

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM: 5.J

DATE: June 10, 2015

SUBJECT: WICHE Passport Update

The Regental system’s involvement with the WICHE Passport initiative has been advancing under the proposed timeline and campus representatives have been working to develop the Learning Outcomes and Proficiency Criteria for the four primary areas currently under discussion (Human Culture, Physical/Natural Science, Critical Thinking and Creative Expression). Institutional representatives were identified this past year and those facilitating this work on behalf of the system can be found below.

<i>Passport Area</i>	<i>Institutional Representative</i>
Human Culture	
BHSU	Amy Fuqua (English) & David Wolff (History)
DSU	Viki Johnson (Sociology)
NSU	Erin Fouberg (Geography) & David Grettler (History)
SDSM&T	Kathy Antonen (Humanities) & Frank Van Nuys (Social Sciences)
SDSU	Dale Potts (History) & Christi Garst-Santos (Modern Languages)
USD	Kurt Hackemer (History) & Laura Vidler (Languages & Linguistics)
Natural/Physical Science	
BHSU	Charlie Lamb (Chemistry) & Dan Asunskis (Biology)
DSU	Dale Droge (Biology)
NSU	George Nora (Chemistry) & Andrew Russell (Biology)
SDSM&T	Linda DeVeaux (Biology)
SDSU	Madhav Nepal (Biology) & David Cartrette (Chemistry)
USD	Tina Keller (Physics) and Lynn Riley (Biology)
Critical Thinking	
BHSU	Tim Steckline (Speech) & Adam Gaffey (Speech)
DSU	Mary Francis (Library)
NSU	Jon Schaff (Political Science) & Lynn Dilivio (Psychology)
SDSM&T	Dan Dolan (Mechanical Engineering) & Stu Kellogg (Industrial Engineering)
SDSU	Hillary Hungerford & Tyler Miller (Psychology)
USD	Joseph Tinguely (Philosophy)

(Continued)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Discussion and Recommendation.

Creative Expression	
BHSU	Desi (Jami) Schoenewies (Art) & Gina Gibson (Digital Communication)
DSU	Alan Montgomery (Arts & Science)
NSU	Greg Blair (Art) & Josh Frachiseur (Theatre)
SDSM&T	Deb Mitchell (Art) & Michael Hudgens (English Literature)
SDSU	Sharon Smith & Don Crowe (Music)
USD	David Holdhusen (Music) & Sara Sik (Art)

Regental system leads for Human Culture (Laura Vidler – USD) and Physical/Natural Science (Madhav Nepal – SDSU) have taken part in two face-to-face meetings in Boulder during the Spring 2015 term, and through a series of follow-up conference calls matrixes have been developed to capture the current framework being discussed (see Attachment I). Representatives for Critical Thinking (Lynn Dilivio – NSU) and Creative Expression (Alan Montgomery – DSU) have taken part in one face-to-face meeting with their multi-state counterparts and will return in October to further develop and refine the proficiency criteria to align with the learning outcomes currently under consideration (see Attachment II).

As this work has unfolded, a number of faculty representatives voiced their concern about ongoing system participation in the Passport initiative. To evaluate the extend of these concerns, campus representatives were encourage to respond to a brief survey that was distributed on May 29 and the feedback received can be found in Attachment III. AAC representatives should be prepared to discuss the feedback received from institutional representatives and evaluate the systems continued involvement in this initiative.

