

**Proposed Changes in Ohio's Articulation and Transfer Policy
Report to the Academic Senate, October 1, 2003**

Resources

- **Current Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy:** Each state-assisted college or university (plus some private ones) designates a “Transfer Module”: 36-40 semester hours of general education courses in English composition, mathematics, arts/humanities, social and behavioral sciences, natural and physical sciences, and interdisciplinary courses. Students who **complete** the module at their **home** institution are guaranteed that they can transfer the courses and apply them to a subset of the general education requirements at **another** Ohio state-assisted or participating private institution. Other stipulations of the current policy (developed in 1989) are online at the following address: <<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/transfer/policy.html>>.
- **YSU's Current Module:** YSU's Transfer Module is described on pages 10-11 of the 2002-2003 *Undergraduate Bulletin*; see <<http://www.ysu.edu/catalog/catalog.htm>>.
- **Recommendations for Revising the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Module:** In 2002-2003, a statewide Policy Review Committee outlined recommendations for revising the current policy. Those recommendations are available via the “Draft Report” link at <<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/transfer/>>. The draft loads slowly but contains the full set of recommendations (pages 1-15). You may e-mail any concerns about proposed changes to Dick Arndt at the Ohio Board of Regents: darndt@regents.state.oh.us.
- **Revised House Bill 95:** Revised Ohio House Bill 95, passed this summer, requires in item A.2 a “universal course equivalency classification system.” This version of the bill, while not ideal, is less problematic than the original version, which called for common course numbering and titling statewide. The version that passed the legislature is online at <<http://www.regents.state.oh.us/transfer/H.B.95-web.pdf>>. The Policy Review Committee was aware of HB9 95 and tried to draft measures to address its stipulations.

**Some Strengths of Proposed Changes in the Articulation and
Transfer Policy and Its Implementation**

- New to the policy will be Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs)—advising guides outlining courses to take within, and in several cases beyond, the Transfer Module, depending on the discipline in which the student plans to major. These TAGs will help prospective transfer students with a strong sense of major choose Transfer Module (TM) courses that will apply to their degree and major after they transfer.
- The current TM will continue to serve “undecided or undetermined” students—i.e, those who don't know what their major will be.
- Technical Transfer Cores (also new to the policy) will help students with applied degrees transfer and apply more of their courses than is currently the case (current policy aids students with AA and AS degrees, but not those with applied degrees).

- Enabling students with a C average in the TM to transfer courses within the TM **whether or not** they have completed the full TM will ensure that all students are treated fairly. Currently, some students who take a partial TM are not allowed to transfer or apply the very same courses that a student who takes the full TM is allowed to transfer.
- The proposed changes will facilitate transfer rather than punishing students for transferring.
- The proposed changes will facilitate articulation agreements, distance learning, and development of degree-completion programs, potentially increasing the number of Ohioans with a baccalaureate degree.
- By holding transfer students to the same admissions requirements at the receiving institution as “native” students, the proposed policy recognizes differences in institutional mission and continues to treat native students and transfer students equitably.
- Publicizing the Articulation and Transfer Policy and the CAS system (available online at <<http://www.transfer.org/>>) as suggested in the recommendations will serve students and help advisors at both levels—postsecondary and K-12—advise students more effectively.

Possible Problems with Implementing Proposed Changes

- Implementing a Universal Course Equivalency System: A Universal Course Equivalency System is less problematic than the common course numbering and titling that the original HB 95 proposed, but achieving a Universal Course Equivalency System will be far more difficult to implement than the Review Committee imagined. It's one thing for Institution A to decide that a particular course at Institution B is equivalent to a particular course at Institution A and then to enter the equivalency into CAS; it will be a far harder thing to get institutions across the state to agree on which courses are equivalent.
- Translating Courses into Learning Outcomes: Translation of general education courses into learning outcomes and competencies will be a controversial issue at some institutions (despite current North Central Association emphasis on learning outcomes), as well as a time-consuming process for institutions and the committee charged with approving courses at the state level. It will likely be several years before outcomes and competencies can be defined in all areas within the transfer module, TAGs, and Technical Transfer Cores.
- Aligning Postsecondary and K-12 Standards: Aligning postsecondary entry standards with K-12 academic content standards will be difficult. The K-12 standards in areas such as English Language Arts are so high that open-admissions institutions could end up with most of their students taking developmental courses.
- Accepting Courses in the TAGs That Go Beyond the TM: Institutions may lose a bit of autonomy in stipulating some of the prereqs that a transfer student must meet for a particular major.
- Agreeing on Common ACT/SAT Cutoffs, CLEP Scores, etc: Agreeing on common placement and testing scores will be difficult, especially given differing institutional missions and admissions policies.
- Implementing the Recommendations: Implementing the recommendations will be expensive in time and money, at both state and institutional levels. If the state is not

willing to invest much of the money required for implementation of a Universal Course Equivalency System, institutions may be unable to implement many of the changes.

- Giving Credit for Completing a Partial Transfer Module: The state will need to make the transfer modules for all institutions available on a common web site, require all institutions to designate TM courses (as opposed to just designating a completed TM) on students' transcripts, or otherwise provide details about all of the transfer modules in the state because current rules require institutions to post only a statement about completed transfer modules on students' transcripts. It will be difficult for personnel at the receiving institution to know that a student has completed a partial TM.

Bege Bowers