



**The Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN)
OGTP Steering Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, August 30 2017

10:00 am to 2:00 p.m.

25 S. Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215

Basement Boardroom B-004

Present: Mary Ellen Mazey, John Fischer, Robbin Hoopes, Jack Cooley, Cindy McQuade, Marcia Ballinger, Jack Hershey, Code Loew, Laura Rittner, Randy Smith, Tamara Davis, Didi Chilcott, Steve Robinson, Joseph Abbott Jr., Donnie McGovern, Mark Nutter, Carl Brun, Tom Traynor, Mary Ann Haley

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

I. Welcome & Introductions

Dr. Marcia Ballinger of Lorain County Community College and Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey of Bowling Green State University welcomed the attendees of the meeting and asked that members introduce themselves. Dr. Candice Grant of the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN) elaborated on her role within the Pathway network and touched briefly on its status. The legislative charge and timeframe for implementing the legislation was discussed. Dr. Paula Compton of the OATN led the discussion on the timeline of the development of Phase I given the December 1, 2018 deadline. It was suggested that a faster pace would be required, but Dr. Compton indicated that an interpretation of the legislation did not necessarily require full completion. She informed attendees that they were working on completing Phase I of their plan, that they were beginning Phase II, and that Phase III was set to occur in Spring 2018. Dr. Compton explained that Phase II would focus on education, arts and humanities, and the STEM fields. She also stressed that although the timeline is not formally being sped up, everyone is working as quickly as possible to move the plan forward and implement the policies and procedures while also ensuring that quality is not compromised. The importance of managing expectations was also noted; as different campuses have different abilities and traits, it cannot be assumed that they will all be able to implement the policies in the exact same manner.

Dr. Jack Hershey of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) emphasized that he views the charge as requiring the policies and procedures in place such that by the December deadline, associate's degrees can be transferred. He acknowledged that there will be some cases that are particularly difficult to figure out, but that he believes the legislature would like to see the majority of the work done by December 2018. Dr. Compton recognized his desire to see the plan push forward and encouraged his proactive collaboration with faculty clusters to see change occur quickly, but also noted that complications will continue to arise throughout the process that will likely make it simply impractical to progress at the rate that Dr. Hershey is desiring. She also pointed out that working diligently on Phases I and II would establish strong foundations upon which Phase III could build, thereby creating an overall more successful

policy. An updated timeline will be available on the website. Others agreed that while continuing to move forward expeditiously is important, ensuring quality of pathways and in turn student success is paramount.

II. Update on Tackling Transfer Grant

Dr. Compton addressed the \$50,000 grant received from the Community College Research Center (CCRC). The grant is supporting a series of workshops, one in Spring 2017, one on September 25, and one in Spring 2018. She mentioned that at the September 25 meeting the CRCC will be bringing facilitators to talk about data on transfer, transfer goal setting at institutions, and regional efforts to establish pathways. Based on the money received, the IUC and OACC will be hosting a meeting for presidents to ensure the statewide commitment to getting the project done. Out of the \$50,000 grant, \$20,000 will be set aside to provide mini grants to institutions and regions so that they may collaborate in enacting regional programs that promote transfer.

Ms. Laura Rittner of the OACC clarified that the partners in this initiative are the CCRC, Public Agenda, and the Aspen Institute, which are working together to support three different states.

III. Discussion on Associate Degrees

Dr. Shoumi Mustafa presented his findings on pathways that lead from associate degrees to baccalaureate degrees in business. In general, pathways leading to baccalaureate degrees in particular disciplines differ because of differences in associate degree types and also the choice of the baccalaureate degree discipline. In light of the large number of potential pathways, Dr. Mustafa talked about the importance of finding a general analytical structure for understanding the diverse array of pathways commonly taken by students.

He showed that a large majority of associate degrees granted by two-year institutions in a given year can be classified as Applied-Technical degrees (almost 80%); Associates of Applied Business, Applied Science, and Technical Studies fall in this group. The remaining associate degrees, classified as Arts-Science, are Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Science (AS). Four-year college enrollment rates of Associate degree recipients of the two types are very different: 22.1% for Applied-Technical and 48.8% for the Arts-Science students. The two groups have differential rates of graduation as well: 50.8% to 70.1%, showing the presence of a potential currently untapped pool of students.