Draft Passport Learning Outcomes for Human Culture and Natural/Physical Science

HUMAN CULTURES SOUTH DAKOTA		
Passport Learning Outcome Features	Passport Learning Outcomes (What the student has learned)	Transfer-Level Proficiency Criteria (Evidence of proficiency of the learning outcome appropriate at the transfer level) No single student is expected to demonstrate ALL of these Proficiency Criteria nor is this intended to be a list of all possible Proficiency Criteria. Students will be able to:
Core Knowledge	Define and apply knowledge of changing human cultures (including vocabulary, terminology, information, concepts, theories, and debates relevant to the disciplines).	<p>Identify and analyze major philosophical and ethical theories in world cultures.</p> <p>Identify and analyze the complexity and diversity of cultures, religious beliefs, and economic and governmental systems.</p> <p>Respond to media using appropriate vocabulary, terminology, and identifying core concepts.</p> <p>Identify grammatical structures used in the target language (tenses, moods, parts of speech, pronouns, etc.)</p> <p>Identify stereotypes of the target culture in texts, images, etc.</p> <p>Identify basic geographical features related to the target language/culture (countries, capital cities, topographical features, bodies of water, flora/fauna etc.)</p> <p>Use vocabulary in the target language at the novice level in the areas of family, health, travel, food, work, education, celebrations, sport, pastimes, and daily life.</p> <p>Identify products, practices, and perspectives of the target culture in the target language.</p>
Modes of Inquiry	Identify and describe past and current forms of inquiry into changing human cultures across time and place.	<p>Identify the techniques of historical analysis including cause and effect and change over time that include understanding of cultural diversity.</p> <p>Identify the difference between primary and secondary sources in history.</p> <p>Identify the importance of striving for objective interpretation of evidence.</p>

		<p>Respond to a reading, identifying themes, issues, and approaches.</p> <p>Identify and reflect on effective strategies for language learning.</p> <p>Identify and describe two teaching strategies used in your language classroom and explain their purpose.</p> <p>Identify several benefits of multilingualism and multiculturalism.</p> <p>Identify methods and practices for successful language learning.</p>
Investigation	<p>Research human cultures using relevant methodologies.</p>	<p>Relate the significance of religion to ethical/philosophical thought.</p> <p>Analyze primary sources from world religions, both polytheistic and monotheistic.</p> <p>Discuss the development and contributions of world cultures.</p> <p>Analyze cultural, political, religious, and economic interactions between cultures.</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of the role of choices in the historical record.</p> <p>Using sources in the target language, research a prominent figure or product from the target culture.</p>
Areas of Study	<p>Examine identities, languages, beliefs, and behaviors of oneself and others as parts of a dynamic culture or cultures.</p>	<p>Demonstrate an understanding of the methodology in the field of religious studies.</p> <p>Demonstrate knowledge of the importance of interreligious dialogue.</p> <p>Demonstrate analytical skills involved in interpretation of primary and secondary sources.</p> <p>Compare commercial advertisements from one's own culture and from another's.</p> <p>Using the target language, compare and contrast family structures, university/political/economic systems, and traditions of your culture and the target culture.</p>

		Explain the cultural implications of grammatical differences between your language and the target language.
Attitudes Toward Cultural Difference	Demonstrate understanding, respect, sensitivity, and empathy when interacting with one's own or others' cultures (including but not limited to people, language, artifacts, ideas, values, and customs).	<p>Understand and apply the concept of cultural relativism.</p> <p>Demonstrate engagement with at least two major world religions through reflection essays.</p> <p>Learn a rubric for evaluating world religions, creating a lens with which to engage unfamiliar religions.</p> <p>In an in-class writing assignment, respond to a prompt related to historical developments pertaining to cultural tensions.</p> <p>Demonstrate the use of formal and informal modes of address using the target language.</p> <p>Respond in writing in the target language to a text, film, song, or work of art that sensitively contextualizes the piece within the target culture.</p> <p>In the target language, role-play a dinner party in the target culture. Demonstrate what you would bring, how you would greet and take leave of your hosts, what you would eat, and how you would interact.</p> <p>In the target language, role-play a business meeting in the target culture. Demonstrate what you would bring, how you would greet and take leave of your hosts, what you would eat, and how you would interact.</p>
Factors Shaping Human Cultures	Examine and explain the external, structural, and social elements influencing human cultures: class, race and mixed race, ethnicity, age, language, gender, disability, sovereignty, sexual orientation,	<p>Explain the role of cultural, religious, and political institutions in history.</p> <p>Explain the impact of the natural environment on cultures in history.</p> <p>Explain the impact of intellectual, cultural, political, economic, and ideological developments in history.</p> <p>Discover the logic of different cultures and people in chronological and geographical contexts.</p> <p>Research, analyze, and present, either orally or in writing in the target language, a prominent figure or product from the target culture.</p> <p>Explain the impact of the natural environment on the target language and culture.</p>

	political ideologies, economic structure, natural environments, historical events, social movements, religion, and other forms of identity.	Research, analyze, and present, either orally or in writing in the target language, the causes and effects of an important historical event in the target culture.
--	---	--

