



STATEWIDE ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER COUNCIL

Virtual via Zoom

Monday, June 13, 2022 • 11:00 am

– Minutes –

Roll Call

Statewide Articulation Transfer Council Present - Matthew Lee, Chair, LSU; Jeannine Kahn, UL System; James Ammons, SU System; Ernise Singleton, LDOE

Board of Regents' Staff Present – Tristan Denley, Allison Vicknair; Lupe Lamadrid; Kim Langlois

Absent – Wendi Palermo, LCTCS; Kenya Messer, LAICU; Adrienne Fontenot, LCTCS

Guests Present – Sarah Barlow, LCTCS; Jessica Vallelungo, LDOE

Handouts: Agenda; Minutes from March 25, 2022 meeting

Approval of Minutes. The SATC Committees unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2022 meeting.

Transfer Pathways/Reverse Transfer

Dr. Tristan Denley, Deputy Commissioner of Academic Affairs and Innovation, BoR, began the meeting providing an update on Reverse Transfer. He advised the Council that Reverse Transfer is already happening at some institutions, but a statewide process needs to be created due to the new legislation that was passed this session. He explained that they already have the benefit of having multi-system data and that he has already written some code as a first attempt. The data run will allow them to get a list of candidates that they can share with campuses to begin a student record review. He also informed the Council that from the initial data review there are approximately 5,000 plausible candidates and going forward there will be approximately 500 students each year who could be candidates. He also advised that he would like to begin working with Community College Registrars to minimize the number of false positives.

Dr. Jeannine Khan advocated that the four-year institutions receive the list of potential candidates before it is sent to the community colleges and asked how the list would be shared. Dr. Denley responded that the way code is currently written shows those who have satisfied their core requirements and have 60 hours. He also advised that his initial idea was that the campuses would work together with the set of records.

Dr. Matt Lee asked for clarification about the process. Dr. Denley responded that campuses will still need to run degree audits to determine if a student qualifies for reverse transfer.

Ms. Sarah Barlow asked if the list of candidates can list be filtered by the percentage of credits earned to lessen the number of institutions involved. Dr. Denley responded that it would be beneficial for the institution with the most hours earned to be the one to award the degree. Ms. Barlow also asked if the responsibility for working with the student is the four-year institution's responsibility. Dr. Denley responded that both parties need to know so they can work together and share records so the degrees can be awarded. He also explained that as the student will need to give permission for their information to be shared, he would like to see something added to the admissions application.

Dr. James Ammons asked if there were any issues that caused this to become legislation. Dr. Denley responded that not everyone knows that they can do this.

Ms. Barlow mentioned that currently a transcript request doesn't currently trigger an audit. Dr. Denley responded that what is unavailable now is once a student transfers, they do not know if they took the courses need to complete an associates degree. This now provides information so a student is notified, and campuses can share the information. Ms. Barlow mentioned that perhaps a reverse transfer application could be created.

Dr. Denley advised the Council that the process needs to be in place by Fall 2023. The next step will be for the Board of Regents to work with campus registrars and the model to be used will be that whichever school contributes the highest number of hours will be the campus that is contacted by Board of Regents.

Dr. Denley then spoke to the Council regarding transfer pathways. He advised the Council that they need to discuss which pathways would be created as well as how will they be created. He suggested that they bring together campus representatives for each discipline to create pathways, and once they discuss they can provide an example of what a pathway should be and can determine how to approach the courses that do not apply to all campuses.

Ms. Barlow asked about the program title to be listed on the pathways, to which Dr. Denley responded that it is the program title for the four-year institutions. Dr. Lee added that although the four-year institutions will be determining the pathways, the two-year institutions will need to be part of the conversation.

Dr. Denley asked the Council to begin thinking thorough and starting work on the top 20 pathways during the fall semester so campus approvals can be done by Spring 2023. Dr. Lee asked who should be working on the pathways to which Dr. Denley replied that it needs to be someone who can make decisions but also knows the degree programs.

Ms. Barlow asked about the last 4 semesters of the pathways. Dr. Denley replied that the last four semesters will vary by institutions, but the design principles of creating the pathways is to be beneficial to the student, so the fall out can be minimized if student changes their major.

Dr. Lee also advised the Council that there needs to be an understanding that if a student changes to a completely different major, it is possible that they will get slowed down.

2022 Matrix Review Update

Dr. Lupe Lamadrid provided an update on the 2022 matrix review. She advised that she has received all the campus responses and there will be robust changes to the matrix. She also advised that the normal process will be used, and she hopes to have the updates done by July 1st to be able to send to campuses.

Dr. Lamadrid also discussed the confusion on the new general education rubrics. She explained that she has had conversations with individual campuses regarding application of the new proposed rubrics and will also discuss with Dr. Denley on how to move forward. Dr. Denley explained to the Council that this is why the work is needed, to remove the conflation between courses satisfying general education requirements and counting towards a degree. Mrs. Allison Vicknair provided the example of MATH 1550 and how it's pre-requisites fulfill their general education requirements, but do not count towards the Engineering degree. Ms. Lamadrid also commented that if a course is a prescribed degree requirement, then the student will need to take the course. However, if you are selecting from a group of general education courses, they there is some flexibility. Dr. Denley advised the Council that the rubrics were created to clarify the information that BoR is getting from campuses to understand how they are transferring in courses.

Dr. Kahn asked if this process was being discussed with CARTO members as this is part of the articulation conversation. Dr. Lamadrid responded that CARTO has the information.

Fast Forward Pathways

Dr. Ernise Singleton, LDoE advised the Council that 76 new Fast Forward Pathways will be presented at tomorrow's BESE meeting.

Dr. Denley explained that he would like to see the Council focus on is the transfer implications of the Pathways as there are courses not commonly on the matrix that exist in the Pathways.

Other Business

There was no other business.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.