



TRANSFER COUNCIL REPORT ON
COMMON COURSE NUMBERING (CCN),
CORE TRANSFER MAPS (CTM),
& MAJOR TRANSFER MAPS (MTM), 2023

ORS 350.423 and ORS 350.429
September 15, 2023



LIST OF ACRONYMS

Associate of Art Oregon Transfer	AAOT
Associate of Science Oregon Transfer	ASOT
Common Course Numbering	CCN
Complex Adaptive Systems	CAS
Core Transfer Maps	CTMs
Course Learning Outcomes	CLOs
Course Content and Outcomes Guides	CCOG
Higher Education Coordinating Commission	HECC
House Bill	HB
Institutions of Higher Education	IHEs
Learning Management System	LMS
Major Transfer Maps	MTMs
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	NWCCU
Oregon Public University	OPU
Oregon Revised Statute	ORS
Science, Technology, Engineering, Math	STEM
Senate Bill	SB
Student Information Systems	SIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background	4
Methodological Approach	5
Theoretical Framework	6
Data and Method	7
Findings	8
Interpretation of Findings	13
Recommendations	16

APPENDICES

A. CCN Implementation Survey for Community Colleges	19
B. CTM/MTM Implementation Survey for Community Colleges	23
C. CCN Implementation Survey for Public Universities	27
D. CTM/MTM Implementation Survey for Public Universities	31
E. Implementation Checklist for Institutions of Higher Education	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2998, which directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), community colleges, and public universities listed in Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 352.002 to streamline transfer pathways. This could be viewed as the culmination of decades of legislation geared toward improving transfer in Oregon because it signaled a change in the approach taken by the Legislature by establishing foundational curricula (Unified Statewide Transfer Agreements now known as Major Transfer Maps or MTMs), Core Transfer Maps (CTMs), and a baseline for “excess credits,” or “the difference in the average total number of credits at degree completion between transfer students and first-time freshmen.” Then in 2021, Senate Bill (SB) 233 called for the creation of a Common Course Numbering (CCN) system for the purpose of aligning the most frequently transferred, lower-level courses at Oregon public institutions (2- and 4-year). Collectively, these transfer initiatives are intended to create clear and transparent degree pathways for Oregon students.

Senate Bill (SB) 233 also established the creation of a 15-member Transfer Council with representation from Oregon's public universities, community colleges, and secondary education partners. Part of the work assigned to the Transfer Council is the creation of recommendations to the Commission regarding the development of a common course numbering (CCN) system and other transfer initiatives (ORS 350.423). The Transfer Council's responsibilities include oversight of faculty subcommittees charged with aligning curricula and learning outcomes in the common course number system and those charged with developing and maintaining the MTMs. The Transfer Council is also responsible for submitting annual reports regarding CCN, CTMs, and MTMs:

- (3)(a) No later than September 1 of each year, the council shall report to the commission on the progress the council is making in enhancing and maintaining the common course numbering system described in ORS 350.423 and on any other current work regarding the transfer of academic credit on which the council is focused.

Additionally,

- (8)(1) The Transfer Council established under section 6 of this 2021 Act shall: (F) Ensure that each community college and each public university listed in ORS 352.002 submits an annual report to the commission that includes all information necessary for the commission to determine the effect of common course numbering, foundational curricula, and unified statewide transfer agreements on a demographically and institutionally disaggregated basis.

To date, Oregon community colleges and public universities, with support from HECC staff have accomplished the following:

- Development, approval, and implementation (in academic year 2024 catalogs) of ten CCN courses, with 14 more in process for AY 25.
- Establishment of two CTMs, a General Core and a STEM Core.
- Establishment of MTMs in Biology, Business, Computer Science, Elementary Education, English Literature, with three additional in process.

[Summary of achievements from past reports to HECC]

During the summer of 2023, a series of surveys were sent to Oregon's 17 community colleges and seven public universities. Surveys were designed to gather information on institutions' progress implementing CCN/CTMs/MTMs. This report contains findings and recommendations based on these surveys. Data collected revealed successes and five (?) themes having to do broadly with communication, coordination, workload, organization, and guidance. To ensure the continued success of these projects, we recommend that each institution strive to identify individuals and processes to support implementation and maintenance of CCN/CTMs/MTMs on their campus. Many institutions already have these in place. We also recommend that institutions establish processes for communicating with students and advisors about the on-going development of CCN and MTMs. Again, many institutions have already accomplished this. Looking to the future, we recommend that institutions consider methods for tracking the success of students related to their engagement with commonly numbered courses in the context of transfer and with the CTMs and MTMs. The HECC staff could serve in a coordinating role for all of these recommendations, by sharing effective practices across the institutions. .

The data from the community college surveys reveal...

The data from the public university surveys reveal that all OPUs have implemented CCN with some residual clean-up of documents and systems and some ongoing training needed. The document and systems clean-up should be accomplished by the end of September. Responsible leadership at each university is identified. Communication about CCN began as early as March 2023 at the universities, while resources for MTMs became available as early as June 2020, with the final institution providing resources for MTMs in September 2023. To date, no students have matriculated an MTM to an OPU. Resources and processes supporting the transfer effort are different across institutions. These processes include curricular approval processes, faculty and advisor council meetings, work of transfer transition coordinators, information provided by registrars (in person and online), website information, transfer guide documents, catalogs, registration system, degree maps, and advising guides. For public universities to identify students completing CTM and MTM requirements, the community colleges must make some sort of notation on student transcripts. Faculty and administrators are actively engaged in the Transfer Council and its subcommittees as well as CCN and MTM activities; however, the additional workload has begun to impact the universities' abilities to secure additional faculty for subject area subcommittees.

~~Responses to the survey indicate that there are different stages of implementation of transfer initiatives at the 24 institutions of higher education in Oregon. The surveys also revealed opportunities for further alignment, including 1) identifying individuals and processes dedicated to implementation of CCN/CTMs/MTMs, 2) assessing and revising processes for communicating with students and advisors, and 3) creating systems for tracking or evaluating student success as it relates to CCN/CTMs/MTMs.~~

BACKGROUND

Each year, thousands of community college students transfer to one of Oregon's four-year institutions and thousands of new students transfer between institutions (e.g., 2-year to 2-year, 2-year to 4-year). These students sometimes experience have experienced challenges with the process of transferring credits. In an effort to mitigate these challenges, Oregon instituted several transfer initiatives, including the 90-credit Associate of Art Oregon Transfer (AAOT), the 45-credit Oregon Transfer Module (OTM), and the Associate of Science Oregon Transfer (ASOT), among others. Additionally, many institutions developed

agreements among themselves to facilitate successful credit transfer. However, these agreements are specific to partner institutions and offer no guarantees for students when transferring between other public institutions in Oregon. Data from 2014-15 to 2017 showed that roughly three in five Oregon transfer students enter universities with fewer credits accepted than they had earned at community college and about

~~one-third lose more than one term of coursework upon transfer.⁴ Those students often found that while their transfer degree helps them meet the admission standard of the receiving university, their general education and major course of study credits were accepted only on a course-by-course, institution-by-institution basis. Much of the work on MTMs and CCN since then is intended to address those issues.~~

Independent reports like the [2019 Supporting Transfer Student Success in Oregon: Lessons from Oregon Community Colleges and Universities](#) by the Ford Family Foundation provide data driven recommendations for improving transfer by providing clear transfer pathways for students. Key findings from this study show the need for investments in Oregon's institutions of higher education in order to improve advising and support for transfer students. Additionally, the report suggests the need to develop and maintain statewide partnerships that will ensure and strengthen the maintenance of transfer agreements. A key part of this is leveraging Oregon's longitudinal data system to help institutional partners support successful transfer outcomes. The current Thisreport serves as a baseline for sharing information on how institutions are implementing CCN/CTMs/MTMs to provide a starting point for continuous improvement with a focus on student success. It also echoes the key findings from the 2019 Ford Family Foundation study, mainly the need for improved communication, and the use of data to adopt, implement, and improve upon statewide transfer initiatives.

