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Credit When It’s Due (CWID)

Community college and university partnerships dedicated to awarding associate degrees to transfer students who complete their associate degree requirements while pursuing a bachelor’s degree.
States with CWID Funding

12 Grants – 2012

3 Grants – 2013

Funders: Lumina Foundation, The Kresge Foundation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, USA Funds, The Helios Education Foundation, and Greater Texas Foundation
Optimization
Study of optimization of policies and processes using qualitative and quantitative data from the initial 12 CWID states
What do we mean by “optimization”?

Policy and program change at any level—state, system, institution—that…

- yields the largest number of students who are eligible for and able to benefit from reverse transfer.
- enables as many deserving students as possible to be conferred associate’s degrees without diminishing quality or otherwise negatively impacting student learning outcomes and program integrity.
- Doesn’t overextend resources
• About 50% of RT-eligible students do not complete a bachelor’s degree four years after transfer

• Only 3% of students completed an associate’s degree en route to the bachelor’s degree
## Initial Number Associate’s Degrees Conferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Associate’s Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associate degrees conferred through CWID as of **March 2014**
Five Dimensions

- Student Identification
- Consent
- Transcript Exchange
- Degree Audit
- Degree Conferral and Advising
## Five Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Identification</td>
<td>- Partner Institutions&lt;br&gt;- Eligibility Criteria&lt;br&gt;- Frequency and Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>- Consent Methods&lt;br&gt;- Consent Method Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript Exchange</td>
<td>- Transcript Exchange Method&lt;br&gt;- Transcript Exchange Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Audit</td>
<td>- Technology Infrastructure&lt;br&gt;- Course Equivalency Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Conferral and Advising</td>
<td>- Notification&lt;br&gt;- Engaging and Advising Near-Completers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who is involved?

- State, system or region?
- Institutions or partnerships?
- Publics or privates?
- In-state vs. out-of-state?
- Associate’s-degree granting only?
Eligibility Requirements

- No associate’s degree
- Residency requirement
- Cumulative college credits
- Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Criteria on Student Eligibility for Reverse Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating institution (ranges from 15 to 21 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student earned 16 or 17 courses (~45 college credits) toward the associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥ 15 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 60 cumulative college credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Suggested state criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥15 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 36 credit hour general education requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 60 cumulative college credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student is in good academic standing at the community college and the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥12 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 61 cumulative college credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student has a 2.0 GPA from participating community college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 15 cumulative college credits prior to transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student is in good standing at the 2-year and 4-year institution with a GPA of 2.0 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>• No state policy; but institutional residency requirements range from 12 to 45 college credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate in arts degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥ 12 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student does not have an academic suspension on record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student has not applied to graduate with a bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥ 15 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college and/or met community college residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirement (varies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥ 15 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student transcript evaluation occurs between 50 and 90 cumulative credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>• Student does not have an earned associate’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student met residency requirement at a participating community college (≥ 20 college credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student completed ≥ 45 cumulative college credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student has a 2.0 GPA from the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student enrolled at a university with intended degree of bachelor’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>• No state policy; institutional residency requirement is ≥ 10 semester credits or 24 quarter credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligibility Requirements

Credit right now or... Credit when ready?
Five Dimensions

- Partner Institutions
- Eligibility Criteria
- Frequency and Scope

- Consent Methods
- Consent Method Outcomes

- Transcript Exchange Method
- Transcript Exchange Capacity

- Technology Infrastructure
- Course Equivalency Systems

- Notification
- Engaging and Advising Near-Completers

CREDIT: when it’s due
Methods

FERPA
- Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) assisting many states; No written guidance from USDE
- Guidance toward Opt-in

Dominant Models
- **Opt-In**: students *actively affirm* consent to have transcripts sent and/or degree conferred
- **Opt-Out**: if students do not *actively deny* consent, they are assumed to have consented
Consent Methods

– Traditional: Email, postcards, letters, phone calls

– Technological solutions:
  • Integration with student information system
    – NC use of pop-up screens when students online to register
  • Integration into transfer student admission’s application
    – University of South Florida, Texas common application
Consent Method Outcomes

Opt-Out

- Virtually all students consent

Opt-In:

- Consent rate is percent of potentially eligible students who agree to participate of potentially eligible students contacted
  
  - Range: 10% to 50%
## Consent Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number Students Contacted</th>
<th>Number Students Opted In</th>
<th>Consent Rate</th>
<th>Consent Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6,307</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing the Consent Gap: North Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Contact</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Contact</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>+1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Contact</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td>+1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Contact</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>+505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Methods

