Ohio Board of Regents Special Meeting Minutes
Condition Report Subcommittee
Ohio Board of Regents
25 S. Front Street
Main Conference Room, 7th Floor
May 26, 2015

I. Welcome and Call to Order

Chair Elizabeth P. Kessler called the May 26th, 2015, Ohio Board of Regents (BOR) Special Meeting of the Condition Report Subcommittee to order. She welcomed the members and staff to the meeting. Chair Kessler stated, "the record reflects that notice of this meeting was given in accordance with provisions of the Ohio Board of Regents' Ohio Administrative Code §3333-1-14, which rule itself was adopted in accordance with Section 121.22(F) of the Ohio Revised Code and of the State Administrative Procedure Act." She called the roll and those present were:

- Thomas M. Humphries
- Elizabeth P. Kessler

Chair Kessler declared there was a quorum of the Condition Report Subcommittee members present.

*Note: Virginia M. Lindseth planned to attend the meeting via video conference from Cleveland State University. However, there were unforeseen technical difficulties; therefore she listened via tele-conference. There were no public participants at this site.

II. Approval of Minutes

Chair Kessler asked if there were any additions or corrections to the draft March 18, 2015, minutes. There being none, Vice Chair Humphries made a motion to approve the March 18, 2015, minutes as drafted and the motion was seconded by Chair Kessler. All Regents voted in favor of the motion approving the minutes as submitted from March 18, 2015.

III. Review of Ohio Data

Charles See, Assistant Deputy Chancellor for External Relations for BOR began by outlining what the subcommittee wanted to accomplish today. He said that the subcommittee recently received a revised draft of the Condition Report. He said in this version the following sections or areas of the report were expanded: Academic; Financial Aid; and Recruitment. He said the basic theme of the document was not substantially changed from what they had previously received. He said a portion of the meeting is strictly dedicated to getting their thoughts and feedback on these changes.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See continued and said that there were a few areas in the report that were on hold and from the beginning there were some challenges obtaining Ohio data that they could use. They believed they could get data from the survey that was released; that was not a reliable source and therefore went to an alternative mechanism. They have had better results but before they summarize this data in writing he said that first, Brett Visger, Associate Vice Chancellor for Institutional Collaboration and Completion for BOR would lead the discussion about the data results and the summaries that may be drawn when composing this information for the report. He said, second, they will discuss the BOR staff's recommendation of changing from the format of having recommendations at the end of every section in favor of a collection of recommendations at the end of the report. They found when there were recommendations at the end of every section a lot of the themes were overlapping. Chair Kessler said that a holistic approach is best and that seemed to be communicated by those that appeared before the subcommittee.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said the target date is still June 3rd to release the next draft of the report to enable the members to be able to discuss the report at the next meeting of the full BOR.

Associate Vice Chancellor Visger began the discussion regarding the Ohio data by doing a recap. He said that during the survey they had approached the institutions with defined questions about certain characteristics (delayed entry, working full-time, etc.) from an adult learner standpoint. He said this approach was problematic because some of the institutions did not track by this method. He said based on this they decided on an alternative approach and sought data for those individuals aged twenty-five years or older. He said this aligns with national trends and fits within the performance funding formula which has a risk weighting for those students aged twenty-five years or older. He said there are some 'gaps' in the methodological approach because an individual who is twenty-two years old who is just beginning their post-secondary experience is closer in characteristics to a thirty-five year old than to a nineteen year old in terms of how they approach education. He said they feel very comfortable in the data adequately 'telling the story'.

Associate Vice Chancellor Visger continued and began to outline the following data: nationally 36% of all college students are over the age of twenty five; in the State of Ohio 34% of all college students are over the age of twenty five; 53%* of all Ohio Technical Center (OTC) students are over the age of twenty five (*they do not always capture age data so 17% of OTC student age data was not available). He said with this: 34% of the undergraduates are attending community colleges; 3% of the undergraduates are attending OTCs; and 63% of the undergraduates are attending universities.

