

Transfer Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College
Asheville, North Carolina
June 13, 2011 9:30 a.m.

Attendance

NCCCS: Dennis King, Van Wilson, Rick Swanson, Thomas Gould

UNC: David English, Ken Gurganus, Lou Riggans, Anthony Britt

Guest: Diane Lodder

1. Minutes from the Meeting of March 21, 2011

Dennis King passed out the minutes from the March 21, 2011 meeting, and the committee reviewed them. The committee made a number of changes, expansions, and clarifications to the minutes. The motion was made by David English and seconded by Ken Gurganus to approve the minutes as amended. The vote was unanimous. A new copy of the minutes will be available shortly.

2. College Transfer Pathway Certificates (CTP)

Rick Swanson presented a copy of the CAA which had been modified to include the College Transfer Pathway Certificate. Modifications needed to be made throughout the CAA to make it consistent with and accepting of the proposed CTP. There was a great deal of discussion. The principle concern was whether the matter had been properly vetted through the faculties of the UNC institutions. An ancillary concern was whether the CTP would be granting more assurances to the transferring student than were initially intended in the Articulation Agreement. Rick Swanson offered assurances that this project was undertaken in response to Dr. Morrissey's request and that no actual changes to the Articulation Agreement are being implemented at this time. In reality, the document he has created simply shows how a CTP can fit into the Articulation Agreement. After much discussion, the following motion was passed (6 in favor, 2 opposed) as made by Rick Swanson and seconded by Tom Gould: In response to Dr. Sharon Morrissey's request of March 21, 2011, the Transfer Advisory Committee provides potential changes to the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement which would incorporate a college transfer pathway certificate of 30 credit hours. This response does not imply endorsement of the certificate at this time. Lou Riggans and Ken Gurganus voted in opposition to the motion.

3. Admissions Process for Students with College Credit

For approximately three years now, the Transfer Advisory Committee has undertaken discussion of the admission status of early college high school graduates who transfer to UNC institutions. While their status is not covered under the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement, this issue nevertheless was of concern to the Transfer Advisory Committee and early colleges. Throughout the years, clarification has been sought and received, and it became the general consensus of the Transfer Advisory Committee that this issue has been satisfactorily dealt with and is therefore being removed from subsequent agendas.

4. Periodic Review of Institutional Response to the CAA

Ken Gurganus provided a report concerning the project which he has undertaken for a periodic review of institutional responses to the CAA. Specifically, the question is: How well are the UNC institutions implementing the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement? Ken presented proposed revisions to the present wording of the Agreement which would incorporate a procedure for review of four institutions annually. The evaluation would be a self evaluation done at the request of the chief academic officer of the UNC system as well as an analysis done by one community college and one UNC member of the

Transfer Advisory Committee. The results of these evaluations would be shared with the CAO of the UNC system as well as the CAO of the institutions being evaluated. Ken provided a rubric for the analysis as well as a review worksheet on a hypothetical evaluation of one institution. The Transfer Advisory Committee recommended that Ken take his work to Dr. Bruce Mallette at the UNC General Administration office and show him the proposal. Ken would seek guidance concerning the potential implementation of such a periodic review.

Dennis King noted that Ken Gurganus is scheduled to rotate off of the Transfer Advisory Committee momentarily, and he has not been notified of reappointment at this time. Dennis King therefore asked Ken Gurganus if he would remain with the project until it is completed. This would be the case even if Ken were rotating off of the Transfer Advisory Committee. Ken willingly accepted this assignment. No motions were presented.

5. Survey of Transfer Students and Community College Advisors Pertaining to Utility of the CAA

Dennis King asked CTPA representative, Diane Lodder, for an update concerning the questionnaire which had been proposed for members of CTPA regarding the effective utility of the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement. An earlier version of this questionnaire failed to yield satisfactory results. Diane Lodder reported that since her role as CTPA President is a new one, she could not provide any information regarding this survey. Dennis King then noted that the survey appears to be attempting to ascertain the same information as Ken Gurganus' project regarding a review of institutional response to the CAA. While the Transfer Advisory Committee agreed as a whole, it was noted that the questionnaire was intended to seek from transferring students and advisors the actual effectiveness of the Articulation Agreement and the Gurganus project was intended to learn from the institutions how they perceived they were implementing the project: two different focuses for the same information being sought.

It was noted that at the March 21 meeting of the TAC, Dr. Mallette suggested that there may be grant funds available to undertake a survey of CAA users, both transfer students and advisors. The following motion was therefore made by David English and seconded by Rick Swanson and passed unanimously: The TAC requests that the UNC GA review to determine whether grant funds are available to support a survey of community college transfer students and their community college advisors regarding the effectiveness of the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement as recommended by Dr. Bruce Mallette on March 21, 2011.

6. Status of CIS 110 as a Mathematics Course Within the General Education Core

At the March 21, 2011 meeting of the TAC, Tom Gould was asked to investigate the appropriateness of CIS 110 being used as a general education course. Tom reported that he has had discussion with a number of individuals regarding the appropriateness of this course being used to meet the six credit hour mathematics requirement of the general education core. Consensus is that the course is only marginally appropriate for use as a mathematics course; however, a number of schools embrace it as a way to help math-challenged individuals through the curriculum. Tom took the position that the use of this course for general education should be a local decision made by the various community colleges. Small schools may find it necessary to offer the course because higher level mathematics courses would not attain the critical mass necessary for instruction, whereas this popular computer course will always have sufficient registrations to ensure its viability. Dennis King noted that it is within the local authority to require higher level courses within the general education core than the Agreement requires. For example, some institutions require MAT 161 as the lowest level math to earn their degree even though the Articulation Agreement allows MAT 140 to be used. The consensus of the Transfer Advisory Committee concurred with the recommendation of Tom Gould that the decision regarding the use of CIS

110 as a general education class therefore is up to the local community college, and no change to the Articulation Agreement should be made at this time.

7. Availability of Sophomore Level Pre-Major Courses at Community Colleges

This issue has been raised a number of times in the past, and deals with the difficulty that many students have getting certain sophomore level courses which are part of the pre-major at their local community college. Dennis King used the example of brief calculus which is part of the pre-major in business administration, a very popular pre-major, which many schools have difficulty offering because of the critical mass needed to teach it. There were other examples offered by other individuals. Discussion revolved around two ways to deal with this problem: one would be to facilitate consortia arrangements among community colleges so that the courses could be offered online or through the information highway from one institution. A second and more difficult possibility would be to allow community college students to register as visiting students during the summer, taking these courses at a local university. After a lengthy discussion, it was suggested that Van Wilson investigate the first of the two options, offering the courses through a consortium of community colleges using either distance or the information highway. Van Wilson agreed to investigate this possibility and to report back at the next meeting. As a result of this discussion, the following motion was made by Rick Swanson, seconded by Ken Gurganus, and passed unanimously: that the TAC encourage and support efforts to make sophomore-level majors courses more readily available to community college students as part of a broader effort to improve the usefulness and effectiveness of pre-majors.

8. September Meeting

Dennis King asked Tom Gould to host the next meeting at Durham Technical Community College, and he agreed. David English then suggested that perhaps the meeting ought to be held at UNC GA in order that the chief academic officer of the university system can be given the opportunity to address the Transfer Advisory Committee. It was agreed that the meeting would be held on September 23 at UNC GA, assuming that space is available. If space is not available, then Tom Gould will host at Durham Technical Community College.

9. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.