I. Welcome & Introductions
Co-chairs of the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways (OGTP) Steering Committee, President Marcia Ballinger of Lorain County Community College and Dr. Randy Smith of The Ohio State Universities welcomed meeting attendees.

II. Status Report Update
Dr. Candice Grant, Director of the OGTP at the Ohio Department of Higher Education, informed the attendees that she would be providing an update on the progress of the initiative. She announced that the generic statewide OGTP in business, social and behavioral sciences, arts and humanities, and math and sciences are all posted to the new student-friendly OGTP website. Institution-specific OGTP in the area of business are also being posted as they are finalized. The website is now visible to students and staff. The areas containing applied degrees have developed some conflicts and difficulties in outlining; however, Dr. Grant asked the committee to provide guidance.

The Engineering faculty panel has identified several challenges to pathway development including sequencing requirements, pre-requisite requirements, and ability to offer specialized courses within the first two years. The initial two years of the pathways at community colleges cannot necessarily cover what an aspiring engineering major would need in order to complete a bachelor’s degree most efficiently, and in some areas of engineering, not even native students are able to complete a bachelor’s degree full-time in four years. For these reasons, the faculty panel has been brainstorming ways in which to develop the most efficient, best transfer pathways for students interested in engineering. They asked for permission to explore the development of one or more of these alternative pathway options, which may offer close to a 2+2 option in certain areas of engineering for the community colleges that have the capacity to offer the necessary courses and a 1+3 option for any other community college.

Dr. Compton suggested that language should be inserted into the living OGTP implementation document. The committee offered language that would allow for flexibility in the development
of OGTP where the pathway leads only to specialized bachelor’s degree programs, such as Engineering and Education. The high degree of specialization in these areas may complicate transfer due to limitations in the ability to offer the specific coursework that would enable students to progress most efficiently through their coursework. In these cases, the faculty panel may recommend different pathway options that best serve students. Attendees also agreed that it is vital to have educated and early advisor support to assist students.

Dr. Grant next presented the challenges facing faculty panels developing OGTP in applied degree fields, such as a diversity of curriculum, non-OTM approved mathematics, limited OTM course requirements within programs, accreditations, and technical electives. One attendee suggested that AAS degree completers could purse technical bachelor’s degrees. Dr. Grant agreed that this would be an option, but noted in the case of human services, there was a strong desire to facilitate student movement into social work programs, with the high need for social workers currently. She outlined the specific steps that she is taking in working with the faculty panel in order to develop this pathway given the challenges outlined above. She noted that it may require some additional hours, more so than an Associate of Arts or Science degree, to complete the bachelor’s degree program; however, she felt that it would be possible to work with each institution to ensure it was no more than an extra semester or summer’s worth of hours in this particular case.

Dr. Grant also addressed the institutional concerns surrounding bilateral agreements. The Steering Committee discussed the relationship between the OGTP and bilateral agreements. The guidance that has been given to institutions up to this point is that bilateral agreements should be harmonious with the OGTP. These bilateral agreements may extend beyond the baseline set by the OGTP by offering various other guarantees, in addition to OTM and TAGs, that could include additional course equivalencies, program admissions, etc. Bilateral agreements that are not harmonious with the OGTP are not allowed. However, with regards to private and out-of-state institutions, bilateral agreements that may not be harmonious are permitted.

III. Discussion about the review process for exemption from participation in an OGTP

Attendees agreed that the document title of “Review Process for Exception to the Legislative Mandate” should be changed to “Review Process for Necessary Exemption to the Legislative Mandate”. It was also agreed that the term ‘flexibility’ should be altered to ‘limited exceptions.’

The OGTP implementation policy recognized that institutions may occasionally require limited and necessary exemptions from participating in a particular OGTP. The Steering Committee discussed the circumstances under which and the process through which institutions may be able to appeal for such an exemption. These circumstances could include restrictive or unavoidable program accreditation rules, highly competitive admission cohort models, and/or nationally acclaimed program features that would be jeopardized. The process would include
the submission of a letter of justification and opportunity to present to the OGTP Steering Committee. The Steering Committee would then provide a recommendation to the Chancellor, and the Chancellor has final decision-making authority. If new information emerges, institutions may have the ability to submit an appeal to the Steering Committee for review.

IV. Lunch

V. Policy Issues Related to Tracking of Students
Dr. Grant discussed the initial efforts to create a statewide standard within the Higher Education Information System (HEI) for tracking students who are pursuing their associate and bachelor’s degrees via OGTP. Some questions that arose include how to handle students who switch off of an OGTP or who change their mind and switch on and off. At the associate degree level, it seems clear that the community college awarding the degree ultimately has responsibility for certifying if a student has completed an OGTP based on their institutional template. There was concern about the workload of tracking a student who may be changing their major every term or multiple times within a term. There were also questions about the timeframe included in the implementation policy giving students five years at each institution to complete their OGTP. This timeframe was included to provide a minimum protection for all students, not to limit the amount of time an institution could choose to accept the OGTP. Finally, there was discussion around if the date of entry into an OGTP mattered and which OGTP at the university-level would be honored. The work on determining the specific mechanisms for tracking is still in progress and will be vetted with all institutions. However, its need is clear given the issues discussed and the need to be able to gather data and conduct research to assess the effectiveness of the OGTP initiative.

VI. Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways Website
Dr. Grant presented the new OGTP website to the committee, which will have a soft launch in December and a hard launch in January. The website has several different options for students to explore their academic interest options. Students can browse by academic cluster area, by major, or by institution. Each OGTP page will have the generic statewide template, institution-specific templates as they are completed, and information about majors and careers on Ohio Means Jobs and the Occupational Handbook. Commentary from the committee included updating the logo and adding three bottom anchors on certain pages.

VII. For the Good of the Order
Dr. Compton and Dr. Grant thanked the attendees for their discussions and attendance. The meeting concluded at approximately 2 pm.