

The Ohio Council of Chief Academic Officers of Two-Year Colleges
Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2006

Present: Kay Adkins (Columbus State), Jim Baber (Jefferson), Sharon Brown (Edison), Dennis Budkowski (Marion), Martha Crawmer (Clark State), Helen Grove (Sinclair), Becki Kurtz (Belmont), Judy Maxson (Hocking), Robin Menschenfreund (Zane State), Mark Nutter (Washington State), Monica Posey (Cincinnati State), Sam Saliba (COTC), Sherry Stout (Southern State), John Thornton (Stark State), and Jim Willey (Terra),

Guests: Attorney General's Office – Amy Nash Golian and Rebecca J. Albers; Ohio Board of Regents Staff --Paula Compton, Bob Casto, Vicki Nellin, Ora McCrae, Jim Ginzer, and Brett Berlinger; Ohio Learning Network – Kate Carey

Information Sharing

Amy Nash Golian, Associate Assistant Attorney General, and Rebecca J. Albers, Senior Deputy Attorney General presented an overview of the case titled Christian Legal Society vs. Walker. The case dealt with a campus student organization that had as part of its bylaws a rule precluding homosexual members. Southern Illinois University decided that this rule violated the university's nondiscrimination policies and disbanded the student organization. The court ruled in favor of the student organization which was then re-instated on the campus. The court concluded that it was unlikely that the organization had actually violated any university policy and that the university had impermissibly infringed upon its right of expressive association. Further, the court found that the university violated the organization's free speech rights by ejecting it from a speech forum in which it had the right to remain.

Following the AGs presentation, the group discussed the annual CAO retreat which will be held this year at Washington State Community College in Marietta on November 16-17. Robin outlined the agenda.

The retreat will begin with lunch at 12:00 p.m. on November 16 followed by a presentation by the AGs office on Public Records Law and Intellectual Property Issues. The afternoon will include a tour of the Washington State Campus. In the evening the group will have a reception and dinner at the Levi House Café in downtown Marietta.

The November 17 session will begin with a continental breakfast at WSCC followed by a panel discussion on Academic Integrity and a presentation by Rich Petrick of the Regents staff on higher education funding issues. The meeting concludes following lunch.

Mark Nutter distributed folders with Marietta tourism information. The Hotel Lafayette is recommended and will offer special rates to anyone who reserves a room by October 16.

Discussion then turned to the possibility of hosting another Chair Academy in Ohio. Robin reported on a conversation she had with Gary Filian of the Chair Academy organization. They would need a minimum of 40-54 participants to come back to Ohio. Filian suggested broadening participation beyond chairs to other emerging leaders including student affairs personnel. As of this date, colleges have indicated they will be willing to send a total of 25 participants, but not all colleges have responded. The cost will be \$1450/person. Prior to the November meeting, Robin

will send out an email reminder in order to arrive at a better estimate of how many individuals may participate from each college. If Ohio is unable to generate 40 participants we may want to consider partnering with community colleges in Michigan.

Judith Maxson reminded the group about the OATYC conference at Hocking College on October 27, 2006.

Dennis Budkowski spoke with the group regarding proposed language to clarify the Articulation and Transfer policy. (See attached handout). Discussion centered on paragraph two and how it would be interpreted by 4-year institutions.

Paula Compton introduced the staff members who are assisting with the TAG process and with the CT² process: Bob Casto (consultant), Vicki Nellin, Candice Grant, Ora McCrae (manages the TAG communication process) Jim Ginzer (Articulation and Transfer Clearing House), Brett Berlinger (manages email communication for TAG results). Tom Shriner (not present) also works part-time with the initiative. Paula noted that Nick Wilson recently left the OBR staff to take a College Tech Prep position with Sinclair.

Paula reported that 59% of courses submitted have been reviewed. The remaining 41% must be reviewed by the end of December. About 6 out of 10 courses are being approved: Round 1 = 69%, Round 2 = 58%, Round 3 = 58%, and Round 4 = 62%. A total of 2,280 courses have been approved.

Paula noted that 974 courses were originally matched to TAGS but never submitted. Colleges need to let the TAG staff know status of these courses.

Paula offered some advice to the CAO group. She noted faculty want to be involved with TAG course submissions so that the course information is up to date and accurate. She asked that CAOs urge the personnel on their campuses to complete submissions, do resubmissions as necessary, and work with faculty to assure accuracy of information.

OBR will have another implementers meeting prior to the New Year to let everyone know where the process stands. Paula is also going to ask TAG review panels to create a rubric for each TAG.

