pennsylvania
TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION CENTER

TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Meeting Notes

August 18, 2011
10:00 AM - 12:30 PM
Dixon University Center
Harrisburg, PA   17110-1201
Remote Locations: CC of Beaver County, IUP, Bucks CCC
Conference Line: 717-705-0091

1. **Roll Call**

2. **Updates and Announcements – See August 2011 Updates**
   a. Jill Hans Named Deputy Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary/Higher Education at PDE.
   b. New primary members appointed to TAOC.
   c. No change to fall meeting schedule.
   d. Transfer language expanding participation by state-related institutions and providing for statewide program-to-program articulation has been added to Public School Code of 1949.
   e. Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 transfer data collections complete.

3. **Spring 2011 PACs**
   a. TAOC-approved program articulation agreements will be available on PA TRAC as of Monday, August. 22.
   b. Criminal Justice PAC – Meet in Harrisburg on Sept. 16 to work on agreement returned by TAOC in June
   c. Communication Studies PAC – Meet in Harrisburg on Sept. 16 to kick-off work with new focus
   d. 4-8 Teacher Education PAC – Draft agreement posted for comment from Sept. 12-30th

4. **Fall 2011 PACs**
   a. Miranda Grove, a graduate student from Bloomsburg University, will be offering administrative support to the PACs during the fall semester.
   b. Sector appointments for twelve new PACs due to PDE by September 2
   c. Primary TAOC members needed to serve on the following PACs:
      • Geography
      • Music
      • Drama/Theatre
      • Modern Languages
      • Environmental Science

5. ACTION ITEM: <u>Recommended</u> policy for revising agreements *after TAOC approval*

Proposal: At the June 16 meeting TAOC asked the Steering Committee to review the proposed policy below and make a recommendation to the full committee in August.

<u>Once a statewide program-to-program articulation agreement has been adopted by TAOC, no amendments to the agreement can be offered by any party within the initial six (6) months of the agreement. After that time, amendments that are offered as clarifying or technical but do not alter the substantive portions or intent of the agreement will be considered by TAOC at a regular meeting and with sufficient time in advance for review and comment. Amendments that seek to alter the substantive nature or intent of the agreement in any part, must be submitted through PDE to the original PAC for review and consideration. The PAC will then make a recommendation to the TAOC and TAOC shall approve or deny the proposed amendments.</u>

TAOC Steering Committee Recommendation: The TAOC Steering Committee recommends the following policy for amending an approved statewide articulation agreement.

<u>*Once a statewide program-to-program articulation agreement has been approved by TAOC, no amendments to the agreement can be offered by any party within the initial six (6) months of the agreement. After that time, a TAOC member with a proposed amendment to an approved agreement should submit the change to PDE.*</u>

<u>*Amendments that are offered as clarifying or technical but do not alter the substantive portions or intent of the agreement must be forwarded to TAOC. TAOC representatives will have at least thirty (30) days to review, comment and approve or deny the proposed amendments.*</u>

<u>*Amendments that seek to alter the substantive nature or intent of the agreement in any part must be forwarded to the appropriate PAC for review and consideration. The PAC will then make a recommendation to the TAOC, and TAOC shall approve or deny the proposed amendments.*</u>

Comments:
- It's important to maintain quality discussion within an effective timeframe.
- "Clarifying or technical" was defined as a typographical error, missed word, etc., or a wording change suggested to assist institutions with implementing the agreement in a way that is consistent with the intent of the agreement.
- "Substantive nature" was basically defined as a change that impacts the academic requirements of the agreement and as a result would require institutions to re-examine, and potentially modify, the articulated associate degree and/or parallel bachelor degree.
- "Appropriate PAC" does not necessarily refer to the original PAC or PAC members. TAOC will define the "appropriate PAC" and PAC members based upon the type of amendment being proposed and the agreement(s) the amendment would affect.
- It is expected that PACs would disband after their agreements are approved by TAOC. TAOC reserves the right to call upon PAC members after approval for the sake of clarification or guidance, but again, that is at TAOC's discretion.
- TAOC does not need to meet in person to "review, comment and approve or deny…" amendments. TAOC reps. could complete this process by email in 30 days.
- TAOC can reconsider the policy if the committee finds that it is not effective.

Decision: Policy approved.

6. **ACTION ITEM: Recommended policy for revising agreements *after implementation***

   Proposal: At the June 16 meeting TAOC asked the Steering Committee to review the proposed policy below and make a recommendation to the full committee in August.
   No less than two years after a statewide program-to-program articulation agreement has been implemented by the institutions, TAOC will convene a PAC, consisting of faculty, staff and personnel, to review the agreement. The PAC will then make recommendations to TAOC and TAOC shall approve or deny the proposed amendments.

   If a TAOC member has a proposed revision *before* the PAC convenes, s/he may submit a written change request to PDE no less than 30 days prior to a full TAOC meeting. TAOC will then consider the request at the meeting and either approve or forward the change to a designated subcommittee for consideration.

   TAOC Steering Committee Recommendation:
   The TAOC Steering Committee recommends:
   - Reviewing statewide articulation agreements every five years after the agreement effective date.
   - Postpone developing a process for reviewing agreements until after all of the agreements have been created and approved and information about similar processes in other states can be reviewed.

