MEETING MINUTES
Joint Boards Articulation Commission
January 5, 2006, Portland State University

Chair: Ed Watson, Vice President Academic Affairs, Linn-Benton Community College
Recorder: Jonathan Jacobs, Admin Asst, OUS Chancellor’s Office

Materials
1. Agenda
2. Conference Document – Toward Improving Transferability of Lower Division in General Education in Oregon

Attendees
Susan Boyanovski, Community Colleges and Workforce Development, Instructional Program Specialist
Agnes Hoffman, Portland State University, Assoc Vice Provost
Dea Hoffman, Eastern Oregon University, Registrar
Jonathan Jacobs, Oregon University System, Administrative Assistant
Donna Koehig, Lane Community College, Associate Vice President for Instruction
Robert Mercer, Portland State University, Assistant Dean
Hilda Roselli, Western Oregon University, Dean, College of Education
Jill Rupert, Chemeketa Community College, English Instructor
Linda Samek, Corban College, Dean of Graduate Studies
Carol Schaaftma, Linn Benton Community College, Director Curriculum and Instructional Programs
Maureen Sevigny, Oregon Institute of Technology, Professor of Management
Karen Sprague, University of Oregon, Molecular Biologist & Vice Provost Undergrad Studies
Reine Thomas, Portland Community College, Dean of Instruction
Ed Watson, Linn Benton Community College, Vice President Academic Affairs
Elaine Yandle-Roth, Community Colleges and Workforce Development, Instructional Program Specialist

Next Meetings
Conference Call
January 20, 2006: 11am-12pm
Dial-in: 541-713-0700
Conf ID: 1188#

In Person Meeting
February 10, 2006: 12-1pm
Portland, University Place
Exact room TBA

Common Acronyms:
- AAOT: Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer
- EDP: Excellence in Delivery and Productivity
- CC: Community College
- CCWD: Community College and Workforce Development
- CIA: Council of Instructional Administrators
- CSSA: College Student Services Administrators
- HS: High School
- IFS: Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
- JBAC: Joint Boards Articulation Committee
- OTM: Oregon Transfer Module
- OSA: Oregon Student Association
- OUS: Oregon University System
- OWEAC: Oregon Writing and English Articulation Commission
- SB: Senate Bill

Statements in the attached minutes are summarized and edited for easier reading. Please report any omissions, typos, or statements that aren’t quite as you meant them to jonathan_jacobs@ous.edu.
EDP MEETING UPDATE

SPRAGUE: We have the two things needed to make good, sustained progress. The first is ATLAS, which takes care of the mechanics. We will know what transfers and how. The second is outcomes based, transferable general education across the state. We can start making rational decisions about courses that should transfer everywhere, and ultimately revise the AAOT in major ways.

WATSON: There is going to be a lot of passion that precedes any rational logic. Karen and I have worked on a vision for the piece, which we will discuss later.

ARTICULATION & TRANSFER CONFERENCE

YANDLE-ROTH: The annual Articulation and Transfer conference has been sponsored by JBAC since Jim Arnold started it about 10 years ago. Part of the reason this conference started was because OUS did not attend the community college-focused Student Success conference. When the Student Success conference lost its partner, it made sense to combine the conferences into a single Student Success and Retention conference in February. This year we had a need for a separate conference focused on the pathway of education. Andy Duncan and Susan Boyanovski led the Articulation and Transfer conference at WOU in December.

TEACHER EDUCATION STRAND

SAMEK: The original Articulation and Transfer conference had a teacher education strand. It is difficult to understand the education pathway in Oregon with so many different teacher education programs and community colleges. The conference got started as a way to communicate good, general information statewide. This new Articulation and Transfer conference had several connections to the old one. It was a very successful event and we were asked to do it again.