OBR is working on some better definitions of terms such as TAGs, approved courses, disapproved courses, etc. Definition of an approved TAG course will not include reference to level of study (100, 200, 300, etc.). It will be based on competency and performance expectations. Courses will be defined as "pre-major" and "beginning major courses." Definition will state that if a university offers a major in a particular TAG area, the institution should have one or more TAG courses mapped to that major. If we create TAGs but a university has no TAG courses in that major, then we don't really have a course equivalency system. Paula distributed a draft of Definitions of Transfer Guarantee and Effective and Expiration Dates (attached).

Jim Ginzer reported on the status of the electronic TAG Clearinghouse. The staff is starting to make good progress on the electronic transcript process. The clearinghouse will automatically apply all of the TAG equivalencies. Electronic transcripts should provide good savings in terms of processing transcripts. This effort is in the development and testing phase now. It will go into internal test mode soon and then out to the user test environment and finally a production environment. The flow of transcripts, including acknowledgements to all parties, is now well

understood and being programmed. OBR has Banner and DATATEL user groups formed and meeting. OBR staff will do a demonstration of a BETA release on December 5 at the Articulation and Transfer council meeting. The staff needs our support in doing quality insurance testing as the first release is rolled out. We will need to help validate the mappings, campus by campus.

Paula responded to a question about confusion over who is the point person for each TAG. Paula acknowledged that this is sometimes a problem. They are working on it, but may need to push harder to get each of the TAG committees to finish their work.

Paula thanked the group for its hard work on the TAGs. She asked that we contact her or someone on her staff if we have questions or concerns.

Kate Carey provided an update on the Ohio Learning Network. She began with a mini-quiz that helped review the facts that OLN has a staff of eleven, an annual budget of \$3,000,000, and a history of distributing more than \$10,000,000 to campuses since its beginning.

Kate talked about the new OLN website and the updated Vision and Mission statements (attached). Kate is planning to go on the road and talk to campuses about future OLN initiatives.

OLN will be focusing on strategic investments and long term planning. The organization has been doing planning on a two or three year cycle. They plan to begin planning for five year cycles for some initiatives such as E4Me. Kate stated that one idea is to give scholarships to E4Me completers (perhaps \$500) to use toward continuing online education after completing ten hours at a college. She wants CAO input on that idea.

In terms of focused investment, OLN plans to continue working on course re-design/re-development. Based on past experience, the process requires better accountability. Ohio should build on our successes with course re-design and OLN plans to develop an approach that helps campuses work on course redevelopment without spending \$100,000 to join a national effort.

OLN is talking with ETech Ohio about possible collaboration.

Lorain, Lakeland, Sinclair, and Columbus State are beginning to work on a pilot Associate of Applied Business Regents degree that will include a transfer option.

Bob Casto joined the group for lunch and provided an overview of House Bill 66 and its implications for our campuses. Bob is working as a consultant for OBR on the HB 66 CT² initiative. He distributed handouts detailing HB 66 (attached), the schedule of CT² panel meetings, and panel membership.

HB 66 requires transfer of credit between the career technical institutions and 2-year and 4-year colleges. The CT² project looks for areas of study with common foundational knowledge where transfer of credit can be achieved. Current efforts include nursing, engineering technology, medical assisting, automotive, and IT networking. Panels have been established and they are working to define common learning outcomes in these areas.

The Nursing and Engineering Technology Panels are functioning well. Learning outcomes have been created and will be reviewed by the nursing panel in a meeting later this month before distribution for broader review. The Engineering Panel has identified six areas for credit transfer in mechanical and electrical engineering.

Participation in this effort is mandatory for state assisted colleges or career technical institutions that offer the content area listed above. Paul Unger and Becky Kurtz are our representatives to the CT² Advisory Board.

Questions remain such as how HB 66 overlaps with Tech Prep, Project Lead the Way, and other technical education programs.

Discussion ensued with regard to duplication of programs and how the initiative may effect college enrollments.

Business Meeting

Minutes of the September meeting were discussed and one correction (spelling of Jim Willey's name) was noted. Approval of minutes was moved by Jim Baber and seconded by Judy Maxson. The motion passed.

As of Sept 30, the association had \$4,439.38 in its treasury.

Becky Kurtz spoke on the process for filling the Vice Chair vacancy. The association has no formal bylaws but the tradition is to form a nominating committee composed of the past president and one other member. Becky Kurtz is our Past President and Kay Adkins volunteered to be the other member. They will bring a nomination to the next meeting if possible.