Natural/Physical Science

1. **The Nature of Science:** Students explain the following attributes of science:
 - a. Science is based on the assumption that reality exists, operates by consistent principles, and that the rules are understandable by critical analysis;
 - b. Processes and results must be reproducible and subjected to peer review;
 - c. The results will display intrinsic variation and limitations;
 - d. Continued scientific inquiry produces credible evidence that is used to develop scientific models and concepts;
 - e. Models and concepts that withstand the most wide-ranging and persistent critical analyses are assumed to most closely describe reality and the principles by which it operates;
 - f. That there is inherent beauty and wonder in science and its possibilities.
2. **Scientific Inquiry:** Students demonstrate the application of specialized methods and tools of scientific inquiry by actively and directly collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data, presenting findings, and using information to answer questions.
3. **Core Concepts:** Students accurately describe the scope of scientific study in both the physical and life sciences, their core theories and practices, using discipline related terminology.
4. **Scientific Literacy:** Students shall:
 - a. Recognize the proper use of scientific data, principles and theories to assess the quality of stated conclusions;
 - b. Demonstrate an ability to gather, comprehend, apply and communicate credible information on scientific and technical topics.
5. **Scientific Reasoning:** Students demonstrate scientific reasoning processes to draw conclusions.

6. **Ethics:** Students demonstrate an understanding of the standards that define ethical scientific behavior, including:
 - a. Honesty: The accurate use and reporting of scientific processes, data, and results, and the proper sharing of credit among colleagues;
 - b. Safety: Ensuring the safety and well-being, both mental and physical, of practitioners, test subjects, local community, and environment;
 - c. Social Responsibility: recognition of the impact of our actions have on the natural and human world.

7. **Science & Society:** Understand the role science plays in historical and contemporary issues.

Draft Passport Learning Outcomes for Critical Thinking & Creative Expression

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is a cross-disciplinary process based on information literacy that uses inquiry and analysis, and leads to problem solving. Critical thinking is also a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating a judgment or conclusion. Critical thinkers deeply reflect on the process and each of the steps below and return to each step as necessary.

1. **Problem Setting:** Identify a problem or question and its component parts.
2. **Recognize Assumptions:** Recognize and assess personal and other relevant underlying assumptions.
3. **Evidence:** Identify, gather, and analyze the information/data necessary to address the problem or question.
4. **Evaluate:** Evaluate information/data for credibility (e.g. bias, reliability, validity) and relevance to a situation.
5. **Context:** Identify relevant (disciplinary) context(s) including, as appropriate, principles, criteria, concepts, values, histories, and theories.
6. **Reasoning/Conclusion:** Develop logical conclusions, solutions, and outcomes that reflect an informed, well-reasoned evaluation.

DRAFT Passport Learning Outcomes

Interpretive and creative expression of the potential and limits of the human condition relies on critical analysis of specific texts or works to support its claims. Relationship to Institutions' Passport Block: This area includes disciplines such as music, visual arts, design, theater, film, media, literature, architecture, and others.

Through the study of literary, performing and/or visual arts, students will:

1. Employ fundamental discipline-specific principles, terminology, skills, technology, and methods (**Basic Knowledge**).
2. Identify, explain and/or demonstrate relationships among societal, cultural, and historical contexts (**History and Cultures**).
3. Demonstrate knowledge of and empathy for the diversity of values, beliefs, ideas, and practices embodied in the human experience (**Ethics**).

4. Engage in a creative process through experimentation, reflection, tolerance for failure, and revision (**Creative Process**).
5. Use appropriate methods and tools to analyze, interpret and critique creative processes, works, and/or presentations (**Aesthetics and Analysis**).