To date, the HECC, community colleges, and public universities have met the following requirements of the legislation:

- Developed and [approved 10 \(CCN\) courses](#) for implementation by all public community colleges and public universities, by the 2023-24 catalog, as per SB 233 Section 2, 3(b).
- Established [Core Transfer Maps](#) (CTMs; General Core and STEM Core): establishes a path for community college students to take courses guaranteed to transfer as general education at ANY Oregon public university.
- Approved five [Major Transfer Maps](#) (MTMs): English Literature, Biology, Business, Computer Science, and Elementary Education, with three more in process.

The It should be noted that meeting many of these requirements occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, when institutions needed to adapt to new teaching and work modes and faced substantial declines in enrollment.

2023 implementation sImplementation urveys were created to understand how institutions are implementing, communicating, measuring, and maintaining compliance with CCN, CTMs, and MTMs as required under HB 2998 and SB 233. These surveys were sent on behalf of Transfer Council and results will be made [available](#) to partner institutions, the Legislature, and the HECC.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The surveys used for this report relied on [descriptive research](#), which blends qualitative and quantitative data to report information accurately. Responses for descriptive research are usually gathered via survey, observation, or case study, which allows for more than one variable to be investigated. Combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies also allows for the collection of respondents' demographics, attitudes, experience, behaviors, needs, and wants. To gauge implementation of CCN/CTMs/MTMs, the data collection instrument used was the survey. Quantitative responses were collected and analyzed, looking not only for trends, but for information that might identify identifies areas where respondents need more clarification or

resources. This type of mixed-methods study looks more at the “what” than the “why” of research questions. This is observational research because none of the variables in the study were manipulated or randomly assigned by the investigators during the research process. Some challenges with interpreting data from this approach are that the number of respondents was intentionally limited and which individuals at institutions should respond to the survey was not defined.

¹ Higher Education Coordinating Commission. 2017. *Improving Transfer Pathways in Oregon*. Slides 9-11. Presentation to the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Two theoretical frameworks were used for analyzing and interpreting data from the surveys: [Institutional Theory](#) and [Complex Adaptive Systems \(CAS\) or Complexity Science](#). According to the [Encyclopedia of Management Theory](#), Institutional Theory is an “approach to understanding organizations and management practices as the product of social rather than economic pressures.” Importantly, the retention and adoption of practices, decisions, and structures are dependent on conformity and social pressure over economic performance.

The second theory, CAS, provides a framework for understanding how institutions address challenges in a rapidly changing climate for complex systems that are accustomed to experiencing transformation and disruption. Systems with many interacting agents and competing pressures experiencing change and adaptation require new ways of doing and thinking. Central to this theory are five attributes that aid institutions with successful interaction with change: networks, emergence, self-organization and social coordination, feedback sensitivity, and agility.

Institutions that embrace *networking* move intentionally away from a central hierarchy that fosters the idea of educational silos (e.g., CCN/MTM subcommittees are representative of all public institutions in Oregon). *Emergence* means transformational change is the result of ideas and concepts that are driven organically by those closest to change, which is not administration or the Transfer Council (e.g., faculty in CCN/MTM subcommittees are driving alignment work). *Self-organization* and *social coordination* provide a lens for understanding how individuals with specialized knowledge can come together (organize) to problem solve (e.g., CCN/MTM subcommittees are organized by discipline/area of interest with highly skilled and dedicated faculty doing the work). The implementation surveys function as a *feedback* mechanism, enabling CCN/MTM to be responsive and resilient. Finally, *agility* allows CCN/MTM to withstand and learn from unintended consequences without systematic failure. Collectively the five attributes of CAS present a complex and interconnected lens for understanding how institutions and change agents are interpreting and embracing change within the implementation and tracking of CCN, CTMs, and MTMs.

The work of the Transfer Council employs this framework. For example, institutions are embracing *networking* by supporting CCN/MTM subcommittees that have representation from the public institutions in Oregon). *Emergence* means transformational change is the result of ideas and concepts that are driven organically by those closest to change such as the faculty in CCN/MTM subcommittees who are driving alignment work. *Self-organization* and *social coordination* results in individuals with specialized knowledge coming together (organize) to problem solve (e.g., CCN/MTM subcommittees are organized by discipline/area of interest with highly skilled and dedicated faculty doing the work). The implementation surveys serve as the *feedback* mechanism, enabling CCN/MTM to be responsive and resilient. Finally, *agility* allows CCN/MTM to withstand and learn from unintended consequences without systematic failure. Collectively, in incorporating the five attributes of CAS to meet the goals of the transfer initiatives, institutions are addressing the complex innovation, adoption, implementation and tracking of CCN, CTM, and MTM.

Table 1. Demographic information on respondents (public 2- and 4-year colleges and universities in Oregon).

Name of Institution	Total Headcount (2022) ² for community colleges and (2022) ³ public universities	Geographic Region ⁴
Blue Mountain Community College	1,685	Eastern Oregon (5)
Central Oregon Community College	5,394	Central Oregon (4)
Chemeketa Community College	9,463	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Clackamas Community College	6,954	Portland Metro (1)
Clatsop Community College	901	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Columbia Gorge Community College	733	Portland Metro (1)
Klamath Community College	1,868	Central Oregon (4)

² [Oregon Community College Fall, 4th week, Total Headcount Enrollment 2022.](#)

³ [Oregon Public University Fall 4th Week Enrollment, Total Headcount, 2022.](#)

⁴ Regions assigned according to the [Oregon Department of Transportation Regions](#): 1. Portland Metro 2. Willamette Valley and North Coast 3. Southwestern Oregon 4. Central Oregon and 5. Eastern Oregon.

Lane Community College	6,057	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Linn-Benton Community College	6,216	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Mount Hood Community College	7,006	Portland Metro (1)
Oregon Coast Community College	908	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Portland Community College	25,263	Portland Metro (1)
Rogue Community College	4,245	Southwestern Oregon (3)
Southwestern Oregon Community College	2,180	Southwestern Oregon (3)
Tillamook Bay Community College	784	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Treasure Valley Community College	1,621	Eastern Oregon (5)
Umpqua Community College	3,463	Southwestern Oregon (3)
Eastern Oregon University	2,674	Eastern Oregon (5)
Oregon Institute of Technology	4,913	Southwestern Oregon (3)
Oregon State University	35,239	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2) and Central Oregon (4)
Portland State University	15,667	Portland Metro (1)
Southern Oregon University	5,156	Southwestern Oregon (3)
University of Oregon	23,202	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)
Western Oregon University	3,752	Willamette Valley & North Coast (2)

DATA AND METHODS

Population

Survey responses were submitted by all 17 community colleges and seven public universities in Oregon. The purpose of the survey was to begin to gather data on the implementation (recording and reporting) of three transfer initiatives: Common Course Numbering (CCN), Core Transfer Maps (CTMs), and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs). Data from the surveys supports continuous improvement efforts with a focus on student success. This is part of the legislative reporting required under [House Bill \(HB\) 2998](#) and [Senate Bill \(SB\) 233](#). Survey questions were designed to gather information related to the implementation of the first [10 CCN courses](#) (starting with catalog year 2023-24), the [first five MTMs](#), and [Core Transfer Maps](#) which were designed to save students time and money by removing barriers that often result in excess credits, duplicate credits, and/or credits that do not count toward a degree or certificate.

The survey was emailed to institutions on June 26, 2023, and all surveys were completed and returned by August 23, 2023.

Data Collection

Surveys. Community colleges were each sent two surveys: one with questions on implementing CCN (Appendix A) and one with questions on implementing CTMs and MTMs (Appendix B). Similarly, public universities were sent two surveys: one with questions on implementing CCN (Appendix C) and one with questions on implementing CTMs and MTMs (Appendix D). The survey instrument was modified and based on a 2021 CTM/MTM Implementation Survey which was administered to all 17 community colleges and

Seven public universities. Survey information was cross-sectional (gathered at a specific point in time, between 6/26-7/28/2023). Surveys were selected for data collection because of their economy of design and ability to obtain data within a narrow timeframe (Creswell, 2014, p. 157). Respondents were instructed to submit one survey per institution. The survey did not define who the respondents should be at each institution or who the institutions should consult internally. Emails with links to surveys were sent to empowered administrators and registrars (Survey Monkey) and included PDFs of the survey questions, to allow for collaboration and collection of data from multiple inter-institutional partners, as needed. Response times for surveys ranged from seven minutes to twenty-three hours with most surveys being completed during the last seven days of July. All responses were recorded in a spreadsheet and grouped according to headings (e.g., course/catalog information, advising, resources). Responses were then coded and grouped according to response type.

