

Annual Report of the  
Faculty Senate Academic Excellence Committee  
2014-2015  
Prepared by Greg Friedman, Chair

For the academic year 2014-2015, the Academic Excellence Committee (AEC) comprised the following members:

Greg Friedman (Mathematics), Chair  
Jan Quesada (Religion), Executive Committee Liaison  
David Bedford (Spanish)  
Nadia Lahutsky (Religion)  
Thomas Moeller (Finance)  
Robert Neilson (Chemistry)  
Steffen Palko (Education)  
Paul Schrodtt (Communications Studies), spring term only  
Loren Spice (Mathematics), AEC Liaison to the Honors College

This report describes the Committee's activity according to its charges. Recommendations for Academic Year 2015-2016 follow.

**Specific Charges:**

**Specific Charge 1. Explore university programs, policies, and institutions of a broad academic nature and of general faculty interest with a view towards proposing future Faculty Senate participation, assistance, and representation of faculty interests.**

This charge arose from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in response to concerns that academic activities were being undertaken throughout the campus without sufficient faculty notification or input. In response, the AEC first identified specific areas of concern and then invited directors of several university programs to meet with the committee, both to inform us about their activities and to discuss whether future Senate participation might be desirable. Overwhelmingly, these program directors made very positive impressions concerning both their ongoing activities and the extent to which faculty are already involved in these activities. These sessions were very informative for the committee members (and thus, indirectly, for the Senate as a whole) and resulted in the identification of several new possibilities for Faculty Senate and/or AEC involvement. All the directors were extremely welcoming of faculty input and participation, mostly allaying Senate concerns. In those instances where faculty input was not being adequately sought, it was largely the program directors who raised the issue and asked for Senate help in overcoming bureaucratic obstacles to faculty participation in decision-making processes.

In more detail:

A. In October, the AEC met with Daniel Terry, director of the FrogFolio program. This program allows students to develop online portfolios highlighting their academic and extracurricular accomplishments at TCU. Dr. Terry gave the committee an informational tour of the online technology and demonstrated some sample portfolios. He was quite upfront that this is new and evolving technology and that faculty input is very desirable in shaping best practices in the future of the program at TCU. There is already a faculty advisory committee helping to steer the program. Dr. Terry also allayed fears that there was an expectation (at least on his part) that FrogFolio participation would become mandatory for students in the near term and without faculty consent.

B. In March, the AEC met with Sarah Robbins, the acting Dean of the Honors College. She provided updates concerning the year-long Honors College program review and discussed several of the issues that the Honors College is grappling with as part of that review. Two particular issues directly involve AEC participation:

- The Honors College wants to reconstitute its advisory committee as two separate committees. Currently, the Honors College Advisory Committee plays the combined roles that the Advisory Committees and Curriculum Committees play in TCU's other colleges, and the Honors College would like to similarly separate out two committees to perform these separate functions. As the AEC wrote the charter for the current Honors College Advisory Committee and as that charter was passed through the Senate, the Honors College has requested that the Senate officially decommission the existing committee and approve the creation of the new committees. Dean Robbins believes there will be a plan in place to bring to the Senate in the fall. As the AEC's Honors College liaison, Loren Spice has been actively involved in these discussions.
- The Honors College has also created a task force to study two grade-based issues. The first issue involves concerns about grade inflation in the College and the perception that Honors students are not sufficiently challenged but are rather automatically rewarded for past academic accomplishments. Such concerns were brought to the AEC last year by Rob Garnett (Economics) based on statistical observations that arose in the Phi Beta Kappa nomination process and were seconded in informal conversations around campus. As a result, the AEC chair brought these concerns to Dean Robbins in the fall, who agreed that these are common concerns and initiated the task force to study the issue. As a result, both the AEC chair and Dr. Spice have been invited to participate in various task force meetings.

The second task force issue has been the question of revising the GPA requirements for continued membership in the Honors College.

Both of these issues (academic rigor and GPA cut-offs) are highly complex, and the task force has been gathering data and discussing possible solutions with the assistance of Cathan Coghlan in Institutional Research. At the March AEC meeting, Dean Robbins brought the AEC up-to-date on these on-going efforts and expressed interest in possible future discussions with the AEC about these and other issues. The next planned step was to discuss the task force's work with the then-upcoming visit to the Honors College by

external reviewers as part of the overall College study. The AEC, or the Senate as a whole, should follow up with Dean Robbins in the fall after the full program review report has been received.

