

Transfer Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Friday, May, 30, 2013
UNC General Administration-Executive Board Room
Chapel Hill, NC

Attendees: Anthony Britt, Rick Swanson, Thomas Gould, David English, Precious Vines, Tenita Philyaw-Rogers, Wesley Beddard, Lisa Chapman, Marcia Conston, Pamela Hilbert, Ken Gurganus, Lou Ellen Riggans, Karrie Dixon, Jami Woods

TAC convened at 9:39 a.m.

Introductions

Co-chair Ken Gurganus welcomed everyone and gave logistical information about the agenda.

Formal Approval of the Minutes-March 22, 2013

Ken Gurganus asked for approval of the minutes of the March 22, 2013, meeting. (Refer to TAC Meeting Minutes-032213). A formal vote was held, and hearing no corrections, co-chair Gurganus made a motion that the minutes be approved as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Role of TAC

Co-chair Marcia Conston asked for a formal review of the role of the TAC, as charged by Dr. Morrissey in the last meeting. The committee reviewed the previous minutes, and a discussion was held (Refer to TAC Meeting Minutes-032213). The fundamental relationship of the TAC should not change, and there should be continual assessment of the CAA. There was discussion on the TAC having the responsibility to view what should be in the CAA, in regards to policies.

Next Meeting Logistics

The next meeting date would be on July 17, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. at Central Piedmont Community College-Central Campus, in Charlotte, NC. This will be a working meeting regarding the CAA policy and procedure revisions.

In regards to the current timeline, Wesley stated that the drafts of the new CAA revisions should go to the colleges before Thanksgiving. The UNC Board of Governors should have the drafts of the CAA in January with voting in February. Karrie Dixon stated that an early fall draft of the CAA would be most ideal due to needing the information for vetting.

CTPA Meeting Update/Grievances to TAC

The TAC representatives, Thomas Gould and Ken Gurganus, presented at the CTPA meeting, on April 19, 2013, at Wake Tech Community College-Main Campus. They both gave updates on the personnel changes and updates to the current revisions taking place with the CAA. In addition, the Math CIP gave an update on the math course changes. Dr. Lisa Chapman also gave an update on the CAA revisions proposed by the CAA Review Steering Committee.

Overall, concerns from the attendees involved all the changes with the courses, future course availability, and how faculty workload may be affected by these changes. There was discussion of how

everyone could work together regarding the CAA changes and how the purpose of the revision is to facilitate effective and efficient student transfer.

Moratorium on CAA Course Requests

Wesley Beddard reviewed the policy regarding how course revisions proceed to the Curriculum Review Committee. He would like to ask for the TAC to vote as to whether there should be a moratorium on new courses being reviewed for implementation in the CAA. He also discussed the need for a review for the current courses in the CAA and their relevance to the new revisions of the CAA.

A motion was made by co-chair Ken Gurganus for a moratorium on the review of new courses for implementation in the CAA. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Update on Work on the CAA Review Team

Wesley gave an updated handout of the proposed CAA Revision/Transfer Articulation “Block Model”. Dr. Lisa Chapman gave a review of the CAA Review Steering Committee work on revision with the CAA and what has transpired in the past few months. The models have slightly changed overtime, as discussions have evolved. There was discussion regarding faculty concerns and how the CAA would be managed in the future.

Tenita Philyaw-Rogers gave an update of the courses reviewed and the additional courses that will be revisited for potential transfer. There was discussion regarding the impact that this may have on current college/university faculty. The committee discussed how it will use the drafts as a guide in revising the policies and procedures in the CAA.

Dr. Chapman stated that there were original four pathways, and now we are looking at two pathways, the AA and AS. There was discussion of a thirty-hour component that is common regardless of what community college and/or university a student is coming from. Additional discussion was held regarding the requirement of completing the “common core” before transfer to the university. With the new revisions, there is a proposed policy regarding the “guarantees” of acceptance of the common credit hours, as outlined in number three of the proposed transfer policies (Refer to CAA Proposed Policies).

Dr. Chapman stated that there are concerns regarding guaranteeing 44 credit hours versus 30 credit hours. Therefore, additional general education courses will be reviewed to add to the common 30 credit hours agreed upon at the discipline team meetings. There was discussion regarding how to proceed to gain feedback of general education courses that may be included in those additional 15 credit hours. The question was asked if there is a “revisiting” of the current standard being used.

There was additional discussion regarding the policy number 6, how many universities are currently using the 44-credit hour core and the “cons” regarding the policy guaranteeing the fulfillment of the lower general education requirements (Refer to CAA Proposed Policies). There was the question of the timeline of reviewing the additional 15 credit hours for potential inclusion in the pre-majors.

The committee discussed that it should review the policy guarantees in number 6 under the proposed transfer policies (Refer to CAA Proposed Policies). Dr. Chapman stated the CAA Review Steering committee’s role is to set up the courses in the CAA revision, and the TAC states the particular mandates in the policies, including the updates with communication, (i.e. Transfer Navigator). Therefore, the TAC

would ultimately take a more active role in the maintenance of the CAA and the policies that are being followed after it is revised.

There will be additional revision of the drafts of the AA and AS, including the discussions regarding additional courses that may be included in the common general education courses proposed. Tenita stated that this summer, there will be meetings with certain discipline chairs, and the pre-major courses that they may require in the additional 15 credit hours being proposed.

There was general discussion on how these revisions could be potentially streamlined better, while adhering to the current timeline needed for all revisions being proposed. The committee talked about the foreign language requirement and how it would be structured in the new drafts. There was the question regarding if the universities should specify what their general education requirements are. An additional question was whether the Academic Transition course (ACA 122) would be a part of the common 30 credit hours.

Wesley stated that ACA 122 may be revisited this summer by a committee in regards to college courses needed for their college of choice and transfer student success learning outcomes geared toward transitioning to a university. There was discussion of whether to include in the language that the university a student transfers to may require an additional “academic transition” course.

Dr. Chapman proposed that courses should potentially come through the TAC versus the CRC first to avoid courses that may not be utilized by the universities. There was discussion of how the revisions will proceed through administration and/or boards. In addition, the committee talked about how the review of courses and policies would go forward, including the following: how the committee will proceed with the pending matters that have required action to be taken, and the status of such action from the committee to be disseminated to all necessary parties. Tenita Philyaw-Rogers stated that the Office of Transfer Articulation could be responsible for ensuring the dissemination of curriculum revisions and other changes.

There was discussion regarding Transfer Navigator, as it is a priority. Karrie Dixon stated that there may be funding for this online tool through the CACG and also a no-cost extension request that potentially will fund Transfer Navigator until the spring of 2014. There will be a request through the legislature for state funding for Transfer Navigator. There is a potential meeting that will take place on strategies on how to improve Transfer Navigator capabilities, to a more robust system that will be utilized more in the future.

Revision of CAA Document

The committee discussed all proposed language revisions of the CAA. These proposed changes are reflected in the working draft of the CAA policy changes, as outlined by the committee, for continued review at the next meeting in June.

Thomas Gould will continue to review and revise the working draft and send potential revisions for review to the committee. The committee was asked to review the CAA to see what would benefit students the most during the CAA revision process. Tenita stated that her office will work on best practices for the overall revised CAA. There was discussion of periodic review of the general education courses.

There was the discussion of whether to add in language of potential oversight by the committee. Any additional thoughts of revisions should be emailed to Thomas.

Having no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m..