Associate Vice Chancellor Visger said they also did an analysis on completion rates. They conducted this analysis on cohorts from 2006-2012 to assess student outcomes. He said the following were the results of the assessment: For students who were younger than age twenty-five – 26% received any degree or certificate within six years; For students who were age twenty-five and older – 19% received any degree or certificate within six years; For students who were first time students age twenty-five and older in 2006 the completion rate was 15%. He said in each of the sectors there is a wide range of outcomes relating to completion. He said in reviewing the data the State of Ohio looks like the rest of the country.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that even though they set the age limit at twenty-five years old they know there are some exceptions in the age ranges of eighteen to twenty-four years and they may fit into the characteristics of those aged twenty-five years old and older. He said he believes they are held to the definition that they chose for the reasons that they did but he thinks it may be worth the conversation that they acknowledge that this age group may fit some of the characteristics of the report as well. Chair Kessler said that the uniform definition, while not perfect, is important because it will standardize conversations to enable Ohio institutions to begin to work cooperatively on this issue. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See agreed and said for the purposes of this report they clearly indicate what their definition and it is those individuals aged twenty-five to forty-four years old.

Chair Kessler asked if they believed the report would speak to the issue of tracking and having the standardized conversation across institutions. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that the recommendation areas that are outlined in the report relate to the following: the baseline for being able to support the data; defining the specific uniform data that will need to be tracked; and what data elements are needed for outreach so they are able to support and serve this group of individuals better.

Chair Kessler asked if there was a certain age (range) that they see for veterans coming back to school. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied that the age varied from twenty and up for veterans and by service-type. Chair Kessler followed-up with another question and asked what the shortest period of enlistment time was. Vice Chair Humphries replied that he believed the United States Army's shortest enlistment period was two years and all other branches of service shortest enlistment periods are four years. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked if this was something they wanted to see in the report. Chair Kessler said they were tackling enough issues and she was just curious about the information as they were looking at age information of students. John Magill, Assistant Deputy Chancellor, Economic Advancement for BOR added that the report in it of itself reinforces the importance of putting emphasis on the students aged twenty-five and older whose population the state's funding formula is based on.

Vice Chair Humphries made further comments about veterans and the BOR's special projects in that area. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that the BOR is scheduled to have a veteran-related advertisement in the *USA Today* this November. This advertisement outlines the State of Ohio and what the state has to offer its veterans in terms of education and workforce development. This will be a national profile for the state. Vice Chair Humphries said with that veterans are adult learners and we do care about them a great deal in the State of Ohio. He said that many of them receive the GI Benefit as well. He said he believes it would be worth a worth a foot note in the report to identify what part of the adult learner population are veterans in this state. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger briefly explained some of the veteran related provisions of House Bill 488 of the 130th General Assembly and said that there are a number of provisions solely dedicated to assisting veterans on campuses.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said they will draft the data section to read that the State of Ohio does not differ much from the rest of the nation. He said that there are not a lot of anomalies across the state so they believe a lot of the recommendations should resonate across all sectors.

IV. Review of Recommendations

Associate Vice Chancellor Visger began by saying that as Assistant Deputy Chancellor See stated earlier they believed that it made more sense to provide a more holistic overview of the recommendations. He summarized the nine draft recommendations (which can be found as Attachment #1): (1) Support campuses to develop an objective baseline analysis of their capacity to serve adult learners; (2) Chancellor should collaborate with institutions of higher education to develop a statewide communications campaign targeted to getting adult learners to enroll in a University System of Ohio institution;(3) Coordinate with three to five campuses to pilot a concierge model that supports moving adult students from interest to enrollment; (4) Convene consultation with colleges to explore ways to provide financial incentives for adults in technical certificate programs; (5) Engage working group from campuses to develop recommendations for implementation of structured pathways for adult students; (6) Build the capacity of campuses to provide prior learning assessment by training faculty assessors and develop common data elements for prior learning assessment; (7) Ensure that competency-based pilots address the needs of adult learners; (8) Develop regional pilot programs that link business and education to connect incumbent adult workers to further education and training; and (9) Collaborate with institutions to develop a set of data elements to be used to facilitate outreach to adults.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See added that some of the draft recommendations will have cost implications associated with them. He said those items will have to be vetted through the budgeting structure of not only the BOR but of the state agenda as a whole. He said any recommendation with cost associated with it will have to go through a separate process so he wanted them to keep that in mind when formulated strategies towards these items.

Chair Kessler asked if there were for-profit institutions students are able to attend that they may not receive credit for as it relates to educating consumers. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied that they are doing a great deal at the federal level around this topic. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said there are subtle ways that the message could be delivered as it relates to public institutions and they just need to avoid any potential negative connotations of for-profit institutions. He said her point is well taken because they want individuals to receive Certificates and Degrees of value that matter and there has to be a level of responsibility in their messaging if they were to do that. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger said that the 'debt to earnings' ratio of the certificate or degree is also an issue as well.