BOYANOVSKI: The Articulation and Transfer: Education Pathways conference ended up with about 108 people with representation from both sectors. It was a good opportunity for people to network with colleagues. Hilda Roselli, Ed Watson, and Linda Samek set the stage nicely with the bigger context, why this is important, and the role of community colleges in teacher preparation.

WATSON: This fits with the pathways section of Senate Bill 342. There are other spin-offs from the old Articulation conference, including an annual degree partnership conference at OSU. From our next conversation we might create curricular spin-offs around AAOT discipline groups. Perhaps there are other ways of organizing and accomplishing our work rather than putting together ad hoc committees and conferences. Much of our work is not isolated within silos, but becoming much more integrated.
STUDENT SUCCESS AND RETENTION CONFERENCE

YANDLE-ROTH: The February Student Success and Retention will be at the PSU University Place convention center. We have concerns about the limits on conference space for total attendees. We must be more selective in attendees than with past Articulation and Transfer conferences. As an initial goal, we have asked that no more than 12 people attend from each campus. This includes the faculty reps needed for the outcomes piece. Community Colleges will register as teams. OUS and private colleges will have individual registrations. On January 17th the first round of registrations will be in and we will know if any space is left for additional attendees. We have expended to a two-day conference. The conference website, including a draft program, is at http://www.ous.edu/aca/ssret.html.

We had space available, so we are hosting the outcomes session. It has been a challenge to keep size down in our discussion groups because there are so many people who want to take part in developing the outcomes for general education. Ruth Stiehl will be the conference facilitator. She does conferences like this across the United States. The challenge is getting down to what level of description we want for the outcomes.

OUTCOMES SESSION

SPRAGUE: We decided to look at broad outcomes, but not so broad that they describe all of general education. We will discuss outcomes for each of the six areas of general education defined by the OTM. The composition of each faculty group will be 5 CC folks, 5 OUS folks, and 2 private institution folks. Provosts' Council are helping to recruiting faculty and have promised to have them within two weeks. I will work with Mark Wahler on recruiting independent faculty. The only independent schools I have included are the ones that accept the AA/OT because they seem the most relevant for this conversation.

SAMEK: From the perspective of private institutions, even those of us that don’t take the AAOT, we still do a lot of transfer work, so down the road please include our participation.

THOMAS: In anticipation of the conversation around SB342, our CIA identified CC faculty representatives for this discussion on outcomes. As I distribute 17 CC faculty into teams, we have 1.75 faculty represent each CC. If we could have 31 slots instead of 30, that would allow the large colleges 2 reps and our contracting colleges 1 rep.

YANDLE-ROTH: Will it work to decrease the number of private representatives rather than adding a 13th member?

THOMAS: It would be preferable.

THOMAS: At CIA somebody raised the question, do we have professional technical folks on our committees? The perspective was we are preparing outcomes for them so they have to be here.

SPRAGUE: We need membership of OWEAC represented on the writing team because of their extensive work around writing criteria.
TIMELINE AND LOGISTICS

YANDLE-ROTH: It’s an all-day process. We expect the Governor will give the keynote and the vision of *One System for Oregon Students*. We would then go to the Willamette room on the first floor. Ruth will give the groups marching orders. Jonathan is helping put together a piece with sample outcomes statements. Then they would be given their charge and work in their six groups. We have two breakout rooms for one group each. The other four groups will stay in the Willamette room. It might be too tight and noisy. We are exploring other options such as shuttling to PSU.

SCHAAFSMA: Shutting folks to PSU would break the energy created in the room. I would choose a noisy chaotic room rather than shuttle people off.

YANDLE-ROTH: I think it will work. The room is carpeted and has draperies to absorb a fair amount of noise. 12 people per group plus a facilitator takes it pretty close to 80. The room holds 120 people in rounds. We need to make sure that we keep the number under control for a variety of reasons.

FACILITATORS

SPRAGUE: To get disciplinary balance and leadership we need a facilitator for each group. The original idea was to have non-faculty administrators (e.g. Provosts/Vice Provosts) do this.

