Co-Chairs Present: Chad Brown, Zane State College, Dione DeMitro, Lakeland Community College, Scott Halm Cuyahoga Community College, Amy Leedy (virtual) Miami Valley Career Technology Center, Barbara Wagner, Upper Valley Career Center, Kelly Zelesnik, Lorain County Community College

Consultants: Carol Puryear and Ellen Weed (teleconference), Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Jon Tafel, Sycamore Street Consulting, Mike Snider, Ohio Association of Community Colleges

Ohio Board of Regents Staff: Paula Compton, Associate Vice Chancellor of Articulation and Transfer, Stephanie Davidson, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Tony Landis, Senior Director of College and Career Access and Success, Calista Smith, Program Manager of Institutional Collaboration, William Souder, Assistant Director of Post-Secondary Pathways, Brett Visger, Associate Vice Chancellor of Institution Collaboration and Completion

Welcome and Introductions- Vice Chancellor Stephanie Davidson
Stephanie Davidson welcomed and facilitated meeting attendees’ personal introductions. She spoke briefly about how in 2007 the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) transferred the duties of a 9-member board to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents. During this period, the University System of Ohio was created. This system brought together Ohio technical centers, community colleges, and universities into one comprehensive system. The goal of this system is to create a seamless transition for students to complete their educational goals.

Background of Project- Associate Vice Chancellor Brett Visger
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-recognized 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 planning process included the formation of focus groups consisting of leadership from community colleges, Ohio technical centers, and a combination of both. As a result, an Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) Internal Steering team and a One-Year Option Stakeholders Team were formed, which crafted the “Getting to 30” document. The guiding principles of the planning process focused on building upon existing systems, staying solutions driven, having a shared responsibility and focusing on students.

Criteria for students to complete this option include the following:
1. Must complete a 900-hour program of study
2. Obtain an industry-recognized credential, approved by the Chancellor
3. Receive 30 college technical credit hours toward a technical degree
4. Upon enrollment into an institution of higher learning, students will be granted 30 block credits

These 30 block credits will then be applied to an Associate of Technical Studies degree as the technical portion and the remaining portion of the program will be the student’s general education requirements.

The Ohio Board of Regents is working to establish a list of existing 900+ hour programs with industry-recognized credentials, and defining elements of varying credentials. OBR is dividing the 31 credential programs into 4 broad clusters and considering any relevant Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requirements as it pertains to the One Year Option.

The goal of the One Year Option is create a system of consistency for all students across Ohio.
This initiative will build off credit processes already in place including Career-Technical Assurance Guides and Apprenticeship Articulation. The goal is not to replace these processes, but to give students another option that focuses on affirmation, not equivalency.

The role of the Credit Affirmation Teams (CATS) will be to review the programs that fit into the One Year Option. These teams were selected based on location, size, and type of institution and are in four different clusters: Business and IT, Health, Trades, and Services and Agriculture.

Several issues were brought up including ensuring that the option fits HLC requirements, tracking these students in AGI, communicating to students about this option, and any college residency requirements. The goal is that creating a template of a curriculum for this type of student may help to facilitate the program evaluation process.

III. Lessons Learned

**Career Technical Credit Transfer- Associate Vice Chancellor Paula Compton**
Paula Compton spoke regarding the lessons learned based upon previously established career technical systems. One important lesson she found was that if an initiative is student focused, it is more likely to succeed. Another lesson is it is imperative for faculty to represent their field of expertise, not their institution. She gave the co-chairs some advice about making the process as seamless as possible. She explained that co-chairs need to lead by example and that completing the upfront intelligence work before the review process begins is important. Lastly, building trust and respect among faculty members will help to reach the ultimate goal, student success.

**Program from Tennessee Higher Education Commission - Ellen Weed and Carol Puryear**
Drawing upon our peers in Tennessee, we spoke with Ellen Weed and Carol Puryear, representatives from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Their pathway is similar to the One Year Option as students who graduate from Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology or TCATS receive 30 technical credit hours toward an Applied Associates Degree. They noted that while their system is in place and works well, many students have not taken advantage of the program. Their data showed that this option was typically pursued by women with an LPN certificate to obtain an Associate’s degree and they believed many of their students pursued this option to further advance their career. Tennessee’s system differed from the One Year Option in that it does not have a licensure requirement and has a 1350 clock hour requirement. It was noted that the federal requirement is that 37.5 clock hours equals 1 credit hour and that Ohio’s 900 clock hours is not in alignment with this. There was discussion that this may be compensated for with hours outside of the classroom. Tennessee also noted that they respected Ohio using an industry credential as a means to assure that credit is granted appropriately and that faculty members will be heavily involved in the process because these elements were not involved in Tennessee’s program.

**Apprenticeships Program- Mike Snider – Ohio Association of Community Colleges**
Mike Snider spoke about his experience working with apprenticeship programs. The apprenticeship group used the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers program as a pilot for the apprenticeship program. These programs ranged widely in the amount of credit hours awarded. The overall goal of this program was to establish consistency among apprenticeship programs for students throughout Ohio. To reach this goal, the team created three different portals and a template with the electrical trade’s curriculum that totals 30 technical credit hours, so there was room for individuality within institutions. Lessons learned included awarding consistent credit for common experience is necessary and that there is great value in community college and technical center individuals communicating with one another. The point was made that adult students need pathways similar to this option because these pathways improve adult students’ chances of earning a degree.
Calculating the Economic Impact
Brett Visger began by presenting on national statistics. For every year a student defers going to college out of high school, their chances of obtaining a baccalaureate degree decrease by 50% until around age 21. When adult students go back to post-secondary education, they tend to pursue a certificate. Thus, this initiative will be crucial to providing another option for these adult learners. It was discussed that by 2025, 60% of jobs will require some level of education beyond a post-secondary degree. Following this discussion, we used the below link to examine the factors needed to reach this goal.

http://www.nchems.org/clasp.php

IV. Review Process
Jon Tafel began by outlining the framework and direction to be taken by the credit affirmation teams; co-chair duties mentioned included completing the upfront intelligence research, working collaboratively with their team and the Ohio Board of Regents, and facilitating the review process. These credit affirmation teams will be utilized to determine whether these programs fit into the parameters of the legislation. It is likely some programs will easily fit into these parameters and some will not fit. The notion is that the credit affirmation teams will provide some recommendations for programs that are 900 clock hours or longer that may not quite fit into the parameters of the initiative.

Additionally, the legislation calls for a proportional system for 600-899 clock hour programs. These programs may require some flexibility to satisfy technical requirements. For now, the focus will be on programs with more than 900 hours and programs with less than 900 clock hours will be considered later.

Jon Tafel presented the draft program affirmation template. This template is designed to provide a common review matrix for each of the cluster areas in the analysis and approval of these programs. Discussion centered on what additional criteria the co-chairs would need to evaluate these programs. A point was made that there is a need to create a more comprehensive checklist outlining program evaluation and accreditation.

The document on student use and the eligible programs and proposed clusters were discussed. It was proposed that aligning these documents and adding information regarding outside accreditations would be useful for future co-chair meetings. Additionally, having a document for institutions defining the curriculum behind the general education portion of this degree may be helpful. However, this could be difficult because different general education courses may be more beneficial for certain programs.

The budget for the project was discussed and will be further clarified at future meetings. Also, discussed was that an in-person co-chair follow-up meeting will be scheduled and the team member orientation would likely be in late July or early August. The meeting was adjourned with the recognition that this process will be difficult, but the legislation states that a process must be established.