

Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services Cluster Faculty Panel Meeting
The Ohio State University
The Fawcett Center
Clinton Room
2400 Olentangy River Road
Columbus, OH 43210
Monday, February 13, 2017
10:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Present: Marie Huff, Tressa Arnold, Mike Thomas, Juliann Bosko Young, Dee A. Malcuit, Bill D. Kosteas, Allysen Todd, Lee Wayand, William Cunion, Caryn Scott, Cindy MCQuade, Mary Ann Haley, Alice Walker, Jennifer Kukis, Cecilia Shore, Michelle Slattery, Melissa Faber, Cody Loew, Laurie R. Hatch, Ramona Olvera, Joseph Abbott, Christopher Kacir, Lisa Mahle-Grisez, Jody Bishop, Shari Shiepis, William H. Taylor, Tamara S. Davis, William Husen, Steve Fink, Paul E. Levy, David Black, Ruth Ann Van Loon, Paul Dovyak, Carl Brun, December Green, Ronal Shaklee, Susan Markel, Mike Snider, and Randy Smith

Guest Presenter: John Fink

ODHE/OATN Staff: Paula Compton, Stephanie Davidson, Hideo Tsuchida, Jessi Spencer, Mae Livingston and Katie Dean

I. Welcome & Introduction

Dr. Paula Compton, Associate Vice Chancellor, called the Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Service Cluster Faculty Panel Meeting to order. She welcomed the panel members and introduced the co-leads: Dr. David Black of The University of Toledo, Dr. Joseph Abbott Jr. of Rhodes State College, and Dr. Tamara S. Davis of The Ohio State University.

II. Meeting Objectives

Dr. Compton reviewed the Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services Cluster Faculty Panel Meeting objectives:

- Engage in discussion to determine the best approach for developing Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways
- Gain an understanding of the goal of the initiative
- Gain an understanding of the process, essential elements, and the faculties' role in development
- Learn about best practices and success stories of transfer at the national and local level
- Confirm that the appropriate individuals are representing their institutions

III. Development of Guaranteed Transfer Pathways

Dr. Stephanie Davidson described the development of the Guaranteed Transfer Pathways and introduced two goals. The first goal, to lower the cost of education, focuses on the student pursuit of a bachelor's degree. The second goal, to develop a program fair to both native and transfer students, maintains native student population opportunity while encouraging transfer student opportunity. Dr. Davidson then reviewed the prior progress of certificate and associate degree alignment. She then stated the next step in the process is to align associate degrees and course transfer to a bachelor's degree program. The Guaranteed Transfer Pathways initiative is rooted in the ideas of clusters and the possibility of general academic courses applying to all major within a single cluster. Dr. Davidson closed her opening remarks with three questions to consider throughout the meeting:

1. How long do students stay in the general area of an academic cluster?
2. How is this completed without losing efficiency?
3. Are we going to build what we are doing based on learning outcomes or based on courses?

Dr. Jim Fowler, the co-lead for the Communication, Outreach, & Engagement Subgroup and assistant professor at The Ohio State University, began by discussing the review model for Ohio mathematics. He addressed concerns regarding the successes of courses and students, as well as the transferability of current courses. He stated the objectives were to increase success and to impact the percentage of students completing degrees. Specifying the new mathematic structure, Dr. Fowler shared goals to provide high-quality intro-level courses: to increase transfer success, to improve outreach and communication, to provide data-driven choices, and to align secondary and postsecondary practices.

Dr. Fowler illustrated that of the students who complete college algebra, only 30% go on to complete business calculus and only 10% pursue additional courses in calculus. The remaining 60% of students do not complete any subsequent calculus courses. He then questioned if the majority of students are not pursuing calculus following college algebra, why is college algebra heavily relied on as the required general education mathematics course?

Dr. Fowler then presented the work completed by the mathematics subgroup. He described how the mathematics course definition now includes concepts to broaden, deepen, and extend student learning. He then explained how learning outcome revisions have been focusing on student learning and assessment-based outcomes, rather than a list of topics. The mathematics initiative, he shared, is in the process of identifying and aligning relevant courses to better fit students within each cluster. The subgroup seeks to revise the traditional course sequence to favor learning outcomes geared toward each program of study. Dr. Fowler presented the

three pathways developed by the Ohio Mathematics Initiative faculty: 1. STEM Preparatory, 2. Statistics, and 3. Quantitative Reasoning.

