**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Joint Boards Articulation Commission**  
**February 10, 2006: University Place, Portland**

Members Present: Ed Watson, Linn-Benton, Chair; Agnes Hoffman, PSU; Dea Hoffman, EOU; Jonathan Jacobs, OUS; Donna Koechig, Lane; Earl Potter, SOU; Jill Rupert, Chemeketa; Maureen Sevigny, OIT; Karen Sprague, UO; Reine Thomas, PCC; Elaine Yandle-Roth, CCWD  

Others Present: Mark Endsley, OUS; Liz Goulard, Chemeketa; Robert Mercer, OUS; Gretchen Schuette, Chemeketa; Julie Suchanek, OCCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Item</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulation Hotline list</strong></td>
<td>Jonathan will post the Articulation Hotline list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The list has been converted to a new PDF format. JBAC approved the format, so it will be posted to the JBAC website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talk to the JBAC Session</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Watson hosted this session at the SSR conference. Most questions were on the AA/OT revision process and ATLAS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Transfer Module</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration: Are we marketing it enough? We will need to provide evidence students are using it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine and Jonathan will work out a March meeting.</td>
<td>Elaine and Jonathan will determine meeting time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES SESSION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty groups worked well. There were some healthy disagreements, but groups emerged with excellent outcomes statements. We are sending both copies back to the groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| When communicating draft outcomes to broad groups, we should mention that the next step will have more representative groups of faculty. In the cover letter, we can reduce fear by characterizing this work as ongoing. We should develop an email list for proactive notification to campus general education committees and interested parties. We need to determine whether the key OUS point of contact will be IFS or Provosts. Initial folks that will receive information include: | Ed Watson will draft cover letter for distribution  
Jonathan will start listserv for broad collaboration  
IFS & Provosts will determine best point of contact for OUS |
| - Conference Participants            |                                                      |
| - CC Council of Instructional Administrators (CIA) |                                                      |
| - OUS Provosts                       |                                                      |
| - OUS Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) |                                                      |
| **Criteria**                         |                                                      |
| Criteria are the characteristics of a course that decide if the course has the potential to let students achieve the desired outcomes. Criteria will bring a lot more clarity to the outcomes. Outcomes and criteria should be moved together to campus discussions. Faculty developed the general outcomes statements from detail similar to criteria. Laying out the brainstorming would be helpful to display the synthesis to the outcomes. We should post the outcomes, the evidence of how they were developed, and more participation to come up with criteria statements. We need a forum for comment. | Linn-Benton will type up brainstorming  
Jonathan will post brainstorming to website.  
Jonathan will arrange a forum on the website |

---

Linn-Benton will type up brainstorming  
Jonathan will post brainstorming to website.  
Jonathan will arrange a forum on the website
### Discussion Item

#### April Conference - Criteria
In April we will have another conference. We need funding. Each group should have an independent room. Find out if Ruth can orchestrate again. These groups can create a first draft of criteria in one single-day session.

**Next Steps**
Karen will ask George for funding
Elaine and Jonathan will coordinate conference once funding is obtained

#### Funding
The Chancellor’s Office might not be able to fund this. An alternative is a joint alignment grant with ODE for $1,000,000. If we draft a concrete proposal quickly, Mark Endsley can request funding for this project.

**Next Steps**
UNASSIGNED: Will draft a proposal for inclusion in the grant

#### Outcomes Work Timeline (Next Steps)

| ASAP: Post brainstorming and draft outcomes from 2/9 on website |
| ASAP: Develop a mechanism for feedback on the website |
| March 2006: Flesh out the outcomes statements based on feedback |
| April 2006: Day-long conference to modify outcomes/develop criteria |
| Fall 2006: Start orchestrated discussion on campuses |
| January 2006: JBAC proposes final wording |

#### QUESTIONS SURROUNDING OUTCOMES WORK

### Size of faculty groups in April conference
Arguments for larger faculty groups:
- more input is needed right at the beginning
- more inclusive representation of social science and arts and letters

Arguments for keeping groups small:
- Groups are developing first drafts only
- Harder to produce results in large groups

### Role of statewide faculty committees
JBAC hosted a discussion on whether faculty groups would form approval committees for future courses

Arguments for statewide approval committee
- All this group will approve is universal transferability.
- Credibility can be enhanced by ensuring standards are upheld.
- The message of criteria is not evenly carried to every college.
- We need to show legislators that accountability is important.
- Would be more powerful for requesting continued funding

Argument against statewide approval committee
- Campuses already do internal criteria review.
- We can rely on the integrity of campuses to uphold the statewide framework without imposing a statewide structure.
- OWEAC is an example of a successful advisory group
- Faculty would resist imposing a governing body
- There is no funding to ensure representation

The faculty can decide whether a governing body is appropriate for this work. It might be too early to have this discussion.

### Considerations for faculty
How will the outcomes influence courses faculty might teach?
How would faculty design those courses with these outcomes in mind?
How do we assess those outcomes?

For general consideration

### Considerations for JBAC
How do we obtain funding to continue?
How do we meaningfully respond to and integrate feedback?
How will emergent themes be dealt with?
Who needs to be at the table in these discussions?
Is the timeline reasonable?
Are we going to include students in this process?

For JBAC consideration