



STATEWIDE ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER COUNCIL

6th Floor BoR Conference Rm • Claiborne Building • Baton Rouge, LA
Monday, 29 August 2011 • 9:10 – 10:45 a.m.

-- Minutes --

Council Members: Mary Ann Coleman (LAICU); Mike Gargano (LSU, Chair); Brad O'Hara (ULS); Monty Sullivan (LCTC System).

General Education Committee: Kevin Cope (LSU A&M, Chair); Steve Guempel (LSUE); Tim Stamm (for Debbie Lea, Delgado); Lesa Taylor-Dupree (BPCC) by telephone; Jeffrey Temple (SLU); Galen Turner (LTU);

Absent: Margaret Ambrose (SU System); Jacqueline Howard-Matthews, SUBR; Lisa Mims-Devezin (SUNO); Debbie Schum (LDoE);

Board of Regents Staff: Karen Denby.

Guests: Peggy H. Fuller (BPCC, Dean of Business); Derrick Manns (LCTC System)

Welcome and Chairman's Remarks

Chair Mike Gargano convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m., and the 1 August minutes were approved unanimously. He turned the meeting over to Monty Sullivan for an update on the work of the Common Course Numbering (CCN) Committee.

Common Course Numbering (CCN)

Monty Sullivan distributed copies of the Common Course Numbering Work Group Proposal and described the report, paragraph by paragraph, as members followed along. The report was well-received as the result of an unquestionably difficult assignment that, when implemented, will pay off very well for student advising -- especially with developmental and general education courses.

Mike Gargano said that the Commissioner and Board of Regents must take ownership in the project, suggesting three actions:

1. That the report from the CCN workgroup be received but that no formal action be taken.
2. That the commissioner meet with the campus chancellor/presidents (and possibly the Chief Academic Officers) to lay out a mandate regarding CCN, a charge, providing them with: a definition of 'equivalence'; what must be done; how it must work; and a timeframe for accomplishing it. The commissioner may choose a different approach, but the task is ready to pass on to the BoR.
3. That the BoR develop a *course catalog*, to replace the articulation matrix, that would list courses that are acceptable for credit and equivalence from (a) 2yr to 2yr; (b) 2yr to 4yr; and (c) 4yr to 4yr campuses. This could be done starting with the existing matrix, establishing initial equivalence by 'imminent domain' because the matrix has been in use for the last 1-15 years.
4. That the BoR clarify policies and procedures to define 'equivalency' and intent within the matrix and to address the fact that courses are not necessarily equivalent across levels and majors, i.e., that auto mechanics at a technical college will not ordinarily transfer into a university's engineering degree.

Monty Sullivan stressed that timing is critical; that we must have something *to show progress* on implementation of Act 356; and that it is important that we all do this together (i.e., that with uniform transfer being a main tenet of Act 356, no one can back out of participation). MaryAnn Coleman agreed, noting that the report would show the legislature that: HEd has agreed in concept; the task has been elevated to BoR as the coordinating board for implementation; that the focus on GenEd, which includes ~75% of the transferred

courses is good; and that timelines for action have been established. She warned to keep it simple and direct, suggesting that the recommendations section be revised somewhat and clarified for a reader outside of education.

Further discussion revolved about the stressing the required academic review and the importance of standardizing the course description, basic framework, and outcomes. Derrick Manns suggested that that review could include: the common number; description; 3-5 goals/objectives; and common content areas.

MaryAnn Coleman moved that the SATC receive the report and extend its thanks and appreciation to the CCN work group for addressing the complex and complicated issues involved. The Chair was to contact the Commissioner with a request from SATC that he meet with system and campus heads to discuss his/BoR vision and direction for CCN. Brad O'Hara seconded, noting that ultimately it is up to the BoR to develop, maintain, and update a CCN process. The SATC and General Education Committee were in unanimous agreement, and the Chair will meet with the Commissioner immediately to convey the message and request that 'next steps' be taken.

Statewide Concentrations – Update

Business – Karen Denby met with Business Deans at ULL. They agreed on a concentration template with strong words urging students to base course selection on requirements in the expected transfer institution, to ensure the best fit in the transfer experience.

Engineering – Galen Turner expects to have the engineering concentration completed by November, after two more meetings with the engineering faculty.

Criminal Justice – Derrick Manns also expects to have the criminal justice concentration finalized by November, so that campuses may include the option in their catalog revisions for 2012.

Other Business/Discussion

Transfer Admission Policy: SATC members agreed that all future statewide policy decisions regarding transfer admission should be discussed with the SATC for input and recommendations. The exception limits in the current policy were clarified as a percentage of the campus' transfer cohort for the semester (not of the campus' total enrollment). It was suggested that an increase in exceptions might be a possible GRAD Act autonomy for institutions that could demonstrate strong retention and graduation statistics for students admitted by exception.

Monty Sullivan said that the SATC still needs a better definition of "transfer student." Karen Denby noted that it had been on the agenda before, but there has not yet been any discussion about how it might be changed. It will be included on the next agenda.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 26 September, at 9:00 am.

[NOTE: Rescheduled for **Tuesday, 4 October, at 9:00 am.**]

The meeting concluded at 10:45 am.