Dr. Compton directed the cluster panel to videos provided by Dr. Fowler to further expand their knowledge on the Ohio Mathematics Initiative. Dr. Compton explained how education is changing to favor pathway development; however, the process will take time and will rely on mutual discussions among the thirty-six public higher education institutions. She identified today's goals are to identify challenges and barriers to pathway development. She emphasized to the cluster panel members that they are not alone in this process; they have the whole state's support. Dr. Compton then clarified the meeting was convened to address the transferability of associate's degrees into bachelor's degree programs at four-year institutions as specified by legislation.

IV. Key Strategies and Practices for Creating a Clear Programmatic Pathway with Aligned High-Quality Instruction

Mr. John Fink, Community College Research Center at Teachers College, Columbia University, conducted a webinar presenting his found strategies and practices for creating a clear and programmatic pathway with aligned high-quality instruction.

Mr. Fink referenced The Transfer Playbook which details the findings of his research. He then began tackling transfer through a summary of his findings. Mr. Fink emphasized that while few students transfer, even less go on to complete their degree. His data subset included 720,000 full-time degree-seeking Community College entrants. Of that number, 80% intended to complete a bachelor's degree; 33% who transferred to a four-year within six years; only 29% of whom earned an associate degree before transfer; and of those who transferred, only 14% earned a bachelor's degree within six years. The sample cohort began in 2007 and was tracked through 2013.

Mr. Fink shared that transfer rates vary widely among states with Ohio being below the national average. He measured rates for transfer-out, transfer-with-award, transfer-out to bachelor's completion, and the overall community college cohort bachelor's completion. He emphasized the consistent and relevant gap present in completion rates for high- and low-income students. In Ohio, just 6% of low-income community college students completed a bachelor's degree while the rate was 11% of high-income students. He additionally stated that race was not researched, but he is confident that completion gaps would be present as well.

Mr. Fink spoke of four understudied barriers to transfer success:

1. Lack of early momentum
2. Students making progress, but not transferring

3. Transfer paths unclear
4. Transfer credit loss

Lack of Early Momentum

Mr. Fink explained how two-year entrants typically take lower credit loads, which can attribute to lack of early momentum. Over time, four-year entrants accumulate more credits. Consequently, the gap widens as four-year students achieve credit faster than their two-year peers.

Student Making Progress, but not Transferring

Mr. Fink articulated while the cause is unknown, students who accumulate credit do not necessarily transfer. Only 23% of all two-year entrants transfer to a four-year institution, while 68% of those who earned an Associate degree will transfer. The hidden data, as depicted by Mr. Fink, show that 77% of community college entrants seeking a bachelor's degree will not transfer out. Similarly, 32% of students who earned an associate's degree and who are seeking a bachelor's degree will not transfer to a four-year institution. The data then depict total credit completion in contrast to the percentage of students who did not pursue a bachelor's degree. Only 5% of students who earn 20 or fewer credits at a community college will transfer to a four-year institution while only 67% of students earning 60 credits or more will continue to a four-year institution.

Transfer Credit Loss

Mr. Fink described how the best indicator of graduation is the transferability of credits. Data show that students who transferred 90% of their credits were 2.5 times more likely to complete their bachelor's degree than students who transferred less than half. Only 58% of students successfully transferred 90% of their credits while 15% could not transfer and apply any credits toward their degree at all. He described how transfer credit loss contributes to higher financial costs of higher education for students. On average, two-year entrants graduate with an excess of eight college-level credits when compared to four-year entrants. When all types of credit are included, the number rises to ten excess credits completed by two-year entrants in pursuit of a bachelor's degree. Both cases of extra credits and credit loss may be explained by students not taking credits within the transfer guarantee program.

Mr. Fink illustrated credit loss through his simplified partition tree. Research derived from 9,500 students who transferred and completed their bachelor's degree showed the sample earned on average twenty-seven excess credits. Students with the lowest amount of excess credits were those who had less than 10% of 200-level credits attempted before sixty credits. These students had an average of twelve excess credits. Students with the highest amount of excess credits were those who

took a 100-level math course after sixty credits. These students had an average of forty-nine excess credits.

