not be initiated on any campus, except in an experimental way, without communication with relevant units on other campuses. If course improvements have changed comparability measures, relevant departments should determine whether to alter the model framework for the course to reflect these improvements and make them systemwide, or to alter course numbering to reflect the fact that different campus offerings are no longer comparable for degree requirement purposes.

Proposed revised version:



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Undergraduate Master Course Inventory

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

Scope
Policy Statement
Reason for Policy
Procedures

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

Additional Contacts
Forms
Related Information
History

Effective: April 24, 2001

Last Updated: --

Responsible University Office:

*University Transfer Office, Office of the EVP for University
Academic Affairs*

Responsible University Administrator

University Faculty Council

Policy Contact:

TJ Rivard, Director
University Transfer Office

trivard@iu.edu

Scope

All Indiana University campuses, schools and departments.

Policy Statement

Campuses that adopt existing IU courses from the MCI have a responsibility to ensure adequate comparability with existing offerings on other campuses. ~~Campuses wishing to adopt an MCI course will follow the UFC Policy on Interim Reform of the Master Course Inventory, adopted in March, 2002, which reads:~~

Units planning to initiate new campus offerings through the adoption of course listings

from the Master Course Inventory must request ~~that the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs report which, if any, IU campuses currently offer the course in question, and that the VPAA collect and forward examples of syllabi and other pertinent information about recent offerings of the course from relevant IU campuses. The initiating unit will formulate a proposed syllabus in awareness of practices on other campuses, to be circulated for remonstrance among campuses currently offering the course through CARMin.~~ Disagreements as to whether the proposed offering is adequately comparable to existing offerings to be designated with an identical number will be adjudicated ~~by the UFC Committee on Course Comparability (formerly known as the UFC ICT Committee)~~ through the Course Conflict Resolution process below in the event that they cannot be resolved between or among the departments across campus lines.

To ensure comparability among identically numbered courses, there should be a mutually agreed upon “model framework” for each IU course that will apply systemwide, which should include:

1. A brief but informative description of the content of the course,
 2. the nature of prerequisite qualifications for enrollment students taking the course,
 3. the anticipated student learning outcomes for the course,
 4. standards of competency as defined by the discipline, and
 5. any other agreed upon features essential to assure the comparability of course offerings.
- A “model framework” with the above information will be developed for any new courses as well as any courses that are adopted from the MCI at any campus from the date of this policy forward.
 - When an existing course at multiple campuses is challenged for comparability, the above framework will be developed for that course, if it does not exist. If the challenged course is deemed incomparable, a new number and name will be assigned and a “model framework” will be designed by the campuses offering the new course.
 - The “model frameworks” will be designed through CARMin and housed in the University Records Office (this will serve as the official reference and repository for courses that campuses wish to offer from the MCI.)
 - When there is a challenge to the equivalency of a course, all **disciplinary** faculty who **regularly that** teach the course will be invited to discuss the issues involved; however, only the challenging campus and the campus that is being challenged will be required to resolve any differences. The opportunity for participation from the other campuses that teach the course could further the comparability of IU coursework.
 - The Course Conflict Resolution process will be used as a means of resolving any discrepancies and facilitated through the University Transfer Office (UTO).

- Recommendations as a result of this process will be forwarded to the UFC for a final decision. UFC decisions will be binding.
- Appeals on these decisions will be submitted to the UTO and the UFC campus representative for consideration at UFC. The appeal can only be based on process. The UTO will also be informed of the appeal for information purposes.

Reason for Policy

In 2002, the UFC passed the Indiana University Master Course Inventory Policy (<http://www.iu.edu/~ufc/docs/policies/MasterCourseInventory.pdf>) with the explicit goal of ensuring that identically numbered/titled courses on multiple IU campuses have sufficient comparability that their full inter-campus transferability for all degree requirements positions students as equivalently as possible across the campuses that offer the course.