WICHE PASSPORT FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS
June 2015

1. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: The internal process within South Dakota used to determine Learning Outcomes for the Interstate Passport project worked well. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 3.44

2. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: Faculty within South Dakota produced quality and workable Learning Outcomes for the Interstate Passport project. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 3.53

3. In the space provided below, please provide any feedback you have regarding how this process unfolded in South Dakota prior to the multi-state meeting.

- *Kathy Antonen* – No feedback.
- *David Cartrette* – The process worked well, but each Regental institution in the state has different priorities and goals for student learning outcomes. As such, there was some disagreement initially in the process, but overall we worked well to iron these out and move forward with SLOs that were satisfactory to all.
- *Don Crowe* – Too hurried – no feeling that our input was going to have any effect.
- *Linda DeVeaux* – I have no feedback. It went about the only way it could.
- *Lynn Dilivio* – South Dakota has been involved in WICHE initiatives for over twenty years. The Interstate Passport allows for transfer of completed lower division general education requirements based on Learning Outcomes, their related Proficiency Criteria, and transfer-level proficiency criteria. The major advantage of this program focuses on barriers to degree completion resulting from uneven transfer policies and practices across states. The pilot project (Phase I) ended in April 2014 while Phase II is expected to be completed in Fall 2016. In short, students who transfer credit with the Interstate Passport will have their coursework recognized regardless of variations in course titles and credit numbers. Thus, students will not be required to repeat general education coursework. This is a research based and fiscally healthy program in which South Dakotan students and institutions brought in millions of dollars and yielded a 27-29 fold return on the state's investment in WICHE. In addition, there are educational benefits to WICHE's learning outcomes. Students will benefit from assignments based on critical thinking and problem solving skills relevant in the real world.
- *Dale Droge* – There was not really enough time, but this is always an issue. There did seem to be a consensus for the broad goals we agreed upon.

- *Mary Francis* – The timeline for this process was ridiculously short. We were only given a couple of weeks to work on this project, and it happened during the busy end of the semester. People could not devote full time to the process. We were also given "suggested outcomes" by the BOR to start the process. Given the timeline, it seemed clear that we were just supposed to rubber stamp these outcomes. Added to this idea that the BOR was not really looking for much faculty input, was that even when we offered additional outcomes to add to the list, we just got back ways that they already fit within the suggested outcomes. A word or two may have changed, but there was no real faculty input. The BOR had already established the outcomes they were going to use. We were also expected to hold a detailed conversation on the outcomes during one, one hour conference call. It is impossible to fine tune learning outcomes for an individual class within an hour, let alone a series of outcomes that are meant to cover an entire broad area of learning for students throughout the United States.
- *Amy Fuqua* – Although I see this process as having limited usefulness, the process itself seemed collaborative enough.
- *Christi Garst-Santos* – I felt that the process for developing the PLOs for Human Cultures worked very well. I felt that faculty voices were included and respected at each step, and I personally felt that my contributions were incorporated. I worked particularly closely with my counterpart at USD and, again here, I felt that we both shaped the outcomes that were put forward to the multi-state meeting. As I understand it from second-hand reports, without the voice that South Dakota provided at that meeting, I'm not sure that languages would have remained in the PLOs. Thus, I am very grateful for the opportunity of working on this project.
- *Gina Gibson* – I think this would have been better as a video conference rather than a phone conference. However, I know this may not have been possible because there were so many participants.
- *Dave Grettler* – General education discussions should start with what we--in South Dakota--want our students to know and the skills we want them to have.
- *David Holdhusen* – Things seemed to work well, but the process seemed a little rushed and we weren't always certain what our goals were.
- *Stuart Kellogg* – Process was fine.
- *Tyler Miller* – I was happy with the process at the BOR level. With the exception of one faculty member it seemed like we all generally agreed about the benefit to students the Passport learning outcomes would have. That is, a student could transfer more seamlessly from one institution to another participating institution.
- *Alan Montgomery* – No problem since the contributions were well thought out and as one might expect from professionals in academia.
- *Madhav Nepal* – Dr. Turman contacted each of the SDBOR representatives in November of 2014 for conference calls among the state team members. Each representative worked with the colleagues within each institute wrote the PLOs, and through conference calls we discussed merged them together into a set that was finalized for the negotiation at the multi-state meeting.

