

**PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING THE POLICY  
ON  
ARTICULATION AND TRANSFER**

Introduction

Based on issues that have emerged relating to the implementation of the 1990 Articulation and Transfer Policy, at its meeting on June 21, 1991, the Articulation and Transfer Council formed a Subcommittee to develop a process whereby the Policy might be amended. The Subcommittee met on August 30, 1991. It adopted three fundamental assumptions:

- I. Written proposals to amend the policy must emanate from one of the following sources:
  1. The Council itself
  2. Any of the standing committees that were formed by and report to the Council
  3. The Board of Regents
  4. An individual institution
  
- II. Proposals to amend the Policy must adhere to a hierarchical structure of evaluation, with no individual level having veto authority.
  
- III. Ultimately, formal amendments to the Policy will be made by the Articulation and Transfer Council for consideration and action by the Board of Regents.

Structure for the Amendment Process

1. Consideration will be given to written proposals to amend the Policy which emanate from one of the following sources: the Council itself, any of the standing subcommittees which report to the Council, the Board of Regents, or an individual institution. A proposal will be "routed" to the appropriate group for consideration.
  
2. A hierarchical procedure for evaluation will be followed. From each group that evaluates the issue or proposal, a recommendation, accompanied by a rationale and the outcome of a formal vote, will be referred to the next higher level, regardless of the outcome of the vote, until a final recommendation is made by the Council.
  
3. Once a proposal reaches the Council, it may be acted upon directly by the Council or be given to a Standing Amendment Subcommittee composed of three members of the current Articulation and Transfer Council and at least one member of each of the Articulation and Transfer Council's standing Subcommittees.
  
4. Within the Council, a formal vote will be taken (see detailed process issues below) on all proposals that have been brought to it, and the results will be conveyed to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents for deliberation and final action.

## Detailed Process Issues

The Amendment Subcommittee recommends the following with regard to the evaluation process for amendments.

1. Given the need for a full deliberation of issues relating to implementation and the need to have all members of all groups participating in the deliberation, it should be made clear to those who are asked to serve on the Council and Standing Committees that attendance at meetings is mandatory. An alternate may be sent to a meeting, but

- a) the alternate member cannot be counted as part of the quorum; and
- b) individuals will not have voting privileges.

2. Within the Council

- a) proposed amendments (from whatever source) must be presented to the Council with a full rationale, and with the result of the formal vote on the proposal from all lower levels in the hierarchical evaluation process. The vote by the Council will not occur until the meeting following the one where the proposal is presented. In this way Council members are given more time to evaluate the proposal, personally, and to consult with others on their campuses, before voting.
- b) before the Council may vote on a proposed amendment, there must be a 2/3 quorum in attendance and recorded.
- c) the proposal will be sent to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents with the Council's formal vote on the proposal recorded.