SCHAAFSMA: One idea is have two facilitators for each group: one from a CC and one from a four-year.

SPRAGUE: We need people with facilitating expertise.

WATSON: Ruth has worked extensively with PCC and Linn-Benton. We might ask Ruth to identify people she has worked with that might help her. It is a good idea to have a OUS facilitator identified who has the responsibility of shadowing the CC facilitator.

SPRAGUE: The OUS person wouldn’t have to be an expert, but would have responsibility as a facilitator.

SCHAAFSMA: Karen, Ruth, and I can work to identify some of the responsibilities and expectations to help when you approach OUS folks for volunteers. I don’t think we’ll have any trouble finding CC folks who will do it.

WATSON: Are the facilitators part of the team of 12 each CC can bring to the conference?

YANDLE-ROTH: We know some CCs like Klamath Falls will not be bringing 12 people, so there is some flexibility. We will know by January 17th how much extra space we have.

COMBINING SPEECH AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

THOMAS: What would it look at if the writing and speech were considered one topic area of communication rather than separate groups?

RUPERT: It makes sense to do that and yet campus members might perceive that as a merging of the two, and loss of jobs. Setting it up this way at the state level could cause worry at campuses.

SCHAAFSMA: Any overlap in the outcomes will come out through the two separate conversations. It doesn’t hurt to have one group take it from a writing perspective and the other from an oral perspective. When they look at the results of their work, the overlap will be obvious, and it will be there own “aha!” as opposed to our forcing the decision up front.
DISCIPLINE SPECIFIC GENERAL EDUCATION

ROSELLI: For education pathways, we hope a coding system can be identified at some point to link broad outcomes to some professional pathways to ensure heavy emphasis in certain areas. Nursing, teacher education, and other pathways count on general education courses for things beyond the well rounded experience. They are preparing for Praxis or other required content tests. Maybe a filter could be coded in some way that is helpful for the prospective nursing student or prospective teacher to think, “I should be taking this course not only for General Ed requirements, but also for content to master in terms of becoming a teacher, or nurse.”

SPRAGUE: Right now we are trying to limit it to general general education, but there is also a differentiated general education which we need to address.

POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS

WATSON: People from outside the discipline and students are important stakeholders in this. The expectation is that this is a start, and larger conversations will follow. It needs to be more inclusive. Writing and speech disciplines need science faculty involved when you get to the nuts and bolts of criteria. Their input is sometimes as valuable as those within the discipline.

SCHAAFSMA: Ruth did have some ideas of ways to group folks. She also had thoughts about how some of the work would be shared, displayed, and reviewed in ways that encourage people who aren’t part of the discipline to provide feedback.

WATSON: I envision a refinement of the statements by Ruth and the facilitators, and we will return in much larger groups to look for the next stage. Ultimately it has to go back to campuses, but there is an intermediate step to hone and build greater understanding.

SPRAGUE: The Provosts are worried about the same thing--how to get the word out to the faculty so when it comes to the campus they will be in favor of the basic idea, and can give input. The provosts will call on IFS can help, but recognize that IFS isn’t an effective conduit at all institutions.

ROSELLI: All of this will have to be sold to the rest of the faculty at all campuses eventually. Faculty senates will be the ones that need to get behind this and push it through.

PURPOSE OF WORK

SEVIGNY: Are these committees building advisory statements? At our campus we have strict procedures for bringing new courses or changing course requirements. The criteria identified by the selected group shouldn’t be binding.

SPRAGUE: The purpose of this work: when a campus thinks a course should be universally transferable within the system they would bring it to this group of faculty who will apply the criteria that has been developed to determine if the course is a good general education course that should be universally transferable.

WATSON: We currently have very little from faculty groups that determines if one course is more rigorous than another, or shows stronger outcomes. We have no rationale for developing new courses.

