

March 20, 2025 Transfer Council

8.0 Legislative Scan Report

Summary: Elizabeth Cox Brand from OCCA, Linn-Benton Community College President Lisa Avery, and Sarah Ancel from Student Ready Strategies will share information about a recently commissioned report on Transfer Legislation in Oregon.

The report contains recommendations that will also be discussed by the transfer council.

Staff Recommendation:

No action needed, informational and discussion purposes only.

Recommended Motion:

No action needed, informational and discussion purposes only.



Spring 2025



POSTSECONDARY TRANSFER IN OREGON

Examining the current landscape of transfer policy



A report prepared for the Oregon Community College Association
by Student-Ready Strategies

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

College transfer is a critical structure to support student success. Oregon has enacted a series of reforms providing transfer students with rights, opportunities, and guarantees, but student experiences and outcomes continue to fall short of what state leaders envision and what the state economy requires. The purpose of this report is to examine Oregon's transfer-related laws and their implementation, and identify additional actions the state can take to make its transfer system more equitable and student-centered.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- While Oregon has strong laws related to streamlined transfer, the implementation of these laws has only documented the complexity that transfer students face, rather than resolving it.
- Reform efforts have explicitly placed the burden on transfer students to navigate the transfer system's complexity and nuances. They must find, digest, and apply transfer information and meet with multiple advisors to make the system work for them.
- There are opportunities to make transfer in Oregon more student-centered and equitable by clarifying legislative intent and resourcing robust implementation to streamline and simplify this complex system.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

- The Transfer Student Bill of Rights has been created, but 15 years later, it lacks visibility and does not reflect more recent transfer reforms. It also included numerous caveats to those rights and substantial requirements on students to be able to receive them.
- Two Core Transfer Maps (CTMs) and six Major Transfer Maps (MTMs) have been created. They thoroughly document the differing curricular requirements of the seven universities, but have not substantially streamlined those requirements.
- The documents that lay out the CTMs and MTMs are not effective as student-facing resources. On their own, they do not provide students with sufficient direction to be able to register for classes with a guarantee that the courses on their resulting schedule will transfer.
- The statewide Transfer Council has been established, regularly meets, and provides the public with transparent information about its activities. However, it does not appear to have finalized the audit system, compliance process, and student appeals process called for in the enacting legislation.
- The law lays out basic requirements for student communication, but there is opportunity to improve the availability and clarity of information for students and their advisors.

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

COLLEGE PRESIDENT

"This is an affordability and a student success issue. The better we do transfer, the more of our students will succeed and will move ourselves exponentially forward to the education trained workforce that we need for our future."

COLLEGE STUDENT

"What is clear is that students are ready for immediate action on this issue. We have seen the studies and the effects of the ability to universally transfer, save dollars, and get through their higher education career at a quick enough pace where they can be given back to society and the workforce."

LAWMAKER

"It's an outrage that we can't transfer credits and it is a bigger outrage that we have passed previous legislation and it has been ignored."

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

- The **sequencing of reforms** from 2011 to 2024 has resulted in challenges. Common course numbers should be incorporated into the CTMs and MTMs, and all of these efforts should inform the content of the Transfer Student Bill of Rights. Given that these reforms were passed in the opposite order, **it will be important to revisit and update the earlier structures to reflect later reforms and make the transfer system cohesive.**
- The guaranteed transfer structures in Oregon still contain **contingencies** that pose challenges for students. Transfer students must know which university they will be accepted into and be able to afford in order to plan their community college coursework, though they will not have this knowledge until the end of their time at the community college. **Greater curricular alignment is the only structural way to remove this contingency and support more efficient credit transfer.**
- There is **tension** between long-standing commitment to **academic differentiation** among universities and the goal of **curricular alignment** found in the transfer laws. The 2021 law makes it clear that none of the authorities and requirements related to establishing differentiated academic programs exempts a university from adopting common course numbering and accepting and applying the related transfer courses. **Unlike the 2021 law, the 2017 law was silent on the issue, leaving lawmakers with an opportunity to clarify their intent.**
- The laws contain **numerous requirements for reports** to and from HECC, the legislature, the transfer council, and the institutions. However, it is not clear that these reports are being routinely submitted, publicized, or used to fuel continuous improvement. **Streamlining reporting but bolstering it with greater visibility and an intentional continuous improvement process would make it more likely that information translates into action.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Legislative amendments:

Make the following technical or clarifying amendments to ORS 350 to resolve interpretive issues and make the law more student-centered.

- Add the “notwithstanding ORS 352.087(1)(q) or any other law” to the beginning of the foundational curricula and unified transfer pathways sections and replicate the credit applicability language in the CCN statute.
- Add one or more purpose statements within the transfer law to clarify intent and add explicit definitions, updating terminology to match common-use terms.
- Establish deadlines to update the Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps to incorporate common course numbers and implement the amendments discussed in the first two recommendations, if enacted.
- Add specificity to the student communications requirement to establish expectations for student-facing versions of transfer resources, including an updated Transfer Student Bill of Rights.
- Consolidate reporting requirements from institutions, the Transfer Council, and HECC, so that there is a single, comprehensive annual report on the State of Oregon Transfer.

Implementation resources:

Allocate resources from the State and/or private philanthropy to support the following implementation and improvement efforts.

- Partner with external facilitators and analysts to assist with curricular alignment and streamlining lower-division course requirements across universities.
- Conduct a comprehensive review of transfer-related communications, centering feedback from students and advisors, and implement the recommended improvements.
- Design and execute intentional continuous improvement processes.

ABOUT THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The legislative recommendations focus on clarifying intent, specifically around curricular alignment, rather than introducing significant new language or structure. However, these modest changes will have a major impact in practice.

For example, specifying intent that the Core Transfer Map must list specific courses that are not contingent on the receiving university would, in practice, require creation of a common general education curriculum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction
1	Foundational Findings
3	Implementation of Oregon’s Evolving Transfer Laws
4	Transfer Student Bill of Rights
5	Foundational Curricula
6	Unified Transfer Agreements
10	Common Course Numbering
11	Student Communications
12	Discussion
15	Recommendations
17	In Their Own Words: Quotes from Oregon’s lawmakers, postsecondary leaders, and students
i	Appendix

INTRODUCTION

College transfer is a critical structure to support student success, in Oregon and across the country. Although Oregon has strong and explicit laws providing transfer students with rights, opportunities, and guarantees, the system of transfer includes nuances and complications that have proven to be significant barriers for students. Oregon students' outcomes continue to fall short of what state leaders envision and what the state economy requires. Efforts to evolve the transfer system to be more equitable and student-centered have been stymied by several factors, including differing curricular requirements among universities and few mechanisms for students to directly advocate for their interests within transfer discussions and decisions.

