The following list of recommended changes have been developed to provide a more consistent and equitable approach to the evaluation of transfer credits while maintaining the academic integrity of FIT.

1. The evaluation of transfer credits needs to be centralized to allow for timely and consistent evaluation. The registrar’s office should evaluate transfer credit, particularly the lower-level classes to ensure course equivalency is documented and all Transfer Credit Evaluation (TCE) paperwork is readily available to prospective transfer students and their major advisors. The registrar’s office completed transfer credit evaluations until 2012, when the current process (academic departments evaluating equivalency) was implemented. Courses that are unique can still be forwarded to the appropriate academic department for evaluation, but basic courses, such as those used to fulfill General Education requirements and those with consistent titles such as Introduction to Psychology or History of Western Civilization, should be evaluated consistently, regardless of a student’s attributes or declared major.

2. If course outcomes and content meet a determined threshold, they will be accepted as FIT courses. Courses from other institutions with the same/similar title as FIT courses should not be expected to exactly mirror the content of the corresponding FIT courses as long as they are consistent with the same basic framework of the FIT course. It is of no benefit to the student to repeat a course that he or she has already completed, nor is there any benefit to FIT in granting credit for two similar courses.

3. Courses that transfer as electives should transfer at the same level. Under current practices, a 2000-level course might only be transferred to FIT as a 1000-level course, with the rationale that the course carries no prerequisites. As many undergraduate (1000-4999) FIT courses don't carry prerequisites, this rationale is not defensible.

4. The use of non-specific transfer designations, such as 1xxx and 2xxx should be kept to a minimum. Direct course equivalencies should be used whenever possible to facilitate direct transfer at the time of admission, rather than creating delays that may prevent enrollment. The use of such designations increases the proliferation of course substitutions. Further to enabling an easier transfer process, ending or limiting this practice helps the university in terms of faculty and staff time.

5. Transfer courses need to be treated as equal for students with or without an associate degree. The requirement for a class to only count as transfer if the student has such a degree must be removed. An equivalent course should be counted regardless of student attributes (degree holder or not) or prerequisites.

6. FIT should formalize the acceptance of other competency-based examinations and evaluations in the granting of transfer credit such as DANTES (Defense Activity for Non-traditional Education Support) credits, ACE (American Council on Education) recommendations, and other academically sound and widely accepted methods of earning college credit.
7. **FIT should sign and consistently support articulation agreements and memoranda of understanding (MOU) with other institutions to allow predetermined transfer courses (block transfer).** This is common practice when students receive an associate degree and subsequently 61 credits transfer into FIT’s four-year degree programs, thus giving the students junior status. The agreement should be negotiated between the institutions’ registrar offices for equivalency of the first two years of study. This serves as a pipeline into FIT for successful students.

8. **The suggested changes do not impact the current policies regarding the required grades of C- to be eligible for undergraduate transfer or that all official transcripts are required as part of the admission process. FIT will use the final calculated grades and GPA on all incoming transcripts to review eligibility.**