Chair Kessler began her comments of the draft recommendations. She asked if the recommendations would be drafted at the end of each section in the report and then summarized. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See responded that they plan to only have a recommendations section at the end of the report and not have recommendations at the end of each section as what was done past reports.

Chair Kessler followed up with another question and asked if they believed that nine recommendations were too many. She said that recommendations one and nine could be combined. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See agreed with her thoughts and said they could combine these two recommendations. He said if there are other 'themes' that can be combined in the recommendations to please let him know. Chair Kessler agreed and said that themes such as the concierge component (advisors, mentors, etc.) that many of the presenters before the subcommittee spoke about seemed to be very important to success adult population. She made comments on the other recommendations and said they were all critical.

Vice Chair Humphries asked who the audience would be for the Condition Report as he believed the recommendations should be structured and targeted for that audience. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said with that, the report is submitted to the Governor and General Assembly leadership so they should be able to extract the policy elements that they want to be highlighted. He said from a practical standpoint the report does circulate around institutions so they want to have enough good information where they are able to draw and learn from the report as well.

Associate Vice Chancellor Visger suggested that they combine recommendations one and nine; and combine recommendation six regarding Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) into another recommendation. He said that PLA is discussed in the Academic section of the report. Chair Kessler agreed with combining recommendation six into other recommendations.

Chair Kessler asked if the individual institutions make the decisions regarding PLA. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied yes; the individual institutions make the decisions regarding PLA. He said the challenges with PLA are that the administration has been interested in doing it however it has been a slower adoption with faculty because it changes their role from the ones conveying the information to ones assessing the information.

They began to discuss recommendation four and Chair Kessler asked what funding the OTCs received. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied that they receive state funding. Chair Kessler said the OTCs' students are graduating at a higher rate and are starting careers so the state investment is worth it. They both made comments about the benefits of the OTC programs for adult learners.

With this, Chair Kessler asked if they then believe that recommendation four is the appropriate recommendation. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied that other states have committed adult-specific funding to this. He said the State of Ohio does not have a great deal of funding so they have to have a certificate program that links to a degree. Assistant Vice Chancellor Magill added that this also benefits Community Colleges to get additional funding points for certificates and credentials.

Chair Kessler asked if other states would read the Condition Report as it may be of interest to other states that were dealing with the same issues in the area of adult learners. She also said she wanted the report shared with the presenters that appeared before the subcommittee. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger said other states may read the report depending on how the report is launched and distributed. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said Demarée Michelau the Director of Policy Analysis, of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education has already expressed interest in receiving a copy of the report upon its completion. He said other states are very interested in what is happening in this area.

*Secretary Lindseth made comments about faculty preparation for adult learners and wanted to know if any reference was made to this in the Condition Report or in the recommendations. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied that this information does not appear in the recommendations but does appear in the body of the report. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said there is a section in the report that needs to expanded upon that talks about 'Centers for Teaching and Learning' which focuses on the idea that as institutions continue to develop their faculty throughout their careers so they can stay abreast of current learning practices, research and theories that included within this must be things that are important to adult instruction.

*Secretary Lindseth said many of the Community Colleges have adjunct faculty who are not on the campus full-time and she wondered how engaged they would be at appealing and teaching specifically to adults. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said this is a valid point and this recommendation can be considered if the subcommittee so chooses. Chair Kessler said they will look at this suggestion when the final report is drafted. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger and Assistant Deputy Chancellor See discussed areas of the report that they may be able to incorporate the recommendation that Secretary Lindseth made regarding faculty.

Chair Kessler asked Assistant Deputy Chancellor See to discuss the ABLE section of the report. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that the 'place holder' for the ABLE section is towards the beginning of the document following the Data section. He said they outline the following: creating the necessary partnerships with different organizations to recruit adults; and universities collaborating with community colleges and employers. He said this is not a group that should be forgotten in terms of trying to forge necessary partnerships and pathways. He said ABLE is part of the University System of Ohio (USO) and they have centered a lot of strategies on the transitioning steps.

Chair Kessler asked if ABLE population would mainly meet the report definition of 'adult learner'. Associate Vice Chancellor Visger replied yes the ABLE population would meet the definition because they are over twenty-five years of age; however they do not have their high school diploma. They made other general comments about the success of the ABLE program and the USO structured pathways.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Magill added that part of the awareness to the institutions is that there is an ABLE population. He talked about the opportunities to earn credits to create 'traction' that creates comeback opportunities for students. He said this is very important for a short term certificate and advancing a student's career at the same time.

