Ohio | Department of Higher Education

John R. Kasich, Governor
John Carey, Chancellor

The Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN)
Ohio Guaranteed Transfer pathway Steering Committee
Wednesday February 28, 2018
10:00 am to 2:00 p.m.
25 S. Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215
Basement Boardroom B-004

Present: John Fischer, Robbin Hoopes, Terry Filicko, Jack Cooley, Cindy McQuade, Marcia Ballinger, Jack Hershey, Mike Snider, Laura Rittner, Cody Loew, Randy Smith, Howard Dewald, Steve Robinson, Rick Kurtz, Donnie McGovern, Mark Nutter, Carl Brun, Dan Krane, Lawrence Johnson

ODHE/OATN Staff: Stephanie Davidson, Paula Compton, Candice Grant, Jessi Spencer, Katie Dean

I. **Welcome & Introductions**
Dr. Marcia Ballinger, President of Lorain County Community College, and Dr. Rick Kurtz, President of Shawnee State University, welcomed the attendees of the meeting and asked that members introduce themselves. Dr. Ballinger introduced and thanked Dr. Candice Grant, Director of the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Program (OGTP), for her work leading the faculty clusters, noting specifically the progress made on implementing the business cluster.

II. **General Update on Faculty Cluster Work**
Dr. Grant informed attendees that all three phases of their cluster plan had been implemented, and that they were currently implementing two new clusters: Public Safety and Health Sciences. Public Safety includes the sub-clusters: Criminal Justice, Emergency Medical Services, and Fire Science. Health Sciences includes the sub-clusters: Clinical/Medical Laboratory Science, Dietetics, Health Information Management, and Nursing. However, the Health Information Management programs are undergoing major changes in standards, necessitating postponing the work until the fall of 2018. Finally, a panel will be convened fall 2018 to discuss Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Exercise Science as a sub-cluster. Dr. Grant explained the process of creating a guaranteed pathway. The pathway process begins with faculty-driven development. Then, each institution has the opportunity to endorse the proposed pathway via their chief academic officer or provost. Once the public institutions have endorsed a pathway, the Chancellor gives final approval of the proposed pathway. The process concludes with implementation of the pathway.

The math and science sub-cluster (biology, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics) engineering sub-cluster, engineering technology sub-cluster, communications sub-cluster, and education cluster are in the faculty-driven development phase. The math

and science panel are still giving more feedback on the templates based on revisions. Dr. Grant believes they will be ready for endorsement by March 2018. Communication and education have created initial pathways; however, they are still on the first round of feedback from the faculty panels. Many opportunities have arisen from the process of creating these pathways, specifically in relation to TAG courses. For example, biology is hopeful to see a genetics or microbiology class added as a possible TAG. Likewise, engineering and engineering technology have become aware of possible revisions that need to be made to the current TAGs. Currently, the social work pathway is in the endorsement phase with 29 schools approving the pathway thus far. A final social work pathway is expected to be finished in the next few weeks. Endorsement surveys are being prepared for social and behavior sciences, humanities, and fine and performing arts, which will soon be sent to the institutions for endorsement. The business pathway is in the implementation process. It has successfully gone through collaborative resolution, which worked to fix the issues that arose during the endorsement phase. Revisions for the business pathway are still underway due to necessary edits to the business statistics TAG. Ms. Katie Dean, Administrator of the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer, discussed a spreadsheet that she created showing every institution's aligned courses within the business pathway. It also showed which institutions still need to submit courses for TAG or OTM approval. The program approval review process was also discussed. A list of schools that currently offer an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science in Business was displayed along with a list of schools that do not currently offer one of those degrees but intend and those who do not intend to offer one of those degree for now. Dr. Compton explained the importance of expediting the program approval process for those schools that will create associate degrees in business.