In general, Dean Robbins was quite interested in future collaboration with the AEC, particularly in gathering faculty input on issues faced by the Honors College. However, it should be noted that a new permanent dean is expected replace Dean Robbins in the near future, and the AEC will need to make efforts to renew its relationship with the Honors College at that time.

C. In April, the AEC hosted Romana (Romy) Hughes, Director of the Koehler Center for Teaching Excellence and Assistant Provost of Educational Technology and Faculty Development. Ms. Hughes presented an overview of the Koehler Center's various programs and activities, which are remarkably varied and numerous. She also emphasized that faculty input is quite welcome and sought by the Koehler Center but that she has concerns that faculty voices are not being heard by other administrative units within the university. In particular, the following problems were mentioned, and it was suggested that the Senate might play a role in attempting to alleviate some of them:

- The current system for scheduling of rooms for courses is not doing a good job of matching faculty with their preferred classroom technologies, especially vis-à-vis the new high-technology classrooms in Rees-Jones Hall. Furthermore, no good surveying is being done of what classroom technologies are in high demand. These concerns overlap both with more general faculty dissatisfaction with the scheduling procedure and with faculty concerns that classroom remodelings, both to introduce technology and as regards basic furnishings, are not taking into account the wishes and needs of the faculty who actually use those rooms.
- The implementation of theme year courses as part of the Academy of Tomorrow seems to have hit some organizational snags. There might be opportunities for the Senate to work on this with David Whillock in his new position as the Associate Provost for the Academy of Tomorrow.
- The Koehler Center has been attempting to organize a "Chairs Council" to allow department chairs to interact, receive training, and mentor new chairs. It sounds like they could use some help with this.
- The Koehler Center lacks a direct Senate liaison. It might be useful to establish one.

**Specific Charge 2: Propose topics related to emerging trends in higher education for a faculty forum to be held in the spring semester and hosted jointly with the FSEC.**

This charge concerned a planned forum, proposed by Senate Chair Jan Quesada, in which faculty could come together to discuss topics of interest and concern as TCU moves forward with the Academy of Tomorrow. The idea was for faculty to propose their own points of focus and engagement for future university activities, curricula, and programs. Toward this end, the AEC was asked by the Senate Chair to provide some broad seed topics to initiate the discussion. At its November meeting, the AEC engaged in brainstorming with the Senate Chair concerning the format for the forum and some basic starting ideas.

Unfortunately, due to other, more pressing, issues in the spring, the forum never occurred.

### **Standing Charges:**

The AEC's standing charges are as follows:

1. Propose solutions to issues arising from policies, procedures, programs, and goals that affect the academic excellence of the University.
2. Act as a consultative body for the Faculty Senate (FS) representative to Faculty the Advisory Committee for the John V. Roach Honors College and bring relevant issues to FS.
3. Act as a consultative body for the FS representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA).
4. Propose strategies for innovation, creativity, & rigor in university programs.

Beyond the AEC's consultative interactions with the Honors College, which have already been covered above, the committee took actions related to its standing charges in the following instances:

- In the middle of the academic year, Paul Schrodt replaced Bob Akin as the Senate's COIA representative. COIA, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, is a "national, grass-roots faculty governance organization whose goal is to promote comprehensive reform of intercollegiate sports." However, after attending a COIA meeting, Dr. Schrodt reported concerns regarding the effectiveness of COIA and suggested that the Faculty Senate might better affiliate itself with other organizations better able to represent faculty interests in the realm of college athletics. Dr. Schrodt plans to meet with TCU's Faculty Athletic Representative, Rhonda Hatcher, to discuss COIA and will report back with further recommendations following that conversation.
- During the year, the AEC Chair was approached by Dick Rinewalt, Associate Dean in the College of Science and Engineering, regarding concerns about TCU's policy on transfer credits from community colleges. The current policy is that such transfers are no longer allowed "once 54 cumulative semester-hours have been earned." After that point, transfer credits are allowed only from four-year institutions, though no more than 12 semester hours may transfer once a student is enrolled at TCU and the last 30 hours of credit must be taken at TCU. Additionally, deans must approve each such transfer, usually in consultation with relevant department chairs. Dean Rinewalt's position is that the 54 hour rule for community college credit is both arbitrary and unnecessary given the other listed restrictions. Furthermore, he reported that the policy often creates hardships for students who, for example, would benefit from taking core courses in locations where four-year colleges are not available. It was also observed that there are large inconsistencies among

TCU's colleges regarding enforcement of this policy, with some colleges frequently waiving it and others strictly enforcing it.