For analyzing the pathways leading to four-year college baccalaureate degree in business, he used the following five groups: Associate of Applied Business, Applied-Tech group with and without business concentration, respectively, and Arts-Science group with and without a business concentration, respectively. He showed that while all types of associate degrees lead to business degrees in four-year institutions, associate degree recipients with a concentration in business go in that direction in higher proportions. This implies a clear connection between the disciplines at the associate and the baccalaureate levels.

However, there is enough flexibility in the system to allow non-business concentration Art-Science associate degree recipients to graduate from four-year institutions with

baccalaureate degrees in business. Dr. Mustafa also showed the presence of large clusters – a large number of associate degree recipients from specific two-year institutions receiving baccalaureate degrees in business from specific four-year institutions.

Dr. Cooley pointed out that social mobility and class mobility are paramount, not simply easy transfer from technical to baccalaureate degrees. He stated there should exist a differentiation between a standard four-year degree and a bachelor's degree in technical studies. Four-year liberal arts degrees give students a large advantage throughout their lifetimes, and as a result, there exists increasing pressure for two-year degree holders to complete four-year ones, when that path might not be suitable for all. Dr. Compton added that four-year universities may be missing out on opportunities by not developing pathways for Bachelors of Technical Studies; in contrast, private schools are seeing these opportunities and catering to transfer students with such programs. Community colleges will also have the opportunity to create limited technical baccalaureate programs.

Dr. Thomas Traynor of Wright State University was then asked to provide his insight. He noted that the first two and a half years of the Business core are similar across all public institutions, thus simplifying the pathway establishment. For example, Sinclair students have communicated that they are interested in pursuing Business degrees, so their progress is monitored and they are considered every two weeks; similarly, Clark State student progress is revisited twice a semester. Technical degrees offer a greater challenge, but a similar statewide pathway is being worked on. He stressed that more specific guidelines on Applied Business degrees should be created to alleviate confusion for two-year colleges and accelerate the transfer process. Finally, he noted the challenges brought by accredited common core requirements and introduced suggestions for a 2+3 Business degree and alternatives for those whose original educational plans did not work out.

Questions were then raised about why some individuals required extra courses and time to get Bachelor's degrees, as well as about the effectiveness of students' advising. The assumption is that those working towards AA/AS degrees originally intended to go on to four-year universities, whereas those with technical degrees planned to go straight to the workforce. As such, AA/AS degree students prioritize those courses that would move them toward a bachelor's degree in the future; whereas, students in technical areas prioritize those courses that would most help their employment.

IV. Update on Current Cluster Work

In the business cluster, the faculty panel created a proposed template of the courses that students would complete to earn an AA/AS degree in Business and be able to transfer to a four-year public institution of higher education toward a bachelor's degree in Business. Students will complete the Ohio Transfer Module as well as seven business courses while at community college. He noted Calculus may recede as a requirement for Business degrees within the next ten years, and that statistics and computer skills will need more coherence between two- and four-years institutions.

Dr. Compton noted that the Business cluster will look at the Associate of Applied Business degree pathway separately, and there will be a discussion specifically on repeatable

courses. Dr. Compton stressed the importance of communication with colleges, and it was suggested that Dr. Traynor meet with the Provosts and Chief Academic Officers during their respective meetings.

From the Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services cluster, Dr. Tamara Davis reviewed the work that the Social Work/Human Services and Social and Behavioral Sciences faculty panels had completed during their meetings. Within the sub-cluster of Social Work, she noted that the main difference between applied/technical degrees and AA/AS degrees is that there are less general education courses incorporated into the applied/technical curriculum, which is challenging for students who eventually intend to get Bachelor's degrees. She estimated there is less than one full year of transferrable credits in the Bachelor's degree in Social Work.

She also noted that two-year institutions do not seem willing to adjust their curriculum, in part because of concerns about accreditation. However, four-year institutions are also bound by accreditation requirements, such as minimum requirements for faculty teaching course Social Work courses. She noted that there does exist a smoother pathway for students earning AA/AS degrees because due to the greater number of transferrable general education courses completed.

Further complicating matters, Social Work does not really have a 33-hour major, but instead a 54-hour one. The possibility of a special program for two-year college students once in four-year universities was quickly dismissed, as that would be unfair to the native four-year students. Instead, it was suggested that greater flexibility exist for the two-year transfer students.