Student-Ready Strategies (SRS), an organization focused on the transformation of higher education systems to more equitably serve students marginalized within those systems, has partnered with the Oregon Community College Association (OCCA) to provide critical information to support the formation of a new path forward for transfer students. SRS has worked in several states, including highly decentralized environments, to identify, promote, and implement a more student-centered transfer system, and thoroughly understands the political dynamics among institutions and the structural mechanisms that comprise transfer systems.

To craft this report, SRS completed a robust policy scan focused on Oregon's Transfer system, evaluating the implementation of these policies and providing recommendations focused on meeting students' needs and achieving more equitable results. To complete this policy scan, SRS reviewed the Oregon Revised Statutes related to higher education, the language and hearings related to legislation passed in 2017 and 2021, website for the Higher Education Coordination Board (HECC), Statewide Transfer Council, and colleges and universities, as well as several formal, public reports. A full list of the key information sources is in the appendix of this report.

FOUNDATIONAL FINDINGS



Finding #1: Higher education in Oregon explicitly and intentionally centers student access and success.

Statute

The authorizing statutes for Oregon higher education, Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 350, begins with findings that articulate the importance of certain educational outcomes to Oregon's "survival," "well-being," and "advancement" across all aspects of life. These outcomes include wise and effective leadership, informed citizenry, imaginative men and women, creative talent, discriminating readers, viewers, and listeners, and many others. It sets forth a specific mission that 80 percent of Oregonians have education beyond high school by 2025, with 40 percent achieving a bachelor's degree, 40 percent with an associate's degree or postsecondary credential. There is also a goal specific to postsecondary attainment for adult learners, that 300,000 Oregonians ages 25 and older earn a postsecondary credential by 2030.

Statute also explicitly establishes fundamental goals of public higher education. These are:

- Creating an educated citizenry to support responsible roles in a democratic society and provide a globally competitive workforce to drive this state's economy, while ensuring access for all qualified Oregonians to a high-quality post-secondary education
- Ensuring a high-quality learning environment that allows students to succeed
- Creating original knowledge and advancing innovation
- Contributing positively to the economic, civic, and cultural life of communities in all regions of Oregon

It further states that “Oregonians need access to educational opportunities beyond high school and throughout life.” This access is to be supported by sustaining “diverse institutions of higher education” that “provide educational access to all segments of Oregon’s diverse populations” in addition to generating knowledge to fuel economic growth, solving social problems, and providing “cultural activities that add to Oregon’s quality of life.”

While these guiding premises discuss institutions of higher education, they center the students - their access, their success, their career outcomes, and their contributions to the state across all aspects of life.

This centralized focus on students is reinforced by the university and community college missions and vision statements and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission’s strategic plan.

For example:

Higher Education Coordinating Commission’s Mission

Through strategic coordination, funding, outreach, services, reporting, and leadership for systems change, the HECC:

- Drives equitable postsecondary access and success for all Oregonians;
- Anticipates and meets workforce and economic needs; and
- Strengthen’s Oregon’s collective future by fostering research, innovation, learning, civic engagement, and cultural contributions.

Sample Institution Missions

Southern Oregon University will become an inclusive, sustainable university for the future that guides all learners to develop the knowledge, capacities, and audacity to innovate boldly and create lives of purpose.

PSU provides access to a top-tier education as a key driver of economic and social mobility, a source of growth for the diverse communities in the region and a catalyst for social progress. And this isn't just what we do – it’s who we are.

At Oregon Coast Community College we equip students for success by providing educational pathways and supports in response to the diverse needs of our community. Through accessible and engaging programs and a commitment to equitable outcomes, we enrich the economic and civic vitality of Lincoln County and beyond.

Lane is the Community’s college. We provide quality, comprehensive, accessible, inclusive, learning-centered educational opportunities that promote equitable student success.

This finding is foundational to the rest of the report, as these documents establish a commitment to serving and prioritizing students that is shared among lawmakers, HECC, and Oregon’s colleges and universities and should inform the continuous improvement of the state’s transfer system.



Finding #2: The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is given broad authority to coordinate the state's higher education system.

Within the Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 350, the HECC is explicitly directed to be guided by the legislative findings described in the previous section of this report, including the 80 percent attainment goal. HECC must adopt goals, determine strategic investments, coordinate data, and adopt a strategic plan with the following sections:

- Attainment
- Economic competitiveness
- Quality of life
- Affordable access
- Removing barriers to on-time completion
- Tracking progress toward the 80 percent goal

HECC is given specific and expansive authority, including the authority to approve academic programs and degrees, approve university mission statements, make tuition recommendations, administer a statewide longitudinal data system, and review and act on student complaints, among other authorities.

It is also notable that postsecondary institutions are explicitly directed to cooperate with the HECC. For example, 352.018 states that “public universities listed in ORS 352.002 shall cooperate with the Higher Education Coordinating Commission in the development of a state comprehensive education plan including post-secondary education and in review of the universities’ programs and budget.”

This finding is foundational to the rest of the report, as HECC is given the primary role in implementing state law related to transfer, and has explicit authority to do so.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OREGON'S EVOLVING TRANSFER LAWS

Oregon law is explicit and, over the past decade, increasingly comprehensive as it relates to transfer among Oregon's public institutions. However, these laws, in practice, have not always resolved the complexity of the transfer system. In many cases, the implementation of these laws has documented that complexity and intentionally sustained it. This section discusses the various transfer laws that have passed, and an assessment of the state of implementation for each.

Three key pieces of legislation have passed between 2011 and 2021, each establishing new transfer structures and requirements on institutions and the HECC in support of improved student transfer outcomes. The core structures created through these new laws are described in this section, and include:

- 2011: Transfer Bill of Rights
- 2017: Foundational Curriculum and Unified Transfer Agreements
- 2021: Common Course Numbering and Transfer Council

Note that this section references the Statewide Transfer Council, which was created in 2021 and is described at the end of this section, though it is referenced in the context of 2017 reforms because statute retroactively included it in these statutes following its creation.

Transfer Student Bill of Rights (2011)

The HECC must develop a Transfer Student Bill of Rights, which is a set of standards for the transfer of credit from community colleges to public universities. It must include:

- Admissions standards for students who earned an associate transfer degree, which is defined as an associate degree awarded by a community college that is intended to allow a student to apply credits to a baccalaureate degree
- Processes to align curricular requirements across public institutions to ensure transferability of courses
- Processes to minimize the number of credits students must take after completing an associate transfer degree in order to earn a baccalaureate degree
- Processes for community colleges to award associate degrees to eligible students without requiring the student to apply for degree conferral
- Processes for the creation of associate transfer degrees in specific majors, including engineering
- Standards students must meet to be eligible for the Transfer Student Bill of Rights
- Other issues identified by the HECC

WHAT IS THE TRANSFER BILL OF RIGHTS?

According to Oregon law, it is “standards related to the ability of students to apply credits earned through courses of study at community colleges to baccalaureate degrees awarded by public universities.”