Data Analysis

Qualitative Coding. Because of the intentionally limited number of responses received per survey (24 institutions responding per survey), information was coded by hand as opposed to using a qualitative software program. This process of coding allowed for the constant comparison of responses as an iterative approach to identify similar themes in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Because of the limited number of respondents, conclusions and interpretations about the resulting data require further analysis and verification.

Quantitative Data. Analysis of quantitative data guided the development of the qualitative data analysis tool and the discovery of themes in responses. Questions with yes/no answers guided respondents to further questions designed to gather more specific information (decision trees). Analysis of survey data allowed for the identification of changes that still need to be made or implementation steps that are yet to be taken by institutions. 100% of Oregon public institutions of higher education completed the surveys (17 community colleges and seven public universities).

FINDINGS

~~Traditional views of transfer depict it as a one-time move toward obtaining a degree, but research demonstrates this is no longer the case. National studies show that vertical transfer (from a 2- to 4-year institution) now comprises less than a third of all of the types of transfer between institutions (Hossler et al., 2012). Students transfer in many ways, including swirling (attending a 2-year institution after or while attending a 4-year), lateral transfer (from 2-year to 2-year or 4-year to 4-year), and/or reverse transfer (from 4-year to 2-year), to name a few of the many options (Katsinas et al., 2019). Data suggests that transfer in Oregon may follow this national pattern, and more study is needed about specific patterns of transfer between IHEs in Oregon. This is relevant because implementation of the three transfer initiatives (CCN, CTMs, and MTMs) are impacted by student mobility and the ability to enroll in multiple institutions concurrently. Additionally, survey respondents revealed that institutions are struggling to identify processes to track the success of these initiatives (CCN/CTMs/MTMs), and to identify stakeholders who are responsible for continuous improvement.~~

Common Course Numbering (CCN) Implementation Surveys. Several respondents from community colleges indicated confusion when asked about changes that need to be made to fully implement CCN (Q3-4 and Q5-6). The first set of questions in the CCN survey focused on steps *yet to be taken* to fully implement CCN and the second set of questions focused on steps that *have been completed*. Two community colleges indicated that they were in the process of updating their fall course catalogs and therefore unable to share links to CCN information, but the remaining 15 community colleges indicated that they have completed the steps needed for adopting and publishing 2023 CCN approved courses. This conflicted with Q3, which asked “Does

your institution need to make any curriculum or credit changes to adopt CCN?” Here 14 community colleges responded that they *do still need* to make changes and only three responded that they do not need to make any changes. Respondents indicated that the most common changes that needed (or still need) to be made include changing course information (e.g., course title, credits, description, learning outcomes), changes to degree programs, catalogs, and changes

to learning management systems (LMS), Webforms (community colleges), curriculum or instructional committee approval, and student information systems (SIS). These conflicting responses may indicate a need to further refine and make clearer the survey instrument.

Community college respondents were then asked whether each of the ten CCN courses had been listed in their course catalog and if so, to provide a link to the information. All respondents replied that the information was either available (12) or would soon be available (5). Of those that shared a link, the following were noted:

- Five community college respondents (of the 12 that provided information; ~42%) listed course learning outcomes for courses in their online catalog. Course learning outcomes (CLOs) are not required in course catalogs, but they are part of the CCN framework. Follow up is needed with these institutions and changes to data collection are necessary.
 - Of the five respondents that listed CLOs in their course catalogs, several contained errors. These errors included wording not matching the approved language for CLOs, removing “Required Course Content” from STAT 243Z, and adding more than the allowed extra 25% to CLOs (excluding the allowed addition of [information literacy outcomes](#)). One institution combined “Required Course Content” with CLOs, though this is not part of the CCN approved course information. One institution listed “Content Outline” in their course catalog, which is also not an approved part of the course (e.g., MTH 105Z).
 - There are inconsistencies in the way some institutions write CLOs (e.g., at one institution, CLOs for one course begin with “students will be able to…” while other CLOs for different CCN courses at the same institution do not).
- None of the Oregon Public University catalogs include CLOs.
- Some course information was missing from community college course catalogs (e.g., a respondent indicated they offer WR 121Z, but it was not found in the course catalog).
- Some community college and OPU respondents listed multiple versions of a course with varying [levels](#) of CCN course information (e.g., COM 111, COM 111M, COM 111Z; WR 127 instead of WR 227Z, though course content appears to be similar). The CCN framework clearly states that “Individual institutional course descriptions must match the baseline course description as approved by faculty subcommittees” although course descriptions may include additional information (for more on this, see the [CCN Systems and Operations 2022 Recommendation Report](#)). *We anticipate that all institutions will come into alignment with this expectation moving forward.*
- Some community college respondents have not yet aligned the subject code (prefix) to match CCN course information (e.g., MATH 243 instead of STAT 243Z).
- All seven OPUs indicated that all approved CCN courses have moved through their institution-specific curriculum processes and are now listed in their respective course catalogs.

Regarding steps community colleges are taking or will take to adopt CCN, respondents shared the following:

1. Changes to Webforms (used for course approval for [community](#) colleges; 16)
2. Approval by Curriculum Committee/Instructional Council (11)
3. Updates to be made:
 - Program/Degree information (9)
 - Catalogs (9)
 - Student Information Systems (SIS; 8)

- Class/Course Schedules (4)

- o Advising/Course Information Guides (4)

The remainder of responses included notifying personnel or committees of changes (e.g., department heads, shared governance), changing syllabi or information on the web, or updating assignments.

Among OPUs, four indicated that no tasks remain to be completed until the next round of CCN classes move forward, two stated that all tasks will be complete by the end of Summer 2023, and one pointed out a need for ongoing training around CCN.

Question 39 on the surveys asked institutions to report how they are tracking CCN, and the responses to this question were varied, which may indicate a lack of clarity about what the question was intending to elicit. How institutions are tracking the adoption of CCN varies from institution to institution. Four community college respondents reported this is done by committees (e.g., Curriculum or Instructional). Other responses (1-2 responses each) included “watching the HECC [Resources for Common Course Numbering webpage](#),” relying on a contact (member) on the Systems and Operations Subcommittee for information, through Transfer Council, by internal institutional processes (unnamed), or through information from Empowered Administrators. For this question, five of the seven OPUs pointed to longstanding curriculum procedures and technologies such as Course Track © for sharing information, while two OPU respondents indicated uncertainty around the meaning of the question.

When asked about how institutions communicate with students about CCN (Q40-41), community college respondents indicated that the most frequent mode of communication is through catalogs (8). The next most common mode of communication is through advising/advisors or advising guides (7), and the third most common way to communicate is through a webpage/website/campus newsletter (each representing 6-7 institutions). Several institutions added information on CCN to a course description (e.g., “This course is part of Oregon Common Course Numbering. MTH 105 and MTH 105Z are equivalent”). In their response, some community colleges included a webpage or mentioned CCN on a webpage (e.g., [Chemeketa](#), [Linn- Benton](#), [Mount Hood](#), [PCC](#), [Rogue](#), and [SOCC](#)). Most institutions indicated they communicated with students about CCN prior to the end of Spring term, 2023 (12) with only a few reporting that they had not started communicating with students until after receiving the survey. ~~Six of the seven OPUs indicated that communication with students regarding CCN has been limited to their respective catalogs, while one is developing online CCN resources for students.~~ Six of the Seven OPUs provide web information about CCN, all show information in their catalogs, and some are providing additional information through advising guides, registrar pages, and the like.



