One Year Option All Team Orientation – Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, July 30, 2014
10:00 AM -2:00 PM
Ohio Board of Regents, Basement Conference Room
25 South Front Street Columbus OH

- Co-Chairs Present: Kelly Darney, Columbiana County Career and Technical Center, Dione DeMitro, Lakeland Community College, Scott Halm, Cuyahoga Community College, Amy Leedy, Miami Valley Career Technology Center, Harry Synder, Great Oaks Career Center, Barbara Wagner, Upper Valley Career Center, Kelly Zelesnik, Lorain County Community College
- Committee Members Present: Janeil Bernheisel, Sinclair Community College, Linda Bumiller, Miami Valley Career Technology Center, Tim Conley, Pickaway-Ross Career and Technology Center, Daniel Deckler, University of Akron: Wayne College, Collin Doolittle, Northwest State Community College, Stacy Franks, Tri-County Adult Career Center, Jeannie Haapalainen, Ashland County West Holmes Career Center, Fran Haldar, Kent State University at Tuscarawas, Jennifer Hall, Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Tony Hills, Northwest State Community College, Stan Jones, Kent State University at Salem, Lorraine Kapka, Sinclair Community College, Emeline Kelly, Tri-Rivers Career Center, Deborah Neal, Scioto County Career Technical Center, Jami Nininger, Knox County Career Center, Phyllis O’Connell, Polaris Career Center, Larry Ray, Stark State College, Mike Sizemore, Miami Valley Career Technology Center, Tina Trombley, Career and Technology Education Centers of Licking County, Kathy Wilcox, Clark State Community College
- Consultants: John Buttelwerth, Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Jon Tafel, Sycamore Street Consulting, Mike Snider, Ohio Association of Community Colleges
- Ohio Board of Regents staff: Paula Compton, Stephanie Davidson, Patty Klein, Anthony Landis, Calista Smith, William Souder, Brett Visger

I. Welcome and Introductions
Brett Visger, Associate Vice Chancellor of Institutional Collaboration, welcomed meeting attendees and asked for attendees to introduce themselves. He discussed that nationally there is a need for more employees to receive education beyond high school. The great news is that Ohio has a lot of capacity for post-secondary education. However, there is some disconnect within the system. The One Year Option will create more connections for more students and give students another option to reach their post-secondary goals. While this initiative has been driven by legislation, the focus is on student success.

II. Background of Project
Stephanie Davidson, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, gave some background on the One Year Option. The legislation behind the One Year Option states “Not later than June 30, 2014, the Chancellor of the Board of Regents shall establish a One-Year Option credit articulation system in which graduates of Ohio Technical Centers who complete a 900-hour program of study and obtain an industry-credential approved by the Chancellor shall receive 30 college technical credit hours toward a technical degree upon enrollment in an institution of higher education.”
- The One Year Option planning process included the formation of focus groups. Within these focus groups, some concerns were about accreditation and assuring that these 900+ clock hour programs could be affirmed to 30 credit hours. Additionally, an OBR Internal Steering team and a One-Year Option Stakeholders Team was formed and established a framework for affirming 30 technical college credit hours in the “Getting to 30” document. Several guiding principles throughout the planning process included building on existing systems, staying solutions driven, having a shared responsibility, and most importantly, staying student focused.
• The Ohio Board of Regents has established a list of existing 900+ programs with industry-recognized credentials into four clusters. Additionally, another group has worked to define and set criteria for certificate programs to be approved as One Year Technical Certificates. This will increase consistency across the University System of Ohio institutions and ensure these technical certificates are connected to labor market outcomes. Lastly, the Ohio Board of Regents met with a Higher Learning Commission employee who stated that instead of creating a contractual relationship for the One Year Option, the Board of Regents could use straight articulation as long as the technical centers created a transcript to send to the community colleges.

• The Ohio Board of Regents considered the different associate degree options and chose to use an Associate of Technical Studies degree. Because this degree already has technical and non-technical requirements, it is a great fit for the One Year Option. The ideal One Year Option ATS degree will consist of 30 hours of block credit and 30 hours of non-technical credit. These 30 hours of non-technical credit will consist of the required general education courses and courses that fit into the student’s academic goals. The students will then receive a degree in a general field of study to differentiate this degree from other degrees. For example, a student who utilizes the One Year Option may receive an ATS in Health Studies, not an ATS in medical assisting.

