



## MEETING MINUTES

### Joint Boards Articulation Commission

October 13, 2006: Conference Call

**Members:** Agnes Hoffman, *PSU*; Dea Hoffman, *EOU*; Donna Koechig, *Lane*; Robert Mercer, *OUS*; Karen Sprague, *UO*; Reine Thomas, *PCC*; Elaine Yandle-Roth, *CCWD*

**Guests:** Jonathan Jacobs, *OUS*; Julie Suchanek, *OCCA*

DISCUSSION ITEM	NEXT STEPS
<p><b><i>AAOT For Students with Disabilities:</i></b></p> <p>Concern: How address proficiencies when student cannot obtain proficiency level because of disability? Affects speech, writing, and math. Current degree contains no variability. How do we accommodate?</p> <p>For reference: Disability waiver at PSU for BS degree:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disability has to be documented;</li> <li>▪ Petition waiver from academic requirement committee; and</li> <li>▪ Petition waiver from major program department.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discuss at campus visits to get leverage and suggestions.</li> <li>▪ Student Services folks can discuss in AAOT focus group (reasonable accommodation for course access &amp; degree access.)</li> <li>▪ Any strategy in allowing transfer agreement between two institutions equivalent to AAOT without a transcribed degree?</li> </ul>	<p><i>Discuss at campus visits and during focus groups.</i></p>
<p><b><i>General Education Campus Visits</i></b></p> <p>First two conversations very warmly received at Umpqua CC and Southwestern Oregon CC. Primarily provided clarification and addressed concerns about the process. They are ready to take on the rest of the work without further JBAC observation.</p> <p>Needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage faculty to have conversations on all campuses.</li> <li>▪ Get OUS started and raise OUS awareness of conversations</li> </ul> <p>Should IFS get discussions going on OUS campus similar to OTM? Should Provosts charge IFS with task? Faculty will identify with IFS on this issue. Will allow more removal from administration. IFS could report to Provosts on results.</p>	<p><i>Karen S. attending campus visits:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>Chemeketa: 10/24</i></li> <li>▪ <i>Lane: 10/25</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Minor edits to packet addressing clarity</i></p> <p><i>Karen S. invited to CIA/Provosts council to report on progress and request additional meetings.</i></p> <p><i>Karen S. and Robert will speak with Earl to determine IFS involvement.</i></p>

DISCUSSION ITEM	NEXT STEPS
<p><b>SB342 report</b></p> <p>Report is a response to legislation that requests an annual report to the legislature on SB342 progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 11/1: UEE will finalize report</li> <li>▪ 11/2: Joint Boards will approve report</li> <li>▪ 11/6: Report sent to Steve Bender’s office for inclusion in legislative E-Board meeting in December.</li> </ul> <p><i>Concern:</i> Why is report from UEE? UEE has not been responsible for much of the response to SB342. UEE is not a widely recognized group. Should it come from the Joint Boards themselves?</p> <p><i>Concern:</i> Many process maps suggest broad consultation early on that might not have happened. Need to be clear on what groups were consulted for each topic.</p> <p>Report will be discussed at CIA/Provosts meeting. Who will be the person to share the report? Should it be Gretchen or Jerry since they gave the original charge to address SB342?</p>	<p><i>Karen S. will connect with Connie Green to discuss.</i></p> <p><i>Any changes to the report please get to Jonathan by October 27.</i></p>
<p><b>OTM Reporting Concerns</b></p> <p>How do students indicate they want to work on OTM?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The OTM is not on college applications;</li> <li>▪ Advisors aren’t initiating conversations about the OTM;</li> <li>▪ No one in college is promoting the OTM;</li> <li>▪ Many don’t see the value of the OTM for their students.</li> </ul> <p><i>Concern-Financial Aid:</i> It is not a degree so doesn’t apply for financial aid. It is not enough to say the OTM is mostly for undeclared students who will transfer for a degree. This was a concern early on that we thought was resolved. Is there a way to change wording on application to make it more acceptable? [i.e. <b>Transfer Degree (OTM)</b> or <b>BA degree (OTM)</b>].</p> <p><i>Concern-Application:</i> Many colleges don’t consider OTM a degree so it isn’t on their application. OUS is not trying to get students to transfer early. We want undeclared students to know all pathways.</p> <p><i>Concern-OTM for high school:</i> Will emphasis on using OTM as HS framework exclude certain courses that might be more useful for student’s major goals? (i.e. Will students take no foreign language because not in OTM?)</p> <p>The OTM is a better structure than having nothing at all. Still allows elective credit. Students will likely be more successful with OTM. It won’t be a perfect fit for everybody.</p>	<p><i>Elaine will work with Marilyn K. and Donna to start conversations.</i></p> <p><i>Elaine will work with Marilyn K. and Donna to start conversations.</i></p>