Concerning how institutions communicate with advisors and/or faculty about CCN changes (Q42) and what resources/materials are shared (Q43), a little under half of community college respondents reported using some form of electronic communication (e.g., email, impact notifications, newsletter, webpage; 8). The next most common way information was communicated was through having an advising member on the curriculum committee and relying on this contact to share information with their department (7). Other responses included via committees, meetings, trainings and through department chairs. When asked about the type of resources used to communicate with advisors, respondents indicated they use email (8), internal process (e.g., shared governance, department chairs, course change forms; 4), training (including fall in-service, 3), and course catalogs/guides/degree maps (3). 18% of community college respondents (3) indicated that they do not share any resources about CCN with advisors. 11 of 17 community college respondents (65%) made resources available to advisors prior to the survey and six (35%) still needed to do this at the time of the survey. All seven OPUs indicated that faculty and staff are made aware of CCN adoption. To give a representative response: “through our standard curriculum management/change process.” In addition, one OPU has set aside time at an advisor town hall event to ensure that advisors are current in this area.

The final question (Q45) in the CCN survey asked institutions what they have learned so far from the CCN implementation experience. Replies varied, but included the following:

- *The CCN work seems like it will be of great benefit to students to ease transfer between institutions.*
- *...it [CCN] takes a tremendous amount of work... [and] Timing and workload associated with implementing CCN into certificates and degrees has caused a bottle neck...[and] There are a lot of moving pieces... takes a lot of time and people-power.*
- *Communication from the Transfer Council out to affected institutions could be improved...[and] The framework developed did not address concerns of community colleges or the amount of labor required to fully implement the framework across all instructional systems, causing some schools to look at minimally viable options for implementation.*
- *...timing in which we make these changes in our systems has an impact on students and the resources they use.*
- *The implementation went very smoothly for us.*
- *Need voices of transfer specialists and academic deans on transfer council[s], not just faculty representatives or special interests.*
- *The value of statewide communication.*
- *Small changes have a HUGE ripple effect.*
- *CCN aligns with our college mission.*
- *We are still learning our best practices for moving this along on campus.*
- *Getting department buy-in and having them engaged in the process is very important.*
- *There is an imbalance in representation on the CCN committees with all 7 universities represented but less than half of community colleges are included. There is also inequities across the state on the time involved to make these changes that places significant burdens on some institutions without supporting resources.*
- *For credit changes, it would help to have had them all occur in the same year so we can make appropriate adjustment to overall credits for degrees.*
- *...the change of Math to STAT was confusing to students - we will need to do more internal communication if a prefix change like this occurs again.*
- *The struggle is real.*
- *It has also been difficult to get information from Transfer website- need a portal like other states.*
- *Faculty and advisors are confused about the purpose of the Z designation and are concerned how students might interpret the courses as different from the previously offered courses.*
- *The timeline to implement credit and curriculum changes, in addition to redesigning course materials, online courses, and preparing faculty to teach courses continues to be a challenge.*
- *Faculty feel that the legislation undermines the ability to offer population-focused approaches to teaching the material and stifles academic freedom.*
- *Advisors are concerned about what the credit change means for helping students meet credit level requirements for certain student populations or for aid requirements.*



- *The advising team continues to develop and improve outreach plans for students.*
- *It is important to determine early on where the courses appear (requisites and programs), which faculty lead each course, and ensure that academic deans are aware of changes coming.*
- *It is important to work with systems folks (for Banner, catalog, admissions, etc.) who will need to make changes.*
- *Ensure that crosswalks of course equivalencies are developed and shared.*

Core Transfer Map (CTM) and Major Transfer Map (MTM) Implementation Surveys.

The 2023 CTM/MTM survey responses revealed less information than CCN survey responses and illuminated some uncertainty about information related to these transfer tools.. For example, seven out of 17 community colleges responded that they had not awarded an MTM to a single student to date, one had no way to determine if a student had been awarded an MTM or not, and five others did not respond at all. Four out of 17 community colleges reported that a total of 53 students had been awarded an MTM to date..

Little is known about students who have completed an MTM and whether they transferred to an OPU. When asked how many students have matriculated with an MTM (Q49), five out of seven respondents reported that they know of none that have; one did not know, and one did not respond to the question. Of the relatively few students known to have earned an MTM, none are known to have transferred to an OPU.

It appears that longstanding institutional technical systems, resources and processes around tracking and transcription of student data at the community colleges and tracking and articulation of student data at the OPUs were not designed to account for CTMs and MTMs. Responses include through “Courseleaf,” “They have a Z designator,” Internal curriculum committee,” “I don’t understand what you mean by track,” and “Unsure what this question means.” Ten out of 17 of the community colleges reported using an automated process of some kind to identify students who have completed an MTM, such as an auto-awarding process (4), degree audit (4), or a note on transcripts (2). Four community colleges require students to take action independently, such as submitting a form, rather than tracking the information on a student’s behalf. Two community colleges reported having not taken any action, and one pointed toward “institutional research” which was not defined. Of these, five of the community colleges report a means of “marking” students who have completed an MTM, but that process may not follow the student out of their institution and on to a target university (degree audit, institutional research). Only two out of 17 community colleges actively note the MTM on transcripts. These responses require further investigation by the Systems and Operations Subcommittee of the transfer council to verify implementation progress.

In their survey responses, OPUs consistently report difficulty in identifying students who have completed an MTM through current transcript review practices. A representative comment from an OPU: “We are not clear if community colleges are not noting CTMs or MTMs on transcripts. If not, that would make it impossible to track and note progress for these students.” OPUs report they are not able to readily or consistently identify students who come to them with a MTM, it is not possible for them to sort and track these students and therefore properly advise them toward degree completion. In addition to the expectation that community colleges must be responsible for identifying (through transcripts) which students have earned an MTM, some of the OPUs also expect the colleges to take sole responsibility for tracking the long-term success of students who complete an MTM. The OPUs track success of all students, transfer and otherwise.

The state of MTM implementation across Oregon, particularly at the community colleges, is uneven. All the MTMs are offered at more than one community college community . The community colleges and universities do not share the same information about MTMs/degree programs, with some offering a few sentences and others offering very detailed webpages with information on courses required (hyperlinked) and/or links to

PDFs with



detailed information about a degree pathway. Several institutions make no mention of MTMs but do mention degrees. There is also apparent inconsistency with the *name* of degrees among some institutions “Associate of Arts Transfer English-MTM” instead of “Associate of Arts Transfer (AAT) in English Literature.” Some provided links that were either broken or provided no information on the degree. A similar unevenness is reported in how community colleges communicate with students about the MTMs. Collectively, 82% of responses indicate that respondents rely on a **passive system** for communicating with students about CTMs and MTMs (e.g., catalog, degree audit, website, print publications, application). Less than 20% of institutions indicated that they use an **active system** for communicating with students (Advisors or Faculty). One institution indicated that they “do not communicate with students” about the MTMs or CTMs.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Responses indicate that respondents have, for the most part, implemented the first 10 CCN courses as recommended by the Transfer Council and approved by the full HECC Commission. There were six themes that emerged from the qualitative data: 1. Communication 2. Coordination 3. Workload 4. 5. Organization, and 6. Guidance. Table 2 shares the codes that were used to determine the six, relevant themes.

Table 2. Emergent Themes and Relevant Codes for CCN Implementation Surveys

Theme	Relevant Codes
Communication	Contacted X Email/newsletter/website/campus systems Meetings/In-service Administration/Faculty Committee/Course approval Sharepoint Communicated with X Transfer Council/the State Transcript Advising/Conversations College catalog Trainings
Coordination	Fully implemented Courses adopted
Workload	Course/degree/program changes or modifications Catalog changes LMS/SIS changes Curriculum changes Manual process Course approval
Buy-in	NWCCU Shared Governance Veterans Administration approval College committees Meetings/In-service
Organization	Catalog/Course Content and Outcomes Guides (CCOG) updates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Webforms Curriculum updates Degree audit Crosswalk Documentation Internal processes Tracking documents Action plans/lead
Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify: High school partners, departments Inform departments/faculty/staff via meetings and email Monitored State committees/website HECC webpage/publications Trainings/sessions Electronic and digital messaging as needed No resources CCOGs

Communication. Because CCN is a new initiative and because the first round of CCN courses were adopted/implemented within the past year, some inaccuracies in course catalogs may be the result of labor constraints or issues with sharing accurate information in a timely manner concerning CCN courses. As a coordinating body, the HECC staff should help institutions ensure accurate and consistent information is displayed for students.

