

**The Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN)  
Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways Steering Committee Meeting  
Ohio Mathematics Initiative**

The Fawcett Center (Hancock Room)  
2400 Olentangy River Rd, Columbus, OH 43210  
Tuesday, November 19, 2019  
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

**Present:** Joe Whitehead, Robbin Hoopes, Martin Maliwesky, Cindy McQuade, Marcia Ballinger, Mike Snider, Laura Rittner, Howard Dewald, Steve Robinson, Kathleen Cleary, Randy Smith, Andrew Martin, Gigi Escoe, Donnie McGovern, Sarah Parker-Clever, Carl Brun

**ODHE/ODE Staff:** Paula Compton, Candice Grant, Mitch Wilson, Jessi Spencer, Holly Hall, Zoe Woodbury, Ellen Peterson

**I. Welcome & Introductions**

Dr. Randy Smith opened the meeting by thanking the Steering Committee members for their attendance and introducing his co-chair Dr. Marcia Ballinger joining the meeting through phone. He asked that attendees introduce themselves as some new members and staff were in attendance.

**II. Approval of 04.04.19 Minutes**

Dr. Smith initiated a motion to approve the 04.04.19 Steering Committee minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes: Steve Robinson

Motion to approve the minutes seconded: Howard Dewald

With no further discussion, the motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

**III. OGTP Exemption Requests**

Dr. Smith stated that this is the first occurrence for the committee in which they will be hearing requests for exemption from the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways (OGTP) initiative. This meeting will set the precedent for how these proceedings will be addressed in future meetings, and will be an opportunity to refine the process. Institutions will present their proposal to the committee, and the committee will make a recommendation to the Chancellor as to if an exemption should be granted. Institutions submitting a request were asked to provide a one-page rationale for exemption. Each institution was able to send representation, either in person and/or over the phone, to present their request and answer questions. These representatives would then be asked to leave the room while the committee discusses each request. Any committee member from an institution making a response was asked to step out of the meeting for the duration of the request process.

The University of Cincinnati presented three requests during this meeting, one for the Bachelor of Fine Arts in the School of Art within the College of Design, Architecture,

Art & Planning and two from the College-Conservatory of Music for the Bachelor of Music and the Bachelor of Fine Arts in Theater & Dance.

#### **IV. Lunch**

During lunch, Dr. Compton reviewed some of the potential additional pieces of information that the committee might want to see in future exemption requests. The items that were suggested included relevant numbers (e.g., size of program, number of applicants, number of students accepted, number of students enrolled, etc.), program learning outcomes, program structure/curriculum, and options for students not admitted to the program. The exemption request instructions will be edited to ask institutions to provide this information.

#### **V. Update on Bilateral Agreements**

Ms. Holly Hall presented the information provided by four-year institutions showing how harmonious each institution's submitted bilateral transfer agreements were with the related OGTP. She stated that, generally, most bilateral agreements included all associated Transfer Assurance Guides (TAG) courses within the first 60-65 credits, with a small exception in business. In addition, most bilateral agreements required completion of the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) within the first 60-65 credits and did not encourage transfer prior to completion of an Associate degree. Reverse transfer was encouraged in two exceptions where the OTM courses were spread out over three years to space out major courses. There were some instances where bilateral agreements included a math course that did not align with the preferred OGTP math course, but no instances of agreements not including one that was explicitly required.

Therefore, most bilateral agreements were determined to be harmonious, with a few programs determined to be 'less harmonious'. One committee member questioned the need for oversight of these agreements. Another committee member suggested the importance of avoiding contradictions and confusion for students. Ms. Hall added that the additional component of the expiration dates for these agreements should be considered. As bilateral agreements expire and the pathways become more solidified, institutions may opt to forgo the agreements in favor of the statewide agreement.