YANDLE-ROTH: This work will not keep a campus from developing courses for their own students, but it would give the rest of the state a guide to say it has been judged against the general criteria for transfer to another institution and meet these general education requirements.
OUTCOMES OF THIS WORK
SEVIGNY: Is an ultimate outcome in 3-4 years to try to document performance or show competence without documenting course credits?

SPRAGUE: No, we’re not going there.

WATSON: There may be more statewide consistency around content, delivery, and assessment which may lead to more consistency about the number of credits and course number. This process will shake up a lot of the institutions around the way we deliver curriculum right now. I think it is a good shake-up. It will stimulate conversations around other ways to deliver and assess curriculum.

SEVIGNY: Presenting it in a non-threatening way will get us through quicker and result in better outcomes.

HOFFMAN: I see the scope of this process as defining the minimum outcomes we are seeking to meet these general education groupings, and leave the freedom at the campus level for the faculty to design their curriculum. The scope can be enlarged as long as they meet the minimum outcomes.

RUPERT: It would be a good idea to address these issues in the keynote. People are worried about this.

CHARGE TO PARTICIPANTS - DOCUMENT
WATSON: (document distributed) The document promotes that we are not trying to impose a transformation of general education philosophy or curriculum. The scope of our work is to find common understanding around general education, and to the greatest extent possible, take those common strands and provide them in a lower division general education transfer degree.

SPRAGUE: I described the work in two stages, talking about broad outcomes and then how would you define the criteria for the courses that would be likely to work. Short term results are that we will produce useful outcomes statements. Long term results include the great vision of faculty making decisions and the whole thing working. We need intermediate goals determining how we will generate statements that have had significant input from all stakeholders.

CRITERIA NEXT STEPS
SPRAGUE: We will get draft broad outcomes on February 9th. Will we ask committees to work on criteria also? It seems to me they go together.

WATSON: You are starting to get into the course level, and will need a larger representation to look at many areas such as social science.

SCHAAFSMA: A lot of the outcomes will be related to criteria. There is an ebb and flow between them.

WATSON: We should keep it focused on outcomes and anticipate these groups will come together again to work on criteria.

RUPERT: You may want to say in the document that the outcomes conversation will be broadened around criteria, so to the extent that groups can articulate criteria associated with the outcomes, do it now. The focus should be on outcomes. It might be useful to offer definitions of outcomes and criteria for folks. A lot of people hear the buzzwords and don’t really know what they mean.
OUTCOMES SAMPLES

SPRAGUE: For the outcomes sample material, I envision segregating it into outcomes and criteria. I want it to go out in advance, and be well organized so that people will want to read and understand it without being overwhelmed. We will organize it in a way that makes sense.

SCHAAFSMA: Any documents going to conference faculty participants should go to Ruth also.

NEXT MEETINGS

YANDLE-ROTH: We will have a conference call to discuss progress on all these items Friday, January 20, from 11am-noon.

YANDLE-ROTH: On February 10th we have a conference session scheduled called “Talk to the JBAC.” It often draws 50-60 people, and we give an outline of our work and the things we are talking about. I envision it coming directly after a morning debrief of the outcomes session.

SPRAGUE: We were hoping we could boil down what had happened on the 9th that night and have clear outcomes statements from each group to present to them the following morning. I volunteered to stay up late to think about this stuff.

WATSON: We will have a quick Noon meeting following the conference to give clarity on next steps.

JBAC WEBSITE:

JACOBS: One of my tasks is updating the JBAC website. The layout will resemble the structure of the EDP webpage. I invite comments or requests for any documents to be posted. I will also post all documents distributed at meetings.

JACOBS: Part of the website is an articulation hotline list. It requests contact information useful for transfer students. We sent an update request to all campuses. Our first deadline for campus response is January 13th.

SPRAGUE: Should we link to the OrACRAO site from the JBAC webpage for easy access to the OTM listings? Most people don’t know about the OrACRAO website.