~~**Communication.** The theory of Institutional Change indicates that learning is a cognitive process for institutions of higher education (IHEs), much like it is for individuals (Hanson, 2001, p. 640). Obstacles in effective communication regarding MTMs, in addition to the above, may stem from differences in institutional practices, such as transcription and credit articulation, between community colleges and public universities.~~

Coordination. Information on what institutions communicate about CCN with students and advisors and how that information is being shared demonstrate that for the most part, institutions are using passive systems for communicating with both advisors and students (e.g., course catalogs, guides). By contrast, active communication takes place between two (or more) people in person, allowing for feedback and clarification. Institutions that rely more heavily on active communication develop communication channels through systems like advising, and faculty and staff communication with students. Of course, this type of communication is resource intensive. The types of resources most often used for communicating with students and advisors about CCN and MTM again demonstrates a reliance on passive systems (e.g., course catalogs, email, webpage).

~~The CAS theoretical framework, which focuses on transformational change within organizations, highlights the importance of networks in bringing about effective change.~~

Respondents indicated that they recognize the benefit of CCN as a tool for improving transfer and the transparency of the transfer process, especially for students. Concerns with the work required to implement CCN were expressed, as was the desire for centralizing transfer information via a statewide transfer portal or website. The value of using this as a tool to alleviate workload for institutions was made evident, which also could be used to improve buy-in for transfer initiatives because of the tangible benefits inherent in a transfer portal (e.g., centralized degree audit, student referrals via the portal).

Responses also indicate the need for continuous improvement with communication between the State and institutional partners, whether in reference to the creation of subcommittees, the legislation (and requirements of that legislation) that prompted CCN, or the limited timing for implementing CCN. Many of the concerns

expressed reveal problems with communicating information in a timely and accurate manner. Improved transparency, communication, and making available easily accessible information (via a transfer portal) would improve institution's ability to see the benefit of CCN/CTMs/MTMs

Workload. Constraints on the ability to adopt and implement 10 CCN courses by the fall 2023 catalog speak to the pressure that institutions are under to complete the work during a period of the COVID -19 pandemic and economic downturn, especially for community colleges and small or rural-serving institutions. Respondents noted how challenging



it was to update degree programs (some respondents mentioned as many as 80 separate programs needing updates) with CCN course information. The impact of changing the number of credits for some courses was also noted as a labor issue because it impacts the calculation of load (a term used to indicate the “units” faculty earn for teaching courses and for performing non-instructional activities such as department chair and research). In contrast, MTM survey respondents did not directly identify workload as an obstacle to implementation but did point to areas where more work was needed to accomplish a goal, such as effective web-based communication with students and staff. The core of CCN and MTM work relies on the specialized knowledge and experience of the faculty and staff who do the alignment work. ~~As the central component to CAS theory, self-organization and social coordination (i.e., faculty and staff expertise) need to be relied on for making informed decisions regarding the alignment of courses and degree pathways. Institutions who have the resources to recognize and honor this work through compensation and tangible support are able to demonstrate their commitment to the integral role their faculty and staff play in improving transfer pathways for students.~~ The HECC staff would serve the institutions well by advocating to the legislature the need for resources at the public institutions to support the added burden of this work.

. community

Organization. Given the limitations of the data gathered, it appears that institutions are relying on passive communication (e.g. email, student information systems) rather than active communication (advisors, training). Further investigation regarding how institutions are communicating about CCN/CTMs/MTMs is warranted. Responses also ~~indicate that there is some lack of clarity on how to track the adoption of CCN/CTMs/MTMs. Four institutions reported that this is done by committees (Curriculum or Instructional council) Other responses (1-2 responses each) included watching the HECC Resources for CCN webpage, through a contact on the CCN Systems & Operations Subcommittee, through Transfer Council (unspecified how that communication occurs), internal process (nondescript), or through empowered administrators.~~ Collectively, this points to the need for the sharing of best practices, continuous feedback, and the creation of agile systems that will allow for learning and continuous improvement to avoid failure with transfer initiatives. Because all 24 institutions have different systems and processes in place, adoption and communication about the common course numbering system and about the CTMs and MTMs is varied. More can be done to share best practices around maintaining the integrity of these courses and programs and around effective communication about them to students, faculty, and advisors.



Guidance. The responses about curriculum changes needed to adopt CCN (Q1-4) and responses about lessons learned during the process (Q45) indicate that there were a number of unanticipated consequences to actions recommended by the Transfer Council due to the wide spectrum of changes required to implement CCN. Given the newness of this implementation and the variety of systems and processes in place across the 24 institutions, this is to be expected, and these struggles will likely decrease as more courses are put into the common numbering system.

~~A lack of shared vision concerning the creation of transfer initiatives and the goal (improving student transfer and success), desire for guidance concerning the implementation process, and obvious unclear channels of communication with faculty and staff about CCN and MTM indicate the need for greater guidance from the process of implementation. The HECC and Transfer Council, with throughout the help process of HECC staff can support this on-going work by implementing clear processes for tracking and evaluating transfer initiatives, improving communication and process development around the transfer initiatives. The theoretical frameworks that guided this study outline attributes that can be leveraged to mitigate challenges by harnessing the power of existing human capital (e.g., networking, feedback).~~

RECOMMENDATIONS

To learn from this first round (year) of CCN implementation, the data from the surveys can be helpful for making recommendations for improvements. The following recommendations are based on data and the interpretation of the data. Institutions would benefit from: Implementation of the CCN system will be improved by:

- Creating to assist in Asking each institution that hasn't already done to to appoint Appointing an individual or individuals who are tasked with ensuring the adoption of CCCCN and tracking and communicating CCN information at their institution.
- Asking institutions to regularly communicate with students about CCN/CTMs/MTMs.
- ~~Communicate across institutional sectors and between institutions, for the purpose of sharing information.~~
- Asking institutions to include CCN updates in regularly scheduled training for advisors. ~~Rely on training/in-service as the primary conduit for communicating with advisors about CCN.~~
- Asking institution to provide information to advisors about CCN information to students. Some institutions may want to rely on advisors as the primary conduit for communicating with students about CCN.
- Asking institutions to create protocols communicating CCN updates with faculty and staff.
- Asking the responsible individual at each institution to verify Check course catalog information and websites to ensure information follows adopted CCN course information. See the Implementation Checklist (Appendix E) for ideas on what this might look like.
- Having the Transfer Council ~~Build institutional buy-in by encouraging participation (faculty/staff) in CCN subcommittees and/or by encouraging attendance at these public meetings.~~
- Asking the Transfer Council to help improve communication about the CCN process by ensuring information is accurate and up to date.

Suggestions concerning next year's CCN/CTMs/MTMs surveys:

- Ask the SysOps committee to help with survey preparation so relevant and actionable information can be obtained.

Recommendations were guided by the Complex Adaptive Systems theory of understanding and managing change in higher education. This lens is useful for encouraging networking as a means of working toward a shared goal (improving student success and transfer rates). The emergence of change is and needs to remain a faculty-led, statewide initiative that recognizes the expertise of discipline- and specialty-specific personnel. Facilitating a venue for this work to take place needs to remain an inclusive and transparent process that follows the legislation (SB 233). Utilizing feedback from these surveys to make improvements in both process and implementation will enable transfer initiatives to be organic, responsive, and resilient. Finally, creating an agile process will allow all stakeholders to learn from unintended consequences while avoiding systematic failure.

