Overview/Background: The Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) was created 30 years ago to address issues of transfer and articulation among Ohio’s 36 two- and four-year public institutions, particularly with respect to the General Education curriculum. The major objective of the OTM is to provide students the assurance that the courses they take can be used towards their degree at the transfer destination. The OTM is comprised of five different subject areas: 1) English Composition and Oral Communication, 2) Mathematics, Statistics and Logic, 3) Arts and Humanities, 4) Social and Behavioral Sciences, and 5) Natural Sciences. Each of these areas has a corresponding faculty panel that oversees approval of new courses, and that more recently has also been working on identifying learning outcomes for courses in their area. The 5 panels meet together, formally, twice each academic year.

Recently there has been growing interest, within the OTM panels and beyond, in the need to rethink the OTM and assess whether it meets the current needs of Ohio college/university students and faculty, because:

- There has been no major revision in thirty years;
- There is a new generation of faculty whose ideas about the purpose and structure of a general education curriculum need to be identified and addressed, and related to that;
- Several four-year institutions have recently revised their general education curriculum or are in the process of doing so, in a way that does not directly align with the current OTM.

Process: In autumn 2019 the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) General Education Steering committee, comprised primarily of academic administrators and faculty representing both the four year and two year sectors, created a small working group charged with revising the OTM. This group, led by Associate Vice Chancellor/Executive Director, ODHE, Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN) Paula Compton, included Carl Brun (Associate Vice Provost, Wright State University), Allysen Todd (Dean of Arts and Sciences, Columbus State Community College), Andrew Martin (Associate Vice Provost, Ohio State University), Michael Snider (Chief Academic Officer, Ohio Association of Community Colleges), and Candice Grant (Senior Director of Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways, OATN), Jared Shank (Senior Director of Military and Apprenticeship Initiatives and Special Projects, OATN), Jessi Spencer (Director of OATN Policy, Budget, and Constituent Relations, OATN), and Cathy Chudzinski (ODHE/OATN consultant), met twice in Autumn 2019, and developed a proposal for a new OTM model. In spring 2020 the group presented the model to the five faculty who lead the OTM panels. Based on that input, the working group revised the model and returned to the OTM panel lead group and received endorsement and got a similar outcome in April 2020 from the full membership of the OTM panels. In May 2020 the model was discussed by and received endorsement from the Chief Academic Officers of the public two-year institutions. In June 2020 the model was presented to the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network Oversight board, which supported moving forward. Finally, in July 2020 the model was discussed, with general support provided, by representatives from the Provosts’ offices of the four-year institutions.
**Objective:**

The revised OTM should meet the following goals.

- Be characterized by “flexibility with certainty”. This is to allow the student to choose different paths through the OTM based on their own unique situation, at the same time assuring the student that those credits will transfer to their destination institution.
- Acknowledge/address the importance of providing guidance to students based on their academic aspirations and career goals - develop an OTM better tailored to the goals of each individual student. This helps ensure that when a student transfers from a two-year to a four-year institution they will be on the same path as their peers who began at that institution, ensuring timely progress to degree.
- Ensure that while the revised OTM has clear recommendations for students based on their major or area of interest, it is not prescriptive; students still are able to develop their own plan of study.

**Description of the Proposed Model:**

The proposed OTM can be divided into two main components:

- the foundational 24 hours distributed among the established five categories; and
- an additional 12 “elective” hours.

The 24 hours remain intact. The additional 12 hours could be used to achieve the goals outlined above and two groups of students are identified.

For students who have already declared a specific major - given the substantial work that has been done around the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways (OGTP) to help students complete major and pre-major courses – they should use these additional 12 hours to begin work in the OGTP of their major.

For students who are undecided, two routes are proposed. For those pursuing an Associate of Science (A) degree, populate the 12 additional hours with STEM OTM- approved courses that might have broad applicability across different Bachelor of Science majors. For those pursuing an Associate of Arts degree, and recognizing that there is considerably more diversity with respect to Bachelor of Arts degree programs, students considering a social science major may draw from OTM courses in the social sciences, a student considering a humanities major may draw from OTM courses in the humanities, with a similar approach for students in the performing arts. OTM panels have already begun to identify courses to recommend to students in these different pathways. While the AS pathway is more straightforward, the workgroup believes that specific pathways for AA students can be identified as well.

Additionally, for students unsure of what pathway to take, the committee recommended that a second writing course be considered as part of the 12 additional hours. Moreover, there is ongoing discussion at the state-level to have a diversity requirement that could be included in the 12 hours as well.