• This initiative will build off credit processes already in place including Career-Technical Assurance Guides (CTAGs). The goal is not to replace these processes, but to give students another option. For example, a student who wants to obtain a specific degree could use the CTAG process. Where as a student who may want a more general degree could use the One Year Option.

• Credit affirmation teams have been created and divided into four clusters: Business and IT, Health, Trades, and Services and Agriculture. These teams are balanced between the technical centers and degree granting institutions and consist of co-chairs, team members, and subject matter experts.

• Numerous guiding principles will be utilized in the review process.
  1) Ohio Board of Regents will work with HLC to ensure this process meets HLC standards
  2) The programs will be reviewed as a block of credit, not on a course by course basis
  3) The affirmation teams will review the 900+ hour program and the teams will make a recommendation to the chancellor
  4) Every attempt to approve 900+ hour programs for 30 semester hours will be made with the exception that programs must be academically viable and adhere to accreditation standards.
  5) The block of credit will fit into the technical portion of an Associate of Technical studies degree.
  6) Programs under 900 hours will be reviewed to determine the credit hours to be awarded
  7) Teams will review the second year of the ATS degree and if appropriate make recommendations

• The differences between what the credit affirmation process is and is not were discussed.
  1) The credit affirmation process will establish a block of credit, not course by course equivalencies.
  2) The credit affirmation process will determine the amount of credit that students should be awarded for obtaining an industry recognized credential. It will not determine if an industry recognized credential is valid for the program.
  3) The credit affirmation process will review all relevant credentials to determine if 30 technical hours can be awarded for all program participants who pass an industry recognized credential. This process will not review program outcomes of each Ohio Technical Center (OTC). If existing credentials do not merit 30 credit hours, the team may consider reviewing program level data.
  4) The credit affirmation process will review acceptance of credit and recommend the design of an ATS degree. The process will not design an existing applied associate’s degree.
  5) The review process will recommend 30 credit hours of non-technical coursework for programs. The process will not recommend additional technical coursework for the college to deliver.
6) The credit affirmation process will set parameters around recency and residency requirements in order to ensure the integrity and ease of student use. The process will not set recency and residency requirements that will unnecessarily restrict student use.

- Additionally, the Board of Regents will consider higher learning commission guidelines, data tracking, communication strategies, college residency requirements, and proportional credit for programs less than 900 hours for the One Year Option.
- Another point was made that many institutions are already offer students credit for prior learning experience. However, this option will guarantee that a student will receive 30 semester hours if they complete a program and obtain an industry credential.

Several student scenarios were discussed and whether these students would fit into the One Year Option.

- Lisa has worked as a help desk technician for 3 years. Lisa received a certificate in Information and Support Services and is CompTia+ certified. Lisa’s supervisor, Dan, believes Lisa has a lot of potential and he would like to promote her to a supervisor position. However, Dan wants Lisa to earn her associate’s degree before promoting her.
  - Lisa could be a great candidate for the One Year Option if Dan was okay with her receiving a general associate’s degree. However, if Dan wanted her to have a specific associate’s degree, she may want to utilize the CTAG process.
- Todd is working as Paramedic for the City of Cleveland. He has been in the field for over 10 years and is ready to change his career path. He has worked with several hospital administrators and believes that he would be a good fit for these positions. His goal is to receive his bachelor’s degree, but because he has a family to support, he knows he needs to do it in steps.
  - Todd could utilize the One Year Option to receive a general associate’s degree and move on to the University of Akron’s online leadership bachelor’s degree program since Akron’s program is flexible and would likely accept his associate degree credit.
  - Todd could look at Hospital Administrator job postings to determine what degrees these companies preferred or required. Then, determine whether utilizing the One Year Option process would be a good fit.
- Lily has been working as a cosmetologist at Mary’s Hair Salon for the past 4 years. She has developed a strong clientele and would like to open her own hair salon. Lily previously completed an 1800 hour certificate program and received her managing cosmetology license. Before Lily opens her own shop, she would like to obtain her associate’s degree to strengthen her business, writing, financial, and communication skills.
  - Lily could utilize the One Year Option, taking 15 hours in general education courses and the additional entrepreneurship courses to help prepare her to open her own shop.