The law does not specify any role for public institutions or the Transfer Council in the creation of the Transfer Student Bill of Rights, placing the responsibility for its development on the HECC alone, but it does not preclude HECC from seeking advice or participation from outside entities. There is no deadline within statute by which the Transfer Student Bill of Rights must be completed.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Transfer Bill of Rights is not a document that is readily available through the HECC website or through broad internet searches, but it can be found within the [State Library of Oregon's Digital Collections](#). This document is dated November 1, 2012. It lays out the following rights for students:

- The right to transfer an Associate of Arts / Oregon Transfer (“AAOT” or “AA/OT”) degree, Associate of Science / Oregon Transfer in Business, and a one-year Oregon Transfer Module to the University of Oregon system, and “can expect full acceptance by OUS of this credit for [these] courses” if they earned a GPA of 2.0 or above.
- The right to junior standing and to not repeat lower division courses after earning an AAOT degree

There is a substantial caveat, however, that articulates that these rights may not apply to all students: “Students and academic advisers need to recognize that although the AAOT provides an excellent structure for many students—particularly those who are unsure of their primary academic focus—it is not ideal for everyone. In particular, it does not articulate well with certain majors such as engineering, biological and physical sciences, and the fine and performing arts.

Students contemplating these majors cannot easily accommodate their highly-specific prerequisite coursework into the AAOT framework. In general, an AAOT recipient who is pursuing any course of study that is credit-heavy at the major lower-division level may have to take additional lower-division coursework, specific to the major, after transfer. Students contemplating such majors should consult closely with an advisor.” (Page 4)

Unlike other states that have created student-centered statewide transfer structures, this Bill of Rights does not establish specific rights or guarantees related to the number of credits an associate degree earner must take to complete a bachelor's degree, rather describing the number of subsequent credits as "dependent upon the university the student is enrolled in, the academic major chosen by the student, the type of degree being pursued, and other factors." (Page 6)

It also does not establish specific rights or guarantees related to the awarding of an associate degree without application, but it does describe two projects underway "to address awarding of an associate degree."

In describing other issues identified, the document indicates that universities have different definitions of transfer. It also asserts the following: "The biggest advantage to coming in as a transfer student is a lower GPA requirement. So a student graduating from high school who has not done very well academically, who nevertheless wants to get a bachelor's degree, is well-advised to start at a community college and thus prove their ability and potential to succeed at a four-year institution." (Page 7)

The Bill of Rights then includes three pages of student responsibilities related to transfer and two pages of reporting requirements from institutions to the Joint Boards of Education. It is notable that **students** are responsible for finding and appropriately applying all information necessary to ensure credit transferability, and meeting with advisors and admissions staff to ensure they have properly understood and applied this information. It is also the **student's** responsibility to make decisions about their major on a timeline that allows for efficient course selection, select courses aligned to their program of study, and "take full advantage of new student orientation and first-year experience programs [after transfer]" while taking "maximum advantage of transfer tools such as ATLAS." (Pages 7-8)

Analysts conclude that the Transfer Student Bill of Rights contains few straightforward guarantees that are not coupled with caveats and student requirements. The document could be more prominent in transfer discussions, and would need to be revised in light of legislative changes enacted after its initial publication to be current, accurate, and complete. It is clear that many of the ideas and perspectives contained within it, such as student responsibilities, have continued forward and are evident in future iterations of transfer reform. At the same time, students have gained substantial rights and opportunities since 2011, which should be specifically referenced in the Bill of Rights.



Foundational Curricula (2017)

This structure has been informally renamed Core Transfer Map (CTM), which is the term commonly used within HECC and institutions, and will be used in this section in place of the term Foundational Curricula.

For this transfer structure, colleges and universities, rather than the HECC, are directly charged with implementation. HECC is charged to "regularly use the Transfer Council to facilitate" the work and inform stakeholders of progress. Colleges and universities must create one or more Core Transfer Maps to be completed by transfer students that are a minimum of 30 credits, and then the institutions must accept the credits completed within the map and apply them to degree requirements.

What is a Core Transfer Map?

Statute does not specifically define it, however, it does say that the Core Transfer Map is "for the first year of coursework at public post-secondary institutions of education in this state" and must be at least 30 credits, which are guaranteed to be accepted and applied to baccalaureate requirements.

During April 18, 2017 committee testimony, Representative Mark Johnson, an author of the bill, described it as "mutually agreed upon courses" and "universally knowable, transferable bucket of credits that will count in any major degree pathway...if you get these credits at a community college, they will transfer with you to your next step."

The statute does permit creation of multiple sets of Core Transfer Maps, specifically stating that colleges and universities shall “establish **a foundational curriculum, or foundational curricula**, for the first year of coursework at public post-secondary institutions of education in this state” (ORS 350.400). Written testimony from Representative Mark Johnson for the initial bill conveyed that there was an option to develop distinct foundational curricula for STEM or CTE requirements. Testimony did not speak to options to create different Core Transfer Maps for different community colleges or different transfer destinations.

The 2017 law specified that at least one Core Transfer Map must be in place for students entering an Oregon community college by Fall 2018.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Core Transfer Maps are available on Oregon’s Transfer Compass website, which is promoted as a student-facing resource, on the HECC’s “Educator Resources” page, the Transfer Council website, and some institutional websites. In most cases, the maps are described as a broad description of course requirements, or a place to start for students without a declared major.

It is unclear from legislative language whether the legislative intent was that the Core Transfer Map be a list of specific courses, versus more general guidelines. Sentiments and phrases in testimony lead analysts to believe it is the former, but the maps that resulted from implementation of the bill clearly fit in the latter. Nearly every category directs students to “see list of AA/OT outcome courses,” an acronym which is not defined on the document, and the source of which is not linked or referenced. Several categories direct students to “see an advisor for recommended courses.”

Credits are also listed in ranges, e.g., “2 courses (6-8 credits)” so it is not clear how, or if, the listed courses combine to total 30 credits. Notes in the Additional Requirements section of the map state that “at least one required course must also meet the Cultural Literacy Outcomes” (also not linked or referenced). **Analysts conclude that the Core Transfer Map, on its own, does not provide students with sufficient direction to be able to register for classes with a guarantee that the courses on their resulting schedule will transfer.**

➤ Unified Transfer Agreements (2017)

This structure has been informally renamed Major Transfer Maps (MTM), which is the term commonly used within HECC and institutions, and will be used in this section in place of the term Unified Transfer Agreements.

Similar to implementation of the Core Transfer Map, colleges and universities are directly charged with the creation of Major Transfer Maps. The institutions were required to create agreements in three major disciplines per year when the bill was passed, but in 2021 that was slowed to one per year until 2026 to allow for the establishment of common course numbers. Colleges and universities must collaborate through the Transfer Council to complete this charge. HECC is charged to “regularly use the Transfer Council to facilitate” the work and inform stakeholders of progress.

What is a Major Transfer Map?

Statute does not specifically define it, but it does list what it must contain, and the guarantees institutions must uphold for students who complete it.

