



The following position on the Course Number Scheme was developed by the MScF Academic Affairs Committee and adopted by the MScF Executive Committee.

**MScF does not support the imposition of a 4 letter and 4 number course numbering scheme.**

We do not support the imposition of this change for these reasons:

- First, the scheme is tied to a separate proposal to number courses similarly across colleges and universities, which the MScF opposes.
- The suggestion that such changes be done on a “Consent Agenda” is in direct opposition to giving faculty control of such changes at each college through their local Academic Affairs and Standards Council.



The following position on the Common Course Numbering across colleges and universities was developed by the MSCF Academic Affairs Committee and adopted by the MSCF Executive Committee.

**MSCF opposes any attempt to impose the same course number (prefix and number) across multiple colleges and universities where the individual disciplines have not, through a system-wide, democratic process, requested common course numbers.**

MSCF is opposed for the following reasons

- The justification seems based on transfer. It was stated that some courses transfer incorrectly at a high rate but no information is provided on what that means. Until the problem is well defined, we cannot support a blanket, simplistic solution.
- Any directive that changes curriculum must go through the local Academic Affairs and Standards Council with full faculty input and approval.
- This proposal on common course numbering completely ignores the critical importance of System Procedure 3.21.1 Part 4 A which allows for a higher standard for equivalency of sequential courses like Anatomy and Physiology 1 & 2, Calculus 1 & 2, etc. That language was included because the sequence of topics can vary enough that the first course at one institution is not sufficient preparation for the second course at another.
- The proposal does not take into account that some colleges and universities require 2 courses to fulfill an MNTC goal and others require only 1. The curriculum at each institution is designed around this and common course numbers will create an incorrect equivalency between the first course at each college or university with the other is not correct. Students will miss important outcomes from the transfer curriculum in such cases.
- Common course numbering would put undue pressure on campuses to reduce their course offerings to these courses only, and this is contrary to diverse offerings that support unique community needs and offerings.
- There are significant, unaddressed concerns about collisions between course numbers. Is it even possible to find a common number across 33 colleges and universities?
- The unintended consequences and additional work is simply not even considered. Changing the number on just one course can impact other course numbers and potentially the discipline designator for many other courses. This cascades through other disciplines because of prerequisites, etc. So even if we supported common numbering, the timeline is simply unrealistic for the amount of work that is needed.
- MSCF does support more effective enforcement of existing transfer and equivalency requirement, particularly for courses in transfer pathways. Until Minnesota State has taken that first step, it seems premature to move to a more complicated system.