

**Ohio's One-Year Option Stakeholders Team**  
**Ohio Board of Regents**  
**Columbus, Ohio**  
**Tuesday, December 17, 2013**  
**9am – 3pm**

**Meeting Minutes**

**In Attendance:** Dennis Budkowski, Bill Bussey, Paula Compton, Dorey Diab, Christine Gardner, Dennis Franks, Steve Gratz, Cathy Hill, Tony Landis, Lauren Massie, Stephanie McCann, Kim McKinley, Dennis Franks, Karen Miller, Steve Nameth, Barb Nichol, Sonja Pluck, B.J. Potter, Adam Schiming, , Calista Smith, Mike Snider, Harry Snyder, Bill Souder, Vicki Thompson, Jamilah Jones-Tucker, and Brett Visger

**Welcome & Introduction – Brett Visger, Associate Vice Chancellor, OBR**

Brett Visger began the meeting by welcoming everyone. Visger stated that he was personally excited about the progress and tremendous success of the CT2 and the Transfer and Articulation work. He recognized that this new legislation is another option for students to achieve success. He asked the stakeholders to be creative and forward focused in providing direction for the One-Year Option system. Visger stressed some “reality data” points:

- 22% who earn a credential at OTC go onto a credit bearing institution in 1-2 years.
- Of those people who move on, 64% completed a development education course in the first year (OTC students match level of readiness of others walking through the door)
- 21% of OTC graduates went on to a community college and 30% (check) of those entering OTCs had some college credit from a USO institution.

**Overview of the Day, Tony Landis, Director, OBR**

Tony Landis expressed that OBR was fortunate enough to assemble a group of great leaders for this endeavor. He noted that OBR plans to be very transparent about this process, so those not in attendance can get the information. We plan to have a web presence, allowing people interested in the work to know who is involved and our progress. Landis introduced the legislation and then outlined the Stakeholders goals: Propose the system mechanism for the One-Year Option, which will include One-Year Option models and institutional level implementation. He then stated the goal for the day: Develop and agree on model(s) that awards 30 college credits from a 900 hour program.

Landis continued by providing a timeline for the committee’s work (only in draft and not finalized—the timeline might change). The committee must develop and agree before the June 30, 2014 deadline. As a part of this timeline it was noted that faculty will be convened to discuss the approach(es). The stakeholders will meet in January and every month until April (no specific dates set as of yet). In March, an ad hoc committee consisting of stakeholders will be formed to discuss the process to award proportional credit toward a technical degree.

Landis remarked that **we want to keep students at the center of this work**. He then noted that the process is very specific explaining how a student must complete the 900 hours and the approved industry credential to be eligible for the 30 technical credit hours. He expressed the need to make sure that the group as well as others is aware of the requirement to gain 30 credit hours. The student must be aware too and understand how this will work.

Landis reviewed the agenda, referenced materials, and set a few ground rules for the discussion. The floor was open for questions/comments.

Some discussion occurred around accreditation and funding source challenges. These were noted and recognized as being a part of the afternoon discussion focused on creating an approach to getting to 30 credit hours. Also, Landis made clear that some specific funding issues could not be solved during the stakeholders work, but will be placed in a “Parking Lot” as important to the overall progress of a One-Year Option system. Visger noted that the group is tasked with satisfying the legislation and HLC guidelines.

Cindy McQuade, IUC, commented that the same discussion happened between the community colleges and universities and they were able to get there.

### **The Credit Equivalency Process – Jamilah Jones Tucker, Director, OATN/OBR**

Jamilah Jones Tucker presented on the five steps institutions take in order to create credit equivalency. Jones-Tucker provided an activity as an example for a medical assisting CTAG.

- Dennis Franks asked if data exists on how many students have taken advantage of CTAGs?

Jones-Tucker responded that OBR is working on getting this data through the HEI system. She also noted that keeping PLA, military and apprenticeship opportunities in mind is also important. She further noted the legislation that established the CTAG policy (**3333.16 Criteria, policies, and procedures for transfer of courses**).

Jones-Tucker discussed the CTAG Policy and why it came about: To reduce barriers and unnecessary duplication. She then noted what worked for the CTAG process was the following approach: Defining, Agreeing, Matching, Submitting, Reviewing. Match competencies and programs so that students can transfer to community colleges easier. These were the steps taken by faculty committees to build confidence around the equivalency process, creating endorsement within the system.

Jones-Tucker stated that secondary, OTCs and post-secondary colleges are 75% compliant with the CTAG submission process. Paula Compton stated that schools are mandated through legislation to comply and honor the credit.

### **How Ohio’s Apprenticeship Model Works – Mike Snider, Project Director, OACC**

Mike Snider Presented on the Electrical Trades Apprenticeship Model that was created through Ohio State Apprenticeship Council, OBR, and OACC. The timeline for developing the Apprenticeship model began in 2009 and received approval in 2012. The timeline gets shorter with every sought approval. There is a 10 credit spread on bi-lateral articulation agreements within apprenticeship programs. The major barriers included: HLC changing in their review policy and Ohio’s change to semesters. Unlike Ohio, the apprenticeship programs are housed in the community colleges in other states such as Indiana and Wisconsin.