– Fully electronic
  • Arkansas, Florida, Hawaii, Minnesota, Ohio
– Partially electronic
  • Missouri
– Manual
  • Maryland, New York, Oregon
– New Solutions:
  • NSC PDF transcript exchange
  • NSC fully electronic solution
  • Parchment (CO & GA)
### Transcript Exchange Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Electronic Transcript Exchange System Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arkansas uses a third-party system, the Standardization of Postsecondary Education Data Exchange (SPEEDE) server operated by NSC to facilitate transcript exchange. SPEEDE is a fully electronic transcript exchange system that individual institutions use to both send and receive electronic transcripts. See: <a href="http://speedeserver.org/">http://speedeserver.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Transcript exchange in Florida is facilitated by the Florida Automated System for Transferring Educational Records (FASTER). FASTER is used statewide by K-12 institutions and higher education to electronically exchange transcripts and records. See: <a href="http://www.floridastudentfinancialaid.org/FASTER/index.htm">http://www.floridastudentfinancialaid.org/FASTER/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>The University of Hawaii (UH) system developed and built the STAR system, which is a cloud-based technology that interfaces and communicates with all UH campus student information systems in real time. STAR allows the system to access students' transcripts and records without the need to send paper transcripts for the purpose of reverse transfer. See: <a href="https://www.star.hawaii.edu.10012/includes/PDFs/student/StarOverview.pdf">https://www.star.hawaii.edu.10012/includes/PDFs/student/StarOverview.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>The MnSCU system uses an internally developed electronic transcript exchange system called eTranscript to exchange transcripts among MnSCU institutions. The system pulls transcript data from Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) to generate the eTranscript. See: <a href="http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/329.html">http://www.mnscu.edu/board/policy/329.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio uses the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Clearinghouse (ATC) to exchange electronic transcripts among Ohio state-assisted institutions within the state. See: <a href="https://www.ohiohighered.org/transfer/atc">https://www.ohiohighered.org/transfer/atc</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Five Dimensions

| Student Identification | Partner Institutions  
|------------------------|----------------------|
|                        | Eligibility Criteria  
|                        | Frequency and Scope  |
| Consent                | Consent Methods      |
|                        | Consent Method Outcomes |
| Transcript Exchange    | Transcript Exchange Method |
|                        | Transcript Exchange Capacity |
| Degree Audit           | Technology Infrastructure |
|                        | Course Equivalency Systems |
| Degree Conferral and Advising | Notification  
|                        | Engaging and Advising Near-Completers |
– Automated vs. Manual

– University of Hawaii (UH) STAR System
  • Cloud-based system interfaces with student information system
  • UH coding routine automatically audits transfer students’ transcripts against associate’s degree requirements
  • Student portal with “what if” scenarios

– Ellucian’s DegreeWorks (SUNY)

– CollegeSource Inc’s u.achieve/DARS (MnSCU)
Technological Frameworks

- Decentralized
- Centralized
- Cloud

Legend: 
- \( Q \) = Identification
- \( \rightarrow \) = Transport
- \( \bigotimes \) = Transfer Credit Eval Processing
- \( \checkmark \) = Degree Audit Processing

Reverse Transfer = Automation of \( Q + \rightarrow + \bigotimes + \checkmark \)

Source: Gary Rodwell (HI) and Technology Working Group
Course Equivalency Systems

Variation in state equivalency and articulation systems

State-level course equivalency systems

- UH STAR, Ohio Course Equivalency Management System

Private Vendors

- Uselect
- CollegeSource’s Transfer Evaluation System
Emerging Articulation Approaches

Impact of articulating upper-division courses to the community college (OH)

- Columbus State Community College: ~80% of RT degrees required course substitutions or new articulations

Competency- or discipline-based (UH)

- 40% RT degrees: course-to-course only articulation
- 20% RT degrees: competency-based only articulation
- 40% RT degrees: mix of course-to-course and competency-based articulation
Five Dimensions

- **Student Identification**
  - Partner Institutions
  - Eligibility Criteria
  - Frequency and Scope

- **Consent**
  - Consent Methods
  - Consent Method Outcomes

- **Transcript Exchange**
  - Transcript Exchange Method
  - Transcript Exchange Capacity

- **Degree Audit**
  - Technology Infrastructure
  - Course Equivalency Systems

- **Degree Conferral and Advising**
  - Notification
  - Engaging and Advising Near-Completers
Degree Conferral & Advising

- Notify students and invite to commencement
- Notify universities and send updated records to them
- Advising
Next Steps: Research
Research Questions

- CWID Impact Study Questions
  - How many students are eligible, consent to participate, and receive associate’s degrees?
  - Which students are most likely to be eligible for reverse transfer?
  - Which students are most likely to receive a reverse transfer associate’s degrees?
  - What is the impact of a reverse transfer associate’s degree on students’ progress toward the bachelor’s degree and bachelor’s degree completion?
  - What is the impact of reverse transfer on states’ degree attainment and production?
Data Note Series

The Purpose of the Data Note Series is to provide ongoing analysis on policy-relevant questions related to reverse transfer using the CWID Baseline Dataset and CWID Impact Study Dataset.
Panelists: Michigan

Chris Baldwin, Ph.D.
Executive Director, Michigan Center for Student Success
Michigan Community College Association