Lessons Learned

1. Transfer is highly complex, especially in Oregon. Institutions are under significant pressure due to constrained budgets and limited capacity. Initiatives such as MTMs and CCN are time-and-effort-intensive and implementation requires most of the institutions to put new/current resources, practices and procedures in place. Because transfer initiatives are simultaneously academic and student support-intensive, they confound the traditional silos of community colleges and universities. In addition, there are several concurrent state-wide transfer initiatives, while at the same time, many institutions are engaging in their own restructuring and student success restructuring efforts. “Initiative fatigue” can complicate the implementation of these projects. In this complex environment, HECC should provide institutions opportunities to learn from each other’s innovations to help ease this burden and improve the timeliness and efficacy of MTM and CCN implementation.
2. Institutions revealed through the 2023 survey findings that very little is known about how students are impacted by CCN and MTM, to date. To support continuous improvement, HECC should consider bringing institutional stakeholders together to better support and (where possible) systematize data collection, analysis, and reporting efforts for transfer initiatives statewide. ~~A statewide transfer portal is an ideal solution for facilitating this collaboration and dissemination of information.~~
3. Building out CCNs and MTMs is challenging intellectual work that places a heavy burden of time and effort on faculty participants. The HECC staff would serve the institutions well by advocating with the legislature for more financial Transfer Council acknowledges that currently this support at the institutions is unfunded.
4. Survey respondents referenced diverging layers of software applications and other technological tools that are used to process curriculum and student success communications within and among institutions. At the same time, respondents demonstrated that current communication channels within and across institutions, and particularly with students, are not satisfactory. Taken together, this reinforces the suggestion of some institutions and other stakeholders for a single, state-wide, integrated, and student-friendly website to support transfer students and those who support them, what HECC staff call a “Transfer Portal.”



APPENDIX A: CCN IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Background

In 2017, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2998, which directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), community colleges, and public universities listed in Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 352.02 to streamline transfer pathways. (ORS 350.400)

Then in 2021, Senate Bill (SB) 233, directed the HECC to establish a 15-member Transfer Council with representation from Oregon's public universities, community colleges, and secondary education partners. Part of the work assigned to Transfer Council is the development of recommendations on a common course numbering (CCN) system to the Commission. (ORS 350.423)

The HECC, community colleges, and public universities met the following requirements of the legislation:

- Developed and [approved 10 \(CCN\) courses](#) for implementation by all public community colleges and public universities, by the 2023-24 catalog, as per SB 233 Section 2, 3(b).

The following survey questions are designed to understand how institutions plan to implement, communicate, measure, and maintain compliance with Common Course Numbering as required under HB 2998 and SB 233. A separate survey will be sent out to gather information on the implementation of Core Transfer Maps (CTMs) and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs). These surveys are sent on behalf of Transfer Council. Survey results will be made available to partner institutions, the legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Purpose

As per Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) [350.429\(3\)\(e\)](#) which outlines Transfer council's responsibilities, (3)(a) no later than September 1 of each year, the Council shall report to the Commission on the progress the Council is making in enhancing and maintaining the common course numbering system described in ORS 350.423 and on any other current work regarding the transfer of academic credit on which the Council is focused.



This survey will provide data for the Transfer Council's report to the Commission and enable the collection of information that maintains the integrity of data for the purpose of recording and reporting such information. The surveys also support continuous improvement efforts with a focus on student success.

Instructions for Completing the Survey

The time required to complete questions will vary, depending on who is completing the survey and access to institutional information. HECC is requesting one survey response per institution. While the implementation and success of CCN will be a campus wide effort, it is important that there is a common understanding on each campus of implementation, timeline, and agreed to measures of success. A PDF of the survey in its entirety will be attached to the email that includes this survey, to facilitate campus communication and collection of answers. If you encounter any problems while completing the survey, please contact jane.denison-furness@hecc.oregon.gov. Surveys are due on 07/28/2023 at 5:00 pm. At that time, the survey will be closed.

1. Name of your institution:
2. Name and email for person(s) completing the survey:

Institutional Process: Common Course Numbering

3. Does your institution need to make any curriculum or credit changes to adopt Common Course Numbering?
4. If yes, please describe changes that need to be made:
5. What implementation steps has your campus taken?
6. What steps does your campus have left?
7. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 105Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
8. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
9. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
10. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 111Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
11. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
12. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
13. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 112Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
14. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
15. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
16. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM 100 Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? 
17. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
18. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
19. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM 111 Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
20. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
21. If no, please  list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.

22. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM 218Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
23. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
24. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
25. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [ST or STAT 243Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
26. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
27. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
28. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 121Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
29. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
30. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
31. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 122Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
32. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
33. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
34. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 227Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)?
35. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
36. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
37. List the name(s) and title(s) of individuals at your institution who are primarily responsible for ensuring the adoption of CCN courses recommended by Transfer Council and approved by the HECC, as per SB 233?
38. List the steps your institution has taken or is taking to adopt CCN courses, including the use of [Web forms](#).
39. How is your institution tracking the adoption of CCN?
40. How does your institution communicate with students about CCN? For example, see [UO's "Oregon Transfer Maps \(CORE\)" webpage](#).

41. When did your institution start communicating with students about CCN? OR when do you plan to start communicating with students about CCN?
42. What is your institution's process for communicating with advisors and faculty when changes are made in courses and/or to curriculum?
43. What resources/materials/training are you making available to advisors and faculty so they can appropriately advise students about CCN?
44. When did you or when do you plan to make these resources available? (date)

Other Observations

45. What have you learned so far from the CCN implementation experience?

Thank you for participating in this survey. Results of the survey will be made available to partner institutions, the Legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

APPENDIX B: CTM/MTM IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Background

In 2017, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2998, which directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), community colleges, and public universities listed in Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 352.02 to streamline transfer pathways. (ORS 350.400)

Then in 2021, Senate Bill (SB) 233, directed the HECC to establish a 15-member Transfer Council with representation from Oregon's public universities, community colleges, and secondary education partners. Part of the work assigned to Transfer Council is the development of recommendations to the Commission on Core Transfer Maps (CTM) and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs). (ORS 350.423)

The HECC, community colleges, and public universities met the following requirements of the legislation:

- Core Transfer Maps (CTMs; General Core and STEM Core): establishes a path for community college students to take courses guaranteed to transfer as general education at ANY Oregon public university.
- Approved five Major Transfer Maps (MTMs): English Literature, Biology, Business, Computer Science, and Elementary Education, with three more in process.

The following survey questions are designed to understand how institutions plan to implement, communicate, measure, and maintain their compliance with CTMs and MTMs as required under HB 2998 and SB 233. A separate survey will be sent out to gather information on the implementation of Common Course Numbering (CCN). These surveys are sent on behalf of Transfer Council. These survey results will be made available to partner institutions, the legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Purpose

As per Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) [350.429\(3\)\(e\)](#) which outlines Transfer council's responsibilities, (3)(a) no later than September 1 of each year, the Council shall report to the Commission on the progress the Council is making in enhancing and maintaining the common course numbering system described in ORS 350.423 and on any other current work regarding the transfer of academic credit on which the Council is focused.

This survey will provide data for the Transfer Council's report to the Commission and enable the collection of information that maintains the integrity of data for the purpose of recording and reporting such information. The surveys also support continuous improvement efforts with a focus on student success.

Instructions for Completing the Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey. We ask that you answer all questions as completely and fully as possible.

The time required to complete questions will vary, depending on who is completing the survey and access to institutional information. HECC is requesting one survey response per institution. While the implementation and success of MTMs will be a campus wide effort, it is important that there is a common understanding on each campus of implementation, timeline, and agreed to measures of success. A PDF of the survey in its entirety will be attached to the email that includes this survey, to facilitate campus communication and collection of answers. If you encounter any problems while completing the survey, please contact

jane.denison-furness@hecc.oregon.gov. Surveys are due on 07/28/2023 at 5:00 pm. At that time, the survey will be closed.