How Can Community College and Four-Year Partners Achieve Strong Transfer Outcomes?

Strategy 1: Prioritize Transfer

Mr. Fink described that through visiting six sets of partnered institutions, all of which had exceptionally better transfer student outcomes, he gained knowledge of how these institutions have achieved higher completion rates than expected. He additionally emphasized how leadership was a key role in their success. He detailed three points to prioritize transfer:

- a. Communicate transfer as a key component of the institution's mission
- b. Share data to increase understanding of the need to improve transfer student outcomes and the benefits of doing so
- c. Dedicate significant resources to support transfer students

Strategy 2: Create Clear Programmatic Pathways with Aligned High-Quality Instruction

Mr. Fink found that successful institutional partnerships developed groups of faculty within disciplines to discuss how transfer worked within their partnership. Together, these faculty groups determined how to develop clear academic pathways which included adequate preparation at the two-year institution and limiting excess credits. He found that each institution strived to determine appropriate pathways while additionally recognizing the need to maintain institutional customization. He listed four key practices to developing clear programmatic pathways:

- a. Work collaboratively with colleagues from partner institutions to create major-specific program maps
- b. Provide rigorous instruction and other high-quality academic experiences to prepare students for four-year programs
- c. Establish regular, reliable processes for updating and improving program maps
- d. Design unconventional pathways, as necessary

Mr. Fink further discussed what program alignment looks like in practice and shared the questions to consider when developing appropriate pathways. He shared a few examples of how partnered institutions were easing the process of transfer: major maps; major informational sheets which included partnered institutions and available advisors; and degree sheets which included appropriate preparation courses, specific institutional requirements, and available resources .

Strategy 3: Provide Tailored Transfer Student Advising

Mr. Fink stated student goals two-year institutions should support. These goals include exploring interests, transferring to a four-year as fast as possible, taking courses applicable to their four-year degree, and lowering financial costs of higher education. He additionally emphasized the importance of fair advising practices across two- and four-year institutions. He then listed how two- and four-year institutions can provide tailored student advising for those who intend to or have already transferred:

- a. Community college advising practices:
 - i. Clearly articulate students' transfer options and help them determine, as early as possible, their field of interest, major, and preferred transfer destination
 - ii. Continuously monitor student progress, provide frequent feedback, and intervene quickly when a student is off-track
 - iii. Help students access the financial resources necessary to achieve their goal
- b. Four-year university advising practices:
 - i. Commit dedicated personnel, structures, and resources for transfer students
 - ii. Assign advisors and clearly communicate essential information to prospective transfer students
 - iii. Strongly encourage transfer students to choose a major prior to transfer
 - iv. Replicate elements of the first-year experience for transfer students
 - v. Exercise fairness in financial aid allocation

Questions Addressed to Mr. Fink

While answering questions, Mr. Fink advised higher education institutions to focus on on-time as defined by individual student goals over the focus of part-time or full-time status. Additionally, he encouraged transparency in advising conversations and degree completion timelines that best fit individual students.

V. Research Reports: Findings on Ohio's Regional Transfer and Common Courses and Learning Outcomes in Cluster

Dr. Compton concluded the morning session by explaining the findings on Ohio's regional transfer research, common courses, and learning outcomes for Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services Cluster. The findings on Ohio's transfer students showed that graduation rates of students transferring from a two-year to a four-year institution are higher when students transfer to an institution in the same region and that Ohio had over 37,000 transfer students in 2015. Ms. Katie Dean, Administrator for the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways, shared how research on common courses among various social and behavioral sciences and human services related majors was performed.