The Transfer Council website lists this definition: “Major Transfer Maps are major-specific transfer degrees that allow students to transfer credits from Oregon community colleges to Oregon public universities if the participating institutions offer programs in the Major Transfer Map subject” while the Transfer Compass website explains that “Major Transfer Maps are streamlined course plans for each major and all credits will transfer and count toward their degree.”

A Major Transfer Map must contain:

- Optimal number of credits, including those in the major
- Classes and completion standards for those optimal credits

It must guarantee:

- Transfer to a public university without loss of credit or requirement to repeat similar coursework
- Junior status in the major course of study (or the equivalent to native students if the optimal credits specified is not 90)
- Ability to complete a bachelor's degree in the major course of study by completing post-transfer credits as specified in the agreement, which must be based on accreditation standards

It must seek to achieve:

- Alignment, "to the greatest extent possible," of lower-division requirements in the major courses of study
- Similar number of credits to degree for transfer and native students
- Minimization of student debt
- Increase in the rate at which community college transfer students earn a bachelor's degree
- Maintenance of standards of intellectual and academic rigor at public institutions

HECC is not responsible for creating the agreements, but is charged with determining the major courses of study for which agreements will be established, based on publicly-identified criteria, which must include consideration of workforce demand and transfer student enrollment for each major course of study.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Oregon Transfer Compass lists six approved Major Transfer Maps, four in development, and two pending development. This appears to be fewer than called for in the legislative timeline of three per year from 2018 to 2021 and one per year thereafter, though it is clear that steady progress has been made to develop and approve them.

Status	Major Transfer Map
Approved	Biology, Business, Computer Science (listed twice), Elementary Education, and English Literature
In Development	Human Development and Family Services, Psychology, Sociology, and Sociology/Anthropology
Pending Development (2025–2026)	Communications and Criminal Justice

The Difference Between Core and Major Transfer Maps

A **Core Transfer Map** contains up to 45 credits of coursework, focuses on general education requirements, and applies to a wide variety of majors and programs.

A **Major Transfer Map** contains 90 credits of coursework, is major-specific, and includes all the courses necessary to earn an associate degree and then have those credits apply to a bachelor's degree. In general, the Core Transfer Map would include the first year of a full-time student's curriculum, while the Major Transfer Map would represent both years of a 2-year associate degree.

The same interpretive question exists for Major Transfer Maps as was discussed for Core Transfer Maps: was the legislative intent that the Maps include specific courses, or simply general guidance?

Analysts' assessment of the Major Transfer Maps is that they contain a substantial amount of nuance and contingency, and that a student could not determine the correct courses to take unless the student was certain of their receiving institution and spent substantial time reading and digesting these documents, which are 15-30 pages in length with legal text, multiple tables, footnotes, course equivalencies, and institution-by-institution articulation agreements. While these documents may not have been intended to be student-facing, no other student-facing versions have been created, and these documents are the ones posted on the state's transfer websites to which students are directed.

Many of the requirements described in the Major Transfer Maps are destination-institution-specific. For example, the Business MTM directs students to take Statistics for EOU, PSU, SOU, and OIT, but Calculus for OSU, WOU, and OU, in order to meet the mathematics core transfer requirement, and then goes further to include a table of different courses at each institution that fits in these categories. See this example below from page 10 of the Business MTM.



	Pathway A: Statistics (EOU, PSU, SOU, OIT)		Pathway B: Calculus (OSU, WOU, UO)	
Courses	Courses	Credits	Courses	Credits
<i>Mathematics</i>	MTH 111 (4-5 cr.) *OIT only, this is not required at EOU, PSU, or SOU)	4-5	MTH 111 (4-5 cr.)	0 (incl. in CTM total)
	--	0	Math 241 or equivalent* If a student takes 251, (112 is a required pre-req)	4-5
<i>Statistics</i>	243 (4-5 cr.)	0 (incl. in CTM total)	243* *Students transferring to OSU can take BA275 instead of MTH243/MTH244	4-5
	244* *This is not required course at EOU & PSU)	4-5	244* *WOU Students do not need 244 *Students transferring to OSU can take BA275 instead of MTH243/MTH244	4-5
<i>Total</i>		0-10		8-15
	Additional General Education (EOU, PSU, SOU)		Additional General Education (OSU, WOU, UO, OIT)	
<i>Natural Sciences</i>	Lab Sciences from AAOT Course List* *This can be non-lab at SOU, this is not required at OIT	4-5	(see recommended additional courses to reach 90 credits)	--
<i>Total</i>		4-5		0
<i>Section Total (Math + Gen Ed)</i>		4-15		8-15
Grand Total (CTM +MTM)		Pathway A Total: 58-80		Pathway B Total:62-80

As another illustration of this complexity, the Biology MTM lists different Writing, Physics/Math/Chemistry, and Elective requirements for different institutions, and contains a six-page table that crosswalks courses across the seven universities for the MTM requirements (excerpt below from Appendix B in the Biology MTM).

Additional electives to reach 90 credits	0-20	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • MTH 243 • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics/math/chemistry options listed above	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • 4-6 credits social science • 1-3 credits humanities • 2 credits lower division health biology	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • COMM 111 (3) • 3 credits Fitness (3) • 1 Difference, Power and Discrimination course (3-4) • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics, math, or chemistry series listed above	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • MTH 243 (if not taken in MTM and transferring to some pre-professional programs) • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics, math, or chemistry series listed above	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • MTH 243 • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics, math, or chemistry series listed above	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • WR 122 • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics, math, or chemistry series listed above	Will apply to gen ed or major requirements, or as electives. Recommended: • WR 122 • Pick a 3 rd sequence from physics, math, or chemistry series listed above
Major Transfer Map Credit Total	90-97	90-97	90-97	90-97	90-97	90-97	90-97	90-97
Remaining Degree Requirements		EOU	OIT	OSU	PSU	SOU	UO	WOU
General Education		1 course that meets Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) requirement (4)	SPE 321 (3)	COMM 111 (3)	Junior Cluster (Univ. Studies) (12)	1 of 1 course in Strand C – Information Literacy (4)	7-9 credits of Arts & Letters	3-4 credits of Foundations: Communication and Language (3-4)

