



THE OHIO COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS FOR TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

December 10, 2009

10:00 am – 2:30 pm

Ohio Board of Regents Conference Room

Attendance:

Richard Prystowsky, Central Ohio	Molly Weiland – Hocking College	Matt Kinkley – Rhodes State
Monica Posey, Cincinnati State	Fred Law – Lakeland	Mark Abbell – Rio Grande
David Devier – Clark State	John Crooks – Lorain County	Ryan McCall – Southern State
Judith Scherer – Columbus State	Dennis Budkowski – Marion Tech	Dorey Diab – Stark State
J. Michael Thomson - Cuyahoga	Karen Reed – North Central	Mark Nutter – Washington State
Sharon Brown – Edison	Cindy Krueger – Northwest State	Chad Brown – Zane State
	Paul Unger – Owens	

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Richard Prystowsky at 10:00 am.

March Symposium – Mike Snider, OACC

Changing the format of the spring symposium to include both faculty and student services into one program. The program will be open to anyone who wants to attend. Changes from last March – a fee between \$25 and \$50 will be charged. Mike asked if a fee would deter attendance. The group did not feel a small fee would impact attendance.

The program would start Thursday late afternoon and continue to Friday. There is a gap between faculty, student services and students and social networking. Skill with social networking will be a possible topic for the program. It was also mentioned to have a joint meeting with student services the morning of March 4 instead of the meeting in February.

ABLE, Stackable Certificates, CT2, Ohio Skills Bank funding – Bill Russell, OBR

Ohio Skills Bank moved to OBR from ODJFS a few months ago. June 30th funding went away and personnel left that were involved with the program. ODJFS has found funding to keep OSB going. A new OBR employee, who will be onboard Jan. 4th, will be heading up the new division which will include Ohio Skills Bank. Bill will be working with institutions to connect with business and industry.

Regional coordinators have submitted reports to Tom before he left. Each region had career pathways identified. OSB brought people together that had never been together before – this has continued even though OSB was not funded.

ABLE – came to Regents in January. ABLE director retired in July. Decided to step back and look at ABLE. Consultant group is reviewing ABLE programs and structure – report due end of this month. Consultants were asked to look at ways to further integrate ABLE into the USO. Several recommendations will be presented. Consultants have interviewed surrounding states and looked at other models, including finance and revenue streams. CAOs expressed an interest in providing input into the recommendations that are embraced.

Stackable certificates – There are three certificates in place: Basic (8.9 grade level), advanced (12.9 grade level), and college and work ready. The advanced certificate is based on two assessments. A question that has been raised “Do students need to retake COMPASS if they have advanced certificate?” The College and work ready certificate is issued between ABLE and colleges. What does this mean? Instead of putting students in developmental courses, do we send them to ABLE? ABLE does not have the capacity to handle all the students that need developmental course work.

Next month there will be a subsidy consultation on ABLE, stackable certificates, adult workforce education, apprenticeships, and dual enrollment. Will be looking at how are going to move forward to meet the strategic plan. Vice Chancellor Rich Petrick is working on this. A request will be made looking for nominations to serve on consultation committee through the college Presidents. Looking at a change in the way we do business.

Concurrent enrollment – adult workforce centers & CT2 will be concurrently enrolled in college. If we want to embrace and do things differently – then we need to look at ways to reinforce that. Need to adjust subsidy model to do what we want.

Developmental education initiative – Regents received \$300,000 for convening meetings and data gathering and analysis through Gates Foundation. Three priorities have been identified. 1. Expand performance funding; identify key transition points for moving students from one point to the next. 2. Focus on developmental education redesign. Design and test additional developmental programs to increase success points. At the end of three year grant, more dollars could come from Gates. 3. Data performance management. There is state-wide policy team meeting next week. Karen Scheid is point person.

Discussion of Rule 2

Discussion led by Paul Unger. Concerns were raised on the interpretation of rule 2. Paul Unger provided scenarios. The issue revolves around one word in rule 2; if all instruction costs were being covered, no subsidy would be paid. It is not an open enrollment class; it is offered for a company with an agreement. If it is not open to public, OBR may only give partial subsidy. Colleges are hearing different things.

First scenario: Caterpillar program with all courses held on campus, co-op program. Student pays tuition, reimbursed by employer. College pays faculty. OBR funded fully.

Second scenario: Students selected by apprenticeship union for a 5 year program. Courses are not held on campus. Tuition paid by union. College rents space from union hall, pay instructor. This is being looked at as partial subsidy.

Would like to see OBR put guidelines into place, such as a sample template for college and company educational programs or provide a review of documents when colleges enter into agreements with companies. The Chancellor’s strategic plan encourages us to take education to business and high schools. As community colleges, we need to meet the needs of employers.