1. Name of your institution:
2. Name and email of person(s) completing the survey:

Institutional Process: Major Transfer Maps, Associate Degrees, and Core Transfer Maps

3. Does your institution offer the [Biology--Associate of Science-Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree? Proposed MTM OAR language states that "All institutions offering a program leading to a two-year certificate, associate degree or bachelor's degree, excluding an applied baccalaureate degree..." are required to participate in the MTM subject area. (Y/N/NA because our community college does not offer a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in this MTM subject area.)
4. If yes, please provide the link to your course guide, program page, or course catalog.
5. If your institution offers a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in Biology, the proposed rules will require your institution to participate in the Biology AST. Please enter the anticipated date the Biology AST will appear in your course catalog.
6. Does your institution offer the [Business--Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree? Proposed MTM OAR language states that "All institutions offering a program leading to a two-year certificate, associate degree or bachelor's degree, excluding an applied baccalaureate degree..." are required to participate in the MTM subject area. (Y/N/NA because our community college does not offer a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in this MTM subject area.)
7. If yes, please provide the link to your course guide, program page, or course catalog.
8. If your institution offers a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in Business, the proposed rules will require your institution to participate in the Business AST. Please enter the anticipated date the Business AST will appear in your course catalog.
9. [Does your institution offer the Computer Science--Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\) degree?](#) Proposed MTM OAR language states that "All institutions offering a program leading to a two-year certificate, associate degree or bachelor's degree, excluding an applied baccalaureate degree..." are required to participate in the MTM subject area. (Y/N/NA because our community college does not offer a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in this MTM subject area.)
10. If yes, please provide the link to your course guide, program page, or course catalog.
11. If your institution offers a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in Computer Science, the proposed rules will require your institution to participate in the Computer Science AST. Please enter the anticipated date the Computer Science AST will appear in your course catalog.
12. [Does your institution offer the Elementary Education--Associate of Arts-Oregon Transfer \(AAOT\) degree?](#) Proposed MTM OAR language states that "All institutions offering a program leading to a two-year certificate, associate degree or bachelor's degree, excluding an applied baccalaureate degree..." are

required to participate in the MTM subject area. (Y/N/NA because our community college does not offer a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in this MTM subject area.)

13. If yes, please provide the link to your course guide, program page, or course catalog.
14. If your institution offers a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in Elementary Education, the proposed rules will require your institution to participate in the Elementary Education AAOT. Please enter the anticipated date the Elementary Education AAOT will appear in your course catalog.
15. Does your institution offer the [English Literature-Associate of Arts Transfer \(AAT\)](#) degree? Proposed MTM OAR language states that "All institutions offering a program leading to a two-year certificate, associate degree or bachelor's degree, excluding an applied baccalaureate degree..." are required to participate in the MTM subject area. (Y/N/NA because our community college does not offer a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in this MTM subject area.)
16. If yes, please provide the link to your course guide, program page, or course catalog.
17. If your institution offers a two-year certificate or Associate Degree in English Literature, the proposed rules will require your institution to participate in the English Literature AAT. Please enter the anticipated date the English Literature AAT will appear in your course catalog.
18. What is your institution's internal process for ensuring any course or curriculum changes made continue to comply with MTM memoranda of understanding (MOUs)?
19. Who has been primarily responsible for implementation of CTM and MTMs on your campus? Please list name(s) and title(s).
20. How is completion of a CTM noted on students' transcripts?

Student-Facing Communication: Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps

21. How does your institution communicate with students about the CTMs and MTMs? For example: COCCs Degree Options for CTE webpage:

<https://www.cocc.edu/departments/admissions/degrees-and-classes/degree-options.aspx> see "Associate of Science Transfer (AST)" dropdown menu OR the "Transfer Without a Degree" dropdown menu.
22. When did your institution start communicating with students about the CTMs? OR when do you plan to start?
23. When did your institution start communicating with students about MTMs? OR when do you plan to start communicating with students about MTMs?
24. What is your process for communicating with advisors and faculty when changes are made in courses and/or to curriculum?

Student Advising: Training and Communication

25. What resources/materials/training are you making available to advisors and faculty so they can appropriately advise students about CTMs and MTMs?

26. When did you or when do you plan to make these resources available? (date)

Measuring Outcomes

27. How do you identify students who earned a CTM?

28. How will you measure the success of students who earned a CTM?

29. How do you identify students who earned an MTM?

30. How will you measure the progress/success of students who earned an MTM?

31. Do you have a system for tracking students who are following an MTM? (Y/N)

32. If yes, please describe your tracking system:

33. How many students have completed an MTM?

Thank you for participating in this survey. Results of the survey will be made available to partner institutions, the Legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

APPENDIX C: CCN IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY FOR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Background

In 2017, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2998, which directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), community colleges, and public universities listed in Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 352.02 to streamline transfer pathways. (ORS 350.400)

Then in 2021, Senate Bill (SB) 233, directed the HECC to establish a 15-member Transfer Council with representation from Oregon's public universities, community colleges, and from secondary education. Part of the work assigned to Transfer Council is the development of recommendations on a common course numbering (CCN) system to the Commission. (ORS 350.423)

The HECC, community colleges, and public universities met the following requirements of the legislation:

- Developed and [approved 10 \(CCN\) courses](#) for implementation by all public community colleges and public universities, by the 2023-24 catalog, as per SB 233 Section 2, 3(b).

The following survey questions are designed to understand how institutions plan to implement, communicate, measure, and maintain their compliance with Common Course Numbering as required under HB 2998 and SB 233. A separate survey will be sent out to gather information on the implementation of Core Transfer Maps (CTMs) and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs). These surveys are sent on behalf of Transfer Council.

These survey results will be made available to partner institutions, the legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Purpose

As per Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) [350.429\(3\)\(e\)](#) which outlines Transfer council's responsibilities, (3)(a) no later than September 1 of each year, the Council shall report to the Commission on the progress the Council is making in enhancing and maintaining the common course numbering system described in ORS 350.423 and on any other current work regarding the transfer of academic credit on which the Council is focused.

This survey will provide data for the Transfer Council's report to the Commission and enable the collection of information that maintains the integrity of data for the purpose of recording and reporting such information. The surveys also support continuous improvement efforts with a focus on student success.

Instructions for Completing the Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey. We ask that you answer all questions as completely and fully as possible.

The time required to complete questions will vary, depending on who is completing the survey and access to institutional information. HECC is requesting one survey response per institution. While the implementation and success of CCN will be a campus wide effort, it is important that there is a common understanding on each campus of implementation, timeline, and agreed to measures of success. A PDF of the survey in its entirety will be attached to the email that includes this survey, to facilitate campus communication and collection of answers. If you encounter any problems while completing the survey, please contact jane.denison-furness@hecc.oregon.gov. Surveys are due on 07/28/2023 at 5:00 pm. At that time, the survey will be closed.

1. Name of your institution:
2. Name and email of person(s) completing the survey:

Institutional Process: Common Course Numbering

3. Does your institution need to make any curriculum or credit changes to adopt Common Course Numbering? (Y/N)
4. If yes, please describe changes that need to be made:
5. What implementation steps has your campus taken?
6. What steps does your campus have left?
7. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 105Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
8. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
9. 9. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion:
10. 10. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 111Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
11. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
12. 12. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
13. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [MTH or MATH 112Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
14. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
15. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
16. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM IO 0 Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
17. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
18. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
19. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM I I I Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
20. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.

21. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
22. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [COM or COMM 218Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
23. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
24. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
25. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [ST or STAT 243Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
26. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
27. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
28. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 121Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
29. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
30. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
31. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 122Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
32. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
33. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
34. Does your Academic Year 2023-24 course catalog list [WR 227Z](#), an approved CCN course (with a Z-designator)? (Y/N)
35. If yes, please provide a link to the course in the course catalog or the date your catalog will contain the new Z-designator.
36. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
37. List the name(s) and title(s) of individuals at your institution who are primarily responsible for ensuring the adoption of CCN courses recommended by Transfer Council and approved by the HECC, as per SB 233?
38. List the steps your institution has taken or is taking to adopt CCN courses, including the use of [Web forms](#).
39. How is your institution tracking the adoption of CCN?

Student-Facing Communication: Common Course Numbering

40. How does your institution communicate with students about CCN? For example, see [UO's "Oregon Transfer Maps \(CORE\)" webpage](#).
41. When did your institution start communicating with students about CCN? OR when do you plan to start communicating with students about CCN?