Page Break

		WRI 122 or 227 (3)	Fitness (3 credits)	Sr. Capstone (Univ. Studies) (6)	1 of 3 courses in Strand E – Humanities (4)	7-9 credits of Social Science	3-4 credits of Foundations: Critical Thinking (3-4)
		WRI 327 (3)	Difference Power and Discrimination (3-4)		1 of 3 courses in Strand F – Social Science (4)	1 of 2 Multicultural Requirement courses (3-4)	4 credits of Foundations: Health Promotion (4)
		4-6 credits social science (4-6)	Contemporary Global Issues (3-4)* * Upper division		1 of 1 course in Strand H – Science, Technology and Society (3-4)* * Upper division		3-4 credits of Integrating Knowledge: Science, Technology, Society (3-4)* * Upper division
		1-3 credits humanities (1-3)	Science Technology and Society (3-4 credits and some overlap BI and Society in major)* * Upper division		1 of 1 course in Strand I – Citizenship and Social Responsibility (3-4)* * Upper division		3-4 credits of Integrating Knowledge: Citizenship, Social Responsibility, Global Awareness (3-4)* * Upper division
					1 of 1 course in Strand J – Diversity and Global Awareness (3-4)* * Upper division		*** First Year seminars requirements is waived student can apply 8 credits of electives
Gen Ed Credits	16-22	14-18	15-18	18	21-24	17-22	16-20
Major Requirements	PHYS 201* 202, 203*(15) can be taken for pre-health professions * If not taken in MTM	CHE 331, 332 & 333 (12) OR PHY 201, 202, and 203 (12) OR MTH 251 & 252 (8)	CHE 331, 332 & 337 (12) OR PH 201, 202, and 203 (15) 3-course Computer Science sequence (14-16) OR MTH 251 & 252 (8)	CH 331 or 334 (4) OR PH 201 or 214 (5) MTH 251 & 252 (8) OR MTH 243 & 244 (8)	PH 201, 202, & 203* (15) * If not taken in MTM	OCHEM 331 and 335 (8) OR PH 201, 202, and 203 (15) OR MTH 251 & 252 (8)	CH 334, 335, 336 (12) OR PH 201, 202, & 203 (12) OR MTH 251 & 252 (8)
	MTH 241 or 251* (4) * If not taken in MTM	Bio 200 (2)	BI 197 or BI 198 professional development course (1)	Area A Course: (Choose ONE) BI 334 Molecular (4) BI 336 Cell (5) BI 341 Genetics (4)	MTH 251 & 252* (8) * If not taken in MTM	BI 214 (4)	BI 314, 315 & 316 (12)
	Core requirements: • Biol 341/342 (8) • Biol 357 (4) • Biol 358 (1) • Biol 490 (3)	Bio 331, 332 & 333 (15)	BI 298 Professional Development for Biologist II (1 credit)	Area C Course: (Choose ONE/ 4 cr) BI 357 Ecology 4 cr BI 358 Evolution 4 cr	BI 314 / 331 Physiology (5) BI 340 Genetics (4) BI 342 Cell Bio (5) BI 340 Ecology (4) BI 348 Evolution (4)	1 course from cell/molecular group (4)	BI 331 (4)
	STAT 352 (4)	Bio 109, 209 & 409 (5)	BI 311 Genetics (4)	Area B Course: (Choose ONE/ 4-6 cr) BI 320 Intro Physiology 4 cr BI 330 Intro Plant Bio 4 cr	CHOOSE ONE OPTION CH Option A: CH 331 OCHEM (4)* CH 350 Biochem (4)	1 course from systems/organisms group (4)	BI 343 biostats (4)

In short, the Major Transfer Maps do not read as a “streamlined course plan” as described on the Transfer Compass website, and do not provide students with a clear resource for selecting courses that are guaranteed to transfer. Rather, they thoroughly document the complexity that occurs when the institutions are not aligned on course requirements. It is the assessment of analysts that there is substantial room for improvement as it relates to the legislative requirements that the Major Transfer Maps ensure “alignment, to the greatest extent possible, of lower-division requirements in the major courses of study.”

Common Course Numbering (2021)

The HECC must adopt rules by September 1, 2024 establishing a system of common course numbers. By the 2025-26 academic year, all public institutions must:

- Adopt a common course numbering system established by the HECC.
- Accept transferred courses with common course numbers and apply them as though they were earned at the institution, with respect to the amount of credit awarded, satisfaction of general education requirements, and satisfaction of major requirements for the degree (ORS 350.423).

What is Common Course Numbering? (CCN)

Statute defines this as a system established by the HECC “for introductory and other lower division courses with similar learning outcomes that are taught in accelerated college credit programs, public post-secondary institutions of education and participating nonpublic post-secondary institutions of education in this state.”

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

HECC rules were adopted January 3, 2024, and according to the HECC website, 37 common course numbers have been approved and another 15 are scheduled to be completed in 2025. Common-course numbering focuses on aligning the most transferred, lower-division coursework to help students receive credit when they transfer between public institutions in Oregon. Alignment includes course title, name, number, subject code, credits, description, and learning outcomes.

It is too early to tell if, or how quickly, Oregon will scale the implementation of Common Course numbers such that they cover the majority of commonly-transferred lower-division courses. It is also too early to know whether commonly numbered courses will reduce the amount of lost credits or facilitate more streamlined advising and communication to students.

Transfer Council (2021)

The Transfer Council is given a series of responsibilities related to common course numbering, Core Transfer Maps, and Major Transfer Maps. Specifically, the Council is charged to:

- Advise HECC on a Common Course Numbering system
- Serve as the “primary venue” for development of Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps
- Develop best practices to improve program planning, communication, and credit acceleration for transfer students among public institutions
- Make recommendations to the HECC for adoption of rules that do the following:
 - Implement common course numbering, including an audit and compliance process and student appeals
 - Successfully implement Foundational Curricula and Unified Transfer Pathways
 - Facilitate required reporting by public institutions
- Provide HECC with a progress report every year by September 1.

HECC is charged with staffing the Council, providing logistical support, maintaining its website, and establishing an annual reporting date for HECC to provide updates to the legislature, the first report of which was required to be completed in 2022.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

The Transfer Council has been created and operationalized. Its website houses transfer resources for students, like the Transfer Compass and transfer tips. It also has resources for educators on the following requirements: common course numbering, major transfer maps, and Oregon's initiatives to streamline the transfer process for students. Additionally, the public meeting materials are available on the website, ranging in dates from 1/19/23 to the final session of 2024, taking place on December 19.

Testimony about the creation of the Transfer Council emphasized the increased level of accountability it would bring, specifically referencing the creation of an audit system, compliance process, and student appeals process. Analysts were not able to find evidence that these systems have yet been constructed and operationalized.

Student Communication

Community colleges are required, under the transfer statute, to provide students who inform the college of their intent to transfer with a list of Major Transfer Maps and "information on potential major courses of study that the community college has received from the public university." Community colleges are further required to encourage these students to select their major course of study within the first 45 academic credits. The legislation does not require community colleges to provide the unified transfer agreements themselves, only a list, nor does it compel creation of student-friendly documents or other communications materials.

Beyond these strict requirements, student communications are exceedingly important in Oregon given the level to which students bear responsibility for making the transfer system work. For example, the Major Transfer Maps have introductory language that directs students to talk to a community college advisor and an advisor at their target institution about how their courses will count, as well as inform the admissions counselor or intake advisor at the receiving university that they are completing an MTM. Older requirements for students were discussed in the Transfer Student Bill of Rights section of this report.

In general, Oregon transfer students are explicitly expected to seek out, digest, and appropriately apply the available information about transfer, and their ability to do so depends on the clarity and accessibility of that information.

STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

A full review of student-facing communication is outside of the scope of this analysis. However, the following successes and opportunities were identified by analysts, acknowledging that this is not an exhaustive list and is not the result of a comprehensive review.