January 7 Dorey Diab, Richard Prystowski, Judith Scherer, Karen Wells are planning to meet with Darrell Glenn, Rich Petrick, Stephanie Davidson regarding rule 2.

Operating Manual – Stephanie Davidson, OBR

The CAO comments on the operating manual (see attached) were reviewed with Stephanie. There will be additional opportunities to review the draft manual. The manual is a preliminary form; it will be reviewed by the Chancellor prior to being sent out for further review by colleges. The numbers below refer to the distributed document.

1. The difference between program approval and program review needs to be clearly stated. Propose some check over time but not sure what it will look like. CAO concern – is there something that is broken? OBR does not have a good sense of what is going on across the state. Would like to tie into current practices so it does not seem onerous. What is going to happen with information? Assurances are needed from CAOs that OBR has been informed of changes and that guidelines have been met.
3. Discussed faculty credentials.
6. Stressed the fiscal restraints if a 30:1 is mandated. Allow flexibility to work toward meeting the standards. CAOs are concerned about quality but fiscal constraints also need to be considered. Under sufficiency of faculty – what does program curriculum mean? This needs clarified –does this refer only to technical courses or all courses in the program?

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of November 12, 2009 meeting were approved with correction following a motion by David Devier, and a second by Karen Reed. Helen Grove also volunteered to work on the Operating Manual white paper.

Treasurer's Report

Report was distributed. The account has been reviewed; the information being received by the treasurer was incomplete. Current balance is \$ 2,514.90

Old Business

Rule 2 discussion – Richard will try to have a conference call with Paul Unger and Ron Abrams prior to the January 7th meeting.

Operating Manual: Next steps

The group will be meeting with Ron Abrams prior to writing the white paper. Need to keep following up on progress of the manual.

Evidence of quality – do we need information from all institutions?

Need to also talk about class size, student inputs.

Need to focus on success metrics, take a stand on quality but focus on success. Need to make strong statement on quality of adjunct faculty – commitment to faculty development.

Need support from the state to provide professional development, including financial support.

New Business

Location of CAO meetings

Ron Abrams has asked us to meet at OACC. Will see if February meeting can be held at OACC.

The following individuals volunteered to meet with Bill Russell regarding ABLE and developmental education: Richard Pry, Dennis Budkowski, Fred Law, David Devier, Mark Nutter, Paul Unger, Dorey Diab, Judy Scherer, and Chad Brown.

Agenda items for upcoming meetings

Tom Bordenkircher will be at January meeting – will ask to address what changes have been made to improve system integration, issues with dual enrollment

See if someone from OACC can attend the next meeting.

Are there things that we could standardize?

Joint meeting with Student Services

Move meeting from February to March 4—morning of the OACC symposium. Have a short business meeting after morning session and prior to afternoon symposium starting.

Sandy Brubaker – conversation regarding joint meeting and discussed possible collaborative efforts.

Possible topics – Ohio Department of Mental Health on Psychological first aid presentation

AG office presentation – student discipline, social media, employment discrimination, direct lending Semester conversion, Red flag rules and sex offenders, Efficiencies, Securing resources / grants as a community college , ADA and academic standards – What is reasonable accommodation?

SSI Consultation Meeting Report on Success points

Total of 2 points - Developmental education – complete first developmental education course, moves from developmental math to college level math, and moves from developmental English to college level English; 0.67 points each

1 point - 15 credit college level work

1 point - 30 credit college level work

1 point - Associate degree completion

1 point – complete 15 credit hours and then transfer

DEI – Chad Brown

Achieve the Dream – there was suppose to be a state policy developed but this did not happen. They are now working with the OBR. Meeting next week with state policy team.

Next meeting January 14, 2010

Submitted by:

Cindy Krueger

Treasurer's Report
Chief Academic Officers
December 2009

Copies of the Treasurer's report have been distributed with the details of the

AS OF JUNE 2009

As of June 2009 (Closing Balance)	\$5,781.24
As of June 2009 (Closing Expenditures)	<u>\$4,761.25</u>
As of June 2009 the total funds available:	\$1,019.99

REVENUES (June - December 2009)

Dues Received (June 2009)	\$2,200.00
Dues Received (July 2009)	\$ 400.00
Dues Received (August 2009)	\$ 600.00
Dues Received (October 2009)	\$1,000.00
Balance of Dues Received November 2009	<u>\$ 200.00</u>
Total Revenues June - December 2009	\$4,400.00
(One college's dues outstanding)	

EXPENSES (June - December 2009)