VI. Small Group Discussion

Following lunch, small group discussion began. Members were grouped by region: central, southeast, southwest, west, northeast, and northwest. Small group discussions were to be focused on the following questions:

1. What learning outcomes and other education experiences are essential in the first two years so the student can transfer to a four-year institution with junior standing?
2. What general education and pre-major courses are typically associated with the learning outcomes and educational experiences?
3. Are these courses readily available at community colleges?
4. Are there expected learning outcomes within a program's first two years that are not covered in courses that are part of Ohio's guaranteed transfer system?
5. What are essential elements of the learning experience for native four-year university freshmen and sophomore may be hard to replicate for community college students seeking transfer?
6. What essential elements are community colleges offering to their students that universities don't include for native students until the junior or senior year?
7. What could university and/or community colleges offer as an alternative to solve these challenges?
What is the best approach to development of cluster and major pathways within the first two years of study?
8. Is there enough consistency in courses across the majors within the cluster for students to take a common first semester or a common first year?
9. How soon will students need to declare a specific major within the cluster in order to not lose efficiency?
10. What is the right balance?
11. What are your success stories about pathway development and partnerships for which we can learn?

VII. Discussion in Large Group

The panel regrouped, and Dr. Compton and the co-leads, Dr. Joseph Abbott Jr., Dr. Tamara Davis, and Dr. David Black, directed the large group discussion. Questions were focused on the following:

1. What approach should be used to construct the transfer pathways?
2. Should the Statewide Panel develop a set of discipline specific associate degree learning outcomes that colleges and universities could match courses to?
3. Should the Statewide Panel use existing statewide guaranteed courses to develop maps to create clear course sequences?
4. Should it be a combination of the two approaches?

5. Is the cluster approach the right approach?
6. Should we go directly to major pathways? If the cluster approach works, how soon will students need to declare a specific major within the cluster in order not to lose efficiency?
7. Did you find examples of learning experiences that occur in the first two years for native university students that would be hard to replicate for community college students?
8. Could you identify alternatives that can be provided by the community college so that student's junior-year standing is not compromised?
9. Can these gaps be filled after students transfer?
10. Share your success stories about pathway development and partnerships from which we all can learn

Dr. Compton and the co-leads moderated overviews provided by a member of each regional group. Reviews of the smaller discussions included insight of how the cluster pathway should proceed. Members addressed the strong aspects of the current Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services cluster. Articulation agreements, certain existing partnerships, and transferrable courses were all discussed as successes. The large group favored individual course requirements over learning outcomes; however, challenges were addressed on whether it is appropriate to determine learning outcomes by cluster or by program. The group presented concerns pertaining to accreditation, certification, foreign language, and course overlap. Other ideas included amending two-year foreign language requirements to better mirror the emphasis from four-year institutions; strengthening general education requirements while clarifying major courses; and finding math courses that are more applicable to the general social and behavioral sciences and human services cluster, as well as each sub-major. A major portion of the large group discussion was committed to discussing how the human services major fits within the cluster. It was determined that it would be beneficial to add additional members from institutions that did not already have their human services programs represented. Dr. Davis stated that she would reach out to members from the human services area to provide additional guidance. Finally, it was discovered that students should be able to narrow their pathway by the end of their first year due to general course limitations found by faculty.

VIII. Reflection and Next Steps

Dr. Compton proposed the question, "Do you believe that you are the right person to be doing this work?" Dr. Compton stressed the importance of being the right fit to represent each member's institution and, if not, to please contact her with the name of the appropriate individual. She additionally stated the value in having all thirty-six institutions come to the table with equal voice.

Dr. Carl Brun, Assistant Vice President for Curricular Programs at Wright State University, and Dr. Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs at The Ohio State University, further detailed how each faculty member can have the cluster conversation with his or her provost's office. Each expressed the importance in finding a partner within a member's institution to mirror the partnership between Dr. Brun and Dr. Smith and their respective panel members. Dr. Smith shared how two-year students are most likely to stay within their region, which is why it was decided that regional discussions would be most impactful. He additionally stated three layers of complication in their cluster decisions:

1. How to create fluidity program to program, rather than on the course level
2. Programs are unique across institutions
3. Programs are continuously changing

Dr. Smith further proposed questions to consider as members continue their work within their institution and through the Social and Behavioral Sciences and Human Services Cluster.

1. How do we deepen our academic work?
2. How do we maintain transparent communication between faculty and provost?
3. Where do you think you are as institution for next meeting?"

IX. For the Good of the Order

Dr. Compton asked if there was anything further for the good of the order. She thanked the cluster panel members and other attendees for their presence. With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.