Dean Rinewalt visited the AEC in November to explain his concerns, and the committee decided to take two courses of action: first, to solicit the opinions of the associate deans in the other colleges, and, second, to survey the transfer credit policies of "peer institutions". The results are summarized below, with more details in the appendix to this report:

- The AEC received responses from associate deans in all TCU colleges except for Harris (and the Honors College, which was not consulted). They were about evenly split on the idea of changing the 54 hour rule. Most indicated that they did not feel strongly either way and would be okay with a rule change. The two exceptions were Dick Rinewalt, whose position has been noted, and Mike Butler of AddRan, who felt strongly that the existing rule should remain in place. Dean Butler further noted that the existing policy arose several years ago as a compromise between not having any restrictions on transfer credits from community colleges and a policy of not allowing transfer credits from community colleges at all.
- A survey of 29 peer institutions revealed that only 5 have policies analogous to TCU's, i.e. that after earning a certain number of credits, students cannot transfer credits from a community college. More common is to have a limit on the total number of credits accepted from a community college, but no restriction on when they can be earned. Many of the universities with the highest ranked academic programs do not accept transfer credits from community colleges post-matriculation (or, in some cases, at all).

After deliberation, the committee saw both pros and cons to altering the policy. These are discussed in detail below in Appendix E. While many agreed that there are enough other restrictions in place that the 54-hour rule is not needed, especially if it is not enforced consistently, others felt that it is more in keeping with the increasing academic character of the university to consider banning transfer credits from community colleges altogether and, barring such an extreme step, to at least maintain current limitations. Ultimately, there was no consensus, and the committee ended its deliberations with a suggestion that the Senate Chair discuss the matter with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with an eye toward recommending further study of the matter. Given the perception that not many students are affected by this policy, it is not clear that this will become a priority issue for the Executive Committee.

(For the record, the following is the AEC Chair's position on the question: While it is true that the number of affected students might be relatively small, especially considering the strong willingness of deans in some colleges to waive such rules, this is not in itself a good reason to keep bad rules around, especially if the policy is not being enforced uniformly, and hence fairly, throughout the university. Given the number of other constraints on transfer credits that ensure that TCU diplomas signify a TCU education, the 54-hour rule seems capricious, especially given that the size of TCU's Core Curriculum makes it not at all unusual for a student with upper-division standing to take a lower-division course. What is the point of allowing a student to take an introductory course at a community college, but only if they take it soon enough? If there is a concern that community college courses are insufficiently rigorous compared to TCU courses, then the issue of whether community college transfer credit is allowed at all should be taken up

again. While compromising to allow post-TCU-matriculation community college transfer credit was a necessity in TCU's past, perhaps the recent increases in the academic reputation of the university merit a reevaluation of that compromise. But the current policy is neither fish nor fowl and so deserves some renewed consideration. Ultimately, the AEC failed to reach a strong conclusion, but it is the Chair's impression that even the committee members opposed to repealing the policy feel not that it is a good policy, but rather only that it is a weak compromise between opposing principles. Hence, the Chair believes this is a matter deserving of further study by a committee commissioned either by the Provost or by the Faculty Senate Chair.)

### **Suggestions for Academic Year 2015-2016**

The following suggestions for possible activities for the AEC for Academic Year 2015-2016 primarily follow from the activities and charges of the past academic year.

1. The AEC should weigh the Faculty Senate's continued membership in COIA (the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics) and consider inter-university affiliations with groups perhaps better suited to promote TCU's interests in academic integrity within college athletics.
2. The AEC should provide the Honors College with whatever aid and/or Senate resolutions are necessary to help them reconstitute their current Advisory Committee in a manner better able to serve their needs. The AEC should also remain available to discuss other issues that come from this year's program review and from continued work by the task force assessing grade-related matters.
3. The AEC should work with the registrar's office and the Koehler Center with a view toward reforming the classroom registration process. The current process promotes "scheduling battles" among departments and does not adequately match classroom functionality with faculty technology usage priorities, especially in non-college-specific buildings such as Rees-Jones Hall. It also does not adequately collect information concerning these faculty priorities.
4. Related to the previous point, and given existing renovation plans in buildings such as Winton-Scott that have been formulated with explicit disregard for, and sometimes directly in opposition to, faculty preferences, the AEC might explore mechanisms for faculty to have a say in decisions concerning classroom remodeling, including both technology and basic furnishings.
5. The AEC should meet with David Whillock to discuss how best to incorporate faculty input into the Academy of Tomorrow. One particular point of discussion would be the planned Theme Years and Theme Courses.
6. The AEC might discuss further with Koehler Center Representatives how the Faculty Senate can aid in the establishment of a Chairs Council.