- *George Nora* – Was very good.
- *Dale Potts* – Each institution had multiple opportunities to provide input.
- *Lynn Riley* – No comment.
- *Andrew Russell* – I think this entire process is useless. The motivation behind this is to make evaluation of transfer credits an easier process. However, I fear that it has done the exact opposite. It has confounded the process and made it muddier than it was before.
- *Jon Schaff* – 1. Respecting the desire to save time and money, I have never liked teleconference for these important matters. 2. Because the whole process strikes me as vague and ephemeral, it was hard to even grasp the task at hand. 3. We never really got into fundamental questions because we were simply given a task by outside constituencies and the assumption of most committee members seemed to be just to finish the task rather than questioning it.
- *Jami Schoenewies* – There was no thoughtful discussion on why the passport is being put into place. We were simply chosen to develop what the learning outcomes would be for our areas.
- *Sarah Sik* – I believe that for an initiative with implications as far-reaching to the general education curriculum as the WICHE passport program, insufficient information and time was afforded to faculty at individual institutions prior to the initial state-wide conference call. I also believe that a broader discussion should have taken place among the faculty at each institution prior to the committee conference calls and email discussions.
- *Tim Steckline* – Quick, narrowly sourced.
- *Joseph Tinguely* – Most of the questions or concerns I have do not relate to the in-state process of formulating Learning Outcomes but the prior determination about what value WICHE offers South Dakota institutions. As a faculty member brought in downstream from that conversation, I can comment positively on how the process unfolded forward from that point, but my questions and concerns relate to bigger picture issues and longer-range implications. Within my working group, I am satisfied that we developed a decent set of learning objectives, but the substantive question concerns how it will be applied to the curriculum. So from my point of view the real impact of our committee's work largely remains to be seen.
- *Laura Vidler* – There was skepticism at first, but folks cooperated well.
- *David Wolff* – It seemed to be fairly collaborative.

4. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: The external process used by WICHE at the multi-state meetings to determine Learning Outcomes for the Interstate Passport project worked well. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 3.13

5. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: The faculty at the Interstate Passport multi-state meeting produced quality and workable Learning Outcomes. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 3.16

6. In the space provided below, please provide any feedback you have regarding the learning outcomes developed by faculty through the multi-state meetings.

- *Kathy Antonen* – No feedback.
- *David Cartrette* – As with the previous answer, the institutions involved all have different goals and priorities for SLOs. While I was not present at the multi-state meeting, I understand that there was quite a bit of contentious discourse related to SLOs that were workable for all involved.
- *Don Crowe* – Had no bearing on what SDSU faculty put forward.
- *Linda DeVeaux* – The learning outcomes are pretty wishy-washy, and don't really have any meat to them. It is unclear how these will be implemented or assessed.
- *Lynn Dilivio* –
 - Faculty came prepared at the multi-state meeting with their different learning outcomes.
 - Faculty were receptive to feedback, criticism, and revision of their learning outcomes at multi-state meetings.
 - After the multi-state meetings, faculty received feedback from their deans, faculty members, and state representatives regarding the learning outcomes from the multi-state meetings.
 - Then, during phone conferences, the learning outcomes were refined (in both form and content) in a collaborative manner based on the feedback from the deans, faculty members, and other state representatives.
 - On a final note, most faculty have built their syllabi based on content based standards. I believe that the learning outcomes/proficiency outcomes is a unique and important opportunity for faculty to look beyond the course content and classroom and reflect on assignment that align to learning outcomes/proficiency criteria that will benefit students' critical thinking and problem solving abilities in the real world.
- *Dale Droge* – The difficulty of working with a large number of states made the final product difficult to predict. So, the final outcomes are likely to be very general (not all bad).
- *Mary Francis* – In order to get so many people to agree on learning objectives, they had to be pared back so much as to be nothing more than a sound bite. They are really too broad and general. When developing useful learning objectives, it is important to put them into the local context. This very idea of the Passport, strips out everything that is local, unique, or personable. We are supposed to be educating individuals, not signing a blank check for the masses.
- *Amy Fuqua* – These outcomes are as good as outcomes can be. I don't think they are helpful, but given the demand for them, we did as well as we could.