   Comments:
   - It's important to maintain quality discussion within an effective timeframe.
   - Would the "PAC" referenced above consist of members of the original PAC that developed the agreement or would TAOC assign new members? TAOC would make this decision at the time of the review. PAC members could retire or leave the institution and not be available to serve on the PAC at a later date.
   - "Subcommittee" is a general term used by TAOC to identify a group of individuals who are working on a common charge/specific task. A PAC is considered to be a subcommittee of TAOC.
   - Will there be a form for submitting agreement revisions or would TAOC members simply send a letter/email to PDE? Not sure.
   - Approval and rejection will be based on a majority vote by TAOC members.

   Decision: Policy approved with the condition that a written process for submitting and voting on amendments will be developed as soon as possible.

7. **ACTION ITEM: Recommended statement concerning external accreditation/certification and development statewide articulation agreements.**

   Steering Committee Recommendation to TAOC: So as not to limit a PAC's use of various resources when developing an agreement, the TAOC Steering Committee advised against an official policy concerning external accreditation and certification and instead recommended PDE address the issue with PAC members during the kick-off meeting information session.

   The following information will also be provided to PAC members in the PAC Toolkit:
   When developing a statewide program-to-program articulation agreement, the Program Articulation Committee is advised to consider requirements of external accreditation and certification organization(s). The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) recognizes accrediting organizations in many disciplines. For more information visit www.chea.org.

   Decision: Approved

8. **ACTION ITEM: Recommended change to TAOC approval process of statewide articulation**
    TAOC approved ten new articulation agreements as of June 10. At the June 16th meeting PDE provided TAOC with the approved agreements, voting results and comments submitted by TAOC representatives at the time of the vote. TAOC decided at this same meeting that the articulation agreements should not include GPA requirements or any language contradicting policies set forth in the General Statewide Articulation Agreement. TAOC asked PDE to return the agreements to the PACs and ask them to 1) address remarks from the TAOC members and 2) remove language that covered by the General Agreement. The PACs have been responsive to TAOC's request. However, some have made substantial changes to the documents. TAOC does not have a process for reviewing the agreements after such changes are made.

    Steering Committee Recommendation:
    The TAOC Steering Committee recommends the TAOC approval process for statewide program-to-program articulation agreements be revised as follows:
    1. PAC Kick-Off Meetings.
    2. PAC elects co-chairs and submits names to PDE.
    3. PAC develops a project timeline that includes the project milestones and final deliverables and submit to PDE.
    4. PAC submits a draft articulation agreement to PDE.
    5. PAC submits an interim report to PDE, describing progress made, <u>challenges identified</u>, milestones achieved and next steps.
    6. PDE post the PAC's draft agreement on the PA TRAC website for feedback.
    7. PDE solicits feedback from TAOC institutions <u>and TAOC representatives on the draft articulation agreement.</u>
    8. PAC submits a final articulation agreement to PDE ~~for TAOC approval~~.
    9. TAOC reviews the agreement and ~~either approves or~~ returns it to PDE <u>with comments within one (1) week of receiving the agreement.</u>
    10. <u>PDE forwards TAOC's comments to the PAC for consideration.</u>
    11. <u>PAC submits the final agreement to PDE for TAOC approval.</u>
    12. <u>TAOC votes to approve the agreement. Approved agreements are posted on PA TRAC. Rejected agreements are returned to the PAC with specific guidance from TAOC and PDE.</u>
    13. PAC obtains final approval of the statewide articulation agreements from the full TAOC.

    Decision: Approved with the following underlined changes:
    1. PAC Kick-Off Meetings.
    2. PAC elects co-chairs and submits names to PDE.
    3. PAC develops a project timeline that includes the project milestones and final deliverables and submit to PDE.
    4. PAC submits a draft articulation agreement to PDE.
    5. PAC submits an interim report to PDE, describing progress made, challenges identified, milestones achieved and next steps.
    6. PDE post the PAC's draft agreement on the PA TRAC website for feedback.
    7. PDE solicits feedback from TAOC institutions and TAOC representatives on the draft articulation agreement.
    8. PAC submits a <u>revised draft</u> articulation agreement to PDE.
    9. TAOC reviews the agreement and returns it to PDE with comments within one (1) week of receiving the agreement.
    10. PDE forwards TAOC's comments to the PAC for consideration.
    11. PAC submits the final <u>draft</u> agreement to PDE for <u>discussion at a TAOC meeting</u>.
    12. TAOC votes to approve <u>or reject</u> the agreement. Approved agreements are posted on PA TRAC. Rejected agreements are returned to the PAC with specific guidance from TAOC and PDE.
    13. PAC obtains final approval of the statewide articulation agreements from the full TAOC.