Two additional issues, which might be addressed next year, have been raised by committee members:

1. Intellectual property ownership issues have become a concern as universities assert more ownership of the academic and other intellectual products of their faculty. The American Association of University Professors recently published a report containing, among other things “eleven very specific principles that ought to be included in handbooks or collective bargaining agreements to clarify intellectual property policies [at universities].” The AEC or full Faculty Senate might consider a motion to adopt these principles.
2. The deadlines for registration for summer study abroad programs that are set by TCU’s Center for International Studies are quite early, often occurring in the fall, and may be adversely affecting registration in such programs, especially those for which funding awards are not made until the spring semester. David Bedford raised this issue regarding study abroad programs originating in the Department of Spanish and Hispanic Studies, and he is currently exploring the experiences of other TCU language programs. Ideally, perhaps the AEC could work with the Center for International Studies and the directors of the affected study abroad programs to discover a solution.

Finally, the AEC would like to suggest some activities for other committees that follow up either on work of the AEC this year or on previous Faculty Senate motions with which the AEC was involved:

1. The AEC should be given a standing charge to interact annually with the Koehler Center. The AEC could have an official liaison to the Koehler Center or could simply be given a charge to act as a consultative body. The AEC Chair believes that deciding on and implementing such a charge would be a task for the Governance Committee.
2. In 2013-2014, the Faculty Senate passed a motion encouraging the university to open a testing center. As the already-high need for such a testing center continues to mount, several colleges have undertaken the process of beginning to develop their own testing centers. However, such ad hoc, individual solutions are unlikely to meet all needs, and the development of a centralized university-level testing center is still a necessity. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee should continue to press this point with the administration.
3. The Executive Committee should follow up on the issue of transfer credits from community colleges, which is discussed in detail above, perhaps appointing a committee to study the broader transfer credit issue in greater depth or asking the Provost to appoint a committee toward the same end.
3. In Fall 2010, the Faculty Senate and the Student Government jointly authorized the implementation of the TCU Undergraduate Honor Code, which had been worked on previously by both the AEC and the Student Relations Committee. While this issue came back to the Senate this year, it has now been reassigned once again to yet another incarnation of a Senate committee for study. The Executive Committee should determine whether there is the institutional will among the faculty, students, and administration for such an honor code. If there is not, then the Honor Code should be abandoned before any more effort is spent on it.

4. In 2008, the Faculty Senate passed a motion suggesting that internal GPA computations for students who have taken a course multiple times use the average of the earned grades (as opposed to the current procedure by which "last grade stands"). The passing of that motion was due to several compelling reasons, not least of which was that this is how student GPAs are computed externally, and so this internal computation gives students a misleading appraisal of their graduate school prospects. Despite repeated requests for action or other official response, the Provost has not acted on this resolution. The Executive Committee should demand an official response from the Provost.

## APPENDIX CONCERNING AEC CONSIDERATION OF A SUGGESTION BY DEAN RINEWALT TO REVOKE THE RULE AGAINST TRANSFER OF CREDIT FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES ONCE A STUDENT HAS ACQUIRED 54 HOURS

Please see the main body of the AEC annual report for details concerning Dean Rinewalt's initial concerns. This appendix contains data gathered and a summary of committee discussion.

### **A. Current TCU Transfer Credit Policies:**

#### **Limit on total transfer credits:**

- Only 66 hours from a community college may be credited toward the TCU degree.

#### **Limits on transfer credits after matriculation:**

- Once a student is enrolled at TCU, no more than 12 total semester hours, except those earned in an approved study abroad program, may be transferred from other schools.
- All students must receive prior written approval of the appropriate academic dean if they wish to take courses at another institution and have those courses count toward a degree at TCU. Coursework taken without prior approval may not be applied to a degree.
- No credit may be transferred from a community college once 54 cumulative semester hours have been earned.