Communications Successes:

- The existence of transfer degrees and "blocks" are well-promoted across state and institutional websites.
- Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps are easy to find through common search engines.
- Common Course Numbers have a consistent naming convention (ending in "Z") to help students and advisors identify them.
- Activities of the Transfer Council are transparent and information about meeting is readily accessible.

Communications Opportunities:

- Ensure consistency of language across various websites in describing what the CTMs, MTMs, and CCNs are and accurately describing their guarantees, parameters, and limitations.
- Revamp the Transfer Student Bill of Rights so that it reads as a straightforward one-page list of things transfer students are entitled to, and use that as a platform to raise awareness around the Core Transfer Maps, Major Transfer Maps, and Common Course Numbers.
- Remove jargon, acronyms, and deficit language from all student-facing documents and ensure other documents incorporated by reference are clearly linked or cited.
- More thoroughly separate the practitioner-focused content and student-focused content on state websites, creating a central portal that speaks directly to students and contains only information students need and can use.

Communications about a transfer system can only be as clear, direct, and streamlined as the system itself. The fact that substantial nuance, contingencies, and caveats exist within Oregon's current transfer system means that student communications are either complicated, extensive, and difficult to digest, or simply incomplete. There are other communications opportunities that are left off this list because they would require system alignment first. For example, the Major Transfer Map documents contain substantial complexity, but as long as curricular requirements differ among the receiving institutions, a more streamlined course list could not be presented without being inaccurate.

DISCUSSION

SEQUENCING OF IMPLEMENTATION

The most logical way to implement this set of transfer reforms, based on analysts' experience, is to first establish common course numbers. SRS conducted a Louisiana transfer analysis and found that disciplines for which there were common course numbers tended to have greater curricular alignment than those that did not, concluding that the process of establishing common course numbers did, in fact, serve to bring four-year institutions into greater alignment for degree requirements. Common course numbers also simplify the process of establishing Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps by giving faculty members a "shorthand" with which to discuss curricular requirements, knowing that learning outcomes for a particular course name and number are the same for all institutions. It is clear from a review of the Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps that a lack of common course numbering added significant complexity to the result.

Given that the legislation set a course of action that created CTMs and MTMs before there were common course numbers, the Transfer Council will likely need to revisit these agreements and update them with the common course numbers, either on a rolling basis or after CCNs have been implemented at scale. The Transfer Council can use this as an opportunity, as well, to encourage and facilitate greater levels of curricular alignment, particularly if additional legislation clarifies that the intent of these transfer structures is a clear course list, rather than general guidance. If it is the intent of the legislature that the common course numbers be integrated into the Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps, language could be added to direct the Transfer Council to do so.

The Common Course Numbering section also has the strongest language related to applicability of credits, requiring that common courses be applied toward degree requirements in the same manner as if they were earned at the receiving institution. This eliminates a loophole that allows institutions to accept credits for transfer but only apply them as electives, not as courses that fulfill degree requirements. Given that this language was in the later law, this is potentially a language improvement, and if it embraces the intent of the 2017 law, this language could be incorporated into the Core Transfer Map and Major Transfer Map sections as well.

Finally, the Transfer Student Bill of Rights, established in 2011, should incorporate each of the subsequent changes to make the rights and opportunities students receive through these reforms accessible, prominent, and easily understood. Updating this document to read as a clear list of guarantees without caveats, and increasing its visibility on state transfer websites and on campus would also address challenges with the sequencing of the reforms and provide a critical piece of communications collateral upon which additional communications efforts can be built.

CONTINGENCIES ON THE MAPS

One of the biggest challenges prospective transfer students face relates to curricular contingencies. When lower-division requirements differ among receiving institutions, students must know with certainty where they will transfer in order to know which courses to take at the community college. To register for the right classes, they must know this before they even start their community college coursework. However, it is not until they are almost finished with their community college coursework that they apply to universities, receive admissions decisions, and evaluate whether they can afford to attend and relocate, if necessary. Students must plan and act based on information they do not have, spending time and money on decisions that are based on – at best – predictions.

Statewide and consortium initiatives to streamline transfer are intended to resolve this dilemma. These agreements, when well-implemented, bring all universities into consensus around specific lower-division course requirements – without footnotes, caveats, and complexity – so that students take the same set of courses with guarantees that they will transfer to any potential receiving institution.

Oregon’s Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps were not created with the foundation of curricular consensus. As described above, in many cases these maps merely document the lack of curricular alignment and resulting complexity, but have not resolved it and therefore have not resolved the dilemma students face with regard to contingency.

Analysts were not able to compile overwhelming evidence that the legislative intent was that these transfer structures would be a streamlined list of courses that were not contingent on the receiving institution, though there is testimony and website content that alludes to it. A clearer expression of this intent and related definitions in the statutory language would provide HECC, the Transfer Council, and the institutions with a more explicit charge related to the outputs of this work and the level of curricular alignment expected.

UNIFICATION, ALIGNMENT, AND INSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENTIATION

Oregon statute requires that public universities “do not unnecessarily duplicate academic programs at other public universities,” a law which testimony indicates has led to a long-standing culture of academic differentiation among Oregon’s four-year institutions. This concept is inherently in tension with the idea of curricular alignment and pathway unification as laid out in the 2017 and 2021 laws. This section explores evidence to assist those implementing with understanding which of these ideas is meant to be prioritized in the implementation of transfer reform.

For common course numbering, statute is clear that institutional discretion related to academic program creation does not supersede institutional responsibilities related to common course numbering. [2021 c.575 §1] added language that states that these duties must be fulfilled “notwithstanding ORS 352.087(1)(q),” which is the section of code that authorizes governing boards of public universities to establish programs, including by reference the charge that programs are consistent with university mission, and do not unnecessarily duplicate academic programs at other public universities, among other requirements. In other words, **none of the authorities and requirements related to establishing differentiated academic programs exempts a university from adopting common course numbering and accepting and applying the related transfer courses.**

Clarification in the law is necessary as this specificity currently only applies to CCNs. If the legislative intent was that implementation of CTMs and MTMs would supersede academic differentiation in the same way that Common Course Numbering does, the language should include that specific direction in the sections that pertain to CTMs and MTMs. If that was not the intent, the statute should explicitly state that the CTM and MTM requirements do not supersede the differentiation statute.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The 2017 and 2021 laws laid out a substantial number of reports that must be completed, many of them annually. However, it is not clear based on a review of publicly-available information that these reports are being routinely submitted, and if they are, that they are being publicized or used in any way to fuel continuous improvement. When reporting requirements are numerous, but the information is not intentionally evaluated, discussed, and utilized, it can lead to a situation in which state and institutional leaders have substantial information available with no resulting action. These reports also predominantly focus on progress reporting and institutional action, without a significant focus on student outcomes other than where emphasized in the report list below:

HB 2998-2017 Required Reporting:

- Institutions to annually report to HECC the **number of academic credits successfully transferred in each major** for which there is a unified transfer pathway
- HECC to report annually to legislative assembly on whether existing unified statewide transfer agreements are meeting goals
- June 1, 2018 - institutions submit a joint report to the interim committees of the Legislative Assembly regarding advising best practices for the transfer structures created in 2017
- Feb 1, 2018 - HECC to report to Legislative Assembly a definition of lost academic credits, **typical number of lost credits**, recommendations on whether there is more than one foundational curriculum, determination if foundational curriculum applies 2-year to 2-year and 4-year to 4-year, and identifies initial major courses of study for unified statewide transfer agreements

SB 233-2021 Required Reporting:

- Dec 15, 2021 - report from HECC to interim committees of the Legislative Assembly detailing any additional legislation or funding needed to develop an “electronic system for the dissemination of information regarding foundational curricula and unified statewide transfer agreements.”
- Jan 15, 2022 - first report from Transfer Council to HECC, including subcommittees to be established, list of courses for common course numbering starting in each 2023-24, 2024-25, and 2025-26.
- March 15, 2022 - HECC’s first report to Legislative Assembly, describing activities of the Transfer Council and recommendations
- Annual report required from institutions to HECC
- Annual report required from HECC to Legislative Assembly
- Annual report required from Transfer Council to HECC (by Sept. 1 of each year)
- HECC can adopt rules related to common course numbering

Having a consolidated, easily-digestible report that focuses on the success of the transfer system in terms of disaggregated student outcomes would be preferable to the multi-faceted list above because it would reduce the administrative burden on institutions, HECC, and legislative staff, and also provide a platform to discuss whether the system is getting the results state and institutional leaders intended. Developing processes to facilitate awareness and use of this report, such as an annual public hearing, press availability, or facilitated institutional workshop, would help to ensure the reporting leads to action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Oregon already has substantial legislation related to transfer. It is analysts' assessment that many of the remaining transfer-related challenges in the state stem not from inadequate legislation, but rather from the manner in which the legislation has been interpreted and implemented. Clarifying the intent of the legislation and supporting more robust implementation of that intent requires only minor legislative changes, but would lead to substantial changes to transfer in practice, improving experiences and outcomes of Oregon's students.

For example, legislatively specifying that "the Core Transfer Map must list specific course names" and "the courses listed in the Core Transfer Map shall be the same for each receiving institution and shall not be contingent upon the university to which a student transfers" does not dramatically alter the law. **In practice, however, this clarification would catalyze creation of a common set of general education requirements and align curriculum across institutions in meaningful ways.**

With this context, analysts make the following recommendations to improve transfer in Oregon:



Legislative Amendments:

Make the following technical or clarifying amendments to ORS 350 to resolve interpretive issues and make the law more student-centered:

- **Add the "notwithstanding ORS 352.087(1)(q) or any other law" to the beginning of the foundational curricula and unified transfer pathways sections and replicate the common course number section's credit applicability language in these sections.** This would resolve ambiguity and clearly state that institutions cannot opt out of the transfer work or maintain disparate curricular requirements within the transfer maps based on the concept of differentiation.
- **Add one or more purpose statements within the transfer law to clarify intent, specifically as it relates to expectations of curricular alignment. Add explicit definitions, updating terminology to match common use terms.** To be student-centered, definitions for Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps (replacing the current statutory terms) should be added that specify that the first two years of coursework must be the same regardless of the four-year institution of intended transfer, and that all approved common course numbers must be incorporated.
- **Establish deadlines to update the Core Transfer Maps and Major Transfer Maps to incorporate common course numbers and the amendments** discussed in the first two recommendations, if enacted. This will give the Transfer Council and the HECC clarity on how to retroactively apply subsequent laws.
- **Add specificity to the student communications requirement** to establish expectations for student-facing versions of transfer resources, including an updated Transfer Student Bill of Rights. Such expectations could include avoiding acronyms and jargons, including specific information and excluding other information, or using a consistent template across disciplines and institutions. It should also create a formal mechanism through which students co-create these student-facing resources alongside institutional faculty and staff.
- **Consolidate reporting requirements** from institutions, the Transfer Council, and HECC, so that there is a single, comprehensive annual report on the State of Oregon Transfer. Center and spotlight disaggregated student outcomes, including lost credits, time to degree, transfer rates, and graduation rates in this report, in addition to providing concise progress reports on the implementation efforts and successes related to the legislation.



Implementation Resources:

Allocate resources from the State and/or private philanthropy to support the following implementation and improvement efforts:

- **Partner with external facilitators and analysts** to assist with curricular alignment and streamlining lower-division course requirements across universities. Outside facilitation has proven to be an effective accelerant to move forward faculty's efforts to achieve consensus about course requirements and alleviate the workload that is often completed on a volunteer basis by faculty leaders. For example, SRS provided such facilitation and objective data analysis to faculty committees within Louisiana; with this support, the committees reached consensus on lower-division course requirements for [22 different disciplines](#) in just one year, resulting in [clear and straightforward pathways](#) for students.
- **Conduct a comprehensive review of transfer-related communications**, centering feedback from students and advisors, and implement the recommended improvements. Augment the opportunities described in the communications section of this report by identifying additional improvements to transfer-related web content, transfer pathway documents, and other communications channels and activities. Specify the role students and advisors will play in contributing to the comprehensive review and creation of updated content and materials.
- **Design and execute intentional continuous improvement processes.** If reporting is consolidated to a single report with greater transparency around student outcomes, the state and/or private philanthropy should resource and support institutions in a periodic continuous improvement process, creating space and direction for them to continuously evaluate their own communications, advising protocols, policies and processes to improve transfer metrics and achieve more equitable student outcomes.

CONCLUSION

While Oregon has strong laws related to streamlined transfer, the implementation of these laws has often only documented the complexity that transfer students face, rather than resolving it. Reform efforts have explicitly placed the burden on transfer students to navigate the transfer system's complexity and nuances. They must find, digest, and apply transfer information and meet with multiple advisors to make the system work for them. However, there are opportunities to make transfer in Oregon more student-centered and equitable by clarifying legislative intent and resourcing robust implementation to streamline and simplify this complex system.

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

Lawmakers, institutional leaders, and students all discuss the importance of reforming transfer.



"One recent national study indicated that 81% beginning community college students intend to transfer and earn a bachelor's degree or higher...separate analysis show that only 11% of degree seeking community college students in Oregon do complete a bachelor's degree within 6 years so there is clearly a disconnect between intent and reality for our community college originating students"

-Ben Cannon,
Executive Director of HECC
(House Higher Ed and Workforce
Development 2/28/17)

"This is an affordability and a student success issue. The better we do transfer, the more of our students will succeed and will move ourselves exponentially forward to the education trained workforce that we need for our future "

-Greg Hamann, President of
Linn Benton Community College
(House Higher Ed and Workforce
Development 2/28/17)

"We just talked about this and what is clear is that students are ready for immediate action on this issue. We have seen the studies and the effects of the ability to universally transfer, save dollars, and get through their higher education career at a quick enough pace where they can be given back to society and the workforce."