- *Christi Garst-Santos* – My departmental colleagues and I are largely content with the PLOs that came out of Boulder. The only critique - and this is common for such a large project - is that the PLOs are a bit vague, but that does not mean they are unworkable. Again, we are happy with the outcome and feel that the humanities are well-represented by them.
- *Gina Gibson* – No comment.
- *Dave Grettler* – General education discussions should be shaped by what we--in South Dakota and our 6 institutions--want our students to know and the skills we want them to have.
- *David Holdhusen* – They are fine, but hard to see where we go from here.
- *Stuart Kellogg* – I do not necessarily argue with the passport project or defined outcomes within that project. However, the only outcome with which I was involved was the critical outcome. I have no problem with the outcome as defined. I do have large concerns with implementation. Specifically, critical thinking is a developmental outcome - it should be gradually introduced and reinforced through out the curriculum. My fear is that it will be designated to one or two specific courses in the first or second year.
- *Tyler Miller* – From the faculty member who attended the multi-state meeting, it sounded like the process went well. But I do not have first-hand knowledge about that process.
- *Alan Montgomery* – The way faculty handled this task was exemplary and a testament to how a team approach with give and take can produce positive results.
- *Madhav Nepal* – Not all faculty came with the equal level of preparation at the Multi-state meetings. Faculty from California, and Utah had no within-state discussion before the multi-state meeting. By talking to the colleagues at the meeting, I found that SD had much more higher level of preparation than the majority of the states. Only other state with our level of preparation was Wyoming. We have developed very strong PLOs and SD PLOs have been well integrated in the final draft. We had Tom Krabacher (from California) as the chair while we wrote the PCs. This person was the least prepared but wanted to dictate others, had no knowledge about many areas of natural sciences and made flat rejections rampantly. I did not like the rejection of some ideas just by voting. This is because majority of the faculty presented themselves as the faculty from an institutes rather than representing the state. The PC are OK but could have been written better.
- *George Nora* – Were very good.
- *Dale Potts* – The Human Cultures learning outcomes successfully reflect the core examples discussed by the institutions.
- *Lynn Riley* – No comment.
- *Andrew Russell* – I think this entire process is useless. The motivation behind this is to make evaluation of transfer credits an easier process. However, I fear that it has done the exact opposite. It has confounded the process and made it muddier than it was before.

- *Jon Schaff* – What we got was vague, bureaucratic language that will help no one learn a thing. The problem is that we have a process driven by people who view higher ed simply as a bureaucratic enterprise and therefore what we got was a bureaucratic document.
- *Jami Schoenewies* – The number of transfer students that this project will ultimately affect seems disproportionately small for the resources involved. I also do not agree with the idea that professionals in their fields need to develop standardized, homogeneous learning outcomes for the sole purpose of accommodating transfer students. The current criteria set for proficiency is (rightfully) so vague that the program's purpose is almost minimal at best. Yet, this Passport Project sets the precedent of installing homogeneous standards across interstate institutions.
- *Sarah Sik* – Unable to comment accurate on questions 4-6 as I did not participate in the multi-state meetings.
- *Tim Steckline* – So broad and vague as to be nearly useless. Not in line with articulation of other state standards, so suspiciously against the grain of what we do already.
- *Joseph Tinguely* – On my sub-committee, the result of the multi-state meeting was not unacceptably different than the in-state recommendations, in part because the learning outcomes were sufficiently vague.
- *Laura Vidler* – They are workable.
- *David Wolff* – No real comments.

7. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: Making it easier for students to transfer to my institution will benefit my institution. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 3.31

8. Rank your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statement: Participation in the WICHE Interstate Passport project will ultimately benefit my institution. (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree)

Average Score = 2.81

9. What issues, if any, do you feel exist for how the WICHE Interstate Passport will be used by students to transfer among participating institutions?