Frames to Remember	\$ 88.25
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette 1/09	\$ 283.50
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette 2/09	\$ 243.50
AVI FoodSystems (2/09)	\$ 489.50
Simply Nanette (4/09)	\$ 254.50
Two Caterers, Inc. (6/09)	\$ 270.18
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette (6/09)	\$ 333.31
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette (9/09)	\$ 322.71
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette (10/09)	\$ 310.14
Two Caterers and Simply Nanette (11/09)	<u>\$ 309.50</u>
Total Expenses June - December 2009	\$2,905.09

AS OF DECEMBER 2009

As of June 2009 the total funds available:	\$1,019.99
Total Revenues June - December 2009	<u>\$4,400.00</u>
	\$5,419.99
Total Expenses June - December 2009	<u>(\$2,905.09)</u>
As of December 2009 the total funds available:	\$2,514.90

Submitted by:
Dr. Judith E. Scherer, Treasurer
Columbus State Community College

Introduction

The Ohio Council of Chief Academic Officers for Two-Year Colleges wishes to express our appreciation to Dr. Stephanie Davidson, from the Ohio Board of Regents, for giving us the opportunity to review and comment upon the latest draft of the *Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Approval*. In the spirit of collaboration, and with the goal of helping to streamline, strengthen, and expedite Ohio's program approval process, we offer the following overall comments and recommendations:

1. There appears to be some confusion of purposes in the present draft, which addresses both *program approval* and *program review*. We suggest either removing the guidelines dealing with program review or re-titling the document "Guidelines and Procedures for Academic Program Approval and Review" and then separating the respective guidelines into their disparate sections.
2. Similarly, some guidelines seem particularly relevant for some higher education sectors (for example, institutions with graduate programs) but not for others (for example, associate degree-granting institutions). We therefore recommend separating the *Guidelines* into separate sections for two-year colleges, four-year USO institutions, and private colleges and universities. (Some guidelines will be repeated in more than one section.)
3. The state's two-year colleges are firmly committed to high standards and appropriate faculty credentials. However, the Chief Academic Officers believe strongly that the most efficacious way for the state's two-year colleges to achieve their individual and collective goal of delivering high-quality education to their students is to adhere to the Higher Learning Commission's guidelines on faculty credentials. These guidelines represent a rigorous standard while also allowing for the degree of flexibility that two-year colleges require in light of their sometimes unique circumstances.

Without such flexibility, the state's two-year colleges will be significantly hampered in their ability to help the state achieve its goal of "increasing enrollment [in the USO] by 230,000 [students] by 2017" (*Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2008 – 2017*, p. 31). As the Chancellor has indicated, the majority of these new 230,000 students are expected to enter higher education through the gateway of the state's two-year colleges.

4. In general, OBR program approval (and program review) requirements should be consistently aligned with the objectives of the USO strategic plan and the guidelines of the Higher Learning Commission.
5. The state's two-year colleges are firmly committed to faculty professional development.

6. Philosophically, the CAOs endorse the commitment to academic quality reflected in the Guidelines. There are, however, significant funding constraints that limit the state's ability to achieve all aspirations reflected in the *Guidelines*.

For example, the CAOs strongly recommend removing the mandate that there be “[a]t least 1 FTE faculty member...for every 30 FTE students...” (*Guidelines*, p. 12). Especially in the current climate of unprecedented enrollment growth and the lack of funding for this growth, this *mandate* would produce nothing short of a crippling fiscal burden on the colleges as they try to meet this goal. In order for the two-year colleges to adhere to this guideline, the state would have to provide funding for significant numbers of new full-time faculty positions, and such funding does not seem realistic at this time.

In short, to help the two-year colleges fulfill their missions and aid the state's efforts at implementing the goals of the USO's Strategic Plan, we request that OBR be highly selective in adding expensive new requirements for program approval (or review) and that it be flexible in its implementation of these requirements.

7. More generally, the draft *Guidelines* seem less streamlined rather than more streamlined than are the existing guidelines. The process for program approval seems quite elaborate and labor-intensive, and we are concerned about the capacity of Board of Regents staffing to manage the process in a timely manner. Further, we are concerned that the proposed processes might impede rather than promote the development of new, innovative programs at two-year colleges. In addition, because the time frame from program idea conception to the granting of program approval will have been extended under the proposed process, colleges will be hampered in their efforts to meet the needs of their constituencies by offering necessary programs in a timely manner.

Based on our review of the proposed *Guidelines*, the CAOs wish to focus on three areas of particular concern: Faculty Credentials; Faculty Sufficiency; and Peer Review. In what follows, the wording from the OBR manual is in boldface, italics, and blue color; the comments from the CAOs are indented and/or are red in color.

I. Faculty Credentials

Faculty members possess the academic preparation and experience appropriate to the field and level of instruction.

- ***Faculty members hold a degree from a regionally or nationally accredited institution recognized by the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation or equivalent as verified by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services Inc.***
- ~~***Faculty members hold a terminal degree or a degree at least one level above the level in which they are teaching (e.g., hold a bachelor's degree if teaching in an associate degree program or hold a graduate degree if teaching in a baccalaureate degree program).***~~ (The main content of this point is moved to OBR bullet point number 4.)