Patty Farrell-Cole, Ph.D.
Director, University Relations and Policy Research
President’s Council, State Universities of Michigan
CWID in Michigan: Origins & Partners

- Legislative language in 2012 requiring colleges and universities to enter into reverse transfer agreements
- CWID emerged at exactly the right time in May 2012
- All 28 community colleges and 15 public universities agreed to participate in CWID grant proposal
- Led by the Michigan Center for Student Success (within the Michigan Community College Association) and Presidents Council State Universities of Michigan
- Other partners: Center for Educational Performance and Information & Michigan State University
CWID in Michigan: Grant Components

- Establish a statewide network
- Convene regular meetings of the network members
- Establish a clearinghouse for best practices emerging from local collaborations
- Launch research partnership
- Develop a common set of reverse transfer principles and practices statewide
- Develop state-level data reporting on reverse transfer
- Create marketing and communication materials for use by local collaborations
Nearly 165 reverse transfer agreements in place with more under discussion (as of January 2015)

Common elements in many agreements:

– Share student information in a manner that complies w/FERPA
– Develop a method to track students
– Follow legal and accrediting parameters
– Develop & document the system, processes, communication, etc.
– Explore opportunities to leverage existing technology
– Outline student communication, procedures and advising
– Attend meetings to monitor the local agreement
## Impact of CWID in Michigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Contacted</td>
<td>Consenting</td>
<td>Audited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample of students</td>
<td>13,961</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students contacted</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>99.28%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who opted-in</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>12.92%</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who did not respond</td>
<td>9,799</td>
<td>70.19%</td>
<td>70.70%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who did not opt-out</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree audits conducted</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>10.38%</td>
<td>77.06%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students awarded degree</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>32.53%</td>
<td>42.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students not awarded degree</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>43.68%</td>
<td>56.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students contacted for follow-up</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>36.23%</td>
<td>47.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps in Michigan

- Explore a partnership with National Student Clearinghouse to streamline the sharing of transcripts.
- Build consensus and buy-in for a common set of reverse transfer principles and processes that can be adopted consistently statewide.
- Develop a common message and supporting communications materials to promote the reverse transfer more effectively and consistently.
- Work to integrate key data elements in the state longitudinal data system to track reverse transfer in the future.
Panelist: Ohio

Calista Smith
Project Manager
Ohio Board of Regents
Ohio Credit When It’s Due Process Model

23 community colleges; 13 public universities

Part A: Identification to Sending Transcripts

*HEI Pool of Eligibility
*University Communicates with Students
Student Authorizes Transcript Release
University Sends Transcript to 2 Year College via ATC

Part B: Receiving Transcript to Degree Notification

2-Year College Evaluates Credit and Performs Degree Audit
Informs Student of Results
Awards Degree
2-Year College Updates University

* Process and technology changes anticipated
Round 1 of the Ohio Pilot

Pool of eligible students: 8718

- Enrolled in a participating university; 45 college level credits in USO; 20 college level credits at a participating 2 yr. institution
- No bachelor’s or associate on record
- Pursuing a bachelor’s with a min. university GPA of 2.0

Degree audits: 1408

- Pool size reduced after screens for recent degrees, financial holds and receipt of FERPA waivers.
- No more than a 20 credit residency requirement
- Institutional choice for which degrees to evaluate
- Waive traditional petition to graduate process

Graduates: 594

- Associate Degrees including Arts, Science, Technical Studies, Applied Business, etc.
- No graduation fee for award only.
- 597 total degrees, 594 unique individuals; 3 additional certificate awards

Source: Institution Self Reports, September 2013. Calculations revised 10/18/13
Pool of eligible students: ~7500 plus

Degree audits: ~1470

Graduates: ~400

- Enrolled in a participating university; 45 college level credits in USO; 20 college level credits at a participating 2 yr. college
- No bachelor’s or associate on record
- Pursuing a bachelor’s with a min. university GPA of 2.0

- Pool size reduced after screens for financial holds and receipt of FERPA waivers.
- No more than a 20 credit residency requirement
- Institutional choice for which degrees to evaluate
- Waive traditional petition to graduate process

- Associate Degrees including Arts, Science, Technical Studies, Applied Business, etc.
- 2 additional certificates
Lessons for Optimization

• Strong four year and two year institutional relationships
  – See benefits to both sides: recruiting, baccalaureate completion, seamless view to student
  – Communication among partners: sending student information, updates on when students are contacted

• Consider adding drop outs to eligibility pool

• Value of incentive structure: state funding for degree awards
Audience Questions & Answers
Contact Information

Debra Bragg (dbragg@Illinois.edu)
Jason Taylor (jason.taylor@utah.edu)
Chris Baldwin (cbaldwin@mcca.org)
Patty Farrell-Cole (patricia.farrell@pcsum.org)
Calista Smith (csmith@regents.state.oh.us)

CWID Website & Resources
http://occrl.illinois.edu/projects/cwid