Excellence in Delivery & Productivity Workgroup  
October 15, 2004, Chemeketa Community College

MINUTES (excerpts relating to transfer module)

Materials:
Workgroup Meeting Agenda – October 15, 2004  
Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Work Plan – Draft

2:15pm - Gretchen Schuette Call to Order

New Workgroup Member Introductions:
Bill Christopher: Rock Creek Campus, President
Joe Johnson: Clackamas CC, President
Adriana Mendoza: EOU, student member, Board of Higher Education
Karen Phillips: Oregon Small Schools Initiative
Tony Van Vliet: member, Board of Higher Education.
Dave Phillips: Clatsop CC, Chief Academic Officer (retired)  
(Not in attendance)

Introductions:
Connie Green: CCWD
Dave McDonald: OUS, Director of Enrollment Svs
Jonathan Jacobs: OUS, Admin Assistant
Karen Sprague: UO, Molecular Biologist  
Vice Provost Undergrad Studies member, JBAC
Maureen Sevigny: OIT, Professor of Management  
IFS Chair for General Ed Transfer Module
Debbie Murdock: PSU, Government Relations
Bob Turner: WOU, President Elect at IFS
Lorraine Davis: UO, VP of Academic Affairs  
OUS, Provost’s council chair
Gary Dukes: WOU, VP Student Affairs
Paul Steinele: SOU, Associate Provost
Diane Saunders: OUS, Director of Communication
Sam Connell: OHSU, Vice Provost Allied Health
Jem Specter: WOU, Provost
Lisa Zavala: OUS, Sr Assoc Dir Gov Relations
Julie Suchanek: OCCA, Gov Relations
John Miller: EOU, Provost
Earl Potter: SOU, Provost
Geri Richmond: (Not in attendance)

LOGISTICS:
SCHUETTE: Wants to invite the right people to the workgroup meetings. Invitations should go to OUS Presidents, CC presidents, Head of CIA, Head of CSSA,
MCDONALD: Confirmed it would be done

Key Accomplishments of the Work Group, SCHUETTE:
• Skeletal work plan is complete
• Plan represents K-16 collaborative statewide student centered platform of improved post-secondary education with statewide impact
• Traction has been gained in collaborative cross-sector work

Today’s Goals, SCHUETTE:
• Current status of all topics.
• Current status of and improvement to processes for each topic
• Clarify how we are projecting costs for near future (current legislative discussion) as well as later phases.
• Focus on integration of initiatives that together will form a strong platform.

Future Meetings:
Next Workgroup Meeting: 11/10/2004, 1-3pm at Chemeketa CC
TOPIC 2: GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER MODULE

Timeline provided by John Miller:
- Early October - Review by CC and OUS early October (complete)
- Early October – IFS visiting all OUS campuses for discussions (on schedule)
- October 18 – JBAC conference call on status led by Peter Gilkey
- November 15 – Deadline for all JBAC faculty input and data gathering
- November 18 or 19 (tentative) – JBAC Summit.
- December 10 – Articulation Conference / JBAC Review
- Winter Quarter – Faculty adoption per institutional practices

Key Description of Program
- **DAVIS:** Currently in existence is the AAOT, which allows for an easily articulated core from 2-yr campuses to 4-yr campuses.
- **SPRAGUE:** This module will set up an array of general education courses guaranteed to count toward general education wherever the student goes in Oregon.
- **SPRAGUE:** The module is smaller than full GE requirements. Other requirements must be articulated per major. This is because all schools have individual characteristics, and additional general education coursework at the receiving school will display that school’s character.

Costs, SCHUETTE: Estimate of cost is $400,000 for communications, advising materials, and associated costs.

Timeline Comments:
- MILLER: Summit will be held after JBAC input deadline, on Nov 19. Invitees: MBF, JBAC, IFS, Provosts, and CIA. Goal will be to look at all information and see what are the major difficulties and common ground on the proposal.
- TURNER: General Education transfer module has been taking up 98% of discussion in IFS meetings because it is more concrete and hits the faculty in curriculum.
- MILLER: Per Peter: Not likely all OUS campuses could adopt JBAC proposal until Jan meeting.
- GREEN: We need a provisional board approval before campuses so that we are ready for January legislative piece.
- SUCHANEK: Legislation is being drafted.
- MCDONALD: We can develop a conceptual draft for legislative session showing what is in place and what will happen.
- SEVIGNY: November Summit will provide vital information for conceptual draft.

General Topic Comments:
- SCHUETTE: The hope is to address barriers that lessen circumstances where student transfers and has to retake courses, to develop a statewide agreed common core to go with the student or easily transfer with the student.
- SPRAGUE: The module does not address the problem of courses improperly selected that do not apply to the major.
- SEVIGNY: Students who do not know what to do and have no advising will flounder. The module will assist a counselor in advising when transferring.
- CHRISTOPHER: **Question:** Does the existence of a transfer module with set units imply to student that Gen Ed classes outside the module taken at CC won’t apply to university? Why would we do that?
- SPRAGUE: **Answer:** Technically you can take general education courses at a CC that apply to CC but not OUS when transfer. You must check articulation to know all the courses that will transfer and take all your general education at the CC level, but PSU general education requirements differ slightly from OIT requirements.
- SCHUETTE: CC Concern: to what extent do the healthy curriculum differences between universities play out as a barrier? Which differences could and should be addressed?
- MILLER: Data shows only about 30% of CC students transfer with complete AAOT.
- CHRISTOPHER: What is the lifespan of this as campuses change their courses that make this invalid? What notification to students must be given? Needs to be a set of time restraints.
- POTTER: We need to go past the agreement to the way we work together. Need to be consultative between campuses as changes occur.
- SCHUETTE: Adapting to course changes needs further addressing in phase 2. A legacy review process.
Module’s Relation to Majors:

CHRISTOPHER: Several majors have major coursework in the first two years, with gen ed taken over all four years. We need to work closer programmatically between campuses. Develop common core agreements in business, sciences, premed, pre-dental, chem., math, biology. The general education transfer module is limiting.

GREEN: Communication is critical. The intent is not to say, ‘when you finish this general ed core you can leave.’ The hope is to say that you can take these to any institutions and they will transfer, but you can and need to continue to take other courses throughout all 4 years (in CC or OUS) that will apply to the school/major you would like to take.

TURNER: We should think of coursework as fitting in one of four boxes: major, minor, general ed, and electives. Gen Ed is covered by transfer module. The major and minor have their own structure and coursework.

Communication Comments:

JOHNSON: We need to provide a report to the outside world that shows the number of students this applies to. This would be helpful for legislature.

SCHUETTE: Agreed. There is much legislative interest in this topic. How can we characterize what we have accomplished and what we have yet to accomplish in a way that is easy to understand and support.

SAUNDERS: Will the general public understand the name “General Education Transfer Module”? Do we want to move to an acronym that public will understand?


SCHUETTE: Lets think about it and bring back ideas.

Competency Comments:

SCHUETTE: Work on stronger general ed common core that relates to student competency. Look at where we are and create something in timely fashion that helps students early on while we continue longer work on student competencies, which is critical.

SPRAGUE: We need a simple way to measure student competencies. How do you measure whether students have learned how to think? Look at other states (North Carolina and Michigan).

TURNER: Idea for cost effective way to determine competencies: Have a course (e.g. biology) which would act as gatekeeper course with elements built in to determine if student had necessary skills in statistics, writing skills, etc to proceed. If the student does not have the skills regardless of where he came from he must go back and take those classes.

SPRAGUE: Pilot programs in other states believe they can measure competencies by building them into courses in this way.