- *Kathy Antonen* – No feedback.
- *David Cartrette* – None that I am aware of.
- *Don Crowe* – None.

- *Linda DeVeaux* – I see a great deal of up-front faculty time put into trying to standardize something that probably is better dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- *Lynn Dilivio* – The issue I am unclear about is the evaluation of students' learning outcomes and proficiency criteria earned from their courses. For example, will faculty evaluate their learning outcomes/proficiency criteria on a Likert scale? Or will faculty evaluate students' learning outcomes/proficiency criteria on a pass/fail basis? Or will it be the responsibility of the registrar's office to evaluate students' learning outcomes/proficiency criteria for transfer equivalency?
- *Dale Droge* – Our transfer process already works well. We try to give students as much credit as possible for the courses taken at other institutions. Therefore, I do not think transfer of credits is an issue that would sway a student that was considering attending our institution.
- *Mary Francis* – The fact the BOR has completely brushed aside any questions on how these outcomes and the entire Passport system will be implemented by the institutions shows what little regard they hold toward the institutions. When asked about how these will be implemented, it was stated that we don't need to worry about that right now, that those questions will be addressed when we reach that part of the process. This highlights that there is no thought on implementation so it is possible that we will go through all this work and not be able to actually implement the process because it will require more work/time/money than we are set to 'save.' I also do not see how we will implement learning objectives on broad – multidisciplinary concepts such as Critical Thinking. Another concern with this process is that when asked, Paul stated that the outcomes we develop will not be required to be added to the courses nor will they be assessed to ensure that students are meeting these outcomes. If there is NO accountability that the faculty are teaching these outcomes or that students are meeting these outcomes, WHY are we spending the time developing these outcomes? We are not putting out students that are meeting the passport, so there is no assurance that the students we are getting to transfer have met any of these learning outcomes either. Related to this is the question as to when and how often will these learning objectives and corresponding courses be reviewed. Are these learning objectives going to be just continued year after year with no acknowledgement that courses may change while the learning objectives they used to address are no longer considered. There was also questions as to whether a course may meet a Passport block, yet also be necessary to meet another requirement by an individual institution. Will the student have to take the class even though they have already taken it elsewhere? When asked, the BOR said yes. This goes against what is stated in the Passport information given to us and the whole idea that this will ease requirements on the students. Given how the BOR treats the universities under it as one thing rather than unique institutions, this means that the courses designated to each category will need to be the same which causes problems as they may address different learning objectives. It is also not addressed how the system will handle students who take classes ala carte from the different institutions within South Dakota. A student can take the "easiest" classes from each institution in order to meet the guidelines. The information provided on the Passport process was also a bit unclear. It sounds like for a student to be able to use the Passport Initiative, they will need to complete ALL of the different content areas. Given the number and range of areas, that means they will basically be completing their gen eds and have an Associates degree. The students who go through all that at one institution are probably not going to transfer than readily. They are already connected to an institution, so this Passport program just becomes something that sounds good, but that doesn't actually help any students. We have done a lot of work to set it up, can promote the idea, but when students read the fine print, they cannot actually use it. It is unclear what South Dakota will be getting from this program. Are we looking to get in more transfers that will have met the

barest minimum of generic learning outcomes, or are we looking to provide a cheap version of an AA for students to leave the state for another school? Until we are actually given a clear reason as to why we are going through this work and what we will be gaining, I do not see the point in continuing.