Procedures

Master Course Inventory (MCI) Principles

1. Identically numbered courses must be sufficiently comparable to allow substitution/interchangeability.
2. Identically numbered courses should be treated equivalently on all campuses. (This is not to suggest that degree requirements be the same across campuses. Requirements must remain in the hands of the degree-granting academic units. The intent, however, is that if a given course is determined as appropriate to fulfill a given requirement, that determination should apply to every offering of the given course, regardless of the campus of enrollment.)
3. Differences in mode of delivery are not indicative of incomparability, but changes in method for some courses (e.g., lab courses, language courses), may create substantial enough differences in student proficiency that may create a discrepancy in the learning outcomes.
4. Comparability should also include consideration of what the purpose for the course is, i.e., proficiency for subsequent courses in a major versus the same course on another campus to only meet general education requirements. For example, a proficiency in a language course that is preparing a student for a major in the language may be very different from a language course on a campus with no major and a different mission.
5. Courses that are not sufficiently comparable must have different course numbers.

6. When identically numbered courses are determined not to be sufficiently comparable, the campus(es) which will retain the original number will be based on the following considerations:
 - a. For which campuses is the original name and number integral to their degree program(s)?
 - b. Which campus originated the course and how are they using it (i.e., gen ed, requirement, general elective, etc.)?
 - c. How often is the course offered?

The final decision for any changes will rest within the Course Conflict Resolution Process.
7. Substantive changes proposed for existing courses offered on multiple campuses must be discussed with the appropriate faculty on all affected campuses prior to the remonstrance period.

Revisions of MCI Information

~~Once information of the nature of the ECI is posted on the MCI,~~ Once adoption of courses and equivalencies across campuses have been established, it is the responsibility of units on campuses offering the course periodically to review the information to assure that it is current and represents a standard for comparability. Substantial changes in course content, method, or requirements that may affect comparability should not be initiated on any campus, except in an experimental way, without communication with relevant units on other campuses. If course improvements have changed comparability measures, relevant departments should determine whether to alter the model framework for the course to reflect these improvements and make them ~~systemwide~~ university-wide, or to alter course numbering to reflect the fact that different campus offerings are no longer comparable for degree requirement purposes.

Course Conflict Resolution

Inevitably, discrepancies become apparent from time to time in already established courses with the same name and number. The process for communicating any incompatibilities should follow usual academic hierarchies, i.e., faculty report to chairs who report issues to the Dean, etc. Incompatibilities should be well-documented before this process is engaged. When offerings of identically numbered courses are found to be incompatible in terms of content, requirements, and standards, the following procedure will be followed (this will take the place of the UFC Committee on Course Comparability stipulated in the original MCI policy:

- 1) Any discrepancy among or between identically numbered courses offered at different campuses of Indiana University will be reported to the appropriate school and campus officials, who will notify the University Transfer Office (UTO). The UTO

will in turn report the discrepancy to the IU Articulation and Transfer Committee (IU A&T) for discussion.

- 2) The members of IU A&T who represent the affected campuses will consult with representatives of the appropriate academic unit and with one another regarding possible resolution of the discrepancy. These discussions will be facilitated through the UTO.
- 3) If no solution can be reached through discussion by the IU A&T representatives, the UTO will gather pertinent information and documents, including but not limited to syllabi, statement of course goals and learning outcomes, schedule of topics covered, readings, assignments, and a brief summary of the issue and will convene disciplinary faculty from all IU campuses to establish the scope, purpose, and outcomes of the course within their program and for their curricular needs. These faculty may also recommend actions on course names and numbers to UFC as appropriate.
- 4) The UTO will inform the UFC of the issue and present the summary, documentation, and recommendation to the UFC.
- 5) The UFC shall vote on the recommendation, and their decision will be binding.
- 6) The UTO will inform the appropriate academic officers, the IU Records Office, track necessary changes, and report the results to IU A&T.
- 7) Appeals on the UFC decisions will be submitted to the UTO and the UFC campus representative for consideration at UFC. The appeal can only be based on a breach of process rather than substance. The UTO will also be informed of the appeal for information purposes.

Related Information

List other Transfer Policies here

History

Approved by the University Faculty Council: April 24, 2001; by action of the University Faculty Council: April 23, 2002 (will attached this version here)

Revised 2016