-Lamar Weiss,
Oregon Student Association
(House Higher Ed and Workforce
Development 2/28/17)

"This is my second stint with community college, and I am eager to transfer to University of Oregon in the fall. A critical issue facing community college students is the aspect of time. I am 24 years old, which by the standards of ever increasing and competitive job market, has new responsibilities and expectations that did not exist a generation before. I fear for my own clock, for the closing window into a viable job market, and for the eclipse of a chance to build a profession of my vision."

-Gus Smith, Student at
Lane Community College
(House Higher Ed and Workforce
Development 2/28/17)

"This issue is especially important to students. There are a lot of things lost in the transfer process for students."

-Nicki Amin, Student at
Oregon State University & Member
of Oregon Student Association
(Education Subcommittee of Ways
and Means 6/20/17)

"[The bill's intent is to] free students from the unnecessary expense in dollars and expense in time of having to retake courses...[and] improve communication between the different educational sectors."

-Senator Dembrow,
(Common Course Numbers, Senate
Committee on Education 3/1/21)

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

Lawmakers express urgency and frustration that transfer problems persist.



"This bill came to be because in 2017, we still do not have a credit alignment between community colleges and universities ... we have been talking about alignment for the past 30 years. It's time to stop talking about it and time to start doing something about it."

*-Representative Reardon
(Education Subcommittee of Ways
and Means 6/20/17)*

"I just can't let this pass without piling on - I can't tell you how many of us have sat here over and over and over again and we've studied this and we have cajoled and begged and I sure as hell hope that this time they actually DO something. It's an outrage that we can't transfer credits and it is a bigger outrage that we have passed previous legislation and it has been ignored."

*-Senator B. Johnson
(Joint Committee on Ways and Means
06/28/17)*

"Every time I read this I think 'haven't we already done this?'"

*-Representative Warner
(Education Subcommittee of Ways
and Means 6/20/17)*

"I say it's about time and that the stars align because there are good people in the senate who have forced them to align."

*-Senator Monroe
(Education Subcommittee of Ways and
Means 6/20/17)*

"[Transfer] is an issue this committee has been wrestling with for quite awhile...it is a real challenge for students still to successfully transfer. They come up against different obstacles. It is really important that we address those issues head-on and remove those barriers."

*-Senator Dembrow
(Common Course Numbers, Senate
Committee on Education 3/1/21)*

"This has been in the works for a long time... We were talking about this back in 2013...it has been a very long discussion. That we are getting finally to the point where this might become a reality is such an important step and will do so much to assist my students and other community college students as they try to navigate that movement [among institutions]."

*-Senator Gorsich
(Common Course Numbers, Senate
Committee on Education 3/1/21)*

"As you well know, this is not the first bite at the apple on transfer from the legislature. This builds on decades of transfer work. We have made progress...but we have also learned a lot about the remaining challenges and the ways in which this falls short of the ideal."

*-Patrick Crane, HECC
(Common Course Numbers,
Senate Committee on Education 3/1/21)*

IN THEIR OWN WORDS

Institutional leaders voice support for proposed legislative solutions.



“We do not want students paying for classes twice, nor the taxpayers. We do not want students to have to retake classes for their major that they already paid for.”

*-Lisa Avery, President of Portland Community College, Sylvania Campus
(Education Subcommittee of Ways and Means 6/20/17)*

“[Common course numbering] will help with core transfer maps and major transfer map work which has uncovered many inconsistencies among colleges and universities around courses used for general education sequences, prerequisites, etc.”

*-Teresa Rivenes, Oregon Chief Instructional Administrator from Community Colleges
(Common Course Numbers - Senate Committee on Education 3/1/21)*

“The universities have some differentiation in their course but that typically happens at the upper level, junior and senior years. The first two years of the college and university experience should have the same learning outcomes.”

*-Senator Dembrow
(Common Course Numbers - Senate Committee on Education 3/1/21).*

“[SB 233 will establish] a more solid foundation for the ongoing work to align academic majors...HB 2998 has also helped identify the friction spots in majors between the various institutions.”

*-Jessica Howard, President of Chemeketa Community College, representing Oregon Community College Association
(House Committee on Higher Education and Workforce Development 4/18/17)*

“The goal of creating a common course numbering system is for all public institutions of higher education in Oregon to align on the common learning outcomes and course numbers for the set of 100- and 200-level courses that are offered at the great majority of the institutions and are critical to successful transfer student progression. When a set of institutions adopts a set of common learning outcomes mapped to common numbers, the transfer experience for students is transparent and seamless...[all public universities] believe common course numbering can be achieved while respecting the important academic authority of colleges and universities.”

*-Susan Jefferts, Provost at PSU, Chair of Statewide Provosts Council
(Common Course Numbers - Senate Committee on Education 3/1/21)*

APPENDIX

Key Information Sources

- Read and annotated legislation
 - [ORS 348, 350, 352](#)
 - [HEA 2998-2017](#) and [SEA 233-2021](#)
- Read the HECC rules and guidance around transfer legislation
- Watched legislative committee hearings for transfer-related legislation of HB 2998-2017 and SB 233-2021 amendments
 - [Feb 28, 2017 House Higher Ed and Workforce Development](#)
 - [April 18, 2017 Work Session](#)
 - [June 20, 2017 Education Subcommittee of Ways and Means](#)
 - [June 22, 2017 Work Session](#)
 - [June 28, 2017 Work Session](#)
 - [March 1, 2021 Senate Committee on Education](#)
 - [April 5, 2021 Work Session](#)
 - [April 7, 2021 Work Session](#)
 - [April 12, 2021 Work Session](#)
 - [June 8, 2021 Work Session](#)
 - [June 11, 2021 Work Session](#)
- Reviewed all reports related to transfer and published since 2017 that researchers were able to locate:
 - [Unified Statewide Transfer Agreement Analyses: 2017](#)
 - [HEA 298-2017: January 2018 - Higher Education Coordinating Commission](#)
 - [House Bill 2998 \(2017\): December 2020 - Postsecondary Student Transfer](#)
 - [SEA 233-2021: January 15, 2022 - Oregon TransferCompass](#)
 - [ORS 350.423 & ORS 350.429: December 8, 2022 - Common Course Numbering](#)
 - [ORS 350.423 and ORS 350.429: September 15, 2023 - Transfer Council Report on Common Course Numbering, Core Transfer Maps, & Major Transfer Maps](#)
 - [ORS 350.395-350.432: December 2023 - Legislative Report: Postsecondary Student Transfer](#)
- Reviewed the HECC and Statewide Transfer Council websites
- Examined state and institutional websites for other evidence of implementation

Analysts acknowledge that their review of publicly-available artifacts of implementation of transfer-related law may not fully document all efforts of those involved. This analysis focuses on the overarching activities for which there is transparent information available online.