Dr. Grant went on to discuss issues that have arisen over the implementation process. The first issue was OTM/TAG compliance. It was discovered that each four-year institution had at least one non-approved business TAG course. Meaning, no school has every TAG class approved and there are 41 missing TAG courses. Moreover, nine institutions had not submitted TAG matches for at least one or more TAG course and ten institutions had submitted but not approved TAG courses. Regarding the 11 two-year institutions that offered associate degrees in business, all of these institutions likewise had at least one non-approved Business TAG course. Eight institutions had not submitted at least one or more TAG courses, seven had submitted courses but had not yet approved them, and seven needed to develop a business statistics course. Dr. Grant noted that a potential change to the Business Statistics TAG course (OBU009) could result in the Ohio Transfer Module Introductory Statistics course (TMM010) meeting the Business Statistics I requirement , provided that a second course was taken at the four-year institution. Dr. Compton added that many four-year institutions appreciated the students taking a general statistics course because it allowed the four-year institutions to provide a specialized business statistics course. Faculty panels are making progress on the business statistics course issue, but there is still a lack of clarity into the exact nature

of the future solution. Dr. Compton explained that one current issue for the schools desiring to begin offering associate degrees in business is ensuring that their class offerings are TAG approved before allowing them to offer the degree. One attendee pointed out that the problem of offering non-TAG courses already exists amongst institutions who offer the associate degree in business, so it may be a non-issue. Another attendee asked how the classes were submitted, but not accepted. It was explained that the courses were under review and that they should be approved during the next review cycle. Dr. Compton explained that if a two-year institution did not offer a specific course, they could use course sharing, provide the course through an online partnership with another institution, etc. One attendee argued that it was necessary for four-year institutions to have the TAG courses, while two-year institutions had more variability in how they met the requirements. Questions were then asked about who had authority over issues surrounding compliance. Dr. Compton answered that the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) was going to require all Ohio public institutions comply with TAG alignments. Dr. Nutter of Washington State Community College stated that because there was little to no repercussions for not complying with the law, it has led to many of the compliance issues. One attendee agreed with Dr. Nutter, but they went on to say that now that the transfer pathways have been made, unknown consequences could be implemented, though that is undesirable. The definitions used to describe a submitted course on the spreadsheet was explained by Ms. Dean and Dr. Compton acknowledged that seeing student success was their greatest tool to encourage compliance.

It was asked if the committee would like to make a suggestion to ODHE with regard to TAG compliance. One attendee recommended that ODHE communicate to all of the institutions that the business pathway has been approved and that TAG compliance is a part of that, with the hope that it would help to resolve the issue. It was also recommended that courses that need approval be clearly sent to the institutions after the next course review cycle so that the new courses could be sent with the necessary revisions of the courses currently under review. Another attendee recommended that ODHE communicate the compliance issues that have become apparent to the institutions. It was noted that in the emails sent to individual institutions, the email should celebrate where each institution currently is before asking them to continue to pursue compliance. It was clarified that the recommendation is to give feedback regularly to the institutions with both positive and constructive feedback. Another attendee emphasized that it was important to place the TAG course approvals within the context of the pathways because it showed the importance of compliance. It was then recommended that the future communication from ODHE to the institutions state that is via the recommendation of the committee and that the committee is working to resolve compliance issues. Dr. Compton recommended that the Chancellor send a letter to the business schools commending their hard work first, which was affirmed by other attendees. An attendee advised to abstain from using "noncompliance" in the first

letter; rather it should ask that institutions align their TAG agreements. Due to concerns about only having TAG review cycles three times a year, Dr. Compton suggested a more continual process for the pathways courses, but it would necessitate committee recommendation. One attendee responded by stating that most faculty are gone over the summer so it would be preferred to wait until the October cycle. Dr. Compton also reminded all of the attendees that many of the schools who currently lack the approved TAG courses are acting in "good faith."

A summary of the recommendations include the following:

1. A conversation with the chief academic officer and provost should happen prior to communication being sent to the institution, letting them know that they will be receiving an Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways update for their institution
2. Thank all participants for the time they have given to the pathways project and let them know the progress that has been made
3. Tell each institution that in order to complete their pathway they need to do… [fill in for each institution]
4. Hold a special meeting with all of the TAG coordinators

All communication should be positive, simply stating what the institution needs to do, not that they are noncompliant. Institutions who do not yet have their associate degree in business degree should still be given approval for their programs. However, the institution should receive the same reports as the other institutions pertaining to which TAG courses they still need to submit for approval.