#### **TCU Residency Requirements:**

- Successfully complete at least 124 semester hours of credit (total).
- Complete residence work at the University earning at least 58 semester hours applicable to the degree program in addition to any hours accepted from other schools.
- The last 30 semester hours for the degree must be taken at TCU except as provided for in certain degree programs.
- Successfully complete at TCU at least 42 of the total hours required for graduation in advanced courses numbered 30000 or above.
- Successfully complete at TCU at least 12 semester hours of advanced work in the field of the major and at least six semester hours of advanced work in the field of the minor.

## **B. Data gathered from associate deans:**

### Letter sent to deans by the committee:

Dear Dean ,

I'm writing to you in my capacity as chair of the TCU Faculty Senate Academic Excellence Committee because my committee has been asked to examine TCU's policy on transfer credits from community colleges, in particular the policy of forbidding such transfers once a student has accrued 54 TCU credit hours.

We have been told that this policy creates practical difficulties for some students and for deans attempting to help students deal with unusual circumstances outside of their control. It has also been suggested to us that, since early-career community-college credit is permitted and there is no time constraint on transfer hours from four-year colleges, the existing residency requirements and transfer credit caps minimize the need for an additional restriction specifically on late-career community-college credit.

We are interested in hearing all sides of this matter, and so I seek your input as a TCU associate dean. In particular, we would like to know your position on the existing policy, your rationale for that opinion, and whether you would consider any change to this policy to be necessary or appropriate.

Thank you in advance for your response.

Sincerely,  
Greg Friedman  
Department of Mathematics  
Chair, Faculty Senate Academic Excellence Committee TCU

### Responses from deans:

#### Mike Butler (AddRan):

Hi Greg,

I was part of the task force that made the recommendations to University Council that resulted in the current transfer credit policy. At the time, TCU's policies were extremely lax in comparison to most of our peer and aspirant institutions. After examining those policies at other institutions, the group settled on something of a mid-point solution, falling between those institutions who had few if any restrictions on transfer credit and those who prohibited virtually any post-matriculation transfer credit. I am attaching a file that I created at the time (Fall 2005, I believe) summarizing many of those policies. [See following appendix - GBF]

As far as the particular restriction on community college transfer after 54 hours have been earned, I guess I would say that I do not find it inappropriate and have not had any special difficulty either enforcing the policy or granting occasional exceptions to it in situations that I deemed to

be appropriate. Indeed, much of what we as Associate Deans do in relation to individual students is to consider requests for exceptions to some policy or another. I don't see what makes requests for exceptions to this policy any more difficult to address than any other.

Hope this helps.

Mike

---

### Chip Stewart (Communication):

Greg <

I appreciate you reaching out to me on this. It's not something we see very often in this college < though I imagine that's because we generally advise people that taking community college credits after 54 hours isn't allowed.

I know I've waived this restriction in the past couple of years, but I think it was only once, for the kind of unusual circumstances you mentioned. Student dealing with some family issues that required her to stay at home for the summer, where the only option to take a course was at a 2-year school.

Here's an example where the bar wasn't helpful < we have a student this fall who had to stay home in Houston for medical reasons (her doctor and physical therapy were there), but she was hoping to graduate in spring 2015. Her best option was going to be to take some courses down there that she could transfer up < and the best option for those was at a nearby community college. But we already had to break one rule (no transfer hours in final 30 hours) to make that a possibility; I didn't feel comfortable breaking a second (no community college hours after 54) to make this happen.

Thankfully, she found a willing four-year school (a branch of UH) to accommodate this, and it worked out OK. But all she needed were general 10000- and 20000-level courses, and I think a 2-year school would have been fine for that.

So, as I mentioned, I don't see this is a big issue < it's not one we face often. But I certainly wouldn't oppose dropping the rule.

Thanks, and best wishes as you deliberate on this.

Chip Stewart  
Associate Dean, Bob Schieffer College of Communication

---

Joe Butler (Fine Arts):

Greg,

I've discussed this matter with Andie Piehl, who is in charge of undergraduate degree certification for the CFA.

In short, we would be happy to eliminate the 54 credit rule. Our experience jibes with the view expressed in your second paragraph. We find the rule to be an unnecessary encumbrance, considering all the other checks and balances that are in place.

Joe

---

Ray Pfeiffer (Neeley)

Dear Greg,

I've spoken with some of our more experienced folks in student advising and with my Assistant Dean, Lynn Muller, about this issue.

While it seems that for a relatively small number of students this does create practical difficulties, the number appears to be quite small.