- ~~Faculty members teaching general education courses hold a master's degree or higher in the subject matter discipline.~~
 - As per the *Higher Learning Commission Guidance on Determining Qualified Faculty*, “faculty teaching in undergraduate programs should hold a degree at least one level above that of the program in which they are teaching, and those teaching general education courses typically hold a master’s degree or higher and should have completed substantial graduate coursework in the discipline of those courses.” [*The CAOs recommend using the HLC guidelines as written.*]¹

¹ Most program faculty must meet these guidelines. However, individual exceptions may be granted for individuals teaching technically/occupationally related courses in areas where a degree one level above the level taught is uncommon and when it can be shown that the individual faculty member has clear expertise in the field as demonstrated by professional experience, licensure, or certification.

- *Faculty members teaching technically/occupationally related courses possess formal education and experience appropriate to the specialization.*
 - Generally, faculty members hold a terminal degree or a degree at least one level above¹ the level in which they are teaching.
 - ~~Technical faculty members hold a degree one level above¹ the level in which they are teaching.~~
 - Where applicable and appropriate, *technical faculty members possess certification or licenses, as appropriate.*
 - While the phrase “as appropriate” (deleted immediately above) allows flexibility, the CAOs prefer to use the “Tested Experience” guidance found on page 2 of the HLC faculty Credentials Guidance document as a basis for determining qualified faculty:
 - ✓ Tested experience implies that some objective measure ensures that the individual’s knowledge and expertise are sufficient for determining what students must learn and have learned. HLC examples include:
 - A faculty member who teaches courses for a pre-associate information technology, may not possess a graduate degree, but this person might have the industry certification and years of experience successfully working in the field;
 - A faculty member teaching creative writing, painting, or music may have had his/her expertise, ability, and talent validated through publication or through wide critical and public acclaim.

¹ Most program faculty must meet these guidelines. However, individual exceptions may be granted for individuals teaching technically/occupationally related courses in areas where a degree one level above the level taught is uncommon and when it can be shown that the individual faculty member has clear expertise in the field as demonstrated by professional experience, licensure, or certification.

- **Evidence of practical experience other than teaching is required, as demonstrated by employment or substantial experiences in the career area or related field.**

- **Faculty members show evidence of professional development in the discipline.**

Faculty members prepared by the institution do not constitute the majority of a degree or program's faculty. (Clarification on the purpose of this guideline is needed. It appears to be a standard more relevant to baccalaureate and graduate programs than to associate degree programs.)

- **Sufficiency of Faculty**

The number of faculty is sufficient to meet the teaching, scholarship, service and advising needs of the program and the expectations of the institution. [Here and throughout, the term "program" is neither clearly defined nor clearly understood.]

- **Full-time faculty resources will be sufficient to ensure the continuity of the program.**

- ~~**Each program is led by a full-time faculty member.**~~ (The CAOs would like this requirement to be removed. If the requirement is to remain, then we suggest the use of language such as "overseen by a full-time equivalent faculty member" instead of "led by a full-time faculty member.")

- **Full time faculty members will be involved at each physical location where more than 50% of an academic program can be completed (e.g., main campus, regional campus, external site).**

- ~~**A minimum of 60% of the program curriculum (excluding internships, clinical practicum, field experiences, and student teaching) is taught by full-time faculty members, including individuals involved in administration.**~~ (Strike this mandate. It is unaffordable for the state's two-year institutions. **At least 1 FTE faculty member is required for every 30 FTE students² in an undergraduate program.**

- **Where feasible, programs will be designed to encourage student interaction with various faculty members in a discipline-so that students receive a diversity of experiences and perspectives.**

- II. **Program Review** (The CAO's request that OBR focus on *initial program authorization* and leave the periodic program review to the usual and customary practices undertaken at each institution.)

Some additional points:

- Given that the *Guidelines* will address ever emerging trends in higher education, we recommend that general skills and abilities not be called by the limiting phrase "21st

² "Full-time-equivalent enrollment" is a measure of credit enrollment determined by dividing total student credit units of course registration for an entire fiscal year by thirty for institutions using a semester calendar and forty-five for institutions using a quarter calendar (3333-1-02)."

Century Skills.” We recommend the use of phrasing such as, for example, “lifelong learning skills,” instead.

- On p. 13 of the *draft*, for the purpose of clarity we recommend adding the word “program” to the first “hollow” bullet point at the top of the page, so that the item reads thus: “Program learning outcomes are appropriate for the degree designation....”
- In order to evaluate the draft proposal as fully as possible, we need to see and study the appendices, which we have not yet seen.