III. Issues Identified by the Institutions with their Business Template Return

Dr. Grant introduced the issue of program approval allowed hours. Institutions created templates for their associate degrees in Business with the expected number of credit hours. The two-year institutions were categorized by how many hours they were over the approved number of hours. One attendee asked for clarification on which program these were discussing. This question prompted Dr. Grant to explain that the general associate degree programs need to be between 60 and 65 hours in order to be approved, yet programs ranged from 54 credits to 79 credits. The ODHE would be working with the individual intuitions in the future to ensure that their program met approval requirements. Dr. Grant explained that many institutions were over because they had some unnecessary overlapping courses. She also noted that most institutions that one credit over was due to college algebra being four credit hours rather than three credit hours. Likewise, the two-year institutions offered accounting as a four credit hour course; however, at nearly all of the four-year institutions it was a three credit hour course. Dr. Grant acknowledged that for some programs, it will take some time to meet the approval requirements, but she stressed that if ODHE and the individual institutions work together, a solution could be found. The total number of program hours for transfer students to a four-year institution was considered as well. Dr. Stephanie Davidson of the ODHE interjected that the guidelines were that an associate degree program must be less than 65 hours and a bachelor's degree program must be less than

126 hours, unless there are specific accreditation or licensure reasons that supersede the limit. One attendee added that the marketing of affordability and accessibility applies to the reasoning behind decreasing the number of credit hours in a program. It was also noted that business courses required many specific TAG courses, thus the hope was that the social and behavioral sciences would not run into this similar problem because the TAG alignment would be simpler. Dr. Hoopes asked how co-op hours were considered in the total number of hours. One attendee responded that co-op hours were considered, and Cincinnati State was close to meeting the program hour requirements.

Dr. Grant concluded her discussion on issues by stating that there were issues with identifying when an institution actually offers a program. She cited the example of some institutions not offering an associate degree in business, but they do offer an Associate of Arts transfer degree in business. She cited a similar example for Social Work. Thus, Dr. Grant asked that the committee help provide a clear way of asking about the existence of areas that would be covered by a guaranteed transfer pathway. In other words, if a specific program is not offered at an institution, how can the survey be clear about whether or not a similar pathway is comparable? Dr. Compton added that ODHE was unsure about how the institution labeled their degree and program offerings. . One attendee answered that the pathways were a benefit, not a burden and that ODHE should state that the Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees work to numerous pathways. A second attendee stated that two-year institutions should not be required to create new pathways, but rather they should know that the pathways are available. Another attendee asked if an institution could state that they have a pathway, separate from ODHE transfer pathway. There were questions regarding if the market was students or institutions. Dr. Fischer of Bowling Green State University noted that if a student enters through the ODHE pathway, it would be approved as a block credit. However, if a student enters in through a non ODHE pathway, each course would need to be individually approved. It was clarified that ODHE should not tell community colleges that they must have a given pathway, but institutions should clarify on their websites if a pathway is the Ohio Guaranteed Pathway or an individual institution pathway. It was also noted that advisor's would need to clearly explain the choices to perspective students if a pathway was an Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathway or not. Dr. Compton added that the hope would be for these pathways to be used by students with College Credit Plus credits. It was suggested that on future surveys, rather than asking if an institution had a degree program in a particular subject, ODHE should ask if an institution has a particular major or concentration in the subject. An attendee asked if these pathways will be assessed, which Dr. Compton affirmed that they would.