V. Subcommittee Members Initial Thoughts of the Draft Report

Chair Kessler asked what their next steps were as a subcommittee. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said they need to give them their overall general impression of the draft report (length; subject matter, topics missed, grammar, etc.).

Chair Kessler asked when the draft report would be available for the full board review. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied that they anticipate the next draft being ready June 3rd. He said that draft will be sent to the entire board.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See made general comments about what areas still need to be drafted and said that he anticipates that the report may lengthen once these areas are added. Vice Chair Humphries said that he believes that individuals will 'generally' read the Executive Summary and the Recommendations. *Secretary Lindseth added that she believed that the 'body' of the report needed to be strengthened and be made clearer as it relates to student and institution-based examples. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they do intend to include institution-based examples that were obtained from the surveys. He said it may be worth an effort to try to obtain some student-based examples if they can obtain those and time allows.

*Secretary Lindseth asked what editing process the draft would go through from this point forward and how they should note suggested grammar or spelling edits. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See replied they are still drafting the document and the draft they received on June 3rd should have a complete edit of the full document. Elizabeth Coulter, Communications Project Manager added that they should 'make it as a comment or track change' in the document and return those to her for editing.

*Secretary Lindseth made comments about the content of the report. She said as it related to individuals hoping to better their job position and yet there was very little at institutions for finding actual jobs after students finish their programs. Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said that they focused on these efforts in the last Condition Report up to and including legislative efforts in the area of Career Services; however that is not to say that it is

worth mentioning in this report especially as it related to concierge engagement and career opportunities. Vice Chair Humphries said that there was a great deal of effort put into the 7th Condition Report and referencing that would be very valuable to individuals.

VI. Next Steps

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See said all the board members will receive the draft report after June 3rd and they will take all board members comments and edits into consideration at the June 11th meeting. He said based on the edits at the June 11th board meeting they have one of two approaches to finalizing the Condition Report. If the edits are minor, the board can vote to approve the report giving the Chancellor the authority to finalize the report subject to those edits being made. If the members believe the edits are more substantial, and another draft review is necessary a special meeting of the board will be held.

Assistant Deputy Chancellor See asked the subcommittee members if they were in general agreement with the draft report. The subcommittee members agreed they were comfortable with the today's discussions and the draft report to date. He said based on the member's comments today they will incorporate the changes into the draft.

VII. Adjournment

Chair Kessler asked if there were any further items to be brought before the subcommittee. There being none, Vice Chair Humphries made a motion to adjourn the meeting and this motion was seconded by Chair Kessler. All Regents voted in favor of the motion adjourning the meeting and Chair Kessler declared the meeting adjourned.

Ohio Board of Regents

8/13/15
Date

Draft Recommendations

1. **Support campuses to develop an objective baseline analysis of their capacity to serve adult learners.** An important first step for campus-level efforts is to understand how existing capacity and policy has an effect on adult learners. In addition to looking more closely at campus data for adults, campuses should conduct a baseline assessment of policies and services focused on adults. Such an assessment would be comprehensive in approach and examine important elements such as depth of learning modalities available to adults and supportive services. Rather than have each campus research the elements necessary for assessing their adult serving capacity, there is value in a common tool that is cost-effective to administer. The Chancellor should investigate and identify sources of tools for campuses to assess their capacity to serve adult learners. Ideally, these tools will be research-based and can allow campuses to benchmark themselves against other institutions of similar size and mission.

2. **The Chancellor should collaborate with institutions of higher education to develop a statewide communications campaign targeted to getting adult learners to enroll in a University System of Ohio institution.** Research cited in the report demonstrated that adults don't always have the knowledge of the opportunities available for them to engage in postsecondary education. The Chancellor should coalesce campuses around common messaging opportunities around cost, time, flexibility and benefits at University System of Ohio institutions to better engage potential adult learners. The Chancellor should establish a messaging campaign for Ohio that can be shared both with institutions and strategic partners such as Ohio Means Jobs. These efforts are complementary to, campus-specific marketing plans that they indicated would expand in the next 12 months.