Student Advising: Training and Communication

42. What is your institution's process for communicating with advisors and faculty when changes are made in courses and/or to curriculum?
43. What resources/materials/training are you making available to advisors and faculty so they can appropriately advise students about CCN?
44. When did you or when do you plan to make these resources available? (date)

Other Observations

45. What have you learned so far from the CCN implementation process?

Thank you for participating in this survey. Results of the survey will be made available to partner institutions, the Legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

APPENDIX D: CTM/MTM IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY FOR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Background

In 2017, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2998, which directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), community colleges, and public universities listed in Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 352.02 to streamline transfer pathways. (ORS 350.400)

Then in 2021, Senate Bill (SB) 233, directed the HECC to establish a 15-member Transfer Council with representation from Oregon's public universities, community colleges, and from secondary education. Part of the work assigned to Transfer Council is the development of recommendations on Core Transfer Maps (CTMs) and Major Transfer Maps (MTMs) to the Commission. (ORS 350.423)

The HECC, community colleges, and public universities met the following requirements of the legislation:

- [Core Transfer Maps](#) (General Core and STEM Core): establishes a path for community college students to take courses guaranteed to transfer as general education at ANY Oregon public university.
- Approved five [Major Transfer Maps](#) (MTMs): English Literature, Biology, Business, Computer Science, and Elementary Education, with three more in process.

The following survey questions are designed to understand how institutions plan to implement, communicate, measure, and maintain their compliance with CTMs and MTMs as required under HB 2998 and SB 233. A separate survey will be sent out to gather information on the implementation of CCN. These surveys are sent on behalf of Transfer Council. These survey results will be made available to partner institutions, the legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Purpose

As per Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) [350.429\(3\)\(e\)](#) which outlines Transfer council's responsibilities, (3)(a) no later than September 1 of each year, the Council shall report to the Commission on the progress the Council is making in enhancing and maintaining the common course numbering system described in ORS 350.423 and on any other current work regarding the transfer of academic credit on which the Council is focused.

This survey will provide data for the Transfer Council's report to the Commission and enable the collection of information that maintains the integrity of data for the purpose of recording and reporting such information. The surveys also support continuous improvement efforts with a focus on student success.

Instructions for Completing the Survey

Thank you for participating in this survey. We ask that you answer all questions as completely and fully as possible.

The time required to complete questions will vary, depending on who is completing the survey and access to institutional information. HECC is requesting one survey response per institution. While the implementation and success of MTMs will be a campus wide effort, it is important that there is a common understanding on each campus of implementation, timeline, and agreed to measures of success. A PDF of the survey in its entirety will be attached to the email that includes this survey, to facilitate campus communication and

collection of answers. If you encounter any problems while completing the survey, please contact jane.denison-furness@hecc.oregon.gov. Surveys are due on 07/28/2023 at 5:00 pm. At that time, the survey will be closed.

1. Name of your institution:
2. Name and email of person(s) completing the survey:

Institutional Processes: Major Transfer Maps and Core Transfer Maps

3. When a student transfers to your institution with a [Biology Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree, does this articulate to at least 30 general education credits? (Y/N)
4. If no, [ORS 350.400 1\(b\)](#) requires all OPUs to establish CTMs that count toward students' general education requirements. Please list the additional steps your institution must take to implement this requirement.
5. Anticipated completion date:
6. When a student transfers to your institution with a [Business Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree, does this articulate to at least 30 general education credits? (Y/N)
7. If no, [ORS 350.4001\(b\)](#) requires all OPUs to establish CTMs that count toward students' general education requirements. Please list the additional steps your institution must take to implement this requirement.
8. Anticipated completion date:
9. When a student transfers to your institution with a [Computer Science Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree, does this articulate to at least 30 general education credits? (Y/N)
10. If no, [ORS 350.400 1\(b\)](#) requires all OPUs to establish CTMs that count toward students' general education requirements. Please list the additional steps your institution must take to implement this requirement.
11. Anticipated completion date:
12. When a student transfers to your institution with an [Elementary Education Associate of Arts Transfer \(AAT\)](#) degree, does this articulate to at least 30 general education credits? (Y/N)
13. 13. If no, [ORS 350.400 1\(b\)](#) requires all OPUs to establish CTMs that count toward students' general education requirements. Please list the additional steps your institution must take to implement this requirement.
14. Anticipated completion date:
15. When a student transfers to your institution with an [English Literature Associate of Arts \(AAT\)](#) degree, does this articulate to at least 30 general education credits? (Y/N)

16. If no, ORS 350.400 l(b) requires all OPUs to establish CTMs that count toward students' general education requirements. Please list the additional steps your institution must take to implement this requirement.
17. Anticipated date of completion:
18. When a student transfers to your institution with the [Biology Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree, will they be able to complete a bachelor's degree in the major identified in the MTM, in 90 credits or fewer? (Y/N/Degree not offered)
19. If yes, please list those 90 credits or provide a link and page number to the program guide or MTM (e.g., [CS MTM MOU, pp. 19-24](#)).
20. If no, what steps does your institution need to take to implement this MTM?
21. Anticipated date of completion:
22. When a student transfers to your institution with the [Business Associate of Science Transfer \(AST\)](#) degree, will they be able to complete a bachelor's degree in the major identified in the MTM, in 90 credits or fewer? (Y/N/Degree not offered)
23. If yes, please list those 90 credits or provide a link and page number to the program guide or MTM (e.g., [CS MTM MOU, pp. 79-24](#)).
24. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
25. Anticipated date of completion:
26. When a student transfers to your institution with the [Computer Science Associate of Science \(AST\)](#) degree, will they be able to complete a bachelor's degree in the major identified in the MTM, in 90 credits or fewer? (Y/N/Degree not offered)
27. If yes, please list those 90 credits or provide a link and page number to the program guide or MTM (e.g., [CS MTM MOU, pp. 19-24](#)).
28. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
29. Anticipated date of completion:
30. When a student transfers to your institution with the [Elementary Education Associate of Arts Transfer \(AAT\)](#) degree, will they be able to complete a bachelor's degree in the major identified in the MTM, in 90 credits or fewer? (Y/N/Degree not offered)
31. If yes, please list those 90 credits or provide a link and page number to the program guide or MTM (e.g., [CS MTM MOU, pp. 19-24](#)).
32. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
33. Anticipated date of completion:

34. When a student transfers to your institution with the [English Literature Associate of Arts Transfer \(AAT\)](#) degree, will they be able to complete a bachelor's degree in the major identified in the MTM, in 90 credits or fewer? (Y/N/Degree not offered)
35. If yes, please list those 90 credits or provide a link and page number to the program guide or MTM (e.g., [CS MTM MOU, pp. 19-24](#)).
36. If no, please list your institution's steps for implementation and the date for completion.
37. Anticipated date of completion:
38. Who has been primarily responsible for the implementation of CTM and MTMs on your campus?
39. What is your institution's process for ensuring any course changes made continue to comply with MTM memoranda of understanding (MOUs)?

Student-Facing Communication: MTMs

40. How does your institution communicate with students about the MTMs? For example, UO's "Oregon Transfer Maps (CORE)" webpage:

<https://registrar.uoregon.edu/transfer-students/oregon-transfer-module/oregon-transfer-maps> and WOU's "Transfer Pathways" webpage:

<https://wou.edu/transferpathways/oregon-transfer-compass-hb2998/>

41. When did your institution start communicating with students about the MTM(s)? OR when do you plan to start communicating with students about the MTM(s)?

Student Advising: Training and Communication

42. What is your process for communicating with advisors and faculty when changes are made in courses and/or to curriculum?
43. What resources/materials/training are you making available to advisors and faculty so they can a
44. When did you or when do you plan to make these resources available?

Measuring Outcomes

45. How do you identify students who earned a CTM?
46. How will you measure the success of students who earned a CTM?
47. How do you identify students who earned an MTM?
48. How will you measure their progress/success?
49. How many students have matriculated with an English Literature, Biology, Business, Computer Science, or Elementary Education MTM?

Other Observations

50. Do you have any other insights to share regarding MTM implementation?

Thank you for participating in this survey. Results of the survey will be made available to partner institutions, the Legislature, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

APPENDIX E: IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Link to draft checklist:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1mdN9srMMO5F5Ra41kby0lv8YvzGnpFzDWfoNv3WMMR4/edit?usp=sharing>