III. Certification Affirmation Template Discussion

The certification affirmation template was discussed. The intended goal of the template is to assist the teams in affirming programs that are equivalent to 30 credit hours. The focus of this template is on whether the competencies a student obtains from passing an industry recognized credential are equivalent to 30 credit hours. The group discussed each portion of the template and the form directions. Please see the form directions for a more extensive list of steps in the review process.

1) Fill in program name, cluster, and CIP code and move on to “Step One: Credential Review”
2) Fill in the primary industry credential and determine the type of credential. Complete another page if there is more than one industry credential. In the comments section, teams can include a basic description of the credential. Some description elements may be whether the credential is
modular or embedded, how the credential is assessed, the review cycle of the credential, and
genral comments about the credential.

3) Describe essential elements of primary credential and competencies demonstrated by
credential attainment. For these steps, completing upfront intelligence research about the
primary industry credentials will help when reviewing the program. In the comments section,
the committee may also enter any questions they may have as well as information about the
credential competencies. This could be in the form of an addendum or a hyperlink.

4) Answer whether the competencies signaled by credential attainment are equivalent 30 credit
hours? If yes, then the review process is over. If no, state why. Then move on to “Step Two:
Program-Related Competencies Obtained Outside of Primary Credential.”

5) Consider additional complimentary credentials and the competencies these demonstrate. Some
example may include OSHA10 and CPR. The comments section may include questions or
comments about the credentials and information about the credential competencies.

6) Determine if adding these credentials, the program is equivalent to 30 credit hours. If yes, then
the review process is over. If no, then consider additional program elements.

7) At this point, the goal is to look at additional elements included in all or most of the career
technical programs. The comments section may include any questions, comments, or concerns
as well as competencies demonstrated from these additional elements.

8) Determine if with these additional program elements and credentials, the program is equivalent
to 30 credit hours. If yes, fill 30 into the affirmed number of technical block credits. If no, fill in
the affirmed number of block credit hours.

9) Fill in the length of time credential can be used for the One Year Option. This could vary greatly
depending on the field. One example recommendation may be that a paramedic has to have
obtained their license in the least 10 years and maintained the currency of the license to be
eligible for the One Year Option.

10) Co-chairs need to sign and date certification affirmation template and send to Ohio Board of
Regents staff.

After discussing the template, several comments were made. One was the recognition that some of
these programs will be easy to review and others will be more of a challenge. There will likely be a few
programs that cannot be deemed worthy of 30 credit hours. The goal of these teams is to make a
recommendation to the Chancellor on whether a program is equivalent to 30 credit hours and make
recommendations for general education requirements that may fit with this student’s potential career.

IV. Case Study: HVAC

The group ran through HVAC as a mock example. The importance of completing upfront intelligence
research was discussed so that when a team reviews a program, they have background information to
affirm the program is worth 30 credit hours. For HVAC, there are numerous credentials. The group
focused on the North American Technician Excellence Industry Competency Exam and went through a
brief example of how Step 1 of the template may look. For the case of the example, the team stated that
this credential did not quite reach 30 credit hours. The team then looked at some of the additional
credentials that Ohio HVAC programs offer such as OSHA 10 and EPA 608. There were questions about a
program that may use a different industry credential than the other schools throughout Ohio. The
discussion centered on that these teams are looking for commonalities among programs and are not
completing individual program reviews.
V. Report Outs/Questions
Attendees divided into their 4 different clusters. Each team reported briefly on their discussion.

- The health team determined their priority programs and members are working together in groups of two or three to complete background research on those programs.
- The trade teams stated their highest priority reviews would look at programs with the NCCER credential. They also are planning to complete all of the reviews by September 30, 2014.
- The services and agriculture team discussed their priority programs.
- The business and IT team determined that they were going to start working on the administrative and office technology program. Then they will plan to move on to the other two programs.

There were several comments to conclude the meeting. The first was around background information needed to begin review. One key item the group requested was the list of career center with programs that fit into the One Year Option. The next comment was the Board of Regents planning to have monthly co-chair meetings to answer any questions that may arise. Information about the stipend for the review process was discussed. In regards to contracts, meeting attendees were asked to verify their contact information and to contact Patty Klein with any questions. Lastly, it was stated that the Ohio Board of Regents staff does not have all of the details figured out for so if there are thoughts about the structure or how to move forward, please let an Ohio Board of Regents staff member know.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:54 PM.