**CCHE Transfer Committee Agenda**

January 11, 2024

Greetings and Introductions

Demonstration and Q&A from EduNav Transfer

Open Discussion

Following the EduNav Transfer demonstration, committee members engaged in a discussion on how the EduNav Transfer tool could be used. Committee members liked that the EduNav Transfer tool pulled course information from existing platforms, meaning institutions would not be required to change or update their systems, nor would there be a need for common course numbering. Commissioner Abramson and Dr. Pirius were clear that they were not endorsing this specific tool – they had heard from committee members over the last few meetings that there was a need for better transparency around course transferability across the state. They each had heard about this vendor and tool and wanted to provide committee members with an opportunity to review and provide feedback.

Commissioner Kostenbauer wondered if academic advisors would be needed as much if students had the ability to look up things as much on their own?

* It was noted that while we do not know the actual number, we know a large percentage of students will never meet with an advisor (the student will self-advise) – this tool will at least provide them something to help them along their transfer journey.

Commissioner Abramson challenged committee members to consider what might the resistance or other push back be from institutions?

* It was noted that academic advisors may face challenges if a campus degree audit (e.g., Degree Check) provides one result while another degree audit tool (e.g., EduNav Transfer) provides a different result. It will be important to stress test any tool and to help support advisors who may see two different versions of degree audits.
	+ Is it possible to run a pilot between a handful of 2- and 4-years before considering it statewide? How many institutions would be willing to volunteer for a pilot?
	+ Is a pilot the best way to make the case to show this tool has value for our students?
* Committee members expressed concerns regarding cost: how much will this cost and who will pay for it?
	+ DHE staff informed committee members that EduNav Transfer has presented to other stakeholder groups in the past (e.g., Registrar’s Council) – this group expressed concern with the amount of data EduNav Transfer would have access to.
	+ DHE staff also expressed concern regarding cost.

Commissioner Abramson acknowledged the cost component to the tool – and challenged committee members to consider the ways in which the tool could change the student transfer experience.

* It was noted that advisors at one community college have been manually identifying students who have earned a credential but who have never applied for graduation, which is required for credential completion. This has helped to increase credential completion by 20% over two years. Would the tool be able to help the student identify what other programs/credentials they may be eligible for?
* What about potential students thinking about enrolling at a community college? Could it be used in recruitment to lay out a student’s future plans?

What are the next steps?

* There is support for a pilot for a technology-based tool that would allow for better transfer credit transparency; yet there were still questions on how to ensure the tool demonstrates value for students. It was determined that a pilot might be the best way to demonstrate it has value and to encourage other institutions to participate (i.e., expand statewide).
* A question that may need to be addressed prior to institutional participation: how often would the vendor reach into their systems to update information?
* It is important to note that there is no commitment to this vendor – this committee was created to bring recommendations to the state on how to improve credit transfer acceptance and the student experience; a pilot could be one of a handful of recommendations to take to the Commission.
* If there is interest in a pilot, Department staff would need to do a little more due diligence first.
	+ Committee members expressed a desire to hear about EduNav Transfer’s current clients’ experience.

Commissioner Abramson called for consensus on the following action: to develop a pilot with two or more institutions to explore a technology-based platform that would allow for better transfer credit transparency. Consensus reached. Committee members stated it was critical to have both 2- and 4-year institutions involved in the pilot. Commissioner Abramson will ask staff to begin reviewing other their vendor options.