

Board Retreat Agenda

April 17, 2026 | Marion Tech Downtown

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 9:00–9:10 | Welcome and agenda overview |
| 9:10–9:30 | Review of legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Requirements (required vs optional)-Timeline for completion of initial work |
| 9:30–10:00 | Review of College Graduate Competencies <ul style="list-style-type: none">-How they are assessed-Curricular process |
| 10:00–10:30 | State transfer options explained <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Importance of transfer to the GE program |
| 10:30–10:45 | Break |
| 10:45–11:15 | Proposed guiding principles for work |
| 11:15–12:45 | Lunch (visit one of the downtown Marion restaurants) |
| 1:00–2:00 | Review/refine guiding principles and answer questions <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Determine timeline for next steps in the process |
| 2:00–2:30 | Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Future information needs of the Board for completion of work-Questions we need to address |

Marion Technical College
Board of Trustees
Special Board Meeting
Friday, April 17, 2026
Marion Tech Downtown Conference Room

Call to Order

Vice Chair McCleese called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll. Trustees present in-person were Vice Chair Michael McCleese, Mr. Tim Anderson, Ms. Mary Fox, Ms. Vidya Iyengar, Ms. Roxane Somerlot, and Mr. Don Plotts.

Chair Fogle and Ms. Jude Foulk were absent.

Dr. Ryan McCall, Dr. Bob Haas, Ms. Rhonda Ward, Ms. Laura Woughter, Ms. Amy Stahl, and Ms. Laura Emerick were also present.

General Education Curriculum Review

The Board convened for their retreat to discuss the legislative requirements to review the College's general education curriculum.

Legislative Requirement

Dr. McCall reviewed the agenda with the Board to discuss the state mandated general education curriculum review by the Board, in accordance with House Bill 96 of the 136th General Assembly.

Ms. Woughter and Dr. McCall reviewed with the Board the statutory requirements to meet the obligations of the legislation, with deadlines established:

- December 31, 2026 – Formal review and evaluation of components of the general education curriculum and adopt a resolution acknowledging the review.
- March 31, 2027 – Formal review and evaluation of curriculum to enhance content to meet attainment and workforce goals, including consideration of civics, culture, society, AI, STEM, computational thinking, entrepreneurship, innovation, and workforce readiness.

- June 30, 2027 – Adopt a resolution summarizing the changes as a result of the above process.

The group had an in-depth discussion related to the background for how the legislative requirement came about, including concerns about Board authority and other institutions struggling with enrollment or finances.

College Graduate Competencies

Ms. Stahl, Instructional Designer and Business Faculty, serves as the chair of the Curriculum Committee and as a Faculty Senate co-chair.

The curriculum process is responsible for aligning education with expectations in the field, ensuring quality programming, and improving student success. The College has identified seven College Graduate Competencies (CGCs) that all graduates are expected to possess as a common skill set. Ms. Stahl provided information on helping faculty develop learning outcomes to measure student proficiency. The College maintains levels of learning outcomes for the institution (i.e., CGCs), the program, and the individual course.

The curriculum mapping process ensures degrees and courses are aligned, identifies gaps, and provides clear paths for assessment of student learning. Faculty are responsible for designing curriculum, assessing outcomes, improving instruction from assessment results, and continuously improving the course. In assessing student learning, faculty are responsible for using data, including CGC data, to improve instruction. Assessment is a significant component of the College's accreditation requirements established by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC).

The group discussed the assessment process and how student learning data informs changes in curriculum design. The College's Assessment Committee, also chaired by Ms. Stahl, is aiding faculty to align program outcomes, mapping curriculum, and improving assessment to include both a "learn it" and "use it" point in time to demonstrate proficiency. Ms. Stahl showed the Board the assessment worksheet to show where CGCs are assessed throughout programs. Ms. Stahl noted there is a workgroup considering an AI policy for the institution, and anticipates from that work the College may adopt an AI-specific CGC based on industry feedback and state expectations.

Ms. Somerlot asked if there is a state-driven conversation of AI use in higher education, as opposed to each institution developing their own policies. Dr. McCall noted that would be commonplace for a system of institutions, but the College is able to determine what works best for its own processes and programs.

Ms. Somerlot asked how students are measured on professionalism, and Ms. Stahl provided the four categories of the CGC and explained examples of measuring the proficiency via a rubric. The group also discussed the differing expectations of programs based on industry and workforce expectations.

Transfer

Dr. Haas presented to the Board on transfer in the State of Ohio, with the end goal of ensuring easy transfer of courses between public institutions for the benefit of students. Faculty panels at the state level review submitted courses to the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Network (OATN) and determine if the course will be deemed Ohio Transfer 36 (general education), another transfer assurance guide (TAG, CTAG, ITAG, MTAG), or whether the student can demonstrate proficiency through advanced placement or a prior learning assessment (PLA). Dr. Haas reviewed a snapshot of the College's transfer compliance, as tracked by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). Marion Tech is ahead of the statewide average for compliance with TAG, CTAG, and ITAG courses and only slightly behind the average for OT36.

Ms. Emerick reviewed the Ohio Guaranteed Transfer Pathways developed by the State of Ohio through dedicated panels. The panels determine the eligible courses, and the College is responsible for matching courses, primarily OT36 or TAG, to the pathways. The College works to ensure OGTP are flexible to ensure students can maximize their credits toward transfer to their desired institution.

Proposed Guiding Principles

Dr. McCall provided to the group a list of proposed guiding principles for review and implementation:

- Mission alignment and community role;
- Student-centered;
- Faculty expertise and academic integrity;
- Clarity, simplicity, and transparency;
- Outcomes-based and assessable framework;
- Coherence, breadth, and relevance;
- Transferability and external alignment;
- Evidence-based decision making; and,
- Continuous improvement and accountability.

Ms. Iyengar asked how much of the outlined work is new to the institution, and Dr. McCall affirmed the College is already completing curriculum review, though the role of the Board in understanding and revising general education curriculum will be new. Mr. Plotts shared the

faculty still have the autonomy in developing curriculum, however the Board is to ensure alignment to workforce needs and having a global understanding of the process.

The group discussed the guiding principles as provided, which can be utilized as evidence in showing the Board's review and evaluation process.

The group also discussed how to manage the review of individual courses and the difference of the curricular approval process adopted in March 2026.

Ms. Fox urged the Board to take an active role on AI policy development to provide guidance to the faculty. Dr. McCall asked to allow Dr. Stacie Campbell, Chief Academic Officer, to continue to develop a recommendation to provide to the Board for approval.

Ms. Iyengar moved to adopt the guiding principles, and Ms. Fox seconded. By a unanimous vote, the principles were adopted.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting. The Board adjourned at 11:45 a.m.