MEMORANDUM

To: Chief Academic Officers, Provosts, Superintendents, Adult and Secondary Directors, OBR Coordinators, (CT)² Contacts, CTAG Coordinators, VCCs, Validation Panel Members, Tony Landis, Barbara Nicol, Kathy Shibley, and Rick Mangini

From: Paula Compton, Associate Vice Chancellor, Articulation and Transfer

Date: January 19, 2010

Topic: The Statewide Nature of (CT)² vs. Bilateral Local Transfer Agreements

Some confusion exists as to whether public institutions are required to participate in the Career Technical Credit Transfer (CT)² initiative (ORC 3333.162). The issue of mandatory participation in a statewide transfer initiative, such as (CT)², is further complicated by some who believe that locally crafted transfer agreements negate the necessity to submit their institution’s programs and/or courses for (CT)² approval.

It is helpful to take a moment and briefly review how the Career Technical Credit Transfer initiative came into existence. Revised Code 3333.162 called for criteria, policies, and procedures to be developed 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 policies and procedures using industry standards were to build upon the articulation agreement and transfer initiative course equivalency system required by section 3333.16 of the Revised Code. This association with Revised Code 3333.16 is very significant because Revised Code 3333.16 calls for the development of a required course equivalency system. In response to the mandates of Revised Code 3333.162 Career Technical Assurance Guides (CTAGs) have been developed. So far there are CTAGs in 17 technologies.

To address the confusion outlined earlier, when institutions offer any of the 17 (CT)² technologies they are required to submit their programs and/or courses for approval even when local transfer agreements exist. This rule applies to career-technical institutions (secondary or adult) and to colleges and universities alike. When an equivalent course or program has yet to be established by a college or university and when the institution offers the technical program it is required to grant credit that is no less than the minimum value assigned to the (CT)² course or program. As stated, this rule applies even though a local transfer agreement exists between a college and a career center.

(CT)² is a statewide transfer initiative whereas local transfer agreements are regional in nature. Local agreements address specific local needs, whereas, (CT)² addresses the more global necessity to move about the state without unnecessary duplication.

Career Technical Credit Transfer does not supplant nor replace local agreements. In fact, (CT)² encourages local transfer agreements; however such agreements must offer equivalent credit when compared to (CT)². It is recommended to use (CT)² guidelines that are found in the Career Technical Assurance Guides when renegotiating local transfer agreements. Lastly, the fact that local agreements exist does not excuse institutions from enrolling their programs or courses via the state system.

In closing, participation in (CT)² is mandatory and is backed by state statute. When institutions offer the programs or courses they must submit for approval. It is the responsibility of Chancellor Fingerhut to implement Revised Code 3333.162; therefore, all questions regarding the legislation should be directed to the Ohio Board of Regents in care of Dr. Paula Compton, Associate Vice Chancellor of Articulation and Transfer, at pcompton@regents.state.oh.us or 614.466.3334.

For more information about (CT)², readers are encouraged to visit www.regents.ohio.gov/careertechtransfer.