3. **Coordinate with 3-5 campuses to pilot a concierge model that supports moving adult students from interest to enrollment.** Many campuses have dedicated offices that offer resources for returning adult students. These offices, however, provide a range of services for students. . While some Ohio institutions offer services similar to the concierge approach, the group is small. Amidst scarce resources, however, there is benefit to further analyses of both the direct cost of such a program and the longer term returns of better enrollment, retention and completion – especially factoring Ohio's performance-based funding models that provide weighted funding for adult learners. In order to accelerate this study, the Chancellor should create a pilot for concierge services for adults at 3-5 institutions; this would provide the Chancellor with opportunity to study the outcomes and conduct cost-benefit research on the outcomes of completion for adults of the concierge model.

4. **Convene consultation with colleges to explore ways to provide financial incentives for adults in technical certificate programs.** Two realities facing adults in returning to postsecondary education is time and money. Technical certificate programs that are less-than one year offer great opportunities for adults to obtain skills that the labor market needs in a shorter period of time. In most cases, these technical certificate programs articulate to degree programs through initiatives like the One Year Option and Career Tech Credit Transfer (CT2), offering a strong foundation to continue their academic career. The Chancellor should work with institutions to develop a proposal for the next biennial budget that provides adults over 25 with financial incentives to return to less than one year technical programs that are part of a pathway to a degree. This proposal would include research into how the funding formula may be leveraged to provide financial resources for adult students. Other possibilities include research into braiding other funding sources, dedicating a portion of existing state grant funds to adults or identification of a separate, discrete funding source.

5. **Engage working group from campuses to develop recommendations for implementation of structured pathways for adult students.** Campuses that have implemented structured pathways have shown resulting improvements in student completion; this is true for both traditional and adult students Structured pathways involve of courses of study and include milestone courses with timelines for taking them combined with intrusive advising; this approach provides the clarity of expectations and supports that research has shown adults desire. The Chancellor should continue disseminating information on successful structured pathway approaches so that campuses have the tools that can help all students and also address important needs of adult learners. In addition to disseminating information on guided pathways, the Chancellor should empanel a working group with representatives from a cross-section of campuses to make recommendations on how to effectively implement structured pathways for adult students. Structured pathways hold promise, but how they are implemented is critical to their success; the working group could spell out the necessary steps to effective implementation.

6. **Build the capacity of campuses to provide prior learning assessment by training faculty assessors and develop common data elements for prior learning assessment.** Prior learning assessment has been shown to be an important asset in the engagement of adults in postsecondary education. It validates adult learning theory and recognizes that adults return to college with high-quality learning experiences. Ohio's colleges and universities have responded to the Chancellor's PLA with a Purpose initiative by expanding opportunities to award credit for prior learning. As part of these efforts, there has been continued interest in gathering and disseminating information as well as looking for opportunities to provide professional development to faculty on PLA in their role as assessor. The Chancellor should also establish common data reporting elements for PLA to be included in the rewritten Higher Education Information (HEI) system.

7. **Ensure that competency-based pilots address the needs of adult learners**. Competency-based education holds great promise for adult learners; done well, it can provide the flexibility that many adults require when returning to postsecondary education. The pilots included in the FY2016-17 budget will build the foundation for Ohio's efforts in competency-based postsecondary education, so it is critical that adult learners are included as key constituency.

8. **Develop regional pilot programs that link business and education to connect incumbent adult workers to further education and training.** The Chancellor should look to expand/pilot regional approaches that link business and education to further opportunities for incumbent adult workers. The pilots would work with 3-5 institutions to produce and develop a regional model that addresses the needs of business and leverages educational strategies for adults. The outcomes of these regional pilots would be analyzed to review academic, administrative and financial models to inform potential future efforts to scale. This information would be shared at a Chancellor led convening with institutions and business stakeholders.

9. **Collaborate with institutions to develop a set of data elements to be used to facilitate outreach to adults.** The Ohio Board of Regents is currently in the process of developing a rewrite of the Higher Education Information System. Part of that work could include a focus on the data elements needed for campuses to identify and conduct outreach to adult learners. OBOR could facilitate a focus group of Campus Institutional Research Personnel, institution marketing or institutional advancement personnel and academic chairs of programs at institutions that have been targeted as key "re-entry" programs for "adult learners". This group could develop an outline of the data important to track and collect on adult learners across the public education system who fit the profile as determined by the institutions. That data outline could then be presented to the Chancellor for consideration/adoption within the parameters of the HEI rewrite. This would enable both institutional and state level planning to take place related to identifying and then providing targeted marketing strategies and supportive service design to attract and retain these individuals across the system. Such data could be a key element in assessing and developing future strategies aimed at this population.