Dr. Ballinger stepped in to ask that more research be done on these bilateral agreements in reference to student success rates post-transfer. If students are using these agreements and succeeding then perhaps no effort should be taken by the state. Another member agreed and asked that research also be done to see if the examples selected by the institutions formed a sort of selection bias in the results. For example, Dr. Howard Dewald stated that the program he selected was one of the most used agreements but not one that was disharmonious, such as their business agreements. Therefore, the final decision was to give institutions time to examine their bilateral agreements as they naturally come up for renewal. Moreover, the committee would like institutions that have bilateral agreements not well-aligned with the related OGTP to collect data to show that there is evidence the agreement is effectively facilitating student success and transfer.

## VI. OGTP Update

Dr. Grant stated that there are about 30 pathways still in development, with the remaining ones posing a greater challenge. She stated that they have been in the process of reviewing pathways, but it's a very detail-oriented process and that is taking time. She hopes to have initial drafts of pathways reviewed and back to institutions by the end of the fall 2019 semester. Dr. Grant noted that there is an opportunity in this process for detailed review and self-reflection at the institutional level, particularly concerning program and degree requirements.

Beginning this fall the OGTP team began formulating a pathway for Applied Business, but the challenge is the large amount of technical electives, limited OTM courses taken, and accreditation issues. Most universities' schools or colleges of business are AACSB-accredited and prohibit acceptance of credit for upper-level courses from institutions that are not AACSB-accredited. A focus group was formed out of the OGTP Business panel to delve into these issues and discuss possible solutions. They proposed the following actions, which will be brought to the statewide OGTP Business Panel at their meeting in Spring 2020: advisory notes for students explaining the difference between the AA/AS and AAB pathway options, a common first year for certain applied business degree programs and the AA/AS pathway, a comprehensive listing of programs providing a 2+2 pathway, and finally a 2+3 pathway option into the accredited programs. The statewide meeting to discuss next steps will be on February 28, 2020.

Dr. Grant announced that they also began working with Computer Science and Information Technology panels this fall, and the new panel was excited to begin pathway work. However, the panel determined there is a need to develop new TAGs in order to guarantee course equivalency in transfer in the following areas: Computer Science, Information Systems, and Information Technology. For Computer Science, courses to be included might be Discrete Mathematics, Introduction to Computer Science, Computer Science I and II, and a Data Structure course. For Information Technology, panelists are considering course in Networking, Security, Programming, Systems Administration, Web Development, and Human Computer Interaction. For Information Systems, the courses being considered are Introduction to Programming, Systems Design and Analysis, and Database Management.

## VII. TAG/OGTP Collaboration

Dr. Grant then transitioned to discussing the related topic of TAG/OGTP Collaboration, for which she proposed a process design distributed to the members. This process recognizes the interconnectedness of the TAG and OGTP work now. Ms. Jessi Spencer provided an overview of how the TAG/OGTP collaboration would be handled. As OGTP panels recommend new TAGs, the TAG panel can be brought into the discussion. If the TAG panel agrees to the development of new TAG courses, they will work in conjunction with representatives of the OGTP panel to develop learning outcomes and

seek statewide endorsement. The TAG panels that will be working on OGTP panel-recommended TAG development include English, Biology (genetics), Anatomy and Physiology, education, Information Systems, Computer Science, and Information Technology.

The Philosophy TAG is another area that OGTP panel recommended adding coursework. The Philosophy TAG panel has proposed learning outcomes that are currently in the process of statewide endorsement. The deadlines for responses are in early December, so we hope to move forward with announcement by the end of December. Development of TAGs for the other areas will begin in spring 2020, and Ms. Spencer asked for nominations in the areas listed as it will be an entirely new panel. Once each area has a full panel and have created learning outcomes, they will progress into statewide endorsement. Similar to the Philosophy survey currently sent out to institutions, a question will be included asking each institution to identify “If they agree with TAG learning outcomes do they then also agree with incorporating the learning outcomes within the pathway discipline?” This will guarantee that both the TAG and pathways are working together cohesively.

- VIII.** With no further comments or questions, Dr. Compton concluded the meeting and thanked attendees for their participation.