IV. **Implementation Policy Conceptual Model**
Dr. Grant led a presentation on implementation of statewide Associate to Baccalaureate Degree Pathways. She believed that the attendees understood the guiding principles but

expressed the importance of involving all institutions in the endorsement process. Following endorsements, Dr. Grant spoke about compliance. Specifically, she mentioned that TAG courses were guaranteed to transfer and be offered. One issue that has arisen with education is that the Ohio Transfer Module is not used within the general education component. Meaning, certain education programs do not have general education courses that are approved because they require specific courses such as "Math for Educators," or "Biology for Educators," etc. Dr. Compton desired that all people be aware of this issue because it made it more difficult to create pathways in programs with similar requirements such as nursing. Multiple attendees cited their own experiences with the difficulty of creating an education or nursing pathway. Dr. Compton asked for thoughts from attendees from a community college. One attendee from a community college responded that an education pathway was particularly difficult because there was multiple types of education degrees. University of Cincinnati noted that they desired to make individual plans due to the amount of options for each student. Dr. Grant stated that Education Pathways had been created and would soon be sent to the faculty panel for feedback. One attendee asked how GPA requirements would be handled, given that many programs have GPA requirements to enter the program or after 60 credit hours. Dr. Compton stated that in the future it should be clarified that in some situations individual institutions can make decisions based on GPA requirements within the guaranteed transfer pathway. Dr. Grant explained that the pathway will attempt to be transparent, including such things the needed completion of a background check and necessary GPA requirements for entrance into a program.

Dr. Grant went on to discuss changing the language in the compliance agreement. It now reads, "The OATN prefers that institutions implement the endorsed pathway no later than one year from the date of announcement of a pathway" rather than "The OATN recommends that institutions implement the endorsed pathway no later than one year from the date of announcement of a pathway." She also stated that a pathway would not expire for ten years, though an individual institution's program could be discontinued before that time. Next, Dr. Grant explained that once institutions had submitted their pathways, they would be recommended by the OGTP Steering Committee and/or the OATN Oversight Board to the Chancellor for final approval. Institutions would then modify existing policies as necessary to accept the program and market the pathway on their website and to their students. Any changes in curriculum would be sent to the ODHE for approval and as changes in curriculum persist, ODHE must approve all of the future changes. There was a discussion on if every course change needed to be submitted, but it was only when there was a curriculum change. It was decided that future policy needed clear wording on which changes needed submitted for approval. Dr. Grant continued her presentation on compliance by stating that institutions will adjust their credit hour requirements to be within the range of the endorsed pathway. She concluded by mentioning that research would be conducted to assess the effectiveness of each endorsed pathway and that institutions needed to

monitor the academic progress and retention of students using the Guaranteed Transfer Pathways and TAG courses.

V. **Lunch**

VI. **Discussion of the Direction on the Technical Associate Degrees**
One attendee began the discussion by asking if it were being considered what would be done if a student chose to change pathways. Dr. Compton responded by stating that if a student switched pathways, it could require more time, but the student and the advisor would be responsible for knowing that. Another attendee noted that at his institution there were pathway advisors, who specifically engaged with the intricacies and complications relating to students' specific pathways. One institution is currently developing an online class, which will educate people on the different 2+2 models and the Guaranteed Transfer Pathways through the institution. Dr. Grant explained that the background behind this discussion was that ODHE had attempted to create pathways with technical associate degrees in human service and social work and found it incredibly difficult. The challenge with the applied degree in social work was that the two-year programs had been highly protective of their programs, which has made it too difficult to continue the process at the current time. As such, a proposal for a technical associate degree pathway exists; there will be a statewide meeting prior to the announcement of the pathway. Dr. Grant expressed that ODHE is learning best practices surrounding applied degrees, noting the example of Washington State. At Washington State, the program is structured in such a way that both applied degree and Associate of Arts students take the same courses initially, providing them time to determine which degree is best for them before having to decide. Dr. Grant highlighted the importance of showing no partiality between the two types of pathway options, but emphasized the importance of ensuring that there was a pathway from both options. She went on to discuss the importance of giving students in applied degree program OTM approved general education classes because they were often missing and negatively affected students who desired to receive a bachelor's degree. Originally, ODHE posed creating a pathway from an applied degree to an applied bachelor degree, but the response was that institutions wanted that as well as a pathway from the applied degree to a traditional bachelor's degree. Dr. Compton interjected that there was a list of technical bachelor's degrees, for which they hoped to create guaranteed pathways. However, the pathways would only be with the four-year institutions that desired to make technical degree pathways, offering the possibility of "2+2." One attendee mentioned that the approach does not require there be a pathway in each region, thus students may have to travel out of their region to attain their bachelor's degree. Dr. Compton explained that ODHE would need to convene a meeting, where attendees would discuss how to create these technical pathways. It was stated that there was a lack of awareness regarding the technical degree pathways, and that the meeting would work to increase awareness of the issue and the institutional possibilities. Miami University explained