Mike noted that the Apprenticeship program standards are national. They learned three key things from HLC: 1) concurrent enrollment of apprenticeship and college; 2) liaisons serve as advisors to students; and 3) liaisons serve as review of curriculum from the community college. Paula Compton stated if you look at history of articulation and transfer, starting with general education courses, then courses to course, then programs to courses –the one thing unique about apprenticeships is that they are block, 30

hour credits that are competency-based. This process opened the door to HLC because when Ohio went to them, they had never seen it before.

#### **Developing a 900 Hour Program – Harry Snyder, Adult Director, Great Oaks Career Center**

Harry presented on the process used to create a 900 hour program at most OTCs. He said he begins the process by looking to other states and institutions to see “Who has done this?” He stated that the market has to support a program and OBR has to sign off on a new program. Once approved, he then markets to students through catalogs. Once the program is started, the OTC will run it and determine if there is a good return on the investment. He noted that it is important to know if it will benefit the community and if not, sometimes new programs get halted. Right now, fracking jobs are widespread especially in the eastern Ohio.

The question was asked “What is considered a contact hour? Answer: A contact hour could be an hour in class, or an hour interning, or an hour in the lab.

#### **Survey Results: One + One Programs Currently in Place**

Due to time constraints, Tony Landis decided to pass on reviewing the One-Year Option Survey. Instead, there was discussion around the data. Calista Smith developed a spreadsheet that provided an overview of the 900 hour programs, which included the variation in similar programs (Ex: HVAC programs that range from 900-1150 hours). The handout/excel sheet provided a list of the 900+ programs, organized by program area, then joined with industry credential and CTAG credit (if available).

Brett Visger pointed out that the list of programs is not extensive. It was acknowledged that some programs were missing and will be updated at a later date.

#### **Getting to 30: Creating approaches for Ohio’s One-Year Option – Group discussion – Facilitated by Calista Smith, Program Coordinator, OBR**

Calista Smith facilitated discussion on the opportunities or hurdles that need to be addressed in order to get a model for the One Year Option. She began by noting some questions that came up earlier in the day:

- How to increase student utilization of the one-year option?
- How to handle “boutique” courses and competencies?
- Will the model be based on competencies and tying it to examinations? Will the test only measure certain competencies? Will it be enough according to the scope?

The session primarily discussed the following models and examples:

1. Using the CTAG process for a discipline that has been reviewed for 30 semester credits (e.g. paramedic).
  - a. Pros: May apply well to existing programs that have industry licenses. The CTAG process meets HLC requirement of faculty review. The CTAG process has 75% compliance regarding program submission.
  - b. Cons: There are concerns about the implementation of the CTAG processes including time constraint of process (faculty panels), receiving institutions not submitting CTAG information, difficulty for students in getting CTAG credit recognition. It was clarified that all colleges must accept credit of a CTAG program even if the colleges program has not submitted for CTAG.

2. What to do for an OTC 900 hour program that lacks a comparable degree program. This will need to be discussed in more detail at the discipline level. Associate of technical studies may have to be an option.
3. ATS degree – All community colleges have this capability. This was the model the group wanted to explore in greater detail to accommodate the One Year Option. It was suggested statewide committees by discipline be utilized to meet HLC requirements and determine how to award block credit. There were additional suggestions about relying on competencies outlined by regulatory bodies, particularly for programs that lead to an occupational license.
  - a. Pros: Can comply with HLC requirements for peer review. Some existing models of the ATS working. Have flexibility with credit alignment.
4. Concurrent enrollment agreements. This was mentioned as a potential item to explore but was placed in the parking lot for future discussion.

### **General Comments/ Questions affecting potential models**

This list is a compilation of comments and questions that arose during the afternoon:

- We need to stay focused on the student outcomes and the goals for Ohio including clear degree pathway for students.
- Colleges may need to minimize residency requirements.
- Requirements (internal and external) for the amount of technical credits that have to be delivered by the awarding institution needs to be monitored
- The level of liability an institution may have for accepting credits for prior learning and awarding a degree
- Need to determine how to have good student utilization or the One Year Option. Credit verification process should be made as easy as possible for the student. Need to address questions and concerns about transcripts.
- Level of applicability of credits of credit program verification
- OTC, colleges, and employers will need to work together regarding program design in the best interest of the student.
- Who determines competency-- Receiving institution, licensing institution?
- Need to consider solutions that are not solely dependent on course by course alignment to accept credit. Block credit is preferred by some. This may include using more competency-based awarding of credit.
- Need to determine how to handle “boutique” courses and competencies that are unique to a particular institution.
- Utilizing PLA (prior learning assessments. The amount may depend on recommendations from CAEL. May be a part of the credit awarding process.
- Are all colleges organized the same so far as 30 hour general education requirements? How can we learn from or consider this in the design of the One-Year Option.

**The majority agreed to continue to explore the Associate of Technical Studies (ATS) degree pathways for implementing the One-Year Option Initiative in the next meeting.**

### **Parking Lot:**

**The following items were mentioned as issues to address in the future:**

- Financial Aid Impact
- Concurrent enrollment

- Multiple enrollment scenarios in OTCs and College
- Financial incentives/barriers for institutions

### **Next Steps**

Tony Landis thanked everyone for their participation and was glad that the group was able to reach their goal for the meeting. He will follow up with everyone by the end of the week with more information about work to be accomplished during the next meeting on Tuesday, January 7, 2014 (**Update: This meeting was moved to Thursday, January 30, 2014 due to snow and sub-zero temperatures—the Artic Vortex**).

### **Adjourned**

Meeting ended at 3 p.m.