9. DISCUSSION ITEM: Issues Related to 30-Credit Transfer Framework
   a. The Framework as it relates to associate degree programs
      - Should the Framework be included in every AA or AS degree offered by a participating institution?
   b. The Framework as it relates to statewide program-to-program articulation
      - Is the Framework needed now that we have statewide program-to-program articulation?
      - How does the Framework fit into statewide P2P articulation?
   c. Expanding the Framework
      - How are course titles added to the categories?
      - Who is responsible for deciding if a new course title is included in a Framework category? Is the decision made by the appropriate subcommittee based upon the established equivalency standards? Or does TAOC need to review and approve new course titles? In March, the Social/Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee submitted three proposals for new course titles. A decision was never made concerning the request.
      - How should the Framework be maintained in light of statewide articulation? Should the category standards be redeveloped based on competencies?
      - What is the process for expanding the Framework? In June, TAOC was presented with the following proposal: "Changes to the Framework will be considered by TAOC in October of each year. Any TAOC member may propose a change by submitting a written request to PDE no less than 30 days before the October TAOC meeting. TAOC will then either approve or forward the proposal to a designated subcommittee for recommendation. All changes must be decided by TAOC no later than December 15. The revised Framework shall be effective no later than start of the following fall semester."
   d. Assessing the Framework
      - How do we know institutions are honoring the Framework?
      - Do students and advisors know about the Framework? Are they using it?
      - Should the Framework standards be reviewed and revised? If so, what is that process?

Comments:
   - The framework is not a requirement. It's an option.
   - The Framework is not a blanket guarantee if students are swirling the system.
   - We need to link the Framework to general education. All of us have at least one course in each category in our programs under Gen Ed. It would be helpful to students to have some commonality as part of general education.
   - It's important that we don't treat transfer student different from native students. In keeping with that thought, we need to do right by the student as best as possible.
   - Data is needed to assess the value/success of the system – are students using it? Are institutions honoring it? How many students are taking more than 30 cr. in the Framework? Which institutions are accepting more than 30 credits and which are accepting less?
   - Clarification may be needed at the course level. Should there be specific Framework selections for certain majors?
   - We tell students that the Framework transfers into nearly all degree programs. But how can that be true under statewide articulation if the Framework isn't part of every AA/AS and parallel bachelor degree?
   - The Framework needs to be included in every degree program in order for it to work.
   - The Framework doesn't need to be included in all degree programs.
   - The Framework is intended for students w/o a major and/or transfer institution. Statewide program articulation is designed for students pursuing a designated program of study.
   - The Framework is a risk unless students work with an advisor and understand its intent, benefits, limitations, etc.
   - Statewide articulation doesn't negate the Framework. The Framework is still in effect as an advising tool because it has a unique purpose. However, if a student earns an articulated associated degree, then that's the status quo.

- Is the Framework even needed? Yes, because 1) it's the way all TAOC institutions, including the state-relateds, meet the legislative 30-credit requirement and 2) it's an effective advising tool for students without a major or transfer institution.

   Decision: Referred to TAOC Steering Committee for further consideration.

10. New Business

11. Next meeting: Thursday, September 22, 2011 – Harrisburg, IUP, Beaver, MontCo
   - September meeting might be canceled to allow the TAOC Steering Committee to meet.
   - PDE will email TAOC members to confirm.

Attendees:

Name	Institution	Location
Barbara Ford	Bucks County CC	Bucks
Judith Gay	Community College of Philadelphia	Bucks
Grant Snyder	Delaware County Community College	Bucks
Virginia Carter	Delaware County Community College	Bucks
Emily Wagner	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Bucks
Richard Laughner	Butler County Community College	CCBC
Jean Berkeley	Carlow University	CCBC
Mary Frances Archey	Community College of Allegheny County	CCBC
Frances Dice	Community College of Allegheny County	CCBC
Melissa Denardo	Community College of Beaver County	CCBC
Robert Wright	Westmoreland County Community College	CCBC
Johnathan Lincoln	Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	DUC
Yun Kim	East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	DUC
Cindy Doherty	Harrisburg Area Community College	DUC
Carlos Vargas-Aburto	Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	DUC
Jill Murray	Lackawanna College	DUC
Virginia Mihalik	Lehigh Carbon Community College	DUC
Jill Mitchley	Lock Haven University	DUC
Dana Clark	Luzerne County Community College	DUC
Libby Yeager	Luzerne County Community College	DUC
Robert Smith	Millersville University of Pennsylvania	DUC
Cathy Schwab	Penn State University	DUC
Thomas Gregory	Pennsylvania College of Technology	DUC
Diane Bosak	Pennsylvania Commission for Community Colleges	DUC
Jill Hans	Pennsylvania Department of Education	DUC
Julie Kane	Pennsylvania Department of Education	DUC
Kathleen Howley	Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education	DUC
Wade Davenport	Reading Area Community College	DUC
Barbara Lyman	Shippensburg University	DUC
William Williams	Slippery Rock University	DUC
Joseph H. Santivasci	West Chester University	DUC
Inno Onwueme	Indiana University of PA	IUP
Bill Sands	IUP	IUP
Ted Nichols	Pennsylvania Highlands Community College	IUP
Pete Skoner	Saint Francis University	IUP
Juan Manfredi	University of Pittsburgh	IUP
Ivan Banks	Cheyney University of Pennsylvania	Phone
Jason Gasper-Hulvat	Temple University	Phone
Terri Greene	California University	CCBC