- *Amy Fuqua* – This project just does not seem useful to me. I fully support the effort to encourage transfers into our institution and to those in our system; however, this approach does not seem helpful.
- *Christi Garst-Santos* – The only negative or issue of concern would be if SD students suddenly start transferring out of SD to our WICHE peers. Otherwise, making it easier for students to transfer in is obviously a benefit.
- *Gina Gibson* – My concern is that although these standards will list criteria they may not be enough to show that a student has learned the material. For example, a student may have a false sense that they are prepared for upper level courses within another institution. We see this at times when students are transferring from a two-year program to a four-year program.
- *Dave Grettler* – General education discussions should end with what we--as a system and an institution--want our students to know and the skills we want them to have. Why does "reforming" gen. ed. always mean cutting it?
- *David Holdhusen* – As a department chair, it is my responsibility to approve course equivalencies. In the past year of the many requests that came across my desk there was only one I did not approve. It was not approved because we don't offer the class. I believe this is a lot of work for no reason. The current system seems to work. I think if anything we need to clean up the BOR transfer process before we worry about other states. I also fear this process will take academic freedom from the professors and everyone will be pigeonholed into this box. I believe that SD should withdraw from this process.
- *Stuart Kellogg* – While laudable, it is more difficult to set transfer along the idea of specific outcomes rather than specific courses. It is not yet clear if these outcomes will create or enhance other program outcomes, particularly those that have specific accreditation requirements.
- *Tyler Miller* – Like I wrote in another comment section, at face-value this seems like it would be a good initiative. But I would like to know more about, or have some projections, about how it will impact the SD BOR system.
- *Alan Montgomery* – I cannot foresee any major obstacles presently.
- *Madhav Nepal* – Many faculty and administrators would have a misconception about the PLOs as developed for standardization. This is NOT true! The Interstate passport LOs are not standards. The passport is an optional tool for helping transfer students across universities.
- *George Nora* – Each school can do what ever they want about this and thus some will use and others will not.
- *Dale Potts* – No issues at this time.

- *Lynn Riley* – No comment.
- *Andrew Russell* – I think this entire process is useless. The motivation behind this is to make evaluation of transfer credits an easier process. However, I fear that it has done the exact opposite. It has confounded the process and made it muddier than it was before.
- *Jon Schaff* – This is a red herring as there is little evidence that students transferring between institutions is much of a problem.
- *Jami Schoenewies* – If the idea is to streamline students transferring between schools, then the originating schools should not be adversely affected when retention numbers are down for schools involved in the project. Systems like this encourage student transfer, and yet our institutional priorities and budget forecasts are focused on student retention. This will definitely be a negative on all 4 year programs in the WICHE system. I only envision a handful of students actually utilizing the Passport system.
- *Sarah Sik* – I trust the standards and approaches of individual professional educators over the certification of rubberstamping programs such as the WICHE passport initiative. Particularly with the nationwide trend towards the use of deprofessionalized adjunct instructors, I am especially concerned that the WICHE passport program may be used to provide a veneer of "quality assurance" without reason for confidence in the consistency of actual substance, rigor, or standards among a broad variety of teaching institutions. I believe that the current individualized transfer mechanism, overseen by department chairs, subjects transfer courses to appropriate scrutiny by the institution accepting transfer courses for credit.
- *Tim Steckline* – 1. It contravenes current standards, and introduces a whole new rationale for Gen Ed work, by cutting criteria against the bias of current standards. 2. Never heard a critique of what is wrong with the current system of transfers. So not clear on what the shortcomings of the status quo are. What is wrong with transfer requirements being resolved on a case by case basis, between two trained professionals? 3. Done in a hurry, with relatively few persons representing broad swaths of other fields. I have heard complaints already about the two persons who did the Cultural criteria not being representative of people from social sciences and visual arts. There may be blowback as other faculty discover the decisions made without their input or approval.
- *Joseph Tinguely* – Speaking not from a position of great experience, I do not see the current transfer structure as a significant obstacle to students's ability to graduate on time from an institution of their choice. I have had students transfer in and transfer out without reporting that it was particularly onerous or costly. For what it is worth, I also don't think it is particularly advisable for a student to transfer; it wouldn't improve the college experience if the norm was to transfer. Moreover, to the extent that there is a problem of interstate transfer, I do not see how a "passport" of learning outcomes significantly improves on transferring credit. In addition, the "passport" of learning outcomes requires or may require changes to the curriculum to accommodate a process that would supersede institutional or state control. The worry, then, is that the cure is worse than the disease.
- *Laura Vidler* – Students should be able to transfer a partial passport.
- *David Wolff* – If standardizing learning outcomes helps students transfer from outside of South Dakota into the state, I don't see any issues.