Dr. Mary Ann Haley of Kent State University spoke of how she met regionally with students and found preexisting bilateral agreements to help transfer students. Institutional concern was expressed that changes at the OATN would supplement or supersede those agreements and cause confusion as to how to implement those pathways and advertise them to students. Institutions wish to maintain awareness that while there may be a general pathway in place, there also exist specific ones between particular two-year and four-year institutions. In addition, at some two-year institutions, students do declare majors and can take additional subject area focused courses above and beyond the TAG courses. Some faculty at four-year institutions have expressed concern about students taking too many major courses in their two-year program prior to transferring.

The foreign language requirement of most four-year universities was also discussed in detail. It is challenging because many students of two-year colleges do not take foreign language classes, and therefore struggle to catch up upon entering four-year universities. As such, it was determined that two-year colleges should offer and encourage foreign language be taken by students who plan to transfer. Also included in the discussion was the need for early advising in community colleges so that students can understand their options and available pathways. Dr. Haley also noted that there were not many community colleges that could offer all TAG courses in some Social and Behavioral Sciences majors, such as Anthropology and Geography.

Dr. Davis suggested that programs should be focused by major. She stated that the 60+60 program was faulty because by the time a student reaches their second year, if they do not know what they wish to major in, then they have already fallen behind. She explored the possibility of 1+3 or 3+1 rather than 2+2, and again brought up the foreign language complication, as not all Social Work programs require it, so it depends on which four-year institution the student plans to attend. She also mentioned that the math requirement challenge may be overcome once the proper pathways are implemented. She noted that there was confusion among the two-year institutions about how much they needed to shift programming in relation to what four-year institutions desired. She suggested that the four-year colleges could come together, make a comprehensive decision, and then communicate it to the two-year institutions.

V. Lunch

VI. Discussion and Resolution to Issues

Dr. Compton stated that there is a focus on regional pathways because they were where the early victories could occur. It was also noted that technical degree students are required to take a number of extra classes in general education in order to fulfill the general education requirements and to earn a bachelor's degree. This could be cost-prohibitive, and it also would require additional time, which may be challenging if students are balancing families and full-time jobs.

It was clarified that four-year institutions are the co-designer of AA/AS degrees along with the two-year institutions; however, industry needs drive the technical associate's degrees. The legislative mandate "without unnecessary duplication" was intended primarily for the AA/AS degrees, and the creation of pathways for these degrees will be prioritized. After those pathways are created, pathways will also be developed for technical degrees. Dr. Cooley agreed that the process is being slowed by the challenges of technical degrees, and that AA/AS degrees should be focused on for the December 2018 deadline. It was also argued that there should exist a simple solution for when a required class is not offered by a specific two-year institution—namely, that another, existing class be considered a viable alternative.

VII. Future Faculty Cluster Panels

Dr. Grant informed members that there would be three cluster panels coming up this fall: Education; STEM; and Arts & Humanities, History, Communication, and Design. She asked faculty panel members to reflect on how Phase I went in order to influence the progression of Phase II, and she realized that more facilitation of up-front intelligence gathering paired with a clearer understanding on which degree pathways will be addressed would aid in the process.

To refine the process, Dr. Grant suggested the creation of focus groups comprised of institutional nominees that would convene prior to the formation of the larger cluster faculty panels. Responsibilities of these focus groups will include: defining the field (determining what degree pathways exist and which are going to be prioritized); recommending the formation of sub-clusters and the number of panel leads, as well as assisting with the identification of those

leads; and working out a framework beforehand which will help expedite and clarify the process. Then, panel leads will be selected from institutional nominations. They will facilitate the development of a template for the pathways; create timelines for panel work; organize, facilitate, and communicate with panels; and serve as liaisons to ODHE. Finally, statewide faculty panels will be selected from institutional nominations with assistance from the Steering Committee.

Dr. Grant also stressed the importance of ensuring that panels know the difference between applied degrees and transfer associate's degrees and that they should try to determine commonalities across four-year programs statewide. It was suggested that even in the early stages, some curriculum decision-makers, e.g. Provosts, will need to be involved; however, the transfer pathway development should be faculty-driven.

Finally, she reminded members to have faith in the collegiate faculty. Once the faculty are clear about the parameters in which they are working, they should be given the freedom to construct the pathways. As they are volunteering their time, they truly believe in what the OGTP is doing and therefore can be trusted to use their best judgment.

VIII. For the Good of the Order

Dr. Ballinger thanked everyone for their participation, and in the final minutes, there was discussion about the foreign language requirement.