Robin is still looking for volunteers for an academic integrity panel discussion at the CAO Retreat in November.

Becky Kurtz reported on the work of the statewide funding policy committee. The draft budget is nearly ready to move forward for consideration. She noted that 56% of new funds in this budget will be directed toward STEM projects.

Dennis Budkowski reported that the Secondary to Postsecondary Articulation Team is working on entry-level assessment and cutoff scores for developmental education. The Team will eventually make a recommendation.

Mark Nutter suggested that the CAO Association could be instrumental in the creation of a state-wide consortium for AQIP schools. This idea will be discussed further at the March meeting. We may wish to identify common data points that we can share for comparative data purposes.

A draft phone tree for meeting cancellations was distributed. Mark will work to finalize and distribute this document prior to the November retreat.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

**DRAFT OF SUGGEST LANGUAGE FOR OHIO'S ARTICULATION & TRANSFER
POLICY (10/10/06) - NOT FOR ATTRIBUTION**

**d. UPPER DIVISION CREDIT AT FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS,
REGIONAL CAMPUSES, COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES**

Many four-year institutions distinguish between lower and upper division courses and require a given number of courses that must be taken at the upper division level. The intent is to guarantee that each student will have at least a minimum number of classroom experiences in areas of specialization after completion of prerequisite courses at the lower division level.

Upper division credit and lower division credit will be awarded for transfer work based upon the level of the course at the sending institution. If a lower division course at the sending institution is transferred as equivalent in content to an upper division course at the receiving institution, it will be counted as lower division credit. Likewise, an upper division course taken at the sending institution which is transferred as equivalent in content to a lower division course at the receiving institution will be counted as upper division credit.

Because of variance in curricular design and course numbering among two-year and four-year institutions the division of upper and lower courses is not always clear and absolute. Consequently there must be latitude for exceptions to the guidelines above. For example, a receiving university may determine that a community or technical college course is equivalent in nature and content to an upper division university course. In this instance the receiving institution could accept the course as upper division credit.

LOWER DIVISION

Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with freshman and sophomore students and offered during the first half of a baccalaureate degree program are called lower division courses. These courses are numbered at a lower level than junior or senior courses (e.g., 100 or 200 instead of 300 or 400). Since there is not a one-to-one correspondence of the concept of baccalaureate lower division courses to community and technical colleges, a course considered lower division by a university may be completed by a student enrolled at a community or technical college during the first and/or second year of a two-year curriculum.

UPPER DIVISION

Courses at a level of comprehension usually associated with junior and senior students and offered during the last half of a baccalaureate degree program are called upper division courses. In general, these courses are numbered at a higher level than the freshmen or sophomore level courses (e.g., 300 or 400 numbered courses as opposed to 100 or 200 numbered courses). Because of variance in curricular design and course numbering among two-year and four-year institutions the division of upper and lower courses is not always clear and absolute. Consequently a receiving university may determine that a community or technical college course is equivalent in nature and content to an upper division university course. In this instance the receiving institution could choose to accept the course as upper division credit.

**Definitions of Transfer Guarantee
and
Effective and Expiration Dates**

Draft 10/12/06

	“Leap of Faith” Era Autumn 2005 Winter 2006 Spring 2006	Summer 2006	Autumn 2006
Effective Dates	All TAG Course Matches approved up to August 31, 2006 will be effective starting Autumn 2005		All TAG Course Matches approved September 1, 2006 and after will be effective the academic term following the term they were approved
Expiration Dates	The final term in which the course is considered a TAG course		
Definition of Transfer Guarantee	TAG courses taken during this time will transfer and apply in one of the following ways: direct equivalency, major course credit (possibly a major elective) or degree credit Direct equivalencies of TAG Course Matches that are now in effect apply	TAG courses taken during this time will transfer and apply in one of the following two ways: Direct Equivalency or No Direct Equivalency and then the course will transfer and apply toward meeting a major course requirement or elective (not increasing degree requirements) Identified specific problem set of learning outcomes – corresponding TAG Course Match will count as meeting a degree requirement in addition to direct equivalency and major credit until the problem is resolved	
HEI Submissions	HEI file contains all TAG Course Matches	HEI file contains only approved TAG Course Matches	
Method for Monitoring Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HEI Course Matches from Autumn 2005 - Listing of institution’s majors 		

Working toward a universal course equivalency classification system →

Search go



- [About OLN](#)
- [Major Initiatives](#)
- [Community](#)

[OLN Home](#) ● [About Oln](#) ● [OLN Vision &](#)

[Mission](#)

About OLN

- [Introduction to OLN](#)
- [Mission](#)
- [Accomplishments](#)
- [Members](#)
- [Allied Organizations](#)
- [Ohio Institutions](#)

Vision and Mission

Vision

OLN seeks to be recognized nationally for its leadership in facilitating collaborative improve and expand innovative applications of technologies that enhance learning

Mission

OLN works in collaboration with higher education, schools, policy makers, business industry, government, and local communities to expand educational opportunities

OLN

- develops and promotes learning and assessment through the use of technology
- tests and provides advice on emerging learning-directed technologies, and
- facilitates cost effectiveness through shared technology investments.

