



STATEWIDE ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER COUNCIL

6th Floor BoR Conference Rm • Claiborne Building • Baton Rouge, LA
Monday, 1 August 2011 • 9:00 – 11:20 a.m.

-- Minutes --

Council Members: Margaret Ambrose (SU System); Mike Gargano (LSU, Chair); Brad O'Hara (ULS); Monty Sullivan (LCTC System).

General Education Committee: Kevin Cope (LSU A&M, Chair); Lisa Mims-Devezin (SUNO) by telephone; Lesa Taylor-Dupree (BPCC) by telephone; Galen Turner (LTU); Tim Stamm (for Debbie Lea, Delgado, by telephone); Debra Tilson (for Jacqueline Howard-Matthews, SUBR).

Absent: Mary Ann Coleman (LAICU); Steve Guempel (LSUE); Debbie Schum (LDoE); Jeffrey Temple (SLU);

Board of Regents Staff: Karen Denby; Kathy Hoyt.

Guests: Derrick Manns (LCTC System)

Welcome and Chairman's Remarks

Chair Mike Gargano convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m., and the 27 June 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 reviewed the work of the CCN Committee, noting that campus responses to the questions regarding impact of implementing CCN are filtering in. (The requested deadline was 5 August.) He expressed concern that the university responses received to date (two were distributed) seemed overly negative as to the cost of quick implementation if that meant changing course files and, thus, every related system that draws from course identifiers (numbers). Mike Gargano noted that there are three repeated priorities (in law and in state policy) for every campus today: improving retention; improving same-institution graduation rate; and increasing the number of graduates. For any project not directly tied to one of those priorities, an administrator must very carefully consider and weigh the investment of fiscal and human capital. The costs noted by campuses that are not in the midst of changing or upgrading student information systems are, indeed, very high. Discussion followed.

CCN vs Course Content – the CCN is a number. It is not the role of the CCN Committee to establish course equivalencies and derive common content. It *is* the committee's purpose to demonstrate progress toward both the letter and the spirit of the Law (Act 356), which requires that the BoR develop, coordinate, and maintain a statewide course numbering system, including determining course equivalences, starting with general education courses.

Articulation MATRIX – Common Course Numbers imply commonalities within the courses. Concern was raised on the realities of matrix courses being accepted (or not) in transfer by all institutions, and in the comparison of content and curriculum for lower division courses at colleges and universities. Discussion followed about whether a course needed to have *exact* content and curriculum to be considered for CCN, or if courses with *similar* objectives and preferred outcomes should also qualify. It was recommended that the BoR gather campus faculty in specific lower division courses, starting with General Education courses on the matrix, for additional review and resolution. Likewise, it was agreed that as part of the CCN effort, it is essential that footnote issues on the matrix be resolved as campuses (Faculty) recommit to content

equivalency of matrix courses. BoR must coordinate the conversations to “define the minima,” i.e., the fundamental content of the General Education matrix courses. At the same time, it is essential that the campus articulation officer and/or Provost communicate to the faculty about the meaning and function of the matrix, possibly to include a signature from the campus’ CAO and duly appointed faculty representative (F/S president or C&C chair) to indicate agreement and buy-in as the matrix is updated each year.

Implementation: Shadow vs System Changes – the Master Plan, funding formula, and the GRAD Act and other legislation all focus on campus productivity, measured by: retention, same-institution graduation rates, and degree production. Though full implementation of CCN could make it easier for students to plan for transfers from one institution to another, it will not directly affect any of the three priorities and the cost in human capital to change existing student record systems is prohibitive. Therefore, it was agreed that as campuses convert to new student information systems, the CCNs would be fully integrated as the primary course numbers, but until such a conversion, the Statewide Articulation Matrix would reflect the CCN and campuses would be allowed to list both numbers in catalogs and registration materials.

Need for DATA – SATC agreed on the need for analysis of the data to compare transfer and native student success in key predictor courses, particularly in upper division courses, i.e., performance. Since BoR receives data from every campus, the BoR would be the logical group to do the evaluations, but campuses should first identify key predictor courses to be evaluated.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Monday, 29 August, at 9:00 am. For that meeting, Dr Sullivan expects to present the report and recommendations from the CCN Committee.

The meeting concluded by 11:30am.