that they used a "3+1" model for applied degrees in business and marketing. There was a discussion involving multiple participants about Ms. Dean's research on the schools who have available pathways for technical degrees. One attendee asked if a reasonable next step would be to clarify with institutions on rather or not they had more information to add to Ms. Dean's research. It was decided by attendees that a survey would be created and sent to the two-year institutions. The survey would ask which program the student was graduating from, where the student was transferring to, and which program the student was transferring into, in applied degrees. The goal of the survey would be to define available pathways already in existence, increase transparency of existing pathways, and to discover best existing practices. The hope would be to find consistency amongst programs and create a template for a guaranteed pathway. Dr. Compton clarified the next steps to be as follows:

1. Send out a survey to the institutions
2. Hold a large meeting to discuss technical degree pathways. At this meeting, it would be necessary to invite those with authority, namely deans and provost offices.

VII. Website for the Templates

Dr. Compton stated that part of the implementation policy would be the creation of an OGTP website and requested the input of the committee. The website would be categorized by the seven clusters. Then, within each cluster, one would find the template for each pathway, be it Associate of Arts degree, Associate of Science degree, or for an applied degree. Institutions offering a specific pathway would be listed within the cluster as well. Official pathway PDFs, would be sent to institutions to be posted on their websites. One attendee asked for an approximate timeline on the website for the templates. Dr. Compton answered that the hope was that within one month the business templates would be on the website. Likewise, within three to four months, ODHE was hopeful to have a general template for each program that had been approved by the state. PDFs and the website link should be sent to institution's provost offices to ensure that their websites were updated with the information. An introduction would be added to the site, as well as written communication that the unfinished clusters were under construction. One attendee voiced concern about the pdfs being formatted in way to make them accessible to students with disabilities. Based on comments made from committee members, it was suggested that a web link for transfer policies at individual institutions be added. Dr. Compton explained that other institutions could make their websites more beautiful and interactive; however, the information was necessary either way. One attendee suggested that certain caveats be added to the website. One such caveat is the pathway differences amidst the education pathways. Dr. Compton spoke on ODHE's inability to increase the interactive nature of the website due to resource and capacity limits. One attendee asked if the website was mobile friendly, but the answer was unknown. Dr. Compton also clarified that institutions could still have all of their other pathways on their website, but it was

necessary that an institution's websites state the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathway with a link to the website. Dr. Compton explained that on the Tennessee website, a student could click on an institution's logo and find their state approved pathways. She was hopeful that in the future, ODHE's website would have similar capabilities. Regardless of the look, the hope would be that students could categorize pathways by institutions. One attendee asked if the link would take students away from an institution's website. However, Dr. Compton stated that it simply needed to take students to the pdf template, such that they would never know that they had left the institution website. She went on to explain that her concern was that, even though ODHE would have an official site that was definitely correct, the institution might create a website that may or may not be correct. One attendee suggested that the pdfs have an official watermark or approval date. It was also suggested that there be one website designed for universities and one website designed for students referencing the guaranteed pathways.

VIII. **For the Good of the Order**

There was a conversation about how to send the future guaranteed pathway templates to the provosts for approval. Dr. Compton asked if there were any issues that were not addressed. With no additional feedback, the meeting was adjourned.