OLN works to reduce the Ohio education deficit through its programs by providing 1) e-learning and services supporting learners, 2) efficiencies with technology investments and 3) professional development for faculty.



The Ohio Learning Network is a consortium of Ohio's colleges and universities using technology to enhance education.



**CREDIT
TRANSFER**
THE STATE OF OHIO
A joint effort between the
Ohio Board of Regents and
the Ohio Department
of Education



Ohio Career-Technical Credit Transfer

[Home](#) | [Meetings](#) | [Resources](#) | [Agency Roles](#) | [Advisory Committee](#) | [Contact Us](#)

→ [Definitions & Terms](#)

→ [Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[Ohio Articulation & Transfer](#)



[The Ohio Board of Regents](#)



Office of Career Technical and
Adult Education

Background

The language in section 3333.162 of the Ohio Revised Code requires the Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education to develop policies and procedures ensuring that students at an adult career-technical education institution or secondary career-technical education institution can transfer agreed upon technical courses completed there (that adhere to recognized industry standards) to any state institution of higher education "without unnecessary duplication or institutional barriers."

Guiding Principles

The following principles will guide the successful implementation of the project.

- Where applicable, the policies and procedures developed will build upon the articulation agreement and transfer initiative course equivalency system required by section 3333.162 of the Ohio Revised Code.
- The project will build upon the "lessons learned" from previous articulation and transfer work.
- This learner-centered project requires a system to be developed that will enable commonly agreed-upon course work, based on recognized industry standards and successfully completed by either adult or secondary career-technical students, to be transferable and applicable to any state supported institution of higher education. This initiative does not alter the mission of participating schools and does not imply the evolution of adult-career schools into associate or baccalaureate degree offering entities.
- The overall goal of this initiative will be to allow identified technical courses/content to transfer "without unnecessary duplication or institutional barriers."
- This project is being implemented by the Regents in collaboration with the Ohio Department of Education and other key stakeholders.
- Consensus decision-making will guide the project work to effect a change in Ohio's educational system by providing a guarantee that enables learners to reach their educational goals in the most efficient manner. However, the primary foci and missions of career technical centers or comprehensive high schools and the public institutions of higher education will remain unaltered.
- Continuous communication about the progress of this project is important and will be ensured through a variety of media. A website will be developed at the Ohio Board of Regents to disseminate information relevant to the work of the committees.
- Project work will be completed in a timely manner to support delivery of a progress report to the General Assembly by April 15, 2006 and completion of the project by April 15, 2007.

The above Articulation and Transfer principles provide a context for understanding the enhancements to the policy and to provide a clearer P-16 continuum and enhancement of workforce development. The principles are a result of the leadership of the Career-Technical Credit Transfer Advisory Committee of the Articulation and Transfer Advisory Council, a representative committee drawn from various segments of the state's educational community.

[Disclaimer](#) | [Contact the Webmaster](#)

Am. Sub. H. B. No. 66

Sec. 3333.162. (A) As used in this section, "state institution of higher education" means an institution of higher education as defined in section 3345.12 of the Revised Code.

(B) By April 15, 2007, the Ohio board of regents, in consultation with the department of education, public adult and secondary career-technical education institutions, and state institutions of higher education, shall establish criteria, policies, and procedures that enable students to transfer agreed upon technical courses completed through an adult career-technical education institution, a public secondary career-technical institution, or a state institution of higher education to a state institution of higher education without unnecessary duplication or institutional barriers. The courses to which the criteria, policies, and procedures apply shall be those that adhere to recognized industry standards and equivalent coursework common to the secondary career pathway and adult career-technical education system and regionally accredited state institutions of higher education. Where applicable, the policies and procedures shall build upon the articulation agreement and transfer initiative course equivalency system required by section 3333.16 of the Revised Code.

(C) By April 15, 2006, the board shall report to the general assembly on its progress in establishing these policies and procedures.