We did observe that as long as there are controls on the system in the form of specific identification of course that do and do not transfer, one could argue that the 54 credit hour rule is not necessary, which I think you're referring to in your second paragraph.

Lynn also noted that the separate restriction of a maximum of 12 credit hours transferred once at TCU and the restriction of no transferred hours in the last 30 hours also serve to make the 54 credit hour rule unnecessary.

No one seemed to feel strongly about the 54-hour rule. I'd characterize it as, yes, there are occasionally some students we'd like to be able to help in this regard, but it's a fairly rare occurrence.

I hope this is helpful.

Ray

---

Becky Taylor (Education)

Greg,

As an associate dean, I do encounter this, but only rarely. Our students are not accepted into the College of Education until they are juniors, so most have already transferred credit. On those occasions when this does occur, I make an exception if the student appears to be a good student (GPA) or has other extenuating circumstances. I like that it is a rule that can have exceptions rather than the other way around. If they have more than 54 hours, I most often require that they take a course from a 4-year college.

Becky

---

Dick Rinewalt (Science and Engineering)

[Note: Dean Rinewalt presented his arguments against the current policy directly to the committee, and these have been summarized in the main report. These are additional e-mails sent later by Dean Rinewalt.]

E-mail 1:

Greg,

There is another argument for removing the community college rule that I forgot to mention. The community colleges are becoming harder to recognize.

1) They are changing their names. Tarrant County Junior College dropped "Junior" from its name in 1999. Collin County Community College became Collin College in 2007. Dallas County Community College District is composed of campuses named El Centro College, Richland College, Brookhaven College, etc.

2) Ten years ago, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board approved Brazosport College, South Texas Community College, and Midland College to offer bachelors degrees. Other community colleges are pressing for that authority, and there will be a push in the next legislative session for that. <http://www.texastribune.org/2014/09/01/momentum-bachelors-degrees-community-colleges>

Dick

E-mail 2:

Greg,

Here is an Excel document [omitted from report but available upon request - GBF] that summarizes the 420 Academic Action Forms (AAFs) that I approved during the previous academic year (August 1, 2013, to July 31, 2014). There are two sheets, one for four-year schools and one for two-year schools.

(I was able to create this summary because Science & Engineering has been doing AAFs on line for three years. The other colleges were still using paper forms until a month ago.)

I did not try to standardize the school listing. The school is listed the way the student entered it. For example, some students listed Brookhaven College while others listed Dallas County Community College District (DCCCD), but Brookhaven is part of DCCCD.

CUM HRS are projected for the time that the student would be taking the course, but the TCU GPA is what was on the transcript at the time the student submitted the request.

I have not listed the 40 AAFs that I denied during that period. Five of those were for violation of the 54-hour rule. However, many more were denied

informally; i.e., a student asked before submitting the AAF and I denied the request. I estimate that I verbally deny at least 20 per year because of the 54-hour rule. I ask advisors to warn students that I never approve an exception, so there are probably more that I don't hear about. I approved only one exception to the 54-hour rule last year. It was an extreme hardship case.

86% of the hours transferred from four-year schools was in major and associated requirements. Faculty in Science & Engineering are best qualified to evaluate those courses and should be allowed to advise their students to take courses at a school that best fits their needs.

Dick

**C. Transfer credit policies at other universities at the time the policy was enacted (provided by Dean Butler):**

	In addition to standard residency requirement.....
Baylor	after matriculation, students are limited to 15 hours for transfer to Baylor.
Creighton	normally students will not be able to transfer more than 12 hours of approved transient study during the entire degree program at Creighton.
Duke	a student may receive transfer credit for no more than two courses taken at other U.S. institutions.
Emory	students are permitted to take summer work at another institution if they have not completed 68 semester hours; amount of credit earned may not exceed the number of hours necessary to bring total to 68.
Northwestern	a maximum of four transfer credits from other domestic colleges or universities may be earned; acceptability of community college credit varies by college.
Notre Dame	no more than eight transfer credits may be approved for a single summer.
Pepperdine	after ininitial enrollment, no more than twelve units may be transferred from another school; nothing from a two-year college once 64 units have been earned.
Rice	no more than 14 semester hours of transfer credit in summer schools other than Rice may be applied to any rice degree.
SMU	after matriculation, students are limited to 15 hours for transfer to SMU from accredited colleges or universities; post-matriculation transfer work from two-year institutions will not be approved.
Tulane	students may earn transfer credit from accredited 4-year instiutions.
Tulsa	permission to transfer junior college hours will be granted only in extenuating circumstances; tuition differentials, personal finances, or the fact that a course may be easier at a junior college do not qualify as extenuating circumstances.
Vanderbilt	students may receive credit for a maximum of two courses from another accredited 4-year institution.
Wake Forest	students may earn transfer credit from accredited 4-year instiutions.
Denver	as far as I can tell, nothing beyond standard residency requirements.
Drake	
Marquette	
North Texas	
St. Louis	
UT-Arlington	

## **D. Current transfer credit policies at other universities:**

<b>Stricter Policies</b>	
Dartmouth College	Courses offered by accredited four year degree-granting institutions are potentially acceptable for transfer credit. Credits given by extension programs, junior or community colleges or internship programs are not transferable. Students who transfer to Dartmouth after one or more years elsewhere may not transfer further credits.
Davidson College	Courses from a two-year college are not acceptable after completion of sophomore year.
Duke University	Students are allowed to transfer credit for a maximum of two-courses taken at another accredited college or university in the United States after having matriculated at Duke.
Duquesne University	Students may transfer up to 60 credits. Enrolled students who have earned, or will have earned, a total of 60 credits prior to a transfer enrollment are not permitted to take additional coursework from any two-year institution.
Furman University	Credit cannot be accepted from a two-year institution once a student has earned 64 semester hours.
George Washington University	Once a student has earned 60 credits, including advanced standing and transfer credits, any additional transfer credits must come from accredited four-year, degree-granting institutions.
Pepperdine University	After initial enrollment at Seaver College, students can transfer at most twelve units from another school. Courses taken at a two-year college are transferable only if the students have earned fewer than sixty-four units total. Units earned at a two-year college after the student has earned a total of 70 units for all college work, including Seaver College, will not be accepted.
Rice University	The BUSI, CHEM, ECON, ENGL, HIST, PHYS, and POSC departments will not grant Rice equivalent credit to coursework completed at community colleges or 2-year institutions.
Texas Christian University	Students must receive prior written approval of the academic dean of their major if they wish to take courses at another institution. No more than 12 total semester hours may be transferred from other schools. No credit may be transferred from a community college once 54 cumulative semester hours have been earned.
Tulane University	Continuing or returning students in academic good standing are eligible to apply for transfer credit from other regionally accredited four-year institutions. Credit earned at junior or community colleges is not accepted for transfer.
Vanderbilt University	Students may receive credit for a maximum of two courses taken during summers at another four-year, fully accredited institution.
Wake Forest University	Once a student is enrolled at Wake Forest he/she may not take courses to satisfy the math/science, art, English, philosophy or sociology requirements elsewhere, nor may he/she take community or junior college classes for transfer credit.
<b>Looser Policies</b>	
Baylor University	A maximum of seventy (70) semester hours may be transferred from a community/junior college. No course at or above the "3000" level may be taken at a community/junior college and no community/junior college course will be evaluated as an advanced course. After matriculation, a student may transfer a maximum of fifteen (15) semester hours. They may transfer a maximum of

	two (2) courses from any single course prefix.
Boston College	At Boston College, transfer credit is established on a course-by-course basis. Transferable courses must have been completed at regionally accredited colleges or universities.
Chapman University	A maximum of 70 semester credits of community college credit will be applied toward the bachelor's degree. No limit is placed on the number of transferable credits from regionally accredited four-year colleges or universities.
College of the Holy Cross	Courses taken by current Holy Cross students at other colleges and universities may be accepted in transfer: 1) if they satisfy degree requirements, that is, if they are used to remove deficiencies or to fulfill major or common requirements; or 2) if they satisfy requirements for College-sponsored academic programs, that is, if they satisfy requirements for minors, concentrations, or the premedical program. Distance learning courses (correspondence and internet courses) are not transferable.
DePaul University	DePaul will accept for transfer credit baccalaureate-level courses completed at baccalaureate granting US institutions that are fully accredited. DePaul will accept for transfer credit college-level courses that are earned in Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree programs earned at 2-year institutions that are fully accredited. Applied Sciences or Fine Arts will be reviewed for transfer credit on a course-by-course basis.
Drexel University	The maximum number of credits that may be transferred into a Drexel undergraduate program is 90 quarter credits (60 semester credits).
Elon University	Students must get pre-approval. Credit can be earned through courses at accredited junior colleges or community colleges and for courses taken at accredited four year colleges. No more than 65-semester hours of credit will be allowed from two-year institutions.
Georgetown University	The maximum number of transferable credits is one-half of the total required for the degree (60 credits).
Gonzaga University	Transfer of credit for courses taken in the summer at another college or university by Gonzaga students must be authorized prior to taking the course.
Hofstra University	A maximum of 64 semester hours is transferable from a junior or community college.
Lafayette College	All courses must have prior approval via a petition to the Registrar's Office.
Lehigh University	Courses taken at a two or four year institution where a grade lower than a "C" has been earned will not transfer. ("C-" or below will not transfer)
Lipscomb University	A maximum of 63 semester hours may be transferred from a two-year school. A maximum of 94 semester hours may be transferred from a four-year school.
Loyola Marymount University	Credit will not be accepted for courses which exceed the 60 semester hour maximum allowed for undergraduate course work from community colleges, or exceed the 90 semester hour maximum allowed for undergraduate course work from four-year institutions.
Loyola University	Undergraduate students are limited to a total of 12 hours of study at other colleges and universities after they matriculate to Loyola.
Marist College	Up to 70 credits may be accepted from a community college or accredited two-year institution.
Stetson University	Once 64 credits have been earned in courses generally accepted in a bachelor's degree program, permission of the Dean is required to transfer credit from a primarily lower-division, two-year community or junior college.
Syracuse University	Students who intend to complete coursework elsewhere (such as during summer session or while on leave of absence) must receive prior approval from the home college office if credit is to be applied toward the SU degree.

## **E. Summary of AEC deliberations:**

Arguments in favor of changing the current policy (that prohibits transferring hours from a junior college once a student has 54 hours at TCU):

1. Removing the policy would create greater consistency across the university by removing dean judgement concerning how strictly they want to enforce the policy.
2. Most transfer courses after matriculation (especially from junior colleges) are core courses or associated requirements and it's not so clear why such transfers should be allowed in roughly the first two years but then not in the junior year (senior year is already nixed by the last-thirty-hours at TCU rule).
3. The basic idea of the policy seems to be quality control but a) as already noted, students can take exactly the same classes earlier in their careers and b) students can still take these courses from a lot of low-quality four year institutions, for example online and for-profit universities. Also, c) there are a number of other restrictions on transfer credits that manage how many outside courses student can bring in and their quality, including residency requirements, the last-30-hour rule, and the need for dean's approval (in consultation with chairs) on all transfers.
4. Only one associate dean (Dean Butler) seems to feel strongly about keeping the policy as-is.
5. While a few peer institutions have similar policies, there are not many of them. More common are caps on total amounts of transfer credit (in many cases allowing none from junior colleges at all).

Arguments in favor of keeping the current policy:

1. Students can take junior college courses earlier in their academic careers, but once past a certain point they should be committed to taking courses from the highest level academic institutions (the prima facie argument).
2. Deans should have individual discretion within their colleges to implement or override policies as they see fit, and it's okay if they have different philosophies about how to approach such decisions.
3. The policy makes a statement about quality control that creates a certain perception while still not abolishing all post-matriculation junior college transfer credit (basically Dean Butler's "midpoint solution" argument and together with an argument that the perception resulting from the rule is more important than the rule itself).
4. Only one associate dean (Dean Rinewalt) seems to feel strongly about abolishing the policy.
5. Some peer institutions do have policies analogous to ours (Davidson, Furman, George Washington, Pepperdine, Stetson).
6. The policy probably doesn't harm too many students in the long run, so it might not be worth the effort to fight over it when the Senate has other business to which to attend.

General conclusions: The real goal of policies like this (and those at other schools) seems to be to try as best as possible to ensure that students are taking the best possible classes; while there might be bad classes offered at some four-year schools, at least junior colleges are a clear target. Consequently, while not many schools have policies exactly like TCU's, many have at least some restrictions on community college credit, a good number of the better schools banning it altogether (or at least banning it post-matriculation). Thus, given this overarching goal and given that the original argument for the existing halfway measure is ten years old and that TCU has made strides in academic improvement in the interim, perhaps the best solution is to appoint a blue-ribbon committee comprising deans and faculty to revisit the

entire transfer credit policy from scratch in order to rethink exactly what policies are best suited to achieve this desired goal.

The Senate Chair was asked to